

MPLS Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: February 9, 2016

G. Mirsky  
J. Tantsura  
Ericsson  
I. Varlashkin  
Google  
M. Chen  
Huawei  
August 8, 2015

**Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) Directed Return Path  
draft-mirsky-mpls-bfd-directed-04**

Abstract

Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) is expected to monitor bi-directional paths. When a BFD session monitors in its forward direction an explicitly routed path there is a need to be able to direct egress BFD peer to use specific path as reverse direction of the BFD session.

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 February 9, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 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. Conventions used in this document . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [1.1.1. Terminology . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [1.1.2. Requirements Language . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [2. Problem Statement . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [3. Direct Reverse BFD Path . . . . .](#) [4](#)
- [3.1. Case of MPLS Data Plane . . . . .](#) [4](#)
- [3.1.1. BFD Reverse Path TLV . . . . .](#) [4](#)
- [3.1.2. Static and RSVP-TE sub-TLVs . . . . .](#) [5](#)
- [3.1.3. Segment Routing Tunnel sub-TLV . . . . .](#) [5](#)
- [3.2. Case of IPv6 Data Plane . . . . .](#) [6](#)
- [3.3. Bootstrapping BFD session with BFD Reverse Path over Segment Routed tunnel . . . . .](#) [6](#)
- [3.4. Return Codes . . . . .](#) [7](#)
- [4. Use Case Scenario . . . . .](#) [7](#)
- [5. IANA Considerations . . . . .](#) [7](#)
- [5.1. TLV . . . . .](#) [8](#)
- [5.2. Sub-TLV . . . . .](#) [8](#)
- [5.3. Return Codes . . . . .](#) [8](#)
- [6. Security Considerations . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [7. Acknowledgements . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [8. Normative References . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . [10](#)

**1. Introduction**

[RFC 5880](#) [[RFC5880](#)], [RFC 5881](#) [[RFC5881](#)], and [RFC 5883](#) [[RFC5883](#)] established the BFD protocol for IP networks and [RFC 5884](#) [[RFC5884](#)] set rules of using BFD asynchronous mode over IP/MPLS LSPs. All standards implicitly assume that the egress BFD peer will use the shortest path route regardless of route being used to send BFD control packets towards it. As result, if the ingress BFD peer sends its BFD control packets over explicit path that is diverging from the best route, then reverse direction of the BFD session is likely not to be on co-routed bi-directional path with the forward direction of the BFD session. And because BFD control packets are not guaranteed to cross the same links and nodes in both directions detection of Loss of Continuity (LoC) defect in forward direction may demonstrate positive negatives.



This document defines the extension to LSP Ping [[RFC4379](#)], BFD Reverse Path TLV, and proposes that it to be used to instruct the egress BFD peer to use explicit path for its BFD control packets associated with the particular BFD session. The TLV will be allocated from the TLV and sub-TLV registry defined by [RFC 4379](#) [[RFC4379](#)]. As a special case, forward and reverse directions of the BFD session can form bi-directional co-routed associated channel.

## **1.1. Conventions used in this document**

### **1.1.1. Terminology**

BFD: Bidirectional Forwarding Detection

MPLS: Multiprotocol Label Switching

LSP: Label Switching Path

LoC: Loss of Continuity

### **1.1.2. 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 [[RFC2119](#)].

## **2. Problem Statement**

BFD is best suited to monitor bi-directional co-routed paths. In most cases, given stable environments, the forward and reverse direction between two nodes is likely to be co-routed, this fulfilling the implicit BFD requirements. If BFD is used to monitor unidirectional explicitly routed paths, e.g. MPLS-TE LSPs, its control packets in forward direction would be in-band using the mechanism defined in [[RFC5884](#)] and [[RFC5586](#)]. But the reverse direction of the BFD session would still follow the shortest path route and that might lead to the following problems detecting failures on the unidirectional explicit path:

- o detection of a failure on the reverse path cannot reliably be interpreted as bi-directional defect and thus trigger, for example, protection switchover of the forward direction;
- o if a failure of the reverse path had been ignored, the ingress node would not receive indication of forward direction failure from its egress peer.



To address these challenges the egress BFD peer should be instructed to use specific path for its control packets.

