Network Working Group Request for Comments: 3746 Category: Informational L. Yang Intel Corp. R. Dantu Univ. of North Texas T. Anderson Intel Corp. R. Gopal Nokia April 2004

Forwarding and Control Element Separation (ForCES) Framework

Status of this Memo

This memo provides information for the Internet community. It does not specify an Internet standard of any kind. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document defines the architectural framework for the ForCES (Forwarding and Control Element Separation) network elements, and identifies the associated entities and their interactions.

Table of Contents

Definitions
1.1. Conventions used in this document
1.2. Terminologies
Introduction to Forwarding and Control Element Separation
(ForCES)
Architecture
3.1. Control Elements and Fr Reference Point
3.2. Forwarding Elements and Fi reference point 11
3.3. CE Managers
3.4. FE Managers
Operational Phases
4.1. Pre-association Phase
4.1.1. Fl Reference Point
4.1.2. Ff Reference Point
4.1.3. Fc Reference Point
4.2. Post-association Phase and Fp reference point 17
4.2.1. Proximity and Interconnect between CEs and FEs 18

Yang, et al.

DOCKET

Informational

[Page 1]

	4.2.2. Association Establishment	. 18
	4.2.3. Steady-state Communication	. 19
	4.2.4. Data Packets across Fp reference point	. 21
	4.2.5. Proxy FE	. 22
	4.3. Association Re-establishment	. 22
5. 7.	4.3.1. CE graceful restart	. 23
	4.3.2. FE restart	. 24
5.	Applicability to RFC 1812	. 25
5.	5.1. General Router Requirements	. 25
	5.2. Link Layer	. 26
	5.3. Internet Layer Protocols	. 27
	5.4. Internet Layer Forwarding	. 27
5. 6. 7.	5.5. Transport Layer	. 28
	5.6. Application Layer Routing Protocols	. 29
	5.7. Application Layer Network Management Protocol	. 29
б.	Summary	. 29
7.	Acknowledgements	. 30
8.	Security Considerations	20
•••		. 30
0.	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES	. 30
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs	. 30 . 31 . 31
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 33
	 8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 34
	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 33 . 34 . 35
9.	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 33 . 34 . 35 . 37
9.	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 33 . 34 . 35 . 37 . 37
9.	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 33
9.	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 33 . 34 . 35 . 37 . 37 . 37 . 39
9. 10. 11.	8.1. Analysis of Potential Threats Introduced by ForCES 8.1.1. "Join" or "Remove" Message Flooding on CEs 8.1.2. Impersonation Attack	. 30 . 31 . 31 . 31 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 33 . 33 . 33

1. Definitions

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 BCP 14, RFC 2119 [1].

Yang, et al. Informational

[Page 2]



^{1.1.} Conventions used in this document

RFC 3746

1.2. Terminologies

A set of terminology associated with the ForCES requirements is defined in [4] and we only include the definitions that are most relevant to this document here.

Addressable Entity (AE) - An entity that is directly addressable given some interconnect technology. For example, on IP networks, it is a device to which we can communicate using an IP address; on a switch fabric, it is a device to which we can communicate using a switch fabric port number.

Physical Forwarding Element (PFE) - An AE that includes hardware used to provide per-packet processing and handling. This hardware may consist of (but is not limited to) network processors, ASICs (Application-Specific Integrated Circuits), or general purpose processors, installed on line cards, daughter boards, mezzanine cards, or in stand-alone boxes.

PFE Partition - A logical partition of a PFE consisting of some subset of each of the resources (e.g., ports, memory, forwarding table entries) available on the PFE. This concept is analogous to that of the resources assigned to a virtual switching element as described in [9].

Physical Control Element (PCE) - An AE that includes hardware used to provide control functionality. This hardware typically includes a general purpose processor.

PCE Partition - A logical partition of a PCE consisting of some subset of each of the resources available on the PCE.

Forwarding Element (FE) - A logical entity that implements the ForCES Protocol. FEs use the underlying hardware to provide per-packet processing and handling as directed by a CE via the ForCES Protocol. FEs may happen to be a single blade (or PFE), a partition of a PFE, or multiple PFEs.

