IDR Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: August 31, 2020

J. Tantsura
Apstra, Inc.
U. Chunduri
Futurewei Technologies
K. Talaulikar
Cisco Systems
G. Mirsky
ZTE Corp.
N. Triantafillis
Amazon Web Services

February 28, 2020

Signaling MSD (Maximum SID Depth) using Border Gateway Protocol - Link State
draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-msd-10

Abstract

This document defines a way for a Border Gateway Protocol - Link State (BGP-LS) speaker to advertise multiple types of supported Maximum SID Depths (MSDs) at node and/or link granularity.

Such advertisements allow entities (e.g., centralized controllers) to determine whether a particular Segment Identifier (SID) stack can be supported in a given network.

Status of This Memo

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

When Segment Routing (SR) [RFC8402] paths are computed by a centralized controller, it is critical that the controller learn the Maximum SID Depth (MSD) that can be imposed at each node/link on a given SR path. This ensures that the Segment Identifier (SID) stack depth of a computed path doesn't exceed the number of SIDs the node is capable of imposing.

[RFC8664] defines how to signal MSD in the Path Computation Element Protocol (PCEP). The OSPF and IS-IS extensions for signaling of MSD are defined in [RFC8476] and [RFC8491] respectively.

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 of learning the MSD of nodes and links. BGP-LS [RFC7752] defines a way to expose topology and associated attributes and capabilities of the nodes in that topology to a centralized controller.

This document defines extensions to BGP-LS to advertise one or more types of MSDs at node and/or link granularity. Other types of MSD are known to be useful. For example, [I-D.ietf-ospf-mpls-elc] and [I-D.ietf-isis-mpls-elc] define Readable Label Depth Capability (RLDC) that is used by a head-end to insert an Entropy Label (EL) at a depth that can be read by transit nodes.

In the future, it is expected that new MSD-Types will be defined to signal additional capabilities, e.g., ELs, SIDs that can be imposed through recirculation, or SIDs associated with another data plane such as IPv6. MSD advertisements MAY be useful even if SR itself is not enabled. For example, in a non-SR MPLS network, MSD defines the maximum label depth.

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

Label Imposition: Imposition is the act of modifying and/or adding labels to the outgoing label stack associated with a packet. This includes:

- o replacing the label at the top of the label stack with a new label.

o pushing one or more new labels onto the label stack. The number of labels imposed is then the sum of the number of labels that are replaced and the number of labels that are pushed. See [RFC3031] for further details.

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 BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here .

2. Advertisement of MSD via BGP-LS

This document describes extensions that enable BGP-LS speakers to signal the MSD capabilities (described in [RFC8491]) of nodes and their links in a network to a BGP-LS consumer of network topology such as a centralized controller. The centralized controller can leverage this information in computation of SR paths and their instantiation on network nodes based on their MSD capabilities. When a BGP-LS speaker is originating the topology learnt via link-state routing protocols like OSPF or IS-IS, the MSD information for the nodes and their links is sourced from the underlying extensions as defined in [RFC8476] and [RFC8491] respectively. The BGP-LS speaker may also advertise the MSD information for the local node and its links when not running any link-state IGP protocol e.g. when running BGP as the only routing protocol. The Protocol-ID field should be set to BGP since the link and node attributes have BGP based identifiers. Deployment model for such case would be: a limited number (meeting resiliecy requirements) of BGP-LS speakers exposing the topology to the controller, full-mesh/RouterReflectors for iBGP or regular eBGP connectivity between every node in the topology.

The extensions introduced in this document allow for advertisement of different MSD-Types. This document does not define these MSD-Types but leverages the definition, guidelines and the code-point registry specified in [RFC8491]. This enables sharing of MSD-Types that may be defined in the future by the IGPs in BGP-LS.

