IDR Working Group   J. Tantsura
Internet-Draft   Individual
Intended status: Standards Track   U. Chunduri
Expires: April 18, 2018   Huawei Technologies
                                                               G. Mirsky
                                                               ZTE Corp.
                                                            S. Sivabalan
                                                                   Cisco
                                                        October 15, 2017

        Signaling Maximum SID Depth using Border Gateway Protocol Link-State
                draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-msd-01

Abstract

   This document proposes a way to signal Maximum SID Depth (MSD)
   supported by a node at node and/or link granularity by a BGP-LS
   speaker. In a Segment Routing (SR) enabled network a centralized
   controller that programs SR tunnels needs to know the MSD supported
   by the head-end at node and/or link granularity to push the SID stack
   of an appropriate depth. MSD is relevant to the head-end of a SR
   tunnel or Binding-SID anchor node where Binding-SID expansions might
   result in creation of a new SID stack.

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 April 18, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

[1](). Introduction

When Segment Routing tunnels are computed by a centralized controller, it is critical that the controller learns the MSD "Maximum SID Depth" of the node or link SR tunnel exits over, so the SID stack depth of a path computed doesn't exceed the number of SIDs the node is capable of imposing. This document describes how to use BGP-LS to signal the MSD of a node or link to a centralized controller.

PCEP SR extensions draft [[I-D.ietf-pce-segment-routing]()] signals MSD in SR PCE Capability TLV and METRIC Object. However, if PCEP is not supported/configured on the head-end of a SR tunnel or a Binding-SID anchor node and controller does not participate in IGP routing, it has no way to learn the MSD of nodes and links which has been configured. BGP-LS [[RFC7752]()] defines a way to expose topology and associated attributes and capabilities of the nodes in that topology to a centralized controller.

MSD of sub-type 1, called Base MSD as defined in [Section 3]() is used to signal the number of SID's a node is capable of imposing, to be used

by a path computation element/controller. In case, there are
additional labels (e.g. service) that are to be pushed to the stack -
this would be signaled with an another MSD type (TBD), no adjustment
to the Base MSD should be made. In the future, new MSD types could
be defined to signal additional capabilities: entropy labels, labels
that can be pushed thru recirculation, or another dataplane e.g IPv6.

1.1. Conventions used in this document

1.1.1. Terminology

BGP-LS: Distribution of Link-State and TE Information using Border
Gateway Protocol

MSD: Maximum SID Depth

PCC: Path Computation Client

PCE: Path Computation Element

PCEP: Path Computation Element Protocol

SID: Segment Identifier

SR: Segment routing

1.1.2. 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
[RFC2119].

2. Problem Statement

In existing technology only PCEP has extension to signal the MSD (SR
PCE Capability TLV/ METRIC Object as defined in
[I-D.ietf-pce-segment-routing],If PCEP is not supported by the node
(head-end of the SR tunnel) controller has no way to learn the MSD of
the node/link configured. OSPF and IS-IS extensions are defined in:

[I-D.ietf-ospf-segment-routing-msd]

[I-D.ietf-isis-segment-routing-msd]

3. MSD supported by a node

Node MSD is encoded in a new Node Attribute TLV, as defined in
[RFC7752]

```
 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         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|          Sub-Type and Value ...
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+ ...
```

Figure 1: Node attribute format

Type : A 2-octet field specifiying code-point of the new TLV type.
Code-point:(TBD1) from BGP-LS Node Descriptor, Link Descriptor,
Prefix Descriptor, and Attribute TLVs registry

Length: A 2-octet field that indicates the length of the value
portion

Sub-Type and value fields are as defined in corresponding OSPF
[I-D.ietf-ospf-segment-routing-msd] and IS-IS
[I-D.ietf-isis-segment-routing-msd] extensions.

4. MSD supported on a link

Link MSD is encoded in a New Link Attribute TLV, as defined in
[RFC7752]

```
 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         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|          Sub-Type and Value ...
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+ ...
```

Figure 2: Link attribute format

Type : A 2-octet field specifiying code-point of the new TLV type.
Code-point:(TBD2) from BGP-LS Node Descriptor, Link Descriptor,
Prefix Descriptor, and Attribute TLVs registry

Length: A 2-octet field that indicates the length of the value
portion

Sub-Type and value fields are as defined in corresponding OSPF
[I-D.ietf-ospf-segment-routing-msd] and IS-IS
[I-D.ietf-isis-segment-routing-msd] extensions.

5. IANA Considerations

We request IANA assign code points from the registry BGP-LS Node
Descriptor, Link Descriptor, Prefix Descriptor, and Attribute TLVs,
as follows: TLV Code Point Description IS-IS TLV/Sub-TLV Reference
TBD1 Node MSD 242/23 (this document) TBD2 Link MSD
(22,23,25,141,222,223)/15 (this document)

6. Security Considerations

This document does not introduce security issues beyond those
discussed in [RFC7752]

7. Acknowledgements

We like to thank Nikos Triantafillis, Stephane Litkowski and Bruno
Decraene for their reviews and valuable comments.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-isis-segment-routing-msd]
          Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Aldrin, S., and L. Ginsberg,
          "Signaling MSD (Maximum SID Depth) using IS-IS", draft-
          ietf-isis-segment-routing-msd-04 (work in progress), June
          2017.

[I-D.ietf-ospf-segment-routing-msd]
          Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Aldrin, S., and P. Psenak,
          "Signaling MSD (Maximum SID Depth) using OSPF", draft-
          ietf-ospf-segment-routing-msd-05 (work in progress), June
          2017.

[I-D.ietf-pce-segment-routing]
          Sivabalan, S., Filsfils, C., Tantsura, J., Henderickx, W.,
          and J. Hardwick, "PCEP Extensions for Segment Routing",
          draft-ietf-pce-segment-routing-10 (work in progress),
          October 2017.

   [I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing-mpls]
            Filsfils, C., Previdi, S., Bashandy, A., Decraene, B.,
            Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing with MPLS
            data plane", draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-mpls-10
            (work in progress), June 2017.

   [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>.

   [RFC7752] Gredler, H., Ed., Medved, J., Previdi, S., Farrel, A., and
            S. Ray, "North-Bound Distribution of Link-State and
            Traffic Engineering (TE) Information Using BGP", RFC 7752,
            DOI 10.17487/RFC7752, March 2016,
            <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7752>.

8.2. Informative References

   [I-D.ietf-isis-segment-routing-extensions]
            Previdi, S., Filsfils, C., Bashandy, A., Gredler, H.,
            Litkowski, S., Decraene, B., and j. jefftant@gmail.com,
            "IS-IS Extensions for Segment Routing", draft-ietf-isis-
            segment-routing-extensions-13 (work in progress), June
            2017.

   [I-D.ietf-ospf-segment-routing-extensions]
            Psenak, P., Previdi, S., Filsfils, C., Gredler, H.,
            Shakir, R., Henderickx, W., and J. Tantsura, "OSPF
            Extensions for Segment Routing", draft-ietf-ospf-segment-
            routing-extensions-19 (work in progress), August 2017.

Authors' Addresses

   Jeff Tantsura
   Individual

   Email: jefftant.ietf@gmail.com

   Uma Chunduri
   Huawei Technologies

   Email: uma.chunduri@huawei.com

Greg Mirsky
ZTE Corp.

Email: gregimirsky@gmail.com

Siva Sivabalan
Cisco

Email: msiva@cisco.com