

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: [4447](#), [6073](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: January 4, 2013

L. Jin(ed.)  
ZTE  
R. Key(ed.)  
Huawei  
S. Delord  
Alcatel-Lucent  
T. Nadeau  
Juniper  
S. Boutros  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
July 3, 2012

**Pseudowire Control Word Negotiation Mechanism Update**  
**draft-ietf-pwe3-cbit-negotiation-05.txt**

Abstract

The control word negotiation mechanism specified in [RFC4447](#) has a problem when a PE changes the preference for the use of the control word from NOT PREFERRED to PREFERRED. This document updates [RFC4447](#) and [RFC6073](#) by adding the Label Request message to resolve this control word negotiation issue for single-segment and multi-segment pseudowires.

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 January 4, 2013.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal

## Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

(<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Conventions used in this document . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Problem Statement . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Control word renegotiation by Label Request message . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Control word renegotiation for multi-segment PW . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	Control word re-negotiation use case . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Backward Compatibility . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Contributing Authors . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	Normative references . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	Updated C-bit Handling Procedures Diagram . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>



## **1. Introduction**

The control word negotiation mechanism specified in [[RFC4447](#)] [section 6.2](#) encounters a problem when a PE (Provider Edge) changes the preference for the use of the control word from NOT PREFERRED to PREFERRED. [[RFC4447](#)] specifies that if both endpoints prefer the use of the control word, then the pseudowire control word should be used. However, in the case whereby a PE changes its preference from NOT PREFERRED to PREFERRED and both ends of the PW (pseudowire) PE have the use of control word set as PREFERRED, an incorrect negotiated result of the control word as "not used" occurs. This document updates the control word negotiation mechanism in [[RFC4447](#)] by adding Label Request message to resolve this negotiation issue for single-segment PW. Multi-segment PW in [[RFC6073](#)] inherits the control word negotiation mechanism in [[RFC4447](#)], and this document updates [[RFC6073](#)] by adding the processing of Label Request message on S-PE. When PE changes the preference for the use of control word from PREFERRED to NOT PREFERRED, it should follow [[RFC4447](#)], and there is no problem.

## **2. 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 [[RFC2119](#)].

## **3. Problem Statement**

[[RFC4447](#)] [section 6](#) describes the control word negotiation mechanism. Each PW endpoint has a configurable parameter that specifies whether the use of the control word is PREFERRED or NOT PREFERRED. During control word negotiation whereby one PE advertises a C bit set 0 in the label mapping message with its locally configured use of control word as PREFERRED and a corresponding peer PE changes its use of control word from NOT PREFERRED to PREFERRED causes an incorrect negotiated control word result of "not used".

The following case will describe the negotiation problem in detail:






Figure 1

1. Initially, the use of control word on PE1 is configured as PREFERRED, and on PE2 as NOT PREFERRED.
2. The negotiation result for the control word of this PW is not used, and ultimately PE1 sends the Label Mapping message with C bit set to 0 according to [\[RFC4447\] section 6.2](#).
3. PE2 then changes its use of control word configuration from NOT PREFERRED to PREFERRED, by deleting PW configuration with NOT PREFERRED use of control word, and configuring the PW again with PREFERRED use of control word.
4. PE2 will then send the Label Withdraw message to PE1, and correspondingly will receive the Label Release message from PE1.
5. According to the control word negotiation mechanism, the previously received Label Mapping message on PE2 from PE1 carries the C bit set to 0, therefore PE2 will still send the Label Mapping message with C bit set to 0.

The negotiation result for the control word is still not used, even though the use of control word configuration on both PE1 and PE2 are PREFERRED.

#### **4. Control word renegotiation by Label Request message**

The control word negotiation mechanism in [\[RFC4447\] section 6](#) is updated to add the Label Request message described in this section.

The renegotiation process begins when the local PE has received the remote Label Mapping message with the C bit set to 0 and at the point a change occurs of its use of control word from NOT PREFERRED to PREFERRED. The following additional procedure will be carried out:

- i. The local PE MUST send a Label Release message to remote PE. If local PE has previously sent a Label Mapping message, it MUST send a Label Withdraw message to remote PE, and wait until it has received a Label Release message from the remote PE. Note: the above Label Release message and Label Withdraw message sending



does not require specific sequence.

ii. The local PE MUST send a Label Request message to peer PE, and then MUST wait until it receives a Label Mapping message containing the peer's current configured preference for use of control word.

iii. After receiving the remote peer PE Label Mapping message with C bit, local PE MUST follow the procedures defined in [\[RFC4447\] section 6](#) when sending its Label Mapping message.

The remote PE will follow [\[RFC4447\]](#), and once the remote PE has successfully processed the Label Withdraw message and Label Release message, it will reset its use of control word with the locally configured preference. Then the remote PE will send Label Mapping message with locally configured preference for use of control word as a response of Label Request message as specified in [\[RFC5036\]](#).

Note: for the local PE, before processing new configuration changing request, the above message exchanging process should be finished. The FEC (Forwarding Equivalence Class) element in the Label Request message should be the PE's local PW FEC element. As a response of the Label Request message, the peer PE should send Label Mapping message with its own local PW FEC element. The Label Request message format and procedure is described in [\[RFC5036\]](#).

#### **[4.1.](#) Control word renegotiation for multi-segment PW**

The multi-segment PW case for a T-PE (Terminating Provider Edge) operates similarly as the PE in single-segment PW described in the above section. An initial passive role is defined in [\[RFC6073\]](#) for S-PE (Switching Provider Edge) for the processing of Label Mapping message. [\[RFC6073\]](#) is updated by applying this passive role to the processing of Label Request message. When an S-PE receives a Label Request message from one of its adjacent PEs (may be S-PE or another T-PE), it MUST send a matching Label Request message to other adjacent PE (again, it may be an S-PE or a T-PE). This is necessary since an S-PE does not have complete information of the interface parameter field in the FEC advertisement. When the S-PE receives a Label Release message from remote PE, it MUST send a corresponding Label Release message to the other remote PE when it holds a label for the PW from the remote PE.

