

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: March 6, 2015

A. Lindem, Ed.
P. Psenak
Cisco Systems
September 2, 2014

Extensions to OSPF for Advertising Prefix/Link Administrative Tags
draft-acee-ospf-admin-tags-00.txt

Abstract

It is useful for routers in an OSPFv2 or OSPFv3 routing domain to be able to associate tags with prefixes and links. Previously, OSPFv2 and OSPFv3 were relegated to a single tag for AS External and Not-So-Stubby-Area (NSSA) prefixes. With the flexible encodings provided by OSPFv2 Prefix/Link Attribute Advertisement and OSPFv3 Extended LSAs, multiple administrative tags may be advertised for all types of prefixes and links. These administrative tags can be used for many applications including route redistribution policy, selective prefix prioritization, selective IP Fast-ReRoute (IPFRR) prefix protection, and many others.

The ISIS protocol supports a similar mechanism that is described in [RFC 5130](#).

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 March 6, 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

Internet-Draft

OSPF Administrative Tags

September 2014

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.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Requirements notation	3
1.2.	Acknowledgments	3
2.	Administrative Tag Sub-TLVs	4
2.1.	32-Bit Administrative Tag Sub-TLV	4
2.2.	64-Bit Administrative Tag Sub-TLV	5
3.	Administrative Tag Applicability	7
4.	Protocol Operation	8
5.	Security Considerations	9
6.	IANA Considerations	10
7.	References	11
7.1.	Normative References	11
7.2.	Informative References	11
	Authors' Addresses	12

1. Introduction

It is useful for routers in an OSPFv2 [[OSPF](#)] or OSPFv3 [[OSPF](#)] routing domain to be able to associate tags with prefixes and links.

Previously, OSPFv2 and OSPFv3 were relegated to a single tag for AS External and Not-So-Stubby-Area (NSSA) prefixes. With the flexible encodings provided by OSPFv2 Prefix/Link Attribute Advertisement ([[OSPFV2-PREFIX-LINK](#)]) and OSPFv3 Extended LSA ([[OSPFV3-EXTENDED-LSA](#)]), multiple administrative tags may be advertised for all types of prefixes and links. These administrative tags can be used many applications including (but not limited to):

1. Controlling which routes are redistributed into other protocols for readvertisement.
2. Prioritizing selected prefixes for faster convergence and installation in the forwarding plane.
3. Identifying selected prefixes for Loop-Free Alternative (LFA) protection.

The ISIS protocol supports a similar mechanism that is described in [RFC 5130](#) [[ISIS-ADMIN-TAGS](#)].

1.1. Requirements notation

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-KEYWORDS](#)].

1.2. Acknowledgments


The authors of [RFC 5130](#) are acknowledged since this document draws upon both the ISIS specification and deployment experience.

The RFC text was produced using Marshall Rose's xml2rfc tool.

2. Administrative Tag Sub-TLVs

This document creates two new Administrative Tag sub-TLVs for OSPFv2 and two for OSPFv3. These TLVs specify one or more 32-bit or 64-bit unsigned integers that may be associated with an OSPF advertised prefix or OSPF Link. The precise usage of these tags is beyond the scope of this document.

The format of these TLVs is the same as the format used by the Traffic Engineering Extensions to OSPF [\[TE\]](#). The LSA payload consists of one or more nested Type/Length/Value (TLV) triplets. The format of each TLV is:



TLV Format


The Length field defines the length of the value portion in octets (thus a TLV with no value portion would have a length of 0). The TLV is padded to 4-octet alignment; padding is not included in the length field (so a 3-octet value would have a length of 3, but the total

size of the TLV would be 8 octets).

2.1. 32-Bit Administrative Tag Sub-TLV

This sub-TLV will carry one or more 32-bit unsigned integer values that will be used as administrative tags.

The format of the 32-bit Administrative Tag TLV is as follows:



Type A 16-bit field set to TBD. The value MAY be different depending upon the registry from which it is allocated.

Length A 16-bit field that indicates the length of the value portion in octets and will be a multiple of 4 octets dependent on the number of administrative tags advertised. If the sub-TLV is specified, at least one

administrative tag must be advertised.


Value A variable length list of one or more administrative tags.

32-bit Administrative Tag TLV

[2.2.](#) 64-Bit Administrative Tag Sub-TLV

This sub-TLV will carry one or more 64-bit unsigned integer values that will be used as administrative tags.

The format of the 64-bit Administrative Tag TLV is as follows:



Type	A 16-bit field set to TBD. The value MAY be different depending upon the registry from which it is allocated.
Length	A 16-bit field that indicates the length of the value portion in octets and will be a multiple of 8 octets dependent on the number of administrative tags advertised. If the sub-TLV is specified, at least one administrative tag must be advertised.
Value	A variable length list of one or more 64-bit administrative tags.