3. Node MSD TLV

Node MSD is encoded in a new Node Attribute TLV [RFC7752] using the following format:

```
      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            |
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
     |    MSD-Type   |  MSD-Value    |  MSD-Type...  |  MSD-Value... |
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 1: Node MSD TLV Format

Where:

o Type: 266

o Length: variable (multiple of 2); represents the total length of the value field in octets.

o Value : consists of one or more pairs of a 1-octet MSD-Type and 1-octet MSD-Value.

   * MSD-Type : one of the values defined in the IANA registry titled "IGP MSD-Types" under the "Interior Gateway Protocol (IGP) Parameters" registry created by [RFC8491].

   * MSD-Value : a number in the range of 0-255. For all MSD-Types, 0 represents the lack of ability to impose an MSD stack of any depth; any other value represents that of the node. This value MUST represent the lowest value supported by any link configured for use by the advertising protocol instance.

4. Link MSD TLV

Link MSD is encoded in a new Link Attribute TLV [RFC7752] using the following format:

```
      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            |
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
     |    MSD-Type   |  MSD-Value    |  MSD-Type...  |  MSD-Value... |
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 2: Link MSD TLV Format

Where:

o Type: 267

- Length: variable (multiple of 2); represents the total length of the value field in octets.

- Value : consists of one or more pairs of a 1-octet MSD-Type and 1-octet MSD-Value.

  * MSD-Type : one of the values defined in the IANA registry titled "IGP MSD-Types" under the "Interior Gateway Protocol (IGP) Parameters" registry created by [RFC8491].

  * MSD-Value : a number in the range of 0-255. For all MSD-Types, 0 represents the lack of ability to impose an MSD stack of any depth; any other value represents that of the link when used as an outgoing interface.

5. Procedures for Defining and Using Node and Link MSD Advertisements

When Link MSD is present for a given MSD-type, the value of the Link MSD MUST take precedence over the Node MSD. When a Link MSD-type is not signaled but the Node MSD-type is, then the Node MSD-type value MUST be considered as the MSD value for that link.

In order to increase flooding efficiency, it is RECOMMENDED that routers with homogenous link MSD values advertise just the Node MSD value.

The meaning of the absence of both Node and Link MSD advertisements for a given MSD-type is specific to the MSD-type. Generally it can only be inferred that the advertising node does not support advertisement of that MSD-type. However, in some cases the lack of advertisement might imply that the functionality associated with the MSD-type is not supported. The correct interpretation MUST be specified when an MSD-type is defined in [RFC8491].

6. IANA Considerations

This document requests assigning code-points from the registry "BGP-LS Node Descriptor, Link Descriptor, Prefix Descriptor, and Attribute TLVs" based on table below. Early allocation for these code-points have been done by IANA.

Code Point	Description	IS-IS TLV/Sub-TLV
266	Node MSD	242/23
267	Link MSD	(22,23,25,141,222,223)/15

7. Manageability Considerations

The new protocol extensions introduced in this document augment the existing IGP topology information that is distributed via [RFC7752]. Procedures and protocol extensions defined in this document do not affect the BGP protocol operations and management other than as discussed in the Manageability Considerations section of [RFC7752]. Specifically, the malformed attribute tests for syntactic checks in the Fault Management section of [RFC7752] now encompass the new BGP-LS Attribute TLVs defined in this document. The semantic or content checking for the TLVs specified in this document and their association with the BGP-LS NLRI types or their BGP-LS Attribute is left to the consumer of the BGP-LS information (e.g. an application or a controller) and not the BGP protocol.

A consumer of the BGP-LS information retrieves this information over a BGP-LS session (refer Section 1 and 2 of [RFC7752]). The handling of semantic or content errors by the consumer would be dictated by the nature of its application usage and hence is beyond the scope of this document.

This document only introduces new Attribute TLVs and any syntactic error in them would result in the BGP-LS Attribute being discarded with an error log. The MSD information introduced in BGP-LS by this specification, may be used by BGP-LS consumer applications like a SR path computation engine (PCE) to learn the SR SID-stack handling capabilities of the nodes in the topology. This can enable the SR PCE to perform path computations taking into consideration the size of SID Stack that the specific headend node may be able to impose. Errors in the encoding or decoding of the MSD information may result in the unavailability of such information to the SR PCE or incorrect information being made available to it. This may result in the headend node not being able to instantiate the desired SR path in its forwarding and provide the SR based optimization functionality. The handling of such errors by applications like SR PCE may be implementation specific and out of scope of this document.

The extensions specified in this document, do not specify any new configuration or monitoring aspects in BGP or BGP-LS. The specification of BGP models BGP and BGP-LS models is an ongoing work based on the [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-model]. The management of the MSD features within an ietf segment-routing stack is also an ongoing work based on the [I-D.ietf-spring-sr-yang]. Management of the segment routing in IGPs is ongoing work for ISIS [I-D.ietf-isis-sr-yang] , and OSPF [I-D.ietf-ospf-sr-yang].

