

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Category: Standards Track  
Expires: July 2004

Adrian Farrel (Editor)  
Old Dog Consulting

Dimitri Papadimitriou  
Alcatel

Jean-Philippe Vasseur  
Cisco Systems, Inc.

Arthi Ayyangar  
Juniper Networks

January 2004

Encoding of Attributes for Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS)  
Label Switched Path (LSP) Establishment Using RSVP-TE

[draft-ietf-mpls-rsvpte-attributes-02.txt](#)

#### Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC 2026](#) [[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

Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) may be established using the Resource Reservation Protocol Traffic Engineering extensions (RSVP-TE). This protocol includes an object (the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object) which carries a flags field used to indicate options and attributes of the LSP. That flags field has eight bits allowing for eight options to be set. Recent proposals in many documents that extend RSVP-TE have suggested uses for each of the previously unused bits.

This document defines a new object for RSVP-TE messages that allows the signaling of further attribute bits and also the carriage of arbitrary attribute parameters to make RSVP-TE easily extensible to support new requirements. Additionally, this document defines a way to record the attributes applied to the LSP on a hop-by-hop basis.

The object mechanisms defined in this document are equally applicable to Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) Packet Switch Capable (PSC) LSPs and to GMPLS non-PSC LSPs.

Farrel, Papadimitriou, Vasseur and Ayyangar

Page 1

[draft-ietf-mpls-rsvpte-attributes-02.txt](#)

January 2004

## 0. Change History

This section to be removed before publication.

### 0.1 Changes from 01 to 02 Version

- Minor typographical changes.

### 0.2 Changes from 00 to 01 Version

- Change Attributes Flags TLV to be variable length so that more bits can easily be added in the future.
- Define default behaviors for bits absent from the TLV and for absence of the TLV.
- Clarify the IANA requirements for tracking Attributes Flags bits.
- Introduce RRO Attributes Subobject and describe usage.
- Move Fast Reroute reference to informational.
- Update security considerations to handle new RRO subobject
- Remove section that explained the need for this document in advance of any definitive bit definitions.
- Tighten rules for processing LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object in cases where TLVs are unknown or unsupported.
- Clarify that LSP Attributes apply to individual LSPs and not to entire sessions.

## 1. Introduction and Problem Statement

Traffic Engineered Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) [[RFC3031](#)] may be set up using the Path message of the RSVP-TE signaling protocol [[RFC3209](#)]. The Path message includes the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object which carries a flags field used to indicate desired options and attributes of the LSP.

The flags field in the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object has eight bits. Just three of those bits are assigned in [[RFC3209](#)]. A further two bits are assigned in [[FRR](#)] for fast re-reroute functionality leaving only three bits available. Several recent proposals and Internet Drafts

have demonstrated that there is a high demand for the use of the other three bits. Some, if not all, of those proposals are likely to go forward as RFCs resulting in depletion or near depletion of the flags field and a consequent difficulty in signaling new options and attributes that may be developed in the future.

This document defines a new object for RSVP-TE messages that allows the signaling of further attributes bits. The new object is constructed from TLVs, and a new TLV is defined to carry a variable number of attributes bits. Because of the nature of the TLV construction the object is flexible and allows the future definition of:

- further bit flags if further, distinct uses are discovered
- arbitrary options and attributes parameters carried as individual TLVs.

Note that the LSP Attributes defined in this document are specifically scoped to an LSP. They may be set differently on separate LSPs with the same Tunnel ID between the same source and destination (that is, within the same Session).

It is noted that that some options and attributes do not need to be acted on by all Label Switched Routers (LSRs) along the path of the LSP. In particular, these options and attributes may apply only to key LSRs on the path such as the ingress and egress. Special transit LSRs, such as area or AS Border Routers (ABR/ASBRs) may also fall into this category. This means that the new options and attributes should be signaled transparently, and only examined at those points that need to act on them.

On the other hand, other options and attributes may require action at all transit LSRs along the path of the LSP. Inability to support the required attributes by one of those transit LSRs may require the LSR to refuse the establishment of the LSP.

These considerations are particularly important in the context of backwards compatibility. In general, it should be possible to provide new MPLS services across a legacy network without upgrading those LSRs that do not need to participate actively in the new services.

Note that options already specified for the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object in pre-existing RFCs are not migrated to the new mechanisms described in this document.

