TRILL Working Group
Internet Draft
Intended status: Standard Track
Updates: 6325

Tissa Senevirathne
CISCO
Janardhanan Pathangi
DELL
Jon Hudson
Brocade

April 17, 2012

Expires: October 2012

Coordinated Multicast Trees (CMT)for TRILL
draft-ietf-trill-cmt-00.txt

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Abstract

TRILL facilitates loop free connectivity to non TRILL legacy networks via choice of an Appointed Forwarder for set of VLANs. Appointed Forwarder provides VLAN level load sharing with active-standby model. Mission critical operations such as High Performance Data Centers require active-active load sharing model. Active-Active load sharing model can be accomplished by representing any given non TRILL legacy network with a single virtual RBridge. Virtual representation of the non-TRILL legacy network with a single RBridge poses serious challenges in multi-destination RPF calculations. This document presents the required enhancements to build Coordinated Multicast Trees (CMT) within the TRILL campus to solve related RPF issues. CMT provides flexibility to RBridges to select desired path of association to a given distribution tree.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

TRILL presented in [RFC6325] and other related documents, provide methods of utilizing all available paths for active forwarding, with minimum configuration. TRILL utilizes IS-IS as control plane and encapsulates native frames with a TRILL header.

Legacy networks utilize IEEE 802.1D Spanning Tree Protocol as the control protocol and utilizes at any given time, a single path among all available paths for active forwarding. Legacy networks forward frames in ''native'' format.

[RFC6325],[RFC6327] and [RFC6439] provide methods for interoperability between TRILL and Legacy networks. [RFC6439], provide active-standby solution, where only one of the RBridges is in active forwarding state for any given VLAN. The RBridge in active forwarding state for any given VLAN is referred to as the Appointed Forwarder (AF). All frames ingressing into a TRILL network via the Appointed Forwarder are encapsulated with the TRILL header with a nickname held by the ingress AF RBridge. Due to failures, re-configurations and other network dynamics, Appointed Forwarder for any set of VLANs may change. RBridges maintain forwarding table that contain destination MAC address to egress RBridge binding. In the event of AF change, forwarding tables of remote RBridges may continue to forward traffic to the previous AF and may get discarded at the egress, causing traffic disruption.

Mission critical applications such as High Performance Data Centers require resiliency during failover. The active-active forwarding model minimizes impact during failures and maximizes the available network bandwidth. A typical deployment scenario, depicted in Figure

1, which may have either End Stations and/or Legacy bridges attached to the RBridges. These Legacy devices typically are multi-homed to several RBridges and treat all of the uplinks as a single Link Aggregation (LAG) bundle. The Appointed Forwarder designation presented in [RFC6439] requires each of the edge RBridges to exchange TRILL hello packets. By design, a LAG does not forward packets received on one of the member ports of the LAG to other member ports of the same LAG. As a result AF designation methods

presented in [RFC6439] cannot be applied to deployment scenario depicted in Figure 1

An active-active load sharing model can be implemented by representing the edge of the network connected to a specific group of RBridges by a single virtual RBridge. In addition to an active-active forwarding model, there may be other applications that may requires similar representations.

Sections 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 of [RFC6325] specify distribution tree calculation and Reverse Path Forwarding Check calculation algorithms for multi-destination forwarding. The algorithms specified in [RFC6325], strictly depends on link cost and parent RBridge priority. As a result, based on the network topology, it may be possible that a given edge RBridge, if it is forwarding on behalf of the virtual RBridge, may not have a candidate multicast tree that the edge RBridge can forward traffic on because there is no tree for which the virtual RBridge is a leaf node from the edge RBridge.

In this document we present a method that allows RBridges to specify the path of association to distribution trees. Remote RBridges calculate the SPF and derive the RPF for distribution trees based on the distribution tree association advertisements. In the absence of distribution tree association advertisements, remote RBridges derive the SPF based on the algorithm specified in section 4.5.1 of [RFC 6325].

Other applications, beside the above mentioned active-active forwarding model, may utilize the distribution tree association framework presented in this document to associate to distribution trees through a preferred path.

This proposal requires presence of multiple multi-destination trees within the TRILL campus and updating all the RBridges in the network to support the new Affinity sub-TLV. It is expected that both of these requirements will be met as they are control plane changes, and will be common deployment scenario. In case any of the above two conditions are not met RBridges MUST support a fallback option for interoperability. Since the fallback is expected to be a temporary phenomenon till all RBridges are upgraded, this proposal gives guidelines for such fallbacks, and does not mandate or specify any specific set of fallback options.

