# IEEE Infocom 2005 Demonstration ITEA TBONES Project

A GMPLS Unified Control Plane for Multi-Area Networks

D.Papadimitriou (Alcatel), B.Berde (Alcatel), K.Casier (IMEC), and R.Theillaud (Atos Origin)



All rights reserved © 2005, Alcatel







## ITEA TBONES Project: GMPLS Control Plane

#### Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS)

- ✓ Distributed IP-centric control plane
- Supports overlay and unified control plane interconnection model
- Control plane driven recovery (e.g. pre-planned and dynamic rerouting)
- ✓ Traffic Engineering (TE) for multi-area/multi-layer networks

#### **Constraint-based Routing - Operations**



INFOCOM 2005 / DEMO

## TBONES – GMPLS Control Plane Emulator Emulates the behavior of a set of nodes by instantiating for each node, a lower protocol stack and several control plane controllers. Each protocol stack implements IETF GMPLS protocol suite: Open Shortest Path First - Traffic Engineering (OSPF-TE) Resource reSerVation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Each control plane controller set runs in its own process, they communicate with each other through the protocol stacks Each control plane controller consists of a set of modules: Node Emulator (NE) Signaling Controller (SIGC) $\succ$ TE Controller (TEC) Path Computation Controller (PCC)













### Experiments

- 1. TBONES software validation: OSPF(-TE), RSVP(-TE) stacks
- 2. TBONES software load and performance (benchmarking): OSPF(-TE), RSVP(-TE)

### 3. TBONES software capabilities

- 1. Multi-area LSP signaling (+ crankback)
- 2. Multi-region LSP signaling: Forwarding Adjacencies
- 3. Pre-planned and dynamic end-to-end LSP re-routing
- Pre-planned re-routing: protecting LSP resources are allocated at control plane level only and explicit action is required to activate (i.e. commit resource allocation) during the recovery phase
- Dynamic re-routing: switches traffic from the head-end node to an alternate LSP that is fully established only after failure occurrence









age 12

- Routing Adjacency (Two-way, Exstart, Full-State)
  - between Milan (50) Zurich (17) and Milan (50) Munich (21)
- Link State Database Synchronization: LSDB Checksum
  - per LSA (Type 1 and Type 10)
  - per Area
- RIB update check after Type 1 LSA processing (Router Link State)
- TEDB update check after Type 10 LSA processing (TE Link State)
  - add new TE link (e.g. FA-LSP) in Area 0 and in Area 17
  - re-check TEDB
- Re-check after LSRefreshTime (1800s)
- Deletion of LSA by setting MaxAge to 3600s





Page 15

- Routing Adjacency (Two-way, Exstart, Full-State)
- Link State Database Synchronization: LSDB Checksum
- RIB update check after Type 3 LSA processing (Network Summary LS)
  - From Zurich and Strasbourg toward Area 0
- RIB update check after Type 4/5 LSA processing (ASBR Summary LS and AS\_External LS)
  - From Athens
  - From Dublin
  - From Zurich
- After LSRefreshTime (1800s): re-check
- Deletion of LSA by setting MaxAge to 3600s





#### Single Area (strict explicit routing)

- DUT as head-end of LSP (ingress):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different ERO for the set of LSPs between the same sourcedestination pair
- DUT as tail-end of LSP (egress):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different ERO for the set of LSPs between the same sourcedestination pair
- Same experiment with degree of freedom on ERO selection (either CP computes the Explicit Route or the Explicit Route is injected via the Management Plane i.e. XML file)



#### age 18

#### Single Area (strict explicit routing)

- Measure (DUT as ingress)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 3 trials and use source crankback

#### Measure (DUT as egress)

- #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
- #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
- #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
- #Non success events after 3 trials and use source crankback



age 19

### Multi-Area (strict explicit routing)

- DUT as intermediate node (head-end ABR):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same strict ERO (in Area 0) for the set of LSPs between the same source-destination pair
- DUT as intermediate node (tail-end ABR):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same strict ERO (in Area 0) for the set of LSPs between the same source-destination pair
- Same experiment with degree of freedom on ERO selection (either CP computes the Explicit Route or the Explicit Route is injected via the Management Plane i.e. XML file)





age 20

### Multi-Area (loose explicit routing)

- Measure (DUT as intermediate node i.e. head-end ABR)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 3 trials and use source crankback
- Measure (DUT as intermediate node i.e. tail-end ABR)
  - #Success events with first trial: without intermediate/source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use intermediate crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use intermediate crankback
  - #Non success events after 3 trials and use intermediate crankback



