Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: March 23, 2017

C. Filsfils, Ed.
S. Previdi, Ed.
P. Francois
Cisco Systems, Inc.
B. Decraene
Orange
R. Shakir
Jive Communications
September 19, 2016

Use-cases for Resiliency in SPRING
draft-ietf-spring-resiliency-use-cases-05

Abstract

This document identifies and describe the requirements for a set of use cases related to network resiliency on Segment Routing (SPRING) networks.

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].

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 March 23, 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.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Path Protection 3
3. Management-free Local Protection 5
3.1. Management-free Bypass Protection 5
3.2. Management-free Shortest Path Based Protection 6
4. Managed Local Protection 6
4.1. Managed Bypass Protection 7
4.2. Managed Shortest Path Protection 7
5. Loop Avoidance 7
6. Co-existence of multiple resilience techniques in the same infrastructure 8
7. Security Considerations 9
8. IANA Considerations 9
9. Manageability Considerations 9
10. Contributors 9
11. Acknowledgements 9
12. References 9
12.1. Normative References 9
12.2. Informative References 10
Authors' Addresses 10

1. Introduction

SPRING aims at providing a network architecture supporting services with tight SLA guarantees [I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing]. This document reviews various use cases for the protection of services in a SPRING network. Note that these use cases are in particular applicable to existing LDP based and pure IP networks.

Three key alternatives are described: path protection, local protection without operator management and local protection with operator management.

Path protection lets the ingress node be in charge of the failure recovery, as discussed in Section 2.

The rest of the document focuses on approaches where protection is performed by the node adjacent to the failed component, commonly referred to as local protection techniques or Fast Reroute techniques.

In Section 3 we discuss two different approaches providing unmanaged local protection, namely link/node bypass protection and shortest path based protection.

Section 4 illustrates a case allowing the operator to manage the local protection behavior in order to accommodate specific policies.

In Section 5 we discuss the opportunity for the SPRING architecture to provide loop-avoidance mechanisms, such that transient forwarding state inconsistencies during routing convergence do not lead into traffic loss.

The purpose of this document is to illustrate the different approaches and explain how an operator could combine them in the same network (see Section 6). Solutions are not defined in this document.




Figure 1: Reference topology

We use Figure 1 as a reference topology throughout the document. Following link metrics are applied:

Link metrics are bidirectional. In other words, the same metric value is configured at both side of each link.

Links from/to A and Z are configured with a metric of 100.

CH, GD, DI and HE links are configured with a metric of 6.

All other links are configured with a metric of 5.

2. Path Protection

A first protection strategy consists in excluding any local repair but instead use end-to-end path protection where each SPRING path is

protected by a second disjoint SPRING path. In this case local protection MUST NOT be used.

For example, a Pseudo Wire (PW) from A to Z can be "path protected" in the direction A to Z in the following manner: the operator configures two SPRING paths T1 (primary) and T2 (backup) from A to Z. The two paths are installed in the forwarding plane of A and hence are ready to forward packets. The two paths are made disjoint using the SPRING architecture.

T1 is established over path {AB, BC, CD, DE, EZ} as the primary path and T2 is established over path {AF, FG, GH, HI, IZ} as the backup path. As a requirement, the two paths MUST be disjoint in their links, nodes or shared risk link groups (SRLGs).

When the primary path T1 is up, the packets of the PW are sent on T1. When T1 fails, the packets of the PW are sent on backup path T2. When T1 comes back up, the operator either allows for an automated reversion of the traffic onto T1 or selects an operator-driven reversion.

It is essential that the primary and backup path benefit from an end-to-end liveness monitoring/verification. The method and mechanisms that provide such liveness check are outside the scope of this document.

There are multiple options for liveness check, e.g., path liveness where the path is monitored at the network level (either by the head-end node or by a network controller/monitoring system). Another possible approach consists of a service-based path monitored by the service instance (verifying reachability of the endpoint). All these options are given here as examples. While this document does express the requirement for a liveness mechanism, it does not mandate, nor define, any specific one.

From a SPRING viewpoint, we would like to highlight the following requirements:

- Primary and backup paths (T1 and T2 in the example) MUST NOT benefit from local protection.

- The SPRING architecture MUST provide end-to-end liveness check of SPRING based paths.

- SPRING architecture MUST provide a way to compute paths that MUST NOT be protected by local repair techniques.

3. Management-free Local Protection

This section describes two alternatives providing local protection without requiring operator management, namely bypass protection and shortest-path based protection.

For example, a demand from A to Z, transported over the shortest paths provided by the SPRING architecture, benefits from management-free local protection by having each node along the path automatically pre-compute and pre-install a backup path for the destination Z. Upon local detection of the failure, the traffic is repaired over the backup path in sub-50 milliseconds.

The backup path computation SHOULD support the following requirements:

- 100% link, node, and SRLG protection in any topology.
- Automated computation by the IGP.
- Selection of the backup path such as to minimize the chance for transient congestion and/or delay during the protection period, as reflected by the IGP metric configuration in the network.

3.1. Management-free Bypass Protection

One way to provide local repair is to enforce a fail-over along the shortest path around the failed component.

In case of link protection, the point of local repair will create a bypass avoiding the protected link and merging back to primary path at the nexthop.

In case of node protection, the bypass will avoid the protected node and merge back to primary path at the next-nexthop.

In our example, C protects destination Z against a failure of CD link by enforcing the traffic over the bypass {CH, HD}. The resulting end-to-end path between A and Z, upon recovery against the failure of CD, is depicted in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Bypass protection around link CD

3.2. Management-free Shortest Path Based Protection

An alternative protection strategy consists in management-free local protection, aiming at providing a repair for the destination based on the shortest path to the destination.

