

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Expiration Date: September 2006

S. Bryant  
M. Shand  
S. Previdi  
Cisco Systems

March 2006

**IP Fast Reroute Using Not-via Addresses**  
<[draft-bryant-shand-ipfrr-notvia-addresses-02.txt](#)>

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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".

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/1id-abstracts.html>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

Abstract

This draft describes a mechanism that provides fast reroute in an IP network through encapsulation to "not-via" addresses. A single level of encapsulation is used. The mechanism protects unicast, multicast and LDP traffic against link, router and shared risk group failure, regardless of network topology and metrics.



## Conventions used in this document

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](#)].

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1. Introduction.....</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2. Overview of Not-via Repairs.....</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3. Repair Computation.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4. How a repairing node repairs.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.1 Node Failure.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.2 Link Failure.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.3 Multi-homed Prefix.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.4 Shared Risk Link Groups.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.5 Multicast.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.6 Fast Reroute in an MPLS LDP Network.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5. Local Area Networks.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.1 Simple LAN Repair.....</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.2 LAN Component Repair.....</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">5.3 LAN Repair Using Diagnostics.....</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6. Loop Free Alternates.....</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.1 Optimizing not-via computations using LFAs.....</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">6.2 Use of LFAs with SRLGs.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">7. Equal Cost Multi-Path.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">8. Multiple Simultaneous Failures.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">9. Encapsulation.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">10. Routing Extensions.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">11. Incremental Deployment.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">12. IANA considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">13. Security Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>

## **1. Introduction**

When a link or a router fails, only the neighbors of the failure are initially aware that the failure has occurred. In a network operating IP fast reroute (IPFRR), the routers that are the neighbors of the failure repair the failure. These repairing routers have to steer packets to their destinations despite the fact that most other routers in the network are unaware of the nature and location of the failure.

A common limitation in most IPFRR mechanisms is an inability to steer the repaired packet round an identified failure. The extent to which this limitation affects the repair coverage is topology dependent. The mechanism proposed here is to encapsulate the packet to an address that explicitly identifies the network component that the repair must avoid. This produces a repair mechanism, which, provided the network is not partitioned by the failure, will always achieve a repair.

## **2. Overview of Not-via Repairs**

The purpose of a repair is to deliver packets to their destination without traversing a known failure in the network, i.e. to deliver the packet not via the failure. A special address is assigned to each protected component. This address is called the not-via address. The semantics of a not-via address are that a packet addressed to a not-via address must be delivered to the router advertising that address, not via the protected component (link, node, SRLG etc.) with which that address is associated.

A simple example would be node repair in which an additional address is assigned to each interface in the network. To repair a failure, the repairing router encapsulates the packet to the not-via address of the router interface on the far side of the failure. The routers on the repair path then know to which router they must deliver the packet, and which network component they must avoid. The network fragment shown in Figure 1 illustrates a not-via repair for the case of a router failure.






Figure 1: Not-via repair of router failure

Assume that S has a packet for some destination D that it would normally send via P and B, and that S suspects that P has failed. S encapsulates the packet to Bp. The path from S to Bp is the shortest path from S to B not going via P. If the network contains a path from S to B that does not transit router P, i.e. the network is not partitioned by the failure of P, then the packet will be successfully delivered to B. When the packet addressed to Bp arrives at B, B removes the encapsulation and forwards the repaired packet towards its final destination.

Note that if the path from B to the final destination includes one or more nodes that are included in the repair path, a packet may back track after the encapsulation is removed. However, because the decapsulating router is always closer to the packet destination than the encapsulating router, the packet will not loop.

For complete protection, all of P's neighbors will require a not-via address that allows traffic to be directed to them without traversing P. This is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: The set of Not-via P Addresses



### 3. Repair Computation

The not-via repair mechanism requires that all routers on the path from S to B (Figure 1) have a route to Bp. They can calculate this by failing node P, running an SPF, and finding the shortest route to B.

A router has no simple way of knowing whether it is on the shortest path for any particular repair. It is therefore necessary for every router to calculate the path it would use in the event of any possible router failure. Each router therefore fails every router in the network, one at a time, and calculates its own best route to each of the neighbors of that router. In other words, with reference to Figure 2, some router X will consider each router in turn to be P, fail P, and then calculate its own route to each of the not-via P addresses advertised by the neighbors of P. i.e. X calculates its route to Sp, Ap, Bp, and Cp, in each case, not via P.

