

Routing Working Group
Internet Draft
Intended Status: Informational
Expires:

N. So
A. Malis
D. McDysan
Verizon
L. Yong
Huawei
F. Jounay
France Telecom
Y. Kamite
NTT
October 16, 2009

Framework for MPLS Over Composite Link

[draft-so-yong-mpls-ctg-framework-00](#)

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#). This document may not be modified, and derivative works of it may not be created, and it may not be published except as an Internet-Draft.

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#). This document may not be modified, and derivative works of it may not be created, except to publish it as an RFC and to translate it into languages other than English.

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 December 17, 2009.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2009 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the

document authors. All rights reserved.

So, et al,

Expires April 16, 2010

[Page 1]

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents in effect on the date of publication of this document (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>). Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document.

Abstract

This document describes a framework for managing aggregated traffic over a composite link. A composite link consists of a group of non-homogenous links that have the same forward adjacency and can be considered as a single TE link or an IP link used for MPLS. The document primarily focuses on MPLS data plane and control plane traffic over a composite link and composite link advertisement within IGP. MPLS traffic can be set up by either RSVP-TE or LDP signaling. Applicability is described for a single pair of MPLS-capable nodes, a sequence of MPLS-capable nodes, or a set of layer networks connecting MPLS-capable nodes.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	2
2.	Conventions used in this document.....	3
2.1.	Acronyms.....	3
2.2.	Terminology.....	4
3.	Composite Link Framework.....	4
3.1.	Composite Link Architecture.....	4
3.2.	Interior Functions.....	6
3.2.1.	Functions specific to LSP flows with TE information..	7
3.2.2.	Functions specific to LSP flows without TE information	7
3.2.3.	Functions for LSP flows with and without TE information	7
3.3.	Exterior Functions.....	8
3.3.1.	Composite Link Advertisement and Component Link Setup	8
3.3.2.	Functions specific to LSP flows with TE information..	8
3.3.3.	Functions specific to LSP flows without TE information	8
3.3.4.	Functions to LSP flows with and without TE information	9
4.	Applicability.....	9
4.1.	Single-Layer Scenarios.....	9
4.2.	Multi-Layer Scenario.....	10
5.	Security Considerations.....	10
6.	IANA Considerations.....	11
7.	References.....	11
7.1.	Normative References.....	11
7.2.	Informative References.....	11
8.	Acknowledgments.....	11

[1. Introduction](#)

This document describes a framework of Composite Link in IP/MPLS

network. Single link and link bundle [[RFC4201](#)] have been widely used

So, et al.

Expires April 16, 2010

[Page 2]

in today's IP/MPLS networks. A link bundle bundles a group of homogeneous links as a TE link to make routing approach more scalable. A composite link allows bundling non-homogenous links together as a single logical link. The motivations for using a composite link are described in the document [CL Requirement]. This document states composite link framework in the context of MPLS network with MPLS control plane.

A composite link is a single logical link that contains multiple parallel component links between two routers. Unlike a link bundle [RFC4201], the component links in a composite link can have different properties such as cost or capacity. A composite link can transport aggregated traffic as other physical links from the network perspective and use its component links to carry the traffic internally. To achieve the better component link utilization and avoid component link congestion, the document describes some new aspects on the traffic flow assignment to component links. The document also describes the advertisement of a composite link as a routing interface in MPLS control plane and the addition of component links to a composite link.

Specific protocol solutions are outside the scope of this document.

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 [RFC-2119](#).

2.1. Acronyms

BW: Bandwidth

CTG: Composite Transport Group

ECMP: Equal Cost Multi-Path

FRR: Fast Re-Route

LAG: Link Aggregation Group

LDP: Label Distribution Protocol

LSA: Link State Advertisements

LSP: Label Switched Path

MPLS: Multi-Protocol Label Switching

OAM: Operation, Administration, and Management

PDU: Protocol Data Unit

PE: Provider Edge device

RSVP: ReSource reSeRvAtion Protocol

RTD: Real Time Delay

TE: Traffic Engineering

VRF: Virtual Routing and Forwarding

2.2. Terminology

Composite Link: a group of component links, which can be considered as a single MPLS TE link or as a single IP link used for MPLS.

Component Link: a physical link (e.g., Lambda, Ethernet PHY, SONET/SDH, OTN, etc.) with packet transport capability, or a logical link (e.g., MPLS LSP, Ethernet VLAN, MPLS-TP LSP, etc.)

