

BIER WG  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: December 14, 2017

Fangwei. Hu  
Ran. Chen  
ZTE Corporation  
R. Gu  
China Mobile  
June 12, 2017

YANG Data Model for BIER OAM  
draft-hu-bier-oam-yang-01.txt

Abstract

This document defines YANG data model for Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER) Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM). It extends from the basic YANG data model for Layer independent OAM Management defined in [I-D.ietf-lime-yang-connectionless-oam] with BIER technology specifics. It includes BIER OAM related configuration and state.

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 December 14, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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. Introduction . . . . .	2
2. Conventions and Terminology . . . . .	2
2.1. Conventions . . . . .	3
2.2. Terminologies . . . . .	4
3. Architecture of OAM YANG Model and Relationship to BIER OAM . . . . .	4
4. BIER Extensions to LIME connectionless YANG Model . . . . .	5
4.1. Test Point Locations . . . . .	5
5. BIER OAM YANG Data Design . . . . .	5
6. BIER OAM YANG model . . . . .	6
7. Security Considerations . . . . .	8
8. Acknowledgements . . . . .	8
9. IANA Considerations . . . . .	9
10. Normative References . . . . .	9
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	10

## 1. Introduction

YANG [RFC6020] is a data modeling language used to model configuration and state data manipulated by the Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF) [RFC6241], NETCONF remote procedure calls (RPC), and NETCONF notifications. This document defines the YANG data model for Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER)OAM [I-D.ietf-bier-ping]. The BIER OAM YANG module involves the OAM configuration, and notifications, etc.

Currently, [I-D.ietf-lime-yang-connectionless-oam] proposes a basic YANG data model for technology-independent abstraction of key OAM constructs for connectionless protocols. BIER OAM YANG data model can be defined by directly extending the basic model with BIER technology specifics. It can bring some obvious benefits such as unified format, reusable parts, and correlation of defects, faults, network failure at the specific layer.

In addition, various components in the BIER technology specific YANG data model defined in [I-D.ietf-bier-bier-yang] can be directly reused in this draft to define the BIER OAM YANG data model.

## 2. Conventions and Terminology

## 2.1. Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

The following terms are defined in [RFC6241] and are not redefined here:

- o client
- o configuration data
- o server
- o state data

The following terms are defined in [RFC6020] and are not redefined here:

- o augment
- o data model
- o data node

The terminology for describing YANG data models is found in [RFC6020].

The following notations are used within the data tree and carry the meaning as noted below.

Each node is printed as:

```
<status> <flags> <name> <opts> <type>
```

<status> is one of:

- + for current
- x for deprecated
- o for obsolete

<flags> is one of:

- rw for configuration data
- ro for non-configuration data
- x for rpcs
- n for notifications

<name> is the name of the node

If the node is augmented into the tree from another module, its name is printed as <prefix>:<name>.

<opts> is one of:

- ? for an optional leaf or choice
- ! for a presence container
- \* for a leaf-list or list
- [<keys>] for a list's keys

<type> is the name of the type for leafs and leaf-lists

In this document, these words will appear with that interpretation only when in ALL CAPS. Lower case uses of these words are not to be interpreted as carrying RFC2119 significance.

## 2.2. Terminologies

BFR-ID: Bit-Forwarding Router identify [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]

BIER: Bit Index Explicit Replication[I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]

BSL: Bit String Length [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]

LIME: Layer Independent OAM Management  
[I-D.ietf-lime-yang-connectionless-oam]

OAM: Operations, Administration, and Maintenance [RFC6291]

## 3. Architecture of OAM YANG Model and Relationship to BIER OAM

Layer independent OAM YANG model

[I-D.ietf-lime-yang-connectionless-oam] is used as the basis for all the other connectionless OAM YANG models. This allows users to span across OAM tools of different technologies through a uniform API. The following Figure depicts the relationship of BIER OAM YANG model to the Layer Independent OAM YANG Model.



```

module: ietf-bier-oam
  augment /nd:networks/nd:network/nd:node/coam:location-type/coam:ip-prefix-location-type/coam:test-point-ip-prefix-location-list/coam:test-point-locations:
    +--rw bier-test-point-location-list
      +--rw test-point-locations* [bier-bsl bier-subdomainid bier-bfrid]
        +--rw bier-bsl          bier-bsl
        +--rw bier-subdomainid  bier-subdomainid
        +--rw bier-bfrid        bier-bfrid
  augment /nd:networks/nd:network/nd:node/coam:location-type/coam:ip-prefix-location-type/coam:test-point-ip-prefix-location-list/coam:test-point-locations/coam:technology:
    +---:(bier-oam-string)
      +--rw bier-icmp?  string