To calculate the repair paths a router has to calculate n-1 SPFs where n is the number of routers in the network. This is expensive to compute. However, the problem is amenable to a solution in which each router (X) proceeds as follows. X first calculates the base topology with all routers functional and determines its normal path to all not-via addresses. This can be performed as part of the normal SPF computation. For each router P in the topology, X then performs the following actions:-

1. Removes router P from the topology.
2. Performs an incremental SPF on the modified topology. This incremental calculation is terminated when all of the not-via P addresses are attached to the SPT.
3. Reverts to the base topology.

This algorithm is significantly less expensive than a set of full SPFs. Thus, although a router has to calculate the repair paths for n-1 failures, the computational effort is much less than n-1 SPFs.

Experiments on a selection of real world network topologies with between 40 and 400 nodes suggest that the worst-case computational complexity using the above optimizations is equivalent to performing between 5 and 13 full SPFs. Further optimizations are described in [section 6.1](#)





#### **4. How a repairing node repairs**

This section explains the operation of each type of repair necessary in the network.

##### **4.1 Node Failure**

When router P fails (Figure 2) S encapsulates any packet that it would send to B via P to Bp, and then sends the encapsulated packet on the shortest path to Bp. S follows the same procedure for routers A, and C in Figure 2. The packet is decapsulated at the repair target (A, B or C) and then forwarded normally to its destination. The repair target can be determined as part of the normal SPF by recording the "next-next-hop" for each destination in addition to the normal next-hop.

Notice that with this technique only one level of encapsulation is needed, and that it is possible to repair ANY failure regardless of link metrics and any asymmetry that may be present in the network. The only exception to this is where the failure was a single point of failure that partitioned the network, in which case ANY repair is clearly impossible.

##### **4.2 Link Failure**

The normal mode of operation of the network would be to assume router failure. However, where some destinations are only reachable through the failed router, it is desirable that an attempt be made to repair to those destinations by assuming that only a link failure has occurred.

To perform a link repair, S encapsulates to Ps (i.e. it instructs the network to deliver the packet to P not-via S). All of the neighbors of S will have calculated a path to Ps in case S itself had failed. S could therefore give the packet to any of its neighbors (except, of course, P). However, S should preferably send the encapsulated packet on the shortest available path to P. This path is calculated by running an SPF with the link SP failed. Note that this may again be an incremental calculation, which can terminate when address Ps has been reattached.

It is necessary to consider the behavior of IPFRR solutions when a link repair is attempted in the presence of node failure. In its simplest form the not-via IPFRR solution prevents the formation of loops forming as a result of mutual repair, by never providing a repair path for a not-via address. Referring to Figure 2, if A was the neighbor of P that was on the link repair path from S to P, and P itself had failed, the repaired packet from S would arrive at A encapsulated to Ps. A would have

detected that the AP link had failed and would normally attempt

Bryant, Shand

Expires September 2006

[Page 6]

to repair the packet. However, no repair path is provided for any not-via address, and so A would be forced to drop the packet, thus preventing the formation of loop.

### 4.3 Multi-homed Prefix

A multi-homed Prefix (MHP) is reachable via more than one router in the network. When IPFRR router S (Figure 3) discovers that P has failed, it needs to send MHP packets addressed to X, which are normally reachable through P, to an alternate router, which is still able to reach X.




Figure 3: Multi-home Prefixes

S should choose the closest router that can reach X during the failure as the alternate router. S determines which router to use as the alternate while running the SPF with P failed. This is accomplished by continuing to run the incremental SPF with P failed until all of P's not-via addresses and its MHPs (X) are attached.

First, consider the case where the shortest alternate path to X is via Z. S can reach Z without using the failed router P. However, S cannot just send the packet towards Z, because the other routers in the network will not be aware of the failure of P, and may loop the packet back to S. S therefore encapsulates the packet to Z (using a normal address for Z). When Z receives the encapsulated packet it removes the encapsulation and forwards the packet to X.

Now consider the case where the shortest alternate path to X is via Y, which S reaches via P and B. To reach Y, S must first repair the packet to B using the normal not-via repair mechanism. To do this S encapsulates the packet for X to Bp. When B receives the packet it removes the encapsulation and discovers that the packet is intended for MHP X. The situation now reverts to the previous case, in which the shortest alternate path does not require traversal of the failure. B therefore follows the algorithm above and encapsulates the packet to Y (using a normal



address for Y). Y removes the encapsulation and forwards the packet to X.

