

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Expiration Date: November 2002

K. Kompella (Juniper Networks)  
Y. Rekhter (Juniper Networks)  
A. Banerjee (Calient Networks)  
J. Drake (Calient Networks)  
G. Bernstein (Ciena)  
D. Fedyk (Nortel Networks)  
E. Mannie (GTS Network)  
D. Saha (Tellium)  
V. Sharma (Metanoia, Inc.)

## IS-IS Extensions in Support of Generalized MPLS

[draft-ietf-isis-gmpls-extensions-11.txt](#)

### 1. 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>.

Internet Draft    [draft-ietf-isis-gmpls-extensions-11.txt](#)

May 2002

## [2.](#) Abstract

This document specifies encoding of extensions to the IS-IS routing protocol in support of Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching.

## [3.](#) Summary for Sub-IP Area

### [3.1.](#) Summary

This document specifies encoding of extensions to the IS-IS routing protocol in support of Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS). The description of the extensions is specified in [GMPLS-ROUTING].

### [3.2.](#) Where does it fit in the Picture of the Sub-IP Work

This work fits squarely in either CCAMP or IS-IS boxes.

### [3.3.](#) Why is it Targeted at this WG

This draft is targeted at either the CCAMP or IS-IS WGs, because this draft specifies the extensions to the IS-IS routing protocols in support of GMPLS, because GMPLS is within the scope of CCAMP WG, and because IS-IS is within the scope of the IS-IS WG.

### [3.4.](#) Justification

The WG should consider this document as it specifies the extensions to the IS-IS routing protocols in support of GMPLS.

## [4.](#) Specification of Requirements

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](#)].

## [5. Introduction](#)

This document specifies extensions to the IS-IS routing protocol in support of carrying link state information for Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS). The set of required enhancements to IS-IS are outlined in [\[GMPLS-ROUTING\]](#).

## [6. IS-IS Routing Enhancements](#)

In this section we define the enhancements to the TE properties of GMPLS TE links that can be announced in IS-IS TE LSAs.

In this document, we enhance the sub-TLVs for the extended IS reachability TLV (see [\[ISIS-TE\]](#)) in support of GMPLS. Specifically, we add the following sub-TLVs:

Sub-TLV Type	Length	Name
4	4	Link Local/Remote Identifiers
20	2	Link Protection Type
21	variable	Interface Switching Capability Descriptor

We further add one new TLV to the TE LSAs.

TLV Type	Length	Name
138	variable	Shared Risk Link Group

### [6.1. Link Local/Remote Identifiers](#)

A Link Local Interface Identifiers is a sub-TLV of the extended IS reachability TLV. The type of this sub-TLV is 4, and length is eight octets. The value field of this sub-TLV contains four octets of Link Local Identifier followed by four octets of Link Remote Identifier (see Section "Support for unnumbered links" of [\[GMPLS-ROUTING\]](#)). If the





The Switching Capability (Switching Cap) field contains one of the following values:

- |     |                                 |         |
|-----|---------------------------------|---------|
| 1   | Packet-Switch Capable-1         | (PSC-1) |
| 2   | Packet-Switch Capable-2         | (PSC-2) |
| 3   | Packet-Switch Capable-3         | (PSC-3) |
| 4   | Packet-Switch Capable-4         | (PSC-4) |
| 51  | Layer-2 Switch Capable          | (L2SC)  |
| 100 | Time-Division-Multiplex Capable | (TDM)   |
| 150 | Lambda-Switch Capable           | (LSC)   |
| 200 | Fiber-Switch Capable            | (FSC)   |


The Encoding field contains one of the values specified in [Section 3.1.1](#) of [GMPLS-SIG].

Maximum LSP Bandwidth is encoded as a list of eight 4 octet fields in the IEEE floating point format, with priority 0 first and priority 7 last. The units are bytes (not bits!) per second.

The content of the Switching Capability specific information field depends on the value of the Switching Capability field.

When the Switching Capability field is PSC-1, PSC-2, PSC-3, or PSC-4, the Switching Capability specific information field includes Minimum

### LSP Bandwidth and Interface MTU.




The Minimum LSP Bandwidth is encoded in a 4 octets field in the IEEE floating point format. The units are bytes (not bits!) per second. The Interface MTU is encoded as a 2 octets integer.

When the Switching Capability field is L2SC, there is no Switching

Capability specific information field present.

When the Switching Capability field is TDM, the Switching Capability specific information field includes Minimum LSP Bandwidth and an indication whether the interface supports Standard or Arbitrary SONET/SDH.



The Minimum LSP Bandwidth is encoded in a 4 octets field in the IEEE floating point format. The units are bytes (not bits!) per second. The indication whether the interface supports Standard or Arbitrary SONET/SDH is encoded as 1 octet. The value of this octet is 0 if the interface supports Standard SONET/SDH, and 1 if the interface supports Arbitrary SONET/SDH.

When the Switching Capability field is LSC, there is no Switching Capability specific information field present.

To support interfaces that have more than one Interface Switching Capability Descriptor (see Section "Interface Switching Capability Descriptor" of [GMPLS-ROUTING]) the Interface Switching Capability Descriptor sub-TLV may occur more than once within the extended IS reachability TLV.

