

Network Working Group  
Request for Comments: 5302  
Obsoletes: [2966](#)  
Updates: [1195](#)  
Category: Standards Track

T. Li  
Redback Networks, Inc.  
H. Smit  
  
T. Przygienda  
Z2 Sagl  
October 2008

## **Domain-Wide Prefix Distribution with Two-Level IS-IS**

### Status of This Memo

This document specifies an Internet standards track protocol for the Internet community, and requests discussion and suggestions for improvements. Please refer to the current edition of the "Internet Official Protocol Standards" (STD 1) for the standardization state and status of this protocol. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

### Abstract

This document describes extensions to the Intermediate System to Intermediate System (IS-IS) protocol to support optimal routing within a two-level domain. The IS-IS protocol is specified in ISO 10589, with extensions for supporting IPv4 (Internet Protocol) specified in [RFC 1195](#). This document replaces [RFC 2966](#).

This document extends the semantics presented in [RFC 1195](#) so that a routing domain running with both level 1 and level 2 Intermediate Systems (IS) (routers) can distribute IP prefixes between level 1 and level 2, and vice versa. This distribution requires certain restrictions to ensure that persistent forwarding loops do not form. The goal of this domain-wide prefix distribution is to increase the granularity of the routing information within the domain.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	Motivations for Domain-Wide Prefix Distribution . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.2.</a>	Scalability . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">1.3.</a>	Requirements Language . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Proposed Syntax and Semantics for L2->L1 Inter-Area Routes . .	<a href="#">6</a>
2.1.	Clarification of External Route-Type and External Metric-Type . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	Definition of External IP Prefixes in Level 1 LSPs . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Types of IP Routes in IS-IS and Their Order of Preference . .	<a href="#">8</a>
3.1.	Overview of All Types of IP Prefixes in IS-IS Link State PDUs . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
3.2.	Order of Preference for all Types of IP Routes in IS-IS .	11
3.3.	Additional Notes on What Prefixes to Accept or Advertise . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Inter-Operability with Older Implementations . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Comparisons with Other Proposals . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>



## 1. Introduction

This document describes extensions to the Intermediate System to Intermediate System (IS-IS) protocol to support optimal routing within a two-level domain. The IS-IS protocol is specified in [ISO-10589], with extensions for supporting IPv4 (Internet Protocol) specified in [RFC1195].

This document replaces [RFC2966], which was an Informational document. This document is on the standards track. No other intentional substantive changes have been made.

This document extends the semantics presented in RFC 1195 so that a routing domain running with both level 1 and level 2 Intermediate Systems (IS) (routers) can distribute IP prefixes between level 1 and level 2, and vice versa. This distribution requires certain restrictions to ensure that persistent forwarding loops do not form. The goal of this domain-wide prefix distribution is to increase the granularity of the routing information within the domain.

An IS-IS routing domain (a.k.a. an autonomous system running IS-IS) can be partitioned into multiple level 1 (L1) areas, and a level 2 (L2) connected subset of the topology that interconnects all of the L1 areas. Within each L1 area, all routers exchange link state information. L2 routers also exchange L2 link state information to compute routes between areas.

RFC 1195 defines the Type, Length, and Value (TLV) tuples that are used to transport IPv4 routing information in IS-IS. RFC 1195 also specifies the semantics and procedures for interactions between levels. Specifically, routers in an L1 area will exchange information within the L1 area. For IP destinations not found in the prefixes in the L1 database, the L1 router should forward packets to the nearest router that is in both L1 and L2 (i.e., an L1L2 router) with the "attached bit" set in its L1 Link State Protocol Data Unit (LSP).

Also per RFC 1195, an L1L2 router should be manually configured with a set of prefixes that summarizes the IP prefixes reachable in that L1 area. These summaries are injected into L2. RFC 1195 specifies no further interactions between L1 and L2 for IPv4 prefixes.

### 1.1. Motivations for Domain-Wide Prefix Distribution

The mechanisms specified in RFC 1195 are appropriate in many situations and lead to excellent scalability properties. However, in certain circumstances, the domain administrator may wish to sacrifice some amount of scalability and distribute more specific information



than is described by [RFC 1195](#). This section discusses the various reasons why the domain administrator may wish to make such a tradeoff.