```

## 6. BIER OAM YANG model

```

<CODE BEGINS> file "ietf-bier-oam@2017-06-13.yang"
module ietf-bier-oam {
  namespace "urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-bier-oam";
  prefix bieroam;

  import ietf-bier {
    prefix bier;
  }

  import ietf-connectionless-oam {
    prefix coam;
  }
  import ietf-network {
    prefix nd;
  }

  organization
    "IETF BIER(Bit Indexed Explicit Replication ) Working Group";

  contact
    "WG List: <mailto:bier@ietf.org>
    WG Chair: Tony Przygienda
               <mailto:tonysietf@gmail.com>
    WG Chair: Greg Shepherd
               <mailto:gjshep@gmail.com>
    Editor:   Fangwei Hu
               <mailto:hu.fangwei@zte.com.cn>
    Editor:   Ran Chen
               <mailto:chen.ran@zte.com.cn>
    Editor:   Rong Gu
               <mailto:gurong@chinamobile.com>
    ";

  description

```

```
    "The YANG module defines BIER OAM data model.";

    revision 2016-12-05{
    description
        "00 revision";
    reference
        "draft-hu-bier-oam-yang-00";
    }

    revision 2017-06-12{
    description
        "01 revision,remove the OAM Layer part.";
    reference
        "draft-hu-bier-oam-yang-01";
    }

    typedef bier-bsl {
    type leafref {
        path "/bier:bier/bier:bier-global/bier:sub-domain/bier:bitstring
length";
    }
    description "bsl type";
    }

    typedef bier-subdomainid {
    type leafref {
        path "/bier:bier/bier:bier-global/bier:sub-domain/bier:sub-domai
n-id";
    }
    description "sub-domain-id type";
    }

    typedef bier-bfrid {
    type leafref {
        path "/bier:bier/bier:bier-global/bier:sub-domain/bier:bfr-id";
    }
    description "bfr-id type";
    }

    identity bier-type {
    base coam:tp-address-type;
    description "bier type";
    }

    augment "/nd:networks/nd:network/nd:node/coam:location-type/coam:ip-prefix-
location-type"
        +"/coam:test-point-ip-prefix-location-list/coam:test-point-locations" {
        container bier-test-point-location-list {
            list test-point-locations {
                key "bier-bsl bier-subdomainid bier-bfrid";
            }
        }
    }
```

```

        leaf bier-bsl {
            type bier-bsl;
            description "bier bsl";
        }

        leaf bier-subdomainid {
            type bier-subdomainid;
            description "bier sub-domain id";
        }

        leaf bier-bfrid {
            type bier-bfrid;
            description "bfr id";
        }

        description "test point locations list ";
    }
    description "bier-test-point-location-list";
}
description "bier-location-type";
}

augment "/nd:networks/nd:network/nd:node/coam:location-type/coam:ip-prefix-
location-type"
+ "/coam:test-point-ip-prefix-location-list/coam:test-point-locations/co
am:technology" {
    case bier-oam-string{
        leaf bier-icmp{
            type string;
            description
                "bier icmp";
        }
        description "bier oam icmp case.";
    }
    description "bier icmp technology.";
}
}
<CODE ENDS>

```

## 7. Security Considerations

TBD.

## 8. Acknowledgements

TBD.



## 9. IANA Considerations

TBD.

## 10. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]

Wijnands, I., Rosen, E., Dolganow, A., Przygienda, T., and S. Aldrin, "Multicast using Bit Index Explicit Replication", draft-ietf-bier-architecture-06 (work in progress), April 2017.

