

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track

Chandra Ramachandran  
Juniper Networks  
Ina Minei  
Google, Inc  
Dante Pacella  
Verizon  
Tarek Saad  
Cisco Systems Inc.

Expires: February 15, 2017

August 15, 2016

**Refresh Interval Independent FRR Facility Protection**  
**draft-ietf-mpls-ri-rsvp-frr-00**

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), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on February 15, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 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



(<http://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.

## Abstract

RSVP-TE relies on periodic refresh of RSVP messages to synchronize and maintain the LSP related states along the reserved path. In the absence of refresh messages, the LSP related states are automatically deleted. Reliance on periodic refreshes and refresh timeouts are problematic from the scalability point of view. The number of RSVP-TE LSPs that a router needs to maintain has been growing in service provider networks and the implementations should be capable of handling increase in LSP scale.

[RFC 2961](#) specifies mechanisms to eliminate the reliance on periodic refresh and refresh timeout of RSVP messages, and enables a router to increase the message refresh interval to values much larger than the default 30 seconds defined in [RFC 2205](#). However, the protocol extensions defined in [RFC 4090](#) for supporting fast reroute (FRR) using bypass tunnels implicitly rely on short refresh timeouts to cleanup stale states.

In order to eliminate the reliance on refresh timeouts, the routers should unambiguously determine when a particular LSP state should be deleted. Coupling LSP state with the corresponding RSVP-TE signaling adjacencies as recommended in RSVP-TE Scaling Recommendations ([draft-ietf-teas-rsvp-te-scaling-rec](#)) will apply in scenarios other than [RFC 4090](#) FRR using bypass tunnels. In scenarios involving [RFC 4090](#) FRR using bypass tunnels, additional explicit tear down messages are necessary. Refresh-interval Independent RSVP FRR (RI-RSVP-FRR) extensions specified in this document consists of procedures to enable LSP state cleanup that are essential in scenarios not covered by procedures defined in RSVP-TE Scaling Recommendations.

## Requirements 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 [RFC-2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].



## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Motivation.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Terminology.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Problem Description.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Solution Aspects.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Signaling Handshake between PLR and MP.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.1.1.</a>	<a href="#">PLR Behavior.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.1.2.</a>	<a href="#">Remote Signaling Adjacency.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.1.3.</a>	<a href="#">MP Behavior.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.1.4.</a>	<a href="#">"Remote" state on MP.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Impact of Failures on LSP State.....</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Non-MP Behavior.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">LP-MP Behavior.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">NP-MP Behavior.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.2.4.</a>	<a href="#">Behavior of a Router that is both LP-MP and NP-MP...</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	<a href="#">Conditional Path Tear.....</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">4.3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Sending Conditional Path Tear.....</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">4.3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Processing Conditional Path Tear.....</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">4.3.3.</a>	<a href="#">CONDITIONS object.....</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">4.4.</a>	<a href="#">Remote State Teardown.....</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">4.4.1.</a>	<a href="#">PLR Behavior on Local Repair Failure.....</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">4.4.2.</a>	<a href="#">PLR Behavior on Resv RRO Change.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">4.4.3.</a>	<a href="#">LSP Preemption during Local Repair.....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">4.4.3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Preemption on LP-MP after Phop Link failure....</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">4.4.3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Preemption on NP-MP after Phop Link failure....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">4.5.</a>	<a href="#">Backward Compatibility Procedures.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">4.5.1.</a>	<a href="#">Detecting Support for Refresh interval Independent FRR .....</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.5.2.</a>	<a href="#">Procedures for backward compatibility.....</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.5.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Lack of support on Downstream Node.....</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.5.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">Lack of support on Upstream Node.....</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">4.5.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">Incremental Deployment.....</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">21</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	<a href="#">New Object - CONDITIONS.....</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Normative References.....</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References.....</a>	<a href="#">23</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgments.....</a>	<a href="#">23</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	<a href="#">Contributors.....</a>	<a href="#">23</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses.....</a>	<a href="#">24</a>



## **1. Introduction**

RSVP-TE Fast Reroute [[RFC4090](#)] defines two local repair techniques to reroute label switched path (LSP) traffic over pre-established backup tunnel. Facility backup method allows one or more LSPs traversing a connected link or node to be protected using a bypass tunnel. The many-to-one nature of local repair technique is attractive from scalability point of view. This document enumerates facility backup procedures in [RFC 4090](#) that rely on refresh timeout and hence make facility backup method refresh-interval dependent. The RSVP-TE extensions defined in this document will enhance the facility backup protection mechanism by making the corresponding procedures refresh-interval independent.

