PCE Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: April 21, 2016

E. Crabbe
I. Minei
Google, Inc.
J. Medved
Cisco Systems, Inc.
R. Varga
Pantheon Technologies SRO

October 19, 2015

PCEP Extensions for Stateful PCE
draft-ietf-pce-stateful-pce-12

Abstract

The Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) provides mechanisms for Path Computation Elements (PCEs) to perform path computations in response to Path Computation Clients (PCCs) requests.

Although PCEP explicitly makes no assumptions regarding the information available to the PCE, it also makes no provisions for PCE control of timing and sequence of path computations within and across PCEP sessions. This document describes a set of extensions to PCEP to enable stateful control of MPLS-TE and GMPLS LSPs via 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 http://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 April 21, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 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

1. Introduction 3
1.1. Requirements Language 4
2. Terminology 4
3. Motivation and Objectives for Stateful PCE 5
3.1. Motivation 5
3.1.1. Background 5
3.1.2. Why a Stateful PCE? 6
3.1.3. Protocol vs. Configuration 7
3.2. Objectives 8
4. New Functions to Support Stateful PCEs 8
5. Overview of Protocol Extensions 9
5.1. LSP State Ownership 9
5.2. New Messages 9
5.3. Capability Advertisement 10
5.4. State Synchronization 11
5.5. LSP Delegation 14
5.5.1. Delegating an LSP 15
5.5.2. Revoking a Delegation 15
5.5.3. Returning a Delegation 17
5.5.4. Redundant Stateful PCEs 17
5.5.5. Redelegation on PCE Failure 18
5.6. LSP Operations 18
5.6.1. Passive Stateful PCE Path Computation Request/Response 18
5.6.2. Active Stateful PCE LSP Update 20
5.7. LSP Protection 22
5.8. Transport 22
6. PCEP Messages 22
6.1. The PCRpt Message 22
6.2. The PCUpd Message 24
6.3. The PCErr Message 26
6.4. The PCReq Message 26
6.5. The PCRep Message 27
7. Object Formats 28
7.1. OPEN Object 28
7.1.1. Stateful PCE Capability TLV 28

7.2. SRP Object 29
7.3. LSP Object 30
7.3.1. LSP Identifiers TLVs 32
7.3.2. Symbolic Path Name TLV 35
7.3.3. LSP Error Code TLV 36
7.3.4. RSVP Error Spec TLV 36
8. IANA Considerations 37
8.1. PCEP Messages 37
8.2. PCEP Objects 37
8.3. LSP Object 38
8.4. PCEP-Error Object 38
8.5. PCEP TLV Type Indicators 39
8.6. STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV 39
8.7. LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV 40
9. Manageability Considerations 40
9.1. Control Function and Policy 40
9.2. Information and Data Models 41
9.3. Liveness Detection and Monitoring 41
9.4. Verifying Correct Operation 42
9.5. Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components 42
9.6. Impact on Network Operation 42
10. Security Considerations 42
10.1. Vulnerability 42
10.2. LSP State Snooping 43
10.3. Malicious PCE 43
10.4. Malicious PCC 44
11. Acknowledgements 44
12. References 44
12.1. Normative References 44
12.2. Informative References 45
Authors' Addresses 47

1. Introduction

[RFC5440] describes the Path Computation Element Protocol (PCEP). PCEP defines the communication between a Path Computation Client (PCC) and a Path Computation Element (PCE), or between PCEs, enabling computation of Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) for Traffic Engineering Label Switched Path (TE LSP) characteristics. Extensions for support of Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) in PCEP are defined in [I-D.ietf-pce-gmpls-pcep-extensions]

This document specifies a set of extensions to PCEP to enable stateful control of LSPs within and across PCEP sessions in compliance with [RFC4657]. It includes mechanisms to effect LSP state synchronization between PCCs and PCEs, delegation of control over LSPs to PCEs, and PCE control of timing and sequence of path computations within and across PCEP sessions.

1.1. Requirements Language

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].

2. Terminology

This document uses the following terms defined in [RFC5440]: PCC, PCE, PCEP Peer, PCEP Speaker.

This document uses the following terms defined in [RFC4655]: TED.

The following terms are defined in this document:

Stateful PCE: has access to not only the network state, but also to the set of active paths and their reserved resources for its computations. A stateful PCE might also retain information regarding LSPs under construction in order to reduce churn and resource contention. The additional state allows the PCE to compute constrained paths while considering individual LSPs and their interactions. Note that this requires reliable state synchronization mechanisms between the PCE and the network, PCE and PCC, and between cooperating PCEs.

Passive Stateful PCE: uses LSP state information learned from PCCs to optimize path computations. It does not actively update LSP state. A PCC maintains synchronization with the PCE.

Active Stateful PCE: is an extension of Passive Stateful PCE, in which the PCE may issue recommendations to the network. For example, an active stateful PCE may utilize the Delegation mechanism to update LSP parameters in those PCCs that delegated control over their LSPs to the PCE.

Delegation: An operation to grant a PCE temporary rights to modify a subset of LSP parameters on one or more PCC's LSPs. LSPs are delegated from a PCC to a PCE, and are referred to as delegated LSPs. The PCC who owns the PCE state for the LSP has the right to delegate it. An LSP is owned by a single PCC at any given point in time. For intra-domain LSPs, this PCC SHOULD be the LSP head end.

Revocation: An operation performed by a PCC on a previously delegated LSP. Revocation revokes the rights granted to the PCE in the delegation operation.

Redelegation Timeout Interval: when a PCEP session is terminated, a PCC waits for this time period before revoking LSP delegation to a PCE and attempting to redelegate LSPs associated with the terminated PCEP session to an alternate PCE. The Redelegation Timeout Interval is a PCC-local value that can be either operator-configured or dynamically computed by the PCC based on local policy.

State Timeout Interval: when a PCEP session is terminated, a PCC waits for this time period before flushing LSP state associated with that PCEP session and reverting to operator-defined default parameters or behaviors. The State Timeout Interval is a PCC-local value that can be either operator-configured or dynamically computed by the PCC based on local policy.

LSP State Report: an operation to send LSP state (Operational / Admin Status, LSP attributes configured at the PCC and set by a PCE, etc.) from a PCC to a PCE.

LSP Update Request: an operation where an Active Stateful PCE requests a PCC to update one or more attributes of an LSP and to re-signal the LSP with updated attributes.

LSP State Database: information about all LSPs and their attributes.

Within this document, PCE-PCE communications are described by having the requesting PCE fill the role of a PCC. This provides a saving in documentation without loss of function.

The message formats in this document are specified using Routing Backus-Naur Format (RBNF) encoding as specified in [RFC5511].

3. Motivation and Objectives for Stateful PCE

3.1. Motivation

[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce-app] presents several use cases, demonstrating scenarios that benefit from the deployment of a stateful PCE. The scenarios apply equally to MPLS-TE and GMPLS deployments.

3.1.1. Background

Traffic engineering has been a goal of the MPLS architecture since its inception ([RFC3031], [RFC2702], [RFC3346]). In the traffic engineering system provided by [RFC3630], [RFC5305], and [RFC3209] information about network resources utilization is only available as total reserved capacity by traffic class on a per interface basis;

individual LSP state is available only locally on each LER for its own LSPs. In most cases, this makes good sense, as distribution and retention of total LSP state for all LERs within in the network would be prohibitively costly.

Unfortunately, this visibility in terms of global LSP state may result in a number of issues for some demand patterns, particularly within a common setup and hold priority. This issue affects online traffic engineering systems.

A sufficiently over-provisioned system will by definition have no issues routing its demand on the shortest path. However, lowering the degree to which network over-provisioning is required in order to run a healthy, functioning network is a clear and explicit promise of MPLS architecture. In particular, it has been a goal of MPLS to provide mechanisms to alleviate congestion scenarios in which "traffic streams are inefficiently mapped onto available resources; causing subsets of network resources to become over-utilized while others remain underutilized" ([RFC2702]).

3.1.2. Why a Stateful PCE?

[RFC4655] defines a stateful PCE to be one in which the PCE maintains "strict synchronization between the PCE and not only the network states (in term of topology and resource information), but also the set of computed paths and reserved resources in use in the network." [RFC4655] also expressed a number of concerns with regard to a stateful PCE, specifically:

- Any reliable synchronization mechanism would result in significant control plane overhead
- Out-of-band TED synchronization would be complex and prone to race conditions
- Path calculations incorporating total network state would be highly complex

In general, stress on the control plane will be directly proportional to the size of the system being controlled and the tightness of the control loop, and indirectly proportional to the amount of over-provisioning in terms of both network capacity and reservation overhead.

