

Network Working Group
Internet Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 1, 2022

C. Lin
M. Chen
New H3C Technologies
W. Cheng
L. Gong
China Mobile
March 1, 2022

**Advertisement of Dedicated Metric for Flexible Algorithm in IGP
draft-lin-lsr-flex-algo-metric-00**

Abstract

This document proposes a method to advertise dedicated metric for Flex-Algorithm in IGP.

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), 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/1id-abstracts.txt>

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 1, 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 (<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
1.1.	Requirements Language	2
2.	Problem Statement	3
3.	Dedicated Metric for Flexible Algorithm	4
4.	Security Considerations	5
5.	IANA Considerations	6
6.	References	6
6.1.	Normative References	6
6.2.	Informative References	6
	Authors' Addresses	7

[1.](#) Introduction

Flexible Algorithm (Flex-Algorithm) allows IGP to compute constraint-based paths. [[I-D.ietf-lsr-flex-algo](#)] specifies the usage of Flex-Algorithm in Segment Routing (SR) data planes - SR MPLS and SRv6. [[I-D.ietf-lsr-ip-flexalgo](#)] extends the Flex-Algorithm for native IPv4 and IPv6 data planes.

However, links shared among multiple algorithms cannot be configured by different metrics, which may limit the flexibility of Flex-Algorithm.

This document proposes a method to advertise dedicated metric for Flex-Algorithm in IGP.

[1.1.](#) Requirements Language

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 [BCP 14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

2. Problem Statement

Flex-Algorithm allows IGP to compute the best paths over a network based on user-defined constraints and metrics.

We use Figure 1 to illustrate the problem. In this scenario, all the IGP link metrics are 1.

Flex-Algorithm 128 are enabled on Node A, B, C and D. The topology used by Flex-Algorithm 128 is shown in Figure 2.

Another Flex-Algorithm 129 is also enabled on Node A, B, C and D. The metric-type of Flex-Algorithm 129 is the same with Flex-Algorithm 128. So the topology used by Flex-Algorithm 129 is the same as Figure 2.




Figure 1




Figure 2

Assume that the traffics are from A to D. Since the metrics of A->B->D and A->C->D are equal, the traffics are forwarded along both of the two paths by ECMP load sharing.

The network operator expects to use link A->B->D as the primary path and link A->C->D as the backup path in Flex-Algorithm 128. Meanwhile, in Flex-Algorithm 129, the link A->C->D is expected to be the primary path and the link A->B->D is expected to be the backup path. So the traffics steered into Flex-Algorithm 128 and the traffics steered into Flex-Algorithm 129 can be carried by different paths separately. If a failure occurs on one path, the other path can still be used as protection.

However, it cannot be satisfied because Flex-Algorithm 128 and 129 use the same metrics in path computation.

If the metric-type of an algorithm is IGP Metric, the metrics advertised for links are used in path computation. For example, the default metric field of TLV-22 in IS-IS (The extended IS reachability TLV [RFC5305]). So Flex-Algorithm 128 and Flex-Algorithm 129 share the same link metrics with the default algorithm of normal SPF calculation.

If the metric-type of an algorithm is a kind of link attribute, such as Min Unidirectional Link Delay or Traffic Engineering Default Metric, the link attributes advertised in Application-Specific Link Attribute (ASLA) [RFC8919] [RFC8920] are used in path computation. So Flex-Algorithm 128 and Flex-Algorithm 129 also share the link attributes.

3. Dedicated Metric for Flexible Algorithm

This document defines a new optional metric sub-TLV called the Flex-Algorithm-associated Generic Metric sub-TLV to advertise dedicated metric for Flex-Algorithm.

The format of Flex-Algorithm-associated Generic Metric sub-TLV in IS-IS is as the following:

0										1										2										3									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1								
Type										Length										Metric-Type										Algorithm									
Reserved										Metric																													

o Type: TBD.

o Length: 6.

o Metric-Type: A value from the IGP metric-type registry.

o Algorithm: Associated algorithm from 1 to 255.

o Metric: Metric value from 1 to 16,777,215.

The format of Flex-Algorithm-associated Generic Metric sub-TLV in OSPF is as the following:

TBD

5. IANA Considerations

Flex-Algorithm-associated Generic Metric sub-TLV (TBD)

6. References

6.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), May 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-lsr-flex-algo] Psenak, P., Hegde, S., Filsfils, C., Talaulikar, K., and A. Gulko, "IGP Flexible Algorithm", [draft-ietf-lsr-flex-algo-18](#) (work in progress), October 2021.
- [RFC8919] Ginsberg, L., Psenak, P., Previdi, S., Henderickx, W., and J. Drake, "IS-IS Application-Specific Link Attributes", [RFC 8919](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8919, October 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8919>>.
- [RFC8920] Psenak, P., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Henderickx, W., Tantsura, J., and J. Drake, "OSPF Application-Specific Link Attributes", [RFC 8920](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8920, October 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8920>>.

6.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-lsr-ip-flexalgo] Britto, W., Hegde, S., Kaneriy, P., Shetty, R., Bonica, R., and P. Psenak, "IGP Flexible Algorithms (Flex- Algorithm) In IP Networks", [draft-ietf-lsr-ip-flexalgo-04](#) (work in progress), December 2021.
- [RFC5305] Li, T. and H. Smit, "IS-IS Extensions for Traffic Engineering", [RFC 5305](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5305, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5305>>.
- [RFC8362] Lindem, A., Roy, A., Goethals, D., Reddy Vallem, V., and F. Baker, "OSPFv3 Link State Advertisement (LSA) Extensibility", [RFC 8362](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8362, April 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8362>>.

Authors' Addresses

Changwang Lin
New H3C Technologies

Email: linchangwang.04414@h3c.com

Mengxiao Chen
New H3C Technologies

Email: chen.mengxiao@h3c.com

Liyan Gong
China Mobile

Email: gongliyan@chinamobile.com

Weiqiang Cheng
China Mobile

Email: chengweiqiang@chinamobile.com