Network Working Group G. Bernstein
Internet Draft Grotto Networking
Intended status: Standards Track Sugang Xu
NICT
Expires: January 2011 Y.Lee
Huawei
Hiroaki Harai
NICT

July 12, 2010

Signaling Extensions for Wavelength Switched Optical Networks
draft-bernstein-ccamp-wson-signaling-07.txt

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Abstract

This memo provides extensions to Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) signaling for control of wavelength switched optical networks (WSON). Such extensions are necessary in WSONs under a number of conditions including: (a) when optional processing, such as regeneration, must be configured to occur at specific nodes along a path, (b) where equipment must be configured to accept an optical signal with specific attributes, or (c) where equipment must be configured to output an optical signal with specific attributes. In addition this memo provides mechanisms to support distributed wavelength assignment with bidirectional LSPs, and choice in distributed wavelength assignment algorithms. These extensions build on previous work for the control of lambda and G.709 based networks.

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 [RFC2119].

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This memo provides extensions to Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) signaling for control of wavelength switched optical networks (WSON). Fundamental extensions are given to permit simultaneous bi-directional wavelength assignment while more advanced extensions are given to support the networks described in [WSON-Frame] which feature connections requiring configuration of input, output, and general signal processing capabilities at a node along a LSP

These extensions build on previous work for the control of lambda and G.709 based networks.

2. Terminology

CWDM: Coarse Wavelength Division Multiplexing.

DWDM: Dense Wavelength Division Multiplexing.

FOADM: Fixed Optical Add/Drop Multiplexer.

ROADM: Reconfigurable Optical Add/Drop Multiplexer. A reduced port count wavelength selective switching element featuring ingress and egress line side ports as well as add/drop side ports.

RWA: Routing and Wavelength Assignment.

Wavelength Conversion/Converters: The process of converting an information bearing optical signal centered at a given wavelength to one with "equivalent" content centered at a different wavelength. Wavelength conversion can be implemented via an optical-electronic-optical (OEO) process or via a strictly optical process.

WDM: Wavelength Division Multiplexing.

Wavelength Switched Optical Networks (WSON): WDM based optical networks in which switching is performed selectively based on the center wavelength of an optical signal.

AWG: Arrayed Waveguide Grating.

OXC: Optical Cross Connect.

Optical Transmitter: A device that has both a laser tuned on certain wavelength and electronic components, which converts electronic signals into optical signals.

Optical Responder: A device that has both optical and electronic components. It detects optical signals and converts optical signals into electronic signals.

Optical Transponder: A device that has both an optical transmitter and an optical responder.

Optical End Node: The end of a wavelength (optical lambdas) lightpath in the data plane. It may be equipped with some optical/electronic devices such as wavelength multiplexers/demultiplexer (e.g. AWG), optical transponder, etc., which are employed to transmit/terminate the optical signals for data transmission.

3. Requirements for WSON Signaling

The following requirements for GMPLS based WSON signaling are in addition to the functionality already provided by existing GMPLS signaling mechanisms.

3.1. WSON Signal Characterization

WSON signaling MUST convey sufficient information characterizing the signal to allow systems along the path to determine compatibility and perform any required local configuration. Examples of such systems include intermediate nodes (ROADMs, OXCs, Wavelength converters, Regenerators, OEO Switches, etc...), links (WDM systems) and end systems (detectors, demodulators, etc...). The details of any local configuration processes are out of the scope of this document.

From [WSON-Frame] we have the following list of WSON signal characteristic information:

List 1. WSON Signal Characteristics

1. Optical tributary signal class (modulation format).
2. FEC: whether forward error correction is used in the digital stream and what type of error correcting code is used
3. Center frequency (wavelength)
4. Bit rate
5. G-PID: General Protocol Identifier for the information format

The first three items on this list can change as a WSON signal traverses a network with regenerators, OEO switches, or wavelength converters. An ability to control wavelength conversion already exists in GMPLS signaling along with the ability to share client signal type information (G-PID). In addition, bit rate is a standard GMPLS signaling traffic parameter. It is referred to as Bandwidth Encoding in [RFC3471]. This leaves two new parameters: modulation format and FEC type, needed to fully characterize the optical signal.

