

PCE Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: August 7, 2019

S. Litkowski  
Orange  
S. Sivabalan  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
J. Tantsura  
Apstra, Inc.  
J. Hardwick  
Metaswitch Networks  
M. Negi  
Huawei Technologies  
February 3, 2019

**Path Computation Element communication Protocol extension for  
associating Policies and LSPs  
draft-ietf-pce-association-policy-05**

Abstract

This document introduces a simple mechanism to associate policies to a group of Label Switched Paths (LSPs) via an extension to the Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP).

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 <https://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 August 7, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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 (<https://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 Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction . . . . .](#) [2](#)
- [1.1. Requirements Language . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [2. Terminology . . . . .](#) [3](#)
- [3. Motivation . . . . .](#) [4](#)
- [3.1. Policy based Constraints . . . . .](#) [5](#)
- [4. Overview . . . . .](#) [6](#)
- [5. Policy Association Group . . . . .](#) [7](#)
- [5.1. Policy Parameters TLV . . . . .](#) [7](#)
- [6. Security Considerations . . . . .](#) [8](#)
- [7. IANA Considerations . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [7.1. Association object Type Indicators . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [7.2. PCEP TLV Type Indicators . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [8. Manageability Considerations . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [8.1. Control of Function and Policy . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [8.2. Information and Data Models . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [8.3. Liveness Detection and Monitoring . . . . .](#) [9](#)
- [8.4. Verify Correct Operations . . . . .](#) [10](#)
- [8.5. Requirements On Other Protocols . . . . .](#) [10](#)
- [8.6. Impact On Network Operations . . . . .](#) [10](#)
- [9. Acknowledgments . . . . .](#) [10](#)
- [10. References . . . . .](#) [10](#)
- [10.1. Normative References . . . . .](#) [10](#)
- [10.2. Informative References . . . . .](#) [11](#)
- [Appendix A. Contributor Addresses . . . . .](#) [12](#)
- [Authors' Addresses . . . . .](#) [12](#)

**1. Introduction**

[RFC5440] describes the Path Computation Element communication Protocol (PCEP) which enables the communication between a Path Computation Client (PCC) and a Path Control Element (PCE), or between two PCEs based on the PCE architecture [RFC4655]. [RFC5394] provides additional details on policy within the PCE architecture and also provides context for the support of PCE Policy.

PCEP Extensions for Stateful PCE Model [RFC8231] describes a set of extensions to PCEP to enable active control of Multiprotocol Label Switching Traffic Engineering (MPLS-TE) and Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) tunnels. [RFC8281] describes the setup and teardown of PCE-initiated



LSPs under the active stateful PCE model, without the need for local configuration on the PCC, thus allowing for a dynamic network. Currently, the LSPs can either be signaled via Resource Reservation Protocol Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) or can be segment routed as specified in [[I-D.ietf-pce-segment-routing](#)].

[[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)] introduces a generic mechanism to create a grouping of LSPs which can then be used to define associations between a set of LSPs and a set of attributes (such as configuration parameters or behaviors) and is equally applicable to stateful PCE (active and passive modes) and stateless PCE.

This document specifies a PCEP extension to associate one or more LSPs with policies using the generic association mechanism.

A PCEP speaker may want to influence the PCEP peer with respect to path selection and other policies. This document describes a PCEP extension to associate policies by creating Policy Association Group (PAG) and encoding this association in PCEP messages. The specification is applicable to both stateful and stateless PCEP sessions.

## **[1.1.](#) Requirements Language**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## **[2.](#) Terminology**

The following terminology is used in this document.

Association parameters: As described in [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)], the combination of the mandatory fields Association type, Association ID and Association Source in the ASSOCIATION object uniquely identify the association group. If the optional TLVs - Global Association Source or Extended Association ID are included, then they are included in combination with mandatory fields to uniquely identifying the association group.

Association information: As described in [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)], the ASSOCIATION object could include other optional TLVs based on the association types, that provides 'information' related to the association.



LSR: Label Switch Router.

LSR: Label Switch Router.

MPLS: Multiprotocol Label Switching.

PAG: Policy Association Group.

PCC: Path Computation Client. Any client application requesting a path computation to be performed by a Path Computation Element.

