

IS-IS for IP Internets  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: May 21, 2008

C. Hopps  
L. Ginsberg  
Cisco Systems  
November 18, 2007

**IS-IS BFD Enabled TLV**  
**draft-chopps-isis-bfd-tlv-01**

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/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on May 21, 2008.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

Abstract

This document describes a TLV for use in the IS-IS routing protocol that allows for the proper use of the Bidirectional Forwarding Detection protocol (BFD). There exist certain scenarios in which IS-IS will not react appropriately to a BFD detected forwarding plane failure without use of either this TLV or some other method.

## 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](#)].

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	The Problem . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	The Solution . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Determining Local Significance . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Adjacency Establishment and Maintenance . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	Advertisement of Topology Specific IS Neighbors . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Transition . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Graceful Restart . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	The BFD Enabled TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">10.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">10.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>



## 1. Introduction

The Bidirectional Forwarding Detection protocol [[I-D.ietf-bfd-base](#)] is a protocol that allows for detection of a forwarding plane failure between two routers. A router can use [[I-D.ietf-bfd-base](#)] to validate that a peer router's forwarding ability is functioning.

One specific application of BFD as described in [[I-D.ietf-bfd-generic](#)] is to verify the forwarding ability of an IS-IS [[RFC1195](#)] router's adjacencies; however, the method described in [[I-D.ietf-bfd-generic](#)] does not allow for certain failure scenarios. We will define a TLV that will allow for proper response to the detection of all forwarding failures where the use of BFD is employed with IS-IS.

## 2. The Problem

We observe that to allow for mixed use (i.e., some routers running BFD and some not) [[I-D.ietf-bfd-generic](#)] does not require a BFD session be established prior to the establishment of an IS-IS adjacency. Thus, if a router A has neighbors B and C, and B does not support BFD, A would still form adjacencies with B and C, and would only establish a BFD session with C.

The problem with this solution is that it assumes that the transmission and receipt of IS-IS IIHs shares fate with forwarded data packets. This is not a fair assumption to make given that the primary use of BFD is to protect IPv4 (and IPv6) forwarding and IS-IS does not utilize IPv4 or IPv6 for sending or receiving its hellos.

Thus, if we consider our previous example, and if C is currently experiencing an IPv4 forwarding failure that allows for IS-IS IIHs to be sent and received, when A first starts (or restarts) A will assume that C simply does not support BFD, will form an adjacency with C, and may incorrectly forward IPv4 traffic through C.

## 3. The Solution

A simple solution to this problem is for an IS-IS router to advertise that it has BFD enabled on a given interface. It can do this through the inclusion of a TLV in its IIHs, and indeed that is our proposal.

When sending an IIH on a BFD enabled interface, a router which supports this extension MUST include the BFD enabled TLV in its IIH. The contents of the TLV MUST indicate what protocols have been enabled for BFD by including the appropriate NLPID(s).



When sending an IIH on an interface on which BFD is NOT enabled a router MUST NOT include the BFD enabled TLV.

### **3.1. Determining Local Significance**

When receiving an IIH from a neighbor on an interface with BFD enabled, if the IIH contains the BFD enabled TLV the contents of the BFD TLV are examined to determine if they are of local significance. The logic used to determine local significance is impacted by the combination of topologies and NLPIDs supported on each topology by the local system. [\[I-D.ietf-isis-wg-multi-topology\]](#). We introduce the following definitions:

NLPID\_LOCAL\_BFD - The set of NLPIDs for which BFD has been locally enabled on an interface.

NLPID\_LOCAL\_TOPO - The set of NLPIDs supported on a given topology.

NLPID\_BFD\_TLV - The set of NLPIDs advertised in the BFD TLV in a received IIH.

NLPID\_BFD\_TOPO - The set of NLPIDs which are common to (NLPID\_LOCAL\_BFD and NLPID\_LOCAL\_TOPO and NLPID\_BFD\_TLV).