8. Security Considerations

The advertisement of an incorrect MSD value may have negative consequences. If the value is smaller than supported, path computation may fail to compute a viable path. If the value is larger than supported, an attempt to instantiate a path that can't be supported by the head-end (the node performing the SID imposition) may occur. The presence of this information may also inform an attacker of how to induce any of the aforementioned conditions.

The document does not introduce additional security issues beyond discussed in [RFC7752], [RFC8476] and [RFC8491]. However, [RFC7752] is being revised in [I-D.ietf-idr-rfc7752bis] to provide additional clarification in several portions of the specification after receiving feedback from implementers. One of the places that is being clarified is the error handling and security. It is expected that after [I-D.ietf-idr-rfc7752bis] is released that implementers will update all BGP-LS base implementations improving the error handling for protocol work (including this document) that depend on this function.

9. Contributors

Siva Sivabalan
Cisco Systems Inc.
Canada

Email: msiva@cisco.com

10. Acknowledgements

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

11. References

11.1. Normative References

[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>.

[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>.

[RFC8476] Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Aldrin, S., and P. Psenak, "Signaling Maximum SID Depth (MSD) Using OSPF", RFC 8476, DOI 10.17487/RFC8476, December 2018, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8476>.

[RFC8491] Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Aldrin, S., and L. Ginsberg, "Signaling Maximum SID Depth (MSD) Using IS-IS", RFC 8491, DOI 10.17487/RFC8491, November 2018, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8491>.

11.2. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-model] Jethanandani, M., Patel, K., Hares, S., and J. Haas, "BGP YANG Model for Service Provider Networks", draft-ietf-idr-bgp-model-07 (work in progress), October 2019.

[I-D.ietf-idr-rfc7752bis] Talaulikar, K., "Distribution of Link-State and Traffic Engineering Information Using BGP", draft-ietf-idr-rfc7752bis-02 (work in progress), November 2019.

[I-D.ietf-isis-mpls-elc] Xu, X., Kini, S., Psenak, P., Filsfils, C., Litkowski, S., and M. Bocci, "Signaling Entropy Label Capability and Entropy Readable Label Depth Using IS-IS", draft-ietf-isis-mpls-elc-10 (work in progress), October 2019.

[I-D.ietf-isis-sr-yang] Litkowski, S., Qu, Y., Sarkar, P., Chen, I., and J. Tantsura, "YANG Data Model for IS-IS Segment Routing", draft-ietf-isis-sr-yang-07 (work in progress), January 2020.

[I-D.ietf-ospf-mpls-elc] Xu, X., Kini, S., Psenak, P., Filsfils, C., Litkowski, S., and M. Bocci, "Signaling Entropy Label Capability and Entropy Readable Label-stack Depth Using OSPF", draft-ietf-ospf-mpls-elc-12 (work in progress), October 2019.

[I-D.ietf-ospf-sr-yang]
Yeung, D., Qu, Y., Zhang, Z., Chen, I., and A. Lindem, "YANG Data Model for OSPF SR (Segment Routing) Protocol", draft-ietf-ospf-sr-yang-11 (work in progress), February 2020.

[I-D.ietf-spring-sr-yang]
Litkowski, S., Qu, Y., Lindem, A., Sarkar, P., and J. Tantsura, "YANG Data Model for Segment Routing", draft-ietf-spring-sr-yang-15 (work in progress), January 2020.

[RFC3031] Rosen, E., Viswanathan, A., and R. Callon, "Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture", RFC 3031, DOI 10.17487/RFC3031, January 2001, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3031>.

[RFC8402] Filsfils, C., Ed., Previdi, S., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing Architecture", RFC 8402, DOI 10.17487/RFC8402, July 2018, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8402>.

[RFC8664] Sivabalan, S., Filsfils, C., Tantsura, J., Henderickx, W., and J. Hardwick, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for Segment Routing", RFC 8664, DOI 10.17487/RFC8664, December 2019, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8664>.

Authors' Addresses

Jeff Tantsura
Apstra, Inc.

Email: jefftant.ietf@gmail.com

Uma Chunduri
Futurewei Technologies

Email: umac.ietf@gmail.com

Ketan Talaulikar
Cisco Systems

Email: ketant@cisco.com

Greg Mirsky
ZTE Corp.

Email: gregimirsky@gmail.com

Nikos Triantafillis
Amazon Web Services

Email: nikost@amazon.com