

CCAMP Working Group
Internet Draft
Expiration Date: March 2003

A. Fredette, Editor
Hatteras Networks
J. Lang, Editor
Calient Networks

September 2002

Link Management Protocol (LMP) for DWDM Optical Line Systems
draft-ietf-ccamp-lmp-wdm-01.txt

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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>.

Abstract

The Link Management Protocol (LMP) is defined to manage traffic engineering (TE) links. In its present form, LMP focuses on peer nodes; i.e., nodes that peer in signaling and/or routing. In this document we propose extensions to LMP to allow it to be used between a peer node and an adjacent optical line system (OLS). These extensions are intended to satisfy the "Optical Link Interface Requirements" described in a companion document.

Changes from previous version:

- o Editorial changes.
- o Removed the Trace monitoring section to be put in SONET/SDH technology specific draft.
- o Moved the LMP-WDM support bit from the common header of LMP messages to a new LMP-WDM_CONFIG object.

1. Introduction

Networks are being developed with routers, switches, optical crossconnects (OXC), DWDM optical line systems (OLSs), and add-drop multiplexors (ADM) that use a common control plane [e.g., Generalized MPLS (GMPLS)] to dynamically provision resources and to provide network survivability using protection and restoration techniques.

The Link Management Protocol (LMP) is being developed as part of the GMPLS protocol suite to manage traffic engineering (TE) links [LMP]. In its present form, LMP focuses on peer nodes; i.e., nodes that peer in signaling and/or routing (e.g., OXC-to-OXC, as illustrated in Figure 1). In this document, extensions to LMP to allow it to be used between a peer node and an adjacent optical line system (OLS) are proposed. These extensions are intended to satisfy the "Optical Link Interface Requirements" described in [OLI]. It is assumed that the reader is familiar with LMP as defined in [LMP].




Figure 1: LMP Model

Consider two peer nodes (e.g., two OXCs) interconnected by a wavelength-multiplexed link; i.e., a DWDM optical link (see Figure 1 above). Information about the configuration of this link and its current state is known by the two OLSs (OLS1 and OLS2), and allowing

them to communicate this information to the corresponding peer nodes (OXC1 and OXC2) via LMP can improve network usability by reducing required manual configuration and by enhancing fault detection and recovery.

Information about the state of LSPs using the DWDM optical link is known by the peer nodes (OXC1 and OXC2), and allowing them to communicate this information to the corresponding OLSs (OLS1 and OLS2) is useful for alarm management and link monitoring. Alarm management is important because the administrative state of an LSP, known to the peer nodes (e.g., via the Admin Status object of GMPLS Fredette, A., and Lang, J., eds. [Page 2]

signaling [GMPLS-SIG]) can be used to suppress spurious alarm reporting from the OLSs.

The model for extending LMP to OLSs is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Extended LMP Model

In this model, a peer node may have LMP sessions with adjacent OLSs as well as adjacent peer nodes. In Figure 2, for example, the OXC1-OXC2 LMP session can be used to build traffic-engineering (TE) links for GMPLS signaling and routing, as described in [LMP]. The OXC1-OLS1 and the OXC2-OLS2 LMP sessions are used to exchange information about the configuration of the DWDM optical link and its current state and information about the state of LSPs using that link.

The latter type of LMP sessions is discussed in this document. It is important to note that a peer node may have LMP sessions with one or more OLSs and an OLS may have LMP sessions with one or more peer nodes.

Although there are many similarities between an LMP session between two peer nodes and an LMP session between a peer node and an OLS, there are some differences as well. The former type of LMP session

is used to provide the basis for GMPLS signaling and routing. The latter type of LMP session is used to augment knowledge about the links between peer nodes.

A peer node maintains its peer node - OLS LMP sessions and its peer node - peer node LMP sessions independently. This means that it MUST be possible for LMP sessions to come up in any order. In particular, it MUST be possible for a peer node - peer node LMP session to come up in the absence of any peer node - OLS LMP sessions and vice versa.

1.1. Terminology

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](#)].

The reader is assumed to be familiar with the terminology in [[LMP](#)].

Fredette, A., and Lang, J., eds.

[Page 3]

Internet Draft [draft-ietf-ccamp-lmp-wdm-01.txt](#)

Sep 2002

DWDM: Dense wavelength division multiplexor

OLS: Optical line system

Opaque:

A device is called X-opaque if it examines or modifies the X aspect of the signal while forwarding an incoming signal from input to output.

OXC: Optical crossconnect

Transparent:

As defined in [[LMP](#)], a device is called X-transparent if it forwards incoming signals from input to output without examining or modifying the X aspect of the signal. For example, a Frame Relay switch is network-layer transparent; an all-optical switch is electrically transparent.