RSVP includes a way for unrecognized objects to be transparently forwarded by transit nodes without them refusing the incoming protocol messages and with the objects being stripped from the

outgoing protocol message (see [\[RFC2205\] section 3.10](#)). This capability extends to RSVP-TE and provides a good way to ensure that only those LSRs that understand a particular object examine it.

This document distinguishes between options and attributes that are only required at key LSRs along the path of the LSP, and those that must be acted on by every LSR along the LSP. Two LSP Attributes objects are defined in this document: the first may be passed transparently by LSRs that do not recognize it, the second must cause LSP setup failure with the generation of a PathErr message with an appropriate Error Code if an LSR does not recognize it.

### [1.1](#) Applicability to Generalized MPLS

The RSVP-TE signaling protocol also forms the basis of a signaling protocol for Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) as described in [\[RFC3471\]](#) and [\[RFC3473\]](#). The extensions described in this document are intended to be equally applicable to MPLS and GMPLS.

### [1.2](#) A Rejected Alternate Solution

A rejected alternate solution was to define a new C-Type for the existing SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object. This new C-Type could allow a larger Flags field and address the immediate problem.

This solution was rejected because:

- A new C-Type is not backward compatible with deployed implementations that expect to see a C-Type of 1 or 7. It is important that any solution be capable of carrying new attributes transparently across legacy LSRs if those LSRs are not required to act on the attributes.

- Support for arbitrary attributes parameters through TLVs would have meant a significant change of substance to the existing object.

## [2.](#) Terminology


This document uses terminology from the MPLS architecture document [\[RFC3031\]](#) and from the RSVP-TE protocol specification [\[RFC3209\]](#) which inherits from the RSVP specification [\[RFC2205\]](#).

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](#) [6].

## [3.](#) Attributes TLVs

Attributes carried by the new objects defined in this document are encoded within TLVs. One or more TLVs may be present in each object. There are no ordering rules for TLVs and no interpretation should be placed on the order in which TLVs are received.

Each TLV is encoded as follows.



#### Type

The identifier of the TLV.

#### Length

The length of the value field in bytes. Thus if no value field is present the length field contains the value zero. Each value field must be zero padded at the end to take it up to a four byte boundary - the padding is not included in the length so that a one byte value would be encoded in an eight byte TLV with length field set to one.

#### Value

The data for the TLV padded as described above.

### [3.1 Attributes Flags TLV](#)

This document defines only one TLV type value. Type 1 indicates the Attributes Flags TLV. Other TLV types may be defined in future with type values assigned by IANA.

The Attributes Flags TLV may be present in an LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object and/or an LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object. The bits in the TLV represent the same attributes regardless of which object carries the TLV. Documents that define individual bits MUST specify whether the

bit may be set in one object or the other, or both. It is not expected that a bit will be set in both objects on a single Path message at the same time, but this is not ruled out by this document.

The Attributes Flags TLV value field is a variable length array of flags numbered from the MSB as bit zero. The length field for this TLV is always a multiple of 4 bytes, regardless of the number bits carried.

Unassigned bits are considered as reserved and MUST be set to zero on transmission by the originator of the object. Bits not contained in the TLV MUST be assumed to be set to zero. If the TLV is absent either because it is not contained in the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES or LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object, or because those objects are themselves absent, all processing MUST be performed as though the bits were present and set to zero.

No bits are defined in this document. The assignment of bits is managed by IANA.

#### [4.](#) LSP\_ATTRIBUTES Object

The LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object is used to signal attributes required in support of an LSP, or to indicate the nature or use of an LSP where that information is not required to be acted on by all transit LSRs. Specifically, if an LSR does not support the object, it forwards it unexamined and unchanged. This facilitates the exchange of attributes across legacy networks that do not support this new object.

This object effectively extends the flags field in the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object and allows for the future inclusion of more complex objects through TLVs.

Note that some function may require an LSR to inspect both the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object, and the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES or LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object.


The LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object class is TBD of the form 11bbbbbb. This C-Num value (see [section 7](#)) ensures that LSRs that do not recognize the object pass it on transparently.

One C-Type is defined, C-Type = 1 for LSP Attributes.

This object is optional and may be placed on Path messages to convey additional information about the desired attributes of the LSP.

**4.1** Format

LSP\_ATTRIBUTES class = TBD, C-Type = 1



The Attributes TLVs are encoded as described in [section 3](#).

**4.2** Generic Processing Rules

An LSR that does not support this object will pass it on unaltered because of the C-Num.