Despite these concerns in terms of implementation complexity and scalability, several TE algorithms exist today that have been demonstrated to be extremely effective in large TE systems, providing both rapid convergence and significant benefits in terms of

optimality of resource usage [MXMN-TE]. All of these systems share at least two common characteristics: the requirement for both global visibility of a flow (or in this case, a TE LSP) state and for ordered control of path reservations across devices within the system being controlled. While some approaches have been suggested in order to remove the requirements for ordered control (See [MPLS-PC]), these approaches are highly dependent on traffic distribution, and do not allow for multiple simultaneous LSP priorities representing diffserv classes.

The use cases described in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce-app] demonstrate a need for visibility into global inter-PCC LSP state in PCE path computations, and for PCE control of sequence and timing in altering LSP path characteristics within and across PCEP sessions.

3.1.3. Protocol vs. Configuration

Note that existing configuration tools and protocols can be used to set LSP state. However, this solution has several shortcomings:

- Scale & Performance: configuration operations often require processing of additional configuration portions beyond the state being directly acted upon, with corresponding cost in CPU cycles, negatively impacting both PCC stability LSP update rate capacity.

- Scale & Performance: configuration operations often have transactional semantics which are typically heavyweight and require additional CPU cycles, negatively impacting PCC update rate capacity.

- Security: when a PCC opens a configuration channel allowing a PCE to send configuration, a malicious PCE may take advantage of this ability to take over the PCC. In contrast, the PCEP extensions described in this document only allow a PCE control over a very limited set of LSP attributes.

- Interoperability: each vendor has a proprietary information model for configuring LSP state, which prevents interoperability of a PCE with PCCs from different vendors. The PCEP extensions described in this document allow for a common information model for LSP state for all vendors.

- Efficient State Synchronization: configuration channels may be heavyweight and unidirectional, therefore efficient state synchronization between a PCC and a PCE may be a problem.

3.2. Objectives

The objectives for the protocol extensions to support stateful PCE described in this document are as follows:

- Allow a single PCC to interact with a mix of stateless and stateful PCEs simultaneously using the same PCEP.

- Support efficient LSP state synchronization between the PCC and one or more active or passive stateful PCEs.

- Allow a PCC to delegate control of its LSPs to an active stateful PCE such that a given LSP is under the control of a single PCE at any given time. A PCC may revoke this delegation at any time during the lifetime of the LSP. If LSP delegation is revoked while the PCEP session is up, the PCC MUST notify the PCE about the revocation. A PCE may return an LSP delegation at any point during the lifetime of the PCEP session.

- Allow a PCE to control computation timing and update timing across all LSPs that have been delegated to it.

- Enable uninterrupted operation of PCC's LSPs in the event of a PCE failure or while control of LSPs is being transferred between PCEs.

4. New Functions to Support Stateful PCEs

Several new functions are required in PCEP to support stateful PCEs. A function can be initiated either from a PCC towards a PCE (C-E) or from a PCE towards a PCC (E-C). The new functions are:

Capability advertisement (E-C,C-E): both the PCC and the PCE must announce during PCEP session establishment that they support PCEP Stateful PCE extensions defined in this document.

LSP state synchronization (C-E): after the session between the PCC and a stateful PCE is initialized, the PCE must learn the state of a PCC's LSPs before it can perform path computations or update LSP attributes in a PCC.

LSP Update Request (E-C): A PCE requests modification of attributes on a PCC's LSP.

LSP State Report (C-E): a PCC sends an LSP state report to a PCE whenever the state of an LSP changes.

LSP control delegation (C-E,E-C): a PCC grants to a PCE the right to update LSP attributes on one or more LSPs; the PCE becomes the authoritative source of the LSP's attributes as long as the delegation is in effect (See Section 5.5); the PCC may withdraw the delegation or the PCE may give up the delegation at any time.

[I-D.sivabalan-pce-disco-stateful] defines the extensions needed to support autodiscovery of stateful PCEs when using OSPF ([RFC5088]) or IS-IS ([RFC5089]) for PCE discovery.

5. Overview of Protocol Extensions

5.1. LSP State Ownership

In the PCEP protocol (defined in [RFC5440]), LSP state and operation are under the control of a PCC (a PCC may be an LSR or a management station). Attributes received from a PCE are subject to PCC's local policy. The PCEP protocol extensions described in this document do not change this behavior.

An active stateful PCE may have control of a PCC's LSPs that were delegated to it, but the LSP state ownership is retained by the PCC. In particular, in addition to specifying values for LSP's attributes, an active stateful PCE also decides when to make LSP modifications.

Retaining LSP state ownership on the PCC allows for:

- a PCC to interact with both stateless and stateful PCEs at the same time

- a stateful PCE to only modify a small subset of LSP parameters, i.e. to set only a small subset of the overall LSP state; other parameters may be set by the operator through command line interface (CLI) commands

- a PCC to revert delegated LSP to an operator-defined default or to delegate the LSPs to a different PCE, if the PCC get disconnected from a PCE with currently delegated LSPs

5.2. New Messages

In this document, we define the following new PCEP messages:

Path Computation State Report (PCRpt): a PCEP message sent by a PCC to a PCE to report the status of one or more LSPs. Each LSP Status Report in a PCRpt message can contain the actual LSP's path, bandwidth, operational and administrative status, etc. An LSP Status Report carried on a PCRpt message is also used in

delegation or revocation of control of an LSP to/from a PCE. The PCRpt message is described in Section 6.1.

Path Computation Update Request (PCUpd): a PCEP message sent by a PCE to a PCC to update LSP parameters, on one or more LSPs. Each LSP Update Request on a PCUpd message MUST contain all LSP parameters that a PCE wishes to be set for a given LSP. An LSP Update Request carried on a PCUpd message is also used to return LSP delegations if at any point PCE no longer desires control of an LSP. The PCUpd message is described in Section 6.2.

The new functions defined in Section 4 are mapped onto the new messages as shown in the following table.

Function	Message
Capability Advertisement (E-C,C-E)	Open
State Synchronization (C-E)	PCRpt
LSP State Report (C-E)	PCRpt
LSP Control Delegation (C-E,E-C)	PCRpt, PCUpd
LSP Update Request (E-C)	PCUpd
ISIS stateful capability advertisement	ISIS PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV
OSPF stateful capability advertisement	OSPF RI LSA, PCE TLV, PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV

Table 1: New Function to Message Mapping

5.3. Capability Advertisement

During PCEP Initialization Phase, PCEP Speakers (PCE or PCC) advertise their support of stateful PCEP extensions. A PCEP Speaker includes the "Stateful PCE Capability" TLV, described in Section 7.1.1, in the OPEN Object to advertise its support for PCEP stateful extensions. The Stateful Capability TLV includes the 'LSP Update' Flag that indicates whether the PCEP Speaker supports LSP parameter updates.

The presence of the Stateful PCE Capability TLV in PCC's OPEN Object indicates that the PCC is willing to send LSP State Reports whenever LSP parameters or operational status changes.

The presence of the Stateful PCE Capability TLV in PCE's OPEN message indicates that the PCE is interested in receiving LSP State Reports whenever LSP parameters or operational status changes.

The PCEP protocol extensions for stateful PCEs MUST NOT be used if one or both PCEP Speakers have not included the Stateful PCE Capability TLV in their respective OPEN message. If the PCEP Speaker on the PCC supports the extensions of this draft but did not advertise this capability, then upon receipt of PCUpd message from the PCE, it SHOULD generate a PCErr with error-type 19 (Invalid Operation), error-value 2 (Attempted LSP Update Request if the stateful PCE capability was not advertised)(see Section 8.4) and it will terminate the PCEP session. If the PCEP Speaker on the PCE supports the extensions of this draft but did not advertise this capability, then upon receipt of a PCRpt message from the PCC, it SHOULD generate a PCErr with error-type 19 (Invalid Operation), error-value 5 (Attempted LSP State Report if active stateful PCE capability was not advertised) (see Section 8.4) and it will terminate the PCEP session.

LSP delegation and LSP update operations defined in this document MAY only be used if both PCEP Speakers set the LSP-UPDATE Flag in the "Stateful Capability" TLV to 'Updates Allowed (U Flag = 1)'. If this is not the case and LSP delegation or LSP update operations are attempted, then a PCErr with error-type 19 (Invalid Operation) and error-value 1 (Attempted LSP Update Request for a non-delegated LSP).(see Section 8.4) SHOULD be generated. Note that even if the update capability has not been advertised, a PCE can still receive LSP Status Reports from a PCC and build and maintain an up to date view of the state of the PCC's LSPs.

5.4. State Synchronization

The purpose of State Synchronization is to provide a checkpoint-in-time state replica of a PCC's LSP state in a PCE. State Synchronization is performed immediately after the Initialization phase ([RFC5440]).