3.2. Per LSP Network Element Processing Configuration

In addition to configuring a network element (NE) along an LSP to input or output a signal with specific attributes, we may need to signal the NE to perform specific processing, such as 3R regeneration, on the signal at a particular NE. In [WSON-Frame] we discussed three types of processing not currently covered by GMPLS:

(A) Regeneration (possibly different types)

(B) Fault and Performance Monitoring

(C) Attribute Conversion

The extensions here MUST provide for the configuration of these types of processing at nodes along an LSP.

3.3. Bi-Directional Distributed Wavelength Assignment

WSON signaling MAY support distributed wavelength assignment consistent with the wavelength continuity constraint for bi-directional connections. The following two cases MAY be separately supported: (a) Where the same wavelength is used for both upstream and downstream directions, and (b) Where different wavelengths can be used for both upstream and downstream directions.

The need for the same wavelength on both directions mainly comes from the color constraint on some edges' hardware. In fact, the edges can be classified into two types, i.e. without and with the wavelength-port mapping re-configurability.

Without the mapping re-configurability at edges, the edge nodes must use the same wavelength in both directions. For example, (1) transponders are only connected to AWGs (i.e. multiplexer/de-multiplexer) ports directly and fixedly, or (2) transponders are connected to the add/drop ports of ROADM and each port is mapped to a dedicated wavelength fixedly.

On the other hand, with the mapping re-configurability at edges, the edge nodes can use different wavelengths in different directions. For example, in edge nodes, transponders are connected to add/drop ports of colorless ROADM. Thus, the wavelength-port remapping problem can be solved locally by appropriately configuring the colorless ROADM. If the colorless ROADM consists of OXC and AWGs, the OXC is configured appropriately.

The edges of data-plane in WSON can be constructed in different types based on cost and flexibility concerns. Without re-configurability we should consider the constraint of the same wavelength usage on both directions, but have lower costs. While, with wavelength-port mapping re-configurability we can relax the constraint, but have higher costs.

These two types of edges will co-exist in WSON mesh, till all the edges are unified by the same type. The existence of the first type edges presents a requirement of the same wavelength usage on both directions, which must be supported.

Moreover, if some carriers prefer an easy management lightpath usage, say use the same wavelength on both directions to reduce the burden on lightpath management, the same wavelength usage would be beneficial.

In cases of equipment failure, etc., fast provisioning used in quick recovery is critical to protect Carriers/Users against system loss. This requires efficient signaling which supports distributed wavelength assignment, in particular when the centralized wavelength assignment capability is not available.

3.4. Distributed Wavelength Assignment Support

WSON signaling MAY support the selection of a specific distributed wavelength assignment method.

As discussed in the [WSON-Frame] a variety of different wavelength assignment algorithms have been developed. A number of these are suitable for use in distributed wavelength assignment. This feature would allow the specification of a particular approach when more than one are implemented in the systems along the path.

3.5. Out of Scope

This draft does not address signaling information related to optical impairments.

4. WSON Signal Traffic Parameters, Attributes and Processing

As discussed in [WSON-Frame] single channel optical signals used in WSONs are called "optical tributary signals" and come in a number of classes characterized by modulation format and bit rate. Although WSONs are fairly transparent to the signals they carry, to ensure compatibility amongst various networks devices and end systems it can be important to include key lightpath characteristics as traffic parameters in signaling [WSON-Frame].

4.1. Traffic Parameters for Optical Tributary Signals

In [RFC3471] we see that the G-PID (client signal type) and bit rate (byte rate) of the signals are defined as parameters and in [RFC3473] they are conveyed Generalized Label Request object and the RSVP SENDER_TSPEC/FLOWSPEC objects respectively.

4.2. Signal Attributes and Processing

Section 3.2. gave the requirements for signaling to indicate to a particular NE along an LSP what type of processing to perform on an optical signal or how to configure that NE to accept or transmit an optical signal with particular attributes.

One way of accomplishing this is via a new EXPLICIT_ROUTE subobject. Reference [RFC3209] defines the EXPLICIT_ROUTE object (ERO) and a number of subobjects, while reference [RFC5420] defines general mechanisms for dealing with additional LSP attributes. Although reference [RFC5420] defines a RECORD_ROUTE object (RRO) attributes subobject, it does not define an ERO subobject for LSP attributes.

Regardless of the exact coding for the ERO subobject conveying the input, output, or processing instructions. This new "processing" subobject would follow a subobject containing the IP address, or the interface identifier [RFC3477], associated with the link on which it is to be used along with any label subobjects [RFC3473].

