

Workgroup: Network Working Group

Internet-Draft:

draft-chen-pce-sr-ingress-protection-09

Published: 15 November 2022

Intended Status: Standards Track

Expires: 19 May 2023

Authors: H. Chen	M. McBride	M. Toy	G. Mishra
Futurewei	Futurewei	Verizon Inc.	Verizon Inc.
A. Wang	Z. Li	Y. Liu	
China Telecom	China Mobile	China Mobile	
B. Khasanov	L. Liu	X. Liu	
Yandex LLC	Fujitsu	Volta Networks	

### **Path Ingress Protections**

## **Abstract**

This document describes extensions to Path Computation Element (PCE) communication Protocol (PCEP) for fast protecting the ingress nodes of two types of paths or tunnels, which are Segment Routing (SR) paths and Bit Index Explicit Replication Tree/Traffic Engineering (BIER-TE) paths. The extensions comprise a foundation for protecting the ingress nodes of different types of paths. Based on this, the ingress protection of a new type of paths can be easily supported.

## **Requirements Language**

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 [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

## **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 <https://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 19 May 2023.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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 (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of 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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

## Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#)
  - [1.1. Terminologies](#)
- [2. Path Ingress Protection Examples](#)
  - [2.1. SR Path Ingress Protection Example](#)
  - [2.2. BIER-TE Path Ingress Protection Example](#)
- [3. Behavior around Ingress Failure](#)
  - [3.1. Source Detect](#)
  - [3.2. Backup Ingress Detect](#)
  - [3.3. Both Detect](#)
- [4. Extensions to PCEP](#)
  - [4.1. Capabilities for Ingress Protection](#)
    - [4.1.1. Capability for Ingress Protection with Backup Ingress](#)
    - [4.1.2. Capability for Ingress Protection with Traffic Source](#)
  - [4.2. Extensions for Backup Ingress and Traffic Source](#)
    - [4.2.1. Extensions for Backup Ingress](#)
    - [4.2.2. Extensions for Traffic Source](#)
- [5. Security Considerations](#)
- [6. Acknowledgements](#)
- [7. IANA Considerations](#)
- [8. References](#)
  - [8.1. Normative References](#)
  - [8.2. Informative References](#)
- [Authors' Addresses](#)

## 1. Introduction

The fast protection of a transit node in each type of paths or tunnels have been proposed. For example, the fast protection of a transit node in a Segment Routing (SR) path or tunnel is described in [[I-D.ietf-rtgwg-segment-routing-ti-lfa](#)]. The fast protection of a transit node of a "Bit Index Explicit Replication" (BIER) Traffic Engineering (BIER-TE) path or tunnel is described in

[[I-D.chen-bier-te-frr](#)]. [[RFC8424](#)] presents extensions to RSVP-TE for the fast protection of the ingress node of a traffic engineering (TE) Label Switching Path (LSP). However, these documents do not discuss any protocol extensions for the fast protection of the ingress node of an SR path/tunnel, a BIER-TE path/tunnel, or other type of paths/tunnels.

This document fills that void and specifies protocol extensions to Path Computation Element (PCE) communication Protocol (PCEP) [[RFC5440](#)] and [[RFC9050](#)] for fast protecting the ingress nodes of two types of paths: SR paths and BIER-TE paths. The extensions comprise a foundation for protecting the ingress nodes of different types of paths. Based on this, the ingress protection of a new type of paths can be easily supported.

Ingress node and ingress, fast protection and protection, path ingress protection and ingress protection, SR path and SR tunnel, as well as BIER-TE path and BIER-TE tunnel will be used exchangeably in the following sections.

### 1.1. Terminologies

The following terminologies are used in this document.

**PCE:** Path Computation Element or Path Computation Element server

**PCEP:** PCE communication Protocol

**PCC:** Path Computation Client

**BIER:** Bit Index Explicit Replication

**BIFT:** Bit Index Forwarding Table

**CE:** Customer Edge

**PE:** Provider Edge

**TE:** Traffic Engineering

**SR:** Segment Routing

**LFA:** Loop-Free Alternate

**TI-LFA:** Topology Independent LFA

**BFD:** Bidirectional Forwarding Detection

**VPN:** Virtual Private Network

**L3VPN:**  
Layer 3 VPN

**FIB:** Forwarding Information Base

## 2. Path Ingress Protection Examples

This section shows two examples of path ingress protection. One is SR path ingress protection, and the other is BIER-TE path ingress protection.

