

# Fast Notification Framework

draft-lu-fast-notification-framework

IETF 80 - Prague, Czech Republic

**March 27 – April 1, 2011**

Wenhu Lu, Albert Tian, Sriganesh Kini

# Update from IETF 79

- Clarification of Goals
- Development on Transport Methods
- Emerged applications

# Goals

- o Build infrastructure for quick dissemination of the bad news
  - namely link/node failures;
- o Fast notification to benefit its receivers in multiple ways
  - Enable them to perform actions which are otherwise either difficult or impossible;
  - Allow coordinated actions for better network-wide convergence
- o Not replacing IGP protocols, nor their flooding schemes.
  - But to serve them better

# Transport Methods

## Draft-lu-fn-transport-01.txt

1. Various methods were studied and evaluated
  - Tree based vs. non-tree based
  - Simplicity, flexibility, security, resilience
2. Some intermediate approach for
  - Quick prototyping
  - And concept proving
3. Ultimate goal for
  - Perfect coverage, reliability, easy of use,
  - And deployability

# List of Methods

1. Redundant trees
2. Unicast method
  - no forwarding change, for quick prototyping
3. Gated Multicast thru RPF check
  - Using existing SPT, RPF for loop prevention
4. PIM-BiDir
5. SPT-elect-root
6. Bridged-flooding
  - Non-tree based, permeate
7. Messaging
8. Auth

# Applications

- **draft-kini-ospf-fast-notification-01.txt**
  - a. The remote boxes become aware of the failure sooner
  - b. They use the earned time to do SPF and RIB/FIB downloading
  - c. Safety measures are taken
- **draft-csaszar-ipfrr-fn-00.txt**
  - a. redundant trees for fn, can survive node failure
  - b. a different approach for achieving ipfrr.
  - c. Only two trees, vs many trees: Not-via.

# Open topics

- Authentications
  - Area-wide vs link-scope
  - DoS attack (replay attack)
- Messaging
  - False alarm, sequence number
- Packet drop
  - Fn gets lost

# WG Adoption

- The Authors would like to request
  - The work group adoption of this draft



Thank You