During State Synchronization, a PCC first takes a snapshot of the state of its LSPs state, then sends the snapshot to a PCE in a sequence of LSP State Reports. Each LSP State Report sent during State Synchronization has the SYNC Flag in the LSP Object set to 1. The set of LSPs for which state is synchronized with a PCE is determined by advertised stateful PCEP capabilities and PCC's local configuration (see more details in Section 9.1).

The end of synchronization marker is a PCRpt message with the SYNC Flag set to 0 for an LSP Object with PLSP-ID equal to the reserved value 0. The LSP Object does not include the SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME TLV in this case, and it will include an empty ERO in its path. If the PCC has no state to synchronize, it will only send the end of synchronization marker.

A PCE SHOULD NOT send PCUpd messages to a PCC before State Synchronization is complete. A PCC SHOULD NOT send PCReq messages to a PCE before State Synchronization is complete. This is to allow the PCE to get the best possible view of the network before it starts computing new paths.

Either the PCE or the PCC MAY terminate the session using the PCEP session termination procedures during the synchronization phase. If the session is terminated, the PCE MUST clean up state it received from this PCC. The session reestablishment MUST be re-attempted per the procedures defined in [RFC5440], including use of a back-off timer.

If the PCC encounters a problem which prevents it from completing the state transfer, it MUST send a PCErr message with error-type 20 (LSP State Synchronization Error) and error-value 5 (indicating an internal PCC error) to the PCE and terminate the session.

The PCE does not send positive acknowledgements for properly received synchronization messages. It MUST respond with a PCErr message with error-type 20 (LSP State Synchronization Error) and error-value 1 (indicating an error in processing the PCRpt) (see Section 8.4) if it encounters a problem with the LSP State Report it received from the PCC and it MUST terminate the session.

A PCE implementing a limit on the resources a single PCC can occupy, MUST send a PCErr message with error-type 19 (invalid operation) and error-value 4 (indicating resource limit exceeded) in response to the PCRpt message triggering this condition in the synchronization phase and MUST terminate the session.

The successful State Synchronization sequence is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Successful state synchronization

The sequence where the PCE fails during the State Synchronization phase is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Failed state synchronization (PCE failure)

The sequence where the PCC fails during the State Synchronization phase is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Failed state synchronization (PCC failure)

Optimizations to the synchronization procedures and alternate mechanisms of providing the synchronization function are outside the scope of this document and are discussed elsewhere (see [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-sync-optimizations]).

5.5. LSP Delegation

If during Capability advertisement both the PCE and the PCC have indicated that they support LSP Update, then the PCC may choose to grant the PCE a temporary right to update (a subset of) LSP attributes on one or more LSPs. This is called "LSP Delegation", and it MAY be performed at any time after the Initialization phase, including during the State Synchronization phase.

LSP Delegation is controlled by operator-defined policies on a PCC. LSPs are delegated individually - different LSPs may be delegated to different PCEs. An LSP is delegated to at most one PCE at any given point in time. The delegation policy, when all PCC's LSPs are delegated to a single PCE at any given time, SHOULD be supported by all delegation-capable PCCs. Conversely, the policy revoking the delegation for all PCC's LSPs SHOULD also be supported.

A PCE may return LSP delegation at any time if it no longer wishes to update the LSP's state. A PCC may revoke LSP delegation at any time. Delegation, Revocation, and Return are done individually for each LSP.

In the event of an delegation being rejected or returned by a PCE, the PCC should react based on local policy. It can, for example,

either retry delegating to the same PCE using an exponentially increasing timer or delegate to an alternate PCE.

5.5.1. Delegating an LSP

A PCC delegates an LSP to a PCE by setting the Delegate flag in LSP State Report to 1. If the PCE does not accept the LSP Delegation, it MUST immediately respond with an empty LSP Update Request which has the Delegate flag set to 0. If the PCE accepts the LSP Delegation, it confirms this when it sends the first LSP Update Request for the delegated LSP to the PCC by setting the Delegate flag to 1 (note that this may occur at a later time).

The delegation sequence is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Delegating an LSP

Note that for an LSP to remain delegated to a PCE, the PCC MUST set the Delegate flag to 1 on each LSP Status Report sent to the PCE.

5.5.2. Revoking a Delegation

When a PCC decides that a PCE is no longer permitted to modify an LSP, it revokes that LSP's delegation to the PCE. A PCC may revoke an LSP delegation at any time during the LSP's life time. A PCC revoking an LSP delegation MAY immediately clear the LSP state provided by the PCE, but to avoid traffic loss, it SHOULD do so in a make-before-break fashion. If the PCC has received but not yet acted on PCUpd messages from the PCE for the LSP whose delegation is being revoked, then it SHOULD ignore these PCUpd messages when processing the message queue. All effects of all messages for which processing started before the revocation took place MUST be allowed to complete and the result MUST be given the same treatment as any LSP that had

been previously delegated to the PCE (e.g. the state MAY be immediately cleared). Any further PCUpd messages from the PCE are handled according to the PCUpd procedures described in this document.

If a PCEP session with the PCE to which the LSP is delegated exists in the UP state during the revocation, the PCC MUST notify that PCE by sending an LSP State Report with the Delegate flag set to 0, as shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Revoking a Delegation

After an LSP delegation has been revoked, a PCE can no longer update LSP's parameters; an attempt to update parameters of a non-delegated LSP will result in the PCC sending a PCErr message with error-type 19 (Invalid Operation), error-value 1 (attempted LSP Update Request for a non-delegated LSP) (see Section 8.4).

When a PCC's PCEP session with a PCE terminates unexpectedly, the PCC MUST wait the time interval specified in Redelegation Timeout Interval before revoking LSP delegations to that PCE and attempting to redelegate LSPs to an alternate PCE. If a PCEP session with the original PCE can be reestablished before the Redelegation Timeout Interval timer expires, LSP delegations to the PCE remain intact.

Likewise, when a PCC's PCEP session with a PCE terminates unexpectedly, the PCC MUST wait for the State Timeout Interval before flushing any LSP state associated with that PCE. Note that the State Timeout Interval timer may expire before the PCC has redelegated the LSPs to another PCE, for example if a PCC is not connected to any active stateful PCE or if no connected active stateful PCE accepts the delegation. In this case, the PCC SHALL flush any LSP state set by the PCE upon expiration of the State Timeout Interval and revert to operator-defined default parameters or behaviors. This operation SHOULD be done in a make-before-break fashion.

The State Timeout Interval SHOULD be greater than or equal to the Redelegation Timeout Interval and MAY be set to infinity (meaning that until the PCC specifically takes action to change the parameters set by the PCE, they will remain intact).

5.5.3. Returning a Delegation

A PCE that no longer wishes to update an LSP's parameters SHOULD return the LSP delegation back to the PCC by sending an empty LSP Update Request which has the Delegate flag set to 0. Note that in order to keep a delegation, the PCE MUST set the Delegate flag to 1 on each LSP Update Request sent to the PCC.




Figure 6: Returning a Delegation

If a PCC cannot delegate an LSP to a PCE (for example, if a PCC is not connected to any active stateful PCE or if no connected active stateful PCE accepts the delegation), the LSP delegation on the PCC will time out within a configurable Redelegation Timeout Interval and the PCC MUST flush any LSP state set by a PCE at the expiration of the State Timeout Interval.

5.5.4. Redundant Stateful PCEs

In a redundant configuration where one PCE is backing up another PCE, the backup PCE may have only a subset of the LSPs in the network delegated to it. The backup PCE does not update any LSPs that are not delegated to it. In order to allow the backup to operate in a hot-standby mode and avoid the need for state synchronization in case the primary fails, the backup receives all LSP State Reports from a PCC. When the primary PCE for a given LSP set fails, after expiry of the Redelegation Timeout Interval, the PCC SHOULD delegate to the redundant PCE all LSPs that had been previously delegated to the failed PCE. Assuming that the State Timeout Interval had been configured to be larger than the Redelegation Timeout Interval (as

recommended), this delegation change will not cause any changes to the LSP parameters.

5.5.5. Redelegation on PCE Failure

On failure, the goal is to: 1) avoid any traffic loss on the LSPs that were updated by the PCE that crashed 2) minimize the churn in the network in terms of ownership of the LSPs, 3) not leave any "orphan" (undelegated) LSPs and 4) be able to control when the state that was set by the PCE can be changed or purged. The values chosen for the Redelegation Timeout and State Timeout values affect the ability to accomplish these goals.

This section summarizes the behaviour with regards to LSP delegation and LSP state on a PCE failure.

If the PCE crashes but recovers within the Redelegation Timeout, both the delegation state and the LSP state are kept intact.

