

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: April 24, 2014

H. Chen
R. Li
Huawei Technologies
G. Cauchie

N. So
Tata Communications
V. Liu
China Mobile
M. Toy
Comcast
L. Liu
UC Davis
October 21, 2013

**Requirements for OSPF Topology-Transparent Zone
draft-chen-ospf-ttz-req-00.txt**

Abstract

This document presents a list of requirements for OSPF topology-transparent zone in a domain. A topology-transparent zone comprises a group of routers and a number of links connecting these routers. Any router outside of the zone is not aware of the zone. The information about the links and routers inside the zone is not distributed to any router outside of the zone. Any link state change such as a link down inside the zone is not seen by any router outside of the zone.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF 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 April 24, 2014.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 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 (<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](#)
- [2.](#) Conventions Used in This Document [3](#)
- [3.](#) Requirements [4](#)
- [4.](#) Security Considerations [4](#)
- [5.](#) IANA Considerations [4](#)
- [6.](#) Acknowledgement [4](#)
- [7.](#) References [5](#)
 - [7.1.](#) Normative References [5](#)
 - [7.2.](#) Informative References [5](#)
- Authors' Addresses [5](#)

1. Introduction

The number of routers in a network becomes larger and larger as the Internet traffic keeps growing. Through splitting the network into multiple areas, we can extend the network further. However, there are a number of issues when a network is split further into more areas.

At first, dividing an AS or an area into multiple areas is a very challenging task since it is involved in significant network architecture changes.

Secondly, it is complex for a Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Traffic Engineering (TE) Label Switching Path (LSP) crossing multiple areas to be setup. In one option, a TE path crossing multiple areas is computed by using collaborating Path Computation Elements (PCEs) [[RFC5441](#)] through the PCE Communication Protocol (PCEP)[[RFC5440](#)], which is not easy to configure by operators since the manual configuration of the sequence of domains is required. Although this issue can be addressed by using the Hierarchical PCE, this solution may further increase the complexity of network design. Especially, the current PCE standard method may not guarantee that the path found is optimal.

Furthermore, some policies need to be configured on area border routers for reducing the number of link states such as summary Link-State Advertisements (LSAs) to be distributed to other routers in other areas.

OSPF topology-transparent zone may resolve the issues above.

A topology-transparent zone comprises a group of routers and a number of links connecting these routers. Any router outside of the zone is not aware of the zone. The information about the links and routers inside the zone is not distributed to any router outside of the zone. Any link state change such as a link down inside the zone is not seen by any router outside of the zone.

This document presents requirements for OSPF topology-transparent zone.

2. 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](#).

3. Requirements

Topology-Transparent Zone (TTZ) may be deployed for resolving some critical issues in existing networks and future networks. The requirements for TTZ are listed as follows:

- o TTZ MUST be backward compatible. When a TTZ is deployed on a set of routers in a network, the routers outside of the TTZ in the network do not need to know or support TTZ.
- o A group of nodes in an existing network SHOULD be able to migrate to a TTZ smoothly after the configuration of TTZ on these nodes is activated.
- o All the nodes in an existing TTZ SHOULD be able to migrate back to their OSPF area smoothly after the configuration of TTZ on these nodes is deleted.
- o TTZ MUST support at least one more levels of network hierarchies, in addition to the hierarchies supported by existing routing protocols.
- o Users SHOULD be able to easily set up an end to end service crossing TTZs.
- o The protections on the service crossing TTZs SHOULD be transparent to TTZ.
- o The configuration for a TTZ in a network SHOULD be minimum.
- o The changes on the existing protocols for supporting TTZ SHOULD be minimum.

4. Security Considerations

The mechanism described in this document does not raise any new security issues.

5. IANA Considerations

6. Acknowledgement

7. References

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2328] Moy, J., "OSPF Version 2", STD 54, [RFC 2328](#), April 1998.
- [RFC4970] Lindem, A., Shen, N., Vasseur, JP., Aggarwal, R., and S. Shaffer, "Extensions to OSPF for Advertising Optional Router Capabilities", [RFC 4970](#), July 2007.
- [RFC2740] Coltun, R., Ferguson, D., and J. Moy, "OSPF for IPv6", [RFC 2740](#), December 1999.

7.2. Informative References

- [RFC5441] Vasseur, JP., Zhang, R., Bitar, N., and JL. Le Roux, "A Backward-Recursive PCE-Based Computation (BRPC) Procedure to Compute Shortest Constrained Inter-Domain Traffic Engineering Label Switched Paths", [RFC 5441](#), April 2009.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP. and JL. Le Roux, "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), March 2009.

Authors' Addresses

Huaimo Chen
Huawei Technologies
Boston, MA
USA

Email: huaimo.chen@huawei.com

Renwei Li
Huawei Technologies
2330 Central expressway
Santa Clara, CA
USA

Email: renwei.li@huawei.com

Gregory Cauchie
FRANCE

Email: greg.cauchie@gmail.com

Ning So
Tata Communications
2613 Fairbourne Cir.
Plano, TX 75082
USA

Email: ning.so@tatacommunications.com

Vic Liu
China Mobile
No.32 Xuanwumen West Street, Xicheng District
Beijing, 100053
China

Email: liuzhiheng@chinamobile.com

Mehmet Toy
Comcast
1800 Bishops Gate Blvd.
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054
USA

Email: mehmet_toy@cable.comcast.com

Lei Liu
UC Davis
CA
USA

Email: liulei.kddi@gmail.com