### 2.1. SR Path Ingress Protection Example

[Figure 1](#) shows an example of protecting ingress PE1 of a SR path, which is from ingress PE1 to egress PE3 and represented by \*\*\* in the figure.




Figure 1: Protecting Ingress PE1 of SR Path

In normal operations, CE1 sends the traffic with destination PE3 to ingress PE1, which imports the traffic into the SR path.

When CE1 detects the failure of ingress PE1, it switches the traffic to backup ingress PE2, which imports the traffic from CE1 into a backup SR path. The backup path is from the backup ingress PE2 to the egress PE3 and represented by ### in the figure. When the traffic is imported into the backup path, it is sent to the egress PE3 along the path.

### 2.2. BIER-TE Path Ingress Protection Example

[Figure 2](#) shows an example of protecting ingress PE1 of a BIER-TE path, which is from ingress PE1 to egress nodes PE3 and PE4. This primary BIER-TE path is represented by \*\*\* in the figure. The ingress of the primary BIER-TE path is called primary ingress.




Figure 2: Protecting Ingress PE1 of BIER-TE Path

The backup BIER-TE path is from ingress PE2 to egress nodes PE3 and PE4, which is represented by ### in the figure. The ingress of the backup BIER-TE path is called backup ingress.

In normal operations, CE1 sends the packets with a multicast group and source to ingress PE1, which imports/encapsulates the packets into the BIER-TE path through adding a BIER-TE header. The header contains the BIER-TE path from ingress PE1 to egress nodes PE3 and PE4.

When CE1 detects the failure of ingress PE1 using a failure detection mechanism such as BFD, it switches the traffic to backup ingress PE2, which imports the traffic from CE1 into the backup BIER-TE path. When the traffic is imported into the backup path, it is sent to the egress nodes PE3 and PE4 along the path.

Given the traffic source (e.g., CE1), ingress (e.g., PE1) and egresses (e.g., PE3 and PE4) of the primary BIER-TE path, the PCE computes a backup ingress (e.g., PE2), a backup BIER-TE path from the backup ingress to the egresses, and sends the backup BIER-TE path to the PCC of the backup ingress. It also sends the information about the backup ingress, the primary ingress and the traffic to the PCC of the traffic source (e.g., CE1).

When the PCC of the traffic source receives the information about the backup ingress, the primary ingress and the traffic, it sets up the fast detection of the primary ingress failure and the switch over target backup ingress. This setup lets the traffic source node switch the traffic (to be sent to the primary ingress) to the backup ingress when it detects the failure of the primary ingress.

When the PCC of the backup ingress receives the backup BIER-TE path, it adds a forwarding entry into its BIFT. This entry encapsulates the packets from the traffic source in the backup BIER-TE path. This makes the backup ingress send the traffic received from the traffic source to the egress nodes via the backup BIER-TE path.

### **3. Behavior around Ingress Failure**

This section describes the behavior of some nodes connected to the ingress before and after the ingress fails. These nodes are the traffic source (e.g., CE1) and the backup ingress (e.g., PE2). It presents three ways in which these nodes work together to protect the ingress. The first way is called source detect, where the traffic source is responsible for fast detecting the failure of the ingress. The second way is called backup ingress detect, in which the backup ingress is responsible for fast detecting the failure of the ingress. The third way is called both detect, where both the traffic source and the backup ingress are responsible for fast detecting the failure of the ingress.

#### **3.1. Source Detect**

In normal operations, i.e., before the failure of the ingress of a primary path such as a primary BIER-TE path, the traffic source sends the traffic to the ingress of the primary path. The backup ingress (e.g., PE2) is ready to import the traffic from the traffic source into the backup path such as the backup BIER-TE path installed.

When the traffic source detects the failure of the ingress, it switches the traffic to the backup ingress, which delivers the traffic to the egress nodes of the path via the backup path.

#### **3.2. Backup Ingress Detect**

The traffic source (e.g., CE1) always sends the traffic to both the ingress (e.g., PE1) of the primary path such as the primary BIER-TE path and the backup ingress (e.g., PE2).

