

PCE  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: July 9, 2020

H. Chen  
China Telecom  
H. Yuan  
UnionPay  
T. Zhou  
W. Li  
G. Fioccola  
Huawei  
January 6, 2020

**PCEP SR Policy Extensions to Enable IFIT**  
**draft-chen-pce-sr-policy-ifit-00**

Abstract

Segment Routing (SR) policy is a set of candidate SR paths consisting of one or more segment lists and necessary path attributes. It enables instantiation of an ordered list of segments with a specific intent for traffic steering. In-situ Flow Information Telemetry (IFIT) provides a reference framework that supports network OAM applications to apply dataplane on-path telemetry techniques acquiring data about a packet on its forwarding path. This document defines extensions to PCEP to distribute SR policies carrying IFIT information. So that IFIT behavior can be enabled automatically when the SR policy is applied.

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 July 9, 2020.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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 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="#">IFIT Attributes in SR Policy</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">SR Policy for IOAM</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">IOAM Pre-allocated Trace Option TLV</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">IOAM Incremental Trace Option TLV</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	<a href="#">IOAM Directly Export Option TLV</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.4.</a>	<a href="#">IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option TLV</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">SR Policy for Enhanced Alternate Marking</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Examples</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	<a href="#">PCE Initiated SR Policy</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgements</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	<a href="#">References</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	<a href="#">Normative References</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	<a href="#">Appendix A</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">Authors' Addresses</a>	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses</a>	<a href="#">11</a>

## 1. Introduction

Segment Routing (SR) policy [[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy](#)] is a set of candidate SR paths consisting of one or more segment lists and necessary path attributes. It enables instantiation of an ordered list of segments with a specific intent for traffic steering.

In-situ Flow Information Telemetry (IFIT) [[I-D.song-opsawg-ifit-framework](#)] provides a reference framework that supports network OAM applications to apply dataplane on-path



telemetry techniques, including In-situ OAM (IOAM) [[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data](#)], Postcard Based Telemetry (PBT) [[I-D.song-ippm-postcard-based-telemetry](#)], In-band Flow Analyzer (IFA) [[I-D.kumar-ippm-ifa](#)], Enhanced Alternate Marking (EAM) [[I-D.zhou-ippm-enhanced-alternate-marking](#)], and Hybrid Two Steps (HTS) [[I-D.mirsky-ippm-hybrid-two-step](#)]. It can provide flow information on the entire forwarding path on a per- packet basis in real time.

An automatic network requires the Service Level Agreement (SLA) monitoring on the deployed service. So that the system can quickly detect the SLA violation or the performance degradation, hence to change the service deployment. The SR policy native IFIT can facilitate the closed loop control, and enable the automation of SR service.

This document defines extensions to PCEP to distribute SR policies carrying IFIT information. So that IFIT behavior can be enabled automatically when the SR policy is applied.

## **2. IFIT Attributes in SR Policy**

SR Policy Association Group (SRPAG) is defined in [[I-D.barth-pce-segment-routing-policy-cp](#)] to extend PCEP to support association among candidate paths of a given SR policy. SR Policy Identifiers TLV, SR Policy Name TLV, SR Policy Candidate Path Identifiers TLV, and SR Policy Candidate Path Preference TLV are introduced to construct the SR policy structure.

This document is to add IFIT attribute TLVs to the SRPAG. The following sections will describe the requirement and usage of different IFIT modes, and define the corresponding TLV encoding in PCEP.

## **3. SR Policy for IOAM**

In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM) [[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data](#)] records operational and telemetry information in the packet while the packet traverses a path between two points in the network. In terms of the classification given in [RFC 7799](#) [[RFC7799](#)] IOAM could be categorized as Hybrid Type 1. IOAM mechanisms can be leveraged where active OAM do not apply or do not offer the desired results.

When SR policy enables the IOAM, the IOAM header will be inserted into every packet of the traffic that is steered into the SR paths.



### 3.1. IOAM Pre-allocated Trace Option TLV

The IOAM tracing data is expected to be collected at every node that a packet traverses to ensure visibility into the entire path a packet takes within an IOAM domain. The preallocated tracing option will create pre-allocated space for each node to populate its information.

The format of IOAM pre-allocated trace option TLV is defined as follows:




Fig. 1 IOAM Pre-allocated Trace Option TLV

Where:

Type: to be assigned by IANA.

Length: the total length of the value field not including Type and Length fields.

Namespace ID: A 16-bit identifier of an IOAM-Namespace. The definition is the same as described in section 4.4 of [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#).

IOAM Trace Type: A 24-bit identifier which specifies which data types are used in the node data list. The definition is the same as described in section 4.4 of [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#).

Flags: A 4-bit field. The definition is the same as described in [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-flags\]](#) and section 4.4 of [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#).