### **1.1. Motivation**

Standard RSVP [[RFC2205](#)] maintains state via the generation of RSVP Path/Resv 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 RSVP control plane scaling due to periodic refreshes of Path and Resv messages, another relates to the reliability and latency of RSVP signaling.
- An additional problem is the time to clean up the stale state after a tear message is lost. For more on these problems see [Section 1](#) of RSVP Refresh Overhead Reduction Extensions [[RFC2961](#)].

The problems listed above adversely affect RSVP control plane scalability and RSVP-TE [[RFC3209](#)] inherited these problems from standard RSVP. Procedures specified in [[RFC2961](#)] address the above mentioned problems by eliminating dependency on refreshes for state synchronization and for recovering from lost RSVP messages, and by eliminating dependency on refresh timeout for stale state cleanup. Implementing these procedures allows to improve RSVP-TE control plane scalability. For more details on eliminating dependency on refresh timeout for stale state cleanup, refer to "Refresh Interval Independent RSVP" section in [[TE-SCALE-REC](#)].

However, the procedures specified in [[RFC2961](#)] do not fully address stale state cleanup for facility backup protection [[RFC4090](#)], as facility backup protection still depends on refresh timeouts for stale state cleanup. Thus [[RFC2961](#)] is insufficient to address the





problem of stale state cleanup when facility backup protection is used.

The procedures specified in this document, in combination with [\[RFC2961\]](#), eliminate facility backup protection dependency on refresh timeouts for stale state cleanup. These procedures, in combination with [\[RFC2961\]](#), fully address the above mentioned problem of RSVP-TE stale state cleanup, including the cleanup for facility backup protection.

The procedures specified in this document assume reliable delivery of RSVP messages, as specified in [\[RFC2961\]](#). Therefore this document makes support for [\[RFC2961\]](#) a pre-requisite.

## 2. Terminology

The reader is assumed to be familiar with the terminology in [\[RFC2205\]](#), [\[RFC3209\]](#), [\[RFC4090\]](#) and [\[RFC4558\]](#).

Phop node: Previous-hop router along the label switched path

PPhop node: Previous-Previous-hop router along the LSP

LP-MP node: Merge Point router at the tail of Link-protecting bypass tunnel

NP-MP node: Merger Point router at the tail of Node-protecting bypass tunnel

TED: Traffic Engineering Database

Conditional PathTear: PathTear message containing a suggestion to a receiving downstream router to retain Path state if the receiving router is NP-MP

Remote PathTear: PathTear message sent from Point of Local Repair (PLR) to MP to delete state on MP if PLR had not reliably sent backup Path state before

## 3. Problem Description




Figure 1: Example Topology

In the topology in Figure 1, consider a large number of LSPs from A to D transiting B and C. Assume that refresh interval has been configured to be large of the order of minutes and refresh reduction extensions are enabled on all routers.

Also assume that node protection has been configured for the LSPs and the LSPs are protected by each router in the following way

- A has made node protection available using bypass LSP A -> E -> C; A is the Point of Local Repair (PLR) and C is Node Protecting Merge Point (NP-MP)
- B has made node protection available using bypass LSP B -> F -> D; B is the PLR and D is the NP-MP
- C has made link protection available using bypass LSP C -> B -> F -> D; C is the PLR and D is the Link Protecting Merge Point (LP-MP)

In the above condition, assume that B-C link fails. The following is the sequence of events that is expected to occur for all protected LSPs under normal conditions.

1. B performs local repair and re-directs LSP traffic over the bypass LSP B -> F -> D.
2. B also creates backup state for the LSP and triggers sending of backup LSP state to D over the bypass LSP B -> F -> D.

3. D receives backup LSP states and merges the backups with the protected LSPs.
4. As the link on C, over which the LSP states are refreshed has failed, C will no longer receive state refreshes. Consequently the protected LSP states on C will time out and C will send tear down message for all LSPs. As each router should consider itself as a Merge Point, C will time out the state only after waiting for an additional duration equal to refresh timeout.

While the above sequence of events has been described in [\[RFC4090\]](#), there are a few problems for which no mechanism has been specified explicitly.

- If the protected LSP on C times out before D receives signaling for the backup LSP, then D would receive PathTear from C prior to receiving signaling for the backup LSP, thus resulting in deleting the LSP state. This would be possible at scale even with default refresh time.
- If upon the link failure C is to keep state until its timeout, then with long refresh interval this may result in a large amount of stale state on C. Alternatively, if upon the link failure C is to delete the state and send PathTear to D, this would result in deleting the state on D, thus deleting the LSP. D needs a reliable mechanism to determine whether it is MP or not to overcome this problem.
- If head-end A attempts to tear down LSP after step 1 but before step 2 of the above sequence, then B may receive the tear down message before step 2 and delete the LSP state from its state database. If B deletes its state without informing D, with long refresh interval this could cause (large) buildup of stale state on D.
- If B fails to perform local repair in step 1, then B will delete the LSP state from its state database without informing D. As B deletes its state without informing D, with long refresh interval this could cause (large) buildup of stale state on D.