It may be that the cost of reaching X using local delivery from the alternate router is greater than the cost of reaching X via P. Under those circumstances, the alternate router would normally forward to X via P, which would cause the IPFRR repair to loop. To prevent the repair from looping the alternate router must locally deliver a packet received via a repair encapsulation.

Notice that using the not-via approach, only one level of encapsulation was needed to repair MHPs to the alternate router.

#### 4.4 Shared Risk Link Groups

A Shared Risk Link Group (SRLG) is a set of links whose failure can be caused by a single action such as a conduit cut or line card failure. When repairing the failure of a link that is a member of an SRLG, it must be assumed that all the other links that are also members of the SRLG have also failed. Consequently, any repair path must be computed to avoid not just the adjacent link, but also all the links which are members of the same SRLG.

In Figure 4 below, the links S-P and A-B are both members of SRLG "a". The semantics of the not-via address Ps changes from simply "P not-via the link S-P" to be "P not-via the link S-P or any other link with which S-P shares an SRLG" In Figure 4 this is the links that are members of SRLG "a". I.e. links S-P and A-B. Since the information about SRLG membership of all links is available in the Link State Database, all nodes computing routes to the not-via address Ps can infer these semantics, and perform the computation by failing all the links in the SRLG when running the iSPF.

Note that it is not necessary for S to consider repairs to any other nodes attached to members of the SRLG (such as B). It is sufficient for S to repair to the other end of the adjacent link (P in this case).




Figure 4: Shared Risk Link Group

Bryant, Shand

Expires September 2006

[Page 8]

In some cases, it may be that the links comprising the SRLG occur in series on the path from S to the destination D, as shown in Figure 5. In this case, multiple consecutive repairs may be necessary. S will first repair to Ps, then P will repair to Dp. In both cases, because the links concerned are members of SRLG "a" the paths are computed to avoid all members of SRLG "a".




Figure 5: Shared Risk Link Group members in series

While the use of multiple repairs in series introduces some additional overhead, these semantics avoid the potential combinatorial explosion of not-via addresses that could otherwise occur.

Note that although multiple repairs are used, only a single level of encapsulation is required. This is because the first repair packet is de-capsulated before the packet is re-encapsulated using the not-via address corresponding to the far side of the next link which is a member of the same SRLG. In some cases the de-capsulation and re-encapsulation takes place (at least notionally) at a single node, while in other cases, these functions may be performed by different nodes. This scenario is illustrated in Figure 6 below.




Figure 6: Shared Risk Link Group members in series





In this case, S first encapsulates to Ps, and node P decapsulates the packet and forwards it "native" to G using its normal FIB entry for destination D. G then repairs the packet to Dg.

It can be shown that such multiple repairs can never form a loop because each repair causes the packet to move closer to its destination.

It is often the case that a single link may be a member of multiple SRLGs, and those SRLG may not be isomorphic. This is illustrated in Figure 7 below.




Figure 7: Multiple Shared Risk Link Groups

The link SP is a member of SRLGs "a" and "b". When a failure of the link SP is detected, it must be assumed that BOTH SRLGs have failed. Therefore the not-via path to Ps must be computed by failing all links which are members of SRLG "a" or SRLG "b". I.e. the semantics of Ps is now "P not-via any links which are members of any of the SRLGs of which link SP is a member". This is illustrated in Figure 8 below.




Figure 8: Topology used for repair computation for link S-P



In this case, the repair path to Ps will be S-A-C-J-K-E-B-P. It may appear that there is no path to D because GD is a member of SRLG "a" and FH is a member of SRLG "b". This is true if BOTH SRLGs "a" and "b" have in fact failed. But that would be an instance of multiple uncorrelated failures which are out of scope for this design. In practice it is likely that either SRLG "a" or SRLG "b" has failed, but these were indistinguishable from the point of view of S. However, each link repair is considered independently. So, when the packet arrives at G, if only SRLG "b" has failed it will be delivered across the link GD, while if only SRLG "a" has failed it will be repaired around the path G-F-H-D. This is illustrated in Figure 9 below.




Figure 9: Topology used for repair computation for link G-D

A repair strategy that assumes the worst-case failure for each link can often result in longer repair paths than necessary. In cases where only a single link fails, rather than the full SRLG, this strategy may occasionally fail to identify a repair even though a viable repair path exists in the network. The use of sub-optimal repair paths is an inevitable consequence of this compromise approach. The failure to identify any repair is a serious deficiency, but is a rare occurrence in a robustly designed network. This problem can be addressed by:-

1. Reporting that the link in question is irreparable, so that the network designer can take appropriate action.
2. Modifying the design of the network to avoid this possibility.
3. Using some form of SRLG diagnostic (for example, by running BFD over alternate repair paths) to determine which SRLG member(s) has actually failed and using this information to select an appropriate pre-computed repair path. However,



aside from the complexity of performing the diagnostics, this requires multiple not-via addresses per interface, which has poor scaling properties.

