draft-ietf-grow-ops-reqs-for-bgp-error-handling

Rob Shakir, BT.

IETF85 – Nov' 12.
Atlanta, USA.

Open Issues from RtgDir Review and IETF Last Call (I).

- **Thanks to Chris Hall and Geoff Huston for detailed reviews.**

1. How do we classify errors?

- **Critical vs. Semantic** - essentially, those that are length errors vs. those that are in content (current draft) – **rename to "Critical" vs. "Non-Critical"?**
- **Critical/Serious/Ignorable/Recoverable –** Essentially, length errors as above, and then some special treatment – **are Ignorable and Recoverable are special cases requiring knowledge of the attribute?**
- **PROPOSAL:** Follow recommendation to rename to "non-critical" unless there are better suggestions.

2. How much detail of how to classify errors should the draft go to?

- **Current level:** Overview of key considerations for Critical vs. Non-Critical – no detailed analysis of particular attributes.
- **Lower level:** As discussed by Chris Hall – discussion down to what level of framing error is acceptable and how certain we need to be.
- **PROPOSAL**: Leave GROW draft as-is, and allow further detail in IDR draft (drat-ietf-idr-error-handling).

Open Issues from RtgDir Review and IETF Last Call (II).

3. Analysis of existing behaviour (Section 3).

- Is this required in the document? Potentially should be part of the problem statement.
- Historically motivating treat-as-withdraw being implemented wider than Optional Transitive only.
- This looks to be happening within draft-ietf-idr-error-handling.
- **PROPOSAL**: Follow suggestion and integrate this into the problem statement section – noting historical view

4. Operational Toolset section in the draft.

- Note that this potentially is a scope creep. Should it be separate?
- **PROPOSAL**:
- Note criticality of addressing operational monitoring in parallel with changing procedures.
- Recommend that it is kept within this draft – rather than spinning separate draft off.

7. Duplication of requirements/analysis between sections.

- Need to clarify wording, based on historical growth of the document – to be addressed following discussion of above proposals.