

CCAMP WG  
Internet Draft  
Updates: [4427](#)  
Intended status: Standards track  
Expires: January 2014

Huub van Helvoort  
Huawei Technologies

July 11, 2013

Update Forced Switch Priority  
draft-helvoort-ccamp-fs-priority-00.txt

Status of this Memo

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

This document may contain material from IETF Documents or IETF Contributions published or made publicly available before November 10, 2008. The person(s) controlling the copyright in some of this material may not have granted the IETF Trust the right to allow modifications of such material outside the IETF Standards Process. Without obtaining an adequate license from the person(s) controlling the copyright in such materials, this document may not be modified outside the IETF Standards Process, and derivative works of it may not be created outside the IETF Standards Process, except to format it for publication as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 11, 2014.

Internet-Draft

Update Forced Switch Priority

July 2013

## 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.

## Abstract

This document clarifies the definitions related to Manual Switch and Forced Switch. This document updates [RFC 4427](#).

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction .....	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Manual Switch and Forced Switch.....	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Security Considerations .....	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	IANA Considerations .....	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	References .....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	Normative References.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	Informative References.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Acknowledgments .....	<a href="#">4</a>

[1.](#) Introduction

The external commands, Manual Switch and Forced Switch, provide an operator the ability to control the recovery schemes. The definitions in [[RFC4427](#)] provide an informative description but do not provide enough description to distinguish the processing of these commands for usage with priority treatment. The current description has led to the open question of how the commands are to be processed for relative priority treatment.

This document provides clarification of the terms relative to [[G.808.1](#)].

## 2. Manual Switch and Forced Switch

This section updates [\[RFC4427\]](#). [Section 4.13 of \[RFC4427\]](#) contains the following text regarding the definitions:

### D. Forced switch-over for normal traffic:

A switch-over action, initiated externally, that switches normal traffic to the recovery LSP/span, unless an equal or higher priority switch-over command is in effect.

### E. Manual switch-over for normal traffic:

A switch-over action, initiated externally, that switches normal traffic to the recovery LSP/span, unless a fault condition exists on other LSPs/spans (including the recovery LSP/span) or an equal or higher priority switch-over command is in effect.

This definition does not provide enough detail with respect to their usage relative to priorities. In order to avoid mis-interpretation, this document adds the following Note as clarification:

#### Note:

For 1+1 protection schemes (which do not use a communication channel), a Forced Switch over for normal traffic will have the highest priority, it will not be overridden by a signal fail on the protection channel. For other protection schemes (which do use a communication channel), a Forced Switch over for normal traffic will be overridden if a signal fail is present on the protection channel. Definitions of ITU-T terminology in this section are intended to aid understanding of the concepts. For the full definition of these terms and their use, the reader is referred to the appropriate ITU-T Recommendations and RFCs.

## 3. Security Considerations

This document clarifies usage of terms defined in [[RFC4427](#)]. No new information is conveyed; therefore no additional considerations are included here.

#### [4.](#) IANA Considerations

There are no items for IANA to consider.

van Helvoort

Expires January 11, 2014

[Page 3]

---

Internet-Draft

Update Forced Switch Priority

July 2013

#### [5.](#) References

##### [5.1.](#) Normative References

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

##### [5.2.](#) Informative References

[G.808.1] ITU-T Recommendation G.808.1, "Generic protection switching - Linear trail and subnetwork protection", February 2010.

#### [6.](#) Acknowledgments

<Add any acknowledgements>

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

#### Authors' Addresses

Huub van Helvoort

Huawei Technologies

Karspeldreef 4

Amsterdam 1011 CJ

The Netherlands

Phone: +31 20 4300832

Email: Huub.van.Helvoort@huawei.com

van Helvoort

Expires January 11, 2014

[Page 4]