

CCAMP Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: September 19, 2013

F. Zhang, Ed.  
ZTE  
R. Jing  
China Telecom  
R. Gandhi  
Cisco Systems  
March 18, 2013

RSVP-TE Extensions for Associated Bidirectional LSPs  
draft-ietf-ccamp-mpls-tp-rsvpte-ext-associated-lsp-06

## Abstract

The MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) requirements document [[RFC5654](#)], describes that MPLS-TP MUST support associated bidirectional point-to-point LSPs.

This document provides a method to bind two unidirectional Label Switched Paths (LSPs) into an associated bidirectional LSP. The association is achieved by defining the new Association Types in the Extended ASSOCIATION object.

## 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 September 19, 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

---

Internet-Draft    RSVP-TE Extensions for Associated LSPs    March 18, 2013

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="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Conventions used in this document . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Overview . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Provisioning Model . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Signaling Procedure . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Single Sided Provisioning Model . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">Double Sided Provisioning Model . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">Asymmetric Bandwidth LSPs . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.2.4.</a>	<a href="#">Recovery Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.2.5.</a>	<a href="#">Associated Bidirectional LSPs and LSP Recovery . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.2.6.</a>	<a href="#">Associated Bidirectional LSPs and TE Mesh-Groups . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3.2.7.</a>	<a href="#">MPLS-TP Associated Bidirectional LSP Identifiers . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3.2.8.</a>	<a href="#">Teardown of Associated Bidirectional LSPs . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Association of LSPs . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Extended ASSOCIATION Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.1.1</a>	<a href="#">Signaling of the Extended Association Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">REVERSE_LSP Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Format . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Subobjects . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">LSP Control . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">Updated RSVP Message Formats . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.2.4.</a>	<a href="#">Compatibility . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	<a href="#">Association Type . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	<a href="#">REVERSE_LSP Object . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgement . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	<a href="#">Normative references . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>

<a href="#">8.2. Informative References</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>

Internet-Draft    RSVP-TE Extensions for Associated LSPs    March 18, 2013

## [1.](#) Introduction

The MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) requirements document [[RFC5654](#)] describes that MPLS-TP MUST support associated bidirectional point-to-point LSPs. Furthermore, an associated bidirectional LSP is useful for protection switching, for Operations, Administrations and Maintenance (OAM) messages that require a reply path.

The requirements described in [[RFC5654](#)] are specifically mentioned in [Section 2.1](#). (General Requirements), and are repeated below:

7. MPLS-TP MUST support associated bidirectional point-to-point LSPs.

11. The end points of an associated bidirectional LSP MUST be aware of the pairing relationship of the forward and reverse LSPs used to support the bidirectional service.

12. Nodes on the LSP of an associated bidirectional LSP where both the forward and backward directions transit the same node in the same (sub)layer as the LSP SHOULD be aware of the pairing relationship of the forward and the backward directions of the LSP.

14. MPLS-TP MUST support bidirectional LSPs with asymmetric bandwidth requirements, i.e., the amount of reserved bandwidth differs between the forward and backward directions.

50. The MPLS-TP control plane MUST support establishing associated bidirectional P2P LSP including configuration of protection functions and any associated maintenance functions.

The above requirements are also repeated in [[RFC6373](#)].

The notion of association, as well as the corresponding Resource reSerVation Protocol (RSVP) ASSOCIATION object, is defined in [[RFC4872](#)], [[RFC4873](#)] and [[RFC6689](#)]. In that context, the object is

used to associate recovery LSPs with the LSP they are protecting. This object also has broader applicability as a mechanism to associate RSVP state, and [[RFC6780](#)] defines the Extended ASSOCIATION object that can be more generally applied.

This document provides a method to bind two reverse unidirectional Label Switched Paths (LSPs) into an associated bidirectional LSP. The association is achieved by defining the new Association Types in the Extended ASSOCIATION object.

## [2.](#) Conventions used in this document

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](#)].

## [3.](#) Overview

### [3.1.](#) Provisioning Model

The associated bidirectional LSP's forward and backward directions are set up, monitored, and protected independently as required by [[RFC5654](#)]. Configuration information regarding the LSPs can be sent to one end or both ends of the LSP. Depending on the method chosen, there are two models of signaling associated bidirectional LSP. The first model is the single sided provisioning, the second model is the double sided provisioning.

For the single sided provisioning, the configurations are sent to one end. Firstly, a unidirectional tunnel is configured on this end, then a LSP under this tunnel is initiated with the Extended ASSOCIATION object carried in the Path message to trigger the peer end to set up the corresponding reverse TE tunnel and LSP.

For the double sided provisioning, the two unidirectional TE tunnels are configured independently, then the LSPs under the tunnels are signaled with the Extended ASSOCIATION objects carried in the Path message to indicate each other to associate the two LSPs together to be an associated bidirectional LSP.

A number of scenarios exist for binding LSPs together to be an associated bidirectional LSP. These include: (1) both of them do not exist; (2) both of them exist; (3) one LSP exists, but the other one need to be established. In all scenarios described, the provisioning models discussed above are applicable.

### [3.2.](#) Signaling Procedure

This section describes the signaling procedures for associating bidirectional LSPs.

Consider the topology described in Figure 1. (An example of associated bidirectional LSP). The LSP1 [via nodes A,D,B] (from A to B) and LSP2 [via nodes B,D,C,A] (from B to A) are being established or have been established, which can form an associated bidirectional LSP between node A and node B.

LSP1 and LSP2 are referenced at the data plane level by the

identifiers: A-Node\_ID::A-Tunnel\_Num::A-LSP\_Num::B-Node\_ID and B-Node\_ID::B-Tunnel\_Num::B-LSP\_Num::A-Node\_ID, respectively [[RFC6370](#)].




Figure 1: An example of associated bidirectional LSP

#### [3.2.1.](#) Single Sided Provisioning Model

For the single sided provisioning model, LSP1 is triggered by LSP2 or LSP2 is triggered by LSP1. When LSP2 is triggered by LSP1, LSP1 is initialized or refreshed (if LSP1 already exists) at node A with the Extended ASSOCIATION object inserted in the Path message, the Association Type must be set to "Single Sided Associated

Bidirectional LSPs". Terminating node B is triggered to set up LSP2 by the received Extended ASSOCIATION object with the Association Type set to the value "Single Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs", the Extended ASSOCIATION object inserted in LSP2's Path message is the same as in LSP1's Path message.

When LSP1 is triggered by LSP2, the same rules are applicable. Based on the same values of the Extended ASSOCIATION objects in the two LSPs' Path messages, the two LSPs can be bound together to be an associated bidirectional LSP.

### [3.2.2.](#) Double Sided Provisioning Model

For the double sided provisioning model, the Association Type must be set to "Double Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs".

Identification of the LSPs as being Associated Bidirectional LSPs occurs based on the identical contents in the LSPs' Extended ASSOCIATION objects.

### [3.2.3.](#) Asymmetric Bandwidth LSPs

A variety of applications, such as Internet services and the return paths of OAM messages, exist and which MAY have different bandwidth requirements for each direction. Additional [[RFC5654](#)] also specifies an asymmetric bandwidth requirement. This requirement is

specifically mentioned in [Section 2.1](#). (General Requirements), and is repeated below:

14. MPLS-TP MUST support bidirectional LSPs with asymmetric bandwidth requirements, i.e., the amount of reserved bandwidth differs between the forward and backward directions.

The approach for supporting asymmetric bandwidth co-routed bidirectional LSPs is defined in [[RFC6387](#)]. As to the asymmetric bandwidth associated bidirectional LSPs, the existing SENDER\_TSPEC object must be carried in the REVERSE\_LSP object as a sub-object in the initialized LSP's Path message to specify the reverse LSP's traffic parameters in case that single sided provisioning model is adopted. Consider the topology described in Figure 1 in the context

of asymmetric associated bidirectional LSP, and take LSP2 triggered by LSP1 as an example. Node B is triggered to set up the reverse LSP2 with the corresponding asymmetric bandwidth by the Extended ASSOCIATION object with Association Type "Single Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs" and the SENDER\_TSPEC sub-object in LSP1's Path message, and the SENDER\_TSPEC object in the LSP2' Path message is the same as the the SENDER\_TSPEC sub-object in LSP1's Path message. When double sided provisioning model is used, the two opposite LSPs with asymmetric bandwidths are concurrently initialized, and this requirement will be satisfied simultaneously.

#### [3.2.4.](#) Recovery Considerations

Consider the topology described in Figure 1, LSP1 and LSP2 form the associated bidirectional LSP. Under the scenario of recovery, a third LSP (LSP3) may be used to protect LSP1. LSP3 can be established before or after the failure occurs, it can share the same TE tunnel with LSP1.

