

TEAS Working Group
Internet Draft
Intended status: Informational

Fabio Peruzzini
TIM
Jean-Francois Bouquier
Vodafone
Italo Busi
Huawei
Daniel King
Old Dog Consulting
Daniele Ceccarelli
Ericsson

Expires: July 2022

January 17, 2022

**Applicability of Abstraction and Control of Traffic Engineered
Networks (ACTN) to Packet Optical Integration (POI)**

[draft-ietf-teas-actn-poi-applicability-04](#)

Abstract

This document considers the applicability of Abstraction and Control of TE Networks (ACTN) architecture to Packet Optical Integration (POI) in the context of IP/MPLS and Optical internetworking. It identifies the YANG data models being defined by the IETF to support this deployment architecture and specific scenarios relevant for Service Providers.

Existing IETF protocols and data models are identified for each multi-layer (packet over optical) scenario with a specific focus on the MPI (Multi-Domain Service Coordinator to Provisioning Network Controllers Interface) in the ACTN architecture.

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), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at
<http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at
<http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 9, 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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
2.	Reference architecture and network scenario.....	4
2.1.	L2/L3VPN Service Request North Bound of MDSC.....	9
2.2.	Service and Network Orchestration.....	10
2.2.1.	Hard Isolation.....	13
2.2.2.	Shared Tunnel Selection.....	13
2.3.	IP/MPLS Domain Controller and NE Functions.....	14
2.4.	Optical Domain Controller and NE Functions.....	16
3.	Interface protocols and YANG data models for the MPIs.....	16
3.1.	RESTCONF protocol at the MPIs.....	16
3.2.	YANG data models at the MPIs.....	17
3.2.1.	Common YANG data models at the MPIs.....	17
3.2.2.	YANG models at the Optical MPIs.....	18
3.2.3.	YANG data models at the Packet MPIs.....	19
3.3.	PCEP.....	20
4.	Multi-layer and multi-domain services scenarios.....	21
4.1.	Scenario 1: inventory, service and network topology discovery.....	21
4.1.1.	Inter-domain link discovery.....	23
4.1.2.	Multi-layer IP link discovery.....	24
4.1.3.	Inventory discovery.....	24

4.1.4. SR-TE paths discovery.....	25
4.2. Establishment of L2VPN/L3VPN with TE requirements.....	25
4.2.1. Optical Path Computation.....	30
4.2.2. Multi-layer IP link Setup and Update.....	30
4.2.3. SR-TE Path Setup and Update.....	31
5. Security Considerations.....	31
6. Operational Considerations.....	32
7. IANA Considerations.....	32
8. References.....	32
8.1. Normative References.....	32
8.2. Informative References.....	34
Appendix A. Multi-layer and multi-domain resiliency.....	36
A.1. Maintenance Window.....	36
A.2. Router port failure.....	36
Acknowledgments.....	37
Contributors.....	37
Authors' Addresses.....	39

1. Introduction

The complete automation of the management and control of Service Providers transport networks (IP/MPLS, optical, and microwave transport networks) is vital for meeting emerging demand for high-bandwidth use cases, including 5G and fiber connectivity services. The Abstraction and Control of TE Networks (ACTN) architecture and interfaces facilitate the automation and operation of complex Optical and IP/MPLS networks through standard interfaces and data models. Thus allowing a wide range of transport connectivity services that can be requested by the upper layers fulfilling almost any kind of service level requirements from a network perspective (e.g. physical diversity, latency, bandwidth, topology, etc.)

Packet Optical Integration (POI) is an advanced use case of traffic engineering. In wide-area networks, a packet network based on the Internet Protocol (IP), and often Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS), is typically realized on top of an optical transport network that uses Dense Wavelength Division Multiplexing (DWDM)(and optionally an Optical Transport Network (OTN)layer).

In many existing network deployments, the packet and the optical networks are engineered and operated independently. As a result, there are technical differences between the technologies (e.g., routers compared to optical switches) and the corresponding network engineering and planning methods (e.g., inter-domain peering optimization in IP, versus dealing with physical impairments in DWDM, or very different time scales). In addition, customers needs

can be different between a packet and an optical network, and it is not uncommon to use different vendors in both domains. The operation of these complex packet and optical networks is often siloed, as these technology domains require specific skills sets.

The packet/optical network deployment and operation separation are inefficient for many reasons. Both capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operational expenditure (OPEX) could be significantly reduced by integrating the packet and the optical network. Multi-layer online topology insight can speed up troubleshooting (e.g., alarm correlation) and network operation (e.g., coordination of maintenance events), multi-layer offline topology inventory can improve service quality (e.g., detection of diversity constraint violations) and multi-layer traffic engineering can use the available network capacity more efficiently (e.g., coordination of restoration). In addition, provisioning workflows can be simplified or automated as needed across layers (e.g., to achieve bandwidth-on-demand or to perform maintenance events).

ACTN framework enables this complete multi-layer and multi-vendor integration of packet and optical networks through MDSC and packet and optical PNCs.

In this document, critical scenarios for POI are described from the packet service layer perspective and identify the required coordination between packet and optical layers to improve POI deployment and operation. Precise definitions of scenarios can help with achieving a common understanding across different disciplines. The focus of the scenarios are IP/MPLS networks operated as a client of optical DWDM networks. The scenarios are ordered by increasing the level of integration and complexity. For each multi-layer scenario, the document analyzes how to use the interfaces and data models of the ACTN architecture.

Understanding the level of standