

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Intended status: Proposed Standard  
Expires: June 2014

S. Giacalone  
Thomson Reuters

D. Ward  
Cisco Systems

J. Drake  
Juniper Networks

A. Atlas  
Juniper Networks

S. Previdi  
Cisco Systems

December 5, 2013

OSPF Traffic Engineering (TE) Metric Extensions  
draft-ietf-ospf-te-metric-extensions-05.txt

Abstract

In certain networks, such as, but not limited to, financial information networks (e.g. stock market data providers), network performance criteria (e.g. latency) are becoming as critical to data path selection as other metrics.

This document describes extensions to OSPF TE [RFC3630] such that network performance information can be distributed and collected in a scalable fashion. The information distributed using OSPF TE Metric Extensions can then be used to make path selection decisions based on network performance.

Note that this document only covers the mechanisms with which network performance information is distributed. The mechanisms for measuring network performance or acting on that information, once distributed, are outside the scope of this document.

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), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on June 5, 2014.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 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.....	4
2. Conventions used in this document.....	5
3. TE Metric Extensions to OSPF TE.....	5
4. Sub TLV Details.....	7
4.1. Unidirectional Link Delay Sub-TLV.....	7
4.1.1. Type.....	7
4.1.2. Length.....	7

4.1.3. A bit.....	7
4.1.4. Reserved.....	7
4.1.5. Delay Value.....	8
4.2. Min/Max Unidirectional Link Delay Sub-TLV.....	8
4.2.1. Type.....	8
4.2.2. Length.....	8
4.2.3. A bit.....	8
4.2.4. Reserved.....	9
4.2.5. Low Delay.....	9
4.2.6. High Delay.....	9
4.2.7. Reserved.....	9
4.3. Unidirectional Delay Variation Sub-TLV.....	10
4.3.1. Type.....	10
4.3.2. Length.....	10
4.3.3. Reserved.....	10
4.3.4. Delay Variation.....	10
4.4. Unidirectional Link Loss Sub-TLV.....	10
4.4.1. Type.....	11
4.4.2. Length.....	11
4.4.3. A bit.....	11
4.4.4. Reserved.....	11
4.4.5. Link Loss.....	11
4.5. Unidirectional Residual Bandwidth Sub-TLV.....	12
4.5.1. Type.....	12
4.5.2. Length.....	12
4.5.3. Residual Bandwidth.....	12
4.6. Unidirectional Available Bandwidth Sub-TLV.....	13
4.6.1. Type.....	13
4.6.2. Length.....	13
4.6.3. Available Bandwidth.....	13
4.7. Unidirectional Utilized Bandwidth Sub-TLV.....	13
4.7.1. Type.....	14
4.7.2. Length.....	14
4.7.3. Utilized Bandwidth.....	14
5. Announcement Thresholds and Filters.....	14
6. Announcement Suppression.....	15
7. Network Stability and Announcement Periodicity.....	16
8. Enabling and Disabling Sub-TLVs.....	16
9. Static Metric Override.....	16
10. Compatibility.....	17
11. Security Considerations.....	17
12. IANA Considerations.....	17
13. References.....	17
13.1. Normative References.....	17
13.2. Informative References.....	17
14. Acknowledgments.....	18
15. Author's Addresses.....	18

## 1. Introduction

In certain networks, such as, but not limited to, financial information networks (e.g. stock market data providers), network performance information (e.g. latency) is becoming as critical to data path selection as other metrics.

In these networks, extremely large amounts of money rest on the ability to access market data in "real time" and to predictably make trades faster than the competition. Because of this, using metrics such as hop count or cost as routing metrics is becoming only tangentially important. Rather, it would be beneficial to be able to make path selection decisions based on performance data (such as latency) in a cost-effective and scalable way.

This document describes extensions to OSPF TE (hereafter called "OSPF TE Metric Extensions"), that can be used to distribute network performance information (such as link delay, delay variation, packet loss, residual bandwidth, and available bandwidth).

The data distributed by OSPF TE Metric Extensions is meant to be used as part of the operation of the routing protocol (e.g. by replacing cost with latency or considering bandwidth as well as cost), by enhancing CSPF, or for other uses such as supplementing the data used by an Alto server [Alto]. With respect to CSPF, the data distributed by OSPF TE Metric Extensions can be used to setup, fail over, and fail back data paths using protocols such as RSVP-TE [RFC3209]. [Draft-ietf-mpls-te-express-path] describes some methods for using this information to compute Label Switched Paths (LSPs) at the LSP ingress.