#### [6.4.](#) Shared Risk Link Group TLV


The SRLG TLV (of type 138 TBD) contains a data structure consisting of:

- 7 octets of System ID and Pseudonode Number
- 1 octet Flag
- 4 octets of IPv4 interface address or 4 octets of a Link Local

Identifier  
4 octets of IPv4 neighbor address or 4 octets of a Link Remote Identifier

and a list of SRLG values, where each element in the list has 4 octets. The length of this TLV is  $16 + 4 * (\text{number of SRLG values})$ . The Least Significant Bit of the Flag octet indicates whether the interface is numbered (set to 1), or unnumbered (set to 0). All other bits are reserved and should be set to 0.

The neighbor is identified by its System Id (6-octets), plus one octet to indicate the pseudonode number if the neighbor is on a LAN interface.



This TLV carries the Shared Risk Link Group information (see Section "Shared Risk Link Group Information" of [\[GMPLS-ROUTING\]](#)).

## 6.5. Link Identifier for Unnumbered Interfaces

Link Identifies are exchanged in the Extended Local Circuit ID field of the "Point-to-Point Three-Way Adjacency" IS-IS Option type [\[ISIS-3way\]](#).

## 7. Implications on Graceful Restart



The restarting node should follow the ISIS restart procedures [ISIS-RESTART], and the RSVP-TE restart procedures [[GMPLS-RSVP](#)].

When the restarting node is going to originate its TE LSAs, these LSAs should be originated with 0 unreserved bandwidth, Traffic Engineering Default metric set to MAX\_PATH\_METRIC, and if the Link has LSC or FSC as its Switching Capability then also with 0 as Max LSP Bandwidth, until the node is able to determine the amount of unreserved resources taking into account the resources reserved by the already established LSPs that have been preserved across the restart. Once the restarting node determines the amount of unreserved resources, taking into account the resources reserved by the already established LSPs that have been preserved across the restart, the node should advertise these resources in its TE LSAs.

In addition in the case of a planned restart prior to restarting, the restarting node SHOULD originate the TE LSAs with 0 as unreserved bandwidth, and if the Link has LSC or FSC as its Switching Capability then also with 0 as Max LSP Bandwidth. This would discourage new LSP establishment through the restarting router.

Neighbors of the restarting node should continue advertise the actual unreserved bandwidth on the TE links from the neighbors to that node.

Regular graceful restart should not be aborted if a TE LSA or TE topology changes. TE graceful restart need not be aborted if a TE LSA or TE topology changes.

## [8](#). Security Considerations

The extensions proposed in this document does not raise any new security concerns.

## [9](#). Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Suresh Katukam, Jonathan Lang and Quaizar Vohra for their comments on the draft.

## [10](#). References

- [ISIS-TE] Smit, H., Li, T., "IS-IS Extensions for Traffic Engineering",  
[draft-ietf-isis-traffic-03.txt](#) (work in progress)
- [GMPLS-SIG] Generalized MPLS Group, "Generalized MPLS - Signaling Functional  
Description", [draft-ietf-mpls-generalized-signaling-04.txt](#) (work  
in progress)
- [GMPLS-ROUTING] "Routing Extensions in Support of Generalized MPLS",  
[draft-many-ccamp-gmpls-routing-01.txt](#) (work in progress)
- [ISIS-3way] "Three-Way Handshake for IS-IS Point-to-Point  
Adjacencies",  
[draft-ietf-isis-3way-05.txt](#) (work in progress)
- [ISIS-RESTART] "Restart signaling for ISIS", [draft-ietf-isis-restart-00.txt](#)  
(work in progress)
- [GMPLS-RSVP] "Generalized MPLS Signaling - RSVP-TE Extensions",  
[draft-ietf-mpls-generalized-rsvp-te-06.txt](#) (work in progress)
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate  
Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

## [11](#). Authors' Information

Kireeti Kompella  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
[1194](#) N. Mathilda Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
Email: kireeti@juniper.net

---

Internet Draft    [draft-ietf-isis-gmpls-extensions-11.txt](#)

May 2002

Yakov Rekhter  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
[1194](#) N. Mathilda Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
Email: yakov@juniper.net

Ayan Banerjee  
Calient Networks  
[5853](#) Rue Ferrari  
San Jose, CA 95138  
Phone: +1.408.972.3645  
Email: abanerjee@calient.net

John Drake  
Calient Networks  
[5853](#) Rue Ferrari  
San Jose, CA 95138  
Phone: (408) 972-3720  
Email: jdrake@calient.net

Greg Bernstein  
Ciena Corporation  
[10480](#) Ridgeview Court  
Cupertino, CA 94014  
Phone: (408) 366-4713  
Email: greg@ciena.com

Don Fedyk  
Nortel Networks Corp.  
[600](#) Technology Park Drive  
Billerica, MA 01821  
Phone: +1-978-288-4506  
Email: dwfedyk@nortelnetworks.com

Internet Draft    [draft-ietf-isis-gmpls-extensions-11.txt](#)

May 2002

Eric Mannie  
GTS Network Services  
RDI Department, Core Network Technology Group  
Terhulpsessesteeenweg, 6A  
[1560](#) Hoeilaart, Belgium  
Phone: +32-2-658.56.52  
E-mail: [eric.mannie@gtsgroup.com](mailto:eric.mannie@gtsgroup.com)

Debanjan Saha  
Tellium Optical Systems  
[2](#) Crescent Place  
P.O. Box 901  
Ocean Port, NJ 07757  
Phone: (732) 923-4264  
Email: [dsaha@tellium.com](mailto:dsaha@tellium.com)

Vishal Sharma  
Metanoia, Inc.  
[335](#) Elan Village Lane, Unit 203  
San Jose, CA 95134-2539  
Phone: +1 408-943-1794  
Email: [v.sharma@ieee.org](mailto:v.sharma@ieee.org)