1.1. Scope and Applicability

This document provides a concept of Affinity sub-TLV to solve associated RPF issues at the active-active edge. Specific methods in

this document for making use of the Affinity sub-TLV are applicable where multiple RBridges are connected to edge device through link aggregation or to a multiport server or some similar arrangement where the RBridges cannot see each other's Hellos.

This document DOES NOT provide other required operational elements to implement active-active edge solution, such as methods of link aggregation. Solution specific operational elements are outside the scope of this document and will be covered in solution specific documents.

Examples provided in this document are for illustration purposes only.

1.2. Contributors

The work in this document is a result of much passionate discussions and contributions from following individuals. Their names are listed in alphabetical order:

Ayan Banerjee, Dinesh Dutt, Donald Eastlake, Mingui Zhang, Radia Perlman, Sam Aldrin, Shivakumar Sundaram, Zhai Hongjun.

2. Conventions used in this document

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].

In this document, these words will appear with that interpretation only when in ALL CAPS. Lower case uses of these words are not to be interpreted as carrying [RFC2119] significance.

3. AFFINITY TLV

Association of a RBridge to a multicast tree through a specific path is accomplished by using a new IS-IS sub-TLV, Affinity TLV.

AFFINITY TLV is a sub-TLV under the Router capability TLV (242) [RFC 4971]. Section 2.3.10 of [6326bis] formally specifies the code point and data structure for the Affinity sub-TLV.

4.   Multicast Tree Construction and use of Affinity Sub-TLV

Figure 1 and Figure 2 below show the reference topology and a logical topology using CMT to provide active-active service.

```
            ------------------
           /                    \
          |                      |
          | TRILL Campus         |
          |                      |
           \                     /
            ---------------------
               |       |    |
               |       |     ----------
            DRB|       |              |
           +-------+ +-------+    +-------+
           |       | |       |    |       |
           |(RB1)  | |(RB2)  |    |  (RBk)|
           +-------+ +-------+    +-------+
               |       |               |
               |       |    -----------    ----
               |       |   |    -------------  |
                -----  |   |    -----------  | |
```

```
            LAG---->(| |   | )           (| | |) LAG
                    +-------+    . .  .  +-------+
                    | CE1   |            | CEn   |
                    |       |            |       |
                    +-------+            +-------+
```

Figure 1 Reference Topology


```
            ------------------            Sample Multicast Tree (T1)
           /                    \
          |                      |                  |
          | TRILL Campus         |                  o RBn
          |                      |                / | \
           \                     /               /  |  ---\
            ---------------------              RB1o  o      o
               |       |    |                     |   RB2    RBk
               |       |     ----------           |
            DRB|       |              |          oRBv
           +------+ +------+      +------+
           |      | |      |      |   |
           |(RB1) | |(RB2) |      | (RBk)|
           +------+ +------+      +------+
            ooo|ooooooo|oooooooooooooo|oo
           o                             o
           o  virtual RBridge RBv        o
            ooo|ooooooo|ooo|ooooooooooooo  ----
               |       |   |      ----------  |
```

```
          -----   |    |      ----------   | |
      LAG---->(|  |    | )          (|  |  | )  LAG
                +--------+    .  .   .  +--------+
                | CE1    |              | CEn    |
                |        |              |        |
                +--------+              +--------+
```

Figure 2 Example Logical Topology

4.1. Update to RFC 6325

Section 4.5.1 of [RFC6325], is updated as below:

Each RBridge that desires to be a parent RBridge for a specific multi-destination distribution tree x for child RBridge RBy announces the desired association through Affinity sub-TLV. The child RBridge RBy is specified by its nickname (or one of its nicknames if it hold more than one).

When such an Affinity sub-TLV is present, the association specified by the affinity sub-TLV MUST be used when constructing the SPF tree. In the absence of such Affinity sub-TLV, or if there are RBRidges in the network that are do not support Affinity sub-TLV, SPF tree is calculated as specified in the section 4.5.1 of [RFC6325]. Section 4.3. below explains methods of identifying RBridges that support Affinity sub-TLV capability.

4.2. Announcing virtual RBridge nickname

Each edge RBridge RB1 to RBk advertises virtual RBridge nickname RBv using the nickname sub-TLV (6), [6326bis], along with their regular nickname or nicknames.