An LSR that does support this object, but does not recognize a TLV type code carried in this object MUST pass the TLV on unaltered in the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object that it places in the Path message that it sends downstream.

An LSR that does support this object and recognizes a TLV but does not support the attribute defined by the TLV MUST act as specified in the document that defines the TLV.

An LSR that supports the Attributes Flags TLV, but does not recognize a bit set in the Attributes Flags TLV MUST forward the TLV unchanged.

An LSR that supports the Attributes Flags TLV and recognizes a bit that is set but does not support the indicated attribute MUST act as specified in the document that defines the bit.

**5.** LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES Object

The LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object is used to signal attributes required in support of an LSP, or to indicate the nature or use of an LSP where that information MUST be inspected at each transit LSR. Specifically, each transit LSR MUST examine the attributes in the LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object and MUST NOT forward the object transparently.

This object effectively extends the flags field in the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object and allows for the future inclusion of more complex objects through TLVs. It complements the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object.


The LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object class is TBD of the form 0bbbbbbb. This C-Num value ensures that LSRs that do not recognize the object reject the LSP setup effectively saying that they do not support the attributes requested. This means that this object SHOULD only be used for attributes that require support at some transit LSRs and so require examination at all transit LSRs. See [section 4](#) for how end-to-end and selective attributes are signaled.

One C-Type is defined, C-Type = 1 for LSP Required Attributes.

This object is optional and may be placed on Path messages to convey additional information about the desired attributes of the LSP.

### 5.1 Format

LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES class = TBD, C-Type = 1



The Attributes TLVs are encoded as described in [section 3](#).

### 5.2 Generic Processing Rules

An LSR that does not support this object will use a PathErr to reject the Path message based on the C-Num using the error code "Unknown Object Class".

An LSR that does not recognize a TLV type code carried in this object MUST reject the Path message using a PathErr with Error Code "Unknown Attributes TLV" and Error Value set to the value of the unknown TLV type code.

An LSR that does not recognize a bit set in the Attributes Flags TLV MUST reject the Path message using a PathErr with Error Code "Unknown Attributes Bit" and Error Value set to the bit number of



the unknown bit in the Attributes Flags.

An LSR that recognizes an attribute, however encoded, but which does not support that attribute MUST act according to the behavior specified in the document that defines that specific attribute.

## 6. Recording Attributes

### 6.1 Requirements

In some circumstances it is useful to determine which of the requested LSP attributes have been applied at which LSRs along the path of the LSP. For example, an attribute may be requested in the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object such that LSRs that do not support the object are not required to support the attribute or provide the requested function. In this case, it may be useful to the ingress LSR to know which LSRs acted on the request and which ignored it.

Additionally, there may be other qualities that need to be reported on a hop-by-hop basis. These are currently indicated in the Flags field of RRO subobjects. Since there are only eight bits available in this field, and since some are already assigned and there is also likely to be an increase in allocations in new documents, there is a need for some other method to report per-hop attributes.

### 6.2 RRO Attributes Subobject

The RRO Attributes Subobject may be carried in the RECORD\_ROUTE object if it is present. The subobject uses the standard format of an RRO subobject.

The length is variable as for the Attributes Flags TLV. The content is the same as the Attribute Flags TLV - that is, it is a series of bit flags.

There is a one-to-one correspondance between bits in the Attributes Flags TLV and the RRO Attributes Subobject. If a bit is only required in one of the two places, it is reserved in the other place. See the procedures sections, below, for more information.

```

      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           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                                                    |
//                                                                    //
                        Attribute Flags

```



To report compliance with an attribute requested in the Attributes Flags TLV, an LSR MAY set the corresponding bit (see [section 7](#)) in the Attributes subobject. To report non-compliance, an LSR MAY clear the corresponding bit in the Attributes subobject.

The requirement to report compliance MUST be specified in the document that defines the usage of any bit. This will reduce to a statement of whether hop-by-hop acknowledgement is required.

### [6.3.3](#) Reporting Per-Hop Attributes

To report a per-hop attribute, an LSR sets the appropriate bit in the Attributes subobject.

The requirement to report a per-hop attribute MUST be specified in the document that defines the usage of the bit.

### [6.3.4](#) Default Behavior

By default all bits in an Attributes subobject SHOULD be set to zero.

If a received Attribute subobject is not long enough to include a specific numbered bit, that bit MUST be treated as though present and as if set to zero.

