            Remote-LFA Node Protection and Manageability
                draft-ietf-rtgwg-rlfa-node-protection-04

Abstract

   The loop-free alternates computed following the current Remote-LFA
   [RFC7490] specification guarantees only link-protection. The
   resulting Remote-LFA nexthops (also called PQ-nodes), may not
   guarantee node-protection for all destinations being protected by it.

   This document describes procedures for determining if a given PQ-node
   provides node-protection for a specific destination or not. The
   document also shows how the same procedure can be utilised for
   collection of complete characteristics for alternate paths.
   Knowledge about the characteristics of all alternate path is
   precursory to apply operator defined policy for eliminating paths not
   fitting constraints.

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 RFC2119 [RFC2119].

Status of This Memo

   This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the
   provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

   Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering
   Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute
   working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-
   Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

   Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months
   and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any

   time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference
   material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

   This Internet-Draft will expire on April 16, 2016.

Table of Contents

1. **Introduction**

   The Remote-LFA [RFC7490] specification provides loop-free alternates
   that guarantee only link-protection. The resulting Remote-LFA
   alternate nexthops (also referred to as the PQ-nodes) may not provide
   node-protection for all destinations covered by the same, in case of
   failure of the primary nexthop node. Neither does the specification
   provide a means to determine the same.

   Also, the LFA Manageability [I-D.ietf-rtgwg-lfa-manageability]
   document, requires a computing router to find all possible (including
   all possible Remote-LFA) alternate nexthops, collect the complete set
   of path characteristics for each alternate path, run a alternate-
   selection policy (configured by the operator), and find the best
   alternate path. This will require the Remote-LFA implementation to
   gather all the required path characteristics along each link on the
   entire Remote-LFA alternate path.

   With current LFA [RFC5286] and Remote-LFA implementations, the
   forward SPF (and reverse SPF) is run on the computing router and its
   immediate 1-hop routers as the roots. While that enables computation
   of path attributes (e.g. SRLG, Admin-groups) for first alternate
   path segment from the computing router to the PQ-node, there is no
   means for the computing router to gather any path attributes for the
   path segment from the PQ-node to destination. Consequently any
   policy-based selection of alternate paths will consider only the path
   attributes from the computing router up until the PQ-node.

   This document describes a procedure for determining node-protection
   with Remote-LFA. The same procedure is also extended for collection
   of a complete set of path attributes, enabling more accurate policy-
   based selection for alternate paths obtained with Remote-LFA.

2. **Node Protection with Remote-LFA**

   Node-protection is required to provide protection of traffic on a
   given forwarding node, against the failure of the first-hop node on
   the primary forwarding path. Such protection becomes more critical
   in the absence of mechanisms like non-stop-routing in the network.
   Certain operators refrain from deploying non-stop-routing in their
   network, due to the significant additional performance complexities
   it introduces. In such cases node-protection is essential to
   guarantee un-interrupted flow of traffic, even in the case of an
   entire forwarding node going down.

   The following sections discuss the node-protection problem in the
   context of Remote-LFA and propose a solution.

2.1. The Problem

   To better illustrate the problem and the solution proposed in this
   document the following topology diagram from the Remote-LFA [RFC7490]
   draft is being re-used with slight modification.

```
                          D1
                         /
                       S-x-E
                      /      \
                     N        R3--D2
                      \      /
                       R1---R2
```

                        Figure 1: Topology 1

   In the above topology, for all (non-ECMP) destinations reachable via
   the S-E link there is no standard LFA alternate. As per the Remote-
   LFA [RFC7490] alternate specifications node R2 being the only PQ-node
   for the S-E link provides nexthop for all the above destinations.
   Table 1 below, shows all possible primary and Remote-LFA alternate
   paths for each destination.

```
  +-------------+--------------+---------+------------------------+
  | Destination | Primary Path | PQ-node | Remote-LFA Backup Path |
  +-------------+--------------+---------+------------------------+
  | R3          | S->E->R3     | R2      | S=>N=>R1=>R2->R3        |
  | E           | S->E         | R2      | S=>N=>R1=>R2->R3->E     |
  | D1          | S->E->D1     | R2      | S=>N=>R1=>R2->R3->E->D1 |
  | D2          | S->E->R3->D2 | R2      | S=>N=>R1=>R2->R3->D2    |
  +-------------+--------------+---------+------------------------+
```

               Table 1: Remote-LFA backup paths via PQ-node R2

   A closer look at Table 1 shows that, while the PQ-node R2 provides
   link-protection for all the destinations, it does not provide node-
   protection for destinations E and D1. In the event of the node-
   failure on primary nexthop E, the alternate path from Remote-LFA
   nexthop R2 to E and D1 also becomes unavailable. So for a Remote-LFA
   nexthop to provide node-protection for a given destination, it is
   mandatory that, the shortest path from the given PQ-node to the given
   destination MUST not traverse the primary nexthop.

