

MPLS Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 29 October 2022

K. Kompella, Ed.
Juniper Networks
S. Bryant
University of Surrey 5GIC
M. Bocci
Nokia
G. Mirsky
Ericsson
L. Andersson
Bronze Dragon Consulting
27 April 2022

IANA Registry for the First Nibble Following a Label Stack
draft-kbbma-mpls-1stnibble-01

Abstract

The goal of this memo is to create a new IANA registry (called the MPLS First Nibble registry) for the first nibble (4-bit field) immediately following an MPLS label stack. The memo offers a rationale for such a registry, describes how the registry should be managed, and provides some initial entries. Furthermore, this memo sets out some documentation requirements for registering new values. Finally, it provides some recommendations that makes processing MPLS packets easier and more robust.

There is an important caveat on the use of this registry versus the IP version number registry.

This memo, if published, would update [[RFC4928](#)] and [[RFC8469](#)].

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 <https://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 29 October 2022.

Internet-Draft

1st nibble

April 2022

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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 (<https://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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the [Trust Legal Provisions](#) and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
1.1.	Conventions and Definitions	3
2.	Rationale	6
2.1.	Why Look at the First Nibble	6
2.1.1.	Load Balancing	6
2.1.2.	Requirement	8
2.1.3.	Recommendation	8
2.1.4.	Parsing the Post-stack Header	9
2.2.	Why Create a Registry	9
2.3.	Caveat	9
3.	IANA Considerations	10
3.1.	MPLS First Nibble Registry	10
3.1.1.	Allocation Policy	10
4.	References	11
4.1.	Normative References	11
4.2.	Informative References	12
	Authors' Addresses	12

[1.](#) Introduction

An MPLS packet consists of a label stack, an optional "post-stack header" and an optional embedded packet (in that order). However, in the data plane, there are scant clues regarding the post-stack header, and no clue as to the type of embedded packet; this information is communicated via other means, such as the routing protocols that signal the labels in the stack. Nonetheless, in order to better handle an MPLS packet in the data plane, it is common

practice for network equipment to "guess" the type of embedded packet. Such equipment may also need to process the post-stack header. Both of these require parsing the data after the label stack. To do this, the "first nibble" (the top four bits of the first octet following the label stack) is often used.

Internet-Draft

1st nibble

April 2022

The semantics and usage of the first nibble is not well documented, nor are the assignments of values. This memo serves three purposes:

- * To document the assignments already made
- * To provide for the clear documentation of future assignments through the creation of an "MPLS First Nibble registry"
- * Provide a method to tracking usage by requiring more consistent documentation

1.1. Conventions and Definitions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

LSR: label switching router.

MPLS packet: one whose Layer 2 header declares the type to be MPLS. For Ethernet, that means the Ethertype is 0x8847 or 0x8848.

Label Stack: (of an MPLS packet) all labels (four octet fields) after the Layer 2 header, up to and including the label with the BoS bit set ([\[RFC3032\]](#)).

MPLS First Nibble (MFN): the most significant four bits of the first octet following the label stack.

MPLS Payload: all data after the label stack, including the MFN, an optional post-stack header and the embedded packet.

Post-stack Header (PSH): optional field of interest to the egress LSR (and possibly to transit LSRs). Examples include a control

word or an associated channel. The PSH MUST indicate its length, so that a parser knows where the embedded packet starts.

Embedded Packet: All octets beyond the PSH (if any). This could be an IPv4 or IPv6 packet (e.g., for traffic engineering of IP packets, or for a Layer 3 VPN [[RFC4364](#)]), an Ethernet packet (for VPLS ([[RFC4761](#)], [[RFC4762](#)]) or EVPN [[RFC7432](#)]), or some other type of Layer 2 frame [[RFC4446](#)].




Figure 1: Example of an MPLS Packet With Label Stack

April 2022

```

B | (MFN) | non-IP packet |
  | data |
  |
  | ... |
  | end of non-IP packet |
  |

```


Start frame delimiter), starting with the destination MAC address.