#### **4.5 Multicast**

Multicast traffic is repaired in a similar way to unicast, however the multicast forwarder is able to use the not-via address to which the multicast packet was addressed as an indication of the expected receive interface and hence to correctly run the required RPF check.

A more complete description of multicast operation will be provided in a future version of this draft.

#### **4.6 Fast Reroute in an MPLS LDP Network.**

Not-via addresses are IP addresses and LDP will distribute labels for them in the usual way. The not-via repair mechanism may therefore be used to provide fast re-route in an MPLS network by first pushing the label which the repair endpoint uses to forward the packet, and then pushing the label corresponding to the not-via address needed to effect the repair. Referring once again to Figure 1, if S has a packet destined for D that it must reach via P and B, S first pushes B's label for D. S then pushes the label that its next hop to Bp needs to reach Bp.

Note that in an MPLS LDP network it is necessary for S to have the repair endpoint's label for the destination. When S is effecting a link repair it already has this. In the case of a node repair, S either needs to set up a directed LDP session with each of its neighbor's neighbors, or it needs to use the next-next hop label distribution mechanism proposed in [\[NNHL\]](#). Where an extended SRLG is being repaired, S must determine which routers its traffic would traverse on egress from the SRLG, and then establish directed LDP sessions with each of those routers.

### **5. Local Area Networks**

LANs are a special type of SRLG and are solved using the SRLG mechanisms outlined above. With all SRLGs there is a trade-off between the sophistication of the fault detection and the size of the SRLG. Protecting against link failure of the LAN link(s) is relatively straightforward, but as with all fast reroute mechanisms, the problem becomes more complex when it is desired to protect against the possibility of failure of the nodes attached to the LAN as well as the LAN itself.






Figure 10: Local Area Networks

Consider the LAN shown in Figure 10. For connectivity purposes, we consider that the LAN is represented by the pseudonode (N). To provide IPFRR protection, S must run a connectivity check to each of its protected LAN adjacencies P, Q, and R, using, for example BFD [[BFD](#)].

When S discovers that it has lost connectivity to P, it is unsure whether the failure is:

- . its own interface to the LAN,
- . the LAN itself,
- . the LAN interface of P,
- . the node P.

### [5.1](#) Simple LAN Repair

A simple approach to LAN repair is to consider the LAN and all of its connected routers as a single SRLG. Thus, the address P not via the LAN (Pl) would require P to be reached not-via any router connected to the LAN. This is shown in Figure 11.








Figure 11: Local Area Networks - LAN SRLG

In this case, when S detected that P had failed it would send traffic reached via P and B to B not-via the LAN or any router attached to the LAN (i.e. to B1). Any destination only reachable through P would be addressed to P not-via the LAN or any router attached to the LAN (except of course P).

Whilst this approach is simple, it assumes that a large portion of the network adjacent to the failure has also failed. This will result in the use of sub-optimal repair paths and in some cases the inability to identify a viable repair.

## 5.2 LAN Component Repair

In this approach, possible failures are considered at a finer granularity, but without the use of diagnostics to identify the specific component that has failed. Because S is unable to diagnose the failure it must repair traffic sent through P and B, to B not-via P,N (i.e. not via P and not via N), on the conservative assumption that both the entire LAN and P have failed. Destinations for which P is a single point of failure must as usual be sent to P using an address that avoids the interface by which P is reached from S, i.e. to P not-via N. Similarly for routers Q and R.

Notice that each router that is connected to a LAN must, as usual, advertise one not-via address for each neighbor. In addition, each router on the LAN must advertise an extra address not via the pseudonode (N).

Notice also that each neighbor of a router connected to a LAN must advertise two not-via addresses, the usual one not via the neighbor and an additional one, not via either the neighbor or the pseudonode. The required set of LAN address assignments is



shown in Figure 12 below. Each router on the LAN, and each of its neighbors, is advertising exactly one address more than it would otherwise have advertised if this degree of connectivity had been achieved using point-to-point links.