One major reason for distributing more prefix information is to improve the quality of the resulting routes. A well-known property of prefix summarization or any abstraction mechanism is that it necessarily results in a loss of information. This loss of information in turn results in the computation of a route based upon less information, which will frequently result in routes that are not optimal.

A simple example can serve to demonstrate this adequately. Suppose that an L1 area has two L1L2 routers that both advertise a single summary of all prefixes within the L1 area. To reach a destination inside the L1 area, any other L2 router is going to compute the shortest path to one of the two L1L2 routers for that area. Suppose, for example, that both of the L1L2 routers are equidistant from the L2 source and that the L2 source arbitrarily selects one L1L2 router. This router may not be the optimal router when viewed from the L1 topology. In fact, it may be the case that the path from the selected L1L2 router to the destination router may traverse the L1L2 router that was not selected. If more detailed topological information or more detailed metric information was available to the L2 source router, it could make a more optimal route computation.

This situation is symmetric in that an L1 router has no information about prefixes in L2 or within a different L1 area. In using the nearest L1L2 router, that L1L2 is effectively injecting a default route without metric information into the L1 area. The route computation that the L1 router performs is similarly suboptimal.

Besides the optimality of the routes computed, there are two other significant drivers for the domain-wide distribution of prefix information.

When a router learns multiple possible paths to external destinations via BGP, it will select only one of those routes to be installed in the forwarding table. One of the factors in the BGP route selection is the IGP cost to the BGP next hop address. Many ISP networks depend on this technique, which is known as "shortest exit routing". If a L1 router does not know the exact IGP metric to all BGP speakers in other L1 areas, it cannot do effective shortest exit routing.

The third driver is the current practice of using the IGP (IS-IS) metric as part of the BGP Multi-Exit Discriminator (MED). The value in the MED is advertised to other domains and is used to inform other domains of the optimal entry point into the current domain. Current



practice is to take the IS-IS metric and insert it as the MED value. This tends to cause external traffic to enter the domain at the point closest to the exit router. Note that the receiving domain MAY, based upon policy, choose to ignore the MED that is advertised. However, current practice is to distribute the IGP metric in this way in order to optimize routing wherever possible. This is possible in current networks that only are a single area, but becomes problematic if hierarchy is to be installed into the network. This is again because the loss of end-to-end metric information means that the MED value will not reflect the true distance across the advertising domain. Full distribution of prefix information within the domain would alleviate this problem, as it would allow accurate computation of the IS-IS metric across the domain, resulting in an accurate value presented in the MED.

## **1.2. Scalability**

The disadvantage to performing the domain-wide prefix distribution described above is that it has an impact on the scalability of IS-IS. Areas within IS-IS help scalability in that LSPs are contained within a single area. This limits the size of the link state database, which in turn limits the complexity of the shortest path computation.

Further, the summarization of the prefix information aids scalability in that the abstraction of the prefix information removes the sheer number of data items to be transported and the number of routes to be computed.

It should be noted quite strongly that the distribution of prefixes on a domain-wide basis impacts the scalability of IS-IS in the second respect. It will increase the number of prefixes throughout the domain. This will result in increased memory consumption, transmission requirements, and computation requirements throughout the domain.

It must also be noted that the domain-wide distribution of prefixes has no effect whatsoever on the first aspect of scalability, namely the existence of areas and the limitation of the distribution of the link state database.

Thus, the net result is that the introduction of domain-wide prefix distribution into a formerly flat, single area network is a clear benefit to the scalability of that network. However, it is a compromise and does not provide the maximum scalability available with IS-IS. Domains that choose to make use of this facility should be aware of the tradeoff that they are making between scalability and optimality, and provision and monitor their networks accordingly. Normal provisioning guidelines that would apply to a fully





hierarchical deployment of IS-IS will not apply to this type of configuration.

### 1.3. Requirements Language

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 [\[RFC2119\]](#).

## 2. Proposed Syntax and Semantics for L2->L1 Inter-Area Routes

This document defines the syntax of how to advertise level 2 routes in level 1 LSPs. The encoding is an extension of the encoding in [RFC 1195](#).

