

## Internet Routing Architectures, Second Edition

ISBN: 1-57870-233-X

Cisco Press

### Errata

Pg 91 – The fourth sentence of the first paragraph should read: “Chapter 5 **provides** an overview of how BGP Version 4 (BGP-4) operates and how and what it negotiates with neighboring routers”.

Pg 106 – The second sentence of the first paragraph should read: “Transit traffic (relative to the multihomed AS) is any traffic that has an origin and destination that does not belong to the local AS”.

Pg 190 – Table 6-6, Fourth row across should read as follows:

Connected customer routes	$^300\_^100\_$	300 400, 300	NetA, NetB, NetC, NetD
And their customers' routes		100 200, 100	

Table 6-6, Sixth row across should read as follows:

Routes that passed via AS100	$\_ 100 \_$	100 200, 100	NetC, NetD
------------------------------	-------------	--------------	------------

Pg 206 - The fourth sentence of the fourth paragraph, beginning with: “Many operators choose...” needs to be deleted.

Pg 243 – The fourth sentence of the first paragraph should read: “In Figure 8-1, RTA is receiving the 0/0 from RTB with a metric of 10, from RTE with a metric of 20 (**RTA-to-RTE: 10 + RTE-to-RTB: 10**), and from RTF with a metric of 30 (RTA-to-RTF: 10 + RTF-to-RTG: 10+ RTG-to-RTB or RTC: 10).

Pg 250 – The sixth bulleted item should read: “If the NY link goes down, RTD loses the 0/0 route from its provider and continues to receive a 0/0 route via IBGP and **would not generate** a 0/0 route into OSPF because the 0/0 route was not learned via RTD’s provider.

Pg 260 – The fourth bulleted item needs to be omitted, Virtual private networks with route reflectors...

Pg 283 – The first sentence of the fourth paragraph should read: “So far, you have seen how BGP can be a powerful tool in giving routing a more structured look”.

Pg 309-310 – The access list for Example 11-7, needs to be changed to reflect the difference between this example and Example 11-8, according to the second sentence in the first paragraph on pg. 310, which reads: (Note the inverse mask notation 0.0.0.255 versus the explicit 1.1.1.0/24 in the previous example, which permits only that exact prefix length.).

Pg 311 – The first syntax of the page should read: **[no] ip prefix-list** list-name **seq** seq-value **deny / permit** network/len **[ge** ge-value] **[le** le-value]

Pg 315 – The third sentence of the second paragraph should read: “You can also specify a **filter** list on both incoming and outgoing updates based on the value of the AS\_PATH attribute”.

Pg 315 – The second sentence of the third paragraph should read: “Local networks **are networks** originated from the AS itself.

Pg 320 – The first paragraph should read: “The subnets keyword is used to make sure that all subnetted information will be injected into the OSPF process. This is required only when redistributing routes into the OSPF protocol. Example **11-17** illustrates this”, and moved, to refer to Example 11-17, where the keyword is used, not Example 11-18.

Pg 320 – The second paragraph should read: “Note that RTD has configured a static route pointing a 0/0 default toward RTF. For all destinations that are outside C1, RTD will direct the traffic to RTF. RTD will also redistribute the static default route into the internal RIP domain so that all other

routers can follow a default toward AS3. The default-metric router command assigns a metric to the routes redistributed into a particular protocol. In this case, the default metric assigns a hop count of 1 to the 0/0 route injected into RIP. Example **11-18** illustrates this”, and moved to refer to Example 11-18, where it is illustrated.

Pg 326 – The second sentence of the third paragraph should read: “RTC will take the longer path via AS3 (**next hop 172.16.20.2**) to reach 192.68.10.0/24.

Pg 336 – The first sentence at the top of the page should read: “Example 11-42 (still referring to the network in **Figure 11-6**) configures RTF to have a higher local preference for all BGP updates coming from RTD.

Pg 374 – The first bulleted item should read: “AS# will accept only AS1’s local routes and its **customer’s** routes, such as AS6. AS3 will also accept one route from the Internet to set its default toward the provider AS1”.

Pg 384 – The first sentence of the first paragraph which reads: “Note that all of the preceding load-balancing scenarios deal only with egress traffic flows”. This sentence is not correct because the example prior to the sentence deals with both **ingress and egress traffic flow**.

Pg 394 & 395 – The heading for Example 12-37 should read: “Achieving Desired Routing Behavior Via AS\_PATH Manipulation: **RTA** BGP Table”.

Pg 433 – The third sentence of the first paragraph should read: “To rectify the problem, RTC will apply dampening to the BGP **routes** by using a route map to selectively dampen route 172.16.220.0/24 only”.