

LSR Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: November 29, 2020

X. Xu  
Alibaba Inc  
S. Kini

P. Psena  
C. Filsfils  
S. Litkowski  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
M. Bocci  
Nokia  
May 28, 2020

Signaling Entropy Label Capability and Entropy Readable Label Depth  
Using IS-IS  
draft-ietf-isis-mpls-elc-13

Abstract

Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) has defined a mechanism to load-balance traffic flows using Entropy Labels (EL). An ingress Label Switching Router (LSR) cannot insert ELs for packets going into a given Label Switched Path (LSP) unless an egress LSR has indicated via signaling that it has the capability to process ELs, referred to as the Entropy Label Capability (ELC), on that LSP. In addition, it would be useful for ingress LSRs to know each LSR's capability for reading the maximum label stack depth and performing EL-based load-balancing, referred to as Entropy Readable Label Depth (ERLD). This document defines a mechanism to signal these two capabilities using IS-IS and BGP-LS.

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 <https://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 November 29, 2020.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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 (<https://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
2. Terminology . . . . .	3
3. Advertising ELC Using IS-IS . . . . .	3
4. Advertising ERLD Using IS-IS . . . . .	4
5. Signaling ELC and ERLD in BGP-LS . . . . .	4
6. IANA Considerations . . . . .	4
7. Security Considerations . . . . .	5
8. Contributors . . . . .	5
9. Acknowledgements . . . . .	6
10. References . . . . .	6
10.1. Normative References . . . . .	6
10.2. Informative References . . . . .	7
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	7

## 1. Introduction

[RFC6790] describes a method to load-balance Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) traffic flows using Entropy Labels (EL). It also introduces the concept of Entropy Label Capability (ELC) and defines the signaling of this capability via MPLS signaling protocols. Recently, mechanisms have been defined to signal labels via link-state Interior Gateway Protocols (IGP) such as IS-IS [RFC8667]. This draft defines a mechanism to signal the ELC using IS-IS.

In cases where Segment Routing (SR) is used with the MPLS Data Plane (e.g., SR-MPLS [RFC8660]), it would be useful for ingress LSRs to know each intermediate LSR's capability of reading the maximum label stack depth and performing EL-based load-balancing. This capability, referred to as Entropy Readable Label Depth (ERLD) as defined in [RFC8662], may be used by ingress LSRs to determine the position of the EL label in the stack, and whether it's necessary to insert

multiple ELs at different positions in the label stack. This document defines a mechanism to signal the ERLD using IS-IS.

## 2. Terminology

This memo makes use of the terms defined in [RFC6790], and [RFC8662].

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.

## 3. Advertising ELC Using IS-IS

Even though ELC is a property of the node, in some cases it is advantageous to associate and advertise the ELC with a prefix. In a multi-area network, routers may not know the identity of the prefix originator in a remote area, or may not know the capabilities of such originator. Similarly, in a multi-domain network, the identity of the prefix originator and its capabilities may not be known to the ingress LSR.

Bit 3 in the Prefix Attribute Flags [RFC7794] is used as the ELC Flag (E-flag), as shown in Figure 1. If a router has multiple interfaces, the router MUST NOT announce the ELC for any local host prefixes unless all of its interfaces are capable of processing ELs. If a router supports ELs on all of its interfaces, it SHOULD set the ELC for every local host prefix it advertises in IS-IS.

```

  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7...
+--+--+--+--+--+--+...
|X|R|N|E|      ...
+--+--+--+--+--+--+...

```

Figure 1: Prefix Attribute Flags

E-flag: ELC Flag (Bit 3) - Set for local host prefix of the originating node if it supports ELC on all interfaces.

The ELC signaling MUST be preserved when a router propagates a prefix between ISIS levels [RFC5302].

When redistributing a prefix between two IS-IS protocol instances or redistributing from another protocol to an IS-IS protocol instance, a router SHOULD preserve the ELC signaling for that prefix if it exists. The exact mechanism used to exchange ELC between protocol instances running on an Autonomous System Boundary Router is outside of the scope of this document.

#### 4. Advertising ERLD Using IS-IS

A new MSD-Type [RFC8491], called ERLD-MSD, is defined to advertise the ERLD [RFC8662] of a given router. A MSD-Type code 2 has been assigned by IANA for ERLD-MSD. The MSD-Value field is set to the ERLD in the range between 0 to 255. The scope of the advertisement depends on the application. If a router has multiple interfaces with different capabilities of reading the maximum label stack depth, the router MUST advertise the smallest value found across all its interfaces.

The absence of ERLD-MSD advertisements indicates only that the advertising node does not support advertisement of this capability.

The considerations for advertising the ERLD are specified in [RFC8662].

If the ERLD-MSD Type is received in the Link MSD Sub-TLV, it MUST be ignored.

#### 5. Signaling ELC and ERLD in BGP-LS

The IS-IS extensions defined in this document can be advertised via BGP-LS (Distribution of Link-State and TE Information Using BGP) [RFC7752] using existing BGP-LS TLVs.

The ELC is advertised using the Prefix Attribute Flags TLV as defined in [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-ext].

The ERLD-MSD is advertised using the Node MSD TLV as defined in [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-msd].