Connection: An aggregation of traffic flows which are treated together as a single unit by Composite Link Interior Functions for the purpose of routing onto a specific component link and measuring traffic volume.

Exterior Functions: These are performed by an MPLS router that makes a composite link useable by the network via control protocols, or by an MPLS router that interacts with other routers to dynamically configure a component link within a composite link. These functions are those that interact via routing and/or signaling protocols with other routers in the same layer network or other layer networks.

Interior Functions: Actions performed by the MPLS routers directly connected by a composite link. This includes the determination of the component link on which a traffic flow is placed. This is local implementation.

Traffic Flow: A set of packets with a common identifier and characteristics that is used by Composite link interior functions to place the set of packets on the same component link. Identifiers can be an MPLS label stack or any combination of IP addresses and protocol types for routing, signaling, and management packets.

Virtual Interface: Composite link is advertised as a interface in IGP

3. Composite Link Framework

3.1. Composite Link Architecture

Composite Link Characteristics is defined at a high level in ITU-T [ITU-T G.800] that makes multiple parallel component links between

two transport nodes appear as a single logical link from the network perspective. Each component link in a composite link can be supported by a separate server layer trail, i.e. the component links in a composite link can have the same or different properties such as latency and capacity. Composite link framework is illustrated in Figure 1, where a composite link is configured between routers R1 and R2. The composite link has three component links. Individual component links in a composite link may be supported by different transport technologies such as wavelength, Ethernet VLAN, or can be a logical link configured on a LSP [LSP Hierarchy]. Even if the transport technology implementing the component links is identical, the characteristics (e.g., bandwidth, latency) of the component links may differ.

Composite Link can apply to MPLS network. As shown in Figure 1, the composite link may carry LSP traffic flows and control plane packets. A LSP may be established over the link by either RSVP-TE or LDP signaling protocols. All component links in a composite link have the same forwarding adjacency. The composite link forms one routing interface between two connected routers for MPLS control plane. In other words, two routers connected via a composite link have forwarding adjacency and routing adjacency. Each component link only has significance to the composite link, i.e. it does not appear as a link in the control plane.

Composite link relies on its component links to carry the traffic. An important framework concept is the connection shown in Figure 1. The connection only exists within the composite link and is controlled by the composite link function. At the transmitting end (R1 in Figure 1), composite link maps a set of traffic flows including control plane packets into one connection and routes the connection on a specific component link. This method enables connection based routing over component links and traffic volume measurement on a per connection basis. As a result, it guarantees the ordering per traffic flow. One component link may carry one or more connections. At the receiving end (R2 in Figure 1), composite link receives traffic flows from its component links and sends them to MPLS forwarding engine like a regular link. Note that a special case of this model is where a single flow is mapped to a single connection.

A component link in a composite link may fail independently. The interior functions are able to detect component link failure and re-assign impacted flows to other active component links. When a composite link can't recover some impacted flows, it notifies control plane about the flows. When a composite link is not able to transport all flows, it preempts some flows based upon local management configuration and informs the control plane on these preempted flows. This action ensures the remaining traffic is transported properly.

The interior functions provide component link fault notification and composite link fault notification upon the failure of a component link or a composite link. Component link fault notification is sent to the management plane. Composite link fault notification is sent to the control plane and management plane. Composite link allows operator to trace which component link a LSP is assigned to.

3.2.1. Functions specific to LSP flows with TE information

When a composite link is deployed in a MPLS-TE network, LSPs are signaled by RSVP-TE protocol. The protocol message contains LSP parameters like BW, setting/holding priority, latency, etc. The composite link will take these parameters into account when assigning LSP to a connection and a connection to a component link.

3.2.2. Functions specific to LSP flows without TE information

When a composite link is deployed in a non-TE MPLS network, LSPs are signaled by LDP. LDP message does not provide LSP TE information. These LSPs can be mapped to local configured connections with minimum bandwidth, maximum bandwidth, preemption priority, and holding priority parameters. The interior function measures the traffic volume on the connection and derives the BW parameter for the connection. The interior functions use these parameters to assign the connection to a component link.

When the connection bandwidth exceeds the component link capacity, the interior functions are able to reassign the traffic flows to other connections that are over different component links.

3.2.3. Functions for LSP flows with and without TE information

When a composite link carries LSPs that are signaled by LDP or RSVP-TE, the interior functions separates them into different connections that have independent parameters. If there is a shortage of capacity in a composite link, interior functions perform preemption, rerouting or termination of flows based on the traffic flow priority.