The purpose of this document is to provide solutions to the above problems which will then make it practical to scale up to a large number of protected LSPs in the network.

## **4. Solution Aspects**

The solution consists of five parts.

- Utilize MP determination mechanism specified in [[SUMMARY-FRR](#)] that enables the PLR to signal availability of local protection to MP. In addition, introduce PLR and MP procedures to establish Node-ID hello session between the PLR and the MP to detect router failures and to determine capability. See [section 4.1](#) for more details. This part of the solution re-uses some of the extensions defined in [[SUMMARY-FRR](#)] and [[TE-SCALE-REC](#)], and the subsequent sub-sections will list the extensions in these drafts that are utilized in this document.
- Handle upstream link or node failures by cleaning up LSP states if the node has not found itself as MP through the MP determination mechanism. See [section 4.2](#) for more details.

The combination of "path state" maintained as Path State Block (PSB) and "reservation state" maintained as Reservation State Block (RSB) forms an individual LSP state on an RSVP-TE speaker.

- Introduce extensions to enable a router to send tear down message to downstream router that enables the receiving router to conditionally delete its local state. See [section 4.3](#) for more details.
- Enhance facility protection by allowing a PLR to directly send tear down message to MP without requiring the PLR to either have a working bypass LSP or have already signaled backup LSP state. See [section 4.4](#) for more details.
- Introduce extensions to enable the above procedures to be backward compatible with routers along the LSP path running implementation that do not support these procedures. See [section 4.5](#) for more details.

### **[4.1. Signaling Handshake between PLR and MP](#)**

#### **[4.1.1. PLR Behavior](#)**

As per the procedures specified in [RFC 4090](#), when a protected LSP comes up and if the "local protection desired" flag is set in the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object, each node along the LSP path attempts to make local protection available for the LSP.



- If the "node protection desired" flag is set, then the node tries to become a PLR by attempting to create a NP-bypass LSP to the NNhop node avoiding the Nhop node on protected LSP path. In case node protection could not be made available after some time out, the node attempts to create a LP-bypass LSP to Nhop node avoiding only the link that protected LSP takes to reach Nhop
- If the "node protection desired" flag is not set, then the PLR attempts to create a LP-bypass LSP to Nhop node avoiding the link that the protected LSP takes to reach Nhop

With regard to the PLR procedures described above and that are specified in [RFC 4090](#), this document specifies the following additional procedures.

- While selecting the destination address of the bypass LSP, the PLR SHOULD attempt to select the router ID of the NNhop or Nhop node. If the PLR and the MP are in same area, then the PLR may utilize the TED to determine the router ID from the interface address in RRO (if NodeID is not included in RRO). If the PLR and the MP are in different IGP areas, then the PLR SHOULD use the NodeID address of NNhop MP if included in the RRO of RESV. If the NP-MP in a different area has not included NodeID in RRO, then the PLR SHOULD use NP-MP's interface address present in the RRO. The PLR SHOULD use its router ID as the source address of the bypass LSP. The PLR SHOULD also include its router ID as the NodeID in PATH RRO unless configured explicitly not to include NodeID.
- In parallel to the attempt made to create NP-bypass or LP-bypass, the PLR SHOULD initiate a Node-ID based Hello session to the NNhop or Nhop node respectively to establish the RSVP-TE signaling adjacency. This Hello session is used to detect MP node failure as well as determine the capability of the MP node. If the MP sets I-bit in CAPABILITY object [[TE-SCALE-REC](#)] carried in Hello message corresponding to NodeID based Hello session, then the PLR SHOULD conclude that the MP supports refresh-interval independent FRR procedures defined in this document.
- If the bypass LSP comes up, then the PLR SHOULD include Bypass Summary FRR Association object and triggers PATH to be sent. If Bypass Summary FRR Association object is included in PATH message, then the encoding rules specified in [[SUMMARY-FRR](#)] MUST be followed.



#### **4.1.2. Remote Signaling Adjacency**

A NodeID based RSVP-TE Hello session is one in which NodeID is used in source and destination address fields in RSVP Hello. [[RFC4558](#)] formalizes NodeID based Hello messages between two routers. This document extends NodeID based RSVP Hello session to track the state of RSVP-TE neighbor that is not directly connected by at least one interface. In order to apply NodeID based RSVP-TE Hello session between any two routers that are not immediate neighbors, the router that supports the extensions defined in the document SHOULD set TTL to 255 in the NodeID based Hello messages exchanged between PLR and MP. The default hello interval for this NodeID hello session SHOULD be set to the default specified in [[TE-SCALE-REC](#)].

In the rest of the document the term "signaling adjacency", or "remote signaling adjacency" refers specifically to the RSVP-TE signaling adjacency.