In our example, C protects Z, that it initially reaches via CD, by enforcing the traffic over its shortest path to Z, considering the failure of the protected component. The resulting end-to-end path between A and Z, upon recovery against the failure of CD, is depicted in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Shortest path protection around link CD

4. Managed Local Protection

There may be cases where a management free repair does not fit the policy of the operator. For example, in our illustration, the operator may not want to have CD and CH used to protect each other, in fear of a shared risk among the two links.

In this context, the protection mechanism must support the explicit configuration of the backup path either under the form of high-level constraints (end at the next-hop, end at the next-next-hop, minimize this metric, avoid this SRLG...) or under the form of an explicit path.

We discuss such aspects for both bypass and shortest path based protection schemes.

4.1. Managed Bypass Protection

Let us illustrate the case using our reference example. For the demand from A to Z, the operator does not want to use the shortest failover path to the nexthop, {CH, HD}, but rather the path {CG, GH, HD}, as illustrated in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Managed Bypass Protection

The computation of the repair path SHOULD be possible in an automated fashion as well as statically expressed in the point of local repair.

4.2. Managed Shortest Path Protection

In the case of shortest path protection, the operator does not want to use the shortest failover via link CH, but rather reach H via {CG, GH}, for example, due to metric, BW, SRLG or other constraint.

The resulting end-to-end path upon activation of the protection is illustrated in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Managed Shortest Path Protection

The computation of the repair path SHOULD be possible in an automated fashion as well as statically expressed in the point of local repair.

5. Loop Avoidance

It is part of routing protocols behavior to have what called "transient routing inconsistencies". This is due to the routing convergence that happens in each node at different times and during a different lapse of time.

These inconsistencies may cause routing loops that last the time that it takes for the node impacted by a network event to converge. These loops are called "microloops".

Usually, in a normal routing protocol operations, microloops do not last long enough and in general they are noticed during the time it takes for the network to converge. However, with the emerging of fast-convergence and fast-reroute technologies, microloops may be an issue in networks where sub-50 millisecond convergence/reroute is required. Therefore, the microloop problem needs to be addressed.

A set of technologies preventing and addressing microloops have been proposed (e.g.: [I-D.ietf-rtgwg-uloop-delay]).

Networks may be affected by microloops during convergence depending of their topologies. Detecting microloops can be done during topology computation (e.g.: SPF computation) and therefore microloops-avoidance tecnhiques may be applied. An example of such technique is to compute microloop-free path that would be used during network convergence.

The SPRING architecture SHOULD provide solutions to prevent the occurrence of microloops during convergence following a change in the network state. A SPRING enabled router could take advantage of the increased packet steering capabilities offered by SPRING in order to steer packets in a way that packets do not enter such loops.

6. Co-existence of multiple resilience techniques in the same infrastructure

The operator may want to support several very different services on the same packet-switching infrastructure. As a result, the SPRING architecture SHOULD allow for the co-existence of the different use cases listed in this document, in the same network.

Let us illustrate this with the following example:

- Flow F1 is supported over path {C, CD, E}
- Flow F2 is supported over path {C, CD, I}
- Flow F3 is supported over path {C, CD, Z}
- Flow F4 is supported over path {C, CD, Z}

It should be possible for the operator to configure the network to achieve path protection for F1, management free shortest path local

protection for F2, managed protection over path {CG, GH, Z} for F3, and management free bypass protection for F4.

7. Security Considerations

This document lists various ways to provide resiliency in networks by using Segment Routing Policies. As such they do not introduce any new security considerations compared to the security considerations related to the use of segment routing itself and defined in [RFC7855] and [I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing].

8. IANA Considerations

This document does not request any IANA allocations.

9. Manageability Considerations

This document provides use cases. Solutions aimed at supporting these use cases should provide the necessary mechanisms in order to allow for manageability as described in [RFC7855] and [I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing].

Manageability concerns the computation, installation and troubleshooting of the repair path. Also, necessary mechanisms SHOULD be provided in order for the operator to control when a repair path is computed, installed and used.

10. Contributors

TBD.

11. Acknowledgements

TBD.

12. References

12.1. 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>.

[RFC7855] Previdi, S., Ed., Filsfils, C., Ed., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., Horneffer, M., and R. Shakir, "Source Packet Routing in Networking (SPRING) Problem Statement and Requirements", RFC 7855, DOI 10.17487/RFC7855, May 2016, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7855>.

12.2. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-rtgwg-uloop-delay]
Litkowski, S., Decraene, B., Filsfils, C., and P. Francois, "Microloop prevention by introducing a local convergence delay", draft-ietf-rtgwg-uloop-delay-02 (work in progress), June 2016.

[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing]
Filsfils, C., Previdi, S., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing Architecture", draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-09 (work in progress), July 2016.

Authors' Addresses

Clarence Filsfils (editor)
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Brussels
BE

Email: cfilsfil@cisco.com

Stefano Previdi (editor)
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Via Del Serafico, 200
Rome 00142
Italy

Email: sprevidi@cisco.com

Pierre Francois
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Vimercate
Italy

Email: pifranco@cisco.com

Bruno Decraene
Orange
FR

Email: bruno.decraene@orange.com

Rob Shakir
Jive Communications, Inc.
1275 West 1600 North, Suite 100
Orem, UT 84057

Email: rjs@rob.sh