Figure 12: Local Area Networks

### 5.3 LAN Repair Using Diagnostics

A more specific LAN repair can be undertaken by using diagnostics. In order to explicitly diagnose the failed network component, S correlates the connectivity reports from P and one or more of the other routers on the LAN, in this case, Q and R. If it lost connectivity to P alone, it could deduce that the LAN was still functioning and that the fault lay with either P, or the interface connecting P to the LAN. It would then repair to B not via P (and P not-via N for destinations for which P is a single point of failure) in the usual way. If S lost connectivity to more than one router on the LAN, it could conclude that the fault lay only with the LAN, and could repair to P, Q and R not-via N, again in the usual way.

## 6. Loop Free Alternates

The use of loop free alternates (LFA) as a repair mechanism has been studied [[LFA](#)]. Where an LFA exists, S may use this in place of the not-via repair mechanism for unicast packets (including MHP alternate routers). Multicast traffic requires the use of a repair encapsulation so that the packets are delivered to the router at the repair endpoint in order to correctly re-join the multicast tree and so that the necessary RPF check can be made.

LFAs are computed on a per destination basis and in general, only a subset of the destinations requiring repair will have a suitable LFA repair. In this case, those destinations which are



repairable by LFAs are so repaired and the remainder of the destinations are repaired using the not-via encapsulation. This has the advantage of reducing the volume of traffic that requires encapsulation.

In some cases, all the destinations, including the repair endpoint, are repairable by an LFA. In this case, all unicast traffic may be repaired without encapsulation. Multicast traffic still requires encapsulation, but for the nodes on the LFA repair path the computation of the not-via forwarding entry is unnecessary since, by definition, their normal path to the repair endpoint is not via the failure.

### **6.1 Optimizing not-via computations using LFAs**

The above observation permits an optimization to the not-via computations. If repairing node S has an LFA to the repair endpoint it is not necessary for any router to perform the incremental SPF with the link SP removed in order to compute the route to the not-via address Ps. This is because the correct routes will already have been computed as a result of the SPF on the base topology. Node S can signal this condition to all other routers by including a bit in its LSP or LSA associated with each LFA protected link. Routers computing not-via routes can then omit the running of the iSPF for links with this bit set.

When running the iSPF for a particular link AB, the calculating router first checks whether the link AB is present in the existing SPT. If the link is not present in the SPT, no further work is required. This check is a normal part of the iSPF computation.

If the link is present in the SPT, this optimization introduces a further check to determine whether the link is marked as protected by an LFA in the direction in which the link appears in the SPT. If so the iSPF need not be performed. For example, if the link appears in the SPT in the direction A->B and A has indicated that the link AB is protected by an LFA no further action is required for this link.

If the receipt of this information is delayed, the correct operation of the protocol is not compromised provided that the not-via computation is performed on the latest available information.

This optimization is not particularly beneficial to nodes close to the repair since, as has been observed above, the computation for nodes on the LFA path is trivial. However, for nodes upstream

of the link  $SP$  for which  $S-P$  is in the path to  $P$ , there is a significant reduction in the computation required.

## **6.2 Use of LFAs with SRLGs**

[Section 4.4](#) above describes the repair of links which are members of one or more SRLGs. LFAs can be used for the repair of such links provided that any other link with which S-P shares an SRLG is avoided when computing the LFA. This is described for the simple case of "local-SRLGs" in [\[LFA\]](#).

## **7. Equal Cost Multi-Path**

A router can use an equal cost multi-path (ECMP) repair in place of a not-via repair for unicast packets.

A router computing a not-via repair path MAY subject the repair to ECMP.

## **8. Multiple Simultaneous Failures**

The failure of a node or an SRLG can result in multiple correlated failures, which may be repaired using the mechanisms described in this design. This design will not correctly repair a set of unanticipated multiple failures. Such failures are out of scope of this design.

It is important that the routers in the network are able to discriminate between these two classes of failure, and take appropriate action.

## **9. Encapsulation**

Any IETF specified IP in IP encapsulation may be used to carry a not-via repair. IP in IP [\[IPIP\]](#), GRE [\[RFC1701\]](#) and L2TPv3 [\[L2TPv3\]](#), all have the necessary and sufficient properties. The requirement is that both the encapsulating router and the router to which the encapsulated packet is addressed have a common ability to process the chosen encapsulation type.

When an MPLS LDP network is being protected, the encapsulation would normally be an additional MPLS label. In an MPLS enabled IP network an MPLS label may be used in place of an IP in IP encapsulation in the case above.

## **10. Routing Extensions**

IPFRR requires IGP extensions. Each IPFRR router that is directly connected to a protected network component must advertise a not-via address for that component. This must be advertised in such a way that the association between the protected component (link, router or SRLG) and the not-via address can be determined by the



other routers in the network.