The backup ingress does not import any traffic from the traffic source into the backup path such as the backup BIER-TE path in normal operations. When it detects the failure of the ingress of the primary path, it imports the traffic from the source into the backup path.

For the backup ingress to fast detect the failure of the primary ingress, it SHOULD directly connect to the primary ingress. When a PCE computes a backup ingress and a backup path, it SHOULD consider this.

#### **3.3. Both Detect**

In normal operations, i.e., before the failure of the ingress, the traffic source sends the traffic to the ingress of the primary path such as the primary BIER-TE path. When it detects the failure of the ingress, it switches the traffic to the backup ingress.

The backup ingress does not import any traffic from the traffic source into the backup path such as the backup BIER-TE path in normal operations. When it detects the failure of the ingress of the primary path, it imports the traffic from the source into the backup path.

#### 4. Extensions to PCEP

A PCC runs on each of the edge nodes such as PEs of a network normally. A PCE runs on a server as a controller to communicate with PCCs. PCE and PCCs work together to support protection for the ingress of a path. The path is a SR path, a BIER-TE path, or a path of another type.

##### 4.1. Capabilities for Ingress Protection

###### 4.1.1. Capability for Ingress Protection with Backup Ingress

When a PCE and a PCC running on a backup ingress establish a PCEP session between them, they exchange their capabilities of supporting protection for the ingress node of each of different types of paths.

A new sub-TLV called INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY is defined. It is included in the PATH\_SETUP\_TYPE\_CAPABILITY TLV with PST = TBD1 (suggested value 2 for path ingress protection) in the OPEN object, which is exchanged in Open messages when a PCC and a PCE establish a PCEP session between them. Its format is illustrated below.




Figure 3: INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY sub-TLV

- Type:** TBD2 is to be assigned by IANA.
- Length:** 4.
- Reserved:** 2 octets. MUST be set to zero in transmission and ignored on reception.
- PathInd:** 1 octet. Indicators for the types of paths whose ingress protections are supported. Two indicators are defined.

S : S = 1 indicating that the ingress protection of a SR path is supported.

- o B : B = 1 indicating that the ingress protection of a BIER-TE path is supported.

**Flags:** 1 octet. Two flags are defined.

- o D flag: A PCC sets this flag to 1 to indicate that it is able to detect its adjacent node's failure quickly.
- o A flag: A PCE sets this flag to 1 to request a PCC to let the forwarding entry for the backup path/tunnel be Active.

A PCC, which supports ingress protection for different types of paths, sends a PCE an Open message containing INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY sub-TLV. This sub-TLV indicates that the PCC is capable of supporting the ingress protection for the types of paths.

For example, if a PCC supports ingress protection for SR path and BIER-TE path, the PCC sends a PCE an Open message containing INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY sub-TLV with S = 1 and B = 1.

A PCE, which supports ingress protection for different types of paths, sends a PCC an Open message containing INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY sub-TLV. This sub-TLV indicates that the PCE is capable of supporting the ingress protection for the types of paths.

If both a PCC and a PCE support INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY, each of the Open messages sent by the PCC and PCE contains PATH-SETUP-TYPE-CAPABILITY TLV with a PST list containing PST=TBD1 and an INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY sub-TLV.

If a PCE receives an Open message from a PCC without a INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY sub-TLV indicating PCC's support for the ingress protection of a type of paths, then the PCE MUST not send the PCC any request for ingress protection of the type of paths.

If a PCC receives an Open message from a PCE without a INGRESS\_PROTECTION\_CAPABILITY sub-TLV indicating PCE's support for the ingress protection of a type of paths, then the PCC MUST ignore any request for ingress protection of the type of paths from the PCE.

If a PCC sets D flag to zero, then the PCE SHOULD send the PCC an Open message with A flag set to one and the fast detection of the failure of the primary ingress MUST be done by the traffic source.



When the PCE sends the PCC a message for initiating a backup path, the PCC MUST let the forwarding entry for the backup path be Active.

#### 4.1.2. Capability for Ingress Protection with Traffic Source

When a PCE and a PCC running on a traffic source node establish a PCEP session between them, they exchange their capabilities of supporting ingress protection.

The PCECC-CAPABILITY sub-TLV defined in [[RFC9050](#)] is included in the OPEN object in the PATH-SETUP-TYPE-CAPABILITY TLV, which is exchanged in Open messages when a PCC and a PCE establish a PCEP session between them.