Many other packet types are possible, and in principle, any Layer 2 embedded packet is permissible; indeed, in the past, PPP, Frame Relay and ATM packets were reasonably common.

In addition, there may be a post-stack header ahead of the embedded packet, and this needs to be parsed. The MPLS First Nibble is currently used for both of these purposes.

2.1.1. Load Balancing

There are four common ways to load balance an MPLS packet:

1. One can use the top label alone.
2. One can do better by using all the (non-SPL) labels in the stack.
3. One can do even better by "divining" the type of embedded packet, and using fields from the guessed header.
4. One can do best by using either an Entropy Label [[RFC6790](#)] or a FAT Pseudowire Label [[RFC6391](#)]; see [Section 2.1.3.](#))

Load balancing based on just the top label means that all packets with that top label will go the same way -- this is far from ideal. Load balancing based on the entire label stack (not including SPLs) is better, but may still be uneven. If, however, the embedded packet is an IP packet, then the combination of (<source IP address>, <dest IP address>, <transport protocol>, <source port>, and <dest port>) from the IP header of the embedded packet forms an excellent basis for load balancing. This is what is typically used for load

balancing IP packets.

An MPLS packet doesn't, however, carry a payload type identifier. There is a simple heuristic that is commonly used to guess the type of the embedded packet. The first nibble, i.e., the four most significant bits of the first octet, of an IP header contains the IP version number. This in turn indicates where to find the relevant fields for load balancing. The heuristic goes roughly as follows:

2.1.1.1. Heuristic for Load Balancing

1. If the MFN is 0x4 (0100b), treat the payload as an IPv4 packet, and find the relevant fields for load balancing on that basis.
2. If the MFN is 0x6 (0101b), treat the payload as an IPv6 packet, and find the relevant fields for load balancing on that basis.
3. If the MFN is anything else, the MPLS payload is not an IP packet; fall back to load balancing using the label stack.

This heuristic has been implemented in many (legacy) routers, and performs well in the case of Figure 1, A. However, this heuristic can work very badly for Figure 1, B. For example, if payload B is an Ethernet frame, then the MFN is the first nibble of the OUI of the destination MAC address, which can be 0x4 or 0x6, and if so would lead to very bad load balancing. This behavior can happen to other types of non-IP payload as well.

This in turn led to the idea of inserting a PSH (e.g., a pseudowire control word [[RFC4385](#)], a DetNet control word [[RFC8964](#)] or a BIER header [[RFC8296](#)]) where the MPLS First Nibble is NOT 0x4 or 0x6, to explicitly prevent forwarding engines from confusing the MPLS payload with an IP packet. [[RFC8469](#)] recommends the use of a control word when the embedded packet is an Ethernet frame. [RFC 8469](#) was published at the request of the operator community and the IEEE RAC as a result of operational difficulties with pseudowires that did not contain the control word.

building on the above; the second deprecating the use of the heuristic in [Section 2.1.1.1](#). The intent of both of these is that legacy routers continue to operate as they have, with no new problems introduced as a result of this memo. However, new implementations SHOULD follow these recommendations for more robust operation.

[2.1.2](#). Requirement

Going forward, network equipment MUST use a post-stack header with an MPLS First Nibble value that is not 0x4 or 0x6 in all cases when the MPLS payload is not an IP packet. Effectively, Figure 1, B is disallowed. [AGREED??]

This replaces the following text from [\[RFC4928\], section 3](#), paragraph 3:

"It is REQUIRED, however, that applications depend upon in-order packet delivery restrict the first nibble values to 0x0 and 0x1. This will ensure that their traffic flows will not be affected if some future routing equipment does similar snooping on some future version(s) of IP."

This also replaces the following text from [\[RFC8469\], section 4](#), paragraph 1:

"This document updates [\[RFC4448\]](#) to state that both the ingress provider edge (PE) and the egress PE SHOULD support the Ethernet PW CW and that, if supported, the CW MUST be used."

