

MPLS Working Group
Internet Draft
Expiration Date: November 2003
Standards Track

Peter Ashwood-Smith
Bilel Jamoussi
Don Fedyk
Darek Skalecki
Nortel Networks

June 2003

Improving Topology Data Base Accuracy with Label Switched Path
Feedback in Constraint Based Label Distribution Protocol

[draft-ietf-mpls-te-feed-06.txt](#)

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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/lid-abstracts.txt>

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

Abstract

One key component of traffic engineering is a concept known as constraint based routing. In constraint based routing a topology database is maintained on all participating nodes. This database contains a complete list of all the links in the network that participate in traffic engineering and for each of these links a set of constraints, which those links can meet. Bandwidth, for example, is one essential constraint. Since the bandwidth available changes as new LSPs are established and terminated the topology database will develop inconsistencies with respect to the real network. It is not possible to increase the flooding rates arbitrarily to keep the database discrepancies from growing. A new mechanism is proposed whereby a source node can learn about the successes or failures of

its path selections by receiving feedback from the paths it is

attempting. This information is most valuable in failure scenarios but is beneficial during other path setup functions as well. This fed back information can be incorporated into subsequent route computations, which greatly improves the accuracy of the overall routing solution by significantly reducing the database discrepancies.

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction and Description	2
2.0	Adding feedback TLVs to CR-LDP	6
2.1	Bandwidth directionality considerations.	6
3.0	Link Feedback TLV.	7
3.1	Link feedback TLV Description	7
3.2	Local Interface IP Address Subtypes	8
3.3	Remote Interface IP Address Subtypes	8
3.4	Unreserved Bandwidth Sub Type.	8
4.0	Detailed Procedures.	9
5.0	IGP Considerations	10
6.0	Future Considerations	11
7.0	RSVP-TE Considerations	11
8.0	Intellectual Property Considerations	11
9.0	Security Considerations.	11
10.0	IANA Considerations	11
11.0	Acknowledgements	11
12.0	Normative References.	12
13.0	Informative References.	12
14.0	Authors Addresses	12

[1.0](#) Introduction and Description

Because the network is a distributed system, it is necessary to have a mechanism to advertise information about links to all nodes in the network [[IS-IS](#)], [[OSPF](#)]. A node can then build a topology map of the network. This information is required to be as up-to-date as possible for accurate traffic engineered paths. Information about link or node failures must be rapidly propagated through the network so that recovery can be initiated. Other information about links that may be useful for reasons of quality of service includes

parameters such as available bandwidth, and delay. The information in this topology database is often out of date with respect to the real network. Available bandwidth is the most critical of these attributes and it can drift substantially with respect to reality due to the low frequency of link state updates that can be sustained in a very large topology. The deviation in the topology database available bandwidth is referred to as being optimistic if the database shows more available bandwidth than there really is, or

pessimistic if the topology database shows less bandwidth than there really is. This distinction is important to enable an efficient algorithm to deal with optimistic databases without resorting to shorter flooding intervals.

One of the major problems for a constraint based routing system is dealing with changing constraints. Obviously, since bandwidth is one of the essential constraints, dealing with the rapid changes in reserved bandwidth poses some interesting challenges. In smaller networks, one can resort to higher frequency flooding but this obviously does not scale. The feedback mechanism is particularly useful in the case of link or node failures where the rapid change and notification of resource change is crucial to the restoration time. Feedback is work conserving in this case since the availability of feedback information minimizes the extra burden of dealing with out of date topology and resource information.

The basic approach is to add to the signaling protocol the ability to piggyback actual link bandwidth availability information at every link that the signaling traverses. This is done as part of the reverse messaging on success or failure (mapping, release, withdraw or notification). What this means is that every time signaling messages flow backwards toward a source to tell it of the success, failure or termination of a request, that message contains a detailed slice of bandwidth availability information for the exact path that the message has followed. This slice of reservation information, which is very up to date, is received by the source node and attached to the source node's topology database prior to making any further source route computations. The result is that the source node's topology database will tend to stay synchronized with the slices of the network through which it is establishing paths. This is nothing more than learning from successes and failures and represents an intelligent alternative to either waiting for floods or introducing non-determinism (guessing) into the source algorithms. It is important to note that the fed-back data is never

re-flooded. It simply overrides flooded information for the purpose of route computation until a superceding flood or feedback value arrives. As such, it is not actually inserted into a topology database, most likely it simply is linked to that database as an override used only by source route computations. Also the inclusion of feedback information is optional. At a minimum the blocked or failed link is required but if processing resources are scarce the additional feedback at other hops is optional.