   In another extension of the topology in Figure 1 let us consider an
   additional link between N and E with the same cost as the other
   links.

```
                              D1
                             /
                           S-x-E
                          /   / \
                        N---+   R3--D2
                         \     /
                          R1---R2
```

Figure 2: Topology 2

In the above topology, the S-E link is no more on any of the shortest
paths from N to R3, E and D1. Hence R3, E and D1 are also included
in both the Extended-P space and Q space of E (w.r.t S-E link).
Table 2 below, shows all possible primary and R-LFA alternate paths
via PQ-node R3, for each destination reachable through the S-E link
in the above topology. The R-LFA alternate paths via PQ-node R2
remains same as in Table 1.

```
+-------------+--------------+---------+-----------------------+
| Destination | Primary Path | PQ-node | Remote-LFA Backup Path |
+-------------+--------------+---------+-----------------------+
| R3          | S->E->R3     | R3      | S=>N=>E=>R3           |
| E           | S->E         | R3      | S=>N=>E=>R3->E        |
| D1          | S->E->D1     | R3      | S=>N=>E=>R3->E->D1    |
| D2          | S->E->R3->D2 | R3      | S=>N=>E=>R3->D2       |
+-------------+--------------+---------+-----------------------+
```

Table 2: Remote-LFA backup paths via PQ-node R3

Again a closer look at Table 2 shows that, unlike Table 1, where the
single PQ-node R2 provided node-protection for destinations R3 and
D2, if we choose R3 as the R-LFA nexthop, it does not provide node-
protection for R3 and D2 anymore. If S chooses R3 as the R-LFA
nexthop, in the event of the node-failure on primary nexthop E, on
the alternate path from S to R-LFA nexthop R3, one of parallel ECMP
path between N and R3 also becomes unavailable. So for a Remote-LFA
nexthop to provide node-protection for a given destination, it is
also mandatory that, the shortest path from S to the chosen PQ-node
MUST not traverse the primary nexthop node.

2.2. Few Additional Definitions

This document adds and enhances the following definitions extending
the ones mentioned in Remote-LFA [RFC7490] draft.

2.2.1. **Link-Protecting Extended P-Space**

   The Remote-LFA [RFC7490] draft already defines this. The link-
   protecting extended P-space for a link S-E being protected is the set
   of routers that are reachable from one or more direct neighbors of S,
   except primary node E, without traversing the S-E link on any of the
   shortest path from the direct neighbor to the router. This MUST
   exclude any direct neighbor for which there is at least one ECMP path
   from the direct neighbor traversing the link(S-E) being protected.

   A node Y is in link-protecting extended P-space w.r.t to the link
   (S-E) being protected, if and only if, there exists at least one
   direct neighbor of S, Ni, other than primary nexthop E, that
   satisfies the following condition.

   $D\_opt(Ni,Y) < D\_opt(Ni,S) + D\_opt(S,Y)$

   Where,
      D_opt(A,B) : Distance on most optimum path from A to B.
            Ni : A direct neighbor of S other than primary
                    nexthop E.
             Y : The node being evaluated for link-protecting
                    extended P-Space.

               Figure 3: Link-Protecting Ext-P-Space Condition

2.2.2. **Node-Protecting Extended P-Space**

   The node-protecting extended P-space for a primary nexthop node E
   being protected, is the set of routers that are reachable from one or
   more direct neighbors of S, except primary node E, without traversing
   the node E. This MUST exclude any direct neighbors for which there
   is at least one ECMP path from the direct neighbor traversing the
   node E being protected.

   A node Y is in node-protecting extended P-space w.r.t to the node E
   being protected, if and only if, there exists at least one direct
   neighbor of S, Ni, other than primary nexthop E, that satisfies the
   following condition.

```
D_opt(Ni,Y) < D_opt(Ni,E) + D_opt(E,Y)
```

Where,
  D_opt(A,B) : Distance on most optimum path from A to B.
         E : The primary nexthop on shortest path from S
               to destination.
        Ni : A direct neighbor of S other than primary
               nexthop E.
         Y : The node being evaluated for node-protecting
               extended P-Space.