If the PCE crashes but does not recover within the Redelegation Timeout, the delegation state is returned to the PCC. If the PCC can redelegate the LSPs to another PCE, and that PCE accepts the delegations, there will be no change in LSP state. If the PCC cannot redelegate the LSPs to another PCE, then upon expiration of the State Timeout Interval, the state set by the PCE is flushed, which may cause change in the LSP state. Note that an operator may choose to use an infinite State Timeout Interval if he wishes to maintain the PCE state indefinetely. Note also that flushing the state should be implemented using make-before-break to avoid traffic loss.

If there is a standby PCE, the Redelegation Timeout may be set to 0 through policy on the PCC, causing the LSPs to be redelegated immediately to the PCC, which can delegate them immediately to the standby PCE. Assuming the State Timeout Interval is larger than the Redelegation Timeout, the LSP state will be kept intact.

5.6. LSP Operations

5.6.1. Passive Stateful PCE Path Computation Request/Response




Figure 7: Passive Stateful PCE Path Computation Request/Response

Once a PCC has successfully established a PCEP session with a passive stateful PCE and the PCC's LSP state is synchronized with the PCE (i.e. the PCE knows about all PCC's existing LSPs), if an event is triggered that requires the computation of a set of paths, the PCC sends a path computation request to the PCE ([RFC5440], Section 4.2.3). The PCReq message MAY contain the LSP Object to identify the LSP for which the path computation is requested.

Upon receiving a path computation request from a PCC, the PCE triggers a path computation and returns either a positive or a negative reply to the PCC ([RFC5440], Section 4.2.4).

Upon receiving a positive path computation reply, the PCC receives a set of computed paths and starts to setup the LSPs. For each LSP, it sends an LSP State Report carried on a PCRpt message to the PCE, indicating that the LSP's status is "Going-up".

Once an LSP is up or active, the PCC sends an LSP State Report carried on a PCRpt message to the PCE, indicating that the LSP's status is 'Up' or 'Active' respectively. If the LSP could not be set up, the PCC sends an LSP State Report indicating that the LSP is "Down' and stating the cause of the failure. Note that due to timing constraints, the LSP status may change from 'Going-up' to 'Up' (or

'Down') before the PCC has had a chance to send an LSP State Report indicating that the status is 'Going-up'. In such cases, the PCC may choose to only send the PCRpt indicating the latest status ('Active', 'Up' or 'Down').

Upon receiving a negative reply from a PCE, a PCC may decide to resend a modified request or take any other appropriate action. For each requested LSP, it also sends an LSP State Report carried on a PCRpt message to the PCE, indicating that the LSP's status is 'Down'.

There is no direct correlation between PCRep and PCRpt messages. For a given LSP, multiple LSP State Reports will follow a single PCRep message, as a PCC notifies a PCE of the LSP's state changes.

A PCC sends each LSP State Report to each stateful PCE that is connected to the PCC.

Note that a single PCRpt message MAY contain multiple LSP State Reports.

The passive stateful PCE is the model for stateful PCEs is described in [RFC4655], Section 6.8.

5.6.2. Active Stateful PCE LSP Update




Figure 8: Active Stateful PCE

Once a PCC has successfully established a PCEP session with an active stateful PCE, the PCC's LSP state is synchronized with the PCE (i.e. the PCE knows about all PCC's existing LSPs) and LSPs have been delegated to the PCE, the PCE can modify LSP parameters of delegated LSPs.

A PCE sends an LSP Update Request carried on a PCUpd message to the PCC. The LSP Update Request contains a variety of objects that specify the set of constraints and attributes for the LSP's path. Each LSP Update Request has a unique identifier, the SRP-ID-number, carried in the SRP (Stateful PCE Request Parameters) Object described in Section 7.2. The SRP-ID-number is used to correlate errors and state reports to LSP Update Requests. A single PCUpd message MAY contain multiple LSP Update Requests.

Upon receiving a PCUpd message the PCC starts to setup LSPs specified in LSP Update Requests carried in the message. For each LSP, it sends an LSP State Report carried on a PCRpt message to the PCE, indicating that the LSP's status is 'Going-up'. If the PCC decides that the LSP parameters proposed in the PCUpd message are unacceptable, it MUST report this error by including the LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV (Section 7.3.3) with LSP error-value="Unacceptable parameters" in the LSP object in the PCRpt message to the PCE. Based on local policy, it MAY react further to this error by revoking the delegation. If the PCC receives a PCUpd message for an LSP object identified with a PLSP-ID that does not exist on the PCC, it MUST generate a PCErr with error-type 19 (Invalid Operation), error-value 3, (Attempted LSP Update Request for an LSP identified by an unknown PSP-ID) (see Section 8.4).

Once an LSP is up, the PCC sends an LSP State Report (PCRpt message) to the PCE, indicating that the LSP's status is 'Up'. If the LSP could not be set up, the PCC sends an LSP State Report indicating that the LSP is 'Down' and stating the cause of the failure. A PCC may choose to compress LSP State Reports to only reflect the most up to date state, as discussed in the previous section.

A PCC sends each LSP State Report to each stateful PCE that is connected to the PCC.

PCErr and PCRpt messages triggered as a result of a PCUpd message MUST include the SRP-ID-number from the PCUpd. This provides correlation of requests and errors and acknowledgement of state processing. The PCC may choose to compress state when processing PCUpd. In this case, receipt of a higher SRP-ID-number implicitly acknowledges processing all the earlier updates for the specific LSP.

A PCC MUST NOT send to any PCE a Path Computation Request for a delegated LSP. Should the PCC decide it wants to issue a Path Computation Request on a delegated LSP, it MUST perform Delegation Revocation procedure first.

5.7. LSP Protection

LSP protection and interaction with stateful PCE, as well as the extensions necessary to implement this functionality will be discussed in a separate draft.

5.8. Transport

A permanent PCEP session MUST be established between a stateful PCE and the PCC. In the case of session failure, session reestablishment MUST be re-attempted per the procedures defined in [RFC5440].

6. PCEP Messages

As defined in [RFC5440], a PCEP message consists of a common header followed by a variable-length body made of a set of objects that can be either mandatory or optional. An object is said to be mandatory in a PCEP message when the object must be included for the message to be considered valid. For each PCEP message type, a set of rules is defined that specify the set of objects that the message can carry. An implementation MUST form the PCEP messages using the object ordering specified in this document.

6.1. The PCRpt Message

A Path Computation LSP State Report message (also referred to as PCRpt message) is a PCEP message sent by a PCC to a PCE to report the current state of an LSP. A PCRpt message can carry more than one LSP State Reports. A PCC can send an LSP State Report either in response to an LSP Update Request from a PCE, or asynchronously when the state of an LSP changes. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header for the PCRpt message is to be assigned by IANA.

The format of the PCRpt message is as follows:

```
   <PCRpt Message> ::= <Common Header>
                       <state-report-list>
Where:

   <state-report-list> ::= <state-report>[<state-report-list>]

   <state-report> ::= [<SRP>]
                      <LSP>
                      <path>
 Where:
   <path>::= <ERO><attribute-list>[<RRO>]
```

Where:
<attribute-list> is defined in [RFC5440] and extended by PCEP extensions.

The SRP object (see Section 7.2) is optional. If the PCRpt message is not in response to a PCupd message, the SRP object MAY be omitted. When the PCC does not include the SRP object, the PCE treats this as an SRP object with an SRP-ID-number equal to the reserved value 0x00000000. The reserved value 0x00000000 indicates that the state reported is not as a result of processing a PCUpd message.

If the PCRpt message is in response to a PCUpd message, the SRP object MUST be included and the value of the SRP-ID-number in the SRP Object MUST be the same as that sent in the PCUpd message that triggered the state that is reported. If the PCC compressed several PCUpd messages for the same LSP by only processing the latest one, then it should use the SRP-ID-number of that request. No state compression is allowed for state reporting, e.g. PCRpt messages MUST NOT be pruned from the PCC's egress queue even if subsequent operations on the same LSP have been completed before the PCRpt message has been sent to the TCP stack. The PCC MUST explicitly report state changes (including removal) for paths it manages.

The LSP object (see Section 7.3) is mandatory, and it MUST be included in each LSP State Report on the PCRpt message. If the LSP object is missing, the receiving PCE MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=6 (Mandatory Object missing) and Error-value to be assigned by IANA (LSP object missing).

If the LSP transitioned to non-operational state, the PCC SHOULD include the LSP-ERROR-TLV (Section 7.3.3) with the relevant LSP Error Code to report the error to the PCE.

The RRO SHOULD be included by the PCC when the path is up or active, but MAY be omitted if the path is down due to a signaling error or another failure.

A PCE may choose to implement a limit on the resources a single PCC can occupy. If a PCRpt is received that causes the PCE to exceed this limit, it MUST send a PCErr message with error-type 19 (invalid operation) and error-value 4 (indicating resource limit exceeded) in response to the PCRpt message triggering this condition and MAY terminate the session.

6.2. The PCUpd Message

A Path Computation LSP Update Request message (also referred to as PCUpd message) is a PCEP message sent by a PCE to a PCC to update attributes of an LSP. A PCUpd message can carry more than one LSP Update Request. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header for the PCUpd message is to be assigned by IANA.

The format of a PCUpd message is as follows:

```
<PCUpd Message> ::= <Common Header>
                    <update-request-list>
```

Where:

```
<update-request-list> ::= <update-request>[<update-request-list>]

<update-request> ::= <SRP>
                     <LSP>
                     <path>
```

Where:

```
<path>::= <ERO><attribute-list>
```

Where:

<attribute-list> is defined in [RFC5440] and extended by PCEP extensions.

There are three mandatory objects that MUST be included within each LSP Update Request in the PCUpd message: the SRP Object (see Section 7.2), the LSP object (see Section 7.3) and the ERO object (as defined in [RFC5440]. If the SRP object is missing, the receiving PCC MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=6 (Mandatory Object missing) and Error-value=10 (SRP object missing). If the LSP object is missing, the receiving PCC MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=6 (Mandatory Object missing) and Error-value=8 (LSP object missing). If the ERO object is missing, the receiving PCC MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=6 (Mandatory Object missing) and Error-value=9(ERO object missing).

A PCC only acts on an LSP Update Request if permitted by the local policy configured by the network manager. Each LSP Update Request that the PCC acts on results in an LSP setup operation. An LSP Update Request MUST contain all LSP parameters that a PCE wishes to

be set for the LSP. A PCC MAY set missing parameters from locally configured defaults. If the LSP specified in the Update Request is already up, it will be re-signaled.

The PCC SHOULD minimize the traffic interruption, and MAY use the make-before-break procedures described in [RFC3209] in order to achieve this goal. If the make-before-break procedures are used, two paths will briefly co-exist. The PCC MUST send separate PCRpt messages for each, identified by the LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV. When the old path is torn down after the head end switches over the traffic, this event MUST be reported by sending a PCRpt message with the LSP-IDENTIFIERS-TLV of the old path and the R bit set. The SRP-ID-number that the PCE associates with this PCRpt MUST be 0x00000000. Thus, a make-before-break operation will typically result in at least two PCRpt messages, one for the new path and one for the removal of the old path (more messages may be possible if intermediate states are reported).

If the path setup fails due to an RSVP signaling error, the error is reported to the PCE. The PCC will not attempt to resignal the path until it is prompted again by the PCE with a subsequent PCUpd message.

A PCC MUST respond with an LSP State Report to each LSP Update Request it processed to indicate the resulting state of the LSP in the network (even if this processing did not result in changing the state of the LSP). The SRP-ID-number included in the PCRpt MUST match that in the PCUpd. A PCC MAY respond with multiple LSP State Reports to report LSP setup progress of a single LSP. In that case, the SRP-ID-number MUST be included for the first message, for subsequent messages the reserved value 0x00000000 SHOULD be used.

Note that a PCC MUST process all LSP Update Requests - for example, an LSP Update Request is sent when a PCE returns delegation or puts an LSP into non-operational state. The protocol relies on TCP for message-level flow control.

If the rate of PCUpd messages sent to a PCC for the same target LSP exceeds the rate at which the PCC can signal LSPs into the network, the PCC MAY perform state compression on its ingress queue. The compression algorithm is based on the fact that each PCUpd request contains the complete LSP state the PCE wishes to be set and works as follows: when the PCC starts processing a PCUpd message at the head of its ingress queue, it may search the queue forward for more recent PCUpd messages pertaining that particular LSP, prune all but the latest one from the queue and process only the last one as that request contains the most up-to-date desired state for the LSP. The PCC MUST NOT send PCRpt nor PCErr messages for requests which were

pruned from the queue in this way. This compression step may be performed only while the LSP is not being signaled, e.g. if two PCUpd arrive for the same LSP in quick succession and the PCC started the signaling of the changes relevant to the first PCUpd, then it MUST wait until the signaling finishes (and report the new state via a PCRpt) before attempting to apply the changes indicated in the second PCUpd.

Note also that it is up to the PCE to handle inter-LSP dependencies; for example, if ordering of LSP set-ups is required, the PCE has to wait for an LSP State Report for a previous LSP before starting the update of the next LSP. If the PCUpd cannot be satisfied (for example due to unsupported object or TLV), the PCC MUST respond with a PCErr message indicating the failure (see Section 7.3.3).

6.3. The PCErr Message

If the stateful PCE capability has been advertised on the PCEP session, the PCErr message MAY include the SRP object. If the error reported is the result of an LSP update request, then the SRP-ID-number MUST be the one from the PCUpd that triggered the error. If the error is unsolicited, the SRP object MAY be omitted. This is equivalent to including an SRP object with SRP-ID-number equal to the reserved value 0x00000000.

The format of a PCErr message from [RFC5440] is extended as follows:

```
<PCErr Message> ::= <Common Header>
                    ( <error-obj-list> [<Open>] ) | <error>
                    [<error-list>]

<error-obj-list>::=<PCEP-ERROR>[<error-obj-list>]

<error>::=[<request-id-list> | <stateful-request-id-list>]
            <error-obj-list>

<request-id-list>::=<RP>[<request-id-list>]

<stateful-request-id-list>::=<SRP>[<stateful-request-id-list>]

<error-list>::=<error>[<error-list>]
```

6.4. The PCReq Message

A PCC MAY include the LSP object in the PCReq message (see Section 7.3) if the stateful PCE capability has been negotiated on a PCEP session between the PCC and a PCE.

The definition of the PCReq message from [RFC5440] is extended to optionally include the LSP object after the END-POINTS object. The encoding from [RFC5440] will become:

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

Where:

```
<svec-list>::=<SVEC>[<svec-list>]
<request-list>::=<request>[<request-list>]

<request>::= <RP>
             <END-POINTS>
             [<LSP>]
             [<LSPA>]
             [<BANDWIDTH>]
             [<metric-list>]
             [<RRO>[<BANDWIDTH>]]
             [<IRO>]
             [<LOAD-BALANCING>]
```

6.5. The PCRep Message

A PCE MAY include the LSP object in the PCRep message (see (Section 7.3) if the stateful PCE capability has been negotiated on a PCEP session between the PCC and the PCE and the LSP object was included in the corresponding PCReq message from the PCC.

The definition of the PCRep message from [RFC5440] is extended to optionally include the LSP object after the RP object. The encoding from [RFC5440] will become:

```
<PCRep Message> ::= <Common Header>
                    <response-list>
```

Where:

```
<response-list>::=<response>[<response-list>]

<response>::=<RP>
             [<LSP>]
             [<NO-PATH>]
             [<attribute-list>]
             [<path-list>]
```

7. Object Formats

The PCEP objects defined in this document are compliant with the PCEP object format defined in [RFC5440]. The P flag and the I flag of the PCEP objects defined in this document SHOULD always be set to 0 on transmission and SHOULD be ignored on receipt since these flags are exclusively related to path computation requests.

7.1. OPEN Object

This document defines one new optional TLVs for use in the OPEN Object.

7.1.1. Stateful PCE Capability TLV

The STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV is an optional TLV for use in the OPEN Object for stateful PCE capability advertisement. Its format is shown in the following figure:




Figure 9: STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV format

The type of the TLV is to be assigned by IANA and it has a fixed length of 4 octets.

The value comprises a single field - Flags (32 bits):

U (LSP-UPDATE-CAPABILITY - 1 bit): if set to 1 by a PCC, the U Flag indicates that the PCC allows modification of LSP parameters; if set to 1 by a PCE, the U Flag indicates that the PCE is capable of updating LSP parameters. The LSP-UPDATE-CAPABILITY Flag must be advertised by both a PCC and a PCE for PCUpd messages to be allowed on a PCEP session.

Unassigned bits are considered reserved. They MUST be set to 0 on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Advertisement of the stateful PCE capability implies support of LSPs that are signaled via RSVP, as well as the objects, TLVs and procedures defined in this document.

7.2. SRP Object

The SRP (Stateful PCE Request Parameters) object MUST be carried within PCUpd messages and MAY be carried within PCRpt and PCErr messages. The SRP object is used to correlate between update requests sent by the PCE and the error reports and state reports sent by the PCC.

SRP Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA.

SRP Object-Type is 1.

The format of the SRP object body is shown in Figure 10:




Figure 10: The SRP Object format

The SRP object body has a variable length and may contain additional TLVs. The SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME TLV MAY be included as one of the optional TLVs.

Flags (32 bits): None defined yet.

