

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: June 13, 2013

L. Zheng
Huawei Technologies
Z. Zhang
Juniper Networks
R. Parekh
Cisco Systems
December 10, 2012

Survey Report on PIM-SM Implementations and Deployments
draft-zzp-pim-rfc4601-update-survey-report-00.txt

Abstract

This document provides supporting documentation to advance the Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) routing protocol from IETF Proposed Standard to Internet Standard.

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 <http://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 June 13, 2013.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 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 (<http://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. Motivation	3
1.1. Overview of PIM-SM	3
1.2. RFC2026 and RFC6410 Requirements	3
2. Survey on Implementations and Deployments	4
2.1. Methodology	4
2.2. Operator Responses	4
2.2.1. Description of PIM Sparse-Mode deployments	4
2.2.2. PIM Sparse-Mode deployment with other multicast technologies	4
2.2.3. PIM Sparse-Mode RPs and RP Discovery mechanisms	4
2.3. Vendor Responses	5
2.3.1. RFC4601 and RFC2362 implementations	5
2.3.2. Lack of (*,*,RP) and PMBR implementations	5
2.3.3. Implementations of other features of RFC4601	5
2.4. Key Findings	6
3. Security Considerations	7
4. IANA Considerations	8
5. Acknowledgements	9
6. Appendix A. Questionnaire	10
6.1. Appendix A.1 PIM Survey for Operators	10
6.2. Appendix A.2 PIM Survey for Implementors	11
7. References	14
7.1. Normative References	14
7.2. Informative References	14
Authors' Addresses	15

1. Motivation

1.1. Overview of PIM-SM

PIM-SM was first published as [RFC2117] in 1997 and then again as [RFC2362] in 1998. The protocol was classified as Experimental in both of these documents. The PIM-SM protocol specification was then rewritten in whole and advanced to Proposed Standard as [RFC4601] in 2006. Considering its multiple independent implementations developed and sufficient successful operational experience gained, the IETF has decided to advance the PIM-SM routing protocol to Internet Standard.

1.2. RFC2026 and RFC6410 Requirements

[RFC2026] defines the stages in the standardization process, the requirements for moving a document between stages and the types of documents used during this process. Section 4.1.2 of [RFC2026] states that: "The requirement for at least two independent and interoperable implementations applies to all of the options and features of the specification. In cases in which one or more options or features have not been demonstrated in at least two interoperable implementations, the specification may advance to the Draft Standard level only if those options or features are removed."

[RFC6410] updates the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Standards Process defined in [RFC2026]. Primarily, it reduces the Standards Process from three Standards Track maturity levels to two. The second maturity level is a merger of Draft Standard and Standard as specified in [RFC2026]. Section 2.2 of [RFC6410] states that: "(1) There are at least two independent interoperating implementations with widespread deployment and successful operational experience. (3) There are no unused features in the specification that greatly increase implementation complexity."

Optional features which do not meet the foresaid criteria has been identified by the PIM Working Group and will be removed. This document intends to provide supporting documentation to advance the Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) routing protocol from IETF Proposed Standard to Draft Standard.

2. Survey on Implementations and Deployments

2.1. Methodology

A questionnaire had been issued by the PIM WG co-chairs and announced widely to the vendors and operational community to obtain information on PIM-SM implementations and deployments. The Survey concluded on 22nd Oct 2012. The responses will be kept strictly confidential and only combined results will be published. The raw questionnaire will be shown in Appendix A, and a detailed summary of the responses will be included in the following section.

2.2. Operator Responses

Nine operators responded to the survey. They are SWITCH, National Research Council Canada, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Motorola Solutions and five other anonymous operators.

2.2.1. Description of PIM Sparse-Mode deployments

In the last fourteen years, PIM-SM has been deployed for a wide variety of applications: Campus, Enterprise, Research and WAN networks, Broadband ISP and Digital TV. There are five deployments based on [RFC4601] implementation and two on [RFC2362] implementations. PIM-SM for IPv6 has been deployed by three operators. Out of the nine operators, six have deployed PIM-SM implementations from multiple vendors.

Operators reported minor inter-operability issues and these were addressed by the vendors. There was no major inter-operability concern reported by the operators.

2.2.2. PIM Sparse-Mode deployment with other multicast technologies

Except for one deployment of PIM Sparse-Mode with Multicast OSPF (MOSPF), all other operators have deployed PIM-SM exclusively. No operators acknowledged deployments of either (*,*,RP) or Pim Multicast Border Route (PMBR) for inter-connection between PIM Sparse-Mode and other multicast domains.