Operating a constraint based routing system without such feedback is inefficient at best since a source node will continue to give out incorrect route over and over again until it gets an IGP update. This could be minutes away and as a result the worst case blocking time for a new route is the minimum repeatable flooding interval (often several minutes in big networks). Alternatives to feedback mechanisms involve adding some non-determinism (randomness) to the

routing algorithm in the hopes that it will stumble onto a path that works. These sorts of approaches are seen in ATM dynamic routing systems, which do not have these forms of feedback.

In order to get a good understanding of how the feedback works, imagine a network with precisely one path (with sufficient unreserved bandwidth) available from the source to the destination. Further, imagine that the topology database at the source is significantly out of date with respect to the real network in that the source topology database sees sufficient bandwidth available on many different routes to the destination. This is termed being optimistic with respect to the network since the source thinks that more bandwidth is available than there really is.

When such an optimistic source selects its first path it will likely contain links that do not in reality have sufficient unreserved bandwidth. Therefore, the path is only established up to the link that does not have sufficient bandwidth. A notification message is formatted that contains the actual unreserved bandwidth for this blocking link which flows back toward the source, collapsing the partially created path as it goes. In addition, at every link that this notification traverses, the current unreserved bandwidth information for each corresponding link is appended to the vector of unreserved bandwidth along the path. In this manner, an accurate view of the slice through the network traversed is constructed. Eventually this message arrives back at the source node, where the vector is taken and used to temporarily override the topology

database for route computations. This node has just learned from its mistake and is now slightly less optimistic with respect to the real network conditions.

Path selection can be attempted again but this time the node will not make the same mistake it made the previous time. The link in question, at which rejection occurred the first time, will not even be eligible this time around, so a source route computation is guaranteed to produce a different path (or none). The same procedure may be repeated as many times as is necessary, each time learning from its mistakes, until eventually no paths remain in the source topology to the destination, or a path is found that works. This tendency to converge either to a solution or determine that there is no solution is an important property of a routing system (it actually behaves a lot like a depth first search). This property is not present with flooding mechanisms alone since the source node must randomly hunt, or continually make the same mistakes, or abort until the next flood arrives.

In addition to feeding back bandwidth on failure, feedback on success is recommended. This has important consequences on our ability to spread load or to spill over to new links as existing links fill. It is true that spilling over to new links does not require feedback on success since a node could simply wait for a

feedback on failure, but better load spreading can be achieved earlier.

Finally, when a path is torn down the release/withdraw messages also contain bandwidth information that can be fed back to override the source topology database. This is very important during failure scenarios where the links required for rerouting the path share common sub-segments with the failed path. Without the feedback, the common sub-segments may not indicate sufficient available bandwidth until an LSA flood is received which may mean many seconds without a connection. With feedback at least the database is up to date with respect to available bandwidth up to the point of failure in the path. Also since failure involves many paths tearing down and re-establishing this is the time that it is most critical to have an accurate view.

When preemption is being employed it is also extremely important that the topology database inconsistencies be small. If not, high setup priority LSPs may unnecessarily preempt lower holding priority

LSPs to obtain bandwidth that, had they had a more up to date view of unreserved bandwidth, they would have been able to find elsewhere. Since preempted LSPs may in turn preempt other LSPs in a domino like effect, the results of such database inconsistencies can have wide reaching ripple like impacts. These feedback mechanisms help reduce these occurrences significantly.

There are a number of network conditions where feedback shows its value. One can think of a constraint-based network as being in one of three conditions. The first is called ramp-up, this is when the rate of arriving reservations exceeds the rate of departing reservations. The second is called steady state, this is when the rate of arriving reservations is about the same as the rate of departing reservations. Finally, the ramp-down condition is that which has a greater rate of departing reservations than arriving reservations.

