

Network Working Group
Internet Draft
Category: Standards Track
Expiration Date: June 2004

A. Fredette, Editor
(Hatteras Networks)

J. Lang, Editor
(Rincon Networks)

December 2003

**Link Management Protocol (LMP) for Dense Wavelength Division
Multiplexing (DWDM) Optical Line Systems**

[draft-ietf-ccamp-lmp-wdm-03.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/1id-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.

[Editor's note: "Changes from previous version" notes can be removed prior to publication as an RFC.]

Changes from previous version:

- o Modified the IANA Considerations section as a result of IESG review.

1. Introduction

Networks are being developed with routers, switches, optical cross-connects (OXCs), dense wavelength division multiplexing (DWDM) optical line systems (OLSSs), and add-drop multiplexors (ADMs) 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 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].

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 cross-connect

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. Nevertheless, 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.

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:

```
o C-Type = TBA, LMP-WDM_CONFIG
```

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

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

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.

If the node does not support the LMP-WDM extensions, 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 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 coordination 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:

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:


```

      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           |   Length       |           (Reserved)         |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     Link Group ID                       |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

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 (SRLG) Identifier

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, Length=(N+1)*4 where N is the number of SRLG values) 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           |   Length       |           (Reserved)         |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     SRLG value #1                       |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     SRLG value #2                       |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
//                                     ...                                     //
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     SRLG value #(N-1)                   |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                     SRLG value #N                       |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

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

Shared Risk Link Group Value: 32 bits

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

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.

The format of the Total Span Length sub-object (Type=TBD, Length=8) 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      |  Length      |          (Reserved)          |
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
|                                     Span Length              |
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+

```

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:

```

      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      |  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 [[RFC3630](#)].

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.

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.

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

2.4.1. LINK_GROUP CHANNEL_STATUS Object

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

[illegible]

Fredette, A., and Lang, J., Eds. - Standards Track [Page 12]


```

+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|A|D|                                     Channel Status                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

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. Intellectual Property Considerations

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

4. References

4.1. Normative References

- [GMPLS-RTG] Kompella, K., Rekhter, Y. et al, "Routing Extensions in Support of Generalized MPLS," (work in progress).
- [LMP] Lang, J. P., Editor, "The Link Management Protocol (LMP)," (work in progress).
- [LMP-SDH] Lang, J. P., Papadimitriou, D., "SONET/SDH Encoding for Link Management Protocol (LMP) Test messages," (work in progress).

progress).

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels," [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3471] Berger, L., Editor, "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) - Signaling Functional Description," [RFC 3471](#), January 2003.
- [RFC3630] Katz, D., Yeung, D., and Kompella, K., "Traffic Engineering (TE) Extensions to OSPF Version 2," [RFC 3630](#), September 2003.

4.2. Informative References

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

5. Security Considerations

LMP message security uses IPsec as described in [[LMP](#)]. This document only defines new LMP objects that are carried in existing LMP messages. As such, this document introduces no other new security considerations not covered in [[LMP](#)].

6. IANA Considerations

LMP [[LMP](#)] defines the following name spaces and how IANA can make assignments in those namespaces:

- LMP Message Type.
- LMP Object Class.
- LMP Object Class type (C-Type) unique within the Object Class.
- LMP Sub-object Class type (Type) unique within the Object Class.

This memo introduces the following new assignments:

LMP Object Class Types:

- o under CONFIG class name (as defined in [[LMP](#)])
 - LMP-WDM_CONFIG (suggested C-Type = 2)
- o under CHANNEL_STATUS class name (as defined in [[LMP](#)])
 - LINK_GROUP (suggested C-Type = 4)

LMP Sub-Object Class names:

- o under DATA_LINK Class name (as defined in [[LMP](#)])
 - Link_GroupId (suggested sub-object Type = 3)
 - SRLG (suggested sub-object Type = 4)
 - BER_Estimate (suggested sub-object Type = 5)
 - Optical_Protection (suggested sub-object Type = 6)

- Total_Span_Length (suggested sub-object Type = 7)
- Administrative_Group (suggested sub-object Type = 8)

7. 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.

8. Contact Address

Andre Fredette
Hatteras Networks
P.O. Box 110025
Research Triangle Park
NC 27709-0025, USA

EMail: Afredette@HatterasNetworks.com

Jonathan P. Lang
Rincon Networks
829 De La Vina, Suite 220
Santa Barbara, CA 93101, USA

EMail: jplang@ieee.org

9. Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

