

LSR Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: November 20, 2019

U. Chunduri  
Huawei USA  
J. Tantsura  
Apstra, Inc.  
S. Hegde  
Juniper Networks  
May 19, 2019

**IS-IS Multi Topology Deployment Considerations**  
**draft-chunduri-lsr-isis-mt-deployment-cons-02**

**Abstract**

This document analyzes IS-IS Multi Topology (MT) applicability in various deployments (Core/Mobile Backhaul/Data Center underlays). This document explores the nuances around the terminology and usage of various IS-IS address families, topologies with different considerations, for choosing the right combination for a specific deployment scenario.

This document also discusses various ways one can deploy IPv6 only IS-IS topology.

**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 [RFC2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)], [RFC8174](#) [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

**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 November 20, 2019.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Need for MT in IS-IS networks . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Acronyms . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Topologies and Address Families . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Single Topology Mode and Multiple Address Families . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	Multiple Topology Mode and Multiple Address Families . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	Transition Mode . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	IPv6 Only Topology . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	IS-IS MT and LFA . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

ISIS originally developed for OSI [[ISO.10589.1992](#)] and extensions have been made available to support IPv4 [[RFC1195](#)]. A method for exchanging IPv6 routing information using the IS-IS routing protocol is specified in [[RFC5308](#)]. How to run a set of independent IP topologies with topology specific adjacencies, within a single IS-IS domain has been defined in IS-IS MT [[RFC5120](#)].

Multiple mobile backhaul network user plane proposals like [[I-D.ietf-dmm-srv6-mobile-uplane](#)] and [[I-D.herbert-ila-mobile](#)] use IPv6 only solution using source routing, address transformation respectively. It is possible to conceive, various parts of the backhaul networks use IPv4 and appropriate migration strategy needed



before eventually moving towards IPv6 only network. While any IGP can be used in these networks, this document covers only IS-IS protocol aspects.

Various layer-3 DC fabric routing options (refs: openfabric, spine-leaf, controller-based) by changing or optimizing some aspects w.r.t adjacency formation, flooding optimizations, or/and mechanisms to automatically compute the location of the node in the fat tree topology are proposed recently and this document brings some of the multi topology deployment aspects relevant to these networks. Please note, part of the discussion around IS-IS MT is not specific to DC or CLOS fabrics and generally applicable to any IS-IS deployment but discussed here because of multiple proposals to use various forms of IS-IS in this context.

## **2. Need for MT in IS-IS networks**

For mobile transport backhaul networks seeking only IPv6 network or transitioning from parts of the network with only IPv4, IS-IS MT is needed. For layer-3 DC fabric underlay, which provide reachability, only one address family (either IPv4 or IPv6) SHOULD be sufficient. However if either only IPv6 address family is needed in the underlay or deploying both IPv4 and IPv6 address families are desired discussion in [Section 4](#) is relevant.

It is an unlikely requirement, where DC fabric to be partitioned logically to have different topologies in the underlay but this can happen in various scenarios as listed in [Section 4.1](#). If one does the same to meet a particular requirement, it introduces a manageability complexity of these logical topologies. IS-IS MT [[RFC5120](#)] also designed to address the above need and discussion in [Section 4.2](#) is relevant. It is worth noting, majority of the IS-IS deployments use MT primarily to have a separate logical topology for IPv6 address family.

## **3. Acronyms**

IIH : IS-IS Hello Protocol Data Unit

LSP : Link State PDU

MT : Multi Topology

SPF : Shortest Path First



#### **4. Topologies and Address Families**

Terminology around IS-IS topologies and address families is somewhat confusing at best. Just to give an example, MT ID #2 defined in [\[RFC5120\]](#) says, it is "Reserved for IPv6 routing topology". While multiple MT ID's can be deployed in a network with IPv6 topologies, MT ID #2, perhaps referring to a first such topology with IPv6 only address family. This section details various topology and address family options possible with currently available IS-IS specifications with respective defined TLVs.

##### **4.1. Single Topology Mode and Multiple Address Families**

IS-IS with IPv4 address family and with wide-metrics [\[RFC5305\]](#) is widely deployed, with TLV 22 defined for IS Reachability and TLV 135 for IP (IPv4) reachability information. This is essentially a single topology for the entire IS-IS area/domain with a single address family (IPv4 unicast).

