

Network Working Group
Internet Draft
Expiration Date: October 2002

Luca Martini
Nasser El-Aawar
Level 3 Communications, LLC.

Giles Heron
PacketExchange Ltd.

Steve Vogelsang
Laurel Networks, Inc.

Chris Liljenstolpe
Cable & Wireless

Dimitri Stratton Vlachos
Mazu Networks, Inc.

Daniel Tappan
Eric C. Rosen
Cisco Systems, Inc.

Kireeti Kompella
Juniper Networks

Vinai Sirkay
Vivace Networks, Inc.

April 2002

Encapsulation Methods for Transport of Frame-Relay Over IP and MPLS Networks

[draft-martini-frame-encap-mpls-00.txt](#)

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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/lid-abstracts.txt>.

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

Internet Draft [draft-martini-frame-encap-mpls-00.txt](#)

April 2002

Abstract

This document describes methods for encapsulating the Protocol Data Units (PDUs) of Frame Relay for transport across an MPLS or IP network.

Table of Contents

1	Specification of Requirements	2
2	Introduction	2
3	General encapsulation method	3
3.1	The Control Word	4
3.1.1	Setting the sequence number	5
3.1.2	Processing the sequence number	5
3.2	MTU Requirements	6
4	Frame Relay	6
5	Using an MPLS Label as the Demultiplexer Field	8
5.1	MPLS Shim EXP Bit Values	8
5.2	MPLS Shim S Bit Value	8
5.3	MPLS Shim TTL Values	8
6	Security Considerations	8
7	Intellectual Property Disclaimer	9
8	References	9
9	Author Information	9

[1](#). Specification of Requirements

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](#)

[2](#). Introduction

In an MPLS or IP network, it is possible to use control protocols such as those specified in [[1](#)] to set up "emulated virtual circuits" that carry the the Protocol Data Units of layer 2 protocols across the network. A number of these emulated virtual circuits may be

carried in a single tunnel. This requires of course that the layer 2 PDUs be encapsulated. We can distinguish three layers of this encapsulation:

- the "tunnel header", which contains the information needed to transport the PDU across the IP or MPLS network; this header belongs to the tunneling protocol, e.g., MPLS, GRE, L2TP.
- the "demultiplexer field", which is used to distinguish individual emulated virtual circuits within a single tunnel; this field must be understood by the tunneling protocol as well; it may be, e.g., an MPLS label or a GRE key field.
- the "emulated VC encapsulation", which contains the information about the enclosed layer 2 PDU which is necessary in order to properly emulate the corresponding layer 2 protocol.

This document specifies the emulated VC encapsulation for the frame-relay protocol. Although different layer 2 protocols require different information to be carried in this encapsulation, an attempt has been made to make the encapsulation as common as possible for all layer 2 protocols. Other layer 2 protocols are described in separate documents. [3] [4] [5]

This document also specifies the way in which the demultiplexer field is added to the emulated VC encapsulation when an MPLS label is used as the demultiplexer field.

QoS related issues are not discussed in this draft

For the purpose of this document R1 will be defined as the ingress router, and R2 as the egress router. A layer 2 PDU will be received at R1, encapsulated at R1, transported, decapsulated at R2, and transmitted out of R2.

[3.](#) General encapsulation method

In most cases, it is not necessary to transport the layer 2 encapsulation across the network; rather, the layer 2 header can be

stripped at R1, and reproduced at R2. This is done using information carried in the control word (see below), as well as information that may already have been signaled from R1 to R2.

Martini, et al.

[Page 3]

Internet Draft [draft-martini-frame-encap-mpls-00.txt](#)

April 2002

3.1. The Control Word

There are three requirements that may need to be satisfied when transporting layer 2 protocols over an IP or MPLS backbone:

- i. Sequentiality may need to be preserved.
- ii. Small packets may need to be padded in order to be transmitted on a medium where the minimum transport unit is larger than the actual packet size.
- iii. Control bits carried in the header of the layer 2 frame may need to be transported.

The control word defined here addresses all three of these requirements. For some protocols this word is REQUIRED, and for others OPTIONAL. For protocols where the control word is OPTIONAL implementations MUST support sending no control word, and MAY support sending a control word.