64-bit Administrative Tag TLV

3. Administrative Tag Applicability

The administrative tag TLVs specified herein will be valid as sub-TLVs of the following TLVs specified in [[OSPFV2-PREFIX-LINK](#)]:

1. Extended Prefix TLV advertised in the OSPFv2 Extended Prefix LSA
2. Extended Link TLV advertised in the OSPFv2 Extended Prefix LSA

The administrative tag TLVs specified herein will be valid as sub-TLVs of the following TLVs specified in [[OSPFV3-EXTENDED-LSA](#)]:

1. Router-Link TLV advertised in the E-Router-LSA
2. Inter-Area-Prefix TLV advertised in the E-Inter-Area-Prefix-LSA
3. Intra-Area-Prefix TLV advertised in the E-Link-LSA and the E-Intra-Area-LSA
4. External-Prefix TLV advertised in the E-AS-External-LSA and the E-NSSA-LSA

An OSPF router supporting this specification MUST propagate administrative tags when acting as an Area Border Router and originating summary advertisements into other areas. Similarly, an OSPF router supporting this specification and acting as an ABR for a Not-So-Stubby Area (NSSA) MUST propagate tags when translating NSSA routes to AS External advertisements [[NSSA](#)]. The number of tags supported MAY limit the number of tags that are propagated.

An OSPF router supporting this specification MUST be able to advertise and interpret one 32-bit tag for prefixes and links. An OSPF router supporting this specification SHOULD be able to advertise and interpret one 64-bit tag for prefixes and links. An OSPF router supporting this specification MAY be able to advertise and propagate multiple 32-bit and 64-bit tags. The maximum tags that an implementation supports is a local matter depending upon supported tag applications.

When a single tag is advertised for AS External or NSSA LSA prefix, the existing tag encoding SHOULD be utilized.

[5.](#) Security Considerations

This document describes both a generic mechanism for advertising administrative tags for OSPF prefixes and links. The administrative tags are generally less critical than the topology information currently advertised by the base OSPF protocol. The security considerations for the generic mechanism are dependent on the future application and, as such, should be described as additional capabilities are proposed for advertisement. Security considerations for the base OSPF protocol are covered in [[OSPF](#)] and [[OSPFV3](#)].

6. IANA Considerations

The following values should be allocated from the OSPF Extended Prefix TLV Sub-TLV Registry [[OSPFV2-PREFIX-LINK](#)]:

- o TBD - 32-bit Administrative Tag TLV
- o TBD - 64-bit Administrative Tag TLV

The following values should be allocated from the OSPF Extended Link TLV Sub-TLV Registry [[OSPFV2-PREFIX-LINK](#)]:

- o TBD - 32-bit Administrative Tag TLV
- o TBD - 64-bit Administrative Tag TLV

The following values should be allocated from the OSPFv3 Extended-LSA Sub-TLV Registry [[OSPFV3-EXTENDED-LSA](#)]:

- o TBD - 32-bit Administrative Tag TLV
- o TBD - 64-bit Administrative Tag TLV

Internet-Draft

OSPF Administrative Tags

September 2014

[7.](#) References

[7.1.](#) Normative References

- [OSPF] Moy, J., "OSPF Version 2", STD 54, [RFC 2328](#), April 1998.
- [OSPFV2-PREFIX-LINK]
Psenak, P., Gredler, H., Shakir, R., Henderickx, W., Tantsura, J., and A. Lindem, "OSPFv2 Prefix/Link Attribute Advertisement", [draft-ietf-ospf-prefix-link-attr-00.txt](#) (work in progress).
- [OSPFV3] Coltun, R., Ferguson, D., Moy, J., and A. Lindem, "OSPF for IPv6", [RFC 5340](#), July 2008.
- [OSPFV3-EXTENDED-LSA]
Lindem, A., Mirtorabi, S., Roy, A., and F. Baker, "OSPFv3 LSA Extendibility", [draft-ietf-ospf-ospfv3-lsa-extend-02.txt](#) (work in progress).
- [RFC-KEYWORDS]
Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFC's to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [TE] Katz, D., Kompella, K., and D. Yeung, "Traffic Engineering Extensions to OSPF", [RFC 3630](#), September 2003.

[7.2.](#) Informative References

- [ISIS-ADMIN-TAGS]
Previdi, S., Shand, M., and C. Martin, "A Policy Control

Mechanism in IS-IS Using Administrative Tags", [RFC 5130](#), February 2008.

[NSSA] Murphy, P., "The OSPF Not-So-Stubby Area (NSSA) Option", [RFC 3101](#), January 2003.

Lindem & Psenak

Expires March 6, 2015

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

OSPF Administrative Tags

September 2014

Authors' Addresses

Acee Lindem (editor)
Cisco Systems
301 Midenhall Way
Cary, NC 27513
USA

Email: acee@cisco.com

Peter Psenak
Cisco Systems
Apollo Business Center
Mlynske nivy 43
Bratislava, 821 09
Slovakia

Email: ppsenak@cisco.com