4.3. Affinity Sub-TLV capability.

RBridges that announce the TRILL version sub-TLV [6326bis] and set the Affinity capability bit (section 7.) support the Affinity sub-TLV and calculation of multi-destination distribution trees as specified herein.

5. Theory of operation

5.1. Distribution Tree provisioning

Let's assume there are n distribution trees and k edge RBridges in the edge group of interest.

If n >= k

Let's assume edge RBridges are sorted in numerically ascending order by SystemID such that RB1 < RB2 < RBk. Each Rbridge in the numerically sorted list is assigned a monotonically increasing number j such that; RB1=0, RB2=1, RBi=j and RBi+1=j+1.

Assign each tree to RBi such that tree number { (tree_number) % k}+1 is assigned to RBridge i for tree_number from 1 to n. where n is the number of trees and k is the number of RBridges considered for tree allocation.

If n < k

Distribution trees are assigned to RBridges RB1 to RBn, using the same algorithm as n >= k case. RBridges RBn+1 to RBk do not participate in active-active forwarding process on behalf of RBv.

5.2. Affinity Sub-TLV advertisement

Each RBridge in the RB1..RBk domain advertises an Affinity TLV on behalf of RBv.

As an example, let's assume that RB1 has chosen Trees t1 and tk+1 on behalf of RBv.

RB1 advertises affinity TLV; {RBv, Num of Trees=2, t1, tk+1.

Other RBridges in the RB1..RBk edge group follow the same procedure.

5.3. Affinity sub-TLV conflict resolution

If different RBridges advertise Affinity sub-TLVs that try to associate the same virtual RBridge as their child in the same tree or trees, those Affinity sub-TLVs are in conflict for those trees.

The nicknames of the conflicting RBridges are compared to identify which RBridge holds the nickname that is the highest priority to be a tree root, with the System ID as the tie breaker

The RBridge with the highest priority to be a tree root will retain the Affinity association. Other RBridges with lower priority to be a tree root MUST stop advertising their conflicting Affinity sub-TLV, re-calculate the multicast tree affinity allocation, and, if appropriate, advertise a new non-conflict Affinity sub-TLV.

Similarly, remote RBridges MUST honor the Affinity sub-TLV from the RBridge with the highest priority to be a tree root and ignore the conflicting Affinity sub-TLV entries advertised by the RBridges with lower priorities to be tree roots.

5.4. Ingress Multi-Destination Forwarding

If there is at least one tree on which RBv has affinity via RBk, then RBk performs the following operations, for multi-destination frames received from a CE node:

1. Flood to locally attached CE nodes subjected to VLAN and multicast pruning.
2. Encapsulate in TRILL header and assign ingress RBridge nickname as RBv. (nickname of the virtual RBridge).
3. Forward to one of the distribution trees, tree x in which RBv is associated with RBk

5.4.1. Forwarding when n < k

If there is no tree on which RBv can claim affinity via RBk (Probably because the number of trees n built is less than number of RBridges k announcing the affinity sub-TLV), then RBk MUST fall back to one of the following

1. This RBridge should stop forwarding frames from the CE nodes, and should mark its link as passive. This will prevent CE nodes

   from forwarding data on to this RBridge, and only use those RBridges which have been assigned a tree -OR-
2. This RBridge tunnels multi-destination frames received from attached native devices to an RBridge RBy that has an assigned

tree. The tunnel destination should forward it to the TRILL network, and also to its local access links . (The mechanism of tunneling and handshake between the tunnel source and destination are out of scope of this specification and may be addressed in future documents).

Above fallback options may be very specific to active-active forwarding scenario. However, as stated above, Affinity sub-TLV may be used in other applications. In such event the application SHOULD specify applicable fallback options.

5.5. Egress Multi-Destination Forwarding

5.5.1. Traffic Arriving on an assigned Tree to RBk-RBv

Multi-destination frames arriving at RBk on a Tree x, where RBk has announced the affinity of RBv via x, MUST be forwarded to CE members of RBv. Forwarding to other end-nodes and RBridges that are not part of the network represented by the RBv virtual RBridge MUST follow the forwarding rules specified in [RFC6325].

5.5.2. Traffic Arriving on other Trees

Multi-destination frames arriving at RBk on a Tree y, where RBk has not announced the affinity of RBv via y, MUST NOT be forwarded to CE members of RBv. Forwarding to other end-nodes and RBridges that are not part of the network represented by the RBv virtual RBridge MUST follow the forwarding rules specified in RFC6325.