PCE: Path Computation Element. An entity (component, application, or network node) that is capable of computing a network path or route based on a network graph and applying computational constraints.


PCEP: Path Computation Element Communication Protocol.

### **3. Motivation**

Paths computed using PCE can be subjected to various policies on both PCE and PCC. For example, in a centralized traffic engineering scenario, network operators may instantiate LSPs and specifies policies for traffic steering, path monitoring, etc., for some LSPs via the stateful PCE. Similarly, a PCC could request a user- or service-specific policy to be applied at the PCE, such as constraints relaxation to meet optimal QoS and resiliency.

PCEP speaker can use the generic mechanism as per [\[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group\]](#) to associate a set of LSPs with a policy, without the need to know the details of such a policy, which simplifies network operations, avoids frequent software upgrades, as well provides an ability to introduce new policy faster.





Case 1: Policy requested by PCE and enforced by PCC

Case 2: Policy requested by PCC and enforced by PCE

Figure 1: Sample use-cases for carrying policies over PCEP session

3.1. Policy based Constraints

In the context of policy-enabled path computation [RFC5394], path computation policies may be applied at both a PCC and a PCE. Consider an Label Switch Router (LSR) with a policy enabled PCC, it receives a service request via signaling, including over a Network-Network Interface (NNI) or User Network Interface (UNI) reference point, or receives a configuration request over a management interface to establish a service. The PCC may also apply user- or service-specific policies to decide how the path selection process should be constrained, that is, which constraints, diversities, optimization criterion, and constraint relaxation strategies should be applied in order for the service LSP(s) to have a likelihood to be successfully established and provide necessary QoS and resilience against network failures. The user- or service-specific policies





applied to PCC and are then passed to the PCE along with the Path computation request, in the form of constraints [[RFC5394](#)].

PCEP speaker can use the generic mechanism as per [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)] to associate a set of LSPs with policy and its resulting path computation constraints. This would simplify the path computation message exchanges in PCEP.

#### 4. Overview

As per [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)], LSPs are associated with other LSPs with which they interact by adding them to a common association group. Grouping can also be used to define association between LSPs and policies associated to them. One new Association Type is defined in this document, based on the generic Association object -

- o Association type = TBD1 ("Policy Association Type") for Policy Association Group (PAG).

[[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)] specify the mechanism for the capability advertisement of the association types supported by a PCEP speaker by defining a ASSOC-Type-List TLV to be carried within an OPEN object. This capability exchange for the association type described in this document (i.e. Policy Association Type) MUST be done before using the policy association. Thus the PCEP speaker MUST include the Policy Association Type (TBD1) in the ASSOC-Type-List TLV before using the PAG in the PCEP messages.

This Association-Type is operator-configured association in nature and created by the operator manually on the PCEP peers. The LSP belonging to this associations is conveyed via PCEP messages to the PCEP peer. Operator-configured Association Range SHOULD NOT be set for this association-type, and MUST be ignored, so that the full range of association identifier can be utilized.

A PAG can have one or more LSPs and its associated policy. The association parameters including association identifier, type (Policy), as well as the association source IP address is manually configured by the operator and is used to identify the PAG as described in [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)]. The Global Association Source and Extended Association ID MAY also be included.

As per the processing rules specified in section 5.4 of [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)], if a PCEP speaker does not support this Policy association-type, it would return a PCERR message with Error-Type 26 (Early allocation by IANA) "Association Error" and Error-Value 1 "Association-type is not supported". Since the PAG is



opaque in nature, the PAG and the policy MUST be configured on the PCEP peers as per the operator-configured association procedures. All processing is as per section 5.4 of [\[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group\]](#). If a PCE speaker receives PAG in a PCEP message, and the policy association information is not configured, it MUST return a PCErr message with Error-Type TBD "Association Error" and Error- Value 4 "Association unknown". If some of the association information [\[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group\]](#) (the TLVs defined in this document) received from the peer does not match the local configured values, the PCEP speaker MUST reject the PCEP message and send a PCErr message with Error-Type 26 (Early allocation by IANA) "Association Error" and Error-Value 5 "Operator-configured association information mismatch".

