

LFA selection for Multi-homed Prefixes

draft-psarkar-rtgwg-multihomed-prefix-lfa-00

Pushpasis Sarkar psarkar@juniper.net
Shraddha Hegde shraddha@juniper.net
Hannes Gredler hannes@juniper.net
Chris Bowers cbowers@juniper.net

Agenda

- Background
- Motivation
- LFA selection for Internal MHPs
- LFA selection for External MHPs

Background

- MHP (Multi-Homed-Prefix)
 - Sourced from network devices outside the current IGP domain.
 - Mostly re-originated by multiple border routers.
- Use Cases of MHP
 - Increase Coverage for FRR
 - Tail-end Protection

Motivations

- Lack of specific inequalities for MHPs
 - Different scenarios need different handling
 - Specially external MHPs.
 - Erroneous implementations
 - Less coverage than feasible.
 - Backup path chosen may still loop.
- Share experience gained from existing implementations and provide future guidance
 - Propose MHP LFA inequalities
 - For all types of MHPs
 - Internal Prefixes
 - External Prefixes
 - For all applicable protocols (ISIS, OSPF)

Notations

- P - The Multi-homed prefix being evaluated.
- S - The computing router
- N - The alternate router being evaluated
- E - The primary next-hop on shortest path from S to MHP prefix P.
- PO_i - The specific prefix-originating router being evaluated.
- PO_{best} - The prefix-originating router on the shortest path from the computing router S to prefix P.
- Cost (X,P) - Cost of reaching the prefix P from prefix originating node X.
- D_{opt}(X,Y) - Distance on the shortest path from node X to node Y.

Inequalities for Internal MHPs

- Link-Protection:

$$D_{\text{opt}}(N, PO_i) + \text{Cost}(PO_i, P) < \\ D_{\text{opt}}(N, S) + D_{\text{opt}}(S, PO_{\text{best}}) + \text{Cost}(PO_{\text{best}}, P)$$

- Link-Protection + Downstream-paths-only:

$$D_{\text{opt}}(N, PO_i) + \text{Cost}(PO_i, P) < \\ D_{\text{opt}}(S, PO_{\text{best}}) + \text{Cost}(PO_{\text{best}}, P)$$

- Node-Protection:

$$D_{\text{opt}}(N, PO_i) + \text{Cost}(PO_i, P) < \\ D_{\text{opt}}(N, E) + D_{\text{opt}}(E, PO_{\text{best}}) + \text{Cost}(PO_{\text{best}}, P)$$

LFA Selection for External MHPs

- ISIS
 - Same as LFA selection for internal MHPs
- OSPF
 - Multiple Considerations to *select and trim alternate ASBRs*
 - *RFC1583Compatibility* is required or not
 - *Cost Type* advertised by the ASBR
 - *Route-type* advertised by the ASBR
 - Primary ASBR and Alternate ASBR *belonging to different areas*
 - ASBR is permitted as per the *pruning rules of OSPF* [RFC2328 section 16.4.1].
 - Apply Inequalities on selected ASBRs.

OSPF Inequalities for External MHPs

Forwarding Address set to non-zero

- Link-Protection:

$$F_{opt}(N, PO_i) + Cost(PO_i, P) < D_{opt}(N, S) + F_{opt}(S, PO_{best}) + Cost(PO_{best}, P)$$

- Link-Protection + Downstream-paths-only:

$$F_{opt}(N, PO_i) + Cost(PO_i, P) < F_{opt}(S, PO_{best}) + Cost(PO_{best}, P)$$

- Node-Protection:

$$F_{opt}(N, PO_i) + Cost(PO_i, P) < D_{opt}(N, E) + F_{opt}(E, PO_{best}) + Cost(PO_{best}, P)$$

$F_{opt}(X, Y)$ - Distance on the shortest path from node X to Forwarding address specified by ASBR Y.

OSPF Inequalities for External MHPs

ASBRs advertising Type 1 and Type 2

- Link-Protection:

$$D_{\text{opt}}(N, \text{PO}_i) + \text{Cost}(\text{PO}_i, P) < \\ D_{\text{opt}}(N, S) + D_{\text{opt}}(S, \text{PO}_{\text{best}}) + \text{Cost}(\text{PO}_{\text{best}}, P)$$

- Link-Protection + Downstream-paths-only:

$$D_{\text{opt}}(N, \text{PO}_i) + \text{Cost}(\text{PO}_i, P) < \\ D_{\text{opt}}(S, \text{PO}_{\text{best}}) + \text{Cost}(\text{PO}_{\text{best}}, P)$$

- Node-Protection:

$$D_{\text{opt}}(N, \text{PO}_i) + \text{Cost}(\text{PO}_i, P) < \\ D_{\text{opt}}(N, E) + D_{\text{opt}}(E, \text{PO}_{\text{best}}) + \text{Cost}(\text{PO}_{\text{best}}, P)$$

Next Steps

- Invite members review and feedback
- Questions ?
- Adoption as a WG draft ?