The contents of this new "processing" subobject would be a list of TLVs that could include:

- Modulation Type TLV (input and/or output)

- FEC Type TLV (input and/or output)

- Processing Instruction TLV

Currently the only processing instruction TLV currently defined is for regeneration. Possible encodings and values for these TLV are given in below.

4.2.1. Modulation Type sub-TLV

The modulation type sub-TLV may come in two different formats: a standard modulation field or a vendor specific modulation field. Both start with the same 32 bit header shown below.

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|S|I|     Modulation ID           |         Length                |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Where S bit set to 1 indicates a standardized modulation format and S bit set to 0 indicates a vendor specific modulation format. The length is the length in bytes of the entire modulation type field.

Where I bit set to 1 indicates an input modulation format and where I bit set to 0 indicates an output modulation format. Note that the source modulation type is implied when I bit is set to 0 and that the sink modulation type is implied when I bit is set to 1. For signaling purposes only the output form (I=0) is needed.

The format for the standardized type is given by:

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|1|I|        Modulation ID         |           Length            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Possible additional modulation parameters depending upon    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
:   the modulation ID                                           :
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Modulation ID

Takes on the following currently defined values:

0 Reserved

1 optical tributary signal class NRZ 1.25G

2 optical tributary signal class NRZ 2.5G

3 optical tributary signal class NRZ 10G

4 optical tributary signal class NRZ 40G

5 optical tributary signal class RZ 40G

Note that future modulation types may require additional parameters in their characterization.

The format for vendor specific modulation is given by:

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|0|I|    Vendor Modulation ID     |           Length              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                       Enterprise Number                       |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
:   Any vendor specific additional modulation parameters        :
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Vendor Modulation ID

This is a vendor assigned identifier for the modulation type.

Enterprise Number

A unique identifier of an organization encoded as a 32-bit integer. Enterprise Numbers are assigned by IANA and managed through an IANA registry [RFC2578].

Vendor Specific Additional parameters

There can be potentially additional parameters characterizing the vendor specific modulation.

4.2.2. FEC Type sub-TLV

The FEC Type TLV indicates the FEC type output at particular node along the LSP. The FEC type sub-TLV comes in two different types: a standard FEC field or a vendor specific FEC field. Both start with the same 32 bit header shown below.

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|S|I|       FEC ID                |         Length              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Possible additional FEC parameters depending upon           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
:   the FEC ID                                                  :
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Where S bit set to 1 indicates a standardized FEC format and S bit set to 0 indicates a vendor specific FEC format. The length is the length in bytes of the entire FEC type field.

Where the length is the length in bytes of the entire FEC type field.

Where I bit set to 1 indicates an input FEC format and where I bit set to 0 indicates an output FEC format. Note that the source FEC type is implied when I bit is set to 0 and that the sink FEC type is implied when I bit is set to 1. Only the output form (I=0) is used in signaling.

The format for standard FEC field is given by:

```
      0                   1                   2                   3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
     |1|I|        FEC ID              |           Length             |
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
     |   Possible additional FEC parameters depending upon            |
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
     :   the FEC ID                                                    :
     +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Takes on the following currently defined values for the standard FEC ID [G.709, G.975.1]:

0 Reserved

1 G.709 RS FEC

2 G.709V compliant Ultra FEC

3 G.975.1 Concatenated FEC (RS(255,239)/CSOC(n0/k0=7/6,J=8))

4 G.975.1 Concatenated FEC (BCH(3860,3824)/BCH(2040,1930))

5 G.975.1 Concatenated FEC (RS(1023,1007)/BCH(2407,1952))

6 G.975.1 Concatenated FEC (RS(1901,1855)/Extended Hamming Product Code (512,502)X(510,500))

7 G.975.1 LDPC Code

8 G.975.1 Concatenated FEC (Two orthogonally concatenated BCH codes)

9 G.975.1 RS(2720,2550)

10 G.975.1 Concatenated FEC (Two interleaved extended BCH (1020,988) codes)

Where RS stands for Reed-Solomon and BCH for Bose-Chaudhuri-Hocquengham.

The format for vendor-specific FEC field is given by:

```
     0                   1                   2                   3
     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
    +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
    |0|I|         Vendor FEC ID           |          Length          |
    +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
    |                       Enterprise Number                       |
    +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
    :   Any vendor specific additional FEC parameters               :
    +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Vendor FEC ID

This is a vendor assigned identifier for the FEC type.