[I-D.ietf-bier-bier-yang]

Chen, R., hu, f., Zhang, Z., dai.xianxian@zte.com.cn, d., and M. Sivakumar, "YANG Data Model for BIER Protocol", draft-ietf-bier-bier-yang-01 (work in progress), January 2017.

[I-D.ietf-bier-ping]

Kumar, N., Pignataro, C., Akiya, N., Zheng, L., Chen, M., and G. Mirsky, "BIER Ping and Trace", draft-ietf-bier-ping-01 (work in progress), January 2017.

[I-D.ietf-lime-yang-connectionless-oam]

Kumar, D., Wang, Z., Wu, Q., Rahman, R., and S. Raghavan, "Generic YANG Data Model for Connectionless Operations, Administration, and Maintenance(OAM) protocols", draft-ietf-lime-yang-connectionless-oam-06 (work in progress), June 2017.

[RFC6020] Bjorklund, M., Ed., "YANG - A Data Modeling Language for the Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF)", RFC 6020, DOI 10.17487/RFC6020, October 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6020>>.

[RFC6241] Enns, R., Ed., Bjorklund, M., Ed., Schoenwaelder, J., Ed., and A. Bierman, Ed., "Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF)", RFC 6241, DOI 10.17487/RFC6241, June 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6241>>.

[RFC6291] Andersson, L., van Helvoort, H., Bonica, R., Romascanu, D., and S. Mansfield, "Guidelines for the Use of the "OAM" Acronym in the IETF", BCP 161, RFC 6291, DOI 10.17487/RFC6291, June 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6291>>.

Authors' Addresses

Fangwei Hu  
ZTE Corporation  
No.889 Bibo Rd  
Shanghai 201203  
China

Phone: +86 21 68896273  
Email: hu.fangwei@zte.com.cn

Ran Chen  
ZTE Corporation  
No.50 Software Avenue, Yuhuatai District  
Nanjing, Jiangsu Province 210012  
China

Phone: +86 025 88014636  
Email: chen.ran@zte.com.cn

Rong Gu  
China Mobile  
32 Xuanwumen West Ave, Xincheng District  
Beijing 100053  
China

Email: gurong@chinamobile.com

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: September 10, 2017

P. Pfister  
IJ. Wijnands  
S. Venaas  
Cisco Systems  
C. Wang  
Z. Zhang  
ZTE Corporation  
M. Stenberg  
March 9, 2017

BIER Ingress Multicast Flow Overlay using Multicast Listener Discovery  
Protocols  
draft-pfister-bier-mld-03

Abstract

This document specifies the ingress part of a multicast flow overlay for BIER networks. Using existing multicast listener discovery protocols, it enables multicast membership information sharing from egress routers, acting as listeners, toward ingress routers, acting as queriers. Ingress routers keep per-egress-router state, used to construct the BIER bit mask associated with IP multicast packets entering the BIER domain.

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 September 10, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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. Introduction . . . . .	2
2. Terminology . . . . .	3
3. Overview . . . . .	3
4. Applicability Statement . . . . .	4
5. Querier and Listener Specifications . . . . .	4
5.1. Configuration Parameters . . . . .	5
5.2. MLDv2 instances. . . . .	5
5.2.1. Sending Queries . . . . .	6
5.2.2. Sending Reports . . . . .	6
5.2.3. Receiving Queries . . . . .	6
5.2.4. Receiving Reports . . . . .	7
5.3. Packet Forwarding . . . . .	7
6. Security Considerations . . . . .	7
7. IANA Considerations . . . . .	8
8. Acknowledgements . . . . .	8
9. References . . . . .	8
9.1. Normative References . . . . .	8
9.2. Informative References . . . . .	9
Appendix A. BIER Use Case in Data Centers . . . . .	9
A.1. Convention and Terminology . . . . .	11
A.2. BIER in data centers . . . . .	11
A.3. A BIER MLD solution for Virtual Network information . . . . .	12
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	13

## 1. Introduction

The Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER - [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]) forwarding technique enables IP multicast transport across a BIER domain. When receiving or originating a packet, ingress routers have to construct a bit mask indicating which BIER egress routers located within the same BIER domain will receive the packet. A stateless approach would consist in forwarding all incoming packets toward all egress routers, which would in turn make a forwarding decision based on local information. But any more efficient approach would require ingress routers to keep some state about egress routers multicast membership information,

hence requiring state sharing from egress routers toward ingress routers.