IS-IS can also be enabled with IPv6 unicast address family in a single topology mode along with IPv4 unicast address family. Here IPv6 uses the same underlying topology that is used for IPv4 and this can be done as specified in IS-IS IPv6 [\[RFC5308\]](#) which introduces TLV 236, an IPv6 reachability TLV. It is important to note same IS-IS adjacency is used for both address families and with a single SPF (decision process) both IPv4 and IPv6 reachability would be computed.

However, for the above to work effectively, both IPv4 and IPv6 address families MUST share a common network topology. That is to use IS-IS for IPv4 and IPv6 routing, any interface configured for IPv4 IS-IS MUST also be configured for IPv6 IS-IS, and vice versa. All routers within an IS-IS area (Level 1 routing) or domain (Level 2 routing) MUST also support the same set of address families: IPv4 only, IPv6 only, or both IPv4 and IPv6. Any discrepancy in the configuration w.r.t above can cause routing black holes and one such scenario is discussed below.






Figure 1: IS-IS with multiple address families

As shown, in the above diagram all routers in the network enabled with both IPv4 and IPv6 unicast address families at the IS level and single topology would be built. However, at a link level all but except one link, say if IPv6 is not configured on the link between the routers Rx and R2; due to a single IS-IS topology, the shortest path between Rx and R2 is the direct link and since IPv6 is not enabled on that link, Rx and R2 cannot exchange IPv6 data traffic even though there's an alternate path between them in the topology through Rx, R1, Ry and R2.

Hence to summarize the restrictions: all routers in the topology MUST support only IPv4, only IPv6 or both IPv4 and IPv6 address families on all links and node. In other words, network MUST be congruent. While this model is to simpler to operate, might not be flexible enough for some IS-IS deployments. Some examples where congruency is not possible as follows:

- a. When IPv6 is getting introduced in the network legacy nodes that are IPv6 incapable.
- b. Implementation issues causing IPv6 to be disabled on some nodes.
- c. Hardware scale limitations causing IPv6 to be disabled on some low-end nodes.

#### **4.2. Multiple Topology Mode and Multiple Address Families**

Multi-topology IS-IS uses multiple SPFs to compute routes and removes the restriction that all interfaces MUST support all configured address families and that all routers in an IS-IS area or domain MUST support the same set of address families. This introduces the concept of topology specific adjacency with MT IS Reachability TLV 222 and MT capable IPv4 Reachability with TLV 235 and MT capable IPv6 Reachability with TLV 237.



When MT IS-IS is enabled with IPv4 and IPv6 address families, the routers build two topologies, one for each address family (IPv4 and IPv6) and can find the optimum path for each address family even when some links in the network support only one of them. IS-IS MT [RFC5120] defines MT ID #0 for backward compatibility, as the "standard" topology and this essentially operate as IS-IS single topology mode as specified in [Section 4.1](#) and supports both IPv4 and IPv6 address families. MT ID #2 [RFC5120] is defined for IPv6 address family in MT mode.

#### **[4.2.1.](#) Transition Mode**

Most of the vendors supported MT transition feature (though some vendors disabled to avoid confusion around this) in the IS-IS networks to facilitate MT deployments without disrupting the single topology mode. The MT transition mode allows a network operating in single topology IS-IS IPv6 [RFC5308] to continue to work while upgrading routers to include MT IS-IS IPv6 support i.e., MT ID #2 with [RFC5120]. While in transition mode, both types of TLVs (single-topology with TLVs 22/236 and MT with TLVs 222/237) are sent in LSPs for all configured IPv6 addresses, nodes can continue to process these and operate in single topology mode though being in MT mode ("standard" IS-IS topology with MT ID #0). After all routers in the area or domain have been upgraded to support MT IPv6 transition mode can be removed from the configuration. Once all routers in the area or domain are operating in MT IPv6 mode, the topological restrictions of single-topology mode can be made no longer in effect.

When transition mode is enabled, the router advertises both MT TLVs and the old style IS-IS IPv6 TLVs but the topological restrictions of the single topology mode discussed above are in effect. However, there were instances while this mode is enabled and expectations for different result in the actual deployments.