#### **4.1.3. MP Behavior**

When the NNhop or Nhop node receives the triggered PATH with a "matching" Bypass Summary FRR Association object, the node should consider itself as the MP for the PLR IP address "corresponding" to the Bypass Summary FRR Association object. The matching and ordering rules of Bypass Summary FRR Association specified in [[SUMMARY-FRR](#)] SHOULD be followed by implementations supporting this document.

In addition to the above procedures, the node SHOULD check the presence of remote signaling adjacency with PLR (this check is needed to detect network being partitioned). If a matching Bypass Summary FRR Association object is found in PATH and the RSVP-TE signaling adjacency is present, the node concludes that the PLR will undertake refresh-interval independent FRR procedures specified in this document. If the PLR has included NodeID in PATH RRO, then that NodeID is the remote neighbor address. Otherwise, the PLR's interface address in RRO will be the remote neighbor address. If a matching Bypass Summary FRR Association object is included by PPhop node, then it is NP-MP. If a matching Bypass Summary FRR Association object is included by Phop node, it concludes it is LP-MP.

#### **4.1.4. "Remote" state on MP**

Once a router concludes it is MP for a PLR running refresh-interval independent FRR procedures, it SHOULD create a remote path state for





the LSP. The "remote" state is identical to the protected LSP path state except for the difference in RSVP\_HOP object. The RSVP\_HOP object in "remote" Path state contains the address that the PLR uses to send NodeID hello messages to MP.

The MP SHOULD consider the "remote" path state automatically deleted if:

- MP later receives a PATH with no matching Bypass Summary FRR Association object corresponding to the PLR RRO, or
- Node signaling adjacency with PLR goes down, or
- MP receives backup LSP signaling from PLR or
- MP receives PathTear, or
- MP deletes the LSP state on local policy or exception event

Unlike the normal path state that is either locally generated on Ingress or created from PATH message from Phop node, the "remote" path state is not signaled explicitly from PLR. The purpose of "remote" path state is to enable the PLR to explicitly tear down path and reservation states corresponding to the LSP by sending tear message for the "remote" path state. Such message tearing down "remote" path state is called "Remote PathTear.

The scenarios in which "Remote" PathTear is applied are described in [Section 4.4](#) - Remote State Teardown.

#### **[4.2. Impact of Failures on LSP State](#)**

This section describes the procedures for routers on the LSP path for different kinds of failures. The procedures described on detecting RSVP control plane adjacency failures do not impact the RSVP-TE graceful restart mechanisms ([\[RFC3473\]](#), [\[RFC5063\]](#)). If the router executing these procedures act as helper for neighboring router, then the control plane adjacency will be declared as having failed after taking into account the grace period extended for neighbor by the helper.

Immediate node failures are detected from the state of NodeID hello sessions established with immediate neighbors. [\[TE-SCALE-REC\]](#) recommends each router to establish NodeID hello sessions with all its immediate neighbors. PLR or MP node failure is detected from the



state of remote signaling adjacency established according to [Section 4.1.2](#) of this document.

#### [4.2.1](#). Non-MP Behavior

When a router detects Phop link or Phop node failure and the router is not an MP for the LSP, then it SHOULD send Conditional PathTear (refer to Section "Conditional PathTear" below) and delete PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP.

#### [4.2.2](#). LP-MP Behavior

When the Phop link for an LSP fails on a router that is LP-MP for the LSP, the LP-MP SHOULD retain PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP till the occurrence of any of the following events.

- Node-ID signaling adjacency with Phop PLR goes down, or
- MP receives normal or "Remote" PathTear for PSB, or
- MP receives ResvTear RSB.

When a router that is LP-MP for an LSP detects Phop node failure from Node-ID signaling adjacency state, the LP-MP SHOULD send normal PathTear and delete PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP.

#### [4.2.3](#). NP-MP Behavior

When a router that is NP-MP for an LSP detects Phop link failure, or Phop node failure from Node-ID signaling adjacency, the router SHOULD retain PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP till the occurrence of any of the following events.

- Remote Node-ID signaling adjacency with PPhop PLR goes down, or
- MP receives normal or "Remote" PathTear for PSB, or
- MP receives ResvTear for RSB.

When a router that is NP-MP does not detect Phop link or node failure, but receives Conditional PathTear from the Phop node, then the router SHOULD retain PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP till the occurrence of any of the following events.

- Remote Node-ID signaling adjacency with PPhop PLR goes down, or

- MP receives normal or "Remote" PathTear for PSB, or
- MP receives ResvTear for RSB.

Receiving Conditional PathTear from the Phop node will not impact the "remote" state from the PLR. Note that Phop node would send Conditional PathTear if it was not an MP.