5.6. Failure scenarios

5.6.1. Edge RBridge RBk failure

The below failure recovery algorithm is presented only as a guideline. Implementations MAY include other failure recover algorithms. Details of such algorithms are outside the scope of this document.

Each of the member RBridges of given virtual RBridge edge group is aware of its member RBridges through configuration or some other method.

Member RBridges detect nodal failure of a member RBridge through IS-IS LSP advertisements or lack thereof.

Upon detecting a member failure, each of the member RBridges of the RBv edge group start recovery timer T_rec for failed RBrdige RBi. If the previously failed RBridge RBi has not recovered after the expiry of timer T_rec, members RBridges perform distribution tree assignment algorithm specified in section 5.1. Each of the member RBridges re-advertises the Affinity sub-TLV with new tree assignment. This action causes the campus to update the tree calculation with the new assignment.

RBi upon start-up, starts advertising its presence through IS-IS LSPs and starts a timer T_i. Member RBridges detecting the presence of RB start a timer T_j. Timer T_j SHOULD be at least < T_i/2. (Please see note below)

Upon expiry of timer T_j, member RBridges recalculate the multi-destination tree assignment and advertised the related trees using Affinity sub-TLV.

Upon expiry of timer T_i, RBi recalculate the multi-destination tree assignment and advertises the related trees using Affinity TLV.

Note: Timers T_i and T_j are designed so as to minimize traffic down time and avoid multi-destination packet duplication.

5.7. Backward compatibility

Implementations MUST support backward compatibility mode to interoperate with pre Affinity sub-TLV RBRidges in the network. Such backward compatibility operation MAY include, however is not limited to, tunneling and/or active-standby modes of operations.

Example:

Step 1. Stop using virtual RBridge nickname for traffic ingressing from CE nodes

Step 2. Stop performing active-active forwarding. And fall back to active standby forwarding, based on locally defined policies. Definition such policies are outside the scope of this document and may be addressed in future documents.

6. Security Considerations

Security considerations are similar to RFC 6325,RFC 6326 and RFC 6327. Additional security considerations are being discussed.

7. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate a capability bit for ''Affinity Supported'' in the TRILL-VER sub-TLV. ''Affinity Supported'' capability bit and Affinity sub-TLV are specified and allocated in [6326bis].

8. References

8.1. Normative References

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

[RFC6325] Perlman, R., et.al. ''RBridge: Base Protocol Specification'', RFC 6325, July 2011.

[RFC6327] Eastlake, D. et.al., ''RBridge: Adjacency'', RFC 6327, July 2011.

[RFC6439] Eastlake, D. et.al., ''RBridge: Appointed Forwarder'', RFC 6439, November 2011.

[6326bis] Eastlake, D. et.al., ''Transparent Interconnection of Lots of Links (TRILL) Use of IS-IS'', draft-eastlake-isis-rfc6326bis-07.txt, Work in Progress, December 2011.

8.2. Informative References

[RFC6165] Banerjee, A. and Ward, D. ''Extensions to IS-IS for Layer-2 Systems'', RFC 6165, April 2011.

[RFC4971] Vasseur, JP. et.al ''Intermediate System to Intermediate System (IS-IS) Extensions for Advertising Router Information'', RFC 4971, July 2007.

[TRILLPN] Zhai,H., et.al ''RBridge: Pseudonode Nickname'', draft-hu-trill-pseudonode-nickname-01, Work in progress, November 2011.

9. Acknowledgments

Authors wish to extend their appreciations towards individuals who volunteered to review and comment on the work presented in this document and provided constructive and critical feedback. Specific acknowledgements are due for Anoop Ghanwani, Ronak Desai, and Varun Shah.

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

10. Authors' Addresses

Tissa Senevirathne
Cisco Systems
375 East Tasman Drive,
San Jose, CA 95134

Phone: +1-408-853-2291
Email: tsenevir@cisco.com

Janardhanan Pathangi
Dell/Force10 Networks
Olympia Technology Park,
Guindy Chennai 600 032

Phone: +91 44 4220 8400
Email: Pathangi_Janardhanan@Dell.com

Jon Hudson
Brocade
130 Holger Way
San Jose, CA 95134 USA

Email: jon.hudson@gmail.com