

PCE Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Intended status: Standard Track  
Expires: September 8, 2023

Y. Lee  
Samsung  
H. Zheng (Editor)  
Huawei Technologies  
R. Casellas  
R. Vilalta  
CTTC  
D. Ceccarelli  
Cisco  
F. Lazzeri  
Ericsson

March 7, 2023

## **PCEP Extension for Flexible Grid Networks**

[draft-ietf-pce-flexible-grid-09](#)

### Abstract

This document provides the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) extensions for the support of Routing and Spectrum Assignment (RSA) in Flexible Grid networks.

### Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

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 September 8, 2023.



## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2023 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 Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Terminology</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Requirements Language</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Spectrum Assignment (SA) Object</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Frequency-Slot Selection TLV</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Frequency-slot Restriction Constraint TLV</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Frequency-Slot Restriction Field</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Encoding of a RSA Path Reply</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	<a href="#">Error Indicator</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	<a href="#">NO-PATH Indicator</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Manageability Considerations</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	<a href="#">Control of Function and Policy</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	<a href="#">Information and Data Models</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">6.3.</a>	<a href="#">Verifying Correct Operation</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
6.4.	<a href="#">Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">6.5.</a>	<a href="#">Impact on Network Operation</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Implementation Status</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	<a href="#">New PCEP Object</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	<a href="#">New PCEP TLV: Frequency Slot Selection TLV</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
9.3.	<a href="#">New PCEP TLV: Frequency Slot Restriction Constraint TLV</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">9.4.</a>	<a href="#">New PCEP TLV: Spectrum Allocation TLV</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">9.5.</a>	<a href="#">New No-Path Reasons</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">9.6.</a>	<a href="#">New Error-Types and Error-Values</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">9.7.</a>	<a href="#">New Error-Values for Existing Error Type (24)</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	<a href="#">References</a>	<a href="#">16</a>



<a href="#">10.1. Normative References</a> .....	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">10.2. Informative References</a> .....	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">11. Contributors</a> .....	<a href="#">18</a>
Authors' Addresses .....	<a href="#">19</a>

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

This document uses the terminology defined in [[RFC4655](#)], [[RFC5440](#)] and [[RFC7698](#)].

## **[2. 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.

## **[3. Introduction](#)**

[[RFC4655](#)] defines a Path Computation Element (PCE) based path computation architecture and explains how a Path Computation Element (PCE) may compute Label Switched Paths (LSP) in Multiprotocol Label Switching Traffic Engineering (MPLS-TE) and Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) networks at the request of Path Computation Clients (PCCs). A PCC is said to be any network component that makes such a request and may be, for instance, an Optical Switching Element within a Wavelength Division Multiplexing (WDM) network. The PCE, itself, can be located anywhere within the network, and may be within an optical switching element, a Network Management System (NMS) or Operational Support System (OSS), or may be an independent network server.

The PCE communications Protocol (PCEP) is the communication protocol used between a PCC and a PCE, and can also be used between cooperating PCEs. [[RFC4657](#)] sets out the common protocol requirements for PCEP. Additional application-specific requirements for PCEP are deferred to separate documents.

[[RFC8780](#)] provides the PCEP extensions for the support of Routing and Wavelength Assignment (RWA) in Wavelength Switched Optical Networks (WSO) based on the requirements specified in [[RFC6163](#)] and [[RFC7449](#)].



To allow efficient allocation of optical spectral bandwidth for systems that have high bit-rates, the International Telecommunication Union Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T) has extended its Recommendations [G.694.1] and [G.872] to include a new Dense Wavelength Division Multiplexing (DWDM) grid by defining a set of nominal central frequencies, channel spacings, and the concept of the "frequency slot". In such an environment, a data-plane connection is switched based on allocated, variable-sized frequency ranges within the optical spectrum, creating what is known as a flexible grid (flexi-grid). [RFC7698] provides Framework and Requirements for GMPLS-Based Control of Flexi-Grid Dense Wavelength Division Multiplexing (DWDM) Networks.