This document specifies how to use the Multicast Listener Discovery protocol version 2 [RFC3810] (resp. the Internet Group Management protocol version 3 [RFC3376]) as the ingress part of a BIER multicast flow overlay (BIER layering is described in [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]) for IPv6 (resp. IPv4). It enables multicast membership information sharing from egress routers, acting as listeners, toward ingress routers, acting as queriers. Ingress routers keep per-egress-router state, used to construct the BIER bit mask associated with IP multicast packets entering the BIER domain.

This specification is applicable to both IP version 4 and version 6. It therefore specifies two separate mechanisms operating independently. For the sake of simplicity, the rest of this document uses IPv6 terminology. It can be applied to IPv4 by replacing 'MLDv2' with 'IGMPv3', and following specific requirements when explicitly stated.

## 2. Terminology

In this document, the key words "MAY", "MUST", "MUST NOT", "RECOMMENDED", and "SHOULD", are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

The terms "Bit-Forwarding Router" (BFR), "Bit-Forwarding Egress Router" (BFER), "Bit-Forwarding Ingress Router" (BFIR), "BFR-id" and "BFR-Prefix" are to be interpreted as described in [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture].

Additionally, the following definitions are used:

**BIER Multicast Listener Discovery (BMLD):** The modified version of MLD specified in this document.

**BMLD Querier:** A BFR implementing the Querier part of this specification. A BMLD Node MAY be both a Querier and a Listener.

**BMLD Listener:** A BFR implementing the Listener part of this specification. A BMLD Node MAY be both a Querier and a Listener.

## 3. Overview

This document proposes to use the mechanisms described in MLDv2 in order to enable multicast membership information sharing from BFERs toward BFIRs within a given BIER domain. BMLD queries (resp. reports) are sent over BIER toward all BMLD Nodes (resp. BMLD

Queriers) using modified MLDv2 messages which IP destination is set to a configured 'all BMLD Nodes' (resp. 'all BMLD Queriers') IP multicast address.

By running MLDv2 instances with per-listener explicit tracking, BMLD Queriers are able to map BMLD Listeners with MLDv2 membership states. This state is then used to construct the set of BFERs associated with each incoming IP multicast data packet.

#### 4. Applicability Statement

BMLD runs on top of a BIER Layer and provides the ingress part of a BIER multicast flow overlay, i.e, it specifies how BFIRs construct the set of BFERs for each ingress IP multicast data packet. The BFER part of the Multicast Flow Overlay is out of scope of this document.

The BIER Layer MUST be able to transport BMLD messages toward all BMLD Queriers and Listeners. Such packets are IP multicast packets with a BFR-Prefix as source address, a multicast destination address, and containing a MLDv2 message.

BMLD only requires state to be kept by Queriers, and is therefore more scalable than PIMv2 [RFC7761] in terms of overall state, but is also likely to be less scalable than PIMv2 in terms of the amount of control traffic and the size of the state that is kept by individual routers.

This specification is applicable to both IP version 4 and version 6. It therefore specifies two separate mechanisms operating independently. For the sake of simplicity, this document uses IPv6 terminology. It can be applied to IPv4 by replacing 'MLDv2' with 'IGMPv3', and following specific requirements when explicitly stated.

#### 5. Querier and Listener Specifications

Routers desiring to receive IP multicast traffic (e.g., for their own use, or for forwarding) MUST behave as BMLD Listeners. Routers receiving IP multicast traffic from outside the BIER domain, or originating multicast traffic, MUST behave as BMLD Queriers.

BMLD Queriers (resp. BMLD Listeners) MUST act as MLDv2 Queriers (resp. MLDv2 Listeners) as specified in [RFC3810] unless stated otherwise in this section.

### 5.1. Configuration Parameters

Both Queriers and Listeners MUST operate as BFIRs and BFERs within the BIER domain in order to send and receive BMLD messages. They MUST therefore be configured accordingly, as specified in [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture].