To some extent, in IS-IS the level 2 backbone can be seen as a separate area itself. [RFC 1195](#) defines that L1L2 routers can advertise IP routes that were learned via L1 routing into L2. These routes can be regarded as inter-area routes. [RFC 1195](#) defines that these L1->L2 inter-area routes must be advertised in L2 LSPs in the "IP Internal Reachability Information" TLV (TLV 128). Intra-area L2 routes are also advertised in L2 LSPs in an "IP Internal Reachability Information" TLV. Therefore, L1->L2 inter-area routes are indistinguishable from L2 intra-area routes.

[RFC 1195](#) does not define L2->L1 inter-area routes. A simple extension would be to allow an L1L2 router to advertise routes learned via L2 routing in its L1 LSP. However, to prevent routing-loops, L1L2 routers MUST NOT advertise L2->L1 inter-area routes that they learn via L1 routing back into L2. Therefore, there must be a way to distinguish L2->L1 inter-area routes from L1 intra-area routes. [\[RFC5305\]](#) defines the "up/down bit" for this purpose in the extended IP reachability TLV (TLV 135). [RFC 1195](#) defines TLVs 128 and 130 to contain IP routes. TLVs 128 and 130 have a Metric field that consists of 4 Type of Service (TOS) metrics. The first metric, the so-called "default metric", has the high-order bit reserved (bit 8). Routers must set this bit to zero on transmission, and ignore it on receipt.

This document redefines this high-order bit in the default Metric field in TLVs 128 and 130 to be the up/down bit. L1L2 routers MUST set this bit to one for prefixes that are derived from L2 routing and are advertised into L1 LSPs. The bit MUST be set to zero for all other IP prefixes in L1 or L2 LSPs. Prefixes with the up/down bit set that are learned via L1 routing MUST NOT be advertised by L1L2 routers back into L2.



### **2.1. Clarification of External Route-Type and External Metric-Type**

[RFC 1195](#) defines two TLVs for carrying IP prefixes. TLV 128 is defined as "IP Internal Reachability Information", and should be used to carry IP prefixes that are directly connected to IS-IS routers. TLV 130 is defined as "IP External Reachability Information", and should be used to carry routes learned from outside the IS-IS domain. [RFC 1195](#) documents TLV type 130 only for level 2 LSPs.

[RFC 1195](#) also defines two types of metrics. Metrics of the internal metric-type should be used when the metric is comparable to metrics used to weigh links inside the IS-IS domain. Metrics of the external metric-type should be used if the metric of an IP prefix cannot be directly compared to internal metrics. The external metric-type can only be used for external IP prefixes. A direct result is that metrics of the external metric-type should never be seen in TLV 128.

To prevent confusion, this document states again that when a router computes IP routes, it MUST give the same preference to IP routes advertised in an "IP Internal Reachability Information" TLV and IP routes advertised in an "IP External Reachability Information" TLV. [RFC 1195](#) states this quite clearly in the note in paragraph 3.10.2, item 2c). This document does not alter this rule of preference.

NOTE: Internal routes (routes to destinations announced in the "IP Internal Reachability Information" field) and external routes using internal metrics (routes to destinations announced in the "IP External Reachability Information" field, with a metric of type "internal") are treated identically for the purpose of the order of preference of routes, and the Dijkstra calculation.

However, IP routes advertised in "IP External Reachability Information" with the external metric-type MUST be given less preference than the same IP routes advertised with the internal metric-type, regardless of the value of the metrics.

While IS-IS routers MUST NOT give different preference to IP prefixes learned via "IP Internal Reachability Information" and "IP External Reachability Information" when executing the Dijkstra calculation, routers that implement multiple IGPs are free to use this distinction between internal and external routes when comparing routes derived from different IGPs for inclusion in their global Routing Information Base (RIB).



## **2.2. Definition of External IP Prefixes in Level 1 LSPs**

[RFC 1195](#) does not define the "IP External Reachability Information" TLV for L1 LSPs. However, there is no reason why an IS-IS implementation could not allow for redistribution of external routes into L1. Some IS-IS implementations already allow network administrators to do this. This document loosens the restrictions in [RFC 1195](#) and allows for the inclusion of the "IP External Reachability Information" TLV in L1 LSPs.