3.3. Exterior Functions

The Exterior Functions have the aspects that are applicable exterior to the connected MPLS routers. These exterior functions apply to routing and signaling protocols. Protocol solutions are for further study.

3.3.1. Composite Link Advertisement and Component Link Setup

In IGP, a composite Link is advertised as a single virtual routable interface between two connected routers, which forms routing and forwarding adjacency between the connected routers. A composite link must be advertised as a link in IGP.[\[RFC2328\]](#) The interface parameters for the composite link can be pre-configured by operator or be derived from its component links. Composite link latency may be advertised for other routers to perform route computation.

A composite link may contain the set of component links. A component link may be configured by operator or signaled by the control plane. In both cases, it is necessary to convey component link parameters to the composite link.

When a component link is supported by lower layer network as described in [section 4.2](#), the control plane that the composite link resides is able to interoperate with the GMPLS or MPLS-TP control plane that lower layer network uses for component link addition and deletion.

Composite link advertisement and component link setup requirements are specified in [CTG Requirement]

3.3.2. Functions specific to LSP flows with TE information

When RSVP-TE [\[RFC3209\]](#) signals a LSP over a composite link, the composite link takes the signaled LSP parameters as the flow parameters and sends the PATH message to the downstream router of the composite link. The downstream router selects the LSP label that is used over the composite link and sends RESV message with the label info. to the upstream LSR. The forward engine at the upstream LSR will push the label into the LSP packets. Composite link interior functions map the label to a connection that is assigned to a component link.

When a composite link is advertised as a TE link in MPLS-TE network [\[RFC3630\]](#), composite link capacity is advertised. It is possible to advertise multiple capacities and latencies to reflect individual component link property. [CTG requirement]

3.3.3. Functions specific to LSP flows without TE information

When LDP [\[RFC5036\]](#) is used to signal LSPs over a composite link, a LDP session has to be established between two LSRs connected via a

composite link. When signaling a LSP for a FEC over the composite link, the upstream LSR sends label request message to the downstream LSR, the downstream LSR selects a label for the FEC and sends the label mapping message back to the upstream LSR.

3.3.4. Functions to LSP flows with and without TE information

When there is a shortage of capacity in a composite link which supports LSP flows with and without TE information, interior functions are able to perform preemption, rerouting or termination of flows to ensure transport quality, the exterior functions are able to inform LSR control plan preempted flows. Thus the control plan informs the LSP head-end if it is singled by RSVP-TE or prunes label distribution for the LSP that is singled by LDP.

4. Applicability

A composite link may be deployed between two Ps, P and PE, and two PEs. Two routers connected via a composite link forms forwarding adjacency and routing adjacency. It can be used in MPLS-TE only, MPLS non-TE only, or combined environment.

In MPLS-TE application, the composite link is advertised as a link in IGP and a TE link in IGP TE extension that uses either OSPF-TE or IS-IS-TE. RSVP-TE signaling protocol is used to establish a LSP. TE tunnel and private line are examples of applications.

In MPLS non-TE application, the composite link is advertised as a link within the IGP that uses either OSPF or IS-IS as routing protocol. In this case, LDP signaling protocol is used to establish a LSP. L3VPN is the most popular application for this case.

In the hybrid application, the composite link is advertised as a link and a TE link within IGP by using different types of LSA and both RSVP-TE and LDP signaling for LSP establishment, as described in [section 3](#).

4.1. Single-Layer Scenarios

The component links of Figure 1 applies to at least the scenarios illustrated in Figure 2. The component links may be physical or logical, or supported by different technologies. In the first scenario, a set of physical links connect adjacent (P) routers (R1/R2).

In the second scenario, a set of logical links connect adjacent (P or PE) routers over other equipment (i.e., R3/R4) that may implement RSVP-TE signaled MPLS tunnels which may be in the same IGP as R1/R2. In this case, R3/R4 provides a TE-LSP segment of TE-LSP from R1 and R2. In another case, R3/R4 are in different IGP from R1/R2, R3 and R4 provide connectivity for R1 and R2. The connectivity provides a

component link in the composite link of R1/R2. R3 and P4 may implement MPLS-TP.