## 5. Policy Association Group

Association groups and their memberships are defined using the ASSOCIATION object defined in [\[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group\]](#). Two object types for IPv4 and IPv6 are defined. The ASSOCIATION object includes "Association type" indicating the type of the association group. This document add a new Association type -

Association type = TBD1 ("Policy Association Type") for PAG.

PAG may carry optional TLVs including but not limited to -

- o POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV: Used to communicate opaque information useful to apply the policy, described in [Section 5.1](#).
- o VENDOR-INFORMATION-TLV: Used to communicate arbitrary vendor specific behavioral information, described in [\[RFC7470\]](#).

### 5.1. Policy Parameters TLV

The POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV is an optional TLV that can be carried in ASSOCIATION object (with "Policy Association Type") to carry opaque information needed to apply the policy at the PCEP peer. In some cases to apply a PCE policy successfully, it is required to also associate some policy parameters that needs to be evaluated, to successfully apply the said policy. This TLV is used to carry those policy parameters. The TLV could include one or more policy related parameter. The encoding format and the order MUST be known to the PCEP peers, this could be done during configuration of policy (and its association parameters) for the PAG. The TLV format is as per the format of the PCEP TLVs, as defined in [\[RFC5440\]](#), and shown in Figure 2. Only one POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV can be carried and only the first occurrence is processed and any others MUST be ignored.






Figure 2: The POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV format

The type of the POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV is TBD2 and it has a variable length. The Value field is variable field padded to a 4-bytes alignment; padding is not included in the Length field. The PCEP peer implementation need to be aware of the encoding format, order, and meaning of the 'Policy Parameters' well in advance based on the policy. Note that from the protocol point of view this data is opaque and can be used to carry parameters in any format understood by the PCEP peers and associated to the policy. The exact use of this TLV is beyond the scope of this document.

If the PCEP peer is unaware of the policy parameters associated with the policy and it receives the POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV, it MUST ignore the TLV and SHOULD log this event. Further, if one or more parameters received in the POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV received by the PCEP speaker are considered as unacceptable in the context of the associated policy (e.g. out of range value, badly encoded value...), the PCEP speaker MUST NOT apply the received policy and SHOULD log this event.

Note that, the vendor specific behavioral information is encoded in VENDOR-INFORMATION-TLV which can be used along with this TLV.

**6. Security Considerations**

This document defines one new type for association, which do not add any new security concerns beyond those discussed in [RFC5440], [RFC8231] and [I-D.ietf-pce-association-group] in itself.

Some deployments may find policy associations and their implications as extra sensitive and thus should employ suitable PCEP security mechanisms like [RFC8253]. Also extra care needs to be taken by the implementation with respect to POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV while decoding, verifying and applying these policy variables.



## **7. IANA Considerations**

### **7.1. Association object Type Indicators**

This document defines the following new association type originally defined in [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)].

Value	Name	Reference
TBD1	Policy Association Type	[This I.D.]

### **7.2. PCEP TLV Type Indicators**

The following TLV Type Indicator values are requested within the "PCEP TLV Type Indicators" subregistry of the "Path Computation Element Protocol (PCEP) Numbers" registry:

Value	Description	Reference
TBD2	POLICY-PARAMETERS-TLV	[This I.D.]

## **8. Manageability Considerations**

### **8.1. Control of Function and Policy**

An operator **MUST** be allowed to configure the policy associations at PCEP peers and associate it with the LSPs. They **MAY** also allow configuration to related policy parameters, in which case the an operator **MUST** also be allowed to set the encoding format and order to parse the associated policy parameters TLV.

### **8.2. Information and Data Models**

An implementation **SHOULD** allow the operator to view the PAG configured. Further implementation **SHOULD** allow to view the current set of LSPs in the PAG. To serve this purpose, the PCEP YANG module [[I-D.ietf-pce-pcep-yang](#)] includes association groups and can be used for PAG.

### **8.3. Liveness Detection and Monitoring**

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new liveness detection and monitoring requirements in addition to those already listed in [[RFC5440](#)].





#### **8.4. Verify Correct Operations**

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new operation verification requirements in addition to those already listed in [[RFC5440](#)].