Control Element (CE) - A logical entity that implements the ForCES Protocol and uses it to instruct one or more FEs on how to process packets. CEs handle functionality such as the execution of control and signaling protocols. CEs may consist of PCE partitions or whole PCEs.

ForCES Network Element (NE) - An entity composed of one or more CEs and one or more FEs. An NE usually hides its internal organization from external entities and represents a single point of management to entities outside the NE.

Yang, et al. Informational

[Page 3]

Pre-association Phase - The period of time during which an FE Manager (see below) and a CE Manager (see below) are determining whether an FE and a CE should be part of the same network element. It is possible for some elements of the NE to be in pre-association phase while other elements are in the post-association phase.

Post-association Phase - The period of time during which an FE knows which CE is to control it and vice versa, including the time during which the CE and FE are establishing communication with one another.

ForCES Protocol - While there may be multiple protocols used within the overall ForCES architecture, the term "ForCES Protocol" refers only to the ForCES post-association phase protocol (see below).

ForCES Post-Association Phase Protocol - The protocol used for postassociation phase communication between CEs and FEs. This protocol does not apply to CE-to-CE communication, FE-to-FE communication, or to communication between FE and CE managers. The ForCES Protocol is a master-slave protocol in which FEs are slaves and CEs are masters. This protocol includes both the management of the communication channel (e.g., connection establishment, heartbeats) and the control messages themselves. This protocol could be a single protocol or could consist of multiple protocols working together, and may be unicast or multicast based. A separate protocol document will specify this information.

FE Manager - A logical entity that operates in the pre-association phase and is responsible for determining to which CE(s) an FE should communicate. This process is called CE discovery and may involve the FE manager learning the capabilities of available CEs. An FE manager may use anything from a static configuration to a pre-association phase protocol (see below) to determine which CE(s) to use; however, this is currently out of scope. Being a logical entity, an FE manager might be physically combined with any of the other logical entities mentioned in this section.

CE Manager - A logical entity that operates in the pre-association phase and is responsible for determining to which FE(s) a CE should communicate. This process is called FE discovery and may involve the CE manager learning the capabilities of available FEs. A CE manager may use anything from a static configuration to a pre-association phase protocol (see below) to determine which FE to use; however, this is currently out of scope. Being a logical entity, a CE manager might be physically combined with any of the other logical entities mentioned in this section.

DOCKET

Yang, et al. Informational

[Page 4]

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

Pre-association Phase Protocol - A protocol between FE managers and CE managers that is used to determine which CEs or FEs to use. A pre-association phase protocol may include a CE and/or FE capability discovery mechanism. Note that this capability discovery process is wholly separate from (and does not replace) that used within the ForCES Protocol. However, the two capability discovery mechanisms may utilize the same FE model.

FE Model - A model that describes the logical processing functions of an FE.

ForCES Protocol Element - An FE or CE.

Intra-FE topology - Representation of how a single FE is realized by combining possibly multiple logical functional blocks along multiple data paths. This is defined by the FE model.

FE Topology - Representation of how the multiple FEs in a single NE are interconnected. Sometimes it is called inter-FE topology, to be distinguished from intra-FE topology used by the FE model.

Inter-FE topology - See FE Topology.

2. Introduction to Forwarding and Control Element Separation (ForCES)

An IP network element (NE) appears to external entities as a monolithic piece of network equipment, e.g., a router, NAT, firewall, or load balancer. Internally, however, an IP network element (NE) (such as a router) is composed of numerous logically separated entities that cooperate to provide a given functionality (such as routing). Two types of network element components exist: control element (CE) in control plane and forwarding element (FE) in forwarding plane (or data plane). Forwarding elements are typically ASIC, network-processor, or general-purpose processor-based devices that handle data path operations for each packet. Control elements are typically based on general-purpose processors that provide control functionality, like routing and signaling protocols.

ForCES aims to define a framework and associated protocol(s) to standardize information exchange between the control and forwarding plane. Having standard mechanisms allows CEs and FEs to become physically separated standard components. This physical separation accrues several benefits to the ForCES architecture. Separate components would allow component vendors to specialize in one component without having to become experts in all components. Standard protocol also allows the CEs and FEs from different component vendors to interoperate with each other and hence it becomes possible for system vendors to integrate together the CEs and

Yang, et al. Informational

DOCKET

[Page 5]

DOCKET



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

