

SPRING  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: September 6, 2018

Z. Ali  
K. Talaulikar  
C. Filsfils  
Cisco Systems  
March 5, 2018

**Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for Segment Routing Policies  
for Traffic Engineering  
draft-ali-spring-bfd-sr-policy-00**

Abstract

Segment Routing (SR) allows a headend node to steer a packet flow along any path using a segment list which is referred to as a SR Policy. Intermediate per-flow states are eliminated thanks to source routing. The header of a packet steered in an SR Policy is augmented with the ordered list of segments associated with that SR Policy. Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) is used to monitor different kinds of paths between node. BFD mechanisms can be also used to monitor the availability of the path indicated by a SR Policy and to detect any failures. Seamless BFD (SBFD) extensions provide a simplified mechanism which is suitable for monitoring of paths that are setup dynamically and on a large scale.

This document describes the use of Seamless BFD (SBFD) mechanism to monitor the SR Policies that are used for Traffic Engineering (TE) in SR deployments.

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](#)].

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 <https://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 September 6, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 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 (<https://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 . . . . . 2
- 2. Choice of Sbfd over Bfd . . . . . 3
- 3. Procedures . . . . . 4
- 4. IANA Considerations . . . . . 5
- 5. Security Considerations . . . . . 6
- 6. Contributors . . . . . 6
- 7. Acknowledgements . . . . . 6
- 8. References . . . . . 6
  - 8.1. Normative References . . . . . 6
  - 8.2. Informative References . . . . . 7
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . 8

**1. Introduction**

Segment Routing (SR) ([\[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing\]](#)) allows a headend node to steer a packet flow along any path for specific objectives like Traffic Engineering (TE) and to provide it treatment according to the specific established service level agreement (SLA) for it. Intermediate per-flow states are eliminated thanks to source routing. The headend node steers a flow into an SR Policy. The header of a packet steered in an SR Policy is augmented with the ordered list of segments associated with that SR Policy. SR Policy [\[I-D.filsfils-spring-segment-routing-policy\]](#) specifies the concepts of SR Policy and steering into an SR Policy.



SR Policy state is instantiated only on the head-end node and any intermediate node or the endpoint node does not require any state to be maintained or instantiated for it. SR Policies are not signaled through the network nodes except the signaling required to instantiate them on the head-end in the case of a controller based deployment. This enables SR Policies to scale far better than previous TE mechanisms. This also enables SR Policies to be instantiated dynamically and on demand basis for steering specific traffic flows corresponding to service routes as they are signaled. These automatic steering and signaling mechanisms for SR Policies are described in SR Policy [[I-D.filsfils-spring-segment-routing-policy](#)].

There is a requirement to continuously monitor the availability of the path corresponding to the SR Policy along the nodes in the network and to signal any failures detected to the head-end node so that it could take corrective action to restore service. The corrective actions may be either to invalidate the candidate path that has experienced failure and to switch to another candidate path within the same SR Policy OR to activate another backup SR Policy or candidate path for end-to-end path protection. These mechanisms are beyond the scope of this document.

Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) mechanisms have been specified for use for monitoring of unidirectional MPLS LSPs via BFD MPLS [[RFC5884](#)]. Seamless BFD [[RFC7880](#)] defines a simplified mechanism for using BFD with a large proportion of negotiation aspects eliminated, thus providing benefits such as quick provisioning, as well as improved control and flexibility for network nodes initiating path monitoring. When BFD or Sbfd is used for verification of such unidirectional LSP paths, the reverse path is via the shortest path from the tail-end router back to the head-end router as determined by routing.

The SR Policy is essentially a unidirectional path through the network. This document describes the use of BFD and more specifically Sbfd for monitoring of SR Policy paths through the network. SR can be instantiated using both MPLS and IPv6 dataplanes. The mechanism described in this document applies to both these instantiations of SR Policy.

## **2. Choice of Sbfd over BFD**

BFD MPLS [[RFC5884](#)] describes a mechanism where LSP Ping [[RFC8029](#)] is used to bootstrap the BFD session over an MPLS TE LSP path. The LSP Ping mechanism was extended to support SR LSPs via SR LSP Ping [[RFC8287](#)] and a similar mechanism could have been considered for BFD monitoring of SR Policies on MPLS data-plane. However, this document



proposes instead to use SBFD mechanism as it is more suitable for SR Policies.