When node A detects that LSP1 is broken or needs to be reoptimized, LSP3 will be initialized or refreshed with the Extended ASSOCIATION object inherited from LSP1's Path message. Furthermore, if LSP3 is the protecting LSP [[RFC4872](#)], the ASSOCIATION object and PROTECTION object [[RFC4872](#)] need to be inherited from the LSP1 also. In this way, based on the same Extended ASSOCIATION object, LSP2 and LSP3 will compose the new associated bidirectional LSPs.

#### [3.2.5.](#) Associated Bidirectional LSPs and LSP Recovery

LSP recovery as defined in [[RFC4872](#)], [[RFC4873](#)] and [[RFC4090](#)] is not impacted by this document. The recovery mechanisms defined in [[RFC4872](#)] and [[RFC4873](#)] rely on the use of ASSOCIATION Objects, but use a different Association Type field value than defined in this

document so should not be impacted. The mechanisms defined in [[RFC4090](#)] does not rely on the use of ASSOCIATION Objects and is therefore also not impacted by the mechanisms defined in this document.

#### [3.2.6.](#) Associated Bidirectional LSPs and TE Mesh-Groups

TE mesh-groups is defined in [[RFC4972](#)]. A node supporting both Associated Bidirectional LSPs and TE mesh-groups, MAY include an ASSOCIATION object as defined in this document in Path messages of LSPs used to support the mesh-group. To enable unambiguous identification of the mesh-group's associated bidirectional LSPs, the information carried in the ASSOCIATION object, including the contents of the Association Source and Identifier fields MUST be provisioned.

### [3.2.7.](#) MPLS-TP Associated Bidirectional LSP Identifiers

[RFC6370] defines the LSP associated identifiers based on the signaling parameters of each unidirectional LSP. The combination of each unidirectional LSP's parameters is used to identify the Associated Bidirectional LSP. Using the mechanisms defined in this document, any node that is along the path of both unidirectional LSPs can identify which pair of unidirectional LSPs support an Associated Bidirectional LSP as well as the signaling parameters required by [[RFC6370](#)]. Note that the LSP end-points will always be the path of both unidirectional LSPs.

### [3.2.8.](#) Teardown of Associated Bidirectional LSPs

Associated bidirectional LSPs teardown also follows standard procedures defined in [[RFC3209](#)] and [[RFC3473](#)] either without or with the administrative status. Note that teardown procedures of the associated bidirectional LSPs are independent of each other, so it is possible that while one LSP1 follows graceful teardown with administrative status, the other LSP2 is torn down without administrative status (using PathTear/ResvTear/PathErr with state removal). However, for the double sided associated bidirectional LSPs, the teardown of LSP1 does not mean that LSP2 must be deleted, which depends on the local policy. While for the single sided associated bidirectional LSPs, the teardown of the initialized LSP should induce the teardown of the trigger-established LSP, but the teardown of the trigger-established LSP (using PathErr with state removal) should not induce the teardown of the initialized LSP (which depends on the local policy).



#### 4.1. Extended ASSOCIATION Object

The Extended ASSOCIATION object is defined in [[RFC6780](#)], which enables MPLS-TP required LSP identification. The Extended ASSOCIATION object is used as follows for associated bidirectional LSPs.

##### Association Types:

In order to bind two reverse unidirectional LSPs to be an associated bidirectional LSP, new Association Types are defined in this document:

Value	Type
-----	-----
4 (TBD)	Double Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs (D)
5 (TBD)	Single Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs (A)

##### Association ID: 16 bits

For both double sided and single sided provisioning, Association ID is a value assigned by the node that originates the association.

##### Association Source: 4 or 16 bytes

Same as for IPv4 and IPv6 ASSOCIATION objects, see [[RFC4872](#)].

For double sided provisioning, Association Source is set to an address selected by the node that originates the association (which may be a management entity.)

For single sided provisioning, Association Source is set to an address assigned to the node that originates the LSP.

##### Global Association Source: 4 bytes

Same as for IPv4 and IPv6 Extended ASSOCIATION objects defined in [[RFC6780](#)].

For both double sided and single sided provisioning, Global Association Source, when used, is set to the Global\_ID [[RFC6370](#)] of the node that originates association.

##### Extended Association ID: 4 or 16 bytes

This field contains data that is additional information to support

unique identification.

For both double sided and single sided provisioning, Extended Association ID, when used, is selected by the node that originates the association.

If either Global Association Source or Extended Association Address is required, an Extended ASSOCIATION object [[RFC6780](#)] is used. Otherwise an ASSOCIATION object [[RFC4872](#)] is used.