#### **[4.3.](#) IPv6 Only Topology**

Though it is theoretically possible to build IPv6 only underlay (with TLV 236 for IPv6 reachability prefixes) in single topology mode as discussed in [Section 4.1](#), lot of legacy implementations require IPv4 address families too be configured in single topology mode (ingrained code structures for IPv4 address family). IPv6 only DC underlay network can be built with multi topology adjacencies (TLV 222) and reachability prefixes (TLV 237) with MT ID #2 as discussed above in [Section 4.2](#). With this, any other address family can be introduced including "standard" topology MT ID #0 (Single topology mode with both address families) and there are no restrictions on which address family has to enable on which link as specified in [Section 4.1](#).



## **5. IS-IS MT and LFA**

IP Fast Reroute (FRR) or Loop Free Alternative (LFA) computation in MT mode are described in detail in Section 5.2 of [[I-D.ietf-rtgwg-multihomed-prefix-lfa](#)].

## **6. Acknowledgements**

Thanks to Acee Lindem, Chris Hopps, Michael Abramson and Les Ginsberg for various inputs on this work.

## **7. IANA Considerations**

This document has no actions for IANA.

## **8. Security Considerations**

Security concerns for IS-IS are addressed in [[RFC5304](#)] and [[RFC5310](#)]. Further security analysis for IS-IS protocol is done in [[RFC7645](#)].

This document does not introduce any change in any of the IS-IS protocol or IS-IS protocol extensions. This document also does not introduce any new security issues other than as noted in the referenced IS-IS protocol extensions.

## **9. References**

### **9.1. Normative References**

- [ISO.10589.1992]  
International Organization for Standardization,  
"Intermediate system to intermediate system intra-domain-  
routing routine information exchange protocol for use in  
conjunction with the protocol for providing the  
connectionless-mode Network Service (ISO 8473)",  
ISO Standard 10589, 1992.
- [RFC1195] Callon, R., "Use of OSI IS-IS for routing in TCP/IP and  
dual environments", [RFC 1195](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1195,  
December 1990, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1195>>.
- [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>>.



- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

## 9.2. Informative References

- [I-D.herbert-ila-mobile]  
Herbert, T. and K. Bogineni, "Identifier Locator Addressing for Mobile User-Plane", [draft-herbert-ila-mobile-01](#) (work in progress), March 2018.
- [I-D.ietf-dmm-srv6-mobile-uplane]  
Matsushima, S., Filsfils, C., Kohno, M., Camarillo, P., daniel.voyer@bell.ca, d., and C. Perkins, "Segment Routing IPv6 for Mobile User Plane", [draft-ietf-dmm-srv6-mobile-uplane-04](#) (work in progress), March 2019.
- [I-D.ietf-rtgwg-multihomed-prefix-lfa]  
Sarkar, P., Chunduri, U., Hegde, S., Tantsura, J., and H. Gredler, "Loop-Free Alternates selection for Multi-Homed Prefixes", [draft-ietf-rtgwg-multihomed-prefix-lfa-09](#) (work in progress), November 2018.
- [RFC5120] Przygienda, T., Shen, N., and N. Sheth, "M-ISIS: Multi Topology (MT) Routing in Intermediate System to Intermediate Systems (IS-ISs)", [RFC 5120](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5120, February 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5120>>.
- [RFC5304] Li, T. and R. Atkinson, "IS-IS Cryptographic Authentication", [RFC 5304](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5304, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5304>>.
- [RFC5305] Li, T. and H. Smit, "IS-IS Extensions for Traffic Engineering", [RFC 5305](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5305, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5305>>.
- [RFC5308] Hopps, C., "Routing IPv6 with IS-IS", [RFC 5308](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5308, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5308>>.
- [RFC5310] Bhatia, M., Manral, V., Li, T., Atkinson, R., White, R., and M. Fanto, "IS-IS Generic Cryptographic Authentication", [RFC 5310](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5310, February 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5310>>.



[RFC7645] Chunduri, U., Tian, A., and W. Lu, "The Keying and Authentication for Routing Protocol (KARP) IS-IS Security Analysis", [RFC 7645](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7645, September 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7645>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Uma Chunduri  
Huawei USA  
2330 Central Expressway  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
USA

Email: [uma.chunduri@huawei.com](mailto:uma.chunduri@huawei.com)

Jeff Tantsura  
Apstra, Inc.

Email: [jefftant.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:jefftant.ietf@gmail.com)

Shraddha Hegde  
Juniper Networks  
Elnath-Exora Business Park Survey  
Bangalore, Karnataka 560103  
USA

Email: [shraddha@juniper.net](mailto:shraddha@juniper.net)