The terms "Routing and Spectrum Assignment" (RSA) is introduced in [RFC7698] to refer to the process determines a route and frequency slot for an LSP. Hence, when a route is computed, the spectrum assignment process determines the central frequency and slot width. The term "Spectrum Switched Optical Networks" is also introduced in [RFC7698] to refer to a flexi-grid enabled DWDM network, which can be controlled by a GMPLS or PCE control plane.

This document provides PCEP extensions to support RSA in Flexi-grid networks.

Figure 2 shows one typical PCE based implementation, which is referred to as the Combined Routing and Spectrum Assignment (R&SA) [RFC7698]. With this architecture, the two processes of routing and spectrum assignment are accessed via a single PCE. This architecture is the base architecture from which the PCEP extensions are specified in this document.




Figure 1 Combined Process (R&SA) architecture





#### 4. Spectrum Assignment (SA) Object

This document aligns with GMPLS extensions for PCEP [[RFC8779](#)] for generic property such as label, label-set and label assignment noting that frequency is a type of label. Frequency restrictions and constraints are also formulated in terms of labels per [[RFC7579](#)].

Spectrum allocation can be performed by the PCE by different means:

- (a) By means of Explicit Label Control (ELC) where the PCE allocates which label to use for each interface/node along the path.
- (b) By means of a Label Set where the PCE provides a range of potential frequency slots to allocate by each node along the path.

Option (b) allows distributed spectrum allocation (performed during signaling) to complete spectrum assignment.

Additionally, given a range of potential spectrums to allocate, a PC Request SHOULD convey the heuristic / mechanism to the allocation.

The format Routing Backus-Naur Form (RBNF) [[RFC5511](#)] of a PCReq message per [[RFC5440](#)] after incorporating the Spectrum Assignment (SA) object is as follows:

```
<PCReq Message> ::= <Common Header>
                        [<svec-list>]
                        <request-list>
```

Where:

```
<request-list> ::= <request> [<request-list>]
<request> ::= <RP>
                <GENERALIZED ENDPOINTS>
                [ <SA> ]
                [other optional objects...]
```

If the SA object is present in the request, it MUST be encoded after the GENERALIZED ENDPOINTS object.

SA Object-Class is (TBD1) (To be assigned by IANA).

SA Object-Type is 1.

The format of the Spectrum Assignment (SA) object body is as follows:




Figure 2 SA Object

- o Reserved (16 bits)
- o Flags (16 bits)


One Flag bit is allocated as follows:

M (Mode - 1 bit): M bit is used to indicate the mode of spectrum assignment. When M bit is set to 1, this indicates that the spectrum assigned by the PCE must be explicit. That is, the selected way to convey the allocated spectrum is by means of Explicit Label Control (ELC) [RFC4003] for each hop of a computed LSP. Otherwise, the spectrum assigned by the PCE needs not be explicit (i.e., it can be suggested in the form of label set objects in the corresponding response, to allow distributed SA. In such case, the PCE MUST return a Label Set Field as described in [Section 2.6 of \[RFC7579\]](#) in the response. See [Section 5](#) of this document for the encoding discussion of a Label Set Field in a PCRep message.

#### 4.1. Frequency-Slot Selection TLV

The Frequency-Slot Selection TLV is used to indicate the frequency-slot selection constraint in regard to the order of frequency-slot assignment to be returned by the PCE. This TLV is only applied when M bit is set in the SA Object specified in [Section 4](#). This TLV SHOULD NOT be present and MUST be ignored when the M bit is cleared.

The Frequency-Slot Selection sub-TLV value field is defined as:



Where:

Frequency-Slot Assignment (FSA) Method (7 bits):

0: unspecified (any); This does not constrain the SA method used by a PCC. This value is implied when the Frequency-Slot Selection sub-TLV is absent.

1: First-Fit. All the feasible frequency slots are numbered3 (based on "n" parameter), and this SA method chooses the available frequency-slot with the lowest index, where "n" is the parameter in  $f = 193.1 \text{ THz} + n \times 0.00625 \text{ THz}$  where 193.1 THz is the ITU-T "anchor frequency" and "n" is a positive integer including 0 [[RFC7698](#)].

2: Random. This SA method chooses a feasible frequency-slot value of "n" randomly.

3-127: Unassigned.

S (Symmetry, 1 bit): This flag is only meaningful when the request is for a bidirectional LSP (see [\[RFC5440\]](#)).

