

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: January 16, 2014

J. Dong  
M. Chen  
Huawei Technologies  
H. Gredler  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
July 15, 2013

**Distribution of MPLS Traffic Engineering (TE) LSP State using BGP  
draft-dong-idr-te-lsp-distribution-02**

Abstract

This document describes a mechanism to collect the Traffic Engineering (TE) LSP information using BGP. Such information can be used by external components for path reoptimization, service placement and network visualization.

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 <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 January 16, 2014.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 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 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

- [1. Introduction](#) . . . . . [2](#)
- [2. Carrying LSP State Information in BGP](#) . . . . . [3](#)
  - [2.1. LSP Identifier Information](#) . . . . . [3](#)
  - [2.2. LSP State Information](#) . . . . . [5](#)
- [3. IANA Considerations](#) . . . . . [6](#)
- [4. Security Considerations](#) . . . . . [6](#)
- [5. References](#) . . . . . [6](#)
  - [5.1. Normative References](#) . . . . . [6](#)
  - [5.2. Informative References](#) . . . . . [7](#)
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . [7](#)

**1. Introduction**

In some network environments, the states of established Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Traffic Engineering (TE) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) in the network are required by some components external to the network domain. Usually this information is directly maintained by the ingress Label Edge Routers (LERs) of the MPLS TE LSPs.

One example of using the LSP information is stateful Path Computation Element (PCE) [[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce](#)], which could provide benefits in path reoptimization . While some extensions are proposed in Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) for the Path Computation Clients (PCCs) to report the LSP states to the PCE, this mechanism may not be applicable in a management-based PCE architecture as specified in [section 5.5 of \[RFC4655\]](#). As illustrated in the figure below, the PCC is not an LSR in the routing domain, thus the head-end nodes of the TE-LSP may not implement the PCEP protocol. In this case some general mechanism to collect the TE-LSP states from the ingress LERs is needed. This document proposes an LSP state collection mechanism complementary to the mechanism defined in [[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce](#)].
















Figure 3. IPv6 TE LSP NLRI

For IPv4 TE LSP NLRI and IPv6 TE LSP NLRI, the Protocol-ID field is set to 6, which indicates that the NLRI information has been sourced by RSVP-TE.

The Identifier field is used to discriminate between instances with different LSP technology - e.g. one identifier can identify the instance for packet path, and another one is to identify the instance of optical path.

The other fields in the IPv4 TE LSP NLRI and IPv6 TE LSP NLRI are the same as specified in [RFC3209].

**2.2. LSP State Information**

The LSP State TLV is used to describe the characteristics of the TE LSPs, which is carried in the optional non-transitive BGP Attribute "LINK\_STATE Attribute" defined in [I-D.ietf-idr-ls-distribution].

The "Value" field of the LSP State TLV corresponds to the format and semantics of a set of objects defined in [RFC3209], [RFC3473] and [RFC5440] for TE LSPs. Rather than replicating all RSVP-TE related objects in this document the semantics and encodings of existing RSVP-TE objects are re-used. Hence all RSVP-TE LSP objects are regarded as sub-TLVs. The LSP State TLV SHOULD only be used with IPv4/IPv6 TE LSP NLRI.








Figure 4. LSP State TLV

Currently the TE LSP Objects that can be carried in the LSP State TLV include:

- o LSP Attributes (LSPA) Object [[RFC5440](#)]
- o Explicit Route Object (ERO) [[RFC3209](#)]
- o Record Route Object (RRO) [[RFC3209](#)]
- o BANDWIDTH Object [[RFC5440](#)]
- o METRIC Object [[RFC5440](#)]
- o Protection Object [[RFC3473](#)]
- o Admin\_Status Object [[RFC3473](#)]

Other TE LSP objects may also be carried in LSP state TLV, which is for further study.

**3. IANA Considerations**

IANA needs to assign one new TLV type for "LSP State TLV" from the TLV registry of Link\_State Attribute.

IANA needs to assign one Protocol-ID for 'RSVP-TE' from the BGP-TE/LS registry of Protocol-IDs.

**4. Security Considerations**

TBD

**5. References**

**5.1. Normative References**



**[I-D.ietf-idr-ls-distribution]**

Gredler, H., Medved, J., Previdi, S., Farrel, A., and S. Ray, "North-Bound Distribution of Link-State and TE Information using BGP", [draft-ietf-idr-ls-distribution-03](#) (work in progress), May 2013.

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [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.
- [RFC3473] Berger, L., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Resource ReserVation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Extensions", [RFC 3473](#), January 2003.
- [RFC4760] Bates, T., Chandra, R., Katz, D., and Y. Rekhter, "Multiprotocol Extensions for BGP-4", [RFC 4760](#), January 2007.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP. and JL. Le Roux, "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), March 2009.

**5.2. Informative References****[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce]**

Crabbe, E., Medved, J., Minei, I., and R. Varga, "PCEP Extensions for Stateful PCE", [draft-ietf-pce-stateful-pce-05](#) (work in progress), July 2013.

- [RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", [RFC 4655](#), August 2006.

**Authors' Addresses**

Jie Dong  
Huawei Technologies  
Huawei Building, No. 156 Beiqing Rd.  
Beijing 100095  
China

Email: [jie.dong@huawei.com](mailto:jie.dong@huawei.com)



Mach(Guoyi) Chen  
Huawei Technologies  
Huawei Building, No. 156 Beiqing Rd.  
Beijing 100095  
China

Email: mach.chen@huawei.com

Hannes Gredler  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
1194 N. Mathilda Ave.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
US

Email: hannes@juniper.net