If the RRO subobject is not present for a hop in the LSP, all bits MUST be assumed to be set to zero.

## [7](#). Summary of Attribute Bit Allocation

This document defines two uses of per-LSP attribute flag bit fields. The bit numbering in the Attributes Flags TLV and the RRO Attributes subobject is identical. That is, the same attribute is indicated by the same bit in both places. This means that only a single registry of bits is maintained.

The consequence is a degree of clarity in implementation and registration.

Note, however, that it is not always the case that a bit will be used in both the Attributes Flags TLV and the RRO Attributes subobject. For example, an attribute may be requested using the Attributes Flags TLV, but there is no requirement to report the handling of the attribute on a hop-by-hop basis. Conversely, there may be a requirement to report the attributes of an LSP on a hop-by-hop basis, but there is no corresponding request attribute.

In these cases, a single bit number is still assigned for both the Attributes Flags TLV and the RRO Attributes subobject even though the bit may be irrelevant in either the Attributes Flags or the RRO Attributes subobject. The document that defines the usage of the new bit MUST state in which places it is used and MUST handle a default setting of zero.

## 8. Message Formats

The LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object and the LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object MAY be carried in a Path message.

The order of objects in RSVP-TE messages is recommended, but implementations must be capable of receiving the objects in any meaningful order. The LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object and LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES objects are RECOMMENDED to be placed immediately after the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object if it is present, or otherwise immediately after the LABEL\_REQUEST object.

If both the LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object and the LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object are present, the LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object is RECOMMENDED to be placed first.

LSRs SHOULD be prepared to receive these objects in any order in any position within a Path message. Subsequent instances of these objects within a Path message SHOULD be ignored and those objects MUST be forwarded unchanged transparently.

## 9. IANA Considerations

### 9.1 New RSVP C-Nums and C-Types

Two new RSVP C-Nums are defined in this document and should be assigned by IANA.

#### o LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object

The C-Num should be of the form 11bbbbbb so that LSRs that do not recognize the object will ignore the object but forward it, unexamined and unmodified, in all messages resulting from this message.

One C-Type is defined for this object and should be assigned by IANA.

#### o LSP Attributes TLVs

Recommended C-Type value 1.

#### o LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object

The C-Num should be of the form 0bbbbbbb so that LSRs that do not recognize the object will reject the message that carries it with an "Unknown Object Class" error.

One C-Type is defined for this object and should be assigned by IANA.

- o LSP Required Attributes TLVs

Recommended C-Type value 1.

## [9.2](#) New TLV Space

The two new objects referenced above are constructed from TLVs. Each TLV includes a 16-bit type identifier (the T-field). The same T-field values are applicable to both objects.

IANA is requested to manage TLV type identifiers as follows:

- TLV Type (T-field value)
- TLV Name
- Whether allowed on LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object
- Whether allowed on LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object.

This document defines one TLV type as follows:

- TLV Type = 1
- TLV Name = Attributes Flags TLV
- allowed on LSP\_ATTRIBUTES object
- allowed on LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES object.

## [9.3](#) Attributes Flags

This document provides new attributes bit flags for use in other documents that specify new RSVP-TE attributes. These flags are present in the Attributes Flags TLV referenced in the previous section.

IANA is requested to manage the space of attributes bit flags numbering them in the usual IETF notation starting at zero and continuing through 2039.

Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- Bit number
- Defining RFC

- Name of bit
- Whether there is meaning in the Attribute Flags TLV (yes/no)
- Whether there is meaning in the RRO Attributes Subobject (yes/no).

Note that this means that all bits in the Attribute Flags TLV and the RRO Attributes Subobject use the same bit number regardless of whether they are used in one or both places. Thus, only one list of bits is required to be maintained. (It would be meaningless in the context of this document for a bit to have no meaning in neither the Attribute Flags TLV nor the RRO Attributes Subobject.)

#### [9.4](#) SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE Flags Field

This document does not make any alterations to the definition of the existing SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object nor to the definition of meanings assigned to the flags in the Flags field of that object. These flags are assigned meanings in various other RFCs and Internet Drafts.

Farrel, Papadimitriou, Vasseur and Ayyangar

Page 11

[draft-ietf-mpls-rsvpte-attributes-02.txt](#)

January 2004

It is suggested that IANA manage the allocation of meaning to the bits in the Flags field of the SESSION\_ATTRIBUTE object to prevent accidental double allocation of any one bit.