2.2.3. PIM Sparse-Mode RPs and RP Discovery mechanisms

The number of Sparse-Mode RPs deployed by operators range from a few (up to sixteen) to a massively scaled number (four hundred). Both static configuration and Bootstrap Router (BSR) have been deployed as RP discovery mechanisms.

Anycast-RP has been deployed for RP redundancy. Two operator have

deployed Anycast-RP using MSDP and three operators deploy both MSDP and PIM-SM Anycast-RP. The best common practice seems to be to use static-RP configuration with Anycast-RP for redundancy.

2.3. Vendor Responses

Eight vendors have reported PIM Sparse-Mode implementations. They are XORP, Huawei Technologies, Cisco Systems, Motorola Solutions, Juniper Networks and three other anonymous vendors.

2.3.1. RFC4601 and RFC2362 implementations

Four vendors have reported implementations based on [RFC4601] and two have implemented PIM Sparse-Mode based on [RFC2362]. Two implementations are hybrid.

Minor inter-operability issues have been addressed by the vendors over the years and no concern was reported by any vendor.

2.3.2. Lack of (*,*,RP) and PMBR implementations

Most vendors have not implemented (*,*,RP) state as specified in [RFC4601] either due to lack of deployment requirements or due to security concerns. Similarly, most vendors have also not implemented PMBR due to lack of deployment requirements or because it was considered to be too complex and non-scalable.

Only one vendor, XORP, reported (*,*,RP) and PMBR implementation and they were implemented just because these were part of the [RFC4601] specification.

2.3.3. Implementations of other features of RFC4601

Most vendors have implemented all of the following from [RFC4601] specifications:

- SSM
- Join Suppression
- Explicit tracking
- Register mechanism
- SPT switchover at last-hop router
- Assert mechanism

- Hashing of group to RP mappings

Some vendors do not implement explicit tracking and SSM.

2.4. Key Findings

1. PIM Sparse-Mode has been widely implemented and deployed for different applications. The PIM Sparse-Mode protocol is sufficiently well specified in RFC 4601 resulting in inter-operable implementation deployed by operators.

2. There are no deployments and only one known implementation of (*,*,RP) and PMBR as specified in RFC 4601. Hence, it is necessary to remove these features from the specification as required by [RFC2026] and [RFC6410]

3. Security Considerations

This document does not directly affect the security of the Internet.

4. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of the IANA.

5. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thanks Tim Chown and Bill Atwood who had helped to collect and anonymize the responses as the neutral third-party. Special thanks are also given to Alexander Gall, William F Maton Sotomayor, Steve Bauer, Sonum Mathur, Pavlin Radoslavov, Shuxue Fan, Sameer Gulrajani and to the anonymous responders.

6. Appendix A. Questionnaire

This appendix reproduces a questionnaire that was made available for operators and vendors to express their experience and considerations.

6.1. Appendix A.1 PIM Survey for Operators

Introduction:

PIM-SM was first published as RFC2117 in 1997 and then again as RFC2362 in 1998. The protocol was classified as Experimental in both of these documents. The PIM-SM protocol specification was then rewritten in whole and advanced to Proposed Standard as RFC4601 in 2006. Considering the multiple independent implementations developed and the successful operational experience gained, the IETF has decided to advance the PIM-SM routing protocol to Draft Standard. This survey intends to provide supporting documentation to advance the Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) routing protocol from IETF Proposed Standard to Draft Standard. (Due to RFC6410, now the intention is to progress it to Internet Standard. Draft Standard is no longer used.)

This survey is issued on behalf of the IETF PIM Working Group.

The responses will be collected by a neutral third-party and kept strictly confidential if requested in the response; only the final combined results will be published. Tim Chown and Bill Atwood have agreed to anonymize the response to this Questionnaire. They have a long experience with multicast but have no direct financial interest in this matter, nor ties to any of the vendors involved. Tim is working at University of Southampton, UK, and he has been active in the IETF for many years, including the mboned working group, and he is a co-chair of the 6renum working group. Bill is at Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, and he has been an active participant in the IETF pim working group for over ten years, especially in the area of security.

Please send questionnaire responses addressed to them both. The addresses are tjc@ecs.soton.ac.uk and william.atwood@concordia.ca. Please include the string "RFC4601 bis Questionnaire" in the subject field.

Before answering the questions, please complete the following background information.