These three network conditions show distinctly different types of error in the topology databases. In particular an optimistic view of available bandwidth by a source node is characteristic of the ramp-up condition of a network. A pessimistic view of available bandwidth by a source node is characteristic of the ramp-down condition of a network. If one plots the average error in the topology databases with respect to the real network for the three different network conditions, one will see the error slowly go positive during ramp up, slowly go negative during ramp down, and drift slowly around 0 for the steady condition. The effect of flooding on this plot is to periodically snap the error back to 0 at flooding intervals. The effect of the feedback algorithm is to bring an optimistic error back to zero without having to wait for the flood interval. On average then, the feedback algorithm tends to halve the absolute error, keeping it mostly negative or pessimistic. This makes sense

since a routing system will never give paths to links that it thinks do not have resources and as a result its pessimistic view of the world stays that way until it gets a flood. This relieves the IGP updates of the most urgent requirement of flooding when bandwidth is consumed. Availability of new bandwidth occurs when paths are released or new links become available. Floods already accompany new links. Significant releases of bandwidth can be broadcast at relatively low frequencies in the order of several minutes with little operational impact.

[2.0](#) Adding feedback TLVs to CR-LDP

Two new TLVs are optionally added to the CR-LDP mapping, notification, and withdraw messages. There may be an arbitrary number of these TLV in any order or position in the message. It is recommended that they be placed such that they can be read and applied to override the topology database by scanning the message forwards and walking the topology database from the point where the last link feedback TLV left off.

Each TLV consists of the eight unreserved bandwidth values for each holding priority 0 through 7 as IEEE floating-point numbers (the units are unidirectional bytes per second). Following this are the IP addresses of the two ends of the interface. Two TLVs are possible, one for IPV4 and one for IPV6 addressing of the link.

Note: the feedback TLVs may also optionally be included in query or query-reply messages in response to bandwidth update queries from an LER. Details of this mechanism are provided in [\[QUERY\]](#).


[2.1](#) Bandwidth directionality considerations

The order of the two addresses in the feedback TLV implies the direction in which the bandwidth is available. For example if the local address is A and the remote address is B the bandwidth is unreserved in the A to B direction.

It is possible for an implementation to provide both the A to B direction and the B to A direction as part of the same feedback message. This is done by simply including a TLV with A, B as the addresses of the link and a different TLV with B, A as the addresses of the link. Should CR-LDP evolve to be able to support bi-directional traffic flow and reservations, it is expected that bi-directional feedback would also be implemented via this mechanism.


3.0 Link Feedback TLV

The Feedback payload consists of one or more nested Type/Length/Value (TLV) triplets for extensibility. The format of each TLV is:



The Length field defines the length of the value portion in octets (thus a TLV with no value portion would have a length of zero). The TLV is padded to four-octet alignment; padding is not included in the length field (so a three octet value would have a length of three, but the total size of the TLV would be eight octets). Nested TLVs are also 32-bit aligned. Unrecognized types are ignored.

3.1 Link feedback TLV Description



This document introduces essentially one Feedback TLV. There may be multiple instances of the Feedback TLV in a CR-LDP message, one for each different links along the path. Due to the current format that TE extension documents organize TE information the feedback TLV has sub TLVs. This allows the information to conform to the current TE conventions and allows options for additional future feedback elements. The formats are derived from the TE extensions TLVs for IS-IS [IS-IS] and OSPF [OSPF].

U bit

Unknown TLV bit must be set to 1. As with all CR-LDP messages, upon receipt of an unknown TLV, if U is if U is set (=1), the unknown TLV

is silently ignored and the rest of the message is processed as if the unknown TLV did not exist.

F bit

Forward unknown TLV bit must be set to 1. This bit applies only when the U bit is set and the CR-LDP message containing the unknown TLV is to be forwarded. If F is set (=1), the unknown TLV is forwarded with the containing message.

The following sub TLVs for the Feedback TLV are defined:

- 1 - Local interface IP address (IPv4)
- 2 - Remote interface IP address (IPv4)
- 3 - Local interface IP address (IPv6)
- 4 - Remote interface IP address (IPv6)
- 5 - Unreserved bandwidth

This document defines the sub types. The code points are to be assigned by IANA.

[3.2](#) Local Interface IP Address Sub Types

The Local Interface IP Address sub-TLV specifies the IP address(es) of the interface corresponding to this link. Normally there will only be one address. If there are multiple local addresses on the link, they are all listed in this sub-TLV.

The Local Interface IPv4 Address sub-TLV is TLV type 1, and is $4N$ octets in length, where N is the number of local addresses.

The Local Interface IPv6 Address sub-TLV is TLV type 3, and is $16N$ octets in length, where N is the number of local addresses.