Page 21

#### 1. Impact of TE routing information exchanges on performance:

- Type10\_LSA: increase number of TE links (through setup of FA-LSPs across a particular LSC TE link) until reaching TEDB saturation
- 2. Impact of multi-area routing information exchanges on performance:
  - Type3\_LSA: using an increasing number of inter-area prefixes until reaching saturation
  - Type4\_/Type5 LSA: using an increasing number of Autonomous System Boundary Routers (ASBR) by injecting an increasing number of external prefixes per ASBR
    - increase number of external prefixes per ASBR
    - increase number of ASBR
- <u>Running conditions</u>: generate load within the network from 0% (default condition) then start from 10% until 90%, 95% and 99% trigger on individual FA-LSP setup for saturation measurement
- Measure DUT (ABR) CP Process CPU and Memory usage





#### Single Area (strict explicit routing)

- Load test (in terms of maximum number of LSP)
  - 1. starting with Min LSP Bandwidth = Max LSP Bandwidth (e.g. 1 Mbps) with Unreserved Bandwidth set to N x 10 Gbps
  - 2. variation of the Max LSP Bandwidth value from Min LSP Bandwidth value per component TE link until Max Reservable Bandwidth value
  - 3. Same test using inverse starting conditions
- Measure (DUT as ingress e.g. ASBR)
  - #Success events with first trial
  - CP process CPU / Memory usage
- Measure (DUT as egress e.g. ASBR)
  - #Success events with first trial
  - CP process CPU / Memory usage



#### Page 24

#### Single Area (strict explicit routing)

- DUT as head-end of LSP (ingress):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different ERO for the set of LSPs between the same sourcedestination pair
- DUT as tail-end of LSP (egress):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different ERO for the set of LSPs between the same sourcedestination pair
- Same experiment with variable degree of freedom on ERO selection





#### age 25

### Single Area (strict explicit routing)

- Measure (DUT as ingress)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage
- Measure (DUT as egress)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage



#### Page 26

#### Multi-Area (loose explicit routing)

- DUT as head-end of LSP (ingress):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different ERO for the set of LSPs between the same sourcedestination pair
- DUT as tail-end of LSP (egress):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different ERO for the set of LSPs between the same sourcedestination pair
- Same experiment with variable degree of freedom on ERO selection





#### age 27

#### Multi-Area (loose explicit routing)

- Measure (DUT as ingress)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage
- Measure (DUT as intermediate node I.e. ABR)
  - #Success events with first trial: without intermediate/source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use intermediate crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use intermediate crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage

# Experiments 3: TBONES software capabilities

#### **TBONES** software capabilities

- 1. Multi-area LSP signaling (+ crankback)
- 2. Multi-region LSP signaling: Forwarding Adjacencies
- 3. Pre-planned and dynamic end-to-end LSP re-routing
- Pre-planned re-routing: protecting LSP resources are allocated at control plane level only and explicit action is required to activate (i.e. commit resource allocation) during the recovery phase
- Dynamic re-routing: switches traffic from the head-end node to an alternate LSP that is fully established only after failure occurrence



#### Single Area (strict explicit routing)

- DUT as head-end of the FA-LSP (nesting LSC LSP):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different (strict/loose) ERO for the set of PSC LSPs between the same source-destination pair
- DUT as tail-end of the FA-LSP (nesting LSC LSP):
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different (strict/loose) ERO for the set of PSC LSPs between the same source-destination pair
- Same experiment with variable degree of freedom on ERO selection











Single Area (strict explicit routing)

- Measure (DUT as ingress)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage
- Measure (DUT as egress)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage



age 34

### Multi-Area (loose explicit routing)

- DUT as head-end of the FA-LSP e.g. ABR:
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different (strict/loose) ERO for the set of PSC LSPs between the same source-destination pair
- DUT as tail-end of the FA-LSP e.g. ABR:
  - load sequential request file
  - force same and different (strict/loose) ERO for the set of PSC LSPs between the same source-destination pair
- Same experiment with variable degree of freedom on ERO selection











age 38

### Multi-Area (loose explicit routing)

- Measure (DUT as ingress)
  - #Success events with first trial: without source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use source crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use source crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage
- Measure (DUT as intermediate node I.e. ABR)
  - #Success events with first trial: without intermediate/source crankback
  - #Non success events after 1 trial and use intermediate crankback
  - #Non success events after 2 trials and use intermediate crankback
  - Path computation time: average, min/max, median
  - DUT CP process CPU / Memory usage