Name of the Respondent:

Affiliation/Organization:

Contact Email:

Provide description of PIM deployment:

Do you wish to keep the information provided confidential:

Questions:

- 1 Have you deployed PIM-SM in your network?
- 2 How long have you had PIM-SM deployed in your network? Do you know if your deployment is based on the most recent RFC4601?
- 3 Have you deployed PIM-SM for IPv6 in your network?
- 4 Are you using equipment with different (multi-vendor) PIM-SM implementations for your deployment?
- 5 Have you encountered any inter-operability or backward-compatibility issues amongst differing implementations? If yes, what are your concerns about these issues?
- 6 Have you deployed both dense mode and sparse mode in your network? If yes, do you route between these modes using features such as *,*,RP or PMBR?
- 7 To what extent have you deployed PIM functionality, like BSR, SSM, and Explicit Tracking?
- 8 Which RP mapping mechanism do you use: Static, AutoRP, or BSR?
- 9 How many RPs have you deployed in your network?
- 10 If you use Anycast-RP, is it Anycast-RP using MSDP (RFC 3446) or Anycast-RP using PIM (RFC4610)?
- 11 Do you have any other comments on PIM-SM deployment in your network?

6.2. Appendix A.2 PIM Survey for Implementors

Introduction:

PIM-SM was first published as RFC2117 in 1997 and then again as RFC2362 in 1998. The protocol was classified as Experimental in both of these documents. The PIM-SM protocol specification was then rewritten in whole and advanced to Proposed Standard as RFC4601 in 2006. Considering the multiple independent implementations developed

and the successful operational experience gained, the IETF has decided to advance the PIM-SM routing protocol to Draft Standard. This survey intends to provide supporting documentation to advance the Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) routing protocol from IETF Proposed Standard to Draft Standard. (Due to RFC6410, now the intention is to progress it to Internet Standard. Draft Standard is no longer used.)

This survey is issued on behalf of the IETF PIM Working Group.

The responses will be collected by a neutral third-party and kept strictly confidential if requested in the response; only the final combined results will be published. Tim Chown and Bill Atwood have agreed to anonymize the response to this Questionnaire. They have a long experience with multicast but have no direct financial interest in this matter, nor ties to any of the vendors involved. Tim is working at University of Southampton, UK, and he has been active in the IETF for many years, including the mboned working group, and he is a co-chair of the 6renum working group. Bill is at Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, and he has been an active participant in the IETF pim working group for over ten years, especially in the area of security.

Please send questionnaire responses addressed to them both. The addresses are tjc@ecs.soton.ac.uk and william.atwood@concordia.ca. Please include the string "RFC 4601 bis Questionnaire" in the subject field.

Before answering the questions, please complete the following background information.

Name of the Respondent:

Affiliation/Organization:

Contact Email:

Provide description of PIM implementation:

Do you wish to keep the information provided confidential:

Questions:

1 Have you implemented PIM-SM?

2 Is the PIM-SM implementation based on RFC2362 or RFC4601?

3 Have you implemented (*,*, RP) state of RFC4601? What is the

rationale behind implementing or omitting (*,*,RP)?

4 Have you implemented the PMBR as specified in RFC4601 and RFC2715?
What is the rationale behind implementing or omitting PMBR?

5 Have you implemented other features and functions of RFC4601:

- SSM
- Join Suppression
- Explicit tracking
- Register mechanism
- SPT switchover at last-hop router
- Assert mechanism
- Hashing of group to RP mappings

6 Does your PIM-SM implementation support IPv6?

7 Have you encountered any inter-operability issues with other PIM implementations in trials or in the field?

8 Do you have any other comments or concerns about PIM-SM as specified in RFC4601?

7. References

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC4601] Fenner, B., Handley, M., Holbrook, H., and I. Kouvelas, "Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification (Revised)", RFC 4601, August 2006.

7.2. Informative References

- [RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, October 1996.
- [RFC2117] Estrin, D., Farinacci, D., Helmy, A., Thaler, D., Deering, S., Handley, M., Jacobson, V., Liu, C., Sharma, P., and L. Wei, "Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification", RFC 2117, June 1997.
- [RFC2362] Estrin, D., Farinacci, D., Helmy, A., Thaler, D., Deering, S., Handley, M., and V. Jacobson, "Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification", RFC 2362, June 1998.
- [RFC6410] Housley, R., Crocker, D., and E. Burger, "Reducing the Standards Track to Two Maturity Levels", BCP 9, RFC 6410, October 2011.

Authors' Addresses

Lianshu Zheng
Huawei Technologies
China

Email: vero.zheng@huawei.com

Zhaohui Zhang
Juniper Networks
USA

Email: zzhang@juniper.net

Rishabh Parekh
Cisco Systems
USA

Email: riparekh@cisco.com