Some of the key aspects of SR Policies that are considered in arriving at this decision are as follows:

- o SR Policies do not require any signaling to be performed through the network nodes in order to be setup. They are simply instantiated on the head-end node via provisioning or even dynamically by a controller via BGP SR-TE [[I-D.ietf-idr-segment-routing-te-policy](#)] or using PCEP (PCEP SR [[I-D.ietf-pce-segment-routing](#)], PCE Initiated [[RFC8281](#)], PCEP Stateful [[RFC8231](#)]).
- o SR Policies result in state being instantiated only on the head-end node and no other node in the network.
- o In many deployments, SR Policies are instantiated dynamically and on-demand or in the case of automated steering for BGP routes, when routes are learnt with specific color communities (refer SR Policy [[I-D.filsfils-spring-segment-routing-policy](#)] for details).
- o SR Policies are expected to be deployed in much higher scale.
- o SR Policies can be instantiated both for MPLS and IPv6 data-planes and hence a monitoring mechanism which works for both is desirable.

In view of the above, the BFD mechanism to be used for monitoring them needs to be simple, lightweight, one that does not result in instantiation of per SR Policy state anywhere but the head-end and which can be setup and deleted dynamically, on-demand and at scale. The SBFD extensions provide this support as described in Seamless BFD [[RFC7880](#)]. Furthermore, SBFD Use-Cases [[RFC7882](#)] clarifies the applicability in the Centralized TE and SR scenarios.

### 3. Procedures

The general procedures and mechanisms for SBFD operations are specified in Seamless BFD [[RFC7880](#)]. This section describes the specifics related to SBFD use for SR Policies.

SR Policies are represented on a head-end router as <color,endpoint IP address> tuple. The SRTE process on the head-end determines the tail-end node of a SR Policy on the basis of the endpoint IP address. In the cases where the SR Policy endpoint is outside the domain of the head-end node, this information is available with the centralized



controller that computed the multi-domain SR Policy path for the head-end.

In order to enable Sbfd monitoring for a given SR Policy, the Sbfd Discriminator for the tail-end node (i.e. one with the endpoint IP address) which is going to be the Sbfd Reflector is required. ISIS Sbfd [RFC7883] and OSPF Sbfd [RFC7884] describe the extensions to the ISIS and OSPF link state routing protocols that allow all nodes to advertise their Sbfd Discriminators across the network. BGP-LS Sbfd [I-D.li-idr-bgp-ls-sbfd-extensions] describes extensions for advertising the Sbfd discriminators via BGP-LS across domains and to a controller. Thus, either the SRTE head-end node or the controller, as the case may be, have the Sbfd Discriminator of the tail-end node of the SR Policy available.

The SRTE Process can straightaway instantiate the Sbfd mechanism on the SR Policy as soon as it is provisioned in the forwarding to start verification of the path to the endpoint. No signaling or provisioning is required for the tail-end node on a per SR Policy basis and it just performs its role as a stateless Sbfd Reflector. The return path used by Sbfd is via the normal IP routing back to the head-end node. Once the specific SR Policy path is verified via Sbfd, then it is considered as active and may be used for traffic steering.

The Sbfd monitoring continues for the SR Policy and any failure is notified to the SRTE process. In response to the failure of a specific candidate path, the SRTE process may trigger any of the following based on local policy or implementation specific aspects which are outside the scope of this document:

- o Trigger path-protection for the SR Policy
- o Declare the specific candidate path as invalid and switch to using the next valid candidate path based on preference
- o If no alternate candidate path is available, then handle the steering over that SR Policy based on its invalidation policy (e.g. drop or switch to best effort routing).

#### **4. IANA Considerations**

None





## **5. Security Considerations**

Procedures described in this document do not affect the BFD or Segment Routing security model. See the 'Security Considerations' section of [[RFC7880](#)] for a discussion of SBFD security and to [[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing](#)] for analysis of security in SR deployments.

## **6. Contributors**

Nagendra Kumar  
Cisco Systems Inc.

Email: [naikumar@cisco.com](mailto:naikumar@cisco.com)

Mallik Mudigonda  
Cisco Systems Inc.

