GROW
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 12 April 2026

M. Srivastava
Juniper Networks
Y. Liu
China Mobile
C. Lin
New H3C Technologies
J. Li
China Mobile

9 October 2025

Advanced BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP) Statistics Types
draft-ietf-grow-bmp-bgp-rib-stats-10

Abstract

RFC 7854 defines different BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP) statistics message types to observe events that occur on a monitored router. This document defines new statistics type to monitor BMP Adj-RIB-In and Adj-RIB-Out Routing Information Bases (RIBs).

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 https://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 12 April 2026.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Requirements Language 2
2. Statistics Definition 3
2.1. Adj-RIB-In Statistics Definition 3
2.2. Adj-RIB-Out Statistics Definition 5
3. IANA Considerations 6
4. Operational Considerations 8
5. Security Considerations 9
6. Implementation Status 9
6.1. Juniper Networks 10
6.2. New H3C Technologies 11
7. Acknowledgements 12
8. References 12
8.1. Normative References 12
8.2. Informational References 13
Authors' Addresses 13

1. Introduction

Section 4.8 of [RFC7854] defines a number of different BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP) statistics types to observe major events that occur on a monitored router. Stats are either counters or gauges. Section 6.2 of [RFC8671] also defines several BMP statistics types for Adj-RIB-Out of a monitored router.

This document defines new gauges for BMP statistics message. The format of the BMP statistics message remains same as defined in [RFC7854].

1.1. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

The terminology in this document aligns with [RFC7854] and [RFC8671].

2. Statistics Definition

This section defines different statistics type for Adj-RIB-In and Adj-RIB-Out monitoring type.

2.1. Adj-RIB-In Statistics Definition

* Type = 18: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in pre-policy Adj-RIB-In [RFC7854]. This gauge updates stats type 7 defined in [RFC7854] and makes it an explicit for pre-policy Adj-RIB-In. When the monitoring station supports both type 7 and type 18, the monitored router SHOULD send only one of these types.

* Type = 19: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-Address Family Identifier (AFI)/Subsequent Address Family Identifier (SAFI) pre-policy Adj-RIB-In. This gauge is similar to stats type 9 defined in Section 4.8 of [RFC7854] and makes it an explicit for pre-policy Adj-RIB-In. When the monitoring station supports both type 9 and type 19, the monitored router SHOULD send only one of these types. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 20: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in post-policy Adj-RIB-In [RFC7854].

* Type = 21: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 22: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI rejected by inbound policy. This gauge is different from stats type 0 defined in Section 4.8 of [RFC7854]. The stats type 0 is a 32-counter which is a monotonically increasing number and doesn’t represent the current number of routes rejected by an inbound policy due to ongoing configuration changes. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 23: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI accepted by inbound policy. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. Some implementations, or configurations in implementations, may discard routes that do not match policy and thus the accepted count and the Adj-RIB-In counts will be identical in such cases.

* Type = 24: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI selected as primary route. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. A primary route is

a recursive or non-recursive path whose next-hop resolution ends with an adjacency (see, e.g., [I-D.ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic]). A prefix can have more than one primary path if multipath is configured. A best path is also considered as a primary path. This statistic would apply to Loc-RIB view as well.

* Type = 25: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI selected as a backup route. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. A backup path is also installed in the Loc-RIB, but it is not used until some or all primary paths become unreachable. Backup paths are used for fast convergence in the event of failures. This statistic would apply to Loc-RIB view as well.

* Type = 26: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI suppressed by configured route damping policy. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. 'Suppressed' refers to a path which has been declared suppressed by the BGP Route Flap Damping mechanism as described in Section 2.2 of [RFC2439]. This statistic would apply to Loc-RIB view as well.

* Type = 27: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI marked as stale by Graceful Restart (GR) events. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. 'Stale' refers to a path which has been declared stale by the BGP GR mechanism as described in Section 4.1 of [RFC4724]. This statistic would apply to Loc-RIB view as well.

* Type = 28: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI marked as stale by Long-Lived Graceful Restart (LLGR). The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. 'Stale' refers to a path which has been declared stale by the BGP LLGR mechanism as described in Section 4.3 of [RFC9494]. This statistic would apply to Loc-RIB view as well.

* Type = 29: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes left until reaching the received route threshold as defined in Section 6.7 of [RFC4271].

* Type = 30: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI left until reaching the received route threshold as defined in Section 6.7 of [RFC4271]. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 31: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes left until reaching a license-customized route threshold. This value is affected by whether a customized license exists for the relevant address family, and when the customized license is installed. This statistic would apply to Loc-RIB view as well.

* Type = 32: (64-bit Gauge) Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI left until reaching a license-customized route threshold. This value is affected by whether a customized license exists for the relevant address family, and when the customized license is installed. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. This statistic would apply to Loc-RIB view as well.

* Type = 33: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes rejected by exceeding the length threshold of AS PATH.

