

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft

L. Dunbar  
Huawei  
N. So  
Verizon

Intended status: Standard Track  
Expires: July 2010

January 19, 2010

## Path Condition Change Marking using BFD

[draft-dunbar-bfd-path-condition-change-marking-00.txt](#)

### 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), 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 July 19, 2010.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2010 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

Internet-Draft

Path Condition Marking using BFD

January 2010

(<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 BSD License.

## Abstract

There are times that an LSP source node needs to know change(s) has occurred along the originally established LSP path. This is especially true in the Mobile Backhaul environment where microwave transport is widely deployed. The bandwidth provided by the microwave transport can change with weather. The source LSR, e.g. LTE's eNodeB, needs to adjust its admission rate or shift more load to alternative paths when the backhaul transport path condition is changed.

This draft describes a simple mechanism for transit LSRs to notify Source LSR of the path condition changes.

## 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](#) 0.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1. Motivation.....</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2. Analysis of potential methods.....</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3. BFD protocol extension for path condition impairment notification .....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4. Path Condition Impairment Notification.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5. Receiving Path Condition Impairment Notification.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6. Manageability Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7. Security Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">8. IANA Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>

<a href="#">9.</a>	Acknowledgments.....	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	References.....	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">10.1.</a>	Normative References.....	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">10.2.</a>	Informative References.....	<a href="#">8</a>
	Authors' Addresses.....	<a href="#">9</a>
	Intellectual Property Statement.....	<a href="#">9</a>

Disclaimer of Validity.....	<a href="#">10</a>
-----------------------------	--------------------

## [1.](#) Motivation

LSP's source node(s) can have multiple paths to the corresponding destination node(s). Those paths can have different performance behavior such as delay, delay variation, bandwidth, and so on. The LSP(s)' can carry traffic with various Class of Services (CoS). Some of the premium CoS require strict performance objectives to be met at all time, so it is desirable to have LSP's source node(s) to be notified if there is any condition change along the LSP path. That way the source node(s), which is aware of the performance objectives, can make the proper decision if an alternative path needs to be established, or the admission rate needs to be changed for the incoming traffic.

A common example for the LSP condition change is the bandwidth fluctuation in Mobile Backhaul network, where Microwave transport is widely deployed. Most Microwave transport nodes adjust its bandwidth based on the weather. Even though there is RSVP-TE for individual links to advertise its available bandwidth to all the nodes in the routing domain, RSVP-TE might not be possible in some Mobile Backhaul environment where there might be multiple routing domains from base stations to MSO. If Source Nodes, i.e. LTE's eNodeB, are aware of the bandwidth change, they can adjust services accepted to the network, request other base stations to accept new calls, or trigger (or increase the frequency of) Performance Monitoring scheme.

In other applications, some source LSRs want to get notified when there is congestion condition or port changes on the transit nodes, so that proper actions can be taken. MPLS-ECN ([RFC 5129](#)) specifies a mechanism for transit nodes to mark EXP bits when congestion happens. However, many deployed MPLS networks already use EXP bits to mark priority, making it not possible to use MPLS-ECN ([RFC 5129](#)) mechanism

for the purpose of LSP change notification.

## 2. Analysis of potential methods

There is MPLS-ECN ([RFC 5129](#)) marking on the MPLS header's EXP field when transit nodes encounter congestion. The problem with MPLS-ECN ([RFC 5129](#)) is that many deployed MPLS networks already use EXP bits to represent priority. Another issue with MPLS-ECN ([RFC 5129](#)) is that the congestion marking doesn't occur until congestion happens. When a transit link bandwidth is reduced, such as microwave transport link bandwidth reduction due to weather, queues on the transit node can

Dunbar, So

Expires July 19, 2010

[Page 3]

---

Internet-Draft

Path Condition Marking using BFD

January 2010

quickly build up. Even if MPLS-ECN ([RFC 5129](#)) scheme is used, the queue on the transit node may already been overrun by the time the egress node recognizing the congestion and notifies the source node.

When there is a hard event change on a transit LSR, such as bandwidth reduction or port change, an alternative approach is for the transit LSR to send a simple notification to the source node indicating the change occurred. However, the transit nodes may not know the source nodes of the LSPs (e.g. LDP LSPs). Although the transit LSR can get the source LSR's IP address from the MPLS-Ping Request message, the MPLS-Ping may not be triggered when there is condition change on the LSP path.

Another alternative is to mark on the MPLS header to indicate the hard impairment event occurred on the path. It is the similar approach as the MPLS-ECN ([RFC5129](#)). However, there are no available bits on the MPSL header for such marking.

## 3. BFD protocol extension for path condition impairment notification

When periodic BFD is enabled between a pair of LSRs (the Source and the destination), the BFD frequency is based on a fixed interval, usually in the magnitude of milliseconds. Since MPLS-BFD is intended to traverse along the LSP path, a transit node has the information on the port to the downstream LSR and is aware of the downstream link status, including impairment status, such as bandwidth being reduced, port being altered, or congested. Therefore, BFD is a good choice for path condition impairment notification when BFD is enabled on the LSP.