A new flag bit P is defined in the Flags field of the PCECC-CAPABILITY sub-TLV:

\*P flag (for Ingress Protection): if set to 1 by a PCEP speaker, the P flag indicates that the PCEP speaker supports and is willing to handle the PCECC based central controller instructions for ingress protection. The bit MUST be set to 1 by both a PCC and a PCE for the PCECC ingress protection instruction download/report on a PCEP session.

#### 4.2. Extensions for Backup Ingress and Traffic Source

This section specifies the extensions to PCEP for the backup ingress and the traffic source. The extensions let the traffic source

**S1:** fast detect the failure of the primary ingress and switch the traffic to the backup ingress when the traffic source detects the failure of the primary ingress, or

**S2:** always send the traffic to both the primary ingress and the backup ingress.

The extensions let the backup ingress

**B1:** always import the traffic received from the traffic source with possible service ID into the backup path, or

**B2:** import the traffic with possible service ID into the backup path when the backup ingress detects the failure of the primary ingress.

The following lists the combinations of Si and Bi (i = 1,2) for different ways of failure detects.

**Source Detect:** S1 and B1.

**Backup Ingress Detect:**

S2 and B2.

**Both Detect:** S1 and B2.

**4.2.1. Extensions for Backup Ingress**

For the packets from the traffic source, if the primary ingress (i.e., the ingress of the primary path) encapsulates the packets with a service ID or label into the path, the backup ingress **MUST** have this service ID or label and encapsulates the packets with the service ID or label into the backup path when the primary ingress fails.

If the backup ingress is requested to detect the failure of the primary ingress, it **MUST** have the information about the primary ingress such as the address of the primary ingress.

A new sub-TLV called INGRESS\_PROTECTION is defined. When a PCE sends a PCC a PCInitiate message for initiating a backup path to protect the primary ingress node of a primary path, the message contains this TLV in the RP/SRP object. Its format is illustrated below.




Figure 4: INGRESS\_PROTECTION sub-TLV

**Type:** TBD3 is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** Variable.

**Reserved:** 2 octets. **MUST** be set to zero in transmission and ignored on reception.

**Flags:** 2 octets. One flag is defined.

A flag bit: it is set to 1 or 0 by PCE.

o

1 is to request the backup ingress to let the forwarding entry for the backup path be Active always. In this case, the traffic source detects the failure of the primary ingress and switches the traffic to the backup ingress when it detects the failure.

- o 0 is to request the backup ingress to detect the failure of the primary ingress and let the forwarding entry for the backup path be Active when the primary ingress fails. In this case, the TLV includes the primary ingress address in a Primary-Ingress sub-TLV. The traffic source can send the traffic to both the primary ingress and the backup ingress. It may switch the traffic to the backup ingress from the primary ingress when it detects the failure of the primary ingress.

Three optional sub-TLVs are defined: Primary-Ingress sub-TLV, Service sub-TLV, and Traffic-Description sub-TLV. The Traffic-Description sub-TLV describes the traffic to be imported into the backup SR path. The Multicast Flow Specification TLV for IPv4 or IPv6, which is defined in [[I-D.ietf-pce-pcep-flowspec](#)], is used as a sub-TLV to indicate the traffic to be imported into the backup BIER-TE path.

#### 4.2.1.1. Primary-Ingress sub-TLV

A Primary-Ingress sub-TLV indicates the IP address of the primary ingress node of a primary path. It has two formats: one for primary ingress node IPv4 address and the other for primary ingress node IPv6 address, which are illustrated below.




Figure 5: Primary Ingress IPv4 Address sub-TLV

**Type:** TBD4 is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** 4.

**Primary Ingress IPv4 Address:** 4 octets. It represents an IPv4 host address of the primary ingress node of a path.

[illegible]






Figure 10: IPv4 FEC sub-TLV

**Type:** TBD9 is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** Variable.

**IPv4 Prefix Len:** Indicates the length of the IPv4 Prefix.

**IPv4 Prefix:** IPv4 Prefix rounded to octets.

**Virtual Network ID:** 2 octets. This is optional. It indicates the ID of a virtual network.




Figure 11: IPv6 FEC sub-TLV

**Type:** TBDA is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** Variable.

**IPv6 Prefix Len:** Indicates the length of the IPv6 Prefix.

**IPv6 Prefix:** IPv6 Prefix rounded to octets.

**Virtual Network ID:** 2 octets. This is optional. It indicates the ID of a virtual network.

An Interface sub-TLV indicates the interface from which the traffic is received and imported into the backup path. It has three formats:

one for interface index, the other two for IPv4 and IPv6 address, which are illustrated below.