Bryant, Shand

Expires September 2006

[Page 17]

It is necessary that not-via capable routers advertise in the IGP that they will calculate not-via routes.

It is necessary for routers to advertise the type of encapsulation that they support (MPLS, GRE [[RFC1701](#)], L2TPv3 etc). However, the deployment of mixed IP encapsulation types within a network is deprecated.

## **11. Incremental Deployment**

Incremental deployment is supported by excluding routers that are not calculating not-via routes from the base topology. In that way repairs may be steered around island of routers that are not IPFRR capable.

Routers that are protecting a network component need to have the capability to encapsulate and decapsulate packets. However, routers that are on the repair path only need to be capable of calculating not-via paths and including the not-via addresses in their FIB i.e. these routers do not need any changes to their forwarding mechanism.

## **12. IANA considerations**

There are no IANA considerations that arise from this draft.

## **13. Security Considerations**

The repair endpoints present vulnerability in that they might be used as a method of disguising the delivery of a packet to a point in the network. The primary method of protection should be through the use of a private address space for the not-via addresses. These addresses MUST NOT be advertised outside the area, and SHOULD be filtered at the network entry points. In addition, a mechanism might be developed that allowed the use of the mild security available through the use of a key [[RFC1701](#)] [L2TPv3]. With the deployment of such mechanisms, the repair endpoints would not increase the security risk beyond that of existing IP tunnel mechanisms.

An attacker may attempt to overload a router by addressing an excessive traffic load to the decapsulation endpoint. Typically, routers take a 50% performance penalty in decapsulating a packet. The attacker could not be certain that the router would be impacted, and the extremely high volume of traffic needed, would easily be detected as an anomaly.

If an attacker were able to influence the availability of a link, they could cause the network to invoke the not-via repair

mechanism. A network protected by not-via IPFRR is less

vulnerable to such an attack than a network that undertook a full convergence in response to a link up/down event.

#### Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

#### Full copyright statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006). This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

#### Normative References

There are no normative references.



## Informative References

Internet-drafts are works in progress available from  
<<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/>>

- [BFD] Katz, D., Ward, D., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection", <[draft-ietf-bfd-base-04.txt](#)>, July 2005, (work in progress).
- [RFC1701](#) [RFC 1701](#), Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE).  
S. Hanks, T. Li, D. Farinacci, P. Traina.  
October 1994.
- [IPFRR] Shand, M., Bryant, S., "IP Fast-reroute Framework",  
<[draft-ietf-rtgwg-ipfrr-framework-05.txt](#)>,  
October 2005, (work in progress).
- [L2TPV3] J. Lau, Ed., et al., "Layer Two Tunneling Protocol - Version 3 (L2TPv3)", [RFC 3931](#), March 2005.
- [LFA] A. Atlas, Ed, A. Zinin, Ed, "Basic Specification for IP Fast-Reroute: Loop-free Alternates", <[draft-ietf-rtgwg-ipfrr-spec-base-04.txt](#)>, July 2005, (work in progress).
- [LDP] Andersson, L., Doolan, P., Feldman, N., Fredette, A. and B. Thomas, "LDP Specification", [RFC 3036](#), January 2001.
- [NNHL] Shen, N., et al "Discovering LDP Next-Next-hop Labels", <[draft-shen-mpls-ldp-nnhop-label-02.txt](#)>, May 2005, (work in progress)
- [MPLS-TE] Ping Pan, et al, "Fast Reroute Extensions to RSVP-TE for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 4090](#), May 2005.
- [TUNNEL] Bryant, S., et al, "IP Fast Reroute using tunnels", <[draft-bryant-ipfrr-tunnels-02.txt](#)>, April 2005 (work in progress).



Authors' Addresses

Stewart Bryant  
Cisco Systems,  
250, Longwater Avenue,  
Green Park,  
Reading, RG2 6GB,  
United Kingdom.                      Email: [stbryant@cisco.com](mailto:stbryant@cisco.com)

Stefano Previdi  
Cisco Systems  
Via Del Serafico, 200  
00142 Rome,  
Italy                                      Email: [sprevidi@cisco.com](mailto:sprevidi@cisco.com)

Mike Shand  
Cisco Systems,  
250, Longwater Avenue,  
Green Park,  
Reading, RG2 6GB,  
United Kingdom.                      Email: [mshand@cisco.com](mailto:mshand@cisco.com)



