Abstract

RFC7432 defines Ethernet VPN as a BGP address family that makes use of Typed NLRIs. IANA has a registry called "EVPN Route Types" that allocates values to Route Types. The purpose of this document is to solicit IANA the registration of a route type value for a vendor specific usage, as well as the definition of the EVPN NLRI for that route.

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), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html
1. Introduction

RFC7432 creates an IANA managed registry called "EVPN Route Types" and makes the initial registrations for different NLRIs. The ability to define Typed NLRIs makes EVPN a flexible and extensible technology that can be used for multiple purposes. This document solicits the value 255 for a new Route Type that will be called "EVPN Vendor Specific" Route Type.

The intend of this new Type is to allow operators and vendors to design rapidly new EVPN applications/prototypes and experiment with them in deployed networks before standardizing the specific application. Software Defined Networks (SDN) are evolving fast and the flexibility allowed by this new Route Type will contribute to the SDN control plane evolution.
Another motivation for this new Route Type is the exchange of vendor specific information that may be relevant only for the vendor using it. Other vendors may convey the information in a different way, or they simply don’t need to exchange it.

In order to allow multiple applications, the new NLRI contains a Organizational Unique Identifier (OUI) field for which the IEEE registers and maintains values.

2. The EVPN Vendor-Specific Route Type

[RFC7432] defines the EVPN NLRI with the following format:

```
+-----------------------------------+
|    Route Type (1 octet)           |
+-----------------------------------+
|     Length (1 octet)              |
+-----------------------------------+
| Route Type specific (variable)    |
+-----------------------------------+
```

Where Route Type can be a value between 0 and 255. IANA maintains a registry called "EVPN Route Types" where the different values are assigned. This document solicits a new Route Type with value 255.

When the Route Type field includes the value 255, the Route Type specific field will include the following information:

```
+--------------------------------------------+
|    Route Distinguisher (RD) (8 octets)     |
+--------------------------------------------+
| Organizational Unique Id (OUI) (3 octets)  |
+--------------------------------------------+
| Vendor Key Length (1 octet)                |
+--------------------------------------------+
|            Vendor Specific Key             |
|                (variable)                  |
+--------------------------------------------+
|               Vendor Specific              |
|            Information (variable)          |
+--------------------------------------------+
```

Where OUI, Vendor Key Length and Vendor Specific Key are considered part of the route key for BGP processing. The Vendor Key Length field indicates the length in octets of the Vendor Specific Key field of...
the NLRI.

The OUI values are owned and assigned by the IEEE Registration Authority.

As per [RFC7606] section 5.4, a BGP speaker advertising support for EVPN address family MUST handle routes with unrecognized NLRI types within that address family by discarding them unless the relevant specification for that address family specifies otherwise. However, a BGP speaker supporting this new Route Type MUST accept the route even if the OUI and Vendor fields are unrecognized. Specifically, a Route Reflector MUST forward this new route type to its BGP peers, even if the receiver does not understand or cannot process the route.

3. Conventions used in this document

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 BCP14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

4. Security Considerations

The relevant Security Considerations described in [RFC7432] apply to the new Route Type defined in this document.

5. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate a new value in the "EVPN Route Types" registry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>255</th>
<th>EVPN Vendor Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[This document]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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