

Networking Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: June 24, 2016

Ran. Chen  
Zheng. Zhang  
ZTE Corporation  
December 22, 2015

PCEP Extensions for BIER  
draft-chen-pce-bier-01

## Abstract

Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER)-TE shares architecture and packet formats with BIER as described in ([[I-D.ietf-bier-architecture](#)]). BIER-TE forwards and replicates packets based on a BitString in the packet header, but every BitPosition of the BitString of a BIER-TE packet indicates one or more adjacencies. BIER-TE Path can be derived from a Path Computation Element (PCE).

This document specifies extensions to the Path Computation Element Protocol (PCEP) to handle requests and responses for the computation of paths for BIER-TE.

## Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on June 24, 2016.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of

Internet-Draft

PCEP Ext for BIER

December 2015

publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Conventions used in this document . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Overview of PCEP Operation in BIER Networks . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">BIER PCEP Message Extensions . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">BIER Capability Advertisement . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.1.1.</a>	<a href="#">The OPEN Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.1.1.1.</a>	<a href="#">The BIER PCE Capability TLV . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Path Computation Request/Reply Message Extensions . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">The RP/SPR Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">The New BIER END-POINT Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">ERO Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.2.3.1.</a>	<a href="#">BIER-ERO Subobject . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.2.4.</a>	<a href="#">RRO Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.2.4.1.</a>	<a href="#">RRO Processing . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP Objects . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP-Error Objects and Types . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">6.3.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP TLV Type Indicators . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">6.4.</a>	<a href="#">New Path Setup Type . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Normative references . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER)-TE shares architecture and packet formats with BIER as described in ([[I-D.ietf-bier-architecture](#)]). BIER-TE forwards and replicates packets based on a BitString in the packet header, but every BitPosition of the BitString of a BIER-TE packet indicates one or more adjacencies. BIER-TE Path can be derived from a Path Computation Element (PCE).

This document specifies extensions to the Path Computation Element

Protocol (PCEP) to handle requests and responses for the computation of paths for BIER-TE.

## [2.](#) 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](#).

## [3.](#) Overview of PCEP Operation in BIER Networks

BIER-TE forwards and replicates packets based on a BitString in the packet header. In a PCEP session, An ERO object specified in [\[RFC5440\]](#) can be extended to carry a BIER-TE path consists of one or more BIER-ERO subobject(s). BIER-TE computed by a PCE can be represented in the following forms:

- o An ordered set of adjacencies BitString(s) in which each bit represents that the adjacencies to which the BFR should replicate packets to in the domain.

In this document, we define a set of PCEP protocol extensions, including a new PCEP capability, a new Path Setup Type (PST), a new BIER END-POINT Object, new ERO subobjects, new RRO subobjects, new PCEP error codes and procedures.

## [4.](#) BIER PCEP Message Extensions

The following section describes the protocol extensions required to support BIER-TE path.

### [4.1.](#) BIER Capability Advertisement

#### [4.1.1.](#) The OPEN Object

This document defines a new optional TLV for use in the OPEN Object.

##### [4.1.1.1.](#) The BIER PCE Capability TLV

The BIER-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV is an optional TLV associated with the OPEN Object to exchange BIER capability of PCEP speakers. The format of the BIER-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV is shown in the following figure:




Figure 1

The code point for the TLV type is to be defined by IANA.

Length: 4 bytes

The "Reserved" (2 octet) and "Flags" (2 octet) fields are currently unused, and MUST be set to zero on transmission and ignored on reception.

4.1.1.1.1. Exchanging BIER Capability

This document defines a new optional BIER-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV for use in the OPEN object to negotiate the BIER capability. The inclusion of this TLV in the OPEN message destined to a PCC indicates the PCE's capability to perform BIER-TE path computations, and the inclusion of this TLV in the OPEN message destined to a PCE indicates the PCC's capability to support BIER-TE Path.

A PCE that is able to support the BIER extensions defined in this document SHOULD include the BIER-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV on the OPEN message. If the PCE does not include the BIER-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV in the OPEN message and PCC does include the TLV, it is RECOMMENDED that the PCC indicates a mismatch of capabilities.

## 4.2. Path Computation Request/Reply Message Extensions

### 4.2.1. The RP/SPR Object

In order to setup an BIER-TE, a new PATH-SETUP-TYPE TLV([[I-D.ietf-pce-lsp-setup-type](#)]) MUST be contained in RP or SRP object. This document defines a new Path Setup Type (PST) for BIER as follows:

- o PST = 2: Path is setup using BIER Traffic Engineering technique.

If a PCEP speaker does not recognize the PATH-SETUP-TYPE TLV, it MUST ignore the TLV in accordance with [[RFC5440](#)]. If a PCEP speaker

recognizes the TLV but does not support the TLV, it MUST send PCErr with Error-Type = 2 (Capability not supported).

### 4.2.2. The New BIER END-POINT Object

The END-POINTS object is used in a PCReq message to specify the BIER information of the path for which a path computation is requested. To represent the end points for a BIER path efficiently, we define a new END-POINT Object for the BIER path:

The format of the new END-POINTS Object is as follows:

```

      0                               1
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5
      +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
      |Subdomain-ID   |   BS Length   |
      +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
      |           Source BFR-id           |
      +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
      |   Destination BFR-id   |
      +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

```






Figure 3

Type: TBD

Length: 4 bytes

BS Length: A 1 octet field encoding the supported BitString length.