Enterprise Number

A unique identifier of an organization encoded as a 32-bit integer. Enterprise Numbers are assigned by IANA and managed through an IANA registry [RFC2578].

Vendor Specific Additional FEC parameters

There can be potentially additional parameters characterizing the vendor specific FEC.

4.2.3. Regeneration Processing TLV

The Regeneration Processing TLV is used to indicate that this particular node is to perform the specified type of regeneration processing on the signal.

```
   0                   1                   2                   3
     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
    +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
    |  T  | C |                   Reserved                          |
    +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Where T bit indicates the type of regenerator:

T=0: Reserved

T=1: 1R Regenerator

T=2: 2R Regenerator

T=3: 3R Regenerator

Where C bit indicates the capability of regenerator:

C=0: Reserved

C=1: Fixed Regeneration Point

C=2: Selective Regeneration Pools

Note that the use of the C field is optional in signaling.

5. Bidirectional Lightpath using Same Wavelength

With the wavelength continuity constraint in CI-incapable [RFC3471] WSONs, where the nodes in the networks cannot support wavelength conversion, the same wavelength on each link along a unidirectional lightpath should be reserved. Per the definition in [RFC3471], a bidirectional lightpath can be seen as a pair of unidirectional lightpaths, which are provisioned along the same route simultaneously by the RSVP-TE signaling with Upstream Label and Label Set Objects in the messages [RFC3473]. This does not necessarily require the same wavelength in both directions.

In addition to the wavelength continuity constraint, requirement 3.2 gives us another constraint on wavelength usage in data plane, in particular, it requires the same wavelength to be used in both directions.

The simplest and efficient way is to only define an extension to the processing of Label Set [RFC3473], and leave the other processes untouched. The issues related to this new functionality including an LSP_ATTRIBUTES object defined in [RFC5420] and the new procedure are described in the following sections. This approach would have a lower blocking probability and a shorter provisioning time. In cases of equipment failure, etc., fast provisioning used in quick recovery is critical to protect Carriers/Users against system loss.

5.1. Using LSP_ATTRIBUTES Object

To trigger the new functionality at each GMPLS node, it is necessary to notify the receiver the new type lightpath request. One multi-purpose flag/attribute parameter container object called

LSP_ATTRIBUTES object and related mechanism defined in [RFC5420] meet this requirement. One bit in Attributes Flags TLV which indicates the new type lightpath, say, the bidirectional same wavelength lightpath will be present in an LSP_ATTRIBUTES object. Please refer to [RFC5420] for detailed descriptions of the Flag and related issues.

5.2. Bidirectional Lightpath Signaling Procedure

Considering the system configuration mentioned above, it is needed to add a new function into RSVP-TE to support bidirectional lightpath with same wavelength on both directions.

The lightpath setup procedure is described below:

1. Ingress node adds the new type lightpath indication in an LSP_ATTRIBUTES object. It is propagated in the Path message in the same way as that of a Label Set object for downstream;

2. On reception of a Path message containing both the new type lightpath indication in an LSP_ATTRIBUTES object and Label Set object, the receiver of message along the path checks the local LSP database to see if the Label Set TLVs are acceptable on both directions jointly. If there are acceptable wavelengths, then copy the values of them into new Label Set TLVs, and forward the Path message to the downstream node. Otherwise the Path message will be terminated, and a PathErr message with a "Routing problem/Label Set" indication will be generated;

3. On reception of a Path message containing both such a new type lightpath indication in an LSP_ATTRIBUTES object and an Upstream Label object, the receiver MUST terminate the Path message using a PathErr message with Error Code "Unknown Attributes TLV" and Error Value set to the value of the new type lightpath TLV type code;

4. On reception of a Path message containing both the new type lightpath indication in an LSP_ATTRIBUTES object and Label Set object, the egress node verifies whether the Label Set TLVs are acceptable, if one or more wavelengths are available on both directions, then any one available wavelength could be selected. A Resv message is generated and propagated to upstream node;

5. When a Resv message is received at an intermediate node, if it is a new type lightpath, the intermediate node allocates the label to interfaces on both directions and update internal database for this bidirectional same wavelength lightpath, then configures the local ROADM or OXC on both directions.

Except the procedure related to Label Set object, the other processes will be left untouched.

5.3. Backward Compatibility Considerations

Due to the introduction of new processing on Label Set object, it is required that each node in the lightpath is able to recognize the new type lightpath indication Flag carried by an LSP_ATTRIBUTES object, and deal with the new Label Set operation correctly. It is noted that this new extension is not backward compatible.

According to the descriptions in [RFC5420], an LSR that does not recognize a TLV type code carried in this object MUST reject the Path message using a PathErr message with Error Code "Unknown Attributes TLV" and Error Value set to the value of the Attributes Flags TLV type code.

An LSR that does not recognize a bit set in the Attributes Flags TLV MUST reject the Path message using a PathErr message with Error Code "Unknown Attributes Bit" and Error Value set to the bit number of the new type lightpath Flag in the Attributes Flags.The reader is referred to the detailed backward compatibility considerations expressed in [RFC5420].

6. Bidirectional Lightpath using Different Wavelengths

TBD

7. RWA Related

7.1. Wavelength Set Metric

Distributed wavelength assignment makes extensive use of the label set object/TLV of [RFC3471]. Some wavelength assignment algorithms require supplemental information concerning the potential lambdas to be used. An ordered set of TLVs in correspondence with the group of one or more label set TLVs can be used to convey this information in the form of a general wavelength "acceptability" metric.

Note that the label set syntax of [RFC3471] allows group of wavelengths into ranges. For the purpose of supplementing this information with wavelength count only those wavelengths with the same counts could be grouped.

The general format for supplemental wavelength selection information could be as follows:

The information carried in a Wavelength Set Metric TLV is:

```
  0                   1                   2                   3
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
 |   Info Type   | Metric Size   |   Num Metrics                 |
 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
 |                          Wavelength Metric Info               |
 |   From lowest to highest frequency if more that one value     |
 |                              ...                              |
 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Info Type: 8 bits

0 - Single Value

The enclosed single value for the wavelength metric is given to all wavelengths in the corresponding wavelength set.

1 - List

The enclosed list gets applied in a one-to-one fashion to each wavelength in the corresponding wavelength set. An error occurs if the number of metrics in this list and the number of wavelengths in the wavelength set is not equal.

Metric Size:

Indicates the size of the wavelength metric information as follows

0 - 8 bits

1 - 16 bits

2 - 32 bits

Number 0f Metrics: 24 bits

Wavelength Metric: (1, 2, or 4 octets)

The wavelength metric represents in some fashion the desirability or lack thereof to use this wavelength over another available wavelength. Different wavelength assignment algorithms may use this information differently.

7.2. Wavelength Assignment Method Selection

As discussed in [HZang00] a number of different wavelength assignment algorithms maybe employed. In addition as discussed in [WSON-Frame] the wavelength assignment can be either for a unidirectional lightpath or for a bidirectional lightpath constrained to use the same lambda in both directions. A simple TLV could be used to indication wavelength assignment directionality and wavelength assignment method. This would be placed in an LSP_REQUIRED_ATTRIBUTES object per [RFC5420]. The use of a TLV in the LSP required attributes object was pointed out in [Xu].

[TO DO: The directionality stuff needs to be reconciled with the earlier material]