Figure 12: Interface Index sub-TLV

**Type:** TBDb is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** 4.

**Interface Index:** 4 octets. It indicates the index of an interface.




Figure 13: Interface IPv4 Address sub-TLV

**Type:** TBDC is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** 4.

**Interface IPv4 Address:** 4 octets. It represents the IPv4 address of an interface.




Figure 14: Interface IPv6 Address sub-TLV

**Type:**

TBDd is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** 16.

**Interface IPv6 Address:** 16 octets. It represents the IPv6 address of an interface.

#### 4.2.2. Extensions for Traffic Source

If the traffic source is requested to detect the failure of the primary ingress and switch the traffic (to be sent to the primary ingress) to the backup ingress when the primary ingress fails, it MUST have the information about the backup ingress, the primary ingress and the traffic. This information may be transferred via a CCI object for INGRESS-PROTECTION to the PCC of the traffic source node from a PCE.

If the traffic source PCC does not accept the request from the PCE or support the extensions, the PCE SHOULD have the information about the behavior of the traffic source configured such as whether it detects the failure of the primary ingress. Based on the information, the PCE instructs the backup ingress accordingly.

The Central Control Instructions (CCI) Object is defined in [RFC9050] for a PCE as a controller to send instructions for LSPs to a PCC. This document defines a new object-type (TBDt) for ingress protection based on the CCI object. The body of the object with the new object-type is illustrated below. The object may be in PCRpt, PCUpd, or PCInitiate message.




Figure 15: INGRESS-PROTECTION Object Body

**CC-ID:** It is the same as described in [RFC9050].

**Flags:** Two flag bits D and B are defined as follows:

**D:**



D = 1 instructs the PCC of the traffic source to Detect the failure of the primary ingress and switch the traffic to the backup ingress when it detects the failure.

**B:** B = 1 instructs the PCC of the traffic source to send the traffic to Both the primary ingress and the backup ingress.

**Optional TLV:** Primary ingress TLV, backup ingress TLV, Traffic-Description TLV or Multicast Flow Specification TLV.

The primary ingress sub-TLV defined above is used as a TLV to contain the information about the primary ingress in the object. The Traffic-Description sub-TLV defined above is used as a TLV to contain the information about the traffic for a SR path in the object. The Multicast Flow Specification TLV for IPv4 or IPv6, which is defined in [[I-D.ietf-pce-pcep-flowspec](#)], is used to contain the information about the traffic for a BIER-TE path in the object. A new TLV, called backup ingress TLV, is defined to contain the information about the backup ingress in the object.

#### 4.2.2.1. Backup-Ingress TLV

A Backup-Ingress TLV indicates the IP address of the ingress node of a backup path. It has two formats: one for backup ingress node IPv4 address and the other for backup ingress node IPv6 address, which are illustrated below. They have the same format as the Primary-Ingress sub-TLVs.




Figure 16: Backup Ingress IPv4 Address TLV

**Type:** TBDe is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** 4.

**Backup Ingress IPv4 Address:** 4 octets. It represents an IPv4 host address of the backup ingress.




Figure 17: Backup Ingress IPv6 Address TLV

**Type:** TBDf is to be assigned by IANA.

**Length:** 16.

**Backup Ingress IPv6 Address:** 16 octets. It represents an IPv6 host address of the backup ingress node.

## 5. Security Considerations

TBD

## 6. Acknowledgements

The authors of this document would like to thank Dhruv Dhody and Robin Li for their reviews and comments.

## 7. IANA Considerations

TBD

## 8. References

### 8.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://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, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5440>>.
- [RFC7356] Ginsberg, L., Previdi, S., Yang, Y., and RFC Publisher, "IS-IS Flooding Scope Link State PDUs (LSPs)", RFC 7356, DOI 10.17487/RFC7356, September 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7356>>.

