MPLS Working Group   Rajiv Asati
Internet Draft   Cisco Systems
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: June 2009   Pradosh Mohapatra
                                                     Cisco Systems

                                                       Bob Thomas

                                                      Emily Chen
                                              Huawei Technologies

                                               December 29, 2008

                          LDP End-of-LIB
                  draft-ietf-mpls-ldp-end-of-lib-02.txt

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Abstract

   There are situations following Label Distribution Protocol (LDP)
   session establishment where it would be useful for an LDP speaker to
   know when its peer has advertised all of its labels. The LDP
   specification provides no mechanism for an LDP speaker to notify a
   peer when it has completed its initial label advertisements to that
   peer. This document specifies means for an LDP speaker to signal
   completion of its initial label advertisements following session
   establishment.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   There are situations following LDP session establishment where it
   would be useful for an LDP speaker to know when its peer has
   advertised all of its labels. For example, when an LDP speaker is
   using LDP-IGP synchronization procedures [LDPSync], it would be
   useful for the speaker to know when its peer has completed
   advertisement of its IP label bindings. Similarly, after an LDP
   session is re-established when LDP Graceful Restart [RFC3478] is in

effect, it would be helpful for each peer to signal the other after
it has advertised all its label bindings.

The LDP specification [RFC5036] provides no mechanism for an LDP
speaker to notify a peer when it has completed its initial label
advertisements to that peer.

This document specifies use of a Notification message with the "End-
of-LIB" Status Code for an LDP speaker to signal completion of its
label advertisements following session establishment.

RFC5036 implicitly assumes that new Status Codes will be defined over
the course of time. However, it does not explicitly define the
behavior of an LDP speaker which does not understand the Status Code
in a Notification message. To avoid backward compatibility issues
this document specifies use of the LDP capability mechanism [LDPCap]
at session establishment time for informing a peer that an LDP
speaker is capable of handling a Notification message that carries an
unrecognized Status Code.

2. Specification Language

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 [RFC2119].

3. Unrecognized Notification Capability

An LDP speaker MAY include a Capability Parameter [LDPCap] in the
Initialization message to inform a peer that it ignores Notification
Messages that carry a Status TLV with a non-fatal Status Code unknown
to it.

The Capability Parameter for the Unrecognized Notification capability
is a TLV with 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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|U|F| Unrecog Notif (IANA)     |             Length            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|S| Reserved    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

          Figure 1 Unrecognized Notification Capability format

   Where:

      U and F bits: Should be set 1 and 0 respectively as per section 4
   of LDP Capabilities [LDPCap].

      Unrecog Notif: TLV code point to be assigned by IANA.

      S-bit: Must be 1 (indicates that capability is being advertised).

   Upon receiving a Notification with an unrecognized Status Code an LDP
   speaker MAY generate a console or system log message for trouble
   shooting purposes.

4. Signaling Completion of Label Advertisement

   An LDP speaker MAY signal completion of its label advertisements to a
   peer by means of a Notification message, if its peer had advertised
   the Unrecognized Notification capability during session
   establishment. The LDP speaker MAY send the Notification message (per
   FEC Type) to a peer even if the LDP speaker had zero Label bindings
   to advertise to that peer.

   Such a Notification message MUST carry:

      - A status TLV (with TLV E- and F-bits set to zero) that carries
        an "End-of-LIB" Status Code (value to be assigned by IANA).

      - A FEC TLV with the Typed Wildcard FEC Element [TypedWC] that
        identifies the FEC type for which initial label advertisements
        have been completed. In terms of Section 3.5.1 of RFC5036,
        this TLV is an "Optional Parameter" of the Notification
        message.

An LDP speaker MUST NOT send a Notification which carries a Status
TLV with the End-of-LIB Status Code to a peer unless the peer had
advertised the Unrecognized Notification capability during session
establishment.

This applies to any LDP peers discovered via either basic discovery
or extended discovery mechanism (per section 2.4 of [RFC5036]).

5. Usage Guidelines

The FECs known to an LDP speaker and the labels the speaker has bound
to those FECs may change over the course of time. This makes
determining when an LDP speaker has advertised "all" of its label
bindings for a given FEC type an issue. Ultimately, this
determination is a judgement call the LDP speaker makes. The
following guidelines may be useful.

An LDP speaker is assumed to "know" a set of FECs. Depending on a
variety of criteria, such as:

   - The label distribution control mode in use (Independent or
     Ordered);

   - The set of FEC's to which the speaker has bound local labels;

   - Configuration settings which may constrain which label bindings
     the speaker may advertise to peers;

the speaker can determine the set of bindings for a given FEC type
that it is permitted to advertise to a given peer.

LDP-IGP Sync, LDP Graceful Restart, and the response to a Wildcard
Label Request [TypedWC] are situations that would benefit from End-
of-LIB Notification. In these situations, after an LDP speaker
completes its label binding advertisements to a peer, sending an End-
of-LIB Notification to the peer makes their outcome deterministic.
The following subsections further explain each of these situations
one by one.

5.1. LDP-IGP Sync

The LDP-IGP Synchronization [LDPSync] specifies a mechanism by which
directly connected LDP speakers may delay the use of the link between

them, for transit IP traffic forwarding until the labels required to
support IP over MPLS traffic forwarding have been distributed and
installed.

Without an End-of-LIB Notification, the speaker must rely on some
heuristic to determine when it has received all of its peer's label
bindings. The heuristic chosen could cause LDP to signal the IGP too
soon in which case the likelihood that traffic will be dropped
increases, or too late in which case traffic is kept on sub-optimal
paths longer than necessary.

