MPLS in UDP: The Adventure Continues

David Black, tsvwg co-chair Ross Callon, mpls co-chair (on behalf of the design team) MPLS WG, IETF Honolulu November 10, 2014

draft-ietf-mpls-in-udp: A Brief History

- IETF Last Call (-04), Jan 2014: Problematic 🖈
 - Concern #1: Congestion
 - Concern #2: UDP Zero Checksums with IPv6
- AD follow-ups @ London and Toronto IETFs
- TSV/RTG design team formed at Toronto IETF
 - Includes tsvwg GRE-in-UDP draft: Similar concerns
 - Key design team members: David Black, Ross
 Callon, Gorry Fairhurst, Xiaohu Xu, Lucy Yong
- Now: Concerns addressed in -07 (we hope)

MPLS in UDP: Congestion

- Congestion-controlled traffic: Not a problem
 - IP traffic assumed to be congestion controlled
- Otherwise (not congestion controlled, or not known to be congestion controlled):
 - Service provider or cooperating providers (MUST)
 - Careful provisioning by network operator(s) (MUST)
 - Prevent uncontrolled traffic from "escaping" (SHOULD)
 - No general/public Internet usage (MUST NOT)
 - Unless congestion controlled (see first bullet)

MPLS in UDP: UDP Zero Checksums with IPv6

- Reminder: No IPv6 header checksum
 - Relies on link and/or UDP checksums
 - Between links: UDP checksum only
- IPv6 UDP zero checksum usage requirements
 - Same as non-congestion controlled traffic
 - Service providers, not general Internet (MUST)
 - Including traffic "escape" prevention (SHOULD)
 - Additional header robustness (MUST)
 - Check everything that it makes sense to check
 - Mis-delivery less likely if 2+ corrupt fields needed

Next Steps

- MPLS in UDP: Needs a second IETF Last Call
 - Brief Q&A here (or come find us)
- GRE-in-UDP: Design team still working on text
 - GRE usage scope: Broader than MPLS
- Design Team did much more work than expected
 - Serious increase in size/length of drafts
 - Many thanks to the design team members
- IAB SEMI workshop position paper submitted:
 - UDP encapsulation: Important (e.g., for middleboxes)
 - This sort of UDP design work should be easier & faster