SRP-ID-number (32 bits): The SRP-ID-number value in the scope of the current PCEP session uniquely identify the operation that the PCE has requested the PCC to perform on a given LSP. The SRP-ID-number is incremented each time a new request is sent to the PCC, and may wrap around.

The values 0x00000000 and 0xFFFFFFFF are reserved.

Every request to update an LSP receives a new SRP-ID-number. This number is unique per PCEP session and is incremented each time an operation is requested from the PCE. Thus, for a given LSP there may be more than one SRP-id-number unacknowledged at a given time. The value of the SRP-ID-number is echoed back by the PCC in PCErr and

PCRpt messages to allow for correlation between requests made by the PCE and errors or state reports generated by the PCC. If the error or report were not as a result of a PCE operation (for example in the case of a link down event), the reserved value of 0x00000000 is used for the SRP-ID-number. The absence of the SRP object is equivalent to an SRP object with the reserved value of 0x00000000. An SRP-ID-number is considered unacknowledged and cannot be reused until a PCErr or PCRpt arrives with an SRP-ID-number equal or higher for the same LSP. In case of SRP-ID wrapping the last SRP-ID before the wrapping MUST be explicitly acknowledged, to avoid a situation where SRP-IDs remain unacknowledged after the wrap. This means that the PCC may need to issue two PCUpd messages on detecting a wrap.

7.3. LSP Object

The LSP object MUST be present within PCRpt and PCUpd messages. The LSP object MAY be carried within PCReq and PCRep messages if the stateful PCE capability has been negotiated on the session. The LSP object contains a set of fields used to specify the target LSP, the operation to be performed on the LSP, and LSP Delegation. It also contains a flag indicating to a PCE that the LSP state synchronization is in progress. This document focuses on LSPs that are signaled with RSVP, many of the TLVs used with the LSP object mirror RSVP state.

LSP Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA.

LSP Object-Type is 1.

The format of the LSP object body is shown in Figure 11:




Figure 11: The LSP Object format

PLSP-ID (20 bits): A PCEP-specific identifier for the LSP. A PCC creates a unique PLSP-ID for each LSP that is constant for the lifetime of a PCEP session. The PCC will advertise the same PLSP-ID on all PCEP sessions it maintains at a given times. The mapping of the Symbolic Path Name to PLSP-ID is communicated to the PCE by sending a PCRpt message containing the SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME TLV. All

subsequent PCEP messages then address the LSP by the PLSP-ID. The values of 0 and 0xFFFFF are reserved. Note that the PLSP-ID is a value that is constant for the lifetime of the PCEP session, during which time for an RSVP-signaled LSP there might be a different RSVP identifiers (LSP-id, tunnel-id) allocated it.

Flags (12 bits):

D (Delegate - 1 bit): on a PCRpt message, the D Flag set to 1 indicates that the PCC is delegating the LSP to the PCE. On a PCUpd message, the D flag set to 1 indicates that the PCE is confirming the LSP Delegation. To keep an LSP delegated to the PCE, the PCC must set the D flag to 1 on each PCRpt message for the duration of the delegation - the first PCRpt with the D flag set to 0 revokes the delegation. To keep the delegation, the PCE must set the D flag to 1 on each PCUpd message for the duration of the delegation - the first PCUpd with the D flag set to 0 returns the delegation.

S (SYNC - 1 bit): the S Flag MUST be set to 1 on each PCRpt sent from a PCC during State Synchronization. The S Flag MUST be set to 0 in other PCRpt messages sent from the PCC.

R(Remove - 1 bit): On PCRpt messages the R Flag indicates that the LSP has been removed from the PCC and the PCE SHOULD remove all state from its database. Upon receiving an LSP State Report with the R Flag set to 1 for an RSVP-signaled LSP, the PCE SHOULD remove all state for the path identified by the LSP Identifiers TLV from its database. When the all-zeros LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV is used, the PCE SHOULD remove all state for the PLSP-ID from its database.

A(Administrative - 1 bit): On PCRpt messages, the A Flag indicates the PCC's target operational status for this LSP. On PCUpd messages, the A Flag indicates the LSP status that the PCE desires for this LSP. In both cases, a value of '1' means that the desired operational state is active, and a value of '0' means that the desired operational state is inactive. A PCC ignores the A flag on a PCUpd message unless the operator's policy allows the PCE to control the corresponding LSP's administrative state.

O(Operational - 3 bits): On PCRpt messages, the O Field represents the operational status of the LSP.

The following values are defined:

0 - DOWN: not active.

1 - UP: signalled.

2 - ACTIVE: up and carrying traffic.

3 - GOING-DOWN: LSP is being torn down, resources are being released.

4 - GOING-UP: LSP is being signalled.

5-7 - Reserved: these values are reserved for future use.

Unassigned bits are considered reserved. They MUST be set to 0 on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

TLVs that may be included in the LSP Object are described in the following sections.

7.3.1. LSP Identifiers TLVs

The LSP Identifiers TLV MUST be included in the LSP object in PCRpt messages for RSVP-signaled LSPs. If the TLV is missing, the PCE will generate an error with error-type 6 (mandatory object missing) and error-value 11 (LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV missing) and close the session. The LSP Identifiers TLV MAY be included in the LSP object in PCUpd messages for RSVP-signaled LSPs. The special value of all zeros for this TLV is used to refer to all paths pertaining to a particular PLSP-ID. There are two LSP Identifiers TLVs, one for IPv4 and one for IPv6.

It is the responsibility of the PCC to send to the PCE the identifiers for each RSVP incarnation of the tunnel. For exmple, in a make-before-break scenario, the PCC MUST send a separate PCRpt for the old and for the reoptimized paths, and explicitly report removal of any of these paths using the R bit in the LSP object.

The format of the IPV4-LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV is shown in the following figure:




Figure 12: IPV4-LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV format

The type of the TLV is to be assigned by IANA and it has a fixed length of 16 octets. The value contains the following fields:

IPv4 Tunnel Sender Address: contains the sender node's IPv4 address, as defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.2.1 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv4 Sender Template Object.

LSP ID: contains the 16-bit 'LSP ID' identifier defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.2.1 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv4 Sender Template Object. A value of 0 MUST be used if the LSP is not yet signaled.

Tunnel ID: contains the 16-bit 'Tunnel ID' identifier defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.1.1 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv4 Session Object. Tunnel ID remains constant over the life time of a tunnel.

Extended Tunnel ID: contains the 32-bit 'Extended Tunnel ID' identifier defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.1.1 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv4 Session Object.

IPv4 Tunnel Endpoint Address: contains the egress node's IPv4 address, as defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.1.1 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv4 Sender Template Object.

The format of the IPV6-LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV is shown in l following figure:




Figure 13: IPV6-LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV format

The type of the TLV is to be assigned by IANA and it has a fixed length of 52 octets. The value contains the following fields:

IPv6 Tunnel Sender Address: contains the sender node's IPv6 address, as defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.2.2 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv6 Sender Template Object.

LSP ID: contains the 16-bit 'LSP ID' identifier defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.2.2 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv6 Sender Template Object. A value of 0 MUST be used if the LSP is not yet signaled.

Tunnel ID: contains the 16-bit 'Tunnel ID' identifier defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.1.2 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv6 Session Object. Tunnel ID remains constant over the life time of a tunnel.

However, when Global Path Protection or Global Default Restoration is used, both the primary and secondary LSPs have their own Tunnel IDs. A PCC will report a change in Tunnel ID when traffic switches over from primary LSP to secondary LSP (or vice versa).

Extended Tunnel ID: contains the 128-bit 'Extended Tunnel ID' identifier defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.1.2 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv6 Session Object.

IPv6 Tunnel Endpoint Address: contains the egress node's IPv6 address, as defined in [RFC3209], Section 4.6.1.2 for the LSP_TUNNEL_IPv6 Session Object.

7.3.2. Symbolic Path Name TLV

Each LSP (path) MUST have a symbolic name that is unique in the PCC. This symbolic path name MUST remain constant throughout a path's lifetime, which may span across multiple consecutive PCEP sessions and/or PCC restarts. The symbolic path name MAY be specified by an operator in a PCC's configuration. If the operator does not specify a unique symbolic name for a path, the PCC MUST auto-generate one.

The SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME TLV MUST be included in the LSP State Report when during a given PCEP session an LSP is first reported to a PCE. A PCC sends to a PCE the first LSP State Report either during State Synchronization, or when a new LSP is configured at the PCC. The symbolic path name MAY be included in subsequent LSP State Reports for the LSP.

The SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME TLV MAY appear as a TLV in both the LSP Object and the SRP Object.

The format of the SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME TLV is shown in the following figure:




Figure 14: SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME TLV format

The type of the TLV is to be assigned by IANA and it has a variable length, which MUST be greater than 0.