* Type = 34: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI rejected by exceeding the length threshold of AS PATH. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 35: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In invalidated through the Route Origin Authorization (ROA) of Resource Public Key Infrastructure (RPKI) [RFC6811]. This is total number of routes invalidated due to origin Autonomous System (AS) number mismatch and prefix length mismatch. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 36: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In validated by verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI [RFC6811]. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 37: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In not found by verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI [RFC6811]. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

2.2. Adj-RIB-Out Statistics Definition

* Type = 38: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI rejected by outbound policy. These routes are active routes which should otherwise would have been advertised in absence of outbound policy which rejected them. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge. This counter only considers routes distributed from Loc-RIB into the Adj-RIB-Out and

does not include cases like BGP add-paths [RFC7911].

* Type = 39: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes refused to be sent by exceeding the length threshold of AS-PATH.

* Type = 40: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI refused to be sent by exceeding the length threshold of AS-PATH. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 41: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-Out invalidated through the ROA of RPKI [RFC6811]. This is total number of routes invalidated due to origin AS number mismatch and prefix length mismatch. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 42: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-Out validated by verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI [RFC6811]. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

* Type = 43: (64-bit Gauge) Current number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-Out not found by verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI [RFC6811]. The value is structured as: 2-byte AFI, 1-byte SAFI, followed by a 64-bit Gauge.

3. IANA Considerations

IANA has assigned the following new parameters in the BMP Statistics Types registry, part of the BMP parameters registry group (https://www.iana.org/assignments/bmp-parameters/bmp-parameters.xhtml).

This document requests IANA to update these entries as follows. Also, the document requests IANA to update the reference cited for the entries with the RFC number to be assigned to this document.

* Type = 18: Number of routes currently in pre-policy Adj-RIB-In.

* Type = 19: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI pre-policy Adj-RIB-In.

* Type = 20: Number of routes currently in post-policy Adj-RIB-In.

* Type = 21: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In.

* Type = 22: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI rejected by inbound policy.

* Type = 23: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI accepted by inbound policy.

* Type = 24: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI selected as primary route.

* Type = 25: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI selected as a backup route.

* Type = 26: Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI suppressed by configured route damping policy.

* Type = 27: Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI marked as stale by GR events.

* Type = 28: Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI marked as stale by LLGR.

* Type = 29: Number of routes left until reaching the received route threshold.

* Type = 30: Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI left until reaching the received route threshold.

* Type = 31: Number of routes left until reaching a license-customized route threshold.

* Type = 32: Number of routes in per-AFI/SAFI left until reaching a license-customized route threshold.

* Type = 33: Number of routes currently rejected due to exceeding the length threshold of AS-PATH.

* Type = 34: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI rejected due to exceeding the length threshold of AS-PATH.

* Type = 35: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In invalidated after verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI.

* Type = 36: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In validated after verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI.

* Type = 37: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-In not found after verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI.

* Type = 38: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI rejected by outbound policy.

* Type = 39: Number of routes currently refused to be sent by exceeding the length threshold of AS-PATH.

* Type = 40: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI refused to be sent by exceeding the length threshold of AS-PATH.

* Type = 41: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-Out invalidated after verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI.

* Type = 42: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-Out validated after verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI.

* Type = 43: Number of routes currently in per-AFI/SAFI post-policy Adj-RIB-Out not found after verifying route origin AS number through the ROA of RPKI.

4. Operational Considerations

This document defines new gauges for BMP statistics messages. The format of BMP statistics messages remains unchanged from [RFC7854]. Transmission scheduling and triggering mechanisms are implementation-dependent. Implementations SHOULD determine appropriate report generation and delivery strategies, including configurable timing intervals and threshold values.

Some statistics are dependent on feature configurations, such as GR, LLGR, and RPKI, so the corresponding statistics are only sent when these features are enabled. This statistics include Type 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 43.

Some statistics are also relevant for the Loc-RIB view, so they may apply to the Loc-RIB view after best-path selection is completed. This statistics include Type 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, and 32.

Certain statistics may have logical relationships (e.g., per-AFI/SAFI counts summing to global totals). Implementations MAY perform consistency checks but MUST NOT assume strict dependencies (due to potential race conditions or partial failures). Discrepancies (e.g., sum(per-AFI/SAFI) != global count) SHOULD be logged as warnings but MUST NOT disrupt protocol operation.

Counters may reset due to session restart, manual clearance, or overflow. Implementations MUST track discontinuities and log this information.

Operators MAY consider rate-limiting statistic updates to minimize performance impact on control-plane processes. Operators SHOULD enable only necessary statistics to reduce memory/CPU overhead.

A BMP implementation MUST ignore unrecognized stat types upon receipt and MUST exclude unsupported stat types upon transmission.

5. Security Considerations

This document does not add any additional security considerations other than those discussed in Section 11 of [RFC7854].

6. Implementation Status

Note to the RFC Editor - remove this section before publication, as well as remove the reference to [RFC7942].

