

# OSPF Operator Defined TLVs for Agile Service Deployment

(previous name self-defined TLVs)

#### draft-chunduri-ospf-operator-defined-tlvs-00

(previously: draft-chunduri-ospf-self-defined-sub-tlvs-03)

#### <u>Uma Chunduri</u>

Ericsson Inc

Xiaohu Xu

Huawei

Luis M. Contreras

**Telefonica** 

Mohamed Boucadair

France Telecom

OSPF WG, IETF 92, Dallas



# **OSPF** Operator Defined (OD) TLVs in RI LSA

# Why?

Operators can deploy services rapidly by advertising associated attributes without requiring of or not waiting long periods for standardization actions for those TLVs or sub-TLVs nor maintaining a global registry; hence meeting TTM objectives.

- Advertising Service Functions and their associated attributes
  - For service auto-discovery without the need of any standardization process while meeting the requirement of advertising service functions and their associated attributes
  - Each service can be identified by a dedicated sub-TLV type while the associated attributes/identifiers of the service are indicated by the value part of the corresponding sub-TLV
  - This also allows the controller to adjust its policies and react accordingly in a dynamical fashion
  - E.g., this attribute is consistent with <a href="http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-sfc-architecture-02">http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-sfc-architecture-02</a> that says: "No IANA registry is required to store the identity of SFs."
- To disseminate the node local information.
  - Critical information like energy efficiency, etc.



#### How?

Through new TLV in OSPF (OSPFv2, OSPFv3) RI Opaque LSA [RFC 4970]

#### Operator Defined (OD) TLV

0	1	2		3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	9012345	5 6 7 8 9 0 1	2 3 4 5 6 7	8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-	-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+
Typ	e	1	Length	1
+-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-	-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-	+-+-+-+
F	irst Operator	defined Sub-	TLV	1
0				0
				1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-+	-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+
//				//
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-+	-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+
Last	Operator de	fined Sub-TLV		1
0				0
				1
+-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-+	-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+

Operator defined TLV

- Type: request to IANA to allocate a TLV type code from OSPF Router Information (RI) TLVs Registry defined by [RFC4970]
- Flooding Scope: Depends on application



#### **OD Sub-TLV**

0	1	2	3	
0 1 2 3 4 5	6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	1 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	
+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-	-+-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-+-+	
1	Type	Le	ngth	
+-				
Att	ribute Length	Attribute Val	ue (variable)	
+-				
//			//	
+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-	-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-+	
Att	ribute Length	Attribute Val	ue (variable)	
+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-	-+-+-+-+-+-	+-+-+-+-+-+	

- TYPE (Per Local Policy), Length (Variable, Total length of value portion of the sub-TLV)
- The Value field contains one or more {Attribute-Len, Attribute-value} tuple
  - Attribute Len (2 bytes)

    For fixed formatting
  - Attribute Value Multi byte value MUST be encoded in NBO.
  - If multiple fixed length values have to be represented it SHOULD be represented with multiple 2-tuples {Attribute-Len, Attribute-value}.



# Properties of this TLV: Policy-driven and Deployment-specific

- The meaning of the Operator Defined sub-TLV is totally opaque to OSPF, but advertising is controlled through local policy engine.
- Routers advertising the OD sub-TLV are configured to do so without knowing (or even explicitly supporting) functionality implied by the sub-TLV.
- The interpretation of the OD sub-TLVs is deployment-specific.
- The meaning of a OD sub-TLV is defined by the network local policy and is controlled via configuration.
- How a receiving node communicates the OD sub-TLVs with the policy manager is outside the scope of this memo.



## Considerations On the Use of Separate Instance

- It's reasonable that non-routing information should be advertised in a non-routing instance of OSPF as defined in <a href="https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ospf-transport-instance-11">https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ospf-transport-instance-11</a> so as to minimize the impact on the operation of routing.
- However, since the information contained in the Operator Defined TLV may be related to the routing, whether or not using a non-routing instance to flood the OD TLVs should be determined by operators according to the information to be conveyed by the OD sub-TLV.



### Acknowledgements:

- Luay Jalil, Verizon for the review
- Chris Bowers, Juniper for detailed review and suggestions
- Thanks for Acee Lindem, Les Ginsberg, Peter Psenak, Cisco on earlier version's of the draft review and discussions.

#### Next Steps:

 Authors feel draft is ready and ask for call on the list regarding adoption as OSPF WG Document

Thank you!