The "Reserved" (1 octets) fields are currently unused, and MUST be set to zero on transmission and ignored on reception.

Adjacency BitString: A 4 octet field encoding the Adjacency BitString where every BitPosition of the BitString indicates one or more adjacencies.

#### [4.2.3.1.1](#). BIER-ERO Processing

If a PCC finds a non-recognize the BIER-ERO subobject, the PCC MUST respond with a PCErr message with Error-Type=3 ("Unknown Object") and Error-Value=2 ("Unrecognized object Type") or Error-Type=4 ("Not supported object") and Error-Value=2 ("Not supported object Type") as described in [[RFC5440](#)] .

If a PCC receives an BIER-ERO subobject in which either BitStringLength or Adjacency BitString is absent, it MUST consider the entire BIER-ERO subobject invalid and send a PCErr message with Error-Type = 10 ("Reception of an invalid object") and Error-Value = TBD ("BitStringLength is absent ") and Error-Value = TBD ("Adjacency BitString is absent ")

If a PCC detects that all subobjects of BIER-ERO are not identical, it MUST send a PCErr message with Error-Type = 10 ("Reception of an invalid object") and Error-Value = TBD ("Non-identical BIER-ERO subobjects").

If a PCC receives an BIER-ERO subobject in which BitStringLength values are not chosen from: 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048, and 4096, as it described in ([[I-D.ietf-bier-architecture](#)]). The PCC MUST send

a PCErr message with Error-Type = 10 ("Reception of an invalid object") and Error-Value = TBD ("Invalid BitStringLength").

#### [4.2.4.](#) RRO Object

A PCC can record BIER-ERO explicit paths and report the paths to a PCE via RRO. An RRO object contains one or more subobjects called "BIER-RRO subobjects" whose formats are the same as that of BIER-ERO subobject.

##### [4.2.4.1.](#) RRO Processing

Processing rules of BIER-RRO subobject are identical to those of BIER-ERO subobject defined in [section 4.2.3.1](#) in this document.

## [5.](#) Security Considerations

TBD.

## [6.](#) IANA Considerations

### [6.1.](#) PCEP Objects

As discussed in [Section 4.2.2](#), a new END-POINTS Object-Type is defined. IANA has made the following Object-Type allocations from the "PCEP Objects" sub-registry:

Object	Object-Class Value
-----	-----
BIER END-POINT Object	TBD

As discussed in [Section 4.2.3](#) and 4.2.4, a new sub-object type for the PCEP explicit route object (ERO), and a new sub-object type for the PCEP record route object (RRO) are defined.

IANA has made the following sub-objects allocation from the RSVP Parameters registry:



EXPLICIT_ROUTE	BIER-ERO (PCEP-specific)	TBD
ROUTE_RECORD	BIER-RRO (PCEP-specific)	TBD

## 6.2. PCEP-Error Objects and Types

As described in [Section 4.2.3.1.1](#), a number of new PCEP-ERROR Object Error Values have been defined.

Error-Type	Meaning	Reference
10	Reception of an invalid object. Error-value = TBD: BitStringLength is absent Error-value = TBD: BitString is absent Error-value = TBD: Invalid BitStringLength	<a href="#">RFC 7752</a> This document This document This document

## 6.3. PCEP TLV Type Indicators

IANA is requested to allocate a new code point in the PCEP TLV Type Indicators registry, as follows:

Value	Meaning	Reference
TBD	BIER-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV	This document

## 6.4. New Path Setup Type

IANA is requested to allocate a new code point in the PCEP PATH\_SETUP\_TYPE TLV PST field registry, as follows:

Value	Description	Reference
2	Path is setup using BIER Traffic Engineering technique	This document

## 7. Normative references

[I-D.eckert-bier-te-arch]

Eckert, T. and G. Cauchie, "Traffic Engineering for Bit Index Explicit Replication BIER-TE", [draft-eckert-bier-te-arch-02](#) (work in progress), October 2015.

[I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]

Wijnands, I., Rosen, E., Dolganow, A., Przygienda, T., and S. Aldrin, "Multicast using Bit Index Explicit Replication", [draft-ietf-bier-architecture-02](#) (work in progress), July 2015.

[I-D.ietf-pce-lsp-setup-type]

Sivabalan, S., Medved, J., Minei, I., Crabbe, E., Varga, R., Tantsura, J., and J. Hardwick, "Conveying path setup type in PCEP messages", [draft-ietf-pce-lsp-setup-type-03](#) (work in progress), June 2015.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

[RFC5440] Vasseur, JP., Ed. and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5440, March 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5440>>.

## Authors' Addresses

Ran Chen  
ZTE Corporation  
No.50 Software Avenue,Yuhuatai District  
Nanjing, Jiangsu Province 210012  
China

Phone: +86 025 88014636  
Email: [chen.ran@zte.com.cn](mailto:chen.ran@zte.com.cn)

Zheng Zhang  
ZTE Corporation  
No.50 Software Avenue,Yuhuatai District  
Nanjing, Jiangsu Province 210012  
China

Email: [zhang.zheng@zte.com.cn](mailto:zhang.zheng@zte.com.cn)