#### [4.1.1](#) Signaling of the Extended Association Object

As described in [[RFC6780](#)], association is always done based on matching Path state or Resv state. Upstream initialized association is represented in Extended ASSOCIATION objects carried in Path message and downstream initialized association is represented in Extended ASSOCIATION objects carried in Resv messages. The new Association Types defined in this document are only used in upstream initialized association. Thus they can only appear in Extended ASSOCIATION objects signaled in Path message.

The rules associated with the processing of the Extended ASSOCIATION objects in RSVP message are discussed in [[RFC6780](#)]. It said that in the absence of Association Type-specific rules for identifying association, the included Extended ASSOCIATION objects MUST be identical. This document adds no specific rules, the association will always operate based on the same Extended ASSOCIATION objects.

#### [4.2](#). REVERSE\_LSP Object


Path Computation Element (PCE)-based approaches, see [[RFC4655](#)], may be used for path computation of a GMPLS LSP, and consequently an associated bidirectional LSP, across domains and in a single domain. The ingress Label Switching Router (LSR), maybe serve as a PCE or Path Computation Client (PCC), has more information about the reverse LSP. When the forward LSP is signaled, the reverse LSP's traffic parameters, explicit route, LSP attributes, etc, can be carried in the REVERSE\_LSP object of the forward LSP's Path message. The egress LSR can be triggered to establish the reverse LSP according to the control information.

##### [4.2.1](#). Format

The information of the reverse LSP is specified via the REVERSE\_LSP object, which is optional with class numbers in the form 11bbbbbb has

the following format:

Class = TBD (of the form 11bbbbbb), C\_Type = 1 (TBD)



This object MUST NOT be used when the Extended ASSOCIATION object do not exist or exist but the Association Type is not "Single Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs".

#### [4.2.1.1.](#) Subobjects

The contents of a REVERSE\_LSP object are a series of variable-length data items called subobjects, which can be SENDER\_TSPCE, EXPLICIT\_ROUTE object (ERO), Session Attribute Object, Admin Status Object, LSP\_ATTRIBUTES Object, LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES Object, PROTECTION Object, ASSOCIATION Object, Extended ASSOCIATION Objects, etc.

#### [4.2.2.](#) LSP Control

The signaling procedure without the REVERSE\_LSP object carried in the LSP1's Path message is described in [section 3.2.1](#), which is the default option. A node includes a REVERSE\_LSP object and Extended ASSOCIATION object with an "Single Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs" Association Type in an outgoing Path message when it wishes to control the reverse LSP, and the receiver node B MUST convert the subobjects of the REVERSE\_LSP object into the corresponding objects that carried in LSP2's Path message. The case of a non-supporting egress node is outside of this document. If node A want to tear down the associated bidirectional LSP, a PathTear message will be sent out and Node B is triggered to tear down LSP2.

### [4.2.3.](#) Updated RSVP Message Formats

This section presents the RSVP message-related formats as modified by this document. Unmodified RSVP message formats are not listed.

The format of a Path message is as follows:

```
<Path Message> ::= <Common Header> [ <INTEGRITY> ]
```

```
[ [<MESSAGE_ID_ACK> | <MESSAGE_ID_NACK>] ... ]  
[ <MESSAGE_ID> ]  
<SESSION> <RSVP_HOP>  
<TIME_VALUES>  
[ <EXPLICIT_ROUTE> ]  
<LABEL_REQUEST>  
[ <PROTECTION> ]  
[ <LABEL_SET> ... ]  
[ <SESSION_ATTRIBUTE> ]  
[ <NOTIFY_REQUEST> ... ]  
[ <ADMIN_STATUS> ]  
[ <EXTENDED_ASSOCIATION> ... ]  
[ <REVERSE_LSP>  
[ <POLICY_DATA> ... ]  
<sender descriptor>
```

The format of the <sender descriptor> is not modified by the present document.

### [4.2.4.](#) Compatibility

The REVERSE\_LSP object is defined with class numbers in the form 11bbbbbb, which ensures compatibility with non-supporting nodes. Per [\[RFC2205\]](#), nodes not supporting this extension will ignore the object but forward it, unexamined and unmodified, in all messages resulting from this message. Especially, this object received in PathTear, or PathErr messages should be forwarded immediately in the same message, but should be saved with the corresponding state and forwarded in any refresh message resulting from that state when received in Path message.

## [5.](#) IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to administer assignment of new values for namespace defined in this document and summarized in this section.