Note that the mechanisms described in this document only disseminate performance information. The methods for initially gathering that performance information, such as [RFC6375], or acting on it once it is distributed are outside the scope of this document. Example mechanisms to measure latency, delay variation, and loss in an MPLS network are given in [RFC6374]. While this document does not specify how the performance information should be obtained, the measurement of delay SHOULD NOT vary significantly based upon the offered traffic load. Thus, queuing delays and/or loss SHOULD NOT be included in any dynamic delay measurement. For links, such as Forwarding Adjacencies, care must be taken that measurement of the

associated delay avoids significant queuing delay; that could be accomplished in a variety of ways, including either by measuring with a traffic class that experiences minimal queuing or by summing the measured link delays of the components of the link's path.

## 2. Conventions used in this document

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 RFC-2119 [RFC2119].

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 RFC-2119 significance.

## 3. TE Metric Extensions to OSPF TE

This document proposes new OSPF TE sub-TLVs that can be announced in OSPF TE LSAs to distribute network performance information. The extensions in this document build on the ones provided in OSPF TE [RFC3630] and GMPLS [RFC4203].

OSPF TE LSAs [RFC3630] are opaque LSAs [RFC5250] with area flooding scope. Each TLV has one or more nested sub-TLVs which permit the TE LSA to be readily extended. There are two main types of OSPF TE LSA; the Router Address or Link TE LSA. Like the extensions in GMPLS (RFC4203), this document proposes several additional sub-TLVs for the Link TE LSA:

Type	Length	Value
TBD1	4	Unidirectional Link Delay
TBD2	8	Low/High Unidirectional Link Delay
TBD3	4	Unidirectional Delay Variation
TBD4	4	Unidirectional Packet Loss
TBD5	4	Unidirectional Residual Bandwidth
TBD6	4	Unidirectional Available Bandwidth

## TBD7 4 Unidirectional Utilized Bandwidth

As can be seen in the list above, the sub-TLVs described in this document carry different types of network performance information. Many (but not all) of the sub-TLVs include a bit called the Anomalous (or "A") bit. When the A bit is clear (or when the sub-TLV does not include an A bit), the sub-TLV describes steady state link performance. This information could conceivably be used to construct a steady state performance topology for initial tunnel path computation, or to verify alternative failover paths.

When network performance violates configurable link-local thresholds a sub-TLV with the A bit set is advertised. These sub-TLVs could be used by the receiving node to determine whether to fail traffic to a backup path, or whether to calculate an entirely new path. From an MPLS perspective, the intent of the A bit is to permit LSP ingress nodes to:

- A) Determine whether the link referenced in the sub-TLV affects any of the LSPs for which it is ingress. If there are, then:
- B) The node determines whether those LSPs still meet end-to-end performance objectives. If not, then:
- C) The node could then conceivably move affected traffic to a pre-established protection LSP or establish a new LSP and place the traffic in it.

If link performance then improves beyond a configurable minimum value (reuse threshold), that sub-TLV can be re-advertised with the Anomalous bit cleared. In this case, a receiving node can conceivably do whatever re-optimization (or failback) it wishes to do (including nothing).

Note that when a sub-TLV does not include the A bit, that sub-TLV cannot be used for failover purposes. The A bit was intentionally omitted from some sub-TLVs to help mitigate oscillations. See section 7. 1. for more information.

Consistent with existing OSPF TE specifications (RFC3630), the bandwidth advertisements defined in this draft MUST be encoded as IEEE floating point values. The delay and delay variation advertisements defined in this draft MUST be encoded as integer values. Delay values MUST be quantified in units of microseconds, packet loss MUST be quantified as a percentage of packets sent, and







#### 4.2.4. Reserved

This field is reserved for future use. It MUST be set to 0 when sent and MUST be ignored when received.

#### 4.2.5. Low Delay

This 24-bit field carries minimum measured link delay value (in microseconds) over a configurable interval, encoded as an integer value.

Implementations MAY also permit the configuration of a static (non dynamic) offset value (in microseconds) to be added to the measured delay value, to facilitate the communication of operator specific delay constraints.

When set to the maximum value 16,777,215 (16.777215 sec), then the delay is at least that value and may be larger.

#### 4.2.6. High Delay

This 24-bit field carries the maximum measured link delay value (in microseconds) over a configurable interval, encoded as an integer value.

Implementations MAY also permit the configuration of a static (non dynamic) offset value (in microseconds) to be added to the measured delay value, to facilitate the communication of operator specific delay constraints.

It is possible for the high delay and low delay to be the same value.

When the delay value is set to maximum value 16,777,215 (16.777215 sec), then the delay is at least that value and may be larger.


