

PCE Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track

Xian Zhang  
Young Lee (Editor)  
Fatai Zhang  
Huawei  
Ramon Casellas  
CTTC  
Oscar Gonzalez de Dios  
Telefonica I+D  
Zafar Ali  
Cisco Systems

Expires: June 5, 2019

December 5, 2018

**Path Computation Element (PCE) Protocol Extensions for Stateful PCE  
Usage in GMPLS-controlled Networks**

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-stateful-pce-gmpls-09](#)

**Abstract**

The Path Computation Element (PCE) facilitates Traffic Engineering (TE) based path calculation in large, multi-domain, multi-region, or multi-layer networks. The PCE communication Protocol (PCEP) has been extended to support stateful PCE functions where the PCE retains information about the paths already present in the network, but those extensions are technology-agnostic. This memo provides extensions required for PCEP so as to enable the usage of a stateful PCE capability in GMPLS-controlled 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 June 5, 2018.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 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.

## 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

Table of Contents.....	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1</a> . Introduction.....	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2</a> . Context of Stateful PCE and PCEP for GMPLS.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3</a> . Main Requirements.....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4</a> . PCEP Extensions.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.1</a> . LSP Update in GMPLS-controlled Networks.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.2</a> . LSP Synchronization in GMPLS-controlled Networks.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.3</a> . Modification of Existing PCEP Messages and Procedures.....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.3.1</a> . Modification for LSP Re-optimization.....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.3.2</a> . Modification for Route Exclusion.....	<a href="#">8</a>



4.3.3. Modification for SRP Object to indicate Bi-directional LSP.....	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">4.4.</a> Object Encoding.....	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">5.</a> IANA Considerations.....	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a> New PCEP Error Codes.....	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a> New Subobject for the Exclude Route Object.....	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a> New "B" Flag in the SRP Object.....	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">6.</a> Manageability Considerations.....	<a href="#">11</a>
6.1. Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components	11
<a href="#">7.</a> Security Considerations.....	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">8.</a> Acknowledgement.....	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">9.</a> References.....	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a> Normative References.....	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a> Informative References.....	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">10.</a> Contributors' Address.....	<a href="#">12</a>
Authors' Addresses.....	<a href="#">14</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

[RFC4655] presents the architecture of a Path Computation Element (PCE)-based model for computing Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) and Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) Traffic Engineering Label Switched Paths (TE LSPs). To perform such a constrained computation, a PCE stores the network topology (i.e., TE links and nodes) and resource information (i.e., TE attributes) in its TE Database (TED). Such a PCE is usually referred as a stateless PCE. To request path computation services to a PCE, [RFC5440] defines the PCE communication Protocol (PCEP) for interaction between a Path Computation Client (PCC) and a PCE, or between two PCEs. PCEP as specified in [RFC 5440] mainly focuses on MPLS networks and the PCEP extensions needed for GMPLS-controlled networks are provided in [PCEP-GMPLS].

Stateful PCEs are shown to be helpful in many application scenarios, in both MPLS and GMPLS networks, as illustrated in [RFC8051]. Further discussion of concept of a stateful PCE can be found in [RFC7399]. In order for these applications to able to exploit the capability of stateful PCEs, extensions to PCEP are required.

[RFC8051] describes how a stateful PCE can be applicable to solve various problems for MPLS-TE and GMPLS networks and the benefits it brings to such deployments.

[RFC8231] provides the fundamental extensions needed for stateful PCE to support general functionality, but leaves out the specification for technology-specific objects/TLVs. This document



focuses on the extensions that are necessary in order for the deployment of stateful PCEs in GMPLS-controlled networks.

## **2. Context of Stateful PCE and PCEP for GMPLS**

This document is built on the basis of Stateful PCE [[RFC8231](#)] and PCEP for GMPLS [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)].

There are two types of LSP operation for Stateful PCE.