**3. Direct Reverse BFD Path**

**3.1. Case of MPLS Data Plane**

LSP ping, defined in [RFC4379], uses BFD Discriminator TLV [RFC5884] to bootstrap a BFD session over an MPLS LSP. This document defines a new TLV, BFD Reverse Path TLV, that MUST contain a single sub-TLV that can be used to carry information about reverse path for the specified in BFD Discriminator TLV session.

**3.1.1. BFD Reverse Path TLV**

The BFD Reverse Path TLV is an optional TLV within the LSP ping protocol. However, if used, the BFD Discriminator TLV MUST be included in an Echo Request message as well. If the BFD Discriminator TLV is not present when the BFD Reverse Path TLV is included, then it MUST be treated as malformed Echo Request, as described in [RFC4379].

The BFD Reverse Path TLV carries the specified path that BFD control packets of the BFD session referenced in the BFD Discriminator TLV are required to follow. The format of the BFD Reverse Path TLV is as presented in Figure 1.




Figure 1: BFD Reverse Path TLV

BFD Reverse Path TLV Type is 2 octets in length and value to be assigned by IANA.

Length is 2 octets in length and defines the length in octets of the Reverse Path field.

Reverse Path field contains a sub-TLV. Any Target FEC sub-TLV, already or in the future defined, from IANA sub-registry Sub-TLVs for TLV Types 1, 16, and 21 of MPLS LSP Ping Parameters registry MAY be









The Segment Routing Tunnel sub-TLV MAY be used in Reply Path TLV defined in [RFC7110]

3.2. Case of IPv6 Data Plane

IPv6 can be data plane of choice for Segment Routed tunnels [I-D.previdi-6man-segment-routing-header]. In such networks the BFD Reverse Path TLV described in Section 3.1.1 can be used as well. To specify reverse path of a BFD session in IPv6 environment the BFD Discriminator TLV MUST be used along with the BFD Reverse Path TLV. The BFD Reverse Path TLV in IPv6 network MUST include sub-TLV.




Figure 3: Segment Routing IPv6 Tunnel sub-TLV

3.3. Bootstrapping BFD session with BFD Reverse Path over Segment Routed tunnel

As discussed in [I-D.kumarkini-mpls-spring-lsp-ping] introduction of Segment Routing network domains with MPLS data plane adds three new sub-TLVs that may be used with Target FEC TLV. Section 6.1 addresses use of new sub-TLVs in Target FEC TLV in LSP ping and LSP traceroute. For the case of LSP ping the [I-D.kumarkini-mpls-spring-lsp-ping] states that:

"Initiator MUST include FEC(s) corresponding to the destination segment.

Initiator, i.e. ingress LSR, MAY include FECs corresponding to some or all of segments imposed in the label stack by the ingress LSR to communicate the segments traversed. "



When LSP ping is used to bootstrap BFD session this document updates this and defines that LSP Ping MUST include the FEC corresponding to the destination segment and SHOULD NOT include FECs corresponding to some or all of segment imposed by the ingress LSR. Operationally such restriction would not cause any problem or uncertainty as LSP ping with FECs corresponding to some or all segments or traceroute MAY precede the LSP ping that bootstraps the BFD session.

**3.4. Return Codes**

This document defines the following Return Codes:

- o "Failed to establish the BFD session. The specified reverse path was not found", (TBD4). When a specified reverse path is not available at the egress LSR, an Echo Reply with the return code set to "Failed to establish the BFD session. The specified reverse path was not found" MUST be sent back to the ingress LSR . ([Section 3.1.1](#))

**4. Use Case Scenario**

In network presented in Figure 4 node A monitors two tunnels to node H: A-B-C-D-G-H and A-B-E-F-G-H. To bootstrap BFD session to monitor the first tunnel, node A MUST include BFD Discriminator TLV with Discriminator value foobar-1 and MAY include BFD Reverse Path TLV that references H-G-D-C-B-A tunnel. To bootstrap BFD session to monitor the second tunnel, node A MUST include BFD Discriminator TLV with Discriminator value foobar-2 [[I-D.ietf-bfd-rfc5884-clarifications](#)] and MAY include BFD Reverse Path TLV that references H-G-F-E-B-A tunnel.




Figure 4: Use Case for BFD Reverse Path TLV

If an operator needs node H to monitor path to node A, e.g. H-G-D-C-B-A tunnel, then by looking up list of known Reverse Paths it MAY find and use existing BFD sessions.