In the example topology in Figure 1, assume C & D are NP-MP for PLRs A & B respectively. Now when A-B link fails, as B is not MP and its Phop link signaling adjacency has failed, B will delete LSP state (this behavior is required for unprotected LSPs - [Section 4.2.1](#)). In the data plane, that would require B to delete the label forwarding entry corresponding to the LSP. So if B's downstream nodes C and D continue to retain state, it would not be correct for D to continue to assume itself as NP-MP for PLR B.

The mechanism that enables D to stop considering itself as NP-MP and delete "remote" path state is given below.

1. When C receives Conditional PathTear from B, it decides to retain LSP state as it is NP-MP of PLR A. C also SHOULD check whether Phop B had previously signaled availability of node protection. As B had previously signaled NP availability in its PATH RRO, C SHOULD remove SUMMARY\_FRR\_BYPASS\_ASSOCIATION sub-object corresponding to B from the RRO and trigger PATH to D.
2. When D receives triggered PATH, it realizes that it is no longer NP-MP and so deletes the "remote" path state. D does not propagate PATH further down because the only change is in PATH RRO SUMMARY\_FRR\_BYPASS\_ASSOCIATION sub-object corresponding to B.

#### **4.2.4. Behavior of a Router that is both LP-MP and NP-MP**

A router may be both LP-MP as well as NP-MP at the same time for Phop and PPhop nodes respectively of an LSP. If Phop link fails on such node, the node SHOULD retain PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP till the occurrence of any of the following events.

- Both Node-ID signaling adjacencies with Phop and PPhop nodes go down, or
- MP receives normal or "Remote" PathTear for PSB, or

- MP receives ResvTear for RSB.

If a router that is both LP-MP and NP-MP detects Phop node failure, then the node SHOULD retain PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP till the occurrence of any of the following events.

- Remote Node-ID signaling adjacency with PPhop PLR goes down, or
- MP receives normal or "Remote" PathTear for PSB, or
- MP receives ResvTear for RSB.

#### **4.3. Conditional Path Tear**

In the example provided in the [Section 4.2.5](#) "NP-MP Behavior on PLR link failure", B deletes PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP once B detects its link to Phop went down as B is not MP. If B were to send PathTear normally, then C would delete LSP state immediately. In order to avoid this, there should be some mechanism by which B can indicate to C that B does not require the receiving node to unconditionally delete the LSP state immediately. For this, B SHOULD add a new optional object called CONDITIONS object in PathTear. The new optional object is defined in [Section 4.3.3](#). If node C also understands the new object, then C SHOULD delete LSP state only if it is not an NP-MP - in other words C SHOULD delete LSP state if there is no "remote" PLR state on C.

##### **4.3.1. Sending Conditional Path Tear**

A router that is not an MP for an LSP SHOULD delete PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP if Phop link or Phop Node-ID signaling adjacency goes down ([Section 4.2.1](#)). The router SHOULD send Conditional PathTear if the following are also true.

- Ingress has requested node protection for the LSP, and
- PathTear is not received from upstream node

##### **4.3.2. Processing Conditional Path Tear**

When a router that is not an NP-MP receives Conditional PathTear, the node SHOULD delete PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP, and process Conditional PathTear by considering it as normal PathTear. Specifically, the node SHOULD NOT propagate Conditional PathTear downstream but remove the optional object and send normal PathTear downstream.



When a node that is an NP-MP receives Conditional PathTear, it SHOULD NOT delete LSP state. The node SHOULD check whether the Phop node had previously included Bypass Summary FRR Association object in PATH. If the object had been included previously by Phop, then the node processing Conditional PathTear from Phop SHOULD remove the corresponding object and trigger PATH downstream.

If Conditional PathTear is received from a neighbor that has not advertised support (refer to [Section 4.5](#)) for the new procedures defined in this document, then the node SHOULD consider the message as normal PathTear. The node SHOULD propagate normal PathTear downstream and delete LSP state.

#### **4.3.3. CONDITIONS object**

As any implementation that does not support Conditional PathTear SHOULD ignore the new object but process the message as normal PathTear without generating any error, the Class-Num of the new object SHOULD be 10bbbbbb where 'b' represents a bit (from [Section 3.10 of \[RFC2205\]](#)).

The new object is called as "CONDITIONS" object that will specify the conditions under which default processing rules of the RSVP-TE message SHOULD be invoked.

The object has the following format:

```

+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
|          Length          | Class      | C-type  |
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
|                               Reserved                               |M|
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+

```

Length

This contains the size of the object in bytes and should be set to eight.

Class

To be assigned

C-type





1

M bit

If M-bit is set to 1, then the PathTear message SHOULD be processed based on the condition if the receiver router is a Merge Point or not.

If M-bit is set to 0, then the PathTear message SHOULD be processed as normal PathTear message.