Following session establishment, with a directly connected peer that
has advertised the Unrecognized Notification capability, an LDP
speaker using LDP-IGP Sync may send the peer an End-of-LIB
Notification after it completes advertisement of its IP label
bindings to the peer. Similarly, the LDP speaker may use the End-of-
LIB Notification received from a directly connected peer to determine
when the peer has completed advertisement of its label bindings for
IP prefixes. After receiving the notification, the LDP speaker
should consider LDP to be fully operational for the link and signal
the IGP to start advertising the link with normal cost.

5.2. LDP Graceful Restart

LDP Graceful Restart [RFC3478] helps to reduce the loss of MPLS
traffic caused by the restart of a router's LDP component. It
defines procedures that allow routers capable of preserving MPLS
forwarding state across the restart to continue forwarding MPLS
traffic using forwarding state installed prior to the restart for a
configured time period.

The current behavior without End-of-LIB Notification is as follows:
the restarting router and its peers consider the preserved forwarding
state to be usable but stale until it is refreshed by receipt of new
label advertisements following re-establishment of new LDP sessions
or until the time period expires. When the time period expires, any
remaining stale forwarding state is removed by the router.

Receiving End-of-LIB Notification from a peer in an LDP Graceful
Restart scenario enables an LDP speaker to stop using stale
forwarding information learned from that peer and to recover the
resources it requires without having to wait until the time period
expiry. The time period expiry can still be used if the End-of-LIB-
Notification message is not received.

5.3. Wildcard Label Request

When an LDP speaker receives a Label Request message for a Typed
Wildcard FEC (e.g. a particular FEC element type) from a peer it
determines the set of bindings, it is permitted to advertise the peer
for the FEC type specified by the request. Assuming the peer had
advertised the Unrecognized Notification capability at session
initialization time, the speaker should send the peer an End-of-LIB
Notification for the FEC type when it completes advertisement of the
permitted bindings.

As in the previous applications, receipt of the Notification
eliminates uncertainty as to when the peer has completed its
advertisements of label bindings for the requested Wildcard FEC
Element Type.

5.4. Missing Expected End-of-LIB Notifications

There is no guarantee that an LDP speaker will receive End-of-LIB
Notifications from a peer even if the LDP speaker has signaled its
capability. Therefore, an implementation SHOULD NOT depend on the
receipt of such a Notification.

To deal with the possibility of missing notifications, an LDP speaker
may time out receipt of an expected End-of-LIB Notification, and if
the timeout occurs, it may behave as if it had received the
notification. If the End-of-LIB Notification message is received
after the time-out occurs, then the message should be ignored.

6. Security Considerations

No security considerations beyond those that apply to the base LDP
specification [RFC5036] and further described in [MPLSsec] apply to
signaling the End-of-LIB condition as described in this document.

7. IANA Considerations

This draft introduces a new LDP Status Code and a new LDP Capability
both of which require IANA assignment -

The 'End-of-LIB' status code requires a code point from the Status Code Name Space. [RFC5036] partitions the Status Code Name Space into 3 regions: IETF Consensus region, First Come First Served region, and Private Use region. The authors recommend that a code point from the IETF Consensus range be assigned to the 'End-of-LIB' status code.

The 'Unrecognized Notification' Capability requires a code point from the TLV Type name space. [RFC5036] partitions the TLV TYPE name space into 3 regions: IETF Consensus region, First Come First Served region, and Private Use region. The authors recommend that a code point from the IETF Consensus range be assigned to the 'Unrecognized Notification' Capability.

8. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Ina Minei, Alia Atlas, Yakov Rekhter, Loa Andersson and Luyuan Fang for their valuable feedback and contribution.

The authors would like to recognize Kamran Raza, who helped to formulate this draft.

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

9. References

9.1. Normative References

   [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
             Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

   [RFC5036] Andersson, L., Doolan, P., Feldman, N., Fredette, A. and
             Thomas, B., "LDP Specification", RFC 5036, January 2001.

   [LDPCap] Thomas, B., Aggarwal, S., Aggarwal, R., Le Roux, J.L., "LDP
             Capabilities", draft-ietf-mpls-ldp-capabilities-02, Work in
             Progress, May 2007.

   [TypedWC] Thomas, B., Minei, I., "LDP Typed Wildcard FEC", draft-
             ietf-mpls-ldp-typed-wildcard-03, Work in Progress, March
             2008.

9.2. Informative References

   [LDPSync] Jork, M., Atlas, A., Fang, L., "LDP IGP Synchronization",
             draft-ietf-mpls-ldp-igp-sync-02, Work in Progress, June
             2008.

   [RFC3478] Leelanivas, M., Rekhter, Y., Aggarwal, R., "Graceful
             Restart Mechanism for Label Distribution Protocol",
             February 2003.

   [MPLSsec] Fang, L., "Security Framework for MPLS and GMPLS Networks",
             draft-ietf-mpls-mpls-and-gmpls-security-framework-04, Work
             in Progress, Nov 2008.

Author's Addresses

   Rajiv Asati
   Cisco Systems,
   7025-6 Kit Creek Rd, RTP, NC, 27709-4987
   Email: rajiva@cisco.com

   Pradosh Mohapatra
   Cisco Systems,
   3750 Cisco Way, San Jose, CA, 95134
   Email: pmohapat@cisco.com

   Bob Thomas
   Email: bobthomas@alum.mit.edu

   Emily Chen
   Huawei Technologies
   No.5 Street, Shangdi Information, Haidian, Beijing, China
   Email: chenying220@huawei.com