

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Expires: November 24, 2010  
Category: Standards Track

Anca Zamfir  
Zafar Ali  
Cisco Systems  
Dimitri Papadimitriou  
Alcatel-Lucent  
May 25, 2010

## **Component Link Recording and Resource Control for TE Link Bundles**

[draft-ietf-mpls-explicit-resource-control-bundle-07.txt](#)

### Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF 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/1id-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 November 24, 2010.

### Abstract

Record Route is a useful administrative tool that has been used extensively by the service providers. However, when TE links are bundled, identification of label resource in Record Route Object (RRO) is not enough for the administrative purpose. Network service



## Component Link Record. & Resource Control for TE Link Bundles

providers would like to know the component link within a TE link that is being used by a given LSP. In other words, when link bundling is used, resource recording requires mechanisms to specify the component link identifier, along with the TE link identifier and Label. As it is not possible to record component link in the RRO, this draft defines the extensions to RSVP-TE [[RFC3209](#)] and [[RFC3473](#)] to specify component link identifiers for resource recording purposes.

This draft also defines the Explicit Route Object (ERO) counterpart of the RRO extension. The ERO extensions are needed to perform explicit label/ resource control over bundled TE link. Hence, this document defines the extensions to RSVP-TE [[RFC3209](#)] and [[RFC3473](#)] to specify component link identifiers for explicit resource control and recording over TE link bundles.

### 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 [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

### Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Terminology.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction .....</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">LSP Resource Recording.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.1</a>	<a href="#">Component Interface Identifier RRO subobject.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2</a>	<a href="#">Processing of Component Interface identifier RRO Subobject.</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Signaling Component Interface Identifier in ERO.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.1</a>	<a href="#">Processing of Component Interface Identifier ERO Subobject.</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Forward Compatibility Note.....</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">References.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">8.1</a>	<a href="#">Normative Reference.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">8.2</a>	<a href="#">Informative Reference.....</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	<a href="#">Author's Addresses.....</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	<a href="#">Copyright Notice.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	<a href="#">Legal.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>



## 1. Terminology

TE Link: Unless specified otherwise, it refers to a bundled Traffic Engineering link as defined in [\[RFC4201\]](#). Furthermore, the terms TE Link and bundled TE Link are used interchangeably in this draft.

Component (interface) link: refers (locally) to a component link as part of a bundled TE link. A component link is numbered/ unnumbered in its own right. For unnumbered component links, the component link ID is assumed to be unique on an advertising node. For numbered component links, the component link ID is assumed to be unique within a domain.

Component Interface Identifier: Refers to an ID used to uniquely identify a Component Interface. On a bundled link a combination of <component link identifier, label> is sufficient to unambiguously identify the appropriate resources used by an LSP [\[RFC4201\]](#).

## 2. Introduction

In GMPLS networks [\[RFC3945\]](#) that deals with unbundled (being either PSC, L2SC, TDM or LSC) TE Links, one of the types of resources that an LSP originator can control and would like to record are the TE Link interfaces used by the LSP. The resource control and recording is done by the use of an explicit route, i.e., Explicit Route (ERO) Object and record Route, i.e., Record Route Object (RRO) object, respectively.

Link Bundling, introduced in [\[RFC4201\]](#), is used to improve routing scalability by reducing the amount of TE related information that needs to be flooded and handled by IGP in a TE network. This is accomplished by aggregating and abstracting the TE Link resource. In some cases the complete resource identification is left as a local decision. However, as described above there are cases when it is desirable for a non-local (e.g., LSP head-end) node to identify completely or partially the LSP resources. In either case, and for administrative reasons, it is required to know which component link within a bundled TE link has been used for a given LSP.

When link bundling is used to aggregate multiple component links into a TE link, label is not the only resource that needs to be identified and recorded. In other words, the TE Link and the Label specified in the ERO/ RRO objects are not enough to completely identify the resource. For the bundled TE link case, in order to fully specify the resources on a link for a given LSP, the component link needs to be specified along with the label. In the case of bi-directional LSPs both upstream and downstream information may be specified. Therefore, explicit resource control and recording over a bundled TE link also

requires ability to specify a component link within the TE link.