[RFC 1195](#) defines that IP routes learned via L1 routing must always be advertised in L2 LSPs in an "IP Internal Reachability Information" TLV. Now that this document allows "IP External Reachability Information" TLVs in L1 LSPs and allows for the advertisement of routes learned via L2 routing into L1, the above rule needs an extension.

When an L1L2 router advertises an L1 route into L2, where that L1 route was learned via a prefix advertised in an "IP External Reachability Information" TLV, that L1L2 router SHOULD advertise that prefix in its L2 LSP within an "IP External Reachability Information" TLV. L1 routes learned via an "IP Internal Reachability Information" TLV SHOULD still be advertised within an "IP Internal Reachability Information" TLV. These rules should also be applied when advertising IP routes derived from L2 routing into L1. Of course in this case, the up/down bit MUST be set also.

[RFC 1195](#) defines that if a router sees the same external prefix advertised by two or more routers with the same external metric, it must select the route that is advertised by the router that is closest to itself. It should be noted that now that external routes can be advertised from L1 into L2, and vice versa, the router that advertises an external prefix in its LSP might not be the router that originally injected this prefix into the IS-IS domain. Therefore, it is less useful to advertise external routes with external metrics into other levels.

## **3. Types of IP Routes in IS-IS and Their Order of Preference**

[RFC 1195](#) and this document define several ways of advertising IP routes in IS-IS. There are four variables involved.

1. The level of the LSP in which the route is advertised. There are currently two possible values: level 1 and level 2.
2. The route-type, which can be derived from the type of TLV in which the prefix is advertised. Internal routes are advertised in IP Internal Reachability Information TLVs (TLV 128), and



external routes are advertised in IP External Reachability Information TLVs (TLV 130).

3. The metric-type: internal or external. The metric-type is derived from the internal/external metric-type bit in the Metric field (bit 7).
4. The fact whether this route is leaked down in the hierarchy, and thus can not be advertised back up. This information can be derived from the newly defined up/down bit in the default Metric field.

### **3.1. Overview of All Types of IP Prefixes in IS-IS Link State PDUs**

The combination IP Internal Reachability Information and external metric-type is not allowed. Also, the up/down bit MUST NOT be set in L2 LSPs. This leaves us with 8 different types of IP advertisements in IS-IS. However, there are more than 8 reasons for IP prefixes to be advertised in IS-IS. The following list describes the types of IP prefixes and how they are encoded.

L1 intra-area routes: These are advertised in L1 LSPs, in TLV 128. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are directly connected to the advertising router.

L1 external routes: These are advertised in L1 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are learned from other IGP, and are usually not directly connected to the advertising router.

L2 intra-area routes: These are advertised in L2 LSPs, in TLV 128. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are directly connected to the advertising router. These prefixes cannot be distinguished from L1->L2 inter-area routes.

L2 external routes: These are advertised in L2 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are learned from other IGP, and are usually not directly connected to the advertising router. These prefixes cannot be distinguished from L1->L2 inter-area external routes.

L1->L2 inter-area routes: These are advertised in L2 LSPs, in TLV 128. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are learned via L1 routing, and were derived during the L1 Shortest Path First (SPF) computation from





prefixes advertised in L1 LSPs in TLV 128. These prefixes cannot be distinguished from L2 intra-area routes.

L1->L2 inter-area external routes: These are advertised in L2 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are learned via L1 routing, and were derived during the L1 SPF computation from prefixes advertised in L1 LSPs in TLV 130. These prefixes cannot be distinguished from L2 external routes.

L2->L1 inter-area routes: These are advertised in L1 LSPs, in TLV 128. The up/down bit is set to one, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are learned via L2 routing, and were derived during the L2 SPF computation from prefixes advertised in TLV 128.

L2->L1 inter-area external routes: These are advertised in L1 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to one, metric-type is internal metric. These IP prefixes are learned via L2 routing, and were derived during the L2 SPF computation from prefixes advertised in L2 LSPs in TLV 130.

L1 external routes with external metric: These are advertised in L1 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is external metric. These IP prefixes are learned from other IGP, and are usually not directly connected to the advertising router.