For Active Stateful PCE, PCUpd message is sent from PCE to PCC to update the LSP state for the LSP delegated to PCE. Any changes to the delegated LSPs generate a PCRpt message by the PCC to PCE to convey the changes of the LSP. Any modifications to the Objects/TLVs that are identified in this document to support GMPLS technology-specific attributes will be carried in the PCRpt and PCUpd messages.

For Passive Stateful PCE where PCReq/PCRep messages are used to convey path computation instruction. As GMPLS-technology specific Objects/TLVs are defined in [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)], this document just points to the work in [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)] and add only the stateful PCE aspect only if applicable. Passive Stateful PCE makes use of PCRpt messages when reporting LSP State changes sent by PCC to PCEs. Any modifications to the Objects/TLVs that are identified in this document to support GMPLS technology-specific attributes will be carried in the PCRpt message.

[[PCEP-GMPLS](#)] defines GMPLS-technology specific Objects/TLVs and this document makes use of these Objects/TLVs without modifications where applicable. Some of these Objects/TLVs may require modifications to incorporate stateful PCE element where applicable.

## **3. Main Requirements**

This section notes the main functional requirements for PCEP extensions to support stateful PCE for use in GMPLS-controlled networks, based on the description in [[RFC8051](#)]. Many requirements are common across a variety of network types (e.g., MPLS-TE networks and GMPLS networks) and the protocol extensions to meet the requirements are already described in [[RFC8231](#)]. This document does not repeat the description of those protocol extensions. This document presents protocol extensions for a set of requirements which are specific to the use of a stateful PCE in a GMPLS-controlled network.

The basic requirements are as follows:



- o Advertisement of the stateful PCE capability. This generic requirement is covered in [Section 5.4. of \[RFC8231\]](#). This document assumes that STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV can be used for GMPLS Stateful PCE capability and therefore does not provide any further extensions.
- o LSP delegation is already covered in [Section 5.7. of \[RFC8231\]](#). [Section 2.2.](#) of this document does not provide any further extensions.
- o Active LSP update is covered in [Section 6.2 of \[RFC8231\]](#). [Section 4.1.](#) of this document provides extension for its application in GMPLS-controlled networks.
- o LSP state synchronization and LSP state report. This is a generic requirement already covered in [Section 5.6. of \[RFC8231\]](#). However, there are further extensions required specifically for GMPLS-controlled networks and discussed in [Section 4.2](#).

## **4. PCEP Extensions**

### **4.1. LSP Update in GMPLS-controlled Networks**

[RFC8231] defines the Path Computation LSP Update Request (PCUpd) message to enable to update the attributes of an LSP. However, that document does not define technology-specific parameters.

A key element of the PCUpd message is the attribute-list construct defined in [\[RFC5440\]](#) and extended by many other PCEP specifications.

For GMPLS purposes we note that the BANDWIDTH object used in the attribute-list is defined in [\[PCEP-GMPLS\]](#). Furthermore, additional TLVs are defined for the LSPA object in [\[PCEP-GMPLS\]](#) and MAY be included to indicate technology-specific attributes. There are other technology-specific attributes that need to be conveyed in the <intended-attribute-list> of the <path> construct in the PCUpd message. Note that these path details in the PCUpd message are the same as the <attribute-list> of the PCRep message. See [Section 4.2](#) for the details.

### **4.2. LSP Synchronization in GMPLS-controlled Networks**

PCCs need to report the attributes of LSPs to the PCE to enable stateful operation of a GMPLS network. This process is known as LSP state synchronization. The LSP attributes include bandwidth, associated route, and protection information etc., are stored by the PCE in the LSP database (LSP-DB). Note that, as described in [\[RFC8231\]](#), the LSP state synchronization covers both the bulk





reporting of LSPs at initialization as well the reporting of new or modified LSP during normal operation. Incremental LSP-DB synchronization may be desired in a GMPLS-controlled network and it is specified in [[RFC8232](#)].