## LSP Resource Recording

LSP Resource Recording refers to the ability to record the resources used by an LSP.

### Component Interface Identifier RRO subobject

[illegible]

This bit must be set to 0.

```
Type 10 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv4
Type 11 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv6
Type 12 (TBD): Component Interface identifier Unnumbered
```

Length





## Component Link Record. & Resource Control for TE Link Bundles

The Length contains the total length of the subobject in bytes, including the Type and Length fields. The Length is 8 bytes for the Component Interface identifier IPv4 and Component Interface identifier Unnumbered types. For Component Interface identifier IPv6 type of sub-object, the length field is 20 bytes.

U: 1 bit

This bit indicates the direction of the component interface. It is 0 for the downstream interface. It is set to 1 for the upstream interface and is only used for bi-directional LSPs.

### **3.2 Processing of Component Interface identifier RRO Subobject**

If a node desires component link recording, the "Component Link Recording desired" flag (value TBD) should be set in the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object, object that is defined in [[RFC5420](#)].

Setting of "Component Link Recording desired" flag is independent of the Label Recording flag in SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object as specified in [[RFC3209](#)]. Nevertheless, the following combinations are valid:

- 1) If both Label and Component Link flags are clear, then neither Labels nor Component Links are recorded.
- 2) If Label Recording flag is set and Component Link flag is clear, then only Label Recording is performed as defined in [[RFC3209](#)].
- 3) If Label Recording flag is clear and Component Link flag is set, then Component Link Recording is performed as defined in this proposal.
- 4) If both Label Recording and Component Link flags are set, then Label Recording is performed as defined in [[RFC3209](#)] and also Component Link recording is performed as defined in this proposal.

In most cases, a node initiates recording for a given LSP by adding the RRO to the Path message. If the node desires Component Link recording and if the outgoing TE link is bundled, then the initial RRO contains the Component Link identifier (numbered or unnumbered) as selected by the sender. As well, the Component Link Recording desired flag is set in the LSP\_ATTRIBUTE object. If the node also desires label recording, it sets the Label\_Recording flag in the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object.



## Component Link Record. & Resource Control for TE Link Bundles

When a Path message with the "Component Link Recording desired" flag set is received by an intermediate node, if a new Path message is to be sent for a downstream bundled TE link, the node adds a new Component Link subobject to the RECORD\_ROUTE object (RRO) and appends the resulting RRO to the Path message before transmission.

Note also that, unlike Labels, Component Link identifiers are always known on receipt of the Path message.

When the destination node of an RSVP session receives a Path message with an RRO and the "Component Link Recording desired" flag set, this indicates that the sender node needs TE route as well as component link recording. The destination node initiates the RRO process by adding an RRO to Resv messages. The processing mirrors that of the Path messages

The Component Interface Record subobject is pushed onto the RECORD\_ROUTE object (RRO) prior to pushing on the node's IP address. A node MUST NOT push on a Component Interface Record subobject without also pushing on the IP address or unnumbered Interface Id subobject that identifies the TE Link.

When component interfaces are recorded for bi-directional LSPs, component interface RRO subobjects for both downstream and upstream interfaces **MUST** be included.

#### 4. Signaling Component Interface Identifier in ERO

A new OPTIONAL subobject of the EXPLICIT\_ROUTE Object (ERO) is used to specify component interface identifier of a bundled TE Link.

This Component Interface Identifier subobject has the following format:

[illegible]

L: 1 bit

This bit must be set to 0.

Type



## Component Link Record. & Resource Control for TE Link Bundles

Type 10 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv4

Type 11 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv6

Type 12 (TBD): Component Interface identifier Unnumbered

### Length

The Length contains the total length of the subobject in bytes, including the Type and Length fields. The Length is 8 bytes for the Component Interface identifier types: IPv4 and Component Interface identifier Unnumbered. For Component Interface identifier IPv6 type of sub-object, the length field is 20 bytes.