#### 4.2.7. Reserved

This field is reserved for future use. It MUST be set to 0 when sent and MUST be ignored when received.

When only an average delay value is sent, this field is not present in the TLV.

### 4.3. Unidirectional Delay Variation Sub-TLV

This sub-TLV advertises the average link delay variation between two directly connected OSPF neighbors. The delay variation advertised by this sub-TLV MUST be the delay from the local neighbor to the remote one (i.e. the forward path latency). The format of this sub-TLV is shown in the following diagram:



#### 4.3.1. Type

This sub-TLV has a type of TBD3.

#### 4.3.2. Length

The length is 4.

#### 4.3.3. Reserved

This field is reserved for future use. It MUST be set to 0 when sent and MUST be ignored when received.

#### 4.3.4. Delay Variation

This 24-bit field carries the average link delay variation over a configurable interval in micro-seconds, encoded as an integer value. When set to 0, it has not been measured. When set to the maximum value 16,777,215 (16.777215 sec), then the delay is at least that value and may be larger.

### 4.4. Unidirectional Link Loss Sub-TLV

This sub-TLV advertises the loss (as a packet percentage) between two directly connected OSPF neighbors. The link loss advertised by this sub-TLV MUST be the packet loss from the local neighbor to the remote






former can be used for applications like Weighted ECMP while the latter can be used for call admission control).

#### 4.6. Unidirectional Available Bandwidth Sub-TLV

This TLV advertises the available bandwidth between two directly connected OSPF neighbors. The available bandwidth advertised by this sub-TLV MUST be the available bandwidth from the system originating the LSA to its neighbor. The format of this sub-TLV is shown in the following diagram:



##### 4.6.1. Type

This sub-TLV has a type of TBD6.

##### 4.6.2. Length

The length is 4.


##### 4.6.3. Available Bandwidth

This field carries the available bandwidth on a link, forwarding adjacency, or bundled link in IEEE floating point format with units of bytes per second. For a link or forwarding adjacency, available bandwidth is defined to be residual bandwidth (see section 4.5. ) minus the measured bandwidth used for the actual forwarding of non-RSVP-TE LSP packets. For a bundled link, available bandwidth is defined to be the sum of the component link available bandwidths.

#### 4.7. Unidirectional Utilized Bandwidth Sub-TLV

This Sub-TLV advertises the bandwidth utilization between two directly connected OSPF neighbors. The bandwidth utilization

advertised by this sub-TLV MUST be the bandwidth from the system originating this Sub-TLV. The format of this Sub-TLV is shown in the following diagram:



4.7.1. Type

This sub-TLV has a type of TBD7.

4.7.2. Length

The length is 4.

4.7.3. Utilized Bandwidth

This field carries the bandwidth utilization on a link, forwarding adjacency, or bundled link in IEEE floating point format with units of bytes per second. For a link or forwarding adjacency, bandwidth utilization represents the actual utilization of the link (i.e. as measured in the router). For a bundled link, bandwidth utilization is defined to be the sum of the component link bandwidth utilizations.

5. Announcement Thresholds and Filters

The values advertised in all sub-TLVs (except min/max delay and residual bandwidth) MUST represent an average over a period or be obtained by a filter that is reasonably representative of an average. For example, a rolling average is one such filter.

Low or high delay MAY be the lowest and/or highest measured value over a measurement interval or MAY make use of a filter, or other technique to obtain a reasonable representation of a low and high value representative of the interval with compensation for outliers.

The measurement interval, any filter coefficients, and any advertisement intervals MUST be configurable per sub-TLV.

In addition to the measurement intervals governing re-advertisement, implementations SHOULD provide per sub-TLV configurable accelerated advertisement thresholds, such that:

1. If the measured parameter falls outside a configured upper bound for all but the min delay metric (or lower bound for min-delay metric only) and the advertised sub-TLV is not already outside that bound or,
2. If the difference between the last advertised value and current measured value exceed a configured threshold then,
3. The advertisement is made immediately.
4. For sub-TLVs which include an A-bit (except low/high delay), an additional threshold SHOULD be included corresponding to the threshold for which the performance is considered anomalous (and sub-TLVs with the A bit are sent). The A-bit is cleared when the sub-TLV's performance has been below (or re-crosses) this threshold for an advertisement interval(s) to permit fail back.

To prevent oscillations, only the high threshold or the low threshold (but not both) may be used to trigger any given sub-TLV that supports both.

Additionally, once outside of the bounds of the threshold, any readvertisement of a measurement within the bounds would remain governed solely by the measurement interval for that sub-TLV.