              Figure 4: Node-Protecting Ext-P-Space Condition

It must be noted that a node Y satisfying the condition in Figure 4
above only guarantees that the R-LFA alternate path segment from S
via direct neighbor Ni to the node Y is not affected in the event of
a node failure of E. It does not yet guarantee that the path segment
from node Y to the destination is also unaffected by the same failure
event.

2.2.3. Q-Space

The Remote-LFA [RFC7490] draft already defines this. The Q-space for
a link S-E being protected is the set of routers that can reach
primary node E, without traversing the S-E link on any of the
shortest path from the node Y to primary nexthop E. This MUST
exclude any destination for which there is at least one ECMP path
from the node Y to the primary nexthop E traversing the link(S-E)
being protected.

A node Y is in Q-space w.r.t to the link (S-E) being protected, if
and only if, the following condition is satisfied.

```
D_opt(Y,E) < D_opt(S,E) + D_opt(Y,S)
```

Where,
  D_opt(A,B) : Distance on most optimum path from A to B.
         E : The primary nexthop on shortest path from S
               to destination.
         Y : The node being evaluated for Q-Space.

                    Figure 5: Q-Space Condition

[2.2.4](#). Link-Protecting PQ Space

A node Y is in link-protecting PQ space w.r.t to the link (S-E) being protected, if and only if, Y is present in both link-protecting extended P-space and the Q-space for the link being protected.

[2.2.5](#). Candidate Node-Protecting PQ Space

A node Y is in candidate node-protecting PQ space w.r.t to the node (E) being protected, if and only if, Y is present in both node-protecting extended P-space and the Q-space for the link being protected.

Again it must be noted that a node Y being in candidate node-protecting PQ-space does not guarantee that the R-LFA alternate path via the same, in entirety, is unaffected in the event of a node failure of primary nexthop node E. It only guarantees that the path segment from S to PQ-node Y is unaffected by the same failure event. The PQ-nodes in the candidate node-protecting PQ space may provide node protection for only a subset of destinations that are reachable through the corresponding primary link.

[2.3](#). Computing Node-protecting R-LFA Path

The R-LFA alternate path through a given PQ-node to a given destination is comprised of two path segments as follows.

1. Path segment from the computing router to the PQ-node (Remote-LFA alternate nexthop), and

2. Path segment from the PQ-node to the destination being protected.

So to ensure a R-LFA alternate path for a given destination provides node-protection we need to ensure that none of the above path segments are affected in the event of failure of the primary nexthop node. Sections [Section 2.3.1](#) and [Section 2.3.2](#) shows how this can be ensured.

[2.3.1](#). Computing Candidate Node-protecting PQ-Nodes for Primary nexthops

To choose a node-protecting R-LFA nexthop for a destination R3, router S needs to consider a PQ-node from the candidate node-protecting PQ-space for the primary nexthop E on shortest path from S to R3. As mentioned in [Section 2.2.2](#), to consider a PQ-node as candidate node-protecting PQ-node, there must be at least one direct neighbor Ni of S, such that all shortest paths from Ni to the PQ-node does not traverse primary nexthop node E.

Implementations should run the inequality in Section 2.2.2 Figure 4
for all direct neighbor, other than primary nexthop node E, to
determine whether a node Y is a candidate node-protecting PQ-node.
All of the metrics needed by this inequality would have been already
collected from the forward SPFs rooted at each of direct neighbor S,
computed as part of standard LFA [RFC5286] implementation. With
reference to the topology in Figure 2, Table 3 below shows how the
above condition can be used to determine the candidate node-
protecting PQ-space for S-E link (primary nexthop E)

```
+------------+---------+---------+---------+--------+----------+
| Candidate  | Direct  | D_opt   | D_opt   | D_opt  | Condition|
|  PQ-node   | Nbr (Ni)| (Ni,Y)  | (Ni,E)  | (E,Y)  |   Met    |
|    (Y)     |         |         |         |        |          |
+------------+---------+---------+---------+--------+----------+
|    R2      |    N    | 2 (N,R2)| 1 (N,E) |   2    |   Yes    |
|            |         |         |         | (E,R2) |          |
|    R3      |    N    | 2 (N,R3)| 1 (N,E) |   1    |   No     |
|            |         |         |         | (E,R3) |          |
+------------+---------+---------+---------+--------+----------+
```

Table 3: Node-protection evaluation for R-LFA repair tunnel to PQ-
node

As seen in the above Table 3 , R3 does not meet the node-protecting
extended-p-space inequality and so, while R2 is in candidate node-
protecting PQ space, R3 is not.