U: 1 bit

This bit indicates the direction of the component interface. It is 0 for the downstream interface. It is set to 1 for the upstream interface and is only used for bi-directional LSPs.

### **4.1 Processing of Component Interface Identifier ERO Subobject**

The Component Interface Identifier ERO subobject follows a subobject containing the IP address, or the link identifier [[RFC3477](#)], associated with the TE link on which it is to be used. It is used to identify the component of a bundled TE Link.

The following SHOULD result in "Bad EXPLICIT\_ROUTE object" error being sent upstream by a node processing an ERO that contains the Component Interface ID sub-object:

- o) The first component interface identifier subobject is not preceded by a sub-object containing an IPv4 or IPv6 address, or an interface identifier [[RFC3477](#)], associated with a TE link.
- o) The Component Interface Identifier ERO subobject follows a subobject that has the L-bit set.
- o) On unidirectional LSP setup, there is a Component Interface Identifier ERO subobject with the U-bit set.
- o) Two Component Interface Identifier ERO subobjects with the same U-bit values exist.

If a node implements the component interface identifier subobject, it MUST check if it represents a component interface in the bundled TE Link specified in the preceding subobject that contains the IPv4/IPv6 address or interface identifier of the TE Link. If the content of the component interface identifier subobject does not match a component



## Component Link Record. & Resource Control for TE Link Bundles

interface in the TE link, a "Bad EXPLICIT\_ROUTE object" error SHOULD be reported as "Routing Problem" (error code 24).

If U-bit of the subobject being examined is cleared (0) and the upstream interface specified in this subobject is acceptable, then the value of the upstream component interface is translated locally in the TLV of the IF\_ID RSVP HOP object [[RFC3471](#)]. The local decision normally used to select the upstream component link is bypassed except for local translation into the outgoing interface identifier from the received incoming remote interface identifier. If this interface is not acceptable, a "Bad EXPLICIT\_ROUTE object" error SHOULD be reported as "Routing Problem" (error code 24).

If the U-bit of the subobject being examined is set (1), then the value represents the component interface to be used for upstream traffic associated with the bidirectional LSP. Again, if this interface is not acceptable or if the request is not one for a bidirectional LSP, then a "Bad EXPLICIT\_ROUTE object" error SHOULD be reported as "Routing Problem" (error code 24). Otherwise, the component interface IP address/ identifier is copied into a TLV sub-object as part of the IF\_ID RSVP\_HOP object. The local decision normally used to select the upstream component link is bypassed except for local translation into the outgoing interface identifier from the received incoming remote interface identifier.

The IF\_ID RSVP\_HOP object constructed as above MUST be included in the corresponding outgoing Path message.

Note that, associated with a TE Link sub-object in the ERO, either the (remote) upstream component interface or the (remote) downstream component interface or both may be specified. As specified in [[RFC4201](#)] there is no relationship between the TE Link type (numbered or unnumbered) and the Link type of any one of its components.

The Component Interface Identifier ERO subobject is optional. Similarly, presence of the Label ERO sub-objects is not mandatory [[RFC3471](#)], [[RFC3473](#)]. Furthermore, component interface identifier ERO subobject and Label ERO subobject may be included in the ERO independently of each other. One of the following alternatives applies:

- o) When both sub-objects are absent, a node may select any appropriate component link within the TE link and any label on the selected component link.
- o) When the Label subobject is only present for a bundled link, then the selection of the component link within the bundle is a local decision and the node may select any appropriate component link,

which can assume the label specified in the Label ERO.