## 6. Announcement Suppression

When link performance values change by small amounts that fall under thresholds that would cause the announcement of a sub-TLV, implementations SHOULD suppress sub-TLV readvertisement and/or lengthen the period within which they are refreshed.

Only the accelerated advertisement threshold mechanism described in section 6 may shorten the re-advertisement interval.

All suppression and re-advertisement interval backoff timer features SHOULD be configurable.

## 7. Network Stability and Announcement Periodicity

Sections 6 and 7 provide configurable mechanisms to bound the number of re-advertisements. Instability might occur in very large networks if measurement intervals are set low enough to overwhelm the processing of flooded information at some of the routers in the topology. Therefore care SHOULD be taken in setting these values.

Additionally, the default measurement interval for all sub-TLVs SHOULD be 30 seconds.

Announcements MUST also be able to be throttled using configurable inter-update throttle timers. The minimum announcement periodicity is 1 announcement per second. The default value SHOULD be set to 120 seconds.

Implementations SHOULD NOT permit the inter-update timer to be lower than the measurement interval.

Furthermore, it is RECOMMENDED that any underlying performance measurement mechanisms not include any significant buffer delay, any significant buffer induced delay variation, or any significant loss due to buffer overflow or due to active queue management.

## 8. Enabling and Disabling Sub-TLVs

Implementations MUST make it possible to individually enable or disable each sub-TLV based on configuration.

## 9. Static Metric Override

Implementations SHOULD permit the static configuration and/or manual override of dynamic measurements data on a per sub-TLV, per metric basis in order to simplify migrations and to mitigate scenarios where measurements are not possible across an entire network.



## 10. Compatibility

As per (RFC3630), unrecognized TLVs should be silently ignored

## 11. Security Considerations

This document does not introduce security issues beyond those discussed in [[RFC3630](#)] and [[RFC5329](#)].

## 12. IANA Considerations

IANA maintains the registry for the sub-TLVs. OSPF TE Metric Extensions will require one new type code per sub-TLV defined in this document.

## 13. References

### 13.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [RFC3630] Katz, D., Kompella, K., Yeung, D., "Traffic Engineering (TE) Extensions to OSPF Version 2", RFC 3630, September 2003.
- [RFC6374] Frost, D. and S. Bryant, "Packet Loss and Delay Measurement for MPLS Networks", RFC 6374, September 2011.

### 13.2. Informative References

- [RFC2328] Moy, J., "OSPF Version 2", RFC 2328, April 1998
- [RFC3031] Rosen, E., Viswanathan, A., Callon, R., "Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture", January 2001
- [RFC3209] Awduche, D., Berger, L., Gan, D., Li, T., Srinivasan,

V., and G. Swallow, "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", RFC 3209, December 2001.

[RFC5250] Berger, L., Bryskin I., Zinin, A., Coltun, R., "The OSPF Opaque LSA Option", RFC 5250, July 2008.

[RFC6375] Frost, D. and S. Bryant, "A Packet Loss and Delay Measurement Profile for MPLS-Based Transport Networks", RFC 6375, September 2011.

[Alto] R. Alimi R. Penno Y. Yang, "ALTO Protocol"

[Draft-ietf-mpls-te-express-path] Atlas, A., Drake, J., Giacalone, S., Ward, D., Previdi, S., and C. Filsfils, "Performance-based Path Selection for Explicitly Routed LSPs using TE Metric Extensions", Draft-ietf-mpls-te-express-path (work in progress), October 2013

#### 14. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to recognize Ayman Soliman, Nabil Bitar, David McDysan, Edward Crabbe, and Don Fedyk for their contributions.

The authors also recognize Curtis Villamizar for significant comments and direct content collaboration.

This document was prepared using 2-Word-v2.0.template.dot.

#### 15. Author's Addresses

Spencer Giacalone  
Thomson Reuters  
195 Broadway  
New York, NY 10007, USA

Email: [Spencer.giacalone@thomsonreuters.com](mailto:Spencer.giacalone@thomsonreuters.com)

Dave Ward  
Cisco Systems  
170 West Tasman Dr.

San Jose, CA 95134, USA

Email: [dward@cisco.com](mailto:dward@cisco.com)

John Drake  
Juniper Networks  
1194 N. Mathilda Ave.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089, USA

Email: [jdrake@juniper.net](mailto:jdrake@juniper.net)

Alia Atlas  
Juniper Networks  
1194 N. Mathilda Ave.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089, USA

Email: [akatlas@juniper.net](mailto:akatlas@juniper.net)

Stefano Previdi  
Cisco Systems  
Via Del Serafico 200  
00142 Rome  
Italy

Email: [sprevidi@cisco.com](mailto:sprevidi@cisco.com)