[RFC8231] describes mechanisms for LSP synchronization using the Path Computation State Report (PCRpt) message, but does not cover reporting of technology-specific attributes. As stated in [[RFC8231](#)], the <path> construct is further composed of a compulsory ERO object and a compulsory attribute-list and an optional RRO object. In order to report LSP states in GMPLS networks, this specification allows the use within a PCRpt message both of technology- and GMPLS-specific attribute objects and TLVs defined in [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)] as follows:

- o IRO/XRO Extensions to support the inclusion/exclusion of labels and label sub-objects for GMPLS. (See [Section 2.6](#) and 2.7 in [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)])
- o END-POINTS (Generalized END-POINTS Object Type. See [Section 2.5](#) in [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)])
- o BANDWIDTH (Generalized BANDWIDTH Object Type. See [Section 2.3](#) in [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)])
- o LSPA (PROTECTION ATTRIBUTE TLV, See [Section 2.8](#) in [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)]).

The END-POINTS object SHOULD be carried within the attribute-list to specify the endpoints pertaining to the reported LSP. The XRO object MAY be carried to specify the network resources that the reported LSP avoids and a PCE SHOULD consider avoid these network resources during the process of re-optimizing after this LSP is delegated to the PCE. To be more specific, the <attribute-list> is updated as follows:

```
<attribute-list> ::= [<END-POINTS>]
                    [<LSPA>]
                    [<BANDWIDTH>]
                    [<metric-list>]
                    [<IRO>]
                    [<XRO>]
```

```
<metric-list> ::= <METRIC>[<metric-list>]
```



If the LSP being reported protects another LSP, the PROTECTION-ATTRIBUTE TLV [[PCEP-GMPLS](#)] MUST be included in the LSPA object to describe its attributes and restrictions. Moreover, if the status of the protecting LSP changes from non-operational to operational, this SHOULD to be synchronized to the stateful PCE using a PCRpt message.

### **[4.3.](#) Modification of Existing PCEP Messages and Procedures**

One of the advantages mentioned in [[RFC8051](#)] is that the stateful nature of a PCE simplifies the information conveyed in PCEP messages, notably between PCC and PCE, since it is possible to refer to PCE managed state for active LSPs. To be more specific, with a stateful PCE, it is possible to refer to an LSP with a unique identifier in the scope of the PCC-PCE session and thus use such identifier to refer to that LSP. Note this MAY also be applicable to packet networks.

#### **[4.3.1.](#) Modification for LSP Re-optimization**

The Request Parameters (RP) object on a Path Computation Request (PCReq) message carries the R bit. When set, this indicates that the PCC is requesting re-optimization of an existing LSP. Upon receiving such a PCReq, a stateful PCE SHOULD perform the re-optimization in the following cases:

- o The existing bandwidth and route information of the LSP to be re-optimized is provided in the PCReq message using the BANDWIDTH object and the ERO.
- o The existing bandwidth and route information is not supplied in the PCReq message, but can be found in the PCE's LSP-DB. In this case, the LSP MUST be identified using an LSP identifier carried in the PCReq message, and that fact requires that the LSP identifier was previously supplied either by the PCC in a PCRpt message or by the PCE in a PCRep message. [[RFC8231](#)] defines how this is achieved using a combination of the per-node LSP identifier (PLSP-ID) and the PCC's address.

If no LSP state information is available to carry out re-optimization, the stateful PCE should report the error "LSP state information unavailable for the LSP re-optimization" (Error Type = TBD1, Error value= TBD2).



#### 4.3.2. Modification for Route Exclusion

[RFC5521] defines a mechanism for a PCC to request or demand that specific nodes, links, or other network resources are excluded from paths computed by a PCE. A PCC may wish to request the computation of a path that avoids all link and nodes traversed by some other LSP.