## Component Link Record. & Resource Control for TE Link Bundles

- o) When only the component interface identifier ERO subobject is present, a node MUST select the component interface specified in the ERO and may select any appropriate label value at the specified component link.
- o) When both component interface identifier ERO subobject and Label ERO subobject are present, the node MUST select the locally corresponding component link and the specified label value on that component link. When present, both subobjects may appear in any relative order to each other but they MUST appear after the TE Link subobject that they refer to.

After processing, the component interface identifier subobjects are removed from the ERO.

Inferred from above, the interface subobject should never be the first subobject in a newly received message. If the component interface subobject is the first subobject in a received ERO, then it SHOULD be treated as a "Bad strict node" error.

Note: Information to construct the Component Interface ERO subobject may come from the same mean used to populate the label ERO subobject. Procedures by which an LSR at the head-end of an LSP obtains the information needed to construct the Component Interface subobject are outside the scope of this document.

### **5. Forward Compatibility Note**

The extensions specified in this draft do not affect the processing of the RRO, ERO at nodes that do not support them. A node that does not support the Component Interface RRO subobject but that does support Label subobject SHOULD only insert the Label subobject in the RRO as per [[RFC3471](#)] and [[RFC3473](#)].

A node that receives an ERO that contains a Component Link ID subobject SHOULD send "Bad EXPLICIT\_ROUTE object" if it does not implement this subobject.

Per [[RFC3209](#)], [Section 4.4.5](#), a non-compliant node that receives an RRO that contains Component Interface Identifier sub-objects should ignore and pass them on. This limits the full applicability of if nodes traversed by the LSP are compliant with the proposed extensions.

### **6. Security Considerations**

This document does not introduce new security issues. The security considerations pertaining to the original RSVP protocol [[RFC2205](#)] remain relevant.



## **7. IANA Considerations**

This document introduces the following RSVP protocol elements:

- o) Component Interface Identifier RRO subobject of the Record Route Object (RRO). The following Types are defined:

Type 10 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv4

Type 11 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv6

Type 12 (TBD): Component Interface identifier Unnumbered

- o) Component Interface Identifier subobject of the Explicit Route Object (ERO). The following Types are defined:

Type 10 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv4

Type 11 (TBD): Component Interface identifier IPv6

Type 12 (TBD): Component Interface identifier Unnumbered

- o) A new "Component Link Recording desired" flag (value TBD) of the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object [[RFC5420](#)]

## **8. References**

### **8.1 Normative Reference**

- [RFC2205] R. Braden, et al., "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) - Version 1, Functional Specification", [RFC 2205](#), September 1997.
- [RFC2119] S. Bradner, "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3209] D. Awduche, et al., "Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 3209](#), December 2001.
- [RFC3471] L. Berger, et al., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Functional Description", [RFC 3471](#), January 2003.
- [RFC3473] L. Berger, et al., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Resource ReserVation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Extensions", [RFC 3473](#), January 2003.
- [RFC3477] K. Kompella, et al., "Signaling Unnumbered Links in Resource ReSerVation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 3477](#), January 2003.



- [RFC4201] K. Kompella, et al., "Link Bundling in MPLS Traffic Engineering", [RFC 4201](#), January 2003.
- [RFC5420] A. Farrel, et al., "Encoding of Attributes for Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Switched Path (LSP) Establishment Using Resource ReserVation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 5420](#).

## **[8.2](#) Informative Reference**

- [RFC3945] E. Mannie, et al., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Architecture", [RFC 3945](#), October 2004.

## **[9.](#) Author's Addresses**

Anca Zamfir  
Cisco Systems Inc.  
Email: [ancaz@cisco.com](mailto:ancaz@cisco.com)

Zafar Ali  
Cisco systems, Inc.,  
Email: [zali@cisco.com](mailto:zali@cisco.com)

Dimitri Papadimitriou  
Email: [dimitri.papadimitriou@alcatel-lucent.be](mailto:dimitri.papadimitriou@alcatel-lucent.be)

## **10. Copyright Notice**

Copyright (c) 2010 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. 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 BSD License.

## **11. Legal**

This documents and the information contained therein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION THEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

### Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).