Page 39

- 1. Policy Based Management: FA-LSP Triggered Setup
  - Experiment impact of triggering PSC LSP on existing FA-LSPs (during FA-LSP deletion phase)
  - <u>Condition</u>: "If more than 90% of the current FA LSC TE link unreserved bandwidth is consumed and enough resources available (including FA LSC-LSP) not higher than a given percentage, e.g., 80 %"
  - <u>Action</u>: "Trigger setup of the FA LSC LSP"



# Experiment 3 – Pre-planned Re-routing (1)

age 40

#### • Shared link (1:N) resource at UNI

- Tunnel ID\_1: LSP working 1 + LSP protecting 1 with LSP protecting 1 using same (shared) resources as LSP working 1 at source and dest. UNI, and different resources within the network
- Tunnel ID\_2: LSP working 2 + LSP protecting 1 with LSP protecting 1 using same (shared) resources as LSP working 1 or 2 at source and dest. UNI, LSP working 2 resource disjoint from LSP working 1
- etc.
- Tunnel ID\_N: LSP working N + LSP protecting 1 with LSP protecting 1 using same (shared) resources as LSP working 1 or ... or N-1, or N at source and dest. UNI, and LSP working N disjoint from LSP Working 1, ..., N-1
- Setting 1: DUT as UNI client/network-side
- Setting 2: DUT as intermediate node
  - generates Notify message towards head-end/tail-end node
- Running conditions: generate load within the network from 0% (default condition) then start from 10% until 90%, 95% and 99%



# Experiment 3 – Pre-planned Re-routing (1)

#### Dimensioning Tool role:

• Help in pre-planning set of working and protecting LSP such that the set of working LSP and protecting LSP are mutually link/node disjoint

#### Measurement

- CP process CPU / Mem. usage
- Generation and Processing of the Notify message (single source to single destination, single source to multiple destination incl. multiple LSPs under failure)
- Generation and Processing of the re-routing triggering Path message (processing overhead measurement) for secondary LSP activation



# Experiment 3 – Pre-planned Re-routing (2)

age 42

#### • Shared link (1:1) ^ n resource at UNI

- Tunnel ID\_1: LSP working 1 + LSP protecting 1 with LSP protecting 1 using same (shared) resources as LSP working 1 at source and destination UNI, and different resources within the network
- Tunnel ID\_2: LSP working 2 + LSP protecting 2 with LSP protecting 2 using same (shared) resources as LSP working 2 at source and destination UNI, LSP working 2 resource disjoint from LSP working 1
- etc.
- Tunnel ID\_N: LSP working N + LSP protecting N with LSP protecting N using same (shared) resources as LSP working N at source and destination UNI, LSP working N resource disjoint from LSP working 1,..., N-1
- Setting 1: DUT as UNI client/network-side
- Setting 2: DUT as intermediate node
  - generates Notify message towards head-end/tail-end node
- Running conditions: generate load within the network from 0% (default condition) then start from 10% until 90%, 95% and 99%







# Experiment 3 – Pre-planned Re-routing (2)

#### Dimensioning Tool role:

• Help in pre-planning set of working and protecting LSP such that the set of working LSP and protecting LSP are mutually link/node disjoint

#### Measurement

- CP process CPU / Mem. usage
- Generation and Processing of the Notify message (single source to single destination, single source to multiple destination incl. multiple LSPs under failure)
- Generation and Processing of the re-routing trigger Path message (processing overhead measurement) for secondary LSP activation

![](_page_44_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Experiment 3 – Dynamic Re-routing (2)

### Configuration

- Starting point:
  - all (working) LSPs starting and terminating at the same source-destination pair (100%) or close at least (90%)

note: 90% means that at least 90% of the LSPs under failure are within the same source and destination pair and the other 10% are within a predetermined set of other source and destination pairs

#### • End point:

- all (working) LSPs start and terminate at different source-destination pair (0 %)
- Setting 1: DUT as UNI client/network-side
- Setting 2: DUT as intermediate node
  - generates Notify message towards head-end/tail-end node
- Running conditions: generate load within the network from 0% (default condition) then start from 10% until 90%, 95% and 99%

## Experiment 3 – Dynamic Re-routing (2)

#### Measurement

- CP process CPU / Mem. usage
- Generation and Processing of the Notify message (single source to single destination, single source to multiple destination incl. multiple LSPs under failure)
- Generation and Processing of the re-routing trigger Path message (processing overhead measurement) for primary LSP establishment

![](_page_46_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_0.jpeg)