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Abstract

The BGP Registries at IANA were set up as one of the earliest IANA registries. Over time, the registries have become denoted as requiring "standards action", "early allocation", "FCFS (first-come, first served)", "vendor specific", and "IETF review". This draft proposes that certain BGP registries that are labelled "standards action", "early allocation", or "IETF Review" add to these registration actions a "Expert Review. It also proposes that the chairs of BGP Protocol related WG groups be part of the review team. The intent is that these chairs will be responsible for bringing questionable allocations to their workings attention.

The BGP relate working groups are currently the IDR, BESS, SIDROPS, and GROW, but other working groups like SPRING might be added.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 14, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.
1. Introduction

During 2016, several BGP attributes were squatted upon causing operational problems during the early deployment of large communities [RFC8092]. Due these problems, [RFC8093] deprecated the use of 6 attribute numbers.

To avoid this problem in the future, it is helpful to increase pace of the early-allocations process and to coordinate the review of key BGP registries. This document proposes to augment existing registration processes for BGP registries with Expert review.

This draft proposes that certain BGP registries that are labelled "standards action", "early allocation", or "IETF Review" add to these registration actions a "Expert Review. It also recommends that the chairs of BGP Protocol related WG groups be part of the review team.

2. BGP Registries to Change Registration Process on

This document proposes the that IETF BGP registries in Table 1 below require their current registration policy plus Expert Review. It recommends that the chairs of the BGP related working groups (e.g. IDR, Bess, SIDROPS, GROW) be a part of this review team. The IESG can define which working groups are BGP working groups, but it is important to get the chairs of the Working Groups that originate or maintain the drafts in Table 1 as part of the review team.
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If no BGP WG groups remain, the IESG may select designated experts to fulfill this role.

ER = Expert Review

Table 1 - Registries with changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BGP registry</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>reference</th>
<th>Add ER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message Types</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC4271</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Path Attributes</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC4271</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Error (notification) codes</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC4271 RFC7313</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Error Subcodes</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC4271</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Message Error subcodes</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC4271</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Finite State Machine Error subcodes</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC6608</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Cease NOTIFICATION message subcodes</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC4486 RFC4486</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Route Refresh Message Error subcodes</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC7313 RFC7313</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Outbound Route Filtering (ORF) Types</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC5291 RFC5291</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Open Optional Parameter types</td>
<td>IETF Review</td>
<td>RFC5492 RFC5492</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Tunnel Encapsulation Attribute Sub-TLVS</td>
<td>Standards Action</td>
<td>RFC7311 RFC7311</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The registries in Table 2 have Expert Review. This document requests that IANA increase their designated expert pool by adding to the pool the chairs in BGP related Working Groups (E.g. IDR, BESS, SIDROPS, GROW).

ER = Expert Review

Table 2 - Registries with Expert Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BGP registry</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>reference</th>
<th>Add ER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGP Layer 2 Encapsulation Types</td>
<td>Expert Review</td>
<td>RFC6624</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0-127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP Layer 2 TLV Types</td>
<td>Expert Review</td>
<td>RFC6624</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Security Considerations

Administrative process - Not applicable.
4.  IANA Considerations

For all of the BGP registries or portions of BGP Registries listed in table 1 append "Designated reviewers" to the registration process.

This document requests the IESG nominate the chairs of the current BGP related working groups which manage the following base protocols that established the registries:

[RFC4271],
[RFC4486],
[RFC5291],
[RFC5492],
[RFC5512],
[RFC6608],
[RFC6624],
[RFC7311],
[RFC7313],
[RFC7385],
[RFC7441],
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