Email: [mmudigon@cisco.com](mailto:mmudigon@cisco.com)

## **7. Acknowledgements**

## **8. References**

### **8.1. Normative References**

[[I-D.filsfils-spring-segment-routing-policy](#)]

Filsfils, C., Sivabalan, S., Raza, K., Liste, J., Clad, F., Talaulikar, K., Ali, Z., Hegde, S., [daniel.voyer@bell.ca](mailto:daniel.voyer@bell.ca), d., Lin, S., [bogdanov@google.com](mailto:bogdanov@google.com), b., Krol, P., Horneffer, M., Steinberg, D., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and P. Mattes, "Segment Routing Policy for Traffic Engineering", [draft-filsfils-spring-segment-routing-policy-05](#) (work in progress), February 2018.

[[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing](#)]

Filsfils, C., Previdi, S., Ginsberg, L., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing Architecture", [draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-15](#) (work in progress), January 2018.

[[I-D.li-idr-bgp-ls-sbfd-extensions](#)]

Li, Z., Aldrin, S., Tantsura, J., Mirsky, G., and S. Zhuang, "BGP Link-State Extensions for Seamless BFD", [draft-li-idr-bgp-ls-sbfd-extensions-01](#) (work in progress), April 2017.



- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC7880] Pignataro, C., Ward, D., Akiya, N., Bhatia, M., and S. Pallagatti, "Seamless Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (S-BFD)", RFC 7880, DOI 10.17487/RFC7880, July 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7880>>.
- [RFC7882] Aldrin, S., Pignataro, C., Mirsky, G., and N. Kumar, "Seamless Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (S-BFD) Use Cases", RFC 7882, DOI 10.17487/RFC7882, July 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7882>>.
- [RFC7883] Ginsberg, L., Akiya, N., and M. Chen, "Advertising Seamless Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (S-BFD) Discriminators in IS-IS", RFC 7883, DOI 10.17487/RFC7883, July 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7883>>.
- [RFC7884] Pignataro, C., Bhatia, M., Aldrin, S., and T. Ranganath, "OSPF Extensions to Advertise Seamless Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (S-BFD) Target Discriminators", RFC 7884, DOI 10.17487/RFC7884, July 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7884>>.

## 8.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-idr-segment-routing-te-policy]  
Previdi, S., Filsfils, C., Jain, D., Mattes, P., Rosen, E., and S. Lin, "Advertising Segment Routing Policies in BGP", draft-ietf-idr-segment-routing-te-policy-02 (work in progress), March 2018.
- [I-D.ietf-pce-segment-routing]  
Sivabalan, S., Filsfils, C., Tantsura, J., Henderickx, W., and J. Hardwick, "PCEP Extensions for Segment Routing", draft-ietf-pce-segment-routing-11 (work in progress), November 2017.
- [RFC5884] Aggarwal, R., Kompella, K., Nadeau, T., and G. Swallow, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for MPLS Label Switched Paths (LSPs)", RFC 5884, DOI 10.17487/RFC5884, June 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5884>>.



- [RFC8029] Kompella, K., Swallow, G., Pignataro, C., Ed., Kumar, N., Aldrin, S., and M. Chen, "Detecting Multiprotocol Label Switched (MPLS) Data-Plane Failures", [RFC 8029](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8029, March 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8029>>.
- [RFC8231] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Medved, J., and R. Varga, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for Stateful PCE", [RFC 8231](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8231, September 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8231>>.
- [RFC8281] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Sivabalan, S., and R. Varga, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for PCE-Initiated LSP Setup in a Stateful PCE Model", [RFC 8281](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8281, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8281>>.
- [RFC8287] Kumar, N., Ed., Pignataro, C., Ed., Swallow, G., Akiya, N., Kini, S., and M. Chen, "Label Switched Path (LSP) Ping/Traceroute for Segment Routing (SR) IGP-Prefix and IGP-Adjacency Segment Identifiers (SIDs) with MPLS Data Planes", [RFC 8287](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8287, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8287>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Zafar Ali  
Cisco Systems

Email: [zali@cisco.com](mailto:zali@cisco.com)

Ketan Talaulikar  
Cisco Systems

Email: [ketant@cisco.com](mailto:ketant@cisco.com)

Clarence Filsfils  
Cisco Systems

Email: [cfilsfil@cisco.com](mailto:cfilsfil@cisco.com)

