

PBB-TE Infrastructure Protection Proposed PAR

IEEE 802.1 May 2009 Interim Meeting
Pittsburgh, PA., USA

Bob Sultan; Ben Mack-Crane (Huawei Technologies)

Vinod Kumar (Tejas Networks)

Corona Wei (ZTE)

Steve Haddock

Ken Young (Gridpoint Systems)

Dave Martin (Nortel Networks)

Abhay Karandikar (Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay)

John Lemon (Adtran)

Haim Porat (Ethos Networks)

Title

- PAR for an amendment to an existing Standard 802.1Q
- P802.1Qbc (or Qbd, etc., as appropriate)
- IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks---Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks - Amendment: PBB-TE Infrastructure Segment Protection

Scope (1)

- **Protect a specified group of Traffic Engineered Shared Forwarding Paths that traverse an Infrastructure Segment, where an Infrastructure Segment is a sequence of LANs and intervening bridges;**
- **Support for explicit association of a Shared Forwarding Path with a Protected Segment or explicit exclusion of a Shared Forwarding Path from participation in Infrastructure Segment Protection;**
- **Support Infrastructure Segment Protection by diverting traffic from the failed segment to a backup segment having the same segment endpoint bridges but an otherwise diverse path;**
- **Support Infrastructure Segment Protection by methods that do not require modification of data or control frames;**

Scope (2)

- **May support the protection of a single segment by multiple backup segments (M:1 Infrastructure Segment Protection) where backup segments become active in a specified priority order;**
- **Support for topologies having adjacent Infrastructure Segments (ie., segments sharing a common endpoint bridge);**
- **Specification of a method to monitor Infrastructure Segment continuity using existing OAM mechanisms;**
- **Operator requests (e.g., FS, MS, LoP) and operational modes (e.g., revertive, non-revertive) consistent with those supported by PBB-TE TESI Protection.**
- **MIBs and Managed Objects associated with Infrastructure Segment Protection.**

Purpose

- **Address the relatively high failure rate of particular links or bridges within a network.**
- **Address the likelihood of concurrent failures occurring in different segments of a network.**
- **Allow maintenance activities to be performed independently in different segments of the network.**
- **Allow maintenance activities to be performed in one segment of a network without disabling protection in another segment.**
- **Localize changes in traffic distribution due to failure or maintenance actions.**

Need

- It is anticipated that Traffic Engineered bridged networks will be widely deployed when the PBB-TE (IEEE 802.1Qay) standard becomes available. Currently, only end-to-end 1:1 TESI protection is specified. Localized infrastructure protection is supported by TDM-based and MPLS-based networks. The absence of such localized protection capability in PBB-TE networks puts Bridging technology at a competitive disadvantage.

Stakeholders

- Vendors, users, administrators, designers, customers, and owners of traffic-engineered bridged networks.

Other standards with similar scope

- There are no standards providing localized protection for IEEE 802.1Q PBB-TE networks.

Five Criteria

Broad Market Potential

A standards project authorized by IEEE 802 shall have a broad market potential. Specifically, it shall have the potential for:

- **Broad sets of applicability.**
 - The commercial provision of Traffic Engineered services is a large and growing business.
- **Multiple vendors and numerous users.**
 - The same large body of vendors and users having a requirement for IEEE 802.1Qay.
- **Balanced costs (LAN versus attached stations).**
 - This project does not materially alter the existing cost structure of bridged networks.

Compatibility

- IEEE 802 defines a family of standards. All standards shall be in conformance with the IEEE 802.1 Architecture, Management, and Interworking documents as follows: 802. Overview and Architecture, 802.1D, 802.1Q, and parts of 802.1f. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with 802.
 - This PAR is for an amendment to 802.1Q, thus ensuring compatibility.
- Each standard in the IEEE 802 family of standards shall include a definition of managed objects that are compatible with systems management standards.
 - Such a definition will be included.

Distinct Identity

Each IEEE 802 standard shall have a distinct identity. To achieve this, each authorized project shall be:

- Substantially different from other IEEE 802 standards.
 - This project will amend the only IEEE 802 standard defining Traffic Engineered bridged networks.
- One unique solution per problem (not two solutions to a problem).
 - There are no other standard solutions to localized recovery in a Traffic Engineered bridged network.
- Easy for the document reader to select the relevant specification.
 - This project will amend the only IEEE 802 standard defining Traffic Engineered bridged networks.

Technical Feasibility

For a project to be authorized, it shall be able to show its technical feasibility.

At a minimum, the proposed project shall show:

- Demonstrated system feasibility.
 - The function technically is similar to PBB-TE TESI protection which is currently specified by amendment 802.1Qay to 802.1Q, which has been successfully implemented.
- Proven technology, reasonable testing.
 - The function can be implemented using existing bridge behaviors. Compliance with the project can be tested using straightforward extensions of existing test tools for bridged networks.
- Confidence in reliability.
 - The reliability of the modified protocols will be not be measurably worse than that of the existing Traffic Engineered Bridged networks.

Economic Feasibility

For a project to be authorized, it shall be able to show economic feasibility (so far as can reasonably be estimated) for its intended applications. At a minimum, the proposed project shall show:

- Known cost factors, reliable data.
 - This project introduces no hardware costs beyond the minimal and well-known resources consumed by extending an existing software protocol.
- Reasonable cost for performance.
 - The cost of upgrading software and configuring a priori knowledge of the overall system topology is reasonable for the significant reduction in the time required to recover from a network failure.
- Consideration of installation costs.
 - The cost of installing enhanced software, in exchange for improved network performance, is familiar to vendors and users of bridged networks.