All Listeners MUST be configured with a 'all BMLD Queriers' multicast address and the BFR-ids of all the BMLD Queriers. This is used by Listeners to send BMLD reports over BIER toward all Queriers. All Queriers MUST be configured to accept BMLD reports sent to this address.

All Queriers MUST be configured with a 'all BMLD Nodes' multicast address and the BFR-ids of all the Queriers and Listeners. This information is used by Queriers to send BMLD queries over BIER toward all BMLD Nodes. All BMLD Nodes MUST be configured to accept BMLD queries sent to this address.

Note that BMLD (unlike MLDv2) makes use of per-instance configured multicast group addresses rather than well-known addresses so that multiple instances of BMLD (using different group addresses) can be run simultaneously within the same BIER domain. Configured group addresses MAY be obtained from allocated IP prefixes using [RFC3306]. One MAY choose to use the well-known MLDv2 addresses in one instance, but different instances MUST use different addresses.

IP packets coming from outside of the BIER domain and having a destination address set to the configured 'all BMLD Queriers' or the 'all BMLD Nodes' group address MUST be dropped. It is RECOMMENDED that these configured addresses have a limited scope, enforcing this behavior by scope-based filtering on BIER domain's egress interfaces.

### 5.2. MLDv2 instances.

BMLD Queriers MUST run a MLDv2 Querier instance with per-host tracking, which means they keep track of the MLDv2 state associated with each BMLD Listener. For that purpose, Listeners are identified by their respective BFR-Prefix, used as IP source address in all BMLD reports.

BMLD Listeners MUST run a MLDv2 Listener instance expressing their interest in the multicast traffic they are supposed to receive for local use or forwarding.

BMLD Listeners and Queriers MUST NOT run the MLDv1 (IGMPv2 and IGMPv1 for IPv4) backward compatibility procedures.

### 5.2.1. Sending Queries

BMLD Queries are IP packets sent over BIER by BMLD Queriers:

- o Toward all BMLD Nodes (i.e., providing to the BIER Layer the BFR-ids of all BMLD Nodes).
- o Without the IPv6 router alert option [RFC2711] in the hop-by-hop extension header [RFC2460] (or the IPv4 router alert option [RFC2113] for IPv4).
- o With the IP destination address set to the 'all BMLD Nodes' group address.
- o With the IP source address set to the BFR-Prefix of the sender.
- o With a TTL value great enough such that the packet can be received by all BMLD Nodes, depending on the underlying BIER layer (whether it decrements the IP TTL or not) and the size of the network. The default value is 64.

### 5.2.2. Sending Reports

BMLD Reports are IP packets sent over BIER by BMLD Listeners:

- o Toward all BMLD Queriers (i.e., providing to the BIER layer the BFR-ids of all BMLD Queriers).
- o Without the IPv6 router alert option [RFC2711] in the hop-by-hop extension header [RFC2460] (or the IPv4 router alert option [RFC2113] for IPv4).
- o With the IP destination address set to the 'all BMLD Queriers' group address.
- o With the IP source address set to the BFR-Prefix of the sender.
- o With a TTL value great enough such that the packet can be received by all BMLD Queriers, depending on the underlying BIER layer (whether it decrements the IP TTL or not) and the size of the network. The default value is 64.

### 5.2.3. Receiving Queries

BMLD Queriers and Listeners MUST check the destination address of all the IP packets that are received or forwarded over BIER whenever their own BIER bit is set in the packet. If the destination address



is equal to the 'all BMLD Nodes' group address the packet is processed as specified in this section.

If the IPv6 (resp. IPv4) packet contains an ICMPv6 (resp. IGMP) message of type 'Multicast Listener Query' (resp. of type 'Membership Query'), it is processed by the MLDv2 (resp. IGMPv3) instance run by the BMLD Querier. It MUST be dropped otherwise.

During the MLDv2 processing, the packet MUST NOT be checked against the MLDv2 consistency conditions (i.e., the presence of the router alert option, the TTL equaling 1 and, for IPv6 only, the source address being link-local).

#### 5.2.4. Receiving Reports

BMLD Queriers MUST check the destination address of all the IP packets that are received or forwarded over BIER whenever their own BIER bit is set. If the destination address is equal to the 'all BMLD Queriers' the packet is processed as specified in this section.