1.2. Scope of LMP-WDM Protocol

This document focuses on extensions required for use with opaque OLSs. In particular, this document is intended for use with OLSs having SONET, SDH, and Ethernet user ports.

At the time of this writing, work is ongoing in the area of fully transparent wavelength routing; however, it is premature to identify the necessary information to be exchanged between a peer node and an OLS in this context. Never-the-less, the protocol described in this document provides the necessary framework in which to exchange whatever additional information is deemed appropriate.

2. LMP Extensions for Optical Line Systems

LMP currently consists of four main procedures, of which the first two are mandatory and the last two are optional:

1. Control channel management
2. Link property correlation
3. Link verification
4. Fault management

All four functions are supported in LMP-WDM.

2.1. Control Channel Management

As in [LMP], we do not specify the exact implementation of the control channel; it could be, for example, a separate wavelength, fiber, Ethernet link, an IP tunnel routed over a separate management network, a multi-hop IP network, or the overhead bytes of a data link.

The control channel management for a peer node - OLS link is the same as for a peer node - peer node link, as described in [LMP].

To distinguish between a peer node - OLS LMP session from a peer node - peer node LMP session, a new LMP-WDM CONFIG object is defined (C-Type = TBA by IANA). The format of the CONFIG object is as follows:

Class = 6.