To this end this document defines a new sub-object for use with route exclusion defined in [RFC5521]. The LSP exclusion sub-object is as follows:

```

      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
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|X|Type (TBD3) |      Length      |  Attributes  |    Flag    |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|
//                Symbolic Path Name                               //
|
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

X bit and Attribute fields are defined in [RFC5521].

X bit: indicates whether the exclusion is mandatory (X=1) and MUST be accommodated, or desired (X=0) and SHOULD be accommodated.

Type: Subobject Type for an LSP exclusion sub-object. Value of TBD3. To be assigned by IANA.

Length: The Length contains the total length of the subobject in bytes, including the Type and Length fields.

Attributes: indicates how the exclusion object is to be interpreted. Currently, Interface (Attributes = 0), Node (Attributes =1) and SRLG (Attributes =2) are defined in [RFC5521] and this document does not define new values.

Flags: This field may be used to further specify the exclusion constraint with regard to the LSP. Currently, no values are defined.

Symbolic Path Name: This is the identifier given to a LSP and is unique in the context of the PCC address as defined in [RFC8231].

Reserved: MUST be transmitted as zero and SHOULD be ignored on receipt.



This sub-object is OPTIONAL in the exclude route object (XRO) and can be present multiple times. When a stateful PCE receives a PCReq message carrying this sub-object, it SHOULD search for the identified LSP in its LSP-DB and then exclude it from the new path computation all resources used by the identified LSP. If the stateful PCE cannot recognize one or more of the received LSP identifiers, it should send an error message PCErr reporting "The LSP state information for route exclusion purpose cannot be found" (Error-type = TBD1, Error-value = TBD4). Optionally, it may provide with the unrecognized identifier information to the requesting PCC using the error reporting techniques described in [\[RFC5440\]](#).

#### 4.3.3. Modification for SRP Object to indicate Bi-directional LSP

The format of the SRP object is defined in [\[RFC8231\]](#) and included here for easy reference with the addition of the new B flag. This SRP object is used in PCUpd and PCInit messages for GMPLS.




Figure 3: The SRP Object Format

A new flag is defined to indicate a bidirectional co-routed LSP setup operation initiated by the PCE:

B (Bidirectional LSP -- 1 bit): If set to 0, it indicates a request to create a uni-directional LSP. If set to 1, it indicates a request to create a bidirectional co-routed LSP.

#### 4.4. Object Encoding

Note that, as is stated in [Section 7 of \[RFC8231\]](#), the P flag and the I flag of the PCEP objects used on PCUpd and PCRpt messages





SHOULD be set to 0 on transmission and SHOULD be ignored on receipt since these flags are exclusively related to path computation requests.

## 5. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate new Types for the TLV/Object defined in this document.

### 5.1. New PCEP Error Codes

IANA is requested to make the following allocation in the "PCEP-ERROR Object Error Types and Values" registry.

Error Type	Meaning	Reference
TBD1	LSP state information missing	[This.I-D]
Error-value TBD2:	LSP state information unavailable for the LSP re-optimization	[This.I-D]
Error-value TBD4:	LSP state information for route exclusion purpose cannot be found	[This.I-D]

### 5.2. New Subobject for the Exclude Route Object

IANA maintains the "PCEP Parameters" registry containing a subregistry called "PCEP Objects". This registry has a subregistry for the XRO (Exclude Route Object) listing the sub-objects that can be carried in the XRO. IANA is requested to assign a further sub-object that can be carried in the XRO as follows:

Value	Description	Reference
-----+-----+-----		
TBD3	LSP identifier sub-object	[This.I-D]

### 5.3. New "B" Flag in the SRP Object

IANA has created a new subregistry, named "SRP Object Flag Field", within the "Path Computation Element Protocol (PCEP) Numbers" registry, to manage the Flag field of the SRP object. New values are to be assigned by Standards Action [[RFC8126](#)]. Each bit is