### [5.1.](#) Association Type

Within the current document, two new Association Types are defined in the Extended ASSOCIATION object.

Value	Type
-----	-----
4 (TBD)	Double Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs (D)
5 (TBD)	Single Sided Associated Bidirectional LSPs (A)

### [5.2.](#) REVERSE\_LSP Object

A new class named REVERSE\_LSP has been created in the 11bbbbbb range (TBD) with the following definition:

Class Types or C-types (1, TBD):

There are no other IANA considerations introduced by this document.

## [6.](#) Security Considerations

This document introduces two new Association Types, and except this, there are no security issues about the Extended ASSOCIATION object are introduced here.

The procedures defined in this document result in an increase in the amount of topology information carried in signaling messages since the presence of the REVERSE\_LSP object necessarily means that there is more information about associated bidirectional LSPs. Thus, in the event of the interception of a signaling message, slightly more could be deduced about the state of the network than was previously the case, but this is judged to be a very minor security risk as this information is already available via routing.

Otherwise, this document introduces no additional security considerations. For a general discussion on MPLS and GMPLS related security issues, see the MPLS/GMPLS security framework [[RFC5920](#)].

## [7.](#) Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Lou Berger for his great guidance in this work, George Swallow and Jie Dong for the discussion of recovery, Lamberto Sterling for his valuable comments on the section of asymmetric bandwidths, Daniel King for the review of the document, Attila Takacs for the discussion of the provisioning model. At the same time, the authors would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Bo Wu, Xihua Fu, Lizhong Jin for the initial discussions, and Wenjuan He for the prototype implementation. The authors would also like to thank Siva Sivabalan, Eric Osborne and Robert Sawaya for the discussion on the association object.

## [8.](#) References

### [8.1.](#) Normative references

- [RFC6780] Berger, L., Le Faucheur, F., and A. Narayanan, "RSVP Association Object Extensions", [RFC 6780](#), October 2012.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2205] Braden, B., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S., and S. Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1 Functional Specification", [RFC 2205](#), September 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.
- [RFC4090] Pan, P., Swallow, G., Atlas, A., "Fast Reroute Extensions to RSVP-TE for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 4090](#), May 2005.
- [RFC4872] Lang, J., Rekhter, Y., and D. Papadimitriou, "RSVP-TE Extensions in Support of End-to-End Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Recovery", [RFC 4872](#), May 2007.
- [RFC4873] Berger, L., Bryskin, I., Papadimitriou, D., and A. Farrel, "GMPLS Segment Recovery", [RFC 4873](#), May 2007.
- [RFC4972] Vasseur, JP., Leroux, JL., Yasukawa, S., Previdi, S., Psenak, P., Mabbey, P., "Routing Extensions for Discovery of Multiprotocol (MPLS) Label Switch Router (LSR) Traffic Engineering (TE) Mesh Membership", [RFC 4972](#), July 2007.

## [8.2.](#) Informative References

- [RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", [RFC 4655](#), August 2006.
- [RFC5654] Niven-Jenkins, B., Brungard, D., Betts, M., Sprecher, N., and S. Ueno, "Requirements of an MPLS Transport Profile", [RFC 5654](#), September 2009.
- [RFC5920] Fang, L., "Security Framework for MPLS and GMPLS Networks", [RFC 5920](#), July 2010.

- [RFC6370] Bocci, M., Swallow, G., and E. Gray, "MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) Identifiers", [RFC 6370](#), September 2011.
- [RFC6373] Andersson, L., Berger, L., Fang, L., Bitar, N., and E. Gray, "MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) Control Plane Framework", [RFC 6373](#), September 2011.
- [RFC6387] Takacs, A., Berger, L., Caviglia, D., Fedyk, D., and J. Meuric, "GMPLS Asymmetric Bandwidth Bidirectional Label Switched Paths (LSPs)", [RFC 6387](#), September 2011.
- [RFC6689] Berger, L., "Usage of The RSVP Association Object", [RFC 6689](#), July 2012.

#### Authors' Addresses

Fei Zhang (editor)  
ZTE



Email: zhang.feiz@zte.com.cn

Ruiquan Jing  
China Telecom

Email: jingrq@ctbri.com.cn

Fan Yang  
ZTE

Email: yang.fan5@zte.com.cn

Weilian Jiang  
ZTE

Email: jiang.weilian@zte.com.cn

Rakesh Gandhi  
Cisco Systems

Email: rgandhi@cisco.com