

AIGP Last Call Issues

- After almost 5 years, 5 implementations, and significant deployment, draft finally reaches WG last call
- So folks not directly involved read the draft for the first time
- Some interesting issues raised during LC, some controversy about how to address those issues
- Some F2F discussion seems worthwhile before finalizing
- Note: no objections raised during LC to “meat” of draft, i.e. to rules for computing and using the value of the AIGP attribute (semantics)
- Objections raised to error handling, encoding, “leakage protection” at admin boundaries, i.e., stuff that might impact “somebody else”
- Want to focus discussion on LC issues ...

AIGP

- BGP Path Attribute: Accumulated IGP Metric of path to prefix
- Allows IGP metric to be major determinant of bestpath selection for BGP-distributed internal routes
 - Provisioning determines the set of prefixes to which AIGP gets attached
 - BGP becomes a sort of IGP for those prefixes
- **Must not leak** out past administrative boundary
 - **Not** an inter-provider metric
 - AIGP is **non-transitive** attribute, discarded when not recognized
 - By default, even if recognized, AIGP treated as unrecognized (discarded) on EBGP sessions
 - All admin boundaries are EBGP sessions (converse not true)
- For possible future expansion, attribute coded as list of TLVs, but only type 1 (*IGP distance*) defined

Error Handling for Malformed AIGP Attribute

- Not clearly specified in draft
- What's best: *treat as withdraw*, or *discard attribute*?
- *Treat as withdraw* is default for attributes affecting bestpath selection
 - But AIGP is only to be used in scenarios where there is tunneling to the next hop; complete consistency not needed
- *Discard attribute* is therefore less disruptive way to handle malformed attribute
- *Discard attribute* is also very like what is done with an unrecognized transitive attribute
- Proposed resolution: use *discard attribute* as error handling method

Can the Non-Transitivity Break?

- R1---(ibgp)---ASBR1----(ebgp)----ASBR2
- AS containing ASBR2 uses AIGP
 - ASBR2 mistakenly sets the transitive bit on the AIGP attribute
 - ASBR2 mistakenly sends AIGP attribute to ASBR1
- ASBR1 does not understand attribute, sees transitive bit, forwards to R1 when really the attribute ought to be discarded
- R1 understands AIGP attribute and is provisioned to use it.
 - But now it mistakenly has received the attribute from across an admin boundary
 - Should R1:
 - Clear the transitive bit and forward the attribute (local repair)? Or
 - *Discard attribute* as malformed
 - Proposed resolution: *discard attribute* as malformed
 - Attribute isn't supposed to be processed by R1 or forwarded any further
 - Restores the proper non-transitive behavior

TLV Encoding Issues

- Length field not specified “correctly”, shouldn’t include length of type and length fields
 - Too late
 - Sorry ☹
- What if attribute contains multiple type 1 TLVs?
 - Is this malformed, or should one of the type 1 TLVs be used and the others ignored?
 - Proposed resolution: do not treat as malformed, use the first one.
 - Other TLV types to be ignored if not recognized, of course.

Disabled By Default

- Default per-session settings:
 - Do not originate routes with AIGP
 - On EBGP sessions, discard attribute if received
 - So:
 - On EBGP sessions, attribute shouldn't pass unless enabled on both sides
 - On IBGP sessions, attribute will pass if enabled on one side
 - Enough protection against leakage?
 - Think so; but controversial on mailing list.
 - Enough protection against errors?
 - Can't protect against all errors

Capability Needed?

- Capability needed?
 - No, shouldn't need a capability for every new (optional) attribute