#### [9.5](#) New Error Codes

This document defines the following new error codes and error values. Numeric values should be assigned by IANA.

Error Code	Error Value
"Unknown Attributes TLV"	Identifies the unknown TLV type code.
"Unknown Attributes Bit"	Identifies the unknown Attribute Bit.

#### [9.6](#) New Record Route Subobject Identifier

A new subobject is defined for inclusion in the RECORD\_ROUTE object.

The RRO Attributes subobject is identified by a Type value of TBD.

### [10.](#) Security Considerations

This document adds two new objects to the RSVP Path message as used in MPLS and GMPLS signaling, and a new subobject to the RECORD\_ROUTE object carried on may RSVP messages. It does not introduce any new direct security issues and the reader is referred to the security considerations expressed in [[RFC2205](#)], [[RFC3209](#)] and [[RFC3473](#)].

It is of passing note that any signaling request that indicates the functional preferences or attributes of an MPLS LSP may provide

anyone with unauthorized access to the contents of the message with information about the LSP that an administrator may wish to keep secret. Although this document adds new objects for signaling desired LSP attributes, it does not contribute to this issue which can only be satisfactorily handled by encrypting the content of the signaling message.

Similarly, the addition of attribute recording information to the RRO may reveal information about the status of the LSP and the capabilities of individual LSRs that operators wish to keep secret. The same strategy that applies to other RRO subobjects also applies here. Note, however, that there is a tension between notifying the head end of the LSP status at transit LSRs, and hiding the existence or identity of the transit LSRs.

## 11. Acknowledgements

Credit to the OSPF Working Group for inspiration from their solution to a similar problem.

Thanks to Rahul Aggarwal for his careful review and support of this work. Thanks also to Raymond Zhang, Kireeti Kompella, Philip Matthews and Jim Gibson for their input.

## 12. Intellectual Property Consideration

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 implementors 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.

### 13. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2205] Braden, R. (Ed.), Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S. and S. Jamin, "Resource ReserVation Protocol -- 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.
- [RFC3471] Berger, L. (Editor), "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Functional Description", [RFC 3471](#), January 2003.
- [RFC3473] Berger, L. (Editor), "Generalized MPLS Signaling - RSVP-TE Extensions", [RFC 3473](#) January 2003.

### 14. Informative References

- [RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", [RFC 2026](#), October 1996.
- [RFC3031] Rosen, E., Viswanathan, A., and Callon, R., "Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture", [RFC 3031](#), January 2001.

- [INTER-AS] Vasseur, JP., Zhang, R., "Inter-AS MPLS Traffic Engineering", [<draft-vasseur-inter-as-te-03.txt>](#), Internet Draft, work in progress.
- [FRR] Pan, P. (Ed.), "Fast Reroute Extensions to RSVP-TE for LSP Tunnels", [<draft-ietf-mpls-rsvp-lsp-fastreroute-03.txt>](#), Internet Draft, work in progress.



- [OSPF-CAPS] Lindem, A., Shen, N., Aggarwal, R., Shaffer, S., Vasseur, JP., "Extensions to OSPF for Advertising Optional Router Capabilities", <[draft-ietf-ospf-cap-00.txt](#)>, Internet Draft, work in progress.
- [REOPT] Vasseur, JP., Ikejiri, Y., "Reoptimization of MPLS Traffic Engineering loosely routed explicit LSP path", <[draft-vasseur-mpls-loose-path-reopt-02.txt](#)>, Internet Draft, work in progress.

## 15. Authors' Addresses

Adrian Farrel  
Old Dog Consulting  
Phone: +44 (0) 1978 860944  
EMail: [adrian@olddog.co.uk](mailto:adrian@olddog.co.uk)

Dimitri Papadimitriou (Alcatel)  
Fr. Wellesplein 1,  
B-2018 Antwerpen, Belgium  
Phone: +32 3 240-8491  
EMail: [dimitri.papadimitriou@alcatel.be](mailto:dimitri.papadimitriou@alcatel.be)

Jean Philippe Vasseur  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
300 Beaver Brook Road  
Boxborough , MA - 01719  
USA  
EMail: [jpv@cisco.com](mailto:jpv@cisco.com)

Arthi Ayyangar  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
1194 N.Mathilda Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
USA  
EMail: [arthi@juniper.net](mailto:arthi@juniper.net)

## 16. Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). 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.