0 denotes requiring the same frequency-slot in both directions;  
1 denotes that different spectrums on both directions are  
allowed.

IANA is to allocate a new PCEP TLV type, Frequency-Slot Selection TLV (TBD2) in the "PCEP TLV Type Indicators" subregistry (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/pcep/pcep.xhtml#pcep-tlv-type-indicators>).

The processing rules for this TLV are as follows:

If a PCE does not support the attribute(s), its behavior is specified below:

- S bit clear not supported: a PathErr MUST be generated with The Error Code "Routing Problem" (24) with error sub-code "Unsupported Frequency slot Selection Symmetry value" (TBD3).
- FSA method not supported: a PathErr MUST be generated with the Error Code "Routing Problem" (24) with error sub-code "Unsupported Frequency Slot Assignment value" (TBD4).

#### **4.2. Frequency-slot Restriction Constraint TLV**

For any request that contains a Frequency-slot assignment, the requester (PCC) must be able to specify a restriction on the frequency-slots to be used. This restriction is to be interpreted by the PCE as a constraint on the tuning ability of the origination laser transmitter or on any other maintenance related constraints.

The format of the Frequency-Slot Restriction Constraint TLV is as follows:

<Frequency-slot Restriction Constraint> ::=

(<Action>

<Link Identifiers> <Freq-slot Restriction>)...

Where

<Link Identifiers> ::= <Link Identifier> [<Link Identifiers>]

See [Section 4.3.1 in \[RFC8780\]](#) for the encoding of the Link Identifiers Field.

IANA is to allocate a new PCEP TLV, the Frequency slot Restriction Constraint TLV type (TBD5). This TLV MAY appear more than once to be able to specify multiple restrictions.

The TLV data is defined as follows:




Figure 3 spectrum Restriction Constraint TLV Encoding

- ```
0 Action: 8 bits
```

0 - Inclusive List indicates that one or more link identifiers are included in the Link Set. Each identifies a separate link that is part of the set.

1 - Inclusive Range indicates that the Link Set defines a range of links. It contains two link identifiers. The first identifier indicates the start of the range (inclusive). The second identifier indicates the end of the range (inclusive). All links with numeric values between the bounds are considered to be part of the set. A value of zero in either position indicates that there is no bound on the corresponding portion of the range. Note that the Action field can be set to 0 when unnumbered link identifier is used.

- o Count: The number of the link identifiers (8 bits)

Note that a PCC MAY add a frequency slot restriction that applies to all links by setting the Count field to zero and specifying just a set of frequency slots.

Note that all link identifiers in the same list must be of the same type.

- o Reserved: Reserved for future use (16 bits)
- o Link Identifiers: Identifies each link ID for which restriction is applied. The length is dependent on the link format and the Count field. See [Section 4.3.1 in \[RFC8780\]](#) for Link Identifier encoding.

#### 4.2.1. Frequency-Slot Restriction Field

The Frequency-Slot Restriction Field of the Frequency slot restriction TLV is encoded as defined in [section 4.2 of \[RFC8363\]](#).

### 5. Encoding of a RSA Path Reply

This section provides the encoding of a RSA Path Reply, in the PCRep/PCUpd message, for frequency slot allocation as discussed in [Section 4](#). Spectrum Allocation TLV IANA is to allocate a new PCEP TLV type, the Spectrum Allocation TLV type (TBD6). The TLV data is defined as follows:




Figure 4 Spectrum Allocation TLV Encoding

- o Type (16 bits): The type of the TLV.
- o Length (15 bits): The length of the TLV including the Type and Length fields.
- o M (Mode): 1 bit

- 0 indicates the allocation is under Explicit Label Control.
- 1 indicates the allocation is expressed in Label Sets.

Note that all link identifiers in the same list must be of the same type.

o Link Identifier (variable): Identifies the interface to which assignment spectrum(s) is applied. See [Section 3.3](#) for Link Identifier encoding.

o Allocated Spectrum(s) (variable): Indicates the allocated spectrum(s) to the link identifier. See [Section 3.3.1](#) for encoding details.