Rsvd1: A 16-bit field reserved for further usage. It MUST be zero.

Rsvd2: A 4-bit field reserved for further usage. It MUST be zero.



### 3.2. IOAM Incremental Trace Option TLV

The incremental tracing option contains a variable node data fields where each node allocates and pushes its node data immediately following the option header.

The format of IOAM incremental trace option TLV is defined as follows:




Fig. 2 IOAM Incremental Trace Option TLV

Where:

Type: to be assigned by IANA.

Length: the total length of the value field not including Type and Length fields.

All the other fields definition is the same as the pre-allocated trace option TLV in [section 4.1](#).

### 3.3. IOAM Directly Export Option TLV

IOAM directly export option is used as a trigger for IOAM data to be directly exported to a collector without being pushed into in-flight data packets.

The format of IOAM directly export option TLV is defined as follows:








Fig. 3 IOAM Directly Export Option TLV

Where:

Type: to be assigned by IANA.

Length: the total length of the value field not including Type and Length fields.

Namespace ID: A 16-bit identifier of an IOAM-Namespace. The definition is the same as described in section 4.4 of [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#).

IOAM Trace Type: A 24-bit identifier which specifies which data types are used in the node data list. The definition is the same as described in section 4.4 of [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#).

Flags: A 16-bit field. The definition is the same as described in section 3.2 of [\[I-D.ioamteam-ippm-ioam-direct-export\]](#).

Flow ID: A 32-bit flow identifier. The definition is the same as described in section 3.2 of [\[I-D.ioamteam-ippm-ioam-direct-export\]](#).

Rsvd: A 4-bit field reserved for further usage. It MUST be zero.

### 3.4. IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option TLV

The IOAM edge to edge option is to carry data that is added by the IOAM encapsulating node and interpreted by IOAM decapsulating node.

The format of IOAM edge-to-edge option TLV is defined as follows:






Fig. 4 IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option TLV

Where:

Type: to be assigned by IANA.

Length: the total length of the value field not including Type and Length fields.

Namespace ID: A 16-bit identifier of an IOAM-Namespace. The definition is the same as described in section 4.6 of [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#).

IOAM E2E Type: A 16-bit identifier which specifies which data types are used in the E2E option data. The definition is the same as described in section 4.6 of [\[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data\]](#).


#### 4. SR Policy for Enhanced Alternate Marking

The Alternate Marking [\[RFC8321\]](#) technique is an hybrid performance measurement method, per [RFC 7799](#) [\[RFC7799\]](#) classification of measurement methods. Because this method is based on marking consecutive batches of packets. It can be used to measure packet loss, latency, and jitter on live traffic.

The Enhanced Alternate Marking (EAM) [\[I-D.zhou-ippm-enhanced-alternate-marking\]](#) defines data fields for the alternate marking with enough space, in particular for Postcard-based Telemetry. More information can be considered within the alternate marking field to facilitate the efficiency and ease the deployment.

The format of EAM TLV is defined as follows:





Where:

Type: to be assigned by IANA.

Length: the total length of the value field not including Type and Length fields.

FlowMonID: A 20-bit identifier to uniquely identify a monitored flow within the measurement domain. The definition is the same as described in section 2 of [[I-D.zhou-ippm-enhanced-alternate-marking](#)].

Period: Time interval between two alternate marking period. The unit is second.

Rsvd: A 4-bit field reserved for further usage. It MUST be zero.

## 5. Examples

### 5.1. PCE Initiated SR Policy

The interactions between the PCE and PCC is the same as described in [[I-D.barth-pce-segment-routing-policy-cp](#)]. The only change is to take the additional optional IFIT TLVs within the SRPAG object.

PCE sends PCInitiate message, containing the SRPAG Association object. The Association Source is set to the IP address of the PCC and the Association ID is set to 0xFFFF.

PCC uses the color, endpoint, preference and IFIT option from the SRPAG object to create a new candidate path. If no SR policy exists to hold the candidate path, then a new SR policy is created to hold the new candidate-path. The Originator of the candidate path is set to be the address of the PCE that is sending the PCInitiate message.

PCC sends a PCRpt message back to the PCE to report the newly created Candidate Path. The PCRpt message contains the SRPAG Association object. The Association Source is set to the IP address of the PCC and the Association ID is set to a number that PCC locally chose to represent the SR Policy.



## 6. IANA Considerations

This document defines new IFIT TLVs for carrying additional information about SR policy and SR candidate paths. IANA is requested to make the assignment of a new value for the existing "PCEP TLV Type Indicators" registry as follows:

Codepoint	Description	Reference
TBD1	IOAM Pre-allocated Trace Option TLV	This document
TBD2	IOAM Incremental Trace Option TLV	This document
TBD3	IOAM Directly Export Option TLV	This document
TBD4	IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option TLV	This document
TBD5	Enhanced Alternate Marking TLV	This document

## 7. Security Considerations

TBD.