IIH\_BFD\_LSIG - A boolean which is TRUE when there exists at least one topology which is supported by both the local system and the neighbor where NLPID\_BFD\_TOPO is not empty.

IS-IS\_BFD\_TOPO\_UP - A per topology boolean whose value is TRUE when IIH\_BFD\_LSIG is TRUE, the topology is supported by both the local system and the neighbor, and either BFD session state for all NLPIDs in the corresponding NLPID\_BFD\_TOPO set is UP or the NLPID\_BFD\_TOPO set is empty for that topology.

IS-IS\_BFD\_UP - A boolean whose value is TRUE when IIH\_BFD\_LSIG is TRUE and there is at least one topology supported by the local system and the neighbor which has an IS-IS\_BFD\_TOPO\_UP value which is TRUE.

If IIH\_BFD\_LSIG is FALSE then the contents of the corresponding received BFD TLV are ignored. Note that this includes the case where BFD is not locally enabled on an interface for any NLPID.

### **3.2. Adjacency Establishment and Maintenance**

When IIH\_BFD\_LSIG is TRUE, the following extensions to the rules for adjacency establishment and maintenance MUST apply:



- o IS-IS\_BFD\_UP state MUST be TRUE before the adjacency can transition from INIT to UP state
- o When the IS-IS adjacency is UP and IS-IS\_BFD\_UP becomes FALSE the IS-IS adjacency MUST transition to DOWN.
- o On a Point-to-Point circuit whenever IS-IS\_BFD\_UP is FALSE, the Three-Way adjacency state MUST be set to DOWN in the Point-to-Point Three Way Adjacency TLV[RFC3373] in all transmitted IIHs.
- o On a LAN circuit whenever IS-IS\_BFD\_UP is FALSE, the IS Neighbors TLV advertising the MAC address of the neighbor MUST be omitted in all transmitted IIHs.

### **3.3. Advertisement of Topology Specific IS Neighbors**

When IIH\_BFD\_LSIG is TRUE for a given neighbor, the advertisement of a topology specific IS-neighbor (as well as the use of the neighbor in the topology specific decision process) is determined by the value of IS-IS\_BFD\_TOPO\_UP for each topology. If IS-IS\_BFD\_TOPO\_UP is TRUE then the topology specific neighbor is advertised. If IS-IS\_BFD\_TOPO\_UP is FALSE then the topology specific neighbor is NOT advertised.

## **4. Transition**

To allow for a non-disruptive transition to the use of BFD some amount of time should be allowed before bringing down an UP adjacency on a BFD enabled interface when the value of IIH\_BFD\_LSIG becomes TRUE as a result of the introduction of the BFD TLV or the modification (by adding a new supported NLPID) of an existing BFD TLV in a neighbor's IIH. A simple way to do this is to not update the adjacency hold-time when receiving such an IIH from a neighbor with whom we have an UP adjacency until IS-IS\_BFD\_UP becomes TRUE.

If the value of IIH\_BFD\_LSIG becomes FALSE as a result of the removal the BFD TLV or the modification (by removing a supported NLPID) of an existing BFD TLV in a neighbor's IIH then BFD session establishment is no longer required to maintain the adjacency in or transition the adjacency to the UP state.

If a BFD session is administratively shut down [[I-D.ietf-bfd-base](#)] and the BFD session state change would impact the value of IS-IS\_BFD\_UP, then IS-IS SHOULD allow time for the corresponding NLPID to be removed from the neighbor's BFD TLV by not updating the adjacency hold time until IIH\_BFD\_LSIG becomes FALSE. Note that while this allows a non-disruptive transition, it still enforces



consistency between the administrative state of the BFD session and the NLPID(s) advertised in the BFD TLV. This is necessary to provide consistent behavior regardless of whether the BFD AdminDown state is introduced before or after an IS-IS adjacency UP state has been achieved.