- o C-Type = TBA, LMP-WDM_CONFIG

```

0           1           2           3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|W|O|                               (Reserved)                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

The Reserved field should be sent as zero and ignored on receipt.

WDM: 1 bit

This bit indicates support for the LMP-WDM extensions defined in this draft.

OLS: 1 bit

If set, this bit indicates that the sender is an optical line system (OLS). If clear, this bit indicates that the sender is a peer node.

The LMP-WDM extensions are designed for peer node - OLS LMP sessions. The OLS bit allows a node to identify itself as an OLS or a peer node. This is used to detect misconfiguration of a peer node - OLS LMP session between two peer nodes or a peer node - peer node LMP session between a peer node and an OLS.

If the node does not support the LMP-WDM extensions, it MUST reply to the Config message with a ConfigNack message.

If a peer node that is configured to run LMP-WDM receives a Config message with the OLS bit clear in LMP-WDM_CONFIG Object, it MUST reply to the Config message with a ConfigNack message.

[2.2. Link Verification](#)

The Test procedure used with OLSs is the same as described in [\[LMP\]](#). The VerifyTransportMechanism (included in the BeginVerify and BeginVerifyAck messages) is used to allow nodes to negotiate a link verification method and is essential for line systems that have access to overhead bytes rather than the payload. The VerifyId (provided by the remote node in the BeginVerifyAck message, and used in all subsequent Test messages) is used to differentiate Test messages from different LMP Link Verification procedures. In Fredette, A., and Lang, J., eds. [Page 5]

addition to the Test procedure described in [\[LMP\]](#), the trace monitoring function of [\[LMP-SDH\]](#) may be used for link verification when the OLS user ports are SONET or SDH.

In a combined LMP and LMP-WDM context, there is an interplay between the data links being managed by peer node - peer node LMP sessions and peer node - OLS LMP sessions. For example, in Figure 2, the OXC1-OLS1 LMP session manages the data links between OXC1 and OLS1, and the OXC2-OLS2 LMP session manages the data links between OXC2 and OLS2. However, the OXC1-OXC2 LMP session manages the data links

between OXC1 and OXC2, which are actually a concatenation of the data links between OXC1 and OLS1, the DWDM span between OLS1 and OLS2, and the data links between OXC2 and OLS2, and it is these concatenated links which comprise the TE links which are advertised in the GMPLS TE link state database.

The implication of this is that when the data links between OXC1 and OXC2 are being verified, using the LMP link verification procedure, OLS1 and OLS2 need to make themselves transparent with respect to these concatenated data links. The co-ordination of verification of OXC1-OLS1 and OXC2-OLS2 data links to ensure this transparency is the responsibility of the peer nodes, OXC1 and OXC2.


It is also necessary for these peer nodes to understand the mappings between the data links of the peer node - OLS LMP session and the concatenated data links of the peer node - peer node LMP session.

[2.3. Link Summarization](#)

As in [[LMP](#)], the LinkSummary message is used to synchronize the Interface Ids and correlate the properties of the TE link. (Note that the term "TE Link" originated from routing/signaling applications of LMP, whereas this concept does not necessarily apply to an OLS. However, the term is used in this document to remain consistent with LMP terminology.) The LinkSummary message includes one or more DATA_LINK objects. The contents of the DATA_LINK object consist of a series of variable-length data items called Data Link sub-objects describing the capabilities of the data links.

In this document, several additional Data Link sub-objects are defined to describe additional link characteristics. The link characteristics are, in general, those needed by the CSPF to select the path for a particular LSP. These link characteristics describe the specified peer node - OLS data link as well as the associated DWDM span between the two OLSs.

The format of the Data Link sub-objects follows the format described in [[LMP](#)] and is shown below for readability:



Type: 8 bits

The Type indicates the type of contents of the sub-object.

Length: 8 bits

The Length field contains the total length of the sub-object in bytes, including the Type and Length fields. The Length MUST be at least 4, and MUST be a multiple of 4.

The following Link Characteristics are exchanged on a per data link basis.


2.3.1. Link Group ID

The main purpose of the Link Group ID is to reduce control traffic during failures that affect many data links. A local ID may be assigned to a group of data links. This ID can be used to reduce the control traffic in the event of a failure by enabling a single ChannelStatus message with the LINK GROUP CHANNEL_STATUS object (see [Section 2.4.1](#)) to be used for a group of data links instead of individual ChannelStatus messages for each data link. A data link may be a member of multiple groups. This is achieved by including multiple Link Group ID sub-objects in the LinkSummary message.

The Link Group ID feature allows Link Groups to be assigned based upon the types of fault correlation and aggregation supported by a given OLS. From a practical perspective, the Link Group ID is used to map (or group) data links into "failable entities" known primarily to the OLS. If one of those failable entities fails, all associated data links are failed and the peer node is notified with a single message.

For example, an OLS could create a Link Group for each laser in the OLS. The data links associated with each laser would then each be assigned the Link Group ID for that laser. If a laser fails, the OLS would then report a single failure affecting all of the data links with Link Group ID of the failed laser. The peer node that receives the single failure notification then knows which data links are affected. Similarly, an OLS could create a Link Group ID for a fiber, to report a failure affecting all of the data links associated with that fiber if a loss-of-signal (LOS) is detected for that fiber.

The format of the Link Group ID sub-object (Type=TBD, Length=8) is as follows:



The Reserved field should be sent as zero and ignored on receipt.


Link Group ID: 32 bits

Link Group ID 0xFFFFFFFF is reserved and indicates all data links in a TE link. All data links are members of Link Group 0xFFFFFFFF by default.

2.3.2. Shared Risk Link Group Identifier (SRLG)

