INTERNET-DRAFT   J. Dai
Intended Status: Proposed Standard
Expires: October 30, 2020

                                                  Fiberhome Telecom LTD
                                                        April 30, 2020

State-updating mechanism in RSVP-TE for MPLS network
draft-gao-mpls-teas-rsvpte-state-update-01

Abstract

   RSVP-TE has the following advantages: source routing capability,
   and the ability to reserve resources hop by hop along the LSP path.

   RSVP takes a "soft state" approach to managing the reservation
   state in routers and hosts. The use of Refresh messages to cover
   many possible failures has resulted in a number of operational
   problems. One problem relates to scaling, another relates to the
   reliability and latency of RSVP Signaling.

   This document describes a number of mechanisms that can be used to
   reduce processing overhead requirements of refresh messages. These
   extension present no backwards compatibility issues.

Status of this Memo

Copyright and License Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Standard RSVP [RFC2205] maintains state via the generation of RSVP
refresh messages. Refresh messages are used to both synchronize
state between RSVP neighbors and to recover from lost RSVP messages.
The use of Refresh messages to cover many possible failures has
resulted in a number of operational problems. One problem relates to
scaling, another relates to the reliability and latency of RSVP
Signaling.

The scaling problems are linked to the resource requirements (in
terms of processing and memory) of running RSVP. The resource
requirements increase proportionally with the number of sessions.
Each session requires the generation, transmission, reception and
processing of RSVP Path and Resv messages per refresh period.
Supporting a large number of sessions, and the corresponding volume
of refresh messages, presents a scaling problem.

The reliability and latency problem occurs when a non-refresh RSVP
message is lost in transmission. Standard RSVP [RFC2205] recovers
from a lost message via RSVP refresh messages. In the face of
transmission loss of RSVP messages, the end-to-end latency of RSVP
signaling is tied to the refresh interval of the node(s) experiencing
the loss. When end-to-end signaling is limited by the refresh
interval, the delay incurred in the establishment or the change of a
reservation may be beyond the range of what is acceptable for some
applications.

This document proposes to disable RSVP refresh messages to solve
soft-state scaling problems. The reliable message delivery mechanism
specified in [RFC2961] states that "Nodes receiving a non-out of
order message containing a MESSAGE_ID object with the ACK_Desired
flag set, SHOULD respond with a MESSAGE_ID_ACK object.". When RSVP
refresh messages are disabled, the time to deallocate resources
after a tear message is lost is an issue. To solve this problem,
MUST make use of the Hello session based on the Node-ID
([RFC3209][RFC4558]) for detection of RSVP-TE signaling adjacency
failures. MUST implement coupling the state of individual LSPs
with the state of the corresponding RSVP-TE signaling adjacency.
When an RSVP-TE speaker detects RSVP-TE signaling adjacency
failure, the speaker MUST act as if all the Path and Resv states
learned via the failed signaling adjacency have timed out. To
avoid compatibility problems, a flag bit in the RSVP message
header is extended to disable RSVP refresh messages.

2. Terminology

2.1.   Terms Used in This Document

Refresh messages: represent previously advertised state and contain
   exactly the same objects and same information as a previously
   transmitted message, and are sent over the same path. Only Path and
   Resv messages can be refresh messages. Refresh messages are
   identical to the corresponding previously transmitted message, with
   some possible exceptions.

Trigger messages: Trigger messages are those RSVP messages that
   advertise state or any other information not previously
   transmitted. Trigger messages include messages advertising new
   state, a route change that alters a reservation path, or a
   modification to an existing RSVP session or reservation.

2.2. Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this document:
   RSVP: Resource ReserVation Protocol.
   RSVP-TE: Resource ReserVation Protocol - Traffic Engineering.

3 Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT",
"SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and
"OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in
BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all
capitals, as shown here.

4 State-updating mechanism in RSVP for MPLS network

To indicate support for the refresh message disable extensions, an
additional capability bit is added to the common RSVP header, which
is defined in [RFC2205].

```
         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
          +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
          | Vers | Flags |   Msg Type    |          RSVP Checksum         |
          +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
          |   Send_TTL    |  (Reserved)   |          RSVP Length          |
          +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                            Figure 1 RSVP header
```

   Flags: 4 bits

        0x02: Refresh message disable

           When set, indicates that this node is willing and capable of
           supporting the refresh message disable extensions described in
           this document. This bit is meaningful only between RSVP
neighbors.

      Nodes supporting the refresh message disable extensions must also
      take care to recognize when a next hop stops sending RSVP messages
      with the Refresh-Message-Disable bit set. To cover this case,
      nodes supporting the refresh message disable extensions MUST
      examine the flags field of each received RSVP message. If the flag
      changes from indicating support to indicating non-support then,
      unless configured otherwise, MUST NOT stop state refreshes to that
      neighbor.