## 5. Graceful Restart

It is worth considering what if anything should be done when IS-IS is gracefully restarting [[RFC3847](#)].

In cases where BFD shares fate with the control plane, it can be expected that BFD session failure may occur in conjunction with the control plane restart. In such cases premature abort of IS-IS graceful restart as a result of BFD session failure is undesirable. Therefore, some mechanism to ignore the BFD session failure for a limited period of time would be beneficial. How this is implemented is beyond the scope of this document. Consult [[I-D.ietf-bfd-generic](#)] for further details.

## 6. The BFD Enabled TLV

The BFD enabled TLV is formatted as shown below. The TLV SHALL only be included in an IS-IS IIH PDU and only when BFD is enabled for one or more supported protocols on the interface over which the IIH is being sent. The NLPIDs encoded in the TLV are defined in [[IS09577](#)]

Type 139 (suggested - to be assigned by IANA)  
 Length # of octets in the value field (1 to 255)  
 Value one octet NLPID for each data protocol  
       for which BFD support is enabled

	No. of octets
+-----+	
NLPID	1
+-----+	
:	:
:	:
+-----+	
NLPID	1
+-----+	



## **7. Security Considerations**

The TLV defined within this document describes an addition to the IS-IS Hello protocol and does not impact the security mechanism of the IS-IS protocol.

## **8. IANA Considerations**

The following IS-IS TLV type is defined by this draft.

Name	Value	IIH	LSP	SNP
-----	-----	---	---	---
BFD Enabled TLV	139	y	n	n

Please update the IS-IS TLV Codepoint Registry accordingly.

Note to RFC Editor: this section may be removed on publication as an RFC.

## **9. Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to thank Matthew Jones, Dave Katz, Jonathan Moon, Stefano Previdi, Michael Shiplett and David Ward, for various input on this document.

## **10. References**

### **10.1. Normative References**

- [IS09577] International Organization for Standardization, "Protocol identification in the network layer (ISO/IEC 9577)", ISO/IEC 9577:1999, Fourth Edition, Dec 1999.
- [RFC1195] Callon, R., "Use of OSI IS-IS for routing in TCP/IP and dual environments", [RFC 1195](#), December 1990.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3373] Katz, D. and R. Saluja, "Three-Way Handshake for Intermediate System to Intermediate System (IS-IS) Point-to-Point Adjacencies", [RFC 3373](#), September 2002.



## **10.2. Informative References**

- [I-D.ietf-bfd-base]  
Katz, D. and D. Ward, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection", [draft-ietf-bfd-base-06](#) (work in progress), March 2007.
- [I-D.ietf-bfd-generic]  
Katz, D. and D. Ward, "Generic Application of BFD", [draft-ietf-bfd-generic-03](#) (work in progress), March 2007.
- [I-D.ietf-bfd-v4v6-1hop]  
Katz, D. and D. Ward, "BFD for IPv4 and IPv6 (Single Hop)", [draft-ietf-bfd-v4v6-1hop-06](#) (work in progress), March 2007.
- [I-D.ietf-isis-wg-multi-topology]  
Przygienda, T., "M-ISIS: Multi Topology (MT) Routing in IS-IS", [draft-ietf-isis-wg-multi-topology-12](#) (work in progress), November 2007.
- [RFC3847] Shand, M. and L. Ginsberg, "Restart Signaling for Intermediate System to Intermediate System (IS-IS)", [RFC 3847](#), July 2004.

### Authors' Addresses

Christian E. Hopps  
Cisco Systems  
170 W. Tasman Dr.  
San Jose, California 95134  
USA

Email: chopps@cisco.com

Les Ginsberg  
Cisco Systems  
510 McCarthy Blvd.  
Milpitas, Ca. 95035  
USA

Email: ginsberg@cisco.com



## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

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, THE IETF TRUST 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.

## Intellectual Property

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).

## Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).