Some SPF implementations may also produce a list of links and nodes
traversed on the shortest path(s) from a given root to others. In
such implementations, router S may have executed a forward SPF with
each of its direct neighbors as the SPF root, executed as part of the
standard LFA [RFC5286] computations. So S may re-use the list of
links and nodes collected from the same SPF computations, to decide
whether a node Y is a candidate node-protecting PQ-node or not. A
node Y shall be considered as a node-protecting PQ-node, if and only
if, there is at least one direct neighbor of S, other than the
primary nexthop E, for which, the primary nexthop node E does not
exist on the list of nodes traversed on any of the shortest path(s)
from the direct neighbor to the PQ-node. Table 4 below is an
illustration of the mechanism with the topology in Figure 2.

```
+-----------+------------------+----------------+----------------+
| Candidate | Repair Tunnel    | Link-Protection | Node-Protection |
| PQ-node   | Path(Repairing   |                |                |
|           | router to PQ-    |                |                |
|           | node)            |                |                |
+-----------+------------------+----------------+----------------+
| R2        | S->N->R1->R2     | Yes            | Yes            |
| R2        | S->E->R3->R2     | No             | No             |
| R3        | S->N->E->R3      | Yes            | No             |
+-----------+------------------+----------------+----------------+
```

          Table 4: Protection of Remote-LFA tunnel to the PQ-node

   As seen in the above Table 4 while R2 is candidate node-protecting
   Remote-LFA nexthop for R3 and D2, it is not so for E and D1, since
   the primary nexthop E is in the shortest path from R2 to E and D1.

2.3.2. Computing node-protecting paths from PQ-nodes to destinations

   Once a computing router finds all the candidate node-protecting PQ-
   nodes for a given directly attached primary link, it shall follow the
   procedure as proposed in this section, to choose one or more node-
   protecting R-LFA paths, for destinations reachable through the same
   primary link in the primary SPF graph.

   To find a node-protecting R-LFA path for a given destination, the
   computing router needs to pick a subset of PQ-nodes from the
   candidate node-protecting PQ-space for the corresponding primary
   nexthop, such that all the path(s) from the PQ-node(s) to the given
   destination remain unaffected in the event of a node failure of the
   primary nexthop node. To ensure this, the computing router will need
   to ensure that, the primary nexthop node should not be on any of the
   shortest paths from the PQ-node to the given destination.

   This document proposes an additional forward SPF computation for each
   of the PQ-nodes, to discover all shortest paths from the PQ-nodes to
   the destination. The additional forward SPF computation for each PQ-
   node, shall help determine, if a given primary nexthop node is on the
   shortest paths from the PQ-node to the given destination or not. To
   determine if a given candidate node-protecting PQ-node provides node-
   protecting alternate for a given destination, the primary nexthop
   node should not be on any of the shortest paths from the PQ-node to
   the given destination. On running the forward SPF on a candidate
   node-protecting PQ-node the computing router shall run the inequality
   in Figure 6 below. A PQ-node that does not qualify the condition for
   a given destination, does not guarantee node-protection for the path
   segment from the PQ-node to the given destination.

    D_opt(Y,D) < D_opt(Y,E) + Distance_opt(E,D)

    Where,
       D_opt(A,B) : Distance on most optimum path from A to B.
             D : The destination node.
             E : The primary nexthop on shortest path from S
                  to destination.
             Y : The node-protecting PQ-node being evaluated