#### **8.5. Requirements On Other Protocols**

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new requirements on other protocols.

#### **8.6. Impact On Network Operations**

Mechanisms defined in this document do not have any impact on network operations in addition to those already listed in [[RFC5440](#)].

### **9. Acknowledgments**

A special thanks to author of [[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group](#)], this document borrow some of the text from it.

### **10. References**

#### **10.1. Normative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP., Ed. and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5440, March 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5440>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC8231] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Medved, J., and R. Varga, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for Stateful PCE", [RFC 8231](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8231, September 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8231>>.



[I-D.ietf-pce-association-group]

Minei, I., Crabbe, E., Sivabalan, S., Ananthakrishnan, H., Dhody, D., and Y. Tanaka, "PCEP Extensions for Establishing Relationships Between Sets of LSPs", [draft-ietf-pce-association-group-07](#) (work in progress), December 2018.

## **10.2. Informative References**

- [RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", [RFC 4655](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4655, August 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4655>>.
- [RFC5394] Bryskin, I., Papadimitriou, D., Berger, L., and J. Ash, "Policy-Enabled Path Computation Framework", [RFC 5394](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5394, December 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5394>>.
- [RFC7470] Zhang, F. and A. Farrel, "Conveying Vendor-Specific Constraints in the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol", [RFC 7470](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7470, March 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7470>>.
- [RFC8253] Lopez, D., Gonzalez de Dios, O., Wu, Q., and D. Dhody, "PCEPS: Usage of TLS to Provide a Secure Transport for the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 8253](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8253, October 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8253>>.
- [RFC8281] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Sivabalan, S., and R. Varga, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for PCE-Initiated LSP Setup in a Stateful PCE Model", [RFC 8281](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8281, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8281>>.
- [I-D.ietf-pce-segment-routing]  
Sivabalan, S., Filsfils, C., Tantsura, J., Henderickx, W., and J. Hardwick, "PCEP Extensions for Segment Routing", [draft-ietf-pce-segment-routing-14](#) (work in progress), October 2018.
- [I-D.ietf-pce-pcep-yang]  
Dhody, D., Hardwick, J., Beeram, V., and J. Tantsura, "A YANG Data Model for Path Computation Element Communications Protocol (PCEP)", [draft-ietf-pce-pcep-yang-09](#) (work in progress), October 2018.



**Appendix A. Contributor Addresses**

Dhruv Dhody  
Huawei Technologies  
Divyashree Techno Park, Whitefield  
Bangalore, Karnataka 560066  
India

EMail: dhruv.ietf@gmail.com

Qin Wu  
Huawei Technologies  
101 Software Avenue, Yuhua District  
Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012  
China

EMail: sunseawq@huawei.com

Clarence Filsfils  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Pegasus Parc  
De kleetlaan 6a, DIEGEM BRABANT 1831  
BELGIUM

Email: cfilsfil@cisco.com

Xian Zhang  
Huawei Technologies  
Bantian, Longgang District  
Shenzhen 518129  
P.R.China

EMail: zhang.xian@huawei.com

Udayasree Palle  
Huawei Technologies  
Divyashree Techno Park, Whitefield  
Bangalore, Karnataka 560066  
India

EMail: udayasreereddy@gmail.com

Authors' Addresses



Stephane Litkowski  
Orange

E-Mail: [stephane.litkowski@orange.com](mailto:stephane.litkowski@orange.com)

Siva Sivabalan  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
2000 Innovation Drive  
Kanata, Ontario K2K 3E8  
Canada

E-Mail: [msiva@cisco.com](mailto:msiva@cisco.com)

Jeff Tantsura  
Apstra, Inc.

E-Mail: [jefftant.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:jefftant.ietf@gmail.com)

Jonathan Hardwick  
Metaswitch Networks  
100 Church Street  
Enfield, Middlesex  
UK

E-Mail: [Jonathan.Hardwick@metaswitch.com](mailto:Jonathan.Hardwick@metaswitch.com)

Mahendra Singh Negi  
Huawei Technologies  
Divyashree Techno Park, Whitefield  
Bangalore, Karnataka 560066  
India

E-Mail: [mahendrasingh@huawei.com](mailto:mahendrasingh@huawei.com)