#### **4.4. Remote State Teardown**

If the Ingress wants to tear down the LSP because of a management event while the LSP is being locally repaired at a transit PLR, it would not be desirable to wait till backup LSP signaling to perform state cleanup. To enable LSP state cleanup when the LSP is being locally repaired, the PLR SHOULD send "remote" PathTear message instructing the MP to delete PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP. The TTL in "remote" PathTear message SHOULD be set to 255.

Consider node C in example topology (Figure 1) has gone down and B locally repairs the LSP.

1. Ingress A receives a management event to tear down the LSP.
2. A sends normal PathTear to B.
3. To enable LSP state cleanup, B SHOULD send "remote" PathTear with destination IP address set to that of D used in Node-ID signaling adjacency with D, and RSVP\_HOP object containing local address used in Node-ID signaling adjacency.
4. B then deletes PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP.
5. On D there would be a remote signaling adjacency with B and so D SHOULD accept the remote PathTear and delete PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP.

##### **4.4.1. PLR Behavior on Local Repair Failure**

If local repair fails on the PLR after a failure, then this should be considered as a case for cleaning up LSP state from PLR to the Egress. PLR would achieve this using "remote" PathTear to clean up state from MP. If MP has retained state, then it would propagate PathTear downstream thereby achieving state cleanup. Note that in

the case of link protection, the PathTear would be directed to LP-MP node IP address rather than the Nhop interface address.

#### **4.4.2. PLR Behavior on Resv RRO Change**

When a router that has already made NP available detects a change in the RRO carried in RESV message, and if the RRO change indicates that the router's former NP-MP is no longer present in the LSP path, then the router SHOULD send "Remote" PathTear directly to its former NP-MP.

In the example topology in Figure 1, assume A has made node protection available and C has concluded it is NP-MP. When the B-C link fails then implementing the procedure specified in [Section 4.2.4](#) of this document, C will retain state till: remote NodeID control plane adjacency with A goes down, or PathTear or ResvTear is received for PSB or RSB respectively. If B also has made node protection available, B will eventually complete backup LSP signaling with its NP-MP D and trigger RESV to A with RRO changed. The new RRO of the LSP carried in RESV will not contain C. When A processes the RESV with a new RRO not containing C - its former NP-MP, A SHOULD send "Remote" PathTear to C. When C receives a "Remote" PathTear for its PSB state, C will send normal PathTear downstream to D and delete both PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP. As D has already received backup LSP signaling from B, D will retain control plane and forwarding states corresponding to the LSP.

#### **4.4.3. LSP Preemption during Local Repair**

If an LSP is preempted when there is no failure along the path of the LSP, the node on which preemption occurs would send PathErr and ResvTear upstream and only delete the forwarding state and RSB state corresponding to the LSP. But if the LSP is being locally repaired upstream of the node on which the LSP is preempted, then the node SHOULD delete both PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP and send normal PathTear downstream.

##### **4.4.3.1. Preemption on LP-MP after Phop Link failure**

If an LSP is preempted on LP-MP after its Phop or incoming link has already failed but the backup LSP has not been signaled yet, then the node SHOULD send normal PathTear and delete both PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP. As the LP-MP has retained LSP state because the PLR would signal the LSP through backup LSP signaling, preemption would bring down the LSP and the node would not be LP-MP any more requiring the node to clean up LSP state.



#### **4.4.3.2. Preemption on NP-MP after Phop Link failure**

If an LSP is preempted on NP-MP after its Phop link has already failed but the backup LSP has not been signaled yet, then the node SHOULD send normal PathTear and delete PSB and RSB states corresponding to the LSP. As the NP-MP has retained LSP state because the PLR would signal the LSP through backup LSP signaling, preemption would bring down the LSP and the node would not be NP-MP any more requiring the node to clean up LSP state.

Consider B-C link goes down on the same example topology (Figure 1). As C is NP-MP for PLR A, C will retain LSP state.

1. The LSP is preempted on C.
2. C will delete RSB state corresponding to the LSP. But C cannot send PathErr or ResvTear to PLR A because backup LSP has not been signaled yet.
3. As the only reason for C having retained state after Phop node failure was that it was NP-MP, C SHOULD send normal PathTear to D and delete PSB state also. D would also delete PSB and RSB states on receiving PathTear from C.
4. B starts backup LSP signaling to D. But as D does not have the LSP state, it will reject backup LSP PATH and send PathErr to B.
5. B will delete its reservation and send ResvTear to A.

#### **4.5. Backward Compatibility Procedures**

The "Refresh interval Independent FRR" or RI-RSVP-FRR referred below in this section refers to the changes that have been proposed in previous sections. Any implementation that does not support them has been termed as "non-RI-RSVP-FRR implementation". The extensions proposed in [[SUMMARY-FRR](#)] are applicable to implementations that do not support RI-RSVP-FRR. On the other hand, changes proposed relating to LSP state cleanup namely Conditional and remote PathTear require support from one-hop and two-hop neighboring nodes along the LSP path. So procedures that fall under LSP state cleanup category SHOULD be turned on only if all nodes involved in the node protection FRR i.e. PLR, MP and intermediate node in the case of NP, support the extensions. Note that for LSPs requesting only link protection, the PLR and the LP-MP should support the extensions.