If the IPv6 (resp. IPv4) packet contains an ICMPv6 (resp. IGMP) message of type 'Multicast Listener Report Message v2' (resp. 'Version 3 Membership Report'), it is processed by the MLDv2 (resp. IGMPv3) instance run by the BMLD Querier. It MUST be dropped otherwise.

During the MLDv2 processing, the packet MUST NOT be checked against the MLDv2 consistency conditions (i.e., the presence of the router alert option, the TTL equaling 1 and, for IPv6 only, the source address being link-local).

#### 5.3. Packet Forwarding

BMLD Queriers configure the BIER Layer using the information obtained using BMLD, which associates BMLD Listeners (identified by their BFR-Prefixes) with their respective MLDv2 membership state.

More specifically, the MLDv2 state associated with each BMLD Listener is provided to the BIER layer such that whenever a multicast packet enters the BIER domain, if that packet matches the membership information from a BMLD Listener, its BFR-id is added to the set of BFR-ids the packet should be forwarded to by the BIER-Layer.

#### 6. Security Considerations

BMLD makes use of IP MLDv2 messages transported over BIER in order to configure the BIER Layer of BFIRs. BMLD messages MUST be secured, either by relying on physical or link-layer security, by securing the

IP packets (e.g., using IPSec [RFC4301]), or by relying on security features provided by the BIER Layer.

Whenever an attacker would be able to spoof the identity of a router, it could:

- o Redirect undesired traffic toward the spoofed router by subscribing to undesired multicast traffic.
- o Prevent desired multicast traffic from reaching the spoofed router by unsubscribing to some desired multicast traffic.

## 7. IANA Considerations

This specification does not require any action from IANA.

## 8. Acknowledgements

Comments concerning this document are very welcome.

## 9. References

### 9.1. Normative References

- [RFC2113] Katz, D., "IP Router Alert Option", RFC 2113, DOI 10.17487/RFC2113, February 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2113>>.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3376] Cain, B., Deering, S., Kouvelas, I., Fenner, B., and A. Thyagarajan, "Internet Group Management Protocol, Version 3", RFC 3376, DOI 10.17487/RFC3376, October 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3376>>.
- [RFC3810] Vida, R., Ed. and L. Costa, Ed., "Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6", RFC 3810, DOI 10.17487/RFC3810, June 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3810>>.
- [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]  
Wijnands, I., Rosen, E., Dolganow, A., Przygienda, T., and S. Aldrin, "Multicast using Bit Index Explicit Replication", draft-ietf-bier-architecture-05 (work in progress), October 2016.

## 9.2. Informative References

- [RFC2460] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", RFC 2460, DOI 10.17487/RFC2460, December 1998, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2460>>.
- [RFC2711] Partridge, C. and A. Jackson, "IPv6 Router Alert Option", RFC 2711, DOI 10.17487/RFC2711, October 1999, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2711>>.
- [RFC3306] Haberman, B. and D. Thaler, "Unicast-Prefix-based IPv6 Multicast Addresses", RFC 3306, DOI 10.17487/RFC3306, August 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3306>>.
- [RFC4301] Kent, S. and K. Seo, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", RFC 4301, DOI 10.17487/RFC4301, December 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4301>>.
- [RFC5015] Handley, M., Kouvelas, I., Speakman, T., and L. Vicisano, "Bidirectional Protocol Independent Multicast (BIDIR-PIM)", RFC 5015, DOI 10.17487/RFC5015, October 2007, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5015>>.
- [RFC7348] Mahalingam, M., Dutt, D., Duda, K., Agarwal, P., Kreeger, L., Sridhar, T., Bursell, M., and C. Wright, "Virtual eXtensible Local Area Network (VXLAN): A Framework for Overlaying Virtualized Layer 2 Networks over Layer 3 Networks", RFC 7348, DOI 10.17487/RFC7348, August 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7348>>.
- [RFC7365] Lasserre, M., Balus, F., Morin, T., Bitar, N., and Y. Rekhter, "Framework for Data Center (DC) Network Virtualization", RFC 7365, DOI 10.17487/RFC7365, October 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7365>>.
- [RFC7761] Fenner, B., Handley, M., Holbrook, H., Kouvelas, I., Parekh, R., Zhang, Z., and L. Zheng, "Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification (Revised)", STD 83, RFC 7761, DOI 10.17487/RFC7761, March 2016, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7761>>.