This draft suggests adding an optional Impairment section to the BFD

Control Frame:

```

      0               1               2               3
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
| Type           | Length           | ImpairmentValue |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
      Optional Routable IPV4 or IPV6 address of source LSR      |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

If a source LSR of a LSP cannot do anything when the LSP path is impaired, then the source LSR SHOULD NOT include this optional section in the BFD control frame. When the Impairment section is not present in the BFD control frame, the transit LSR does not need to mark the path condition change indication.

Dunbar, So

Expires July 19, 2010

[Page 4]

Internet-Draft

Path Condition Marking using BFD

January 2010

If the Source LSR can do something when the normal LSP path is impaired or altered, the Source LSR CAN include the optional Impairment section in the BFD Control Frame. If the Impairment section is attached, the transit LSR CAN do the following when experiencing downstream link impairment:

The transit LSR SHOULD mark on the Impairment field of the condition of downstream link, and/or

The transit LSR SHALL send a Path Condition Impairment Notification (PCIN) back to the source LSR if it knows the source LSR.

The Impairment Value field can take one of the following values:

Value	Meaning
1	port towards downstream LSR is congested
2	Bandwidth of the link towards downstream LSR is reduced
3	Port towards downstream LSR has been altered

The optional Routable IP address in the Impairment Section is for transit LSR to send the Path Condition Impairment Notification back to the source LSR. Since BFD control frames between a pair of LSRs are exchanged frequently, it is not necessary for the transit node to send the Path Condition Impairment Notification every time there is

BFD traversed. In order to minimize work required on transit node, source node takes the responsibility to indicate if it needs a notification from transit node when the transit node experiences downstream link impairment. When the Routable IP address is included in the Impairment Section of BFD control frame, transit node SHALL send back a Path Condition Impairment Notification to the Source LSR when impairment is encountered.

The source LSR CAN perform the following actions upon receiving the Path Condition Impairment Notification from transit LSR.

- send more sophisticated inquiry messages to the transit LSR to diagnose what happened

- trigger performance monitoring scheme to measure the quality of the path

- re-adjust load balancing among the multiple paths from Source LSR to the Destination LSR

- Re-signal LSP to alternative path

Dunbar, So

Expires July 19, 2010

[Page 5]

---

Internet-Draft

Path Condition Marking using BFD

January 2010

- activate the secondary/protection path

- reduce admission rate (in the case of LTE eNodeB).

When a transit node receives a BFD and its downstream link is impaired or altered, it CAN perform the following actions:

1. If the BFD doesn't have the Impairment section, do nothing. Simply forward the BFD to the next hop.

Otherwise:

2. The transit node SHALL set the ImpairmentValue field accordingly and then forward the BFD to the next hop.

3. If Routable IP address is included in the Impairment section, the transit LSR SHALL construct the Path Condition Impairment Notification message and send it to the Source LSR.

#### [4.](#) Path Condition Impairment Notification

Though a new message format can be specified for transit node to send the Path Condition Impairment Notification, it is always easier for LSR to use an existing message type, like LSP-Ping Echo Reply [[RFC4379](#)], with some minor modification to do the job.

This draft suggests a message type similar to the MPLS-Ping Echo reply which is specified in [Section 3 of RFC 4379](#) to indicate the Path Condition Impairment Notification with the following changes:

[RFC 4379](#) specifies that the Message Type of the LSP-Ping has one of the two values. This draft suggests adding a new value to indicate that the message is for Path Condition Impairment Notification in responding to BFD:

Value	Meaning
-----	-----
1	MPLS echo request [ <a href="#">RFC 4379</a> ]
2	MPLS echo reply [ <a href="#">RFC 4379</a> ]
3	Path Condition Impairment Notification in responding to BFD

[MPLS-Ping-Enhanced] introduced Downstream Detailed Mapping TLV. This reflect the condition of the downstream link. When used alone, path condition impairment notification SHALL be activated upon receiving a BFD control Frame with the optional Routable IP Address included in the Impairment Section. In this case, the Downstream Path Condition sub-TLV SHALL be the only sub-TLV in the Downstream Detailed Map [[MPLS-Ping-Enhanced](#)]. When the downstream path condition is included as a sub-type, the Return Code of the echo response message SHALL be set to "See DDM TLV for Return Code and Return SubCode".

Downstream Path Condition Impairment sub-TLV SHOULD have the following field:

```

      0               1               2               3
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
    +--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+

```





## 9. Acknowledgments

This document was prepared using 2-Word-v2.0.template.dot.

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

- [ECN] B. Davie, et. al., "Explicit Congestion Marking in MPLS", [RFC 5129](#), Jan. 2008.
- [MPLS-PING] K. Kompella, et. al., "Detecting MPLS Data Plane Failures", [RFC 4379](#), February 2006.
- [BFD-MPLS] Aggarwal, R., "[draft-ietf-bfd-mpls-07.txt](#)", work in progress.
- [BFD] Katz, D. and Ward, D., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection", [draft-ietf-bfd-base-09.txt](#)
- [LSP-Ping-Enhanced] N. Bahadur, et. al., "Mechanism for performing LSP-Ping over MPLS tunnels", "[draft-ietf-mpls-lsp-ping-enhanced-dsmap-04](#)", work in progress.

### 10.2. Informative References

- [IEEE802.1au] IEEE802.1au Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks-  
Amendment: Congestion Notification

## Authors' Addresses

Linda Dunbar (Ed.)  
Huawei Technologies  
1700 Alma Drive, Suite 500

Plano, TX 75075, USA  
Phone: (972) 543 5849  
Email: ldunbar@huawei.com

Ning So (Ed.)  
Enterprise Data Network and Traffic Planning  
2400 N. Glenville Dr.  
Richardson, TX 75082, USA  
Phone: (972) 729 7905  
Email: ning.so@verizonbusiness.com

## Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF Trust 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 any IETF 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.

Copies of Intellectual Property 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 any standard or specification contained in an IETF Document. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

## Disclaimer of Validity

All IETF Documents and the information contained therein 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 THEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

#### Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.