#### **4.5.1. Detecting Support for Refresh interval Independent FRR**

An implementation supporting the extensions specified in previous sections (called RI-RSVP-FRR here after) SHOULD set the flag "Refresh interval Independent RSVP" or RI-RSVP in CAPABILITY object in Hello messages. The RI-RSVP flag is specified in [[TE-SCALE-REC](#)].

- As nodes supporting the extensions SHOULD initiate Node Hellos with adjacent nodes, a node on the path of protected LSP can determine whether its Phop or Nhop neighbor supports RI-RSVP-FRR enhancements from the Hello messages sent by the neighbor.
- If a node attempts to make node protection available, then the PLR SHOULD initiate remote Node-ID signaling adjacency with NNhop. If the NNhop (a) does not reply to remote node Hello message or (b) does not set "Enhanced facility protection" flag in CAPABILITY object in the reply, then the PLR can conclude that NNhop does not support RI-RSVP-FRR extensions.
- If node protection is requested for an LSP and if (a) PPhop node has not included a matching Bypass Summary FRR Association object in PATH or (b) PPhop node has not initiated remote node Hello messages, then the node SHOULD conclude that PLR does not support RI-RSVP-FRR extensions. The details are described in the "Procedures for backward compatibility" section below.

Any node that sets the I-bit is set in its CAPABILITY object MUST also set Refresh-Reduction-Capable bit in common header of all RSVP-TE messages.

#### **4.5.2. Procedures for backward compatibility**

The procedures defined hereafter are performed on a subset of LSPs that traverse a node, rather than on all LSPs that traverse a node. This behavior is required to support backward compatibility for a subset of LSPs traversing nodes running non-RI-RSVP-FRR implementations.

##### **4.5.2.1. Lack of support on Downstream Node**

- If the Nhop does not support the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions, then the node SHOULD reduce the "refresh period" in TIME\_VALUES object carried in PATH to default small refresh default value.
- If node protection is requested and the NNhop node does not support the enhancements, then the node SHOULD reduce the "refresh



period" in TIME\_VALUES object carried in PATH to a small refresh default value.

If the node reduces the refresh time from the above procedures, it SHOULD also not send remote PathTear or Conditional PathTear messages.

Consider the example topology in Figure 1. If C does not support the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions, then:

- A and B SHOULD reduce the refresh time to default value of 30 seconds and trigger PATH
- If B is not an MP and if Phop link of B fails, B cannot send Conditional PathTear to C but SHOULD time out PSB state from A normally. This would be accomplished if A would also reduce the refresh time to default value. So if C does not support the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions, then Phop B and PPhop A SHOULD reduce refresh time to a small default value.

#### **4.5.2.2. Lack of support on Upstream Node**

- If Phop node does not support the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions, then the node SHOULD reduce the "refresh period" in TIME\_VALUES object carried in RESV to default small refresh time value.
- If node protection is requested and the Phop node does not support the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions, then the node SHOULD reduce the "refresh period" in TIME\_VALUES object carried in PATH to default value.
- If node protection is requested and PPhop node does not support the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions, then the node SHOULD reduce the "refresh period" in TIME\_VALUES object carried in RESV to default value.
- If the node reduces the refresh time from the above procedures, it SHOULD also not execute MP procedures specified in [Section 4.2](#) of this document.

#### **4.5.2.3. Incremental Deployment**

The backward compatibility procedures described in the previous subsections imply that a router supporting the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions specified in this document can apply the procedures specified in the document either in the downstream or upstream direction of an LSP,





depending on the capability of the routers downstream or upstream in the LSP path.

- RI-RSVP-FRR extensions and procedures are enabled for downstream Path, PathTear and ResvErr messages corresponding to an LSP if link protection is requested for the LSP and the Nhop node supports the extensions
- RI-RSVP-FRR extensions and procedures are enabled for downstream Path, PathTear and ResvErr messages corresponding to an LSP if node protection is requested for the LSP and both Nhop & NNhop nodes support the extensions
- RI-RSVP-FRR extensions and procedures are enabled for upstream PathErr, Resv and ResvTear messages corresponding to an LSP if link protection is requested for the LSP and the Phop node supports the extensions
- RI-RSVP-FRR extensions and procedures are enabled for upstream PathErr, Resv and ResvTear messages corresponding to an LSP if node protection is requested for the LSP and both Phop and PPhop nodes support the extensions

For example, if an implementation supporting the RI-RSVP-FRR extensions specified in this document is deployed on all routers in particular region of the network and if all the LSPs in the network request node protection, then the FRR extensions will only be applied for the LSP segments that traverse the particular region. This will aid incremental deployment of these extensions and also allow reaping the benefits of the extensions in portions of the network where it is supported.