## Appendix A. BIER Use Case in Data Centers

In current data center virtualization, virtual eXtensible Local Area Network (VXLAN) [RFC7348] is a kind of network virtualization overlay technology which is overlaid between NVEs and is intended for multi-tenancy data center networks, whose reference architecture is illustrated as per Figure 1.




Figure 1: NVO3 Architecture

And there are two kinds of most common methods about how to forward BUM packets in this virtualization overlay network. One is using PIM as underlay multicast routing protocol to build explicit multicast distribution tree, such as PIM-SM [RFC7761] or PIM-BIDIR [RFC5015] multicast routing protocol. Then, when BUM packets arrive at NVE, it requires NVE to have a mapping between the VXLAN Network Identifier and the IP multicast group. According to the mapping, NVE can encapsulate BUM packets in a multicast packet which group address is the mapping IP multicast group address and steer them through explicit multicast distribution tree to the destination NVEs. This method has two serious drawbacks. It need the underlay network supports complicated multicast routing protocol and maintains multicast related per-flow state in every transit nodes. What is more, how to configure the ratio of the mapping between VNI and IP multicast group is also an issue. If the ratio is 1:1, there should be 16M multicast groups in the underlay network at maximum to map to the 16M VNIs, which is really a significant challenge for the data center devices. If the ratio is n:1, it would result in inefficiency bandwidth utilization which is not optimal in data center networks.

The other method is using ingress replication to require each NVE to create a mapping between the VXLAN Network Identifier and the remote addresses of NVEs which belong to the same virtual network. When NVE receives BUM traffic from the attached tenant, NVE can encapsulate these BUM packets in unicast packets and replicate them and tunnel them to different remote NVEs respectively. Although this method can eliminate the burden of running multicast protocol in the underlay network, it has a significant disadvantage: large waste of bandwidth, especially in big-sized data center where there are many receivers.

BIER [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture] is an architecture that provides optimal multicast forwarding through a "BIER domain" without requiring intermediate routers to maintain any multicast related per-flow state. BIER also does not require any explicit tree-building protocol for its operation. A multicast data packet enters a BIER domain at a "Bit-Forwarding Ingress Router" (BFIR), and leaves the BIER domain at one or more "Bit-Forwarding Egress Routers" (BFERs). The BFIR router adds a BIER header to the packet. The BIER header contains a bit-string in which each bit represents exactly one BFER to forward the packet to. The set of BFERs to which the multicast packet needs to be forwarded is expressed by setting the bits that correspond to those routers in the BIER header. Specifically, for BIER-TE, the BIER header may also contain a bit-string in which each bit indicates the link the flow passes through.

The following sub-sections try to propose how to take full advantage of overlay multicast protocol to carry virtual network information, and create a mapping between the virtual network information and the bit-string to implement BUM services in data centers.

#### A.1. Convention and Terminology

The terms about NVO3 are defined in [RFC7365]. The most common terminology used in this appendix is listed below.

NVE: Network Virtualization Edge, which is the entity that implements the overlay functionality. An NVE resides at the boundary between a Tenant System and the overlay network.

VXLAN: Virtual eXtensible Local Area Network

VNI: VXLAN Network Identifier

Virtual Network Context Identifier: Field in an overlay encapsulation header that identifies the specific VN the packet belongs to.

#### A.2. BIER in data centers

This section tries to describe how to use BIER as an optimal scheme to forward the broadcast, unknown and multicast (BUM) packets when they arrive at the ingress NVE in data centers.

The principle of using BIER to forward BUM traffic is that: firstly, it requires each ingress NVE to have a mapping between the Virtual Network Context Identifier and the bit-string in which each bit represents exactly one egress NVE to forward the packet to. And then, when receiving the BUM traffic, the BFIR/Ingress NVE maps the receiving BUM traffic to the mapping bit-string, encapsulates the

BIER header, and forwards the encapsulated BUM traffic into the BIER domain to the other BFERs/Egress NVEs indicated by the bit-string.