L2 external routes with external metric: These are advertised in L2 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is external metric. These IP prefixes are learned from other IGP, and are usually not directly connected to the advertising router. These prefixes cannot be distinguished from L1->L2 inter-area external routes with external metric.

L1->L2 inter-area external routes with external metric: These are advertised in L2 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to zero, metric-type is external metric. These IP prefixes are learned via L1 routing, and were derived during the L1 SPF computation from prefixes advertised in L1 LSPs in TLV 130 with external metrics. These prefixes can not be distinguished from L2 external routes with external metric.

L2->L1 inter-area external routes with external metric: These are advertised in L1 LSPs, in TLV 130. The up/down bit is set to one, metric-type is external metric. These IP prefixes are learned via L2 routing, and were derived during the L1 SPF computation from prefixes advertised in L2 LSPs in TLV 130 with external metrics.



### **3.2. Order of Preference for all Types of IP Routes in IS-IS**

Unfortunately, IS-IS cannot depend on metrics alone for route selection. Some types of routes must always be preferred over others, regardless of the costs that were computed in the Dijkstra calculation. One of the reasons for this is that inter-area routes can only be advertised with a maximum metric of 63. Another reason is that this maximum value of 63 does not mean infinity (e.g., like a hop count of 16 in RIP denotes unreachable). Introducing a value for infinity cost in IS-IS inter-area routes would introduce counting-to-infinity behavior via two or more L1L2 routers, which would have a bad impact on network stability.

The order of preference of IP routes in IS-IS is based on a few assumptions.

- o [RFC 1195](#) defines that routes derived from L1 routing are preferred over routes derived from L2 routing.
- o The note in [RFC 1195](#), paragraph 3.10.2, item 2c) defines that internal routes with internal metric-type and external prefixes with internal metric-type have the same preference.
- o [RFC 1195](#) defines that external routes with internal metric-type are preferred over external routes with external metric-type.
- o Routes derived from L2 routing are preferred over L2->L1 routes derived from L1 routing.

Based on these assumptions, this document defines the following route preferences.

1. L1 intra-area routes with internal metric; L1 external routes with internal metric
2. L2 intra-area routes with internal metric; L2 external routes with internal metric; L1->L2 inter-area routes with internal metric; L1->L2 inter-area external routes with internal metric
3. L2->L1 inter-area routes with internal metric; L2->L1 inter-area external routes with internal metric
4. L1 external routes with external metric
5. L2 external routes with external metric; L1->L2 inter-area external routes with external metric



6. L2->L1 inter-area external routes with external metric

### 3.3. Additional Notes on What Prefixes to Accept or Advertise

[Section 3.1](#) enumerates all used IP route-types in IS-IS. Besides these defined route-types, the encoding used would allow for a few more potential combinations. One of them is the combination of "IP Internal Reachability Information" and external metric-type. This combination SHOULD NOT be used when building an LSP. Upon receipt of an IP prefix with this combination, routers MUST ignore this prefix. Another issue would be the usage of the up/down bit in L2 LSPs. Because IS-IS is currently defined with two levels of hierarchy, there should never be a need to set the up/down bit in L2 LSPs. However, if IS-IS would ever be extended with more than two levels of hierarchy, L2-only (or L1L2) routers will need to be able to accept L2 IP routes with the up/down bit set. Therefore, it is RECOMMENDED that implementations ignore the up/down bit in L2 LSPs, and accept the prefixes in L2 LSPs regardless of whether the up/down bit is set. This will allow for simpler migration once more than two levels of hierarchy are defined.

Another detail that implementors should be aware of is the fact that L1L2 routers SHOULD only advertise in their L2 LSP those L1 routes that they use for forwarding themselves. They SHOULD NOT unconditionally advertise into L2 all prefixes from LSPs in the L1 database.

Not all prefixes need to be advertised up or down the hierarchy. Implementations might allow for additional manual filtering or summarization to further bring down the number of inter-area prefixes they advertise in their LSPs. It is also RECOMMENDED that the default configuration of L1L2 routers not advertise any L2 routes into L1 (see also [Section 4](#)).