**[RFC8424]**

Chen, H., Ed., Torvi, R., Ed., and RFC Publisher,  
"Extensions to RSVP-TE for Label Switched Path (LSP)  
Ingress Fast Reroute (FRR) Protection", RFC 8424, DOI  
10.17487/RFC8424, August 2018, <[https://www.rfc-  
editor.org/info/rfc8424](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8424)>.

**[RFC9050]**

Li, Z., Peng, S., Negi, M., Zhao, Q., Zhou, C., and RFC  
Publisher, "Path Computation Element Communication  
Protocol (PCEP) Procedures and Extensions for Using the  
PCE as a Central Controller (PCECC) of LSPs", RFC 9050,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC9050, July 2021, <[https://www.rfc-  
editor.org/info/rfc9050](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9050)>.

## 8.2. Informative References

**[I-D.chen-bier-te-frr]** Chen, H., McBride, M., Liu, Y., Wang, A.,  
Mishra, S., Fan, Y., Liu, L., and X. Liu, "BIER-TE Fast  
ReRoute", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-chen-  
bier-te-frr-03, 15 August 2022, <[https://www.ietf.org/  
archive/id/draft-chen-bier-te-frr-03.txt](https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-chen-bier-te-frr-03.txt)>.

**[I-D.ietf-pce-pcep-flowspec]** Dhody, D., Farrel, A., and Z. Li, "PCEP  
Extension for Flow Specification", Work in Progress,  
Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-pce-pcep-flowspec-13, 14  
October 2021, <[https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-  
ietf-pce-pcep-flowspec-13.txt](https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-pce-pcep-flowspec-13.txt)>.

**[I-D.ietf-rtgwg-segment-routing-ti-lfa]**

Litkowski, S., Bashandy, A., Filsfils, C., Francois, P.,  
Decraene, B., and D. Voyer, "Topology Independent Fast  
Reroute using Segment Routing", Work in Progress,  
Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-rtgwg-segment-routing-ti-  
lfa-08, 21 January 2022, <[https://www.ietf.org/archive/  
id/draft-ietf-rtgwg-segment-routing-ti-lfa-08.txt](https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-rtgwg-segment-routing-ti-lfa-08.txt)>.

**[RFC5462]**

Andersson, L., Asati, R., and RFC Publisher,  
"Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Stack Entry:  
"EXP" Field Renamed to "Traffic Class" Field", RFC 5462,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC5462, February 2009, <[https://www.rfc-  
editor.org/info/rfc5462](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5462)>.

## Authors' Addresses

Huaimo Chen  
Futurewei  
Boston, MA,  
United States of America

Email: [Huaimo.chen@futurewei.com](mailto:Huaimo.chen@futurewei.com)

Mike McBride  
Futurewei

Email: [michael.mcbride@futurewei.com](mailto:michael.mcbride@futurewei.com)

Mehmet Toy  
Verizon Inc.  
United States of America

Email: [mehmet.toy@verizon.com](mailto:mehmet.toy@verizon.com)

Gyan S. Mishra  
Verizon Inc.  
13101 Columbia Pike  
Silver Spring, MD 20904  
United States of America

Phone: [301 502-1347](tel:3015021347)  
Email: [gyan.s.mishra@verizon.com](mailto:gyan.s.mishra@verizon.com)

Aijun Wang  
China Telecom  
Beiqijia Town, Changping District  
Beijing  
102209  
China

Email: [wangaj3@chinatelecom.cn](mailto:wangaj3@chinatelecom.cn)

Zhenqiang Li  
China Mobile  
32 Xuanwumen West Ave, Xicheng District  
Beijing  
100053  
China

Email: [lizhengqiang@chinamobile.com](mailto:lizhengqiang@chinamobile.com)

Yisong Liu  
China Mobile

Email: [liuyisong@chinamobile.com](mailto:liuyisong@chinamobile.com)

Boris Khasanov  
Yandex LLC  
Moscow

Email: [bhassanov@yahoo.com](mailto:bhassanov@yahoo.com)

Lei Liu

Fujitsu  
United States of America

Email: [liulei.kddi@gmail.com](mailto:liulei.kddi@gmail.com)

Xufeng Liu  
Volta Networks  
McLean, VA  
United States of America

Email: [xufeng.liu.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:xufeng.liu.ietf@gmail.com)