      Figure 6: Node-Protecting Condition for PQ-node to Destination

All of the above metric costs except D_opt(Y, D), can be obtained
with forward and reverse SPFs with E(the primary nexthop) as the
root, run as part of the regular LFA and Remote-LFA implementation.
The Distance_opt(Y, D) metric can only be determined by the
additional forward SPF run with PQ-node Y as the root. With
reference to the topology in Figure 2, Table 5 below shows how the
above condition can be used to determine node-protection with node-
protecting PQ-node R2.

```
+-------------+-----------+---------+--------+---------+-----------+
| Destination | Primary-NH |  D_opt  | D_opt  |  D_opt  | Condition |
|     (D)     |    (E)    | (Y, D)  | (Y, E) | (E, D)  |    Met    |
+-------------+-----------+---------+--------+---------+-----------+
|     R3      |     E     |    1    |   2    |    1    |    Yes    |
|             |           | (R2,R3) | (R2,E) | (E,R3)  |           |
|      E      |     E     |    2    |   2    | 0 (E,E) |    No     |
|             |           | (R2,E)  | (R2,E) |         |           |
|     D1      |     E     |    3    |   2    |    1    |    No     |
|             |           | (R2,D1) | (R2,E) | (E,D1)  |           |
|     D2      |     E     |    2    |   2    |    1    |    Yes    |
|             |           | (R2,D2) | (R2,E) | (E,D2)  |           |
+-------------+-----------+---------+--------+---------+-----------+
```

      Table 5: Node-protection evaluation for R-LFA path segment between
                        PQ-node and destination

As seen in the above example above, R2 does not meet the node-
protecting inequality for destination E, and D1. And so, once again,
while R2 is a node-protecting Remote-LFA nexthop for R3 and D2, it is
not so for E and D1.

In SPF implementations that also produce a list of links and nodes
traversed on the shortest path(s) from a given root to others, to
determine whether a PQ-node provides node-protection for a given
destination or not, the list of nodes computed from forward SPF run
on the PQ-node, for the given destination, should be inspected. In
case the list contains the primary nexthop node, the PQ-node does not

provide node-protection. Else, the PQ-node guarantees node-
protecting alternate for the given destination. Below is an
illustration of the mechanism with candidate node-protecting PQ-node
R2 in the topology in Figure 2.

+-------------+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+
Destination	Shortest Path	Link-Protection	Node-Protection
	(Repairing		
	router to PQ-		
	node)		
+-------------+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+
R3	R2->R3	Yes	Yes
E	R2->R3->E	Yes	No
D1	R2->R3->E->D1	Yes	No
D2	R2->R3->D2	Yes	Yes
+-------------+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+

Table 6: Protection of Remote-LFA path between PQ-node and
destination

As seen in the above example while R2 is candidate node-protecting
R-LFA nexthop for R3 and D2, it is not so for E and D1, since the
primary nexthop E is in the shortest path from R2 to E and D1.

The procedure described in this document helps no more than to
determine whether a given Remote-LFA alternate provides node-
protection for a given destination or not. It does not find out any
new Remote-LFA alternate nexthops, outside the ones already computed
by standard Remote-LFA procedure. However, in case of availability
of more than one PQ-node (Remote-LFA alternates) for a destination,
and node-protection is required for the given primary nexthop, this
procedure will eliminate the PQ-nodes that do not provide node-
protection and choose only the ones that does.

2.3.3. Limiting extra computational overhead

In addition to the extra reverse SPF computation, one per directly
connected neighbor, suggested by the Remote-LFA [RFC7490] draft, this
document proposes a forward SPF per PQ-node discovered in the
network. Since the average number of PQ-nodes found in any network
is considerably more than the number of direct neighbors of the
computing router, the proposal of running one forward SPF per PQ-node
may add considerably to the overall SPF computation time.

To limit the computational overhead of the approach proposed, this
document proposes that implementations MUST choose a subset from the
entire set of PQ-nodes computed in the network, with a finite limit
on the number of PQ-nodes in the subset. Implementations MUST choose

a default value for this limit and may provide user with a
configuration knob to override the default limit. Implementations
MUST also evaluate some default preference criteria while considering
a PQ-node in this subset. Finally, implementations MAY also allow
user to override the default preference criteria, by providing a
policy configuration for the same.

This document proposes that implementations SHOULD use a default
preference criteria for PQ-node selection which will put a score on
each PQ-node, proportional to the number of primary interfaces for
which it provides coverage, its distance from the computing router,
and its router-id (or system-id in case of IS-IS). PQ-nodes that
cover more primary interfaces SHOULD be preferred over PQ-nodes that
cover fewer primary interfaces. When two or more PQ-nodes cover the
same number of primary interfaces, PQ-nodes which are closer (based
on metric) to the computing router SHOULD be preferred over PQ-nodes
farther away from it. For PQ-nodes that cover the same number of
primary interfaces and are the same distance from the the computing
router, the PQ-node with smaller router-id (or system-id in case of
IS-IS) SHOULD be preferred.