Furthermore, as for how each ingress NVE knows the other egress NVEs that belong to the same virtual network and creates the mapping is the main issue discussed below. Basically, BIER Multicast Listener Discovery is an overlay solution to support ingress routers to keep per-egress-router state to construct the BIER bit-string associated with IP multicast packets entering the BIER domain. The following section tries to extend BIER MLD to carry virtual network information (such as Virtual Network Context identifier), and advertise them between NVEs. When each NVE receives these information, they create the mapping between the virtual network information and the bit-string representing the other NVEs belonging to the same virtual network.

### A.3. A BIER MLD solution for Virtual Network information

The BIER MLD solution allows having multiple MLD instances by having unique pairs of BMLD Nodes and BMLD Querier addresses for each instance. Assume for now that we have a unique instance per VNI and that all BMLD routers are using the same mapping between VNIs and BMLD address pairs. Also for each VNI there is a multicast group used for encapsulation of BUM traffic over BIER. This group may potentially be shared by some or all of the VNIs.

Each NVE acquires the Virtual Network information, and advertises this Virtual Network information to other NVEs through the MLD messages. For a given VNI it sends BMLD reports to the BMLD nodes address used for that VNI, for the group used for delivering BUM traffic for that VNI. This allows all NVE routers to know which other NVE routers have interest in BUM traffic for a particular VNI. If one attached virtual network is migrated, the NVE will withdraw the Virtual Network information by sending an unsolicited BMLD report. Note that NVEs also respond to periodic queries to BMLD Nodes addresses corresponding to VNIs for which they have interest.

When ingress NVE receives the Virtual Network information advertisement message, it builds a mapping between the receiving Virtual Network Context Identifier in this message and the bit-string in which each bit represents one egress NVE who sends the same Virtual Network information. Subsequently, once this ingress NVE receives some other MLD advertisements which include the same Virtual Network information from some other NVEs, it updates the bit-string in the mapping and adds the corresponding sending NVE to the updated bit-string. Once the ingress NVE removes one virtual network, it will delete the mapping corresponding to this virtual network as well as send withdraw message to other NVEs.

After finishing the above interaction of MLD messages, each ingress NVE knows where the other egress NVEs are in the same virtual network. When receiving BUM traffic from the attached virtual network, each ingress NVE knows exactly how to encapsulate this traffic and where to forward them to.

This can be used in both IPv4 network and IPv6 network. In IPv4, IGMP protocol does the similar extension for carrying Virtual Network information TLV in Version 2 membership report message.

Note that it is possible to have multiple VNIs map to the same pair of BMLD addresses. Provided VNIs that map to the same BMLD address uses different multicast groups for encapsulation, this is not a problem, because each instance is tracking interest for each multicast group separately. If multiple VNIs map to the same pair and the multicast group used is not unique, some NVEs may receive BUM traffic for which they are not interested. An NVE would drop packets for an unknown VNI, but it means wasting some bandwidth and processing. This is similar to the non-BIER case where there is not a unique multicast group for encapsulation. The improvement offered by using BMLD is by using multiple instance, hence reducing the problems caused by using the same transport group for multiple VNIs.

#### Authors' Addresses

Pierre Pfister  
Cisco Systems  
Paris  
France

Email: pierre.pfister@darou.fr

IJsbrand Wijnands  
Cisco Systems  
De Kleetlaan 6a  
Diegem 1831  
Belgium

Email: ice@cisco.com

Stig Venaas  
Cisco Systems  
Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134  
USA

Email: stig@cisco.com

Cui(Linda) Wang  
ZTE Corporation  
No.50 Software Avenue, Yuhuatai District  
Nanjing, CA  
China

Email: wang.cuil@zte.com.cn

Zheng(Sandy) Zhang  
ZTE Corporation  
No.50 Software Avenue, Yuhuatai District  
Nanjing, CA  
China

Email: zhang.zheng@zte.com.cn

Markus Stenberg  
Helsinki 00930  
Finland

Email: markus.stenberg@iki.fi