Directionality: 0 unidirectional, 1 bidirectional

Wavelength Assignment Method: 0 unspecified (any), 1 First-Fit, 2 Random, 3 Least-Loaded (multi-fiber). Others TBD.

```
    0                   1                   2                   3
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
   +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   |    Direction  |    WA Method  |           Reserved            |
   +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

[TBD: Should we have a vendor specific extension mechanism or bits allocated for private use for the case of non-standardized methods?]

8. Security Considerations

This document has no requirement for a change to the security models within GMPLS and associated protocols. That is the OSPF-TE, RSVP-TE, and PCEP security models could be operated unchanged.

However satisfying the requirements for RWA using the existing protocols may significantly affect the loading of those protocols.

This makes the operation of the network more vulnerable to denial of service attacks. Therefore additional care maybe required to ensure that the protocols are secure in the WSON environment.

Furthermore the additional information distributed in order to address the RWA problem represents a disclosure of network capabilities that an operator may wish to keep private. Consideration should be given to securing this information.

9. IANA Considerations

TBD. Once finalized in our approach we will need identifiers for such things and modulation types, modulation parameters, wavelength assignment methods, etc...

10. Acknowledgments

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

11. References

11.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

[RFC2578] McCloghrie, K., Perkins, D., and J. Schoenwaelder, "Structure of Management Information Version 2 (SMIv2)", STD 58, RFC 2578, April 1999.

[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.

[RFC3471] Berger, L., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Functional Description", RFC 3471, January 2003.

[RFC3473] Berger, L., Ed., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Resource ReserVation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Extensions", RFC 3473, January 2003.

[RFC3477] Kompella, K. and Y. Rekhter, "Signalling Unnumbered Links in Resource ReSerVation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", RFC 3477, January 2003.

[RFC5420] Farrel, A., Ed., Papadimitriou, D., Vasseur, J.-P., and A. Ayyangar, " Encoding of Attributes for MPLS LSP Establishment Using Resource Reservation Protocol Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", RFC 5420, February 2006.

11.2. Informative References

[WSON-CompOSPF] Y. Lee, G. Bernstein, "OSPF Enhancement for Signal and Network Element Compatibility for Wavelength Switched Optical Networks", work in progress: draft-lee-ccamp-wson-signal-compatibility-OSPF.

[WSON-Frame] G. Bernstein, Y. Lee, W. Imajuku, "Framework for GMPLS and PCE Control of Wavelength Switched Optical Networks", work in progress: draft-bernstein-ccamp-wavelength-switched-03.txt, February 2008.

[HZang00] H. Zang, J. Jue and B. Mukherjeee, "A review of routing and wavelength assignment approaches for wavelength-routed optical WDM networks", Optical Networks Magazine, January 2000.

[Xu] S. Xu, H. Harai, and D. King, "Extensions to GMPLS RSVP-TE for Bidirectional Lightpath the Same Wavelength", work in progress: draft-xu-rsvpte-bidir-wave-01, November 2007.

[Winzer06] Peter J. Winzer and Rene-Jean Essiambre, "Advanced Optical Modulation Formats", Proceedings of the IEEE, vol. 94, no. 5, pp. 952-985, May 2006.

[G.709] ITU-T Recommendation G.709, Interfaces for the Optical Transport Network(OTN), March 2003.

[G.959.1] ITU-T Recommendation G.959.1, Optical Transport Network Physical Layer Interfaces, March 2006.

[G.975.1] ITU-T Recommendation G.975.1, Forward error correction for high bit-rate DWDM submarine systems, February, 2004.

[G.694.1] ITU-T Recommendation G.694.1, Spectral grids for WDM applications: DWDM frequency grid, June 2002.

[G.694.2] ITU-T Recommendation G.694.2, Spectral grids for WDM applications: CWDM wavelength grid, December 2003.

[G.Sup43] ITU-T Series G Supplement 43, Transport of IEEE 10G base-R in optical transport networks (OTN), November 2006.

[RFC4427] Mannie, E., Ed., and D. Papadimitriou, Ed., "Recovery (Protection and Restoration) Terminology for Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS)", RFC 4427, March 2006.

Author's Addresses

Greg M. Bernstein (editor)
Grotto Networking
Fremont California, USA

Phone: (510) 573-2237
Email: gregb@grotto-networking.com

Nicola Andriolli
Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy
Email: nick@sssup.it

Alessio Giorgetti
Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy
Email: a.giorgetti@sssup.it

Lin Guo
Key Laboratory of Optical Communication and Lightwave Technologies
Ministry of Education
P.O. Box 128, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications,
P.R.China
Email: guolintom@gmail.com

Hiroaki Harai
National Institute of Information and Communications Technology
4-2-1 Nukui-Kitamachi, Koganei,
Tokyo, 184-8795 Japan

Phone: +81 42-327-5418
Email: harai@nict.go.jp

Yuefeng Ji
Key Laboratory of Optical Communication and Lightwave Technologies
Ministry of Education
P.O. Box 128, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications,
P.R.China
Email: jyf@bupt.edu.cn

Daniel King
Old Dog Consulting

Email: daniel@olddog.co.uk

Young Lee (editor)
Huawei Technologies

1700 Alma Drive, Suite 100
Plano, TX 75075
USA

Phone: (972) 509-5599 (x2240)
Email: ylee@huawei.com

Sugang Xu
National Institute of Information and Communications Technology
4-2-1 Nukui-Kitamachi, Koganei,
Tokyo, 184-8795 Japan

Phone: +81 42-327-6927
Email: xsg@nict.go.jp

Intellectual Property Statement

Disclaimer of Validity

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.