7.3.3. LSP Error Code TLV

The LSP Error code TLV is an optional TLV for use in the LSP object to convey error information. When an LSP Update Request fails, an LSP State Report MUST be sent to report the current state of the LSP, and SHOULD contain the LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV indicating the reason for the failure. Similarly, when a PCRpt is sent as a result of an LSP transitioning to non-operational state, the LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV SHOULD be included to indicate the reason for the transition.

The format of the LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV is shown in the following figure:




Figure 15: LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV format

The type of the TLV is to be assigned by IANA and it has a fixed length of 4 octets. The value contains an error code that indicates the cause of the failure.

The following LSP Error Codes are currently defined:

Value	Meaning
1	Unknown reason
2	Limit reached for PCE-controlled LSPs
3	Too many pending LSP update requests
4	Unacceptable parameters
5	Internal error
6	LSP administratively brought down
7	LSP preempted
8	RSVP signaling error

7.3.4. RSVP Error Spec TLV

The RSVP-ERROR-SPEC TLV is an optional TLV for use in the LSP object to carry RSVP error information. It includes the RSVP ERROR_SPEC or USER_ERROR_SPEC Object ([RFC2205] and [RFC5284]) which were returned to the PCC from a downstream node. If the set up of an LSP fails at

a downstream node which returned an ERROR_SPEC to the PCC, the PCC SHOULD include in the PCRpt for this LSP the LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV with LSP Error Code = "RSVP signaling error" and the RSVP-ERROR-SPEC TLV with the relevant RSVP ERROR-SPEC or USER_ERROR_SPEC Object.

The format of the RSVP-ERROR-SPEC TLV is shown in the following figure:




Figure 16: RSVP-ERROR-SPEC TLV format

The type of the TLV is to be assigned by IANA and it has a variable length. The value contains the RSVP ERROR_SPEC or USER_ERROR_SPEC object, including the object header.

8. IANA Considerations

This document requests IANA actions to allocate code points for the protocol elements defined in this document. Values shown here are suggested for use by IANA.

8.1. PCEP Messages

This document defines the following new PCEP messages:

Value	Meaning	Reference
10	Report	This document
11	Update	This document

8.2. PCEP Objects

This document defines the following new PCEP Object-classes and Object-values:

Object-Class Value	Name	Reference
32	LSP Object-Type 1	This document
33	SRP Object-Type 1	This document

8.3. LSP Object

This document requests that a registry is created to manage the Flags field of the LSP object. New values are to be assigned by Standards Action [RFC5226]. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- Capability description
- Defining RFC

The following values are defined in this document:

Bit	Description	Reference
0-4	Reserved	This document
5-7	Operational (3 bits)	This document
8	Administrative	This document
9	Remove	This document
10	SYNC	This document
11	Delegate	This document

8.4. PCEP-Error Object

This document defines new Error-Type and Error-Value for the following new error conditions:

Error-Type	Meaning
6	Mandatory Object missing
	Error-value=8: LSP Object missing
	Error-value=9: ERO Object missing
	Error-value=10: SRP Object missing
	Error-value=11: LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV missing
19	Invalid Operation

	Error-value=1:	Attempted LSP Update Request for a non-delegated LSP. The PCEP-ERROR Object is followed by the LSP Object that identifies the LSP.
	Error-value=2:	Attempted LSP Update Request if the stateful PCE capability was not advertised.
	Error-value=3:	Attempted LSP Update Request for an LSP identified by an unknown PLSP-ID.
	Error-value=4:	A PCE indicates to a PCC that it has exceeded the resource limit allocated for its state, and thus it cannot accept and process its LSP State Report message.
	Error-value=5:	Attempted LSP State Report if active stateful PCE capability was not advertised.
20	LSP State synchronization error.	
	Error-value=1:	A PCE indicates to a PCC that it can not process (an otherwise valid) LSP State Report. The PCEP-ERROR Object is followed by the LSP Object that identifies the LSP.
	Error-value=5:	A PCC indicates to a PCE that it can not complete the state synchronization,

8.5. PCEP TLV Type Indicators

This document defines the following new PCEP TLVs:

Value	Meaning	Reference
16	STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY	This document
17	SYMBOLIC-PATH-NAME	This document
18	IPV4-LSP-IDENTIFIERS	This document
19	IPV6-LSP-IDENTIFIERS	This document
20	LSP-ERROR-CODE	This document
21	RSVP-ERROR-SPEC	This document

8.6. STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV

This document requests that a registry is created to manage the Flags field in the STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV in the OPEN object. New values are to be assigned by Standards Action [RFC5226]. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)

- Capability description
- Defining RFC

The following values are defined in this document:

Bit	Description	Reference
31	LSP-UPDATE-CAPABILITY	This document

8.7. LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV

This document requests that a registry is created to manage the value of the LSP error code field in this TLV. This field specifies the reason for failure to update the LSP.

Value	Meaning
1	Unknown reason
2	Limit reached for PCE-controlled LSPs
3	Too many pending LSP update requests
4	Unacceptable parameters
5	Internal error
6	LSP administratively brought down
7	LSP preempted
8	RSVP signaling error

9. Manageability Considerations

All manageability requirements and considerations listed in [RFC5440] apply to PCEP protocol extensions defined in this document. In addition, requirements and considerations listed in this section apply.

9.1. Control Function and Policy

In addition to configuring specific PCEP session parameters, as specified in [RFC5440], Section 8.1, a PCE or PCC implementation MUST allow configuring the stateful PCEP capability and the LSP Update capability. A PCC implementation SHOULD allow the operator to specify multiple candidate PCEs for and a delegation preference for each candidate PCE. A PCC SHOULD allow the operator to specify an LSP delegation policy where LSPs are delegated to the most-preferred online PCE. A PCC MAY allow the operator to specify different LSP delegation policies.

A PCC implementation which allows concurrent connections to multiple PCEs SHOULD allow the operator to group the PCEs by administrative

domains and it MUST NOT advertise LSP existence and state to a PCE if the LSP is delegated to a PCE in a different group.

A PCC implementation SHOULD allow the operator to specify whether the PCC will advertise LSP existence and state for LSPs that are not controlled by any PCE (for example, LSPs that are statically configured at the PCC).

A PCC implementation SHOULD allow the operator to specify both the Redelegation Timeout Interval and the State Timeout Interval. The default value of the Redelegation Timeout Interval SHOULD be set to 30 seconds. An operator MAY also configure a policy that will dynamically adjust the Redelegation Timeout Interval, for example setting it to zero when the PCC has an established session to a backup PCE. The default value for the State Timeout Interval SHOULD be set to 60 seconds.

After the expiration of the State Timeout Interval, the LSP reverts to operator-defined default parameters. A PCC implementation MUST allow the operator to specify the default LSP parameters. To achieve a behavior where the LSP retains the parameters set by the PCE until such time that the PCC makes a change to them, a State Timeout Interval of infinity SHOULD be used. Any changes to LSP parameters SHOULD be done in make-before-break fashion.

A PCC implementation SHOULD allow the operator to specify delegation priority for PCEs. This effectively defines the primary PCE and one or more backup PCEs to which primary PCE's LSPs can be delegated when the primary PCE fails.

Policies defined for stateful PCEs and PCCs should eventually fit in the Policy-Enabled Path Computation Framework defined in [RFC5394], and the framework should be extended to support Stateful PCEs.

9.2. Information and Data Models

PCEP session configuration and information in the PCEP MIB module SHOULD be extended to include advertised stateful capabilities, synchronization status, and delegation status (at the PCC list PCEs with delegated LSPs).

9.3. Liveness Detection and Monitoring

PCEP protocol extensions defined in this document do not require any new mechanisms beyond those already defined in [RFC5440], Section 8.3.

9.4. Verifying Correct Operation

Mechanisms defined in [RFC5440], Section 8.4 also apply to PCEP protocol extensions defined in this document. In addition to monitoring parameters defined in [RFC5440], a stateful PCC-side PCEP implementation SHOULD provide the following parameters:

- Total number of LSP updates
- Number of successful LSP updates
- Number of dropped LSP updates
- Number of LSP updates where LSP setup failed

A PCC implementation SHOULD provide a command to show for each LSP whether it is delegated, and if so, to which PCE.

A PCC implementation SHOULD allow the operator to manually revoke LSP delegation.

9.5. Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components

PCEP protocol extensions defined in this document do not put new requirements on other protocols.

9.6. Impact on Network Operation

Mechanisms defined in [RFC5440], Section 8.6 also apply to PCEP protocol extensions defined in this document.

Additionally, a PCEP implementation SHOULD allow a limit to be placed on the number of LSPs delegated to the PCE and on the rate of PCUpd and PCRpt messages sent by a PCEP speaker and processed from a peer. It SHOULD also allow sending a notification when a rate threshold is reached.