Once a subset of PQ-nodes is found, computing router shall run a
forward SPF on each of the PQ-nodes in the subset to continue with
procedures proposed in section Section 2.3.2.

3. Manageabilty of Remote-LFA Alternate Paths

3.1. The Problem

With the regular Remote-LFA [RFC7490] functionality the computing
router may compute more than one PQ-node as usable Remote-LFA
alternate nexthops. Additionally an alternate selection policy may
be configured to enable the network operator to choose one of them as
the most appropriate Remote-LFA alternate. For such policy-based
alternate selection to run, all the relevant path characteristics for
each the alternate paths (one through each of the PQ-nodes), needs to
be collected. As mentioned before in section Section 2.3 the R-LFA
alternate path through a given PQ-node to a given destination is
comprised of two path segments.

The first path segment (i.e. from the computing router to the PQ-
node) can be calculated from the regular forward SPF done as part of
standard and remote LFA computations. However without the mechanism
proposed in section Section 2.3.2 of this document, there is no way
to determine the path characteristics for the second path segment
(i.e from the PQ-node to the destination). In the absence of the
path characteristics for the second path segment, two Remote-LFA
alternate path may be equally preferred based on the first path

segments characteristics only, although the second path segment
attributes may be different.

3.2. The Solution

The additional forward SPF computation proposed in section
Section 2.3.2 document shall also collect links, nodes and path
characteristics along the second path segment. This shall enable
collection of complete path characteristics for a given Remote-LFA
alternate path to a given destination. The complete alternate path
characteristics shall then facilitate more accurate alternate path
selection while running the alternate selection policy.

Like specified in Section 2.3.3 to limit the computational overhead
of the approach proposed, forward SPF computations MUST be run on a
selected subset from the entire set of PQ-nodes computed in the
network, with a finite limit on the number of PQ-nodes in the subset.
The detailed suggestion on how to select this subset is specified in
the same section. While this limits the number of possible alternate
paths provided to the alternate-selection policy, this is needed keep
the computational complexity within affordable limits. However if
the alternate-selection policy is very restrictive this may leave few
destinations in the entire toplogy without protection. Yet this
limitation provides a necessary tradeoff between extensive coverage
and immense computational overhead.

4. Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Bruno Decraene for providing his useful comments. We
would also like to thank Uma Chunduri for reviewing this document and
providing valuable feedback. Also, many thanks to Harish Raghuveer
for his review and comments on the initial versions of this document.

5. IANA Considerations

N/A. - No protocol changes are proposed in this document.

6. Security Considerations

This document does not introduce any change in any of the protocol
specifications. It simply proposes to run an extra SPF rooted on
each PQ-node discovered in the whole network.

7. References

7.1. 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,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>.

7.2. Informative References

   [I-D.ietf-rtgwg-lfa-manageability]
              Litkowski, S., Decraene, B., Filsfils, C., Raza, K.,
              Horneffer, M., and P. Sarkar, "Operational management of
              Loop Free Alternates", draft-ietf-rtgwg-lfa-
              manageability-11 (work in progress), June 2015.

   [RFC5286] Atlas, A., Ed. and A. Zinin, Ed., "Basic Specification for
              IP Fast Reroute: Loop-Free Alternates", RFC 5286,
              DOI 10.17487/RFC5286, September 2008,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5286>.

   [RFC7490] Bryant, S., Filsfils, C., Previdi, S., Shand, M., and N.
              So, "Remote Loop-Free Alternate (LFA) Fast Reroute (FRR)",
              RFC 7490, DOI 10.17487/RFC7490, April 2015,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7490>.

Authors' Addresses

   Pushpasis Sarkar (editor)
   Juniper Networks, Inc.
   Electra, Exora Business Park
   Bangalore, KA 560103
   India

   Email: pushpasis.ietf@gmail.com; psarkar@juniper.net

   Shraddha Hegde
   Juniper Networks, Inc.
   Electra, Exora Business Park
   Bangalore, KA 560103
   India

   Email: shraddha@juniper.net

Chris Bowers
Juniper Networks, Inc.
1194 N. Mathilda Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94089
US

Email: cbowers@juniper.net

Hannes Gredler
Unaffiliated

Email: hannes@gredler.at

Stephane Litkowski
Orange

Email: stephane.litkowski@orange.com