[2.1.3](#). Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that, going forward, if good load balancing of MPLS packets is desired, either an Entropy Label or a FAT Pseudowire Label SHOULD be used; furthermore, going forward, the heuristic in [Section 2.1.1.1](#) MUST NOT be used. [AGREED??]

A consequence of Recommendation 2 is that, while legacy routers may look for a MPLS First Nibble of 0x4 or 0x6, no router will look for a MPLS First Nibble of 0x7 (or whatever the next IP version number will be) for load balancing purposes. This means that the values 0x4 and 0x6 are used to (sometimes incorrectly) identify IPv4 and IPv6 packets, but no other First Nibble values will be used to identify IP packets.

This obviates the need for paragraph 4, [section 3 in \[RFC4928\]](#):

"This behavior implies that if in the future an IP version is defined with a version number of 0x0 or 0x1, then equipment complying with this BCP would be unable to look past one or more MPLS headers, and loadsplit traffic from a single LSP across multiple paths based on a hash of specific fields in the IPv0 or IPv1 headers. That is, IP traffic employing these version numbers would be safe from disturbances caused by inappropriate loadsplitting, but would also not be able to get the performance benefits."

This also expands the MFN Registry to all 16 possible values, not just 0x0 and 0x1.

[2.1.4.](#) Parsing the Post-stack Header

Given the above recommendations on the use of a post-stack header and future non-use of the heuristic ([Section 2.1.1.1](#)) via the use of Entropy or FAT Pseudowire Labels, the main reason for creating a First Nibble registry is to document the types of post-stack headers that may follow a label stack, and to simplify their parsing.

[2.2.](#) Why Create a Registry

The MPLS WG is currently engaged in updating the MPLS architecture; part of this work involves the use of post-stack headers. This is not possible if post-stack header values are allocated on an ad hoc basis, and their parsing and semantics is ill-specified. Consider that the MPLS First Nibble value of 0x0 has two different formats, depending on whether the post-stack header is a pseudowire control word or a DetNet control word; disambiguation requires the context of the service label. This was a considered decision; documenting this would be helpful to future implementors.

With a registry, post-stack headers become easier to parse; the values are unique, not needing means outside the data plane to interpret them correctly; and their semantics and usage are documented. (Thank you, IANA!)

[2.3.](#) Caveat

The use of the MPLS First Nibble stemmed from the desire to heuristically identify IP packets for load balancing purposes. It was then discovered that non-IP packets, misidentified as IP when the heuristic failed, were being badly load balanced, leading to [\[RFC4928\]](#). This situation may confuse some as to relationship between the MPLS First Nibble Registry and the IP Version Numbers registry. These registries are quite different:

Internet-Draft

1st nibble

April 2022

1. The IP Version Numbers registry's explicit purpose is to track IP version numbers in an IP header.
2. The MPLS First Nibble registry's purpose is to track post-stack header types.

The only intersection points between the two registries is for values 0x4 and 0x6 (for backward compatibility). There is no need to track future IP version number allocations in the MPLS First Nibble registry.

[3.](#) IANA Considerations

[3.1.](#) MPLS First Nibble Registry

This memo recommends the creation of an IANA registry called "The MPLS First Nibble Registry" with the following values:

Value	Meaning	Reference	Allocation Policy
0x0	PW Control Word	RFC 4385	
0x0	DetNet Control Word	RFC 8964	
0x1	PW Assoc Channel	RFC 4385	
0x2	Unallocated		Standards Action
0x3	Unallocated		Standards Action
0x4	IPv4 header	RFC 791	
0x5	BIER header	RFC 8296	
0x6	IPv6 header	RFC 8200	
0x7-e	Unallocated		Standards Action

0xf	Reserved for expansion	Standards Action
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+

Table 1: MPLS First Nibble Values

3.1.1. Allocation Policy

All new values registered here MUST use the Standards Action policy [[RFC8126](#)].