Note: because the local T-PE will send Label Withdraw message before sending Label Request message to the remote peer, the S-PE MUST process the Label Withdraw message before the Label Request message. When the S-PE receives the Label Withdraw message, it should process this message to send a Label Release message as a response and a





Label Withdraw message to upstream S-PE/T-PE. The S-PE will then process the next LDP message, e.g. the Label Request message.

When the local PE changes the use of control word from PREFERRED to NOT PREFERRED, the local PE would then renegotiate the PW control word to be not used by deleting the PW configuration with PREFERRED use of control word, and configuring the PW again with NOT PREFERRED use of control word. All of these procedures have been defined in [\[RFC4447\] section 5.4.1](#).

The diagram in [Appendix A](#) in this document updates the control word negotiation diagram in [\[RFC4447\] Appendix A](#).

#### **[4.2. Control word re-negotiation use case](#)**

The procedure of PE1 and PE2 for the use case in figure 1 will become as follows:

1. PE2 changes locally configured preference for use of control word to PREFERRED.
2. PE2 will then send the Release messages to PE1. PE2 will also send the Label Withdraw message, and wait until it has received the Label Release message from PE1.
3. PE1 will send the Label Release message in response to the Label Withdraw message from PE2. After processing the Label Release from PE2, PE1 will then reset the use of control word to the locally configured preference as PREFERRED.
4. Upon receipt of the Label Release message from PE1, PE2 will send the Label Request message to PE1, and proceed to wait until a Label Mapping message is received.
5. PE1 will send a Label Mapping message with C bit set to 1 again to PE2 as response of the Label Request message.
6. PE2 receives the Label Mapping message from PE1 and gets the remote label binding information. PE2 will wait for the PE1 Label Mapping message before sending its Label Mapping message with C bit set.
7. PE2 will send the Label Mapping to PE1 with C bit set to 1, and follow procedures defined in [\[RFC4447\] section 6](#).

While it is assumed that PE1 is configured to prefer the use of the control word, in step 5 if PE1 doesn't prefer or support the control word, PE1 would then send the Label Mapping message with C bit set to



0. As a result, PE2 in step 7 would send a Label Mapping message with C bit set 0 as per [\[RFC4447\] section 6](#).

By sending a Label Request message, PE2 will get the locally configured preference for use of control word of peer PE1 in the received Label Mapping message. By using the new C bit from the Label Mapping message received from peer PE1 and the locally configured preference for use of control word, PE2 should determine the use of PW control word according to [\[RFC4447\] section 6](#).

## **5. Backward Compatibility**

Since control word negotiation mechanism is updated by adding Label Request message, and still follows the basic procedure described in [\[RFC4447\] section 6](#), this document is fully compatible with existing implementations. For single-segment pseudowire, the remote PE (PE1 in figure 1) which already implements [\[RFC4447\]](#) and Label Request message as defined in [\[RFC5036\]](#) could be compatible with the PE (PE2 in figure 1) following the mechanism of this document. For the multi-segment pseudowire, the T-PE is same as PE in single-segment pseudowire; the S-PE should be upgraded with the mechanism defined in this document.

## **6. Security Considerations**

The security considerations specified in [\[RFC4447\]](#) and [\[RFC6073\]](#) also apply to this document, and this document does not introduce any additional security constraints.

## **7. IANA Considerations**

This document does not require IANA assignment.

## **8. Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Stewart Bryant, Andrew Malis, Nick Del Regno, Luca Martini, Venkatesan Mahalingam, Alexander Vainshtein, Adrian Farrel and Spike Curtis for their discussion and comments.

## **9. Contributing Authors**

Vishwas Manral  
Hewlett-Packard Co.



19111 Pruneridge Ave, Bldg 44,  
Cupertino, CA 95014-0691  
Email: vishwas.manral@hp.com


Reshad Rahman  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
2000 Innovation Drive Ottawa,  
Ontario K2K 3E8  
CANADA  
Email: rrahman@cisco.com

## **10. Normative references**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC4447] Martini, L., Rosen, E., El-Aawar, N., Smith, T., and G. Heron, "Pseudowire Setup and Maintenance Using the Label Distribution Protocol (LDP)", [RFC 4447](#), April 2006.
- [RFC5036] Andersson, L., Minei, I., and B. Thomas, "LDP Specification", [RFC 5036](#), October 2007.
- [RFC6073] Martini, L., Metz, C., Nadeau, T., Bocci, M., and M. Aissaoui, "Segmented Pseudowire", [RFC 6073](#), January 2011.



## Appendix A. Updated C-bit Handling Procedures Diagram






Jin, et al.

Expires January 4, 2013

[Page 9]

Authors' Addresses

Lizhong Jin (editor)  
ZTE Corporation  
889, Bibo Road  
Shanghai, 201203, China

Email: [lizhong.jin@zte.com.cn](mailto:lizhong.jin@zte.com.cn)

Raymond Key (editor)  
Huawei

Email: [raymond.key@ieee.org](mailto:raymond.key@ieee.org)

Simon Delord  
Alcatel-Lucent

Email: [simon.delord@gmail.com](mailto:simon.delord@gmail.com)

Thomas Nadeau  
Juniper

Email: [tnadeau@juniper.net](mailto:tnadeau@juniper.net)

Sami Boutros  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
3750 Cisco Way  
San Jose, California 95134, USA

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