This TLV is encoded as an attributes TLV, per [\[RFC5420\]](#), which is carried in the ERO LSP Attribute Subobjects per [\[RFC7570\]](#).

### [5.1. Error Indicator](#)

To indicate errors associated with the RSA request, a new Error Type (TDB) and subsequent error-values are defined as follows for inclusion in the PCEP-ERROR Object:

A new Error-Type (TBD7) and subsequent error-values are defined as follows:

Error-Type=TBD7; Error-value=1: if a PCE receives a RSA request and the PCE is not capable of processing the request due to insufficient memory, the PCE MUST send a PCErr message with a PCEP-ERROR Object (Error-Type=TDB) and an Error-value(Error-value=1). The PCE stops processing the request. The corresponding RSA request MUST be cancelled at the PCC.

Error-Type=TBD7; Error-value=2: if a PCE receives a RSA request and the PCE is not capable of RSA computation, the PCE MUST send a PCErr message with a PCEP-ERROR Object (Error-Type=TDB) and an Error-value (Error-value=2). The PCE stops processing the request. The corresponding RSA computation MUST be cancelled at the PCC.

### [5.2. NO-PATH Indicator](#)

To communicate the reason(s) for not being able to find RSA for the path request, the NO-PATH object can be used in the corresponding response. The format of the NO-PATH object body is defined in

[RFC5440]. The object may contain a NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV to provide additional information about why a path computation has failed.

One new bit flag is defined to be carried in the Flags field in the NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV carried in the NO-PATH Object.

Bit TBD8: When set, the PCE indicates no feasible route was found that meets all the constraints (e.g., spectrum restriction, etc.) associated with RSA.

## 6. Manageability Considerations

Manageability of flexi-grid Routing and Spectrum Assignment (RSA) with PCE must address the following considerations:

### 6.1. Control of Function and Policy

In addition to the parameters already listed in [Section 8.1 of \[RFC5440\]](#), a PCEP implementation SHOULD allow configuring the following PCEP session parameters on a PCC:

The ability to send a Flexi-Grid RSA request.

In addition to the parameters already listed in [Section 8.1 of \[RFC5440\]](#), a PCEP implementation SHOULD allow configuring the following PCEP session parameters on a PCE:

The support for Flexi-Grid RSA.

A set of Flexi-Grid RSA specific policies (authorized sender, request rate limiter, etc).

These parameters may be configured as default parameters for any PCEP session the PCEP speaker participates in, or may apply to a specific session with a given PCEP peer or a specific group of sessions with a specific group of PCEP peers.

### 6.2. Information and Data Models

Extensions to the PCEP YANG module may include to cover the Flexi-Grid RSA information introduced in this document. 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 [section 8.3 of \[RFC5440\]](#).





### **6.3. Verifying Correct Operation**

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new verification requirements in addition to those already listed in [section 8.4 of \[RFC5440\]](#).

### **6.4. Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components**

The PCE Discovery mechanisms ([\[RFC5089\]](#) and [\[RFC5088\]](#)) may be used to advertise Flexi-Grid RSA path computation capabilities to PCCs. This draft has requirements on other protocols (ERO objects, etc. which are under TEAS or CCAMP.)

### **6.5. Impact on Network Operation**

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new network operation requirements in addition to those already listed in [section 8.6 of \[RFC5440\]](#).

## **7. Implementation Status**

[NOTE TO RFC EDITOR: This whole section and the reference to [\[RFC7942\]](#) is to be removed before publication as an RFC]

This section records the status of known implementations of the protocol defined by this specification at the time of posting of this Internet-Draft, and is based on a proposal described in [\[RFC7942\]](#).

The description of implementations in this section is intended to assist the IETF in its decision processes in progressing drafts to RFCs. Please note that the listing of any individual implementation here does not imply endorsement by the IETF. Furthermore, no effort has been spent to verify the information presented here that was supplied by IETF contributors. This is not intended as, and must not be construed to be, a catalog of available implementations or their features. Readers are advised to note that other implementations may exist.

According to [\[RFC7942\]](#), "this will allow reviewers and working groups to assign due consideration to documents that have the benefit of running code, which may serve as evidence of valuable experimentation and feedback that have made the implemented protocols more mature. It is up to the individual working groups to use this information as they see fit".



