

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 3 March 2023

H. Bidgoli, Ed.
Nokia
S. Venaas
Cisco System, Inc.
M. Mishra
Cisco System
Z. Zhang
Juniper Networks
M. McBride
Futurewei Technologies Inc.
30 August 2022

PIM Light
draft-hb-pim-light-03

Abstract

This document specifies a new Protocol Independent Multicast interface which does not need PIM Hello to accept PIM Join/Prunes or PIM Asserts.

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 3 March 2023.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Conventions used in this document	2
2.1. Definitions	3
3. PIM Light Interface	3
3.1. PLI supported Messages	3
3.1.1. PIM Sparse Mode	4
3.2. Lack of Hello Message considration	4
3.2.1. Join Attribute	4
3.2.2. DR Selection	4
3.3. PLI Configuration	5
3.4. Failures in PLR domain	5
4. IANA Considerations	5
5. Security Considerations	5
6. Acknowledgments	5
7. References	5
7.1. Normative References	5
7.2. Informative References	6
Authors' Addresses	6

1. Introduction

It might be desirable to create a PIM interface between routers where only PIM Join/Prunes packets are triggered over it without having a full PIM neighbor discovery. As an example, this type of PIM interface can be useful in some scenarios where the multicast state needs to be signaled over a network or medium which is not capable of or has no need for creating full PIM neighborship between its Peer Routers. These type of PIM interfaces are called PIM Light Interfaces (PLI).

2. Conventions used in this document

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.

2.1. Definitions

This draft uses definitions used in [RFC7761]

3. PIM Light Interface

RFC [RFC7761] section 4.3.1 describes the PIM neighbor discovery via Hello messages. It also describes that PIM Join/Prune are not accepted from a router unless a Hello message has been heard from that router.

In some scenarios it is desirable to communicate and build multicast states between two directly or non directly attach routers without establishing a PIM neighborhood. There could be many reasons for this desired, but one example is the desired to signal multicast states upstream, between two or more PIM Domains via a network or medium that is not optimized for PIM or does not require PIM Neighbor establishment. An example is a BIER network connecting multiple PIM domains. In these BIER networks PIM Join/prune messages are tunneled via bier as per [draft-ietf-bier-pim-signaling].

A PIM Light Interface (PLI) ONLY accepts Join/Prune messages from an unknown PIM router and it accepts these messages it without receiving a PIM Hello message from the router. Lack of Hello Messages on a PLI means there is no mechanism to learn about the neighboring PIM routers on each interface and their capabilities or run some of the basic algorithms like DR Priority between the routers. As such the router doesn't create any General-Purpose state for neighboring PIM and it only accepts and installs each Join message from upstream routers in its multicast routing table.

Because of this, a PLI needs to be created in very especial cases and the application that is using these PLIs should ensure there is no multicast duplication of packets. As an example, multiple upstream routers sending the same multicast stream to a single downstream router.

3.1. PLI supported Messages

As per IANA [iana_pim-parameters] pim currently supports 12 message types, PIM Light only supports message type 3 (Join/Prune). All other message types are not supported for PIM Light and should not be process if received on a PLR interface.

3.1.1. PIM Sparse Mode

Lack of register message on PLR means that, the Source, DR, RP all need to be in a common PIM domain and can not be connected over PLR. PLR will only processes join/prune regardless of if the join/prune is <S,G> or <*,G>.

3.2. Lack of Hello Message considration

The following should be considered on a PLR domain since hello messages are not processed.

3.2.1. Join Attribute

Since PLI does not process the pim hello message, processing of the join attributes option in pim hello as per [RFC5384] is also not supported, leaving PLRs unaware if their neighbors have the capability of processing the join attribute. A PLR that does not understand the type 1 Encoded-source Address, should not process a join message that contains it. Otherwise the PLR can process the Join Attribute accordingly.

3.2.2. DR Selection

Since DR selection is not supported on the PLR because of lack of hello messages, the network design should ensure that DR selection is achieve on the PIM domain, assuming the PLR domain is connecting PIM domains.

As an example, in a BIER domain which is connecting 2 PIM networks, a PLI can be used between the BIER edge routers. The PLI will be only used for multicast states communication, by transmitting ONLY PIM Join/prunes over the BIER domain. In this case to ensure there is no multicast stream duplication the PIM routers attached on each side of the BIER domain might want to establish PIM Adjacency via [RFC7761] to ensure DR selection on the edge of the BIER router, while PLI is used in the BIER domain, between BIER edge routers. When the Join or Prune message arrives from a PIM domain to the down stream BIER edge router, it can be send over the BIER tunnel to the upstream BIER edge router only via the selected designated router.

3.3. PLI Configuration

Since a PLI doesn't require PIM Hello Messages and PIM neighbor adjacency is not checked for join/prune messages, there needs to be a mechanism to enable PLI on interfaces for security purpose, while on some other interfaces this may be enabled automatically. An example of the latter is the logical interface for a BIER sub-domain [draft-ietf-bier-pim-signaling].

If a system explicitly needs a PLI to be configured, then this system should not accept the Join/Prune messages on interfaces that the PLI is not configured on, and it should drop these messages on a non PLI interface. If the system automatically enables PLI on some special interfaces, as an example interfaces facing a BIER domain, then it should accept Join/Prune messages on these interfaces only.

3.4. Failures in PLR domain

Because the hello messages are not processed on the PLI, some failures may not be discovered in PLI domain and multicast routes will not be pruned toward the source on the PIM domain, leaving the upstream routers continuously sending multicast streams.

Other protocols can be used to detect these failures in the PLR domain and they can be implementation specific. As an example, the interface that PLR is configured on can be protected via BFD or similar technology. If BFD to the far-end PLR goes down, and the PLR is upstream and is an OIF for a multicast route <S,G>, PIM should remove that PLR from its OIF list. In addition if upstream PLR is configured automatically, as an example in BIER case, when the downstream BFR is no longer reachable, the upstream PLR can prune the <S,G> advertised by that BFR, toward the source to stop the transmission of the multicast stream.

4. IANA Considerations

5. Security Considerations

6. Acknowledgments

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[draft-ietf-bier-pim-signaling]

"H.Bidgoli, F.XU, J. Kotalwar, I. Wijnands, M.Mishra, Z. Zhang, "PIM Signaling Through BIER Core"", July 2021.

[iana_pim-parameters]

"", January 2022.

[RFC2119] "S. Brandner, "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels"", March 1997.

[RFC5384] "A. Boers, I. Wijnands, E. Rosen "PIM Join Attribute Format"", March 2016.

[RFC7761] "B.Fenner, M.Handley, H. Holbrook, I. Kouvelas, R. Parekh, Z.Zhang "PIM Sparse Mode"", March 2016.

[RFC8174] "B. Leiba, "ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words"", May 2017.

7.2. Informative References

[RFC8279] "Wijnands, IJ., Rosen, E., Dolganow, A., Przygienda, T. and S. Aldrin, "Multicast using Bit Index Explicit Replication"", October 2016.

Authors' Addresses

Hooman Bidgoli (editor)
Nokia
Ottawa
Canada
Email: hooman.bidgoli@nokia.com

Stig
Cisco System, Inc.
San Jose,
United States of America
Email: stig@cisco.com

Mankamana Mishra
Cisco System
Milpitas,
United States of America
Email: mankamis@cisco.com

Zhaohui Zhang
Juniper Networks
Boston,
United States of America
Email: zzhang@juniper.com

Mike
Futurewei Technologies Inc.
Santa Clara,
United States of America
Email: michael.mcbride@futurewei.com