## 4. Inter-Operability with Older Implementations

The solution in this document is not fully compatible with [RFC 1195](#). It is an extension to [RFC 1195](#). If routers do not use the new functionality of external L1 routes or L2->L1 inter-area routes, older implementations that strictly follow [RFC 1195](#) will be compatible with newer implementations that follow this document.

Implementations that do not accept the "IP External Reachability Information" TLV in L1 LSPs will not be able to compute external L1 routes. This could cause routing loops between L1-only routers that do understand external L1 routes for a particular destination, and L1-only routers that use the default route pointing to the closest attached L1L2 router for that destination.



Implementations that follow [RFC 1195](#) SHOULD ignore bit 8 in the default Metric field when computing routes. Therefore, even older implementations that do not know of the up/down bit should be able to accept the new L2->L1 inter-area routes. These older implementations will install the new L2->L1 inter-area routes as L1 intra-area routes, but that in itself does not cause routing loops among L1-only routers.

However, it is vital that the up/down bit is recognized by L1L2 routers. As has been stated before, L1L2 routers MUST NOT advertise L2->L1 inter-area routes back into L2. Therefore, if L2 routes are advertised down into an L1 area, it is required that all L1L2 routers in that area run software that understands the new up/down bit. Older implementations that follow [RFC 1195](#) and do not understand the new up/down bit will treat the L2->L1 inter-area routes as L1 intra-area routes, and they will advertise these routes back into L2. This can cause routing loops, sub-optimal routing, or extra routing instability. For this reason, it is RECOMMENDED that implementations by default not advertise any L2 routes into L1. Implementations SHOULD force the network administrator to manually configure L1L2 routers to advertise any L2 routes into L1.

## 5. Comparisons with Other Proposals

In [[RFC5305](#)], a new TLV is defined to transport IP prefix information. This TLV format also defines an up/down bit to allow for L2->L1 inter-area routes. [RFC 5305](#) also defines a new TLV to describe links. Both TLVs have wider metric space and have the possibility to define sub-TLVs to advertise extra information belonging to the link or prefix. The wider metric space in IP prefix TLVs allows for more granular metric information about inter-area path costs. To make full use of the wider metric space, network administrators must deploy both new TLVs at the same time.

Deployment of [RFC 5305](#) requires an upgrade of all routers in the network and a transition to the new TLVs. Such a network-wide upgrade and transition might not be an easy task. In this case, the solution defined in this document, which requires only an upgrade of L1L2 routers in selected areas, might be a good alternative to the solution defined in 5305.

## 6. Security Considerations

This document raises no new security issues for IS-IS; for general security considerations for IS-IS see [[RFC5304](#)].





## **[7.](#) References**

### **[7.1.](#) Normative References**

- [ISO-10589] ISO, "Intermediate System to Intermediate System intra-domain routeing information exchange protocol for use in conjunction with the protocol for providing the connectionless-mode network service (ISO 8473)", International Standard 10589:2002, Second Edition, 2002.
- [RFC1195] Callon, R., "Use of OSI IS-IS for routing in TCP/IP and dual environments", [RFC 1195](#), December 1990.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

### **[7.2.](#) Informative References**

- [RFC2966] Li, T., Przygienda, T., and H. Smit, "Domain-wide Prefix Distribution with Two-Level IS-IS", [RFC 2966](#), October 2000.
- [RFC5304] Li, T. and R. Atkinson, "IS-IS Cryptographic Authentication", [RFC 5304](#), October 2008.
- [RFC5305] Li, T. and H. Smit, "IS-IS Extensions for Traffic Engineering", [RFC 5305](#), October 2008.



## Authors' Addresses

Tony Li  
Redback Networks, Inc.  
300 Holger Way  
San Jose, CA 95134  
USA

Phone: +1 408 750 5160  
EMail: [tony.li@tony.li](mailto:tony.li@tony.li)

Henk Smit

EMail: [hww.smit@xs4all.nl](mailto:hww.smit@xs4all.nl)

Tony Przygienda  
Z2 Sagl  
Via Tersaggio 20  
CH-6949 Comano  
Switzerland

EMail: [prz@net4u.ch](mailto:prz@net4u.ch)



## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2008).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

