Network Working Group
Internet Draft
Updates (if published): RFC5586
Intended status: Standards Track

Han Li
China Mobile

Luca Martini
Cisco System

Jia He
Huawei

Feng Huang
Alcatel-Lucent

Expires: November 2011

May 11, 2011

Using the Generic Associated Channel Label for Pseudowire in MPLS-TP
draft-ietf-pwe3-mpls-tp-gal-in-pw-01.txt

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Abstract

This document describes the requirements for using the Generic Associated Channel Label (GAL) in Pseudowires (PWs) in MPLS-TP networks, and provides an update to the description of GAL usage in [RFC5586] by removing the restriction that is imposed on using GAL for PWs especially in MPLS-TP environments.

.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

[RFC5586] generalizes the associated control channel mechanism of [RFC5085] to be used for Sections, Label Switched Paths (LSPs), and Pseudowires (PWs) in MPLS networks. [RFC5085] defines the Associated Channel Header (ACH), and [RFC5586] generalizes this for use in the Generic Associated Channel (G-ACh).

[RFC5586] defines a generalized label-based exception mechanism using the Generic Associated Channel Label (GAL) to work together with the ACH for use with LSPs but places restrictions on GAL usage with PWs.

This document removes the restriction imposed by [RFC5586].

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 [RFC 2119].

2.1. Terminology

ACH	Associated Channel Header
CW	Control Word
G-ACh	Generic Associated Channel
GAL	G-ACh Label
MPLS-TP	MPLS Transport Profile
OAM	Operation, Administration, and Maintenance

3. GAL Usage for MPLS-TP PW

According to the MPLS-TP requirement document [RFC5654], it is necessary that MPLS-TP mechanisms and capabilities be able to interoperate with the existing IETF MPLS [RFC3031] and IETF PWE3 [RFC3985] architectures appropriate. [RFC5586] differentiates between the usage of the GAL with PWs in MPLS and MPLS-TP environments in section 4.2 as follows:

> In MPLS-TP, the GAL MUST be used with packets on a G-ACh on LSPs, Concatenated Segments of LSPs, and with Sections, and MUST NOT be used with PWs.

This indicates that the GAL can be used for MPLS-TP LSPs and Sections, but not for PWs using an MPLS-TP PSN.

However, there is no restriction imposed on the usage of the GAL in MPLS PWs, which is described immediately afterwards in the same section of [RFC5586] (Section 4.2):

> However, in other MPLS environments, this document places no restrictions on where the GAL may appear within the label stack or its use with PWs.

The inconsistency between the usage of the GAL with MPLS PWs and MPLS-TP PWs may cause unnecessary implementation differences and is in disagreement with the MPLS-TP requirements.

Therefore, this document specifies that the GAL can be used with packets on a G-ACh on LSPs, Concatenated Segments of LSPs, Sections, and PWs in both MPLS and MPLS-TP environments without discrimination.

[RFC5586] is updated by removing the restrictions on using GAL for PW as follows:

- Section 1 (Introduction) in [RFC5586], the original text:

  > The GAL mechanism is defined to work together with the ACH for LSPs and MPLS Sections.

  is replaced by:

  > The GAL mechanism is defined to work together with the ACH for LSPs and MPLS Sections, and for PWs.

- Section 4.2. (GAL Applicability and Usage) in [RFC5586], the original text:

  > In MPLS-TP, the GAL MUST be used with packets on a G-ACh on LSPs, Concatenated Segments of LSPs, and with Sections, and MUST NOT be used with PWs. It MUST always be at the bottom of the label stack (i.e., S bit set to 1). However, in other MPLS environments, this document places no restrictions on where the GAL may appear within the label stack or its use with PWs.

  is replaced by:

  > In MPLS-TP, the GAL MUST be used with packets on a G-ACh on LSPs, Concatenated Segments of LSPs, and with Sections, and MAY be used with PWs. It MUST always be at the bottom of the label stack (i.e., S bit set to 1). However, in other MPLS environments, this document places no restrictions on where the GAL may appear within the label stack.

4. Security Considerations

No further security considerations than [RFC5586].

5. IANA Considerations

There are no IANA actions required.

6. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Luyuan Fang, Adrian Farrel, Haiyan Zhang, Guanghui Sun, Italo Busi, Matthew Bocci for their contributions to this work.

The authors would also like to thank the authors of [RFC5586] and people who were involved in the development of [RFC5586].

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997

[RFC3031] Rosen, E., Viswanathan, A., and R. Callon, "Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture", RFC 3031, January 2001.

[RFC3985] Bryant, S. and P. Pate, "Pseudo Wire Emulation Edge-to-Edge (PWE3) Architecture", RFC 3985, March 2005.

[RFC5586] Bocci, M., Vigoureux, M., and S. Bryant, "MPLS Generic Associated Channel", RFC5586, June 2009

7.2. Informative References

[RFC5085] Nadeau, T. and C. Pignataro, "Pseudowire Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV): A Control Channel for Pseudowires", RFC 5085, December 2007.

[RFC5654] Niven-Jenkins, B., Brungard, D., Betts, M., Sprecher, N., and S. Ueno, "Requirements of an MPLS Transport Profile", RFC 5654, September 2009.

8. Authors' Addresses

Han Li
China Mobile Communications Corporation
Email: lihan@chinamobile.com

Luca Martini
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Email: lmartini@cisco.com

Jia He
Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.
Email: hejia@huawei.com

Feng Huang
Alcatel-Lucent shanghai Bell
Email: feng.f.huang@alcatel-sbell.com.cn

Intellectual Property

those that are translated into other languages, should not be considered to be definitive versions of these Legal Provisions.

For the avoidance of doubt, each Contributor to the IETF Standards Process licenses each Contribution that he or she makes as part of the IETF Standards Process to the IETF Trust pursuant to the provisions of RFC 5378. No language to the contrary, or terms, conditions or rights that differ from or are inconsistent with the rights and licenses granted under RFC 5378, shall have any effect and shall be null and void, whether published or posted by such Contributor, or included with or in such Contribution.

Disclaimer of Validity

All IETF Documents and the information contained therein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION THEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Copyright Notice