

Internet Engineering Task Force  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: [6790](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: June 15, 2015

J. Scudder  
K. Kompella  
Juniper Networks  
December 12, 2014

## **Deprecation of BGP Entropy Label Capability Attribute draft-ietf-mpls-deprecate-bgp-entropy-label-02**

### Abstract

[RFC 6790](#) defines the BGP Entropy Label Capability attribute. Regrettably, it has a bug: although [RFC 6790](#) mandates that Entropy Label-incapable routers must remove the attribute, in practice this requirement can't be guaranteed to be fulfilled. This specification deprecates the attribute. A forthcoming document will propose a replacement.

### 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 June 15, 2015.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in [Section 4](#).e of

the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## **1. Introduction**

[RFC6790] defines the Entropy Label Capability attribute (ELCA), an optional, transitive BGP path attribute. For correct operation, it is necessary that an intermediate node modifying the next hop of a route must remove the ELCA unless the node so doing is able to process entropy labels. Sadly, this requirement cannot be fulfilled with the ELCA as specified, because it is an optional, transitive attribute: by definition, a node that does not support the ELCA will propagate the attribute. (This is a general property of optional, transitive attributes, see [RFC4271].) But such an ELCA-oblivious node is likely to also be entropy label-incapable and is exactly the one that we desire to remove the attribute!

This specification updates [RFC 6790](#) by deprecating the version of ELCA defined in [Section 5.2](#) of that document. A forthcoming document will propose a replacement. All other sections of [RFC 6790](#) are unchanged.

### **1.1. Requirements Language**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [RFC2119].

## **2. Deprecation of ELCA**

This document deprecates the ELCA path attribute. This means that any implementation MUST NOT generate the attribute. If received it MUST be treated as any other unrecognized optional transitive attribute as per [RFC4271], until and unless the code point is reused by some new specification. (To the authors' best knowledge, there are no implementations of ELCA at the time of writing.)

## **3. IANA Considerations**

For the reasons given in [Section 1](#), IANA is requested to mark attribute 28 in the "BGP Path Attributes" registry as "deprecated" and reference this RFC.

## **4. Security Considerations**

ELCA as defined in [RFC6790] S. 5.2, has in common with other optional, transitive path attributes the property that it will be "tunneled" through intervening routers that don't implement the



relevant specification. Unfortunately, as discussed elsewhere in this document, implementations of [\[RFC6790\]](#) S. 5.2 receiving such "tunneled" attributes could -- sometimes improperly -- rely on them. The consequence of so doing could be a black hole in the forwarding path for the affected routes. Whether this is a new security issue or not is somewhat debatable, since to be exploited an attacker would have to be part of the control plane path for the route in question, and under those circumstances an attacker already has a panoply of mischief-making tools available, as discussed in [\[RFC4272\]](#).

In any case, this document renders any real or imagined security issues with ELCA moot, by deprecating it.

## **5. Acknowledgements**

Thanks to Alia Atlas, Bruno Decraene, Martin Djernaes, John Drake, Adrian Farrell, Keyur Patel, Ravi Singh and Kevin Wang for their discussion of this issue.

## **6. References**

### **6.1. Normative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC6790] Kompella, K., Drake, J., Amante, S., Henderickx, W., and L. Yong, "The Use of Entropy Labels in MPLS Forwarding", [RFC 6790](#), November 2012.

### **6.2. Informative References**

- [RFC4271] Rekhter, Y., Li, T., and S. Hares, "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", [RFC 4271](#), January 2006.
- [RFC4272] Murphy, S., "BGP Security Vulnerabilities Analysis", [RFC 4272](#), January 2006.

#### Authors' Addresses

John G. Scudder  
Juniper Networks

Email: [jgs@juniper.net](mailto:jgs@juniper.net)

Kireeti Kompella  
Juniper Networks

Email: [kireeti@juniper.net](mailto:kireeti@juniper.net)