## **5. Security Considerations**

This security considerations pertaining to [\[RFC2205\]](#), [\[RFC3209\]](#) and [\[RFC5920\]](#) remain relevant.

This document extends the applicability of Node-ID based Hello session between immediate neighbors. The Node-ID based Hello session between PLR and NP-MP may require the two routers to exchange Hello messages with non-immediate neighbor. So, the implementations SHOULD provide the option to configure Node-ID neighbor specific or global authentication key to authentication messages received from Node-ID neighbors. The network administrator MAY utilize this option to enable RSVP-TE routers to authenticate Node-ID Hello messages received with TTL greater than 1. Implementations SHOULD also



provide the option to specify a limit on the number of Node-ID based Hello sessions that can be established on a router supporting the extensions defined in this document.

## 6. IANA Considerations

### 6.1. New Object - CONDITIONS

RSVP Change Guidelines [[RFC3936](#)] defines the Class-Number name space for RSVP objects. The name space is managed by IANA.

IANA registry: RSVP Parameters

Subsection: Class Names, Class Numbers, and Class Types

A new RSVP object using a Class-Number from 128-183 range called the "CONDITIONS" object is defined in [Section 4.3](#) of this document. The Class-Number from 128-183 range will be allocated by IANA.

## 7. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3209] Awduche, D., "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 3209](#), December 2001.
- [RFC4090] Pan, P., "Fast Reroute Extensions to RSVP-TE for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 4090](#), May 2005.
- [RFC2961] Berger, L., "RSVP Refresh Overhead Reduction Extensions", [RFC 2961](#), April 2001.
- [RFC2205] Braden, R., "Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP)", [RFC 2205](#), September 1997.
- [RFC4558] Ali, Z., "Node-ID Based Resource Reservation (RSVP) Hello: A Clarification Statement", [RFC 4558](#), June 2006.
- [RFC3473] Berger, L., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching Signaling Resource Reservation Protocol-Traffic Engineering Extensions", [RFC 3473](#), January 2003.
- [RFC5063] Satyanarayana, A., "Extensions to GMPLS Resource Reservation Protocol Graceful Restart", [RFC5063](#), October 2007.



[RFC3936] Kompella, K. and J. Lang, "Procedures for Modifying the Resource reSerVation Protocol (RSVP)", [BCP 96](#), [RFC 3936](#), October 2004.

[TE-SCALE-REC] Vishnu Pavan Beeram et. al, "Implementation Recommendations to improve scalability of RSVP-TE Deployments", [draft-ietf-teas-rsvp-te-scaling-rec](#) (work in progress)

[SUMMARY-FRR] Mike Tallion et. al, "RSVP-TE Summary Fast Reroute Extensions for LSP Tunnels", [draft-mtallion-mpls-summary-frr-rsvpte](#) (work in progress)

## **8. Informative References**

[RFC5439] Yasukawa, S., "An Analysis of Scaling Issues in MPLS-TE Core Networks", [RFC 5439](#), February 2009.

[RFC5920] Fang, L., "Security Framework for MPLS and GMPLS Networks", [RFC 5920](#), July 2010.

## **9. Acknowledgments**

We are very grateful to Yakov Rekhter for his contributions to the development of the idea and thorough review of content of the draft. Thanks to Raveendra Torvi and Yimin Shen for their comments and inputs.

## **10. Contributors**

Markus Jork  
Juniper Networks  
Email: [mjork@juniper.net](mailto:mjork@juniper.net)

Harish Sitaraman  
Juniper Networks  
Email: [hsitaraman@juniper.net](mailto:hsitaraman@juniper.net)

Vishnu Pavan Beeram  
Juniper Networks  
Email: [vbeeram@juniper.net](mailto:vbeeram@juniper.net)

Ebben Aries  
Juniper Networks



Email: [exa@juniper.net](mailto:exa@juniper.net)

Mike Tallion  
Cisco Systems Inc.  
Email: [mtallion@cisco.com](mailto:mtallion@cisco.com)

## **11. Authors' Addresses**

Chandra Ramachandran  
Juniper Networks  
Email: [csekar@juniper.net](mailto:csekar@juniper.net)

Ina Minei  
Google, Inc  
[inaminei@google.com](mailto:inaminei@google.com)

Dante Pacella  
Verizon  
Email: [dante.j.pacella@verizon.com](mailto:dante.j.pacella@verizon.com)

Tarek Saad  
Cisco Systems Inc.  
Email: [tsaad@cisco.com](mailto:tsaad@cisco.com)