Figure 4: Illustration of Component Link Types

4.2. Multi-Layer Scenario

In the third scenario in Figure 2, GMPLS lower layer LSPs (e.g., Fiber, Wavelength, TDM) as determined by a lower layer network in a multi-layer network deployment as illustrated by R5/R6. In this case, R5 and R6 would usually not be part of the same IGP as R1/R2 and may have a static interface, or may have a signaling but not a routing association with R1 and R2. Note that in scenarios 2 and 3 when the intermediate routers are not part of the same IGP as R1/R2 (i.e., can be viewed as operating at a lower layer) that the characteristics of these links (e.g., latency) may change dynamically, and there is an operational desire to handle this type of situation in a more automated fashion than is currently possible with existing protocols. Note that this problem currently occurs with a single lower-layer link in existing networks and it would be desirable for the solution to handle the case of a single lower-layer component link as well. Note that the interfaces at R1 and R2 are associated with these different component links can be configured with IP addresses or use unnumbered links as an interior, local function since the individual component links are not advertised as the virtual interface.

5. Security Considerations

The solution is a local function on the router to support traffic engineering management over multiple parallel links. It does not

introduce a security risk for control plane and data plane.

So, et al.

Expires April 16, 2010

[Page 10]

The solution could change the frequency of routing update messages and therefore could change routing convergence time. The solution MUST provide controls to dampen the frequency of such changes so as to not destabilize routing protocols.

6. IANA Considerations

IANA actions to provide solutions are for further study.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[RFC2328] Moy, J., "OSPF Version 2", [RFC 2328](#), April 1998.

[RFC3209] D. Awduche, L. Berger, D. Gan, T. Li, V. Srinivasan, G. Swallow, "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels," December 2001

[RFC3630] Katz, D., "Traffic Engineering (TE) Extension to OSPF Version 2", [RFC 3630](#), September 2003.

[RFC4201] Kompella, K., "Link Bundle in MPLS Traffic Engineering", [RFC 4201](#), March 2005.

[RFC5036] Andersson, L., "LDP Specification", [RFC 5036](#) , October 2007.

7.2. Informative References

[Entropy Label] Kompella, K. and S. Amante, "The Use of Entropy Labels in MPLS Forwarding", November 2008, Work in Progress

[LSP Hierarchy] Shiomoto, K. and A. Farrel, "Procedures for Dynamically Signaled Hierarchical Label Switched Paths", November 2008, Work in Progress

[Soft Preemption] Meyer, M. and J. Vasseur, "MPLS Traffic Engineering Soft Preemption", February 2009, Work in Progress

[CTG Requirement] So, N. and Yong, L, "Requirements for MPLS Over Composite Link", Oct. 2009, Work in Progress

8. Acknowledgments

Authors would like to thank Adrian Farrel for his extensive comments and suggestions, Ron Bonica, Nabil Bitar, Eric Gray, Lou Berger, and Kireeti Kompella for their reviews and great suggestions.

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

Copyright (c) 2009 IETF Trust and the persons identified as authors of the code. All rights reserved.

THIS SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED BY THE COPYRIGHT HOLDERS AND CONTRIBUTORS "AS IS" AND ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE DISCLAIMED. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE COPYRIGHT OWNER OR CONTRIBUTORS BE LIABLE FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, EXEMPLARY, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PROCUREMENT OF SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES; LOSS OF USE, DATA, OR PROFITS; OR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION) HOWEVER CAUSED AND ON ANY THEORY OF LIABILITY, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY, OR TORT (INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE) ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THE USE OF THIS SOFTWARE, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE.

This code was derived from IETF RFC [insert RFC number]. Please reproduce this note if possible.

Authors' Addresses

So Ning
Verizon
2400 N. Glem Ave.,
Richerdson, TX 75082
Phone: +1 972-729-7905
Email: ning.so@verizonbusiness.com

Andrew Malis
Verizon
117 West St.
Waltham, MA 02451
Phone: +1 781-466-2362
Email: andrew.g.malis@verizon.com

Dave McDysan
Verizon
22001 Loudoun County PKWY
Ashburn, VA 20147
Email: dave.mcdysan@verizon.com

Lucy Yong
Huawei USA
1700 Alma Dr. Suite 500
Plano, TX 75075
Phone: +1 469-229-5387
Email: lucyyong@huawei.com

Frederic Jounay
France Telecom
2, avenue Pierre-Marzin
22307 Lannion Cedex,
FRANCE
Email: frederic.jounay@orange-ftgroup.com

Yuji Kamite
NTT Communications Corporation
Granpark Tower
3-4-1 Shibaura, Minato-ku
Tokyo 108-8118
Japan
Email: y.kamite@ntt.com