#### 6. IANA Considerations

Early allocation has been done by IANA for this document as follows:

- Bit 3 in the Bit Values for Prefix Attribute Flags Sub-TLV registry has been assigned to the ELC Flag. IANA is asked to update the registry to reflect the name used in this document: ELC Flag (E-flag).
- Type 2 in the IGP MSD-Types registry has been assigned for the ERLD-MSD. IANA is asked to update the registry to reflect the name used in this document: ERLD-MSD.

## 7. Security Considerations

This document specifies the ability to advertise additional node capabilities using IS-IS and BGP-LS. As such, the security considerations as described in [RFC7981], [RFC7752], [RFC7794], [RFC8491], [RFC8662], [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-ext] and [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-msd] are applicable to this document.

Incorrectly setting the E flag during origination, propagation or redistribution may lead to poor or no load-balancing of the MPLS traffic or black-holing of the MPLS traffic on the egress node.

Incorrectly setting of the ERLD value may lead to poor or no load-balancing of the MPLS traffic.

## 8. Contributors

The following people contributed to the content of this document and should be considered as co-authors:

Gunter Van de Velde (editor)  
Nokia  
Antwerp  
BE

Email: [gunter.van\\_de\\_velde@nokia.com](mailto:gunter.van_de_velde@nokia.com)

Wim Henderickx  
Nokia  
Belgium

Email: [wim.henderickx@nokia.com](mailto:wim.henderickx@nokia.com)

Keyur Patel  
Arrcus  
USA

Email: [keyur@arrcus.com](mailto:keyur@arrcus.com)

## 9. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Yimin Shen, George Swallow, Acee Lindem, Les Ginsberg, Ketan Talaulikar, Jeff Tantsura, Bruno Decraene Carlos Pignataro, Wim Hendrickx, and Gunter Van De Velde for their valuable comments.

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

- [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-ext]  
Previdi, S., Talaulikar, K., Filsfils, C., Gredler, H.,  
and M. Chen, "BGP Link-State extensions for Segment  
Routing", draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-ext-16  
(work in progress), June 2019.
- [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-msd]  
Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Talaulikar, K., Mirsky, G.,  
and N. Triantafyllis, "Signaling MSD (Maximum SID Depth)  
using Border Gateway Protocol - Link State", draft-ietf-  
idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-msd-18 (work in progress), May  
2020.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate  
Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC5302] Li, T., Smit, H., and T. Przygienda, "Domain-Wide Prefix  
Distribution with Two-Level IS-IS", RFC 5302,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC5302, October 2008,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5302>>.
- [RFC6790] Kompella, K., Drake, J., Amante, S., Henderickx, W., and  
L. Yong, "The Use of Entropy Labels in MPLS Forwarding",  
RFC 6790, DOI 10.17487/RFC6790, November 2012,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6790>>.
- [RFC7752] Gredler, H., Ed., Medved, J., Previdi, S., Farrel, A., and  
S. Ray, "North-Bound Distribution of Link-State and  
Traffic Engineering (TE) Information Using BGP", RFC 7752,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC7752, March 2016,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7752>>.

- [RFC7794] Ginsberg, L., Ed., Decraene, B., Previdi, S., Xu, X., and U. Chunduri, "IS-IS Prefix Attributes for Extended IPv4 and IPv6 Reachability", RFC 7794, DOI 10.17487/RFC7794, March 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7794>>.
- [RFC7981] Ginsberg, L., Previdi, S., and M. Chen, "IS-IS Extensions for Advertising Router Information", RFC 7981, DOI 10.17487/RFC7981, October 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7981>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC8491] Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Aldrin, S., and L. Ginsberg, "Signaling Maximum SID Depth (MSD) Using IS-IS", RFC 8491, DOI 10.17487/RFC8491, November 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8491>>.
- [RFC8662] Kini, S., Kompella, K., Sivabalan, S., Litkowski, S., Shakir, R., and J. Tantsura, "Entropy Label for Source Packet Routing in Networking (SPRING) Tunnels", RFC 8662, DOI 10.17487/RFC8662, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8662>>.

## 10.2. Informative References

- [RFC8660] Bashandy, A., Ed., Filsfils, C., Ed., Previdi, S., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing with the MPLS Data Plane", RFC 8660, DOI 10.17487/RFC8660, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8660>>.
- [RFC8667] Previdi, S., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Ed., Filsfils, C., Bashandy, A., Gredler, H., and B. Decraene, "IS-IS Extensions for Segment Routing", RFC 8667, DOI 10.17487/RFC8667, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8667>>.

## Authors' Addresses

Xiaohu Xu  
Alibaba Inc

Email: [xiaohu.xxh@alibaba-inc.com](mailto:xiaohu.xxh@alibaba-inc.com)

Sriganesh Kini

Email: sriganeshkini@gmail.com

Peter Psenak  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Eurovea Centre, Central 3  
Pribinova Street 10  
Bratislava 81109  
Slovakia

Email: ppsenak@cisco.com

Clarence Filsfils  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Brussels  
Belgium

Email: cfilsfil@cisco.com

Stephane Litkowski  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
La Rigourdiere  
Cesson Sevigne  
France

Email: slitkows@cisco.com

Matthew Bocci  
Nokia  
Shoppenhangers Road  
Maidenhead, Berks  
UK

Email: matthew.bocci@nokia.com