In all cases the egress router must be aware of whether the ingress router will send a control word over a specific virtual circuit. This may be achieved by configuration of the routers, or by signaling, for example as defined in [1].

The control word is defined as follows:

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																		
Rsvd										Flags										0 0										Length										Sequence Number									

processing, then the sequence number field in the control word MUST be set to 0.

3.1.2. Processing the sequence number

If a router R2 supports receive sequence number processing, then the following procedures should be used:

When an emulated VC is initially set up, the "expected sequence number" associated with it MUST be initialized to 1.

When a packet is received on that emulated VC, the sequence number should be processed as follows:

- if the sequence number on the packet is 0, then the packet passes the sequence number check
- otherwise if the packet sequence number \geq the expected sequence number and the packet sequence number - the expected sequence number < 32768 , then the packet is in order.
- otherwise if the packet sequence number $<$ the expected sequence number and the expected sequence number - the packet sequence number ≥ 32768 , then the packet is in order.

- otherwise the packet is out of order.

If a packet passes the sequence number check, or is in order then, it can be delivered immediately. If the packet is in order, then the expected sequence number should be set using the algorithm:

```
expected_sequence_number := packet_sequence_number + 1 mod 2**16
if (expected_sequence_number = 0) then expected_sequence_number := 1;
```

Packets which are received out of order MAY be dropped or reordered at the discretion of the receiver.

If a router R2 does not support receive sequence number processing, then the sequence number field MAY be ignored.

3.2. MTU Requirements

The network MUST be configured with an MTU that is sufficient to transport the largest encapsulation frames. If MPLS is used as the tunneling protocol, for example, this is likely to be 12 or more bytes greater than the largest frame size. Other tunneling protocols may have longer headers and require larger MTUs. If the ingress router determines that an encapsulated layer 2 PDU exceeds the MTU of the tunnel through which it must be sent, the PDU MUST be dropped. If an egress router receives an encapsulated layer 2 PDU whose payload length (i.e., the length of the PDU itself without any of the encapsulation headers), exceeds the MTU of the destination layer 2 interface, the PDU MUST be dropped.

4. Frame Relay

A Frame Relay PDU is transported without the Frame Relay header or the FCS. The control word is REQUIRED; however, its use is optional, although desirable. Use of the control word means that the ingress and egress LSRs follow the procedures below. If an ingress LSR chooses not to use the control word, it MUST set the flags in the control word to 0; if an egress LSR chooses to ignore the control word, it MUST set the Frame Relay control bits to 0.

The BECN, FECN, DE and C/R bits are carried across the network in the control word. The edge routers that implement this document MAY, when either adding or removing the encapsulation described herein, change the BECN and/or FECN bits from zero to one in order to reflect congestion in the network that is known to the edge routers, and the D/E bit from zero to one to reflect marking from edge policing of the Frame Relay Committed Information Rate. The BECN, FECN, and D/E bits

SHOULD NOT be changed from one to zero.

The following is an example of a Frame Relay packet:

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	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
+ - + - + - + - + -										+ - + - + - + - + -										+ - + - + - + - + -										+ - + - + - + - + -									
Rsvd										B F D C										Length										Sequence Number									

```

+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     Frame Relay PDU                               |
|                                     "                                           |
|                                     "                                           |
|                                     "                                           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

* B (BECN) Bit

The ingress router, R1, SHOULD copy the BECN field from the incoming Frame Relay header into this field. The egress router, R2, MUST generate a new BECN field based on the value of the B bit.

* F (FECN) Bit

The ingress router, R1, SHOULD copy the FECN field from the incoming Frame Relay header into this field. The egress router, R2, MUST generate a new FECN field based on the value of the F bit.

* D (DE) Bit

The ingress router, R1, SHOULD copy the DE field from the incoming Frame Relay header into this field. The egress router, R2, MUST generate a new DE field based on the value of the D bit.

If the tunneling protocol provides a field which can be set to specify a Quality of Service, the ingress router, R1, MAY consider the DE bit of the Frame Relay header when determining the value of that field. The egress router MAY then consider the value of this field when queuing the layer 2 PDU for egress. Note however that frames from the same VC MUST NOT be reordered.

* C (C/R) Bit

The ingress router, R1, SHOULD copy the C/R bit from the received Frame Relay PDU to the C bit of the control word. The egress router, R2, MUST copy the C bit into the output frame.

To use an MPLS label as the demultiplexer field, a 32-bit label stack entry [2] is simply prepended to the emulated VC encapsulation, and hence will appear as the bottom label of an MPLS label stack. This label may be called the "VC label". The particular emulated VC identified by a particular label value must be agreed by the ingress and egress LSRs, either by signaling (e.g, via the methods of [1]) or by configuration. Other fields of the label stack entry are set as follows.

[5.1.](#) MPLS Shim EXP Bit Values

If it is desired to carry Quality of Service information, the Quality of Service information SHOULD be represented in the EXP field of the VC label. If more than one MPLS label is imposed by the ingress LSR, the EXP field of any labels higher in the stack SHOULD also carry the same value.

[5.2.](#) MPLS Shim S Bit Value

The ingress LSR, R1, MUST set the S bit of the VC label to a value of 1 to denote that the VC label is at the bottom of the stack.

[5.3.](#) MPLS Shim TTL Values

The ingress LSR, R1, SHOULD set the TTL field of the VC label to a value of 2.

[6.](#) Security Considerations

This document specifies only encapsulations, and not the protocols used to carry the encapsulated packets across the network. Each such protocol may have its own set of security issues, but those issues are not affected by the encapsulations specified herein.

[7.](#) Intellectual Property Disclaimer

This document is being submitted for use in IETF standards discussions.

[8.](#) References

- [1] "Transport of Layer 2 Frames Over MPLS", [draft-martini-l2circuit-trans-mpls-09.txt](#). (work in progress)
- [2] "MPLS Label Stack Encoding", E. Rosen, Y. Rekhter, D. Tappan, G. Fedorkow, D. Farinacci, T. Li, A. Conta. [RFC3032](#)
- [3] "Encapsulation Methods for Transport of ATM Cells/Frame Over IP and MPLS Networks", [draft-martini-atm-encap-mpls-00.txt](#). (work in progress)
- [4] "Encapsulation Methods for Transport of Ethernet Frames Over IP and MPLS Networks", [draft-martini-ethernet-encap-mpls-00.txt](#). (work in progress)
- [5] "Encapsulation Methods for Transport of PPP/HDLC Frames Over IP and MPLS Networks", [draft-martini-ppp-hdlc-encap-mpls-00.txt](#). (work in progress)

[9.](#) Author Information

Luca Martini
Level 3 Communications, LLC.
1025 Eldorado Blvd.
Broomfield, CO, 80021
e-mail: luca@level3.net

Nasser El-Aawar
Level 3 Communications, LLC.
1025 Eldorado Blvd.
Broomfield, CO, 80021
e-mail: nna@level3.net

Internet Draft [draft-martini-frame-encap-mpls-00.txt](#)

April 2002

Giles Heron
PacketExchange Ltd.
The Truman Brewery
91 Brick Lane
LONDON E1 6QL
United Kingdom
e-mail: giles@packetexchange.net

Dimitri Stratton Vlachos
Mazu Networks, Inc.
125 Cambridgepark Drive
Cambridge, MA 02140
e-mail: d@mazunetworks.com

Dan Tappan
Cisco Systems, Inc.
250 Apollo Drive
Chelmsford, MA, 01824
e-mail: tappan@cisco.com

Eric Rosen
Cisco Systems, Inc.
250 Apollo Drive
Chelmsford, MA, 01824
e-mail: erosen@cisco.com

Steve Vogelsang
Laurel Networks, Inc.
Omega Corporate Center
1300 Omega Drive
Pittsburgh, PA 15205
e-mail: sjv@laurelnetworks.com

Vinai Sirkay
Vivace Networks, Inc.
2730 Orchard Parkway
San Jose, CA 95134
e-mail: sirkay@technologist.com

Martini, et al.

[Page 10]

Internet Draft [draft-martini-frame-encap-mpls-00.txt](#)

April 2002

Chris Liljenstolpe
Cable & Wireless
11700 Plaza America Drive
Reston, VA 20190
e-mail: chris@cw.net

Kireeti Kompella
Juniper Networks
1194 N. Mathilda Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94089
e-mail: kireeti@juniper.net