At the time of posting the -05 version of this document, there are no known implementations of this mechanism. It is believed that two vendors are considering prototype implementations, but these plans are too vague to make any further assertions.

## 8. Security Considerations

This document has no requirement for a change to the security models within PCEP. However, the additional information distributed in order to address the RSA problem represents a disclosure of network capabilities that an operator may wish to keep private. Consideration should be given to securing this information.

## 9. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to make allocations from the sub-registries as described in the following sections.

### 9.1. New PCEP Object

As described in [Section 4.1](#), a new PCEP Object is defined to carry frequency-slot assignment related constraints. IANA is to allocate the following from "PCEP Objects" sub-registry (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/pcep/pcep.xhtml#pcep-objects>):

| Object Class Value | Name | Object Type            | Reference  |
|--------------------|------|------------------------|------------|
| -----              |      |                        |            |
| TBD1               | SA   | 1: Spectrum Assignment | [This.I-D] |

### 9.2. New PCEP TLV: Frequency Slot Selection TLV

As described in [Sections 4.2](#), a new PCEP TLV is defined to indicate spectrum selection constraints. IANA is to allocate this new TLV from the "PCEP TLV Type Indicators" subregistry (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/pcep/pcep.xhtml#pcep-tlv-type-indicators>).

| Value | Description        | Reference  |
|-------|--------------------|------------|
| ----- |                    |            |
| TBD2  | Spectrum Selection | [This.I-D] |

### 9.3. New PCEP TLV: Frequency Slot Restriction Constraint TLV

As described in [Section 4.3](#), a new PCEP TLV is defined to indicate wavelength restriction constraints. IANA is to allocate this new TLV from the "PCEP TLV Type Indicators" subregistry (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/pcep/pcep.xhtml#pcep-tlv-type-indicators>).

| Value | Description                           | Reference  |
|-------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| ----- |                                       |            |
| TBD5  | Frequency Slot Restriction Constraint | [This.I-D] |

### 9.4. New PCEP TLV: Spectrum Allocation TLV

As described in [Section 5](#), a new PCEP TLV is defined to indicate the allocation of freq-slots(s) by the PCE in response to a request by the PCC. IANA is to allocate this new TLV from the "PCEP TLV Type Indicators" subregistry (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/pcep/pcep.xhtml#pcep-tlv-type-indicators>).

| Value | Description         | Reference  |
|-------|---------------------|------------|
| ----- |                     |            |
| TBD6  | Spectrum Allocation | [This.I-D] |

### 9.5. New No-Path Reasons

As described in [Section 4.3](#), a new bit flag are defined to be carried in the Flags field in the NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV carried in the NO-PATH Object. This flag, when set, indicates that no feasible route was found that meets all the RSA constraints (e.g., spectrum restriction, signal compatibility, etc.) associated with a RSA path computation request.

IANA is to allocate this new bit flag from the "PCEP NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV Flag Field" subregistry (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/pcep/pcep.xhtml#no-path-vector-tlv>).

| Bit   | Description | Reference |
|-------|-------------|-----------|
| ----- |             |           |

TBD8 No RSA constraints met [This.I-D]

### 9.6. New Error-Types and Error-Values

As described in [Section 5.1](#), new PCEP error codes are defined for WSON RWA errors. IANA is to allocate from the "PCEP-ERROR Object Error Types and Values" sub-registry (<http://www.iana.org/assignments/pcep/pcep.xhtml#pcep-error-object>).

| Error-Type | Meaning              | Error-Value                      | Reference  |
|------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------|
| -----      |                      |                                  |            |
| TBD7       | Flexi-Grid RSA Error | 1: Insufficient Memory           | [This.I-D] |
|            |                      | 2: RSA computation Not supported | [This.I-D] |

### 9.7. New Error-Values for Existing Error Type (24)

As discussed in [Section 4.1](#), two new PathErr values for the Existing Error Type (24) are to be allocated:

| Meaning                                             | Error-Value | Reference  |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| -----                                               |             |            |
| Unsupported Frequency slot Selection Symmetry value | TBD3        | [This.I-D] |
| Unsupported Frequency Slot Assignment value         | TBD4        | [This.I-D] |

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC4003] Berger, L., "GMPLS Signaling Procedure for Egress Control", [RFC 4003](#), February 2005.

- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP., Ed. and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation Element (PCE) communication Protocol", [RFC 5440](#), March 2009.
- [RFC5511] A. Farrel, "Routing Backus-Naur Form (RBNF): A Syntax Used to Form Encoding Rules in Various Routing Protocol Specifications", [RFC 5511](#), April 2009.
- [RFC5088] Le Roux, JL, JP. Vasseur, Y. Ikejiri, and R. Zhang, "OSPF Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", [RFC 5088](#), January 2008.
- [RFC5089] Le Roux, JL, JP. Vasseur, Y. Ikejiri, and R. Zhang, "IS-IS Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", [RFC 5089](#), January 2008.
- [RFC8174] B. Leiba, "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [RFC 8174](#), May 2017.

## **10.2. Informative References**

- [RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", [RFC 4655](#), August 2006.
- [RFC4657] Ash, J. and J. Le Roux, "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol Generic Requirements", [RFC 4657](#), September 2006.
- [RFC5420] Farrel, A. "Encoding of Attributes for MPLS LSP Establishment Using Resource Reservation Protocol Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 5420](#), February 2009.
- [RFC6163] Lee, Y. and Bernstein, G. (Editors), and W. Imajuku, "Framework for GMPLS and PCE Control of Wavelength Switched Optical Networks", [RFC 6163](#), March 2011.
- [RFC7449] Lee, Y., et. al., "PCEP Requirements for WSON Routing and Wavelength Assignment", [RFC 7449](#), February 2015.
- [RFC7570] Margaria, et al., "Label Switched Path (LSP) Attribute in the Explicit Route Object (ERO)", [RFC 7570](#), July 2015.
- [RFC7579] Bernstein and Lee, "General Network Element Constraint Encoding for GMPLS Controlled Networks", [RFC 7579](#), June 2015.





- [RFC7698] O. Gonzalez de Dios, R. Casellas, editors, "Framework and Requirements for GMPLS-Based Control of Flexi-Grid Dense Wavelength Division Multiplexing (DWDM) Networks", [RFC 7698](#), November 2015.
- [RFC7942] Sheffer, Y. and A. Farrel, "Improving Awareness of Running Code: The Implementation Status Section", [BCP 205](#), [RFC 7942](#), July 2016,
- [RFC8363] X. Zhang, H. Zheng, R. Casellas, O. Gonzalez de Dios, D. Ceccarelli, "GMPLS OSPF-TE Extensions in Support of Flexi-Grid Dense Wavelength Division Multiplexing (DWDM) Networks", [RFC8363](#), May 2018.
- [RFC8779] Margaria, et al., "PCEP extensions for GMPLS", [RFC 8779](#), July 2020.
- [RFC8780] Y. Lee (Ed.), and R. Casellas (Ed.), "PCEP Extension for WSON Routing and Wavelength Assignment", [RFC8780](#), July 2020.
- [G.694.1] "Spectral grids for WDM applications: DWDM frequency grid", ITU-T G.694.1, February 2012.
- [G.872] "Architecture of optical transport networks", ITU-T G.872, January 2017.

## [11](#). Contributors

Authors' Addresses

Young Lee  
Samsung  
Email: [younglee.tx@gmail.com](mailto:younglee.tx@gmail.com)

Haomian Zheng  
Huawei Technologies  
Email: [zhenghaomian@huawei.com](mailto:zhenghaomian@huawei.com)

Ramon Casellas  
CTTC  
Av. Carl Friedrich Gauss n7  
Castelldefels, Barcelona 08860  
Spain  
Email: [ramon.casellas@cttc.es](mailto:ramon.casellas@cttc.es)

Ricard Vilalta  
CTTC  
Email: [ricard.vilalta@cttc.es](mailto:ricard.vilalta@cttc.es)

Daniele Ceccarelli  
Cisco  
Email: [daniele.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:daniele.ietf@gmail.com)

Francesco Lazzeri  
Ericsson  
Via Melen 77  
Genova - Italy  
Email: [francesco.lazzeri@ericsson.com](mailto:francesco.lazzeri@ericsson.com)