## 8. Acknowledgements

## 9. References

### 9.1. 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>>.
- [RFC7799] Morton, A., "Active and Passive Metrics and Methods (with Hybrid Types In-Between)", [RFC 7799](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7799, May 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7799>>.
- [RFC8321] Fioccola, G., Ed., Capello, A., Cociglio, M., Castaldelli, L., Chen, M., Zheng, L., Mirsky, G., and T. Mizrahi, "Alternate-Marking Method for Passive and Hybrid Performance Monitoring", [RFC 8321](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8321, January 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8321>>.





## 9.2. Informative References

- [I-D.barth-pce-segment-routing-policy-cp]  
Koldychev, M., Sivabalan, S., Barth, C., Li, C., and H. Bidgoli, "PCEP extension to support Segment Routing Policy Candidate Paths", [draft-barth-pce-segment-routing-policy-cp-04](#) (work in progress), October 2019.
- [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]  
Brockners, F., Bhandari, S., Pignataro, C., Gredler, H., Leddy, J., Youell, S., Mizrahi, T., Mozes, D., Lapukhov, P., [remy@barefootnetworks.com](mailto:remy@barefootnetworks.com), r., [daniel.bernier@bell.ca](mailto:daniel.bernier@bell.ca), d., and J. Lemon, "Data Fields for In-situ OAM", [draft-ietf-ippm-ioam-data-08](#) (work in progress), October 2019.
- [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-flags]  
Mizrahi, T., Brockners, F., Bhandari, S., Sivakolundu, R., Pignataro, C., Kfir, A., Gafni, B., Spiegel, M., and J. Lemon, "In-situ OAM Flags", [draft-ietf-ippm-ioam-flags-00](#) (work in progress), October 2019.
- [I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy]  
Filsfils, C., Sivabalan, S., Voyer, D., Bogdanov, A., and P. Mattes, "Segment Routing Policy Architecture", [draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy-06](#) (work in progress), December 2019.
- [I-D.ioamteam-ippm-ioam-direct-export]  
Song, H., Gafni, B., Zhou, T., Li, Z., Brockners, F., Bhandari, S., Sivakolundu, R., and T. Mizrahi, "In-situ OAM Direct Exporting", [draft-ioamteam-ippm-ioam-direct-export-00](#) (work in progress), October 2019.
- [I-D.kumar-ippm-ifa]  
Kumar, J., Anubolu, S., Lemon, J., Manur, R., Holbrook, H., Ghanwani, A., Cai, D., Ou, H., and L. Yizhou, "Inband Flow Analyzer", [draft-kumar-ippm-ifa-01](#) (work in progress), February 2019.
- [I-D.mirsky-ippm-hybrid-two-step]  
Mirsky, G., Lingqiang, W., and G. Zhui, "Hybrid Two-Step Performance Measurement Method", [draft-mirsky-ippm-hybrid-two-step-04](#) (work in progress), October 2019.



[I-D.song-ippm-postcard-based-telemetry]

Song, H., Zhou, T., Li, Z., Shin, J., and K. Lee,  
"Postcard-based On-Path Flow Data Telemetry", [draft-song-ippm-postcard-based-telemetry-06](#) (work in progress),  
October 2019.

[I-D.song-opsawg-ifit-framework]

Song, H., Qin, F., Chen, H., Jin, J., and J. Shin, "In-situ Flow Information Telemetry", [draft-song-opsawg-ifit-framework-10](#) (work in progress), December 2019.

[I-D.zhou-ippm-enhanced-alternate-marking]

Zhou, T., Fioccola, G., Li, Z., Lee, S., and M. Cociglio,  
"Enhanced Alternate Marking Method", [draft-zhou-ippm-enhanced-alternate-marking-04](#) (work in progress), October 2019.

## Appendix A.

### Authors' Addresses

Huanan Chen  
China Telecom  
Guangzhou  
China

Email: [chenhuan6@chinatelecom.cn](mailto:chenhuan6@chinatelecom.cn)

Hang Yuan  
UnionPay  
1899 Gu-Tang Rd., Pudong  
Shanghai  
China

Email: [yuanhang@unionpay.com](mailto:yuanhang@unionpay.com)

Tianran Zhou  
Huawei  
156 Beiqing Rd., Haidian District  
Beijing  
China

Email: [zhoutianran@huawei.com](mailto:zhoutianran@huawei.com)



Weidong Li  
Huawei  
156 Beiqing Rd., Haidian District  
Beijing  
China

Email: poly.li@huawei.com

Giuseppe Fioccola  
Huawei  
Riesstrasse, 25  
Munich  
Germany

Email: giuseppe.fioccola@huawei.com