Kompella, et al. Expires 29 October 2022 [Page 10]

Internet-Draft 1st nibble April 2022

4. References

4.1. 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, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3032] Rosen, E., Tappan, D., Fedorkow, G., Rekhter, Y., Farinacci, D., Li, T., and A. Conta, "MPLS Label Stack Encoding", [RFC 3032](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3032, January 2001, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3032>>.
- [RFC4385] Bryant, S., Swallow, G., Martini, L., and D. McPherson, "Pseudowire Emulation Edge-to-Edge (PWE3) Control Word for Use over an MPLS PSN", [RFC 4385](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4385, February 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4385>>.
- [RFC4928] Swallow, G., Bryant, S., and L. Andersson, "Avoiding Equal Cost Multipath Treatment in MPLS Networks", [BCP 128](#), [RFC 4928](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4928, June 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4928>>.
- [RFC6391] Bryant, S., Ed., Filsfils, C., Drafz, U., Kompella, V., Regan, J., and S. Amante, "Flow-Aware Transport of Pseudowires over an MPLS Packet Switched Network", [RFC 6391](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6391, November 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6391>>.
- [RFC6790] Kompella, K., Drake, J., Amante, S., Henderickx, W., and L. Yong, "The Use of Entropy Labels in MPLS Forwarding",

[RFC 6790](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6790, November 2012,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6790>>.

[RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

Kompella, et al.

Expires 29 October 2022

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

1st nibble

April 2022

[RFC8296] Wijnands, IJ., Ed., Rosen, E., Ed., Dolganow, A., Tantsura, J., Aldrin, S., and I. Meilik, "Encapsulation for Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER) in MPLS and Non-MPLS Networks", [RFC 8296](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8296, January 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8296>>.

[RFC8469] Bryant, S., Malis, A., and I. Bagdonas, "Recommendation to Use the Ethernet Control Word", [RFC 8469](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8469, November 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8469>>.

[RFC8964] Varga, B., Ed., Farkas, J., Berger, L., Malis, A., Bryant, S., and J. Korhonen, "Deterministic Networking (DetNet) Data Plane: MPLS", [RFC 8964](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8964, January 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8964>>.

[4.2.](#) Informative References

[RFC4364] Rosen, E. and Y. Rekhter, "BGP/MPLS IP Virtual Private Networks (VPNs)", [RFC 4364](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4364, February 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4364>>.

[RFC4446] Martini, L., "IANA Allocations for Pseudowire Edge to Edge Emulation (PWE3)", [BCP 116](#), [RFC 4446](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4446, April 2006,

<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4446>>.

- [RFC4761] Kompella, K., Ed. and Y. Rekhter, Ed., "Virtual Private LAN Service (VPLS) Using BGP for Auto-Discovery and Signaling", [RFC 4761](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4761, January 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4761>>.
- [RFC4762] Lasserre, M., Ed. and V. Kompella, Ed., "Virtual Private LAN Service (VPLS) Using Label Distribution Protocol (LDP) Signaling", [RFC 4762](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4762, January 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4762>>.
- [RFC7432] Sajassi, A., Ed., Aggarwal, R., Bitar, N., Isaac, A., Uttaro, J., Drake, J., and W. Henderickx, "BGP MPLS-Based Ethernet VPN", [RFC 7432](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7432, February 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7432>>.

Authors' Addresses

Kompella, et al.

Expires 29 October 2022

[Page 12]

Internet-Draft

1st nibble

April 2022

Kireeti Kompella (editor)
Juniper Networks
1133 Innovation Way
Sunnyvale, 94089
United States of America
Phone: +1-408-745-2000
Email: kireeti.ietf@gmail.com

Stewart Bryant
University of Surrey 5GIC
Email: sb@stewartbryant.com

Matthew Bocci
Nokia
Email: matthew.bocci@nokia.com

Greg Mirsky
Ericsson
Email: gregimirsky@gmail.com

Lars Olaf (Loa) Andersson
Bronze Dragon Consulting
Email: loa@pi.nu