tracked with the following qualities: bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit), description, and defining RFC.

The following values are defined in this document:

Bit	Description	Reference
---	-----	-----
TDB	Bi-directional co-routed LSP	[This.I-D]

## 6. Manageability Considerations

The description and functionality specifications presented related to stateful PCEs should also comply with the manageability specifications covered in [Section 8 of \[RFC4655\]](#). Furthermore, a further list of manageability issues presented in [\[RFC8231\]](#) should also be considered.

Additional considerations are presented in the next sections.

### 6.1. Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components

When the detailed route information is included for LSP state synchronization (either at the initial stage or during LSP state report process), this requires the ingress node of an LSP carry the RRO object in order to enable the collection of such information.

## 7. Security Considerations

This draft provides additional extensions to PCEP so as to facilitate stateful PCE usage in GMPLS-controlled networks, on top of [\[RFC8231\]](#). The PCEP extensions to support GMPLS-controlled networks should be considered under the same security as for MPLS networks, as noted in [\[RFC7025\]](#). Therefore, the security considerations elaborated in [\[RFC5440\]](#) still apply to this draft. Furthermore, [\[RFC8231\]](#) provides a detailed analysis of the additional security issues incurred due to the new extensions and possible solutions needed to support for the new stateful PCE capabilities and they apply to this document as well.

## 8. Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Adrian Farrel and Cyril Margaria for the useful comments and discussions.



## **9. References**

### **9.1. Normative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to indicate requirements levels", [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J.-P., and Ash, J., "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", [RFC 4655](#), August 2006.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, J.-P., and Le Roux, J.L., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), March 2009.
- [RFC8231] Crabbe, E., Medved, J., Varga, R., Minei, I., "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for Stateful PCE", [RFC 8231](#), September 2017.
- [PCEP-GMPLS] Margaria, C., Gonzalez de Dios, O., Zhang, F., "PCEP extensions for GMPLS", [draft-ietf-pce-gmpls-pcep-extensions](#), work in progress.

### **9.2. Informative References**

- [RFC8051] Zhang, X., Minei, I., et al, "Applicability of Stateful Path Computation Element (PCE) ", [RFC 8051](#), January 2017.
- [RFC8232] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Medved, J., Varga, R., Zhang, X., and D. Dhody, "Optimizations of Label Switched Path State Synchronization Procedures for a Stateful PCE", [RFC 8232](#), September 2017.

## **10. Contributors' Address**

Dhruv Dhody  
Huawei Technology  
India

EMail: [dhruv.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:dhruv.ietf@gmail.com)

Yi Lin  
Huawei Technologies  
F3-5-B R&D Center, Huawei Base  
Bantian, Longgang District  
Shenzhen 518129 P.R.China



Phone: +86-755-28972914

Email: yi.lin@huawei.com



## Authors' Addresses

Xian Zhang  
Huawei Technologies  
F3-5-B R&D Center, Huawei Base  
Bantian, Longgang District  
Shenzhen 518129 P.R.China

Phone: +86-755-28972645  
Email: zhang.xian@huawei.com

Young Lee (Editor)  
Huawei  
5340 Legacy Drive, Suite 170  
Plano, TX 75023  
US

Phone: +1 469 278 5838  
EMail: leeyoung@huawei.com

Fatai Zhang  
Huawei  
F3-5-B R&D Center, Huawei Base  
Bantian, Longgang District  
P.R. China

Phone: +86-755-28972912  
Email: zhangfatai@huawei.com

Ramon Casellas  
CTTC  
Av. Carl Friedrich Gauss n7  
Castelldefels, Barcelona 08860  
Spain

Phone:  
Email: ramon.casellas@cttc.es

Oscar Gonzalez de Dios  
Telefonica Investigacion y Desarrollo  
Emilio Vargas 6  
Madrid, 28045  
Spain

Phone: +34 913374013



Email: [ogondio@tid.es](mailto:ogondio@tid.es)

Zafar Ali

Cisco Systems

Email: [zali@cisco.com](mailto:zali@cisco.com)