This section records the status of known implementations of the protocol defined by this specification at the time of posting of this Internet-Draft, and is based on a proposal described in [RFC7942]. The description of implementations in this section is intended to assist the IETF in its decision processes in progressing drafts to RFCs. Please note that the listing of any individual implementation here does not imply endorsement by the IETF. Furthermore, no effort has been spent to verify the information presented here that was supplied by IETF contributors. This is not intended as, and must not be construed to be, a catalog of available implementations or their features. Readers are advised to note that other implementations may exist.

According to [RFC7942], "this will allow reviewers and working groups to assign due consideration to documents that have the benefit of running code, which may serve as evidence of valuable experimentation and feedback that have made the implemented protocols more mature. It is up to the individual working groups to use this information as they see fit".

6.1. Juniper Networks

* Organization: Juniper Networks.
* Implementation:
* Description: Below RIB-IN statistics are implemented.
  - Type = 18.
  - Type = 19.
  - Type = 20.
  - Type = 21.
  - Type = 22.
  - Type = 23.
  - Type = 26.
  - Type = 27.
  - Type = 28.
  - Type = 35.
  - Type = 36.
  - Type = 37.
* Maturity Level: Demo
* Coverage:
* Version: Draft-05
* Licensing: N/A
* Implementation experience: Nothing specific.
* Contact: msri@juniper.net
* Last updated: January 20, 2025

6.2. New H3C Technologies

* Organization: New H3C Technologies.

* Implementation: H3C CR16000, CR19000 series routers implementation of New BMP Statistics Type.

* Description: Below New types have been implemented in above-mentioned New H3C Products (running Version 7.1.086 and above).

  - Type = 18.

  - Type = 19.

  - Type = 20.

  - Type = 21.

  - Type = 22.

  - Type = 23.

  - Type = 24.

  - Type = 25.

  - Type = 29.

  - Type = 30.

  - Type = 31.

  - Type = 32.

  - Type = 33.

  - Type = 34.

  - Type = 35.

  - Type = 36.

  - Type = 37.

  - Type = 38.

  - Type = 39.

- Type = 40.

* Maturity Level: Demo

* Coverage:

* Version: Draft-05

* Licensing: N/A

* Implementation experience: Nothing specific.

* Contact: linchangwang.04414@h3c.com

* Last updated: January 20, 2025

7. Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Jeff Haas, Mohamed Boucadair, Thomas Graf and Prasad S. Narasimha for their valuable input.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>.

[RFC2439] Villamizar, C., Chandra, R., and R. Govindan, "BGP Route Flap Damping", RFC 2439, DOI 10.17487/RFC2439, November 1998, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2439>.

[RFC4271] Rekhter, Y., Ed., Li, T., Ed., and S. Hares, Ed., "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", RFC 4271, DOI 10.17487/RFC4271, January 2006, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4271>.

[RFC4724] Sangli, S., Chen, E., Fernando, R., Scudder, J., and Y. Rekhter, "Graceful Restart Mechanism for BGP", RFC 4724, DOI 10.17487/RFC4724, January 2007, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4724>.

[RFC6811] Mohapatra, P., Scudder, J., Ward, D., Bush, R., and R. Austein, "BGP Prefix Origin Validation", RFC 6811, DOI 10.17487/RFC6811, January 2013, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6811>.

[RFC7854] Scudder, J., Ed., Fernando, R., and S. Stuart, "BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP)", RFC 7854, DOI 10.17487/RFC7854, June 2016, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7854>.

[RFC7911] Walton, D., Retana, A., Chen, E., and J. Scudder, "Advertisement of Multiple Paths in BGP", RFC 7911, DOI 10.17487/RFC7911, July 2016, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7911>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>.

[RFC8671] Evens, T., Bayraktar, S., Lucente, P., Mi, P., and S. Zhuang, "Support for Adj-RIB-Out in the BGP Monitoring Protocol (BMP)", RFC 8671, DOI 10.17487/RFC8671, November 2019, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8671>.

[RFC9494] Uttaro, J., Chen, E., Decraene, B., and J. Scudder, "Long-Lived Graceful Restart for BGP", RFC 9494, DOI 10.17487/RFC9494, November 2023, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9494>.

8.2. Informational References

[I-D.ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic] Bashandy, A., Filsfils, C., and P. Mohapatra, "BGP Prefix Independent Convergence", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic-22, 20 April 2025, <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-rtgwg-bgp-pic-22>.

[RFC7942] Sheffer, Y. and A. Farrel, "Improving Awareness of Running Code: The Implementation Status Section", BCP 205, RFC 7942, DOI 10.17487/RFC7942, July 2016, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7942>.

Authors' Addresses

Mukul Srivastava
Juniper Networks
10 Technology Park Dr
Westford, MA 01886
United States of America
Email: msri@juniper.net

Yisong Liu
China Mobile
32 Xuanwumen West Street
Beijing
Xicheng District, 100053
China
Email: liuyisong@chinamobile.com

Changwang Lin
New H3C Technologies
8 Yongjia North Road
Beijing
Haidian District, 100094
China
Email: linchangwang.04414@h3c.com

Jinming Li
China Mobile
32 Xuanwumen West Street
Beijing
Xicheng District, 100053
China
Email: lijinming@chinamobile.com