

NTAC Peering and Routing Working Group

10/19/2021 Call Notes

1. Agenda Bash
 - a. Discussion of network equipment room horror shows
 - b. Steve Wallace: I2 looking for community consensus on when to change Route Origin Validation policy
2. Update on peering and I2PX
 - a. Focus has been on Service Migrations. For I2PX, peer-facing migrations have been a major focus. NY 111 8th POP completely migrated. Dallas done, Chicago done. San Jose complete. Number of peers at Ashburn migrated. Up next: Seattle, Los Angeles, Ashburn. Equipment locations changing in LA and ASH, which is adding time. In parallel with NGI migration, have public exchange migrations. CoreSite Any2 has been one. Three Equinix upgrades: LA, San Jose, Dallas all to 100G. Working on when service cutover, likely late next week for all three. In NT, DKIX and NYEX to 2x100G from 2x10G.
3. Network Weather Update – trends and coming events
 - a. Nothing specific. Lots of Apple traffic, but that is near normal.
4. Internet2 Network update
 - a. Jeff shared a Grafana dashboard. Illustrated uptick of traffic on NGI. Interconnect links to old network show uptick and decrease as peers are migrated to NGI, as with shim interfaces. Graph illustrating active interface on MX network vs NGI interfaces. BGP Neighbor graph – starting with 850 R&E neighbors, down this week to just under 300. I2PX neighbors from 250 to just under 50.
5. AOB?
 - a. I2 looking for input on when to change Route Origin Validation policy, Steve Wallace. On order of ½ dozen invalid in R&E table. Should look at dropping routes that fail ROV test. This could include both the failed route and peers that share that failed route. GEANT apparently deletes such routes. Question is, at what point in time does I2 actually adopt MANRs policy of dropping such routes?
 - b. Connectors have been made aware of campuses that have such issues. There are also a handful of destination routes in I2PX that also have issues.
 - c. Steve is looking for comments either directly to him, the P&R listserv, or the NTAC slack channel.
 - d. Route reports that Steve produces largely come from Juniper routers on old network. New Cisco routers are less easy to pull such data from. This may result in a brief period of not-updated reports.
 - e. Farmer: is the option yes or no, or is there an in-between? You can validate and accept invalids, but if you're validating, would prefer valid over invalid.
 - i. Harden: trying to validate how validation works in lab but have run into some snags.

- ii. Wallace: if invalid is more specific than a covering route, this could be an issue. Farmer: most are /24's so there would be no more specific. Concern that there would be state churn if there are updates.
- iii. Bartig: If we allow these routes in the table and they are used in route path calculation, could cause issue.
- iv. Wallace: will have a webinar or two to see input. Will not do tomorrow or next month. But, at some point – maybe next year – it may be appropriate to begin dropping RPKI invalids.
- v. Diller: how many are nefarious vs. cruft? Bartig: depends on which direction we are looking. Looking inward, it is cruft. Looking outward, it is nefarious, and that's what we're wanting to protect folks from.

6. Adjourn