A PCC implementation SHOULD allow a limit to be placed on the rate of LSP Updates to the same LSP to avoid signaling overload discussed in Section 10.3.

10. Security Considerations

10.1. Vulnerability

This document defines extensions to PCEP to enable stateful PCEs. The nature of these extensions and the delegation of path control to PCEs results in more information being available for a hypothetical

adversary and a number of additional attack surfaces which must be protected.

The security provisions described in [RFC5440] remain applicable to these extensions. However, because the protocol modifications outlined in this document allow the PCE to control path computation timing and sequence, the PCE defense mechanisms described in [RFC5440] section 7.2 are also now applicable to PCC security.

As a general precaution, it is RECOMMENDED that these PCEP extensions only be activated on authenticated and encrypted sessions across PCEs and PCCs belonging to the same administrative authority.

The following sections identify specific security concerns that may result from the PCEP extensions outlined in this document along with recommended mechanisms to protect PCEP infrastructure against related attacks.

10.2. LSP State Snooping

The stateful nature of this extension explicitly requires LSP status updates to be sent from PCC to PCE. While this gives the PCE the ability to provide more optimal computations to the PCC, it also provides an adversary with the opportunity to eavesdrop on decisions made by network systems external to PCE. This is especially true if the PCC delegates LSPs to multiple PCEs simultaneously.

Adversaries may gain access to this information by eavesdropping on unsecured PCEP sessions, and might then use this information in various ways to target or optimize attacks on network infrastructure. For example by flexibly countering anti-DDoS measures being taken to protect the network, or by determining choke points in the network where the greatest harm might be caused.

PCC implementations which allow concurrent connections to multiple PCEs SHOULD allow the operator to group the PCEs by administrative domains and they MUST NOT advertise LSP existence and state to a PCE if the LSP is delegated to a PCE in a different group.

10.3. Malicious PCE

The LSP delegation mechanism described in this document allows a PCC to grant effective control of an LSP to the PCE for the duration of a PCEP session. While this enables PCE control of the timing and sequence of path computations within and across PCEP sessions, it also introduces a new attack vector: an attacker may flood the PCC with PCUpd messages at a rate which exceeds either the PCC's ability

to process them or the network's ability to signal the changes, either by spoofing messages or by compromising the PCE itself.

A PCC is free to revoke an LSP delegation at any time without needing any justification. A defending PCC can do this by enqueueing the appropriate PCRpt message. As soon as that message is enqueued in the session, the PCC is free to drop any incoming PCUpd messages without additional processing.

10.4. Malicious PCC

A stateful session also result in increased attack surface by placing a requirement for the PCE to keep an LSP state replica for each PCC. It is RECOMMENDED that PCE implementations provide a limit on resources a single PCC can occupy. A PCE implementing such a limit MUST send a PCErr message with error-type 19 (invalid operation) and error-value 4 (indicating resource limit exceeded) upon receiving an LSP state report causing it to exceed this threshold.

Delegation of LSPs can create further strain on PCE resources and a PCE implementation MAY preemptively give back delegations if it finds itself lacking the resources needed to effectively manage the delegation. Since the delegation state is ultimately controlled by the PCC, PCE implementations SHOULD provide throttling mechanisms to prevent strain created by flaps of either a PCEP session or an LSP delegation.

11. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Adrian Farrel, Cyril Margaria and Ramon Casellas for their contributions to this document.

We would like to thank Shane Amante, Julien Meuric, Kohei Shiomoto, Paul Schultz and Raveendra Torvi for their comments and suggestions. Thanks also to Cyril Margaria, Jon Hardwick, Dhruv Dhoddy, Ramon Casellas, Oscar Gonzales de Dios, Tomas Janciga, Stefan Kobza, Kexin Tang, Matej Spanik, Jon Parker, Marek Zavodsky, Ambrose Kwong, Ashwin Sampath, Calvin Ying and Xian Zhang for helpful comments and discussions.

12. References

12.1. 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, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>.

[RFC2205] Braden, R., Ed., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S., and S. Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1 Functional Specification", RFC 2205, DOI 10.17487/RFC2205, September 1997, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2205>.

[RFC3209] Awduche, D., Berger, L., Gan, D., Li, T., Srinivasan, V., and G. Swallow, "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", RFC 3209, DOI 10.17487/RFC3209, December 2001, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3209>.

[RFC5088] Le Roux, JL., Ed., Vasseur, JP., Ed., Ikejiri, Y., and R. Zhang, "OSPF Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", RFC 5088, DOI 10.17487/RFC5088, January 2008, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5088>.

[RFC5089] Le Roux, JL., Ed., Vasseur, JP., Ed., Ikejiri, Y., and R. Zhang, "IS-IS Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", RFC 5089, DOI 10.17487/RFC5089, January 2008, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5089>.

[RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 5226, DOI 10.17487/RFC5226, May 2008, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5226>.

[RFC5284] Swallow, G. and A. Farrel, "User-Defined Errors for RSVP", RFC 5284, DOI 10.17487/RFC5284, August 2008, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5284>.

[RFC5440] Vasseur, JP., Ed. and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", RFC 5440, DOI 10.17487/RFC5440, March 2009, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5440>.

[RFC5511] Farrel, A., "Routing Backus-Naur Form (RBNF): A Syntax Used to Form Encoding Rules in Various Routing Protocol Specifications", RFC 5511, DOI 10.17487/RFC5511, April 2009, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5511>.

12.2. Informative References

[I-D.ietf-pce-gmpls-pcep-extensions] Margaria, C., Dios, O., and F. Zhang, "PCEP extensions for GMPLS", draft-ietf-pce-gmpls-pcep-extensions-11 (work in progress), October 2015.

[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce-app]
Zhang, X. and I. Minei, "Applicability of a Stateful Path Computation Element (PCE)", draft-ietf-pce-stateful-pce-app-04 (work in progress), April 2015.

[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-sync-optimizations]
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", draft-ietf-pce-stateful-sync-optimizations-03 (work in progress), October 2015.

[I-D.sivabalan-pce-disco-stateful]
Sivabalan, S., Medved, J., and X. Zhang, "IGP Extensions for Stateful PCE Discovery", draft-sivabalan-pce-disco-stateful-03 (work in progress), January 2014.

[MPLS-PC] Chaieb, I., Le Roux, JL., and B. Cousin, "Improved MPLS-TE LSP Path Computation using Preemption", Global Information Infrastructure Symposium, July 2007.

[MXMN-TE] Danna, E., Mandal, S., and A. Singh, "Practical linear programming algorithm for balancing the max-min fairness and throughput objectives in traffic engineering", INFOCOM, 2012 Proceedings IEEE Page(s): 846-854, 2012.

[RFC2702] Awduche, D., Malcolm, J., Agogbua, J., O'Dell, M., and J. McManus, "Requirements for Traffic Engineering Over MPLS", RFC 2702, DOI 10.17487/RFC2702, September 1999, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2702>.

[RFC3031] Rosen, E., Viswanathan, A., and R. Callon, "Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture", RFC 3031, DOI 10.17487/RFC3031, January 2001, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3031>.

[RFC3346] Boyle, J., Gill, V., Hannan, A., Cooper, D., Awduche, D., Christian, B., and W. Lai, "Applicability Statement for Traffic Engineering with MPLS", RFC 3346, DOI 10.17487/RFC3346, August 2002, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3346>.

[RFC3630] Katz, D., Kompella, K., and D. Yeung, "Traffic Engineering (TE) Extensions to OSPF Version 2", RFC 3630, DOI 10.17487/RFC3630, September 2003, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3630>.

[RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", RFC 4655, DOI 10.17487/RFC4655, August 2006, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4655>.

[RFC4657] Ash, J., Ed. and J. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol Generic Requirements", RFC 4657, DOI 10.17487/RFC4657, September 2006, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4657>.

[RFC5305] Li, T. and H. Smit, "IS-IS Extensions for Traffic Engineering", RFC 5305, DOI 10.17487/RFC5305, October 2008, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5305>.

[RFC5394] Bryskin, I., Papadimitriou, D., Berger, L., and J. Ash, "Policy-Enabled Path Computation Framework", RFC 5394, DOI 10.17487/RFC5394, December 2008, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5394>.

Authors' Addresses

Edward Crabbe

Email: edward.crabbe@gmail.com

Ina Minei
Google, Inc.
1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
Mountain View, CA 94043
US

Email: inaminei@google.com

Jan Medved
Cisco Systems, Inc.
170 West Tasman Dr.
San Jose, CA 95134
US

Email: jmedved@cisco.com

Robert Varga
Pantheon Technologies SRO
Mlynske Nivy 56
Bratislava 821 05
Slovakia

Email: robert.varga@pantheon.sk