[3.3](#) Remote Interface IP Address Sub Types

The Remote Interface IP Address sub-TLV specifies the IP address(es) of the neighbor's interface corresponding to this link. This and the local address are used to discern multiple parallel links between systems.

The Remote Interface IPv4 Address sub-TLV is TLV type 2, and is $4N$ octets in length, where N is the number of neighbor addresses.

The Remote Interface IPv6 Address sub-TLV is TLV type 4, and is $16N$ octets in length, where N is the number of neighbor addresses.

[3.4](#) Unreserved Bandwidth Sub Type

The Unreserved Bandwidth sub-TLV specifies the amount of bandwidth

not yet reserved at each of the eight priority levels, in IEEE floating point format. The values correspond to the bandwidth that can be reserved with a setup priority of 0 through 7, arranged in increasing order with priority 0 occurring at the start of the sub-TLV, and priority 7 at the end of the sub-TLV. The units are bytes per second.

The Unreserved Bandwidth sub-TLV is TLV type 5, and is 32 octets in length.

[4.0](#) Detailed Procedures

On receipt of a withdraw, notification, query-reply, or mapping message pertaining to a request made by CR-LDP (as opposed to LDP), a feedback TLV of the appropriate format for the interface over which the message was received is inserted into the message before forwarding it back to the source of the request. The interface's local and remote interface address in the appropriate format are placed in the TLV.

The eight bandwidth values are filled in with the outgoing bandwidth available on this interface for each of the eight holding priorities in bytes per second.

On receipt of a CR-LDP request message, which cannot be satisfied, a notification message is formatted normally. The Feedback TLV with the local and remote interface address in the appropriate format and the eight bandwidth values are filled in with the outgoing bandwidth available on this interface for each of the eight holding priorities in bytes per second.

On receipt of a CR-LDP request message which has been satisfied and which results in a mapping being generated. No feedback TLV is added since the previous node will insert the proper TLV when it receives the reverse flowing mapping.

When an LDP session goes down either because of a link failure, TCP/IP timeout, keep alive timeout, adjacency timeout etc. Other LDP

sessions in the module must generate either notification, withdraw or release messages for LSPs that traversed the LDP in question. In the case that the LSP was created by CR-LDP and that a withdraw or notification is about to be generated, LDP will insert a feedback TLV for the interface which just went down that contains 0's for all the bandwidth values and attach to it the proper interface addresses. Where LDP FT procedures [[RFC3479](#)] are in use, LSPs that are protected by FT procedures should not be torn down until after session reestablishment has failed. During LDP re-establishment time new connections may be queued and delayed for the re-establishment time. If signaling delay is undesirable feedback may

be used to report zero bandwidth. In this case, if LDP is successfully re-established a Link LSA should be triggered if sufficient amount bandwidth is available.

When the LDP session that originated a CR-LDP label request receives a mapping that contains feedback TLV's it is recommended that these bandwidth values supersede the corresponding values in the node's topology database for source route computations. Doing so permits this node to immediately synchronize its topology with respect to the real bandwidth reservations along the path that was just established.

When the LDP session that originated a CR-LDP label request receives a notification that contains feedback TLV's it is recommended that these bandwidth values supersede the corresponding values in the node's topology database for source route computations. Doing so permits this node to immediately synchronize its topology with respect to the real bandwidth reservations along the path that just failed to establish. The source node may then re-compute a path knowing that the computation will take into account the failure if it was caused by the topology database being in error with respect to the real network state.

5.0 IGP considerations

Implementations MUST NOT permit bandwidth information learned by this feedback mechanism to be re-flooded via IS-IS, OSPF or any other IGP. The bandwidth information learned via these feedback mechanisms is to be used ONLY for source route computations on the nodes that are directly on the path that fed back the bandwidth. Normally only the source node of the LSP, or perhaps intermediate

gateway nodes will use this information. It is however permitted for intermediate nodes that are forwarding this feedback information to store it for their own local source route computations.

There is a possibility of a race condition between the bandwidth information that is received via feedback and that, which is received via a normal IGP flood. While there may be a discrepancy between the two, both are within a few 100 milliseconds of being correct. Solutions to allow us to determine which information is most up to date (say by adding a sequence number) do not add any significant benefit. Constraint based, source routed systems will always have errors in the local topology database with respect to the real network. These errors can be reduced through reduced flooding intervals, path following feedback and selective flooding but realistically the errors cannot be reduced below the second or so range. As a result propagation delay order race conditions are noise with respect to the average expected errors. An implementation SHOULD therefore consider the most recently received update (IGP or feedback) as being the most up to date.