      Note: Refresh messages can only be disabled if the neighbor node must
      support both reliable RSVP message delivery in [RFC2961] and Hello
message
      extension in [RFC3209] [RFC4558]. When RSVP refresh messages are
disabled,
      both reliable RSVP message delivery in [RFC2961] and Hello message
      extension in [RFC3209] [RFC4558] must be enabled.

4.1. Reliable RSVP message delivery

      Refresh messages are used to both synchronize state between RSVP
neighbors
      and to recover from lost RSVP messages. The reliability and latency
problem
      occurs when a non-refresh RSVP message is lost in transmission.

      An implementation that supports the techniques discussed in this document
      must support the functionality described in [RFC2961] as follows:

      o It MUST support reliable delivery of Path/Resv and the
         corresponding Tear/Err messages (as specified in Section 4 of
         [RFC2961]).

o It MUST support retransmission of all unacknowledged RSVP-TE
      messages using exponential backoff (as specified in Section 6 of
      [RFC2961]).

 4.2. Hello Extension for tear message

      When RSVP refresh messages are disabled, the time to deallocate resources
      after a tear message is lost is an issue. To solve this problem, MUST
make
      use of the Hello session based on the Node-ID ([RFC3209][RFC4558]) for
      detection of RSVP-TE signaling adjacency failures.

      An implementation that supports the techniques discussed in this document
      must support the functionality as follows:

  o MUST make use of the Hello session based on the Node-ID ([RFC3209]
     [RFC4558]) for detection of RSVP-TE signaling adjacency failures.
     A default value of 9 seconds is RECOMMENDED by this document for
     the configurable node hello interval (as opposed to the default
     value of 5 milliseconds proposed in Section 5.3 of [RFC3209]).
     The Hello message format is as follows:
           <Hello Message> ::= <Common Header> [<INTEGRITY>]
                            <HELLO>
     The HELLO Object formats is as follows:


```
 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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Src_Instance                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Dst_Instance                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

                      Figure 2 Format for hello object
     Src_Instance: 32 bits

       a 32 bit value that represents the sender's instance. The
       advertiser maintains a per neighbor representation/value. This
       value MUST change when the sender is reset, when the node reboots,
       or when communication is lost to the neighboring node and
       otherwise remains the same. This field MUST NOT be set to zero
       (0).

     Dst_Instance: 32 bits

       The most recently received Src_Instance value received from the
       neighbor. This field MUST be set to zero (0) when no value has
       ever been seen from the neighbor.

  o MUST implement coupling the state of individual LSPs with the
     state of the corresponding RSVP-TE signaling adjacency. When an

RSVP-TE speaker detects RSVP-TE signaling adjacency failure, the
speaker MUST act as if all the Path and Resv states learned via
the failed signaling adjacency have timed out.

5. Security Considerations

This document does not introduce additional security requirements and mechanisms. Implementation of the mechanism follows the security specification of [RFC2205].

6. IANA Considerations

This document makes no IANA requests.

7. Normative References

[RFC2205]   Braden, R., Ed., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S., and S. Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1 Functional Specification", RFC 2205, DOI 10.17487/RFC2205, September 1997, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2205>.

[RFC2961]   Berger, L., Gan, D., Swallow, G., Pan, P., Tommasi, F., and S. Molendini, "RSVP Refresh Overhead Reduction Extensions", RFC 2961, DOI 10.17487/RFC2961, April 3001, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2961>.

[RFC3209]   Awduche, D., Berger, L., Gan, D., Li, T., Srinivasan, V., and G. Swallow, "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", RFC 3209, DOI 10.17487/RFC3209, December 2001, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3209>.

[RFC4558]   Ali, Z., Rahman, R., Prairie, D., and D. Papadimitriou, "Node-ID Based Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) Hello: A Clarification Statement", RFC 4558, DOI 10.17487/RFC4558, June 2006, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4558>.

[RFC8370]   Beeram, V., Ed., Minei, I., Shakir, R., Pacella, D., and T. Saad, "Techniques to Improve the Scalability of RSVP-TE Deployments", RFC 8402, DOI 10.17487/RFC8370, May 2018, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8370>.

Authors' Addresses

    Jun Gao
      Fiberhome Telecom LTD.
      Gaoxin 4th Road 6#
      Wuhan, Hubei 430079
      China

      Email: jgao@fiberhome.com

    Jinyou Dai
      Fiberhome Telecom LTD.
      Gaoxin 4th Road 6#
      Wuhan, Hubei 430079
      China

      Email: djy@fiberhome.com