**5. IANA Considerations**



5.1. TLV

The IANA is requested to assign a new value for BFD Reverse Path TLV from the "Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture (MPLS) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) Ping Parameters - TLVs" registry, "TLVs and sub-TLVs" sub-registry.

```

+-----+-----+-----+
| Value   | Description           | Reference   |
+-----+-----+-----+
| X (TBD1)| BFD Reverse Path TLV | This document |
+-----+-----+-----+

```

Table 1: New BFD Reverse Type TLV

5.2. Sub-TLV

The IANA is requested to assign two new sub-TLV types from "Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture (MPLS) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) Ping Parameters - TLVs" registry, "Sub-TLVs for TLV Types 1, 16, and 21" sub-registry.

```

+-----+-----+-----+
| Value   | Description           | Reference   |
+-----+-----+-----+
| X (TBD2)| Segment Routing MPLS Tunnel sub-TLV | This document |
| X (TBD3)| Segment Routing IPv6 Tunnel sub-TLV | This document |
+-----+-----+-----+

```

Table 2: New Segment Routing Tunnel sub-TLV

5.3. Return Codes

The IANA is requested to assign a new Return Code value from the "Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) Ping Parameters" registry, "Return Codes" sub-registry, as follows using a Standards Action value.

```

+-----+-----+-----+
| Value   | Description           | Reference   |
+-----+-----+-----+
| X (TBD4)| Failed to establish the BFD session. | This document |
|         | The specified reverse path was not   |               |
|         | found.                             |               |
+-----+-----+-----+

```

Table 3: New Return Code



## 6. Security Considerations

Security considerations discussed in [RFC5880], [RFC5884], and [RFC4379], apply to this document.

## 7. Acknowledgements

## 8. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-bfd-rfc5884-clarifications]

Govindan, V., Rajaraman, K., Mirsky, G., Akiya, N., and S. Aldrin, "Clarifications to RFC 5884", [draft-ietf-bfd-rfc5884-clarifications-02](#) (work in progress), June 2015.

[I-D.kumarkini-mpls-spring-lsp-ping]

Kumar, N., Swallow, G., Pignataro, C., Akiya, N., Kini, S., Gredler, H., and M. Chen, "Label Switched Path (LSP) Ping/Trace for Segment Routing Networks Using MPLS Dataplane", [draft-kumarkini-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-04](#) (work in progress), July 2015.

[I-D.previdi-6man-segment-routing-header]

Previdi, S., Filsfils, C., Field, B., Leung, I., Vyncke, E., and D. Lebrun, "IPv6 Segment Routing Header (SRH)", [draft-previdi-6man-segment-routing-header-07](#) (work in progress), July 2015.

[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>>.

[RFC4379] Kompella, K. and G. Swallow, "Detecting Multi-Protocol Label Switched (MPLS) Data Plane Failures", [RFC 4379](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4379, February 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4379>>.

[RFC5586] Bocci, M., Ed., Vigoureux, M., Ed., and S. Bryant, Ed., "MPLS Generic Associated Channel", [RFC 5586](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5586, June 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5586>>.

[RFC5880] Katz, D. and D. Ward, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD)", [RFC 5880](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5880, June 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5880>>.





- [RFC5881] Katz, D. and D. Ward, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for IPv4 and IPv6 (Single Hop)", [RFC 5881](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5881, June 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5881>>.
- [RFC5883] Katz, D. and D. Ward, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for Multihop Paths", [RFC 5883](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5883, June 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5883>>.
- [RFC5884] Aggarwal, R., Kompella, K., Nadeau, T., and G. Swallow, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for MPLS Label Switched Paths (LSPs)", [RFC 5884](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5884, June 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5884>>.
- [RFC7110] Chen, M., Cao, W., Ning, S., Jounay, F., and S. Delord, "Return Path Specified Label Switched Path (LSP) Ping", [RFC 7110](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7110, January 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7110>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Greg Mirsky  
Ericsson

Email: [gregory.mirsky@ericsson.com](mailto:gregory.mirsky@ericsson.com)

Jeff Tantsura  
Ericsson

Email: [jeff.tantsura@ericsson.com](mailto:jeff.tantsura@ericsson.com)

Ilya Varlashkin  
Google

Email: [Ilya@nobulus.com](mailto:Ilya@nobulus.com)

Mach(Guoyi) Chen  
Huawei

Email: [mach.chen@huawei.com](mailto:mach.chen@huawei.com)