[6.0](#) Future considerations

Constraint based routing systems such as CR-LDP will in the future offer other forms of constraint than simply reserved bandwidth. Actual utilization levels, current congestion levels, number of discrete channels/wavelengths available etc. are all possible constraints that change rapidly and which must be taken into consideration when computing a route. It is expected that this mechanism will be used to feedback these and other new forms of link constraining data.

[7.0](#) RSVP-TE consideration

Nothing precludes the use of such feedback mechanisms with a similar TLV structure in the RSVP-TE Resv and other reverse flowing messages although repeatedly applying unchanged feedback should be avoided. This could be accomplished by a simple rule that only permits feedback information on the original RESV, not on subsequent refreshes. This document only covers the CR-LDP protocol.

[8.0](#) Intellectual Property Consideration

The IETF has been notified of intellectual property rights claimed in regard to some or all of the specification contained in this

document. For more information consult the online list of claimed rights.

[9.0](#) Security Considerations

This document covers an additional data structure, a TLV to an existing LDP message. Therefore the security aspects of this are the same as a LDP. CR-LDP inherits the same security mechanism described in [Section 4.0 of \[RFC3032\]](#) to protect against the introduction of spoofed TCP segments into LDP session connection streams.

[10.0](#) IANA Considerations

The Feedback TLV as well as Types for sub-TLVs in a Feedback TLV are to be registered with IANA.

[RFC3212] defines the CR-LDP TLV name space. This memo requires assignment of one TLV Type from that range.

Also, sub-Types of a Feedback TLV need to be assigned by IANA. The types from 6 to 32767 are by expert review controlled by IANA. The types 32768 to 65535 are reserved for private use.

[11.0](#) Acknowledgments

Ashwood-Smith, et. al. June 2003 [Page 11]

Internet Draft LSP Feedback with CR-LDP June, 2003

The authors would like to thank Keith Dysart for his guidance and Jerzy Miernik for helping implement these concepts and bringing them to life. The authors' would like to acknowledge Dave Allan for his comments and suggestions.

[12.0](#) Normative References

[RFC3212] Jamoussi, B. et al., "Constraint-Based LSP Setup using LDP", [RFC 3212](#), January 2002.

[RFC3032] Andersson, L. et al., "LDP Specification", [RFC 3032](#), January 2001.

[IS-IS] Li, T., Smit, H., "Extensions to IS-IS for traffic engineering", Internet Draft, [draft-ietf-isis-traffic-04.txt](#), December 2001.

[OSPF] Katz,D., Yeung, D., Kompella, K., " Traffic Engineering Extensions to OSPF Version 2," [draft-katz-yeung-ospf-traffic-08.txt](#), September 2002.

[13.0](#) Informative References

[QUERY] Ashwood-Smith, P., Paraschiv, A., " Multi Protocol Label Switching Label Distribution Protocol Query Message Description ", Internet Draft, [draft-anto-ldp-query-08.txt](#), June 2003.

[RFC3479] Farrel, A et al., " Fault Tolerance for the Label Distribution Protocol (LDP)", [RFC 3479](#), February 2003

[14.0](#) Author's Addresses

Peter Ashwood-Smith
Nortel Networks Corp.
P.O. Box 3511 Station C,
Ottawa, ON K1Y 4H7
Canada
Phone: +1 613-763-4534
petera@nortelnetworks.com

Bilel Jamoussi
Nortel Networks Corp.
600 Technology Park Drive
Billerica, MA 01821
USA
phone: +1 978-288-4506
jamoussi@nortelnetworks.com

Darek Skalecki
Nortel Networks Corp.
P.O. Box 3511 Station C,
Ottawa, On K1Y 4H7
Canada
Phone: +1 613-765-2252
dareks@nortelnetworks.com

Don Fedyk
Nortel Networks Corp.
600 Technology Park Drive
Billerica, MA 01821
USA
Phone: +1 978-288-3041
dwfedyk@nortelnetworks.com

Ashwood-Smith, et. al.

June 2003

[Page 12]

Internet Draft

LSP Feedback with CR-LDP

June, 2003

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society 2003. All Rights Reserved. This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing

the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.