This identifies the SRLGs of which the data link is a member. This information may be configured on an OLS by the user and used for diverse path computation (see [GMPLS-RTG]).

The format of the SRLG sub-object (Type=TBD) is as follows:



The Reserved field should be sent as zero and ignored on receipt.

Length: 8 bits

The length is $(N+1)*4$, where N is the number of SRLG values.

Shared Risk Link Group Value: 32 bits

See [GMPLS-RTG]. List as many SRLGs as apply.

2.3.3. Bit Error Rate (BER) Estimate

This object provides an estimate of the BER for the data link.

The bit error rate (BER) is the proportion of bits that have errors relative to the total number of bits received in a transmission, usually expressed as ten to a negative power. For example, a transmission might have a BER of "10 to the minus 13", meaning that, out of every 10,000,000,000,000 bits transmitted, one bit may be in error. The BER is an indication of overall signal quality.

The format of the BER Estimate sub-object (Type=TBD; Length=4) is as follows:

0	1	2	3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	0 1
+-----+-----+-----+-----+			
Type		(Reserved)	
+-----+-----+-----+-----+			

The Reserved field should be sent as zero and ignored on receipt.


BER: 8 bits

The exponent from the BER representation described above. I.e., if the BER is 10 to the minus X, the BER field is set to X.

2.3.4. Optical Protection

This indicates whether the link is protected by the OLS. This information can be used as a measure of link capability. It may be advertised by routing and used by signaling as a selection criterion as described in [GMPLS-SIG].

The format of the Optical Protection sub-object (Type=TBD; Length=4) is as follows:



The Reserved field should be sent as zero and ignored on receipt.

Link Flags: 6 bits


Encoding for Link Flags is defined in [Section 7](#) of [GMPLS-SIG].

2.3.5. Total Span Length

This indicates the total distance of fiber in the OLS. This may be used as a routing metric or to estimate delay.

Fredette, A., and Lang, J., eds. [Page 9]

The format of the Total Span Length sub-object (Type=TBD, Length=8) is as follows:



The Reserved field should be sent as zero and ignored on receipt.


Span Length: 32 bits

This value represents the total Length of the WDM span in meters expressed as an unsigned (long) integer.

2.3.6. Administrative Group (Color)

The administrative group (or Color) to which the data link belongs.

The format of the Administrative Group sub-object (Type=TBD, Length=8) is as follows:



Type	Length	(Reserved)
Administrative Group		

The Reserved field should be sent as zero and ignored on receipt.

Administrative Group: 32 bits

A 32 bit value as defined in [OSPF-TE].

2.4. Fault Management

Fault management consists of three major functions:

1. Fault Detection
2. Fault Localization
3. Fault Notification

The fault detection mechanisms are the responsibility of the individual nodes and are not specified as part of this protocol. Fault detection mechanisms may include a bit error rate (BER) exceeding a threshold, loss of signal (LOS) and SONET/SDH-level

errors. It is the responsibility of the OLS to translate these failures into OK, SF, or SD as described in [LMP].

I.e., an OLS uses the messages defined in the LMP fault localization procedures (ChannelStatus, ChannelStatusAck, ChannelStatusRequest, and ChannelStatusResponse Messages) to inform the adjacent peer node of failures it has detected, in order to initiate the LMP fault localization procedures between peer nodes, but it does not participate in those procedures.

The OLS may also execute its own fault localization process to allow it to determine the location of the fault along the DWDM span. For example, the OLS may be able to pinpoint the fault to a particular amplifier in a span thousands of kilometers in length.

To report data link failures and recovery conditions, LMP-WDM uses the ChannelStatus, ChannelStatusAck, ChannelStatusRequest, and ChannelStatusResponse Messages defined in [LMP].


Each data link is identified by an Interface_ID. In addition, a Link

Group ID may be assigned to a group of data links (see [Section 2.3.1](#)). The Link Group ID may be used to reduce the control traffic by providing channel status information for a group of data links. A new LINK GROUP CHANNEL_STATUS object is defined below for this purpose. This object may be used in place of the CHANNEL_STATUS objects described in [\[LMP\]](#) in the ChannelStatus message.

[2.4.1](#). LINK GROUP CHANNEL_STATUS Object

The LINK GROUP CHANNEL_STATUS object is used to indicate the status of the data links belonging to a particular Link Group. The correlation of data links to Group ID is made with the Link Group ID sub-object of the DATA_LINK Object.

The format of the LINK GROUP CHANNEL_STATUS object is as follows (Class = 13, C-Type =TBA by IANA):



Link Group ID: 32 bits

Link Group ID 0xFFFFFFFF is reserved and indicates all data links in a TE link. All data links are members of Link Group 0xFFFFFFFF by default.

Channel Status: 32 bits

The values for the Channel Status field are defined in [\[LMP\]](#).

This Object is non-negotiable.

[3.](#) Security Considerations

This document only defines new LMP objects extending the capabilities of [LMP]. This document does not introduce any new security considerations.

[4.](#) References

4.1. Normative References

- [LMP] Lang, J. P., ed., "The Link Management Protocol (LMP)," (work in progress).
- [GMPLS-SIG] Ashwood-Smith, P., Banerjee, A., et al, "Generalized MPLS - Signaling Functional Description," (work in progress).
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels," [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [LMP-SDH] Lang, J. P., Papadimitriou, D., "SONET/SDH Encoding for Link Management Protocol (LMP) Test messages," (work in progress).
- [GMPLS-RTG] Kompella, K., Rekhter, Y. et al, "Routing Extensions in Support of Generalized MPLS," (work in progress).
- [OSPF-TE] Katz, D, Yeung, D., and Kompella, K., "Traffic Engineering Extensions to OSPF Version 2," (work in progress).

4.2. Informative References

- [OLI] Fredette, A., Editor, "Optical Link Interface Requirements", (work in progress).

[5.](#) Contributors

Osama S. Aboul-Magd, Stuart Brorson, Sudheer Dharanikota, John Drake, David Drysdale, W. L. Edwards, Adrian Farrel, Andre Fredette, Rohit Goyal, Hirokazu Ishimatsu, Monika Jaeger, Ram Krishnan, Jonathan P. Lang, Raghu Mannam, Eric Mannie, Dimitri Papadimitriou, Jagan Shantigram, Ed Snyder, George Swallow, Gopala Tumuluri, Yong Xue, Lucy Yong, John Yu.

[6.](#) Contact Address

Fredette, A., and Lang, J., eds.

[Page 12]

Goleta, CA 93117
Email: jplang@calient.net

Research Triangle Park
NC 27709-0025
Afredette@HatterasNetworks.com