

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: January 14, 2021

A. Mishra
SES
M. Jethanandani
Kloud Services
A. Saxena
Ciena Corporation
S. Pallagatti
VmWare
M. Chen
Huawei
P. Fan
China Mobile
July 13, 2020

BFD Stability
draft-ietf-bfd-stability-06

Abstract

This document describes extensions to the Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) protocol to measure BFD stability. Specifically, it describes a mechanism for detection of BFD packet loss.

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 January 14, 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Terminology	2
3.	Use Cases	3
4.	BFD Null-Authentication Type	3
5.	Theory of Operation	3
5.1.	Loss Measurement	3
6.	IANA Considerations	4
7.	Security Consideration	4
8.	Contributors	4
9.	Acknowledgements	4
10.	Normative References	4
	Authors' Addresses	5

[1.](#) Introduction

The Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) [[RFC5880](#)] protocol operates by transmitting and receiving BFD control packets, generally at high frequency, over the datapath being monitored. In order to prevent significant data loss due to a datapath failure, BFD session detection time as defined in BFD [[RFC5880](#)] is set to the smallest feasible value.

This document proposes a mechanism to detect lost packet in a BFD session in addition to the datapath fault detection mechanisms of BFD. Such a mechanism presents significant value to measure the stability of BFD sessions and provides data to the operators for the cause of a BFD failure.

This document does not propose any BFD extension to measure data traffic loss or delay on a link or tunnel and the scope is limited to BFD packets.

[2.](#) Terminology

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](#)] and [RFC 8174](#) [[RFC8174](#)].

The reader is expected to be familiar with the BFD [[RFC5880](#)], Optimizing BFD Authentication [[I-D.ietf-bfd-optimizing-authentication](#)] and BFD Secure Sequence Numbers [[I-D.ietf-bfd-secure-sequence-numbers](#)].

3. Use Cases

Bidirectional Forwarding Detection as defined in BFD [[RFC5880](#)] cannot detect any BFD packet loss if loss does not last for detection time. This document proposes a method to detect a dropped packet on the receiver. For example, if the receiver receives BFD control packet k at time t but receives packet $k+3$ at time $t+10\text{ms}$, and never receives packet $k+1$ and/or $k+2$, then it has experienced a drop.

This proposal enables BFD implementation to generate diagnostic information on the health of each BFD session that could be used to preempt a failure on a link that BFD was monitoring by allowing time for a corrective action to be taken.

In a faulty datapath scenario, an operator can use BFD health information to trigger delay and loss measurement OAM protocol (Connectivity Fault Management (CFM) or Loss Measurement (LM)-Delay Measurement (DM)) to further isolate the issue.

4. BFD Null-Authentication Type

The functionality proposed for BFD stability measurement is achieved by appending the Null-Authentication type (as defined in Optimizing BFD Authentication [[I-D.ietf-bfd-optimizing-authentication](#)]) to the BFD control packets that do not have authentication enabled.

5. Theory of Operation

This mechanism allows operators to measure the loss of BFD control packets.

When using MD5 or SHA authentication, BFD uses authentication TLV that carries the Sequence Number. However, if non-meticulous authentication is being used, or no authentication is in use, then the non-authenticated BFD packets MUST include NULL-Auth TLV.

5.1. Loss Measurement

Loss measurement counts the number of BFD control packets missed at the receiver during any Detection Time period. The loss is detected by comparing the Sequence Number field in the Auth TLV (NULL or otherwise) in successive BFD control packets. The Sequence Number in

each successive control packet generated on a BFD session by the transmitter is incremented by one.

The first BFD NULL-Auth type processed by the receiver that has a non-zero sequence number is used for bootstrapping the logic. When using secure sequence numbers, if the expected values are pre-calculated, the value must be matched to detect lost packets as defined in BFD secure sequence numbers [[I-D.ietf-bfd-secure-sequence-numbers](#)].

6. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

7. Security Consideration

Other than concerns raised in BFD [[RFC5880](#)], Optimizing BFD Authentication [[I-D.ietf-bfd-optimizing-authentication](#)] and BFD Secure Sequence Numbers [[I-D.ietf-bfd-secure-sequence-numbers](#)]. There are no new concerns with this proposal.

8. Contributors

Manav Bhatia

9. Acknowledgements

Authors would like to thank Nobo Akiya, Jeffery Haas, Peng Fan, Dileep Singh, Basil Saji, Sagar Soni and Mallik Mudigonda who also contributed to this document.

10. Normative References

- [[I-D.ietf-bfd-optimizing-authentication](#)]
Jethanandani, M., Mishra, A., Saxena, A., and M. Bhatia, "Optimizing BFD Authentication", [draft-ietf-bfd-optimizing-authentication-09](#) (work in progress), December 2019.
- [[I-D.ietf-bfd-secure-sequence-numbers](#)]
Jethanandani, M., Agarwal, S., Mishra, A., Saxena, A., and A. DeKok, "Secure BFD Sequence Numbers", [draft-ietf-bfd-secure-sequence-numbers-05](#) (work in progress), February 2020.

- [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>>.
- [RFC5880] Katz, D. and D. Ward, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD)", [RFC 5880](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5880, June 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5880>>.
- [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>>.

Authors' Addresses

Ashesh Mishra
SES

Email: mishra.ashesh@gmail.com

Mahesh Jethanandani
Kloud Services
CA
USA

Email: mjethanandani@gmail.com

Ankur Saxena
Ciena Corporation
3939 North 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95134
USA

Email: ankurpsaxena@gmail.com
URI: www.ciena.com

Santosh Pallagatti
VmWare
Bangalore, Karnataka 560103
India

Email: santosh.pallagatti@gmail.com

Mach Chen
Huawei

Email: mach.chen@huawei.com

Peng Fan
China Mobile
32 Xuanwumen West Street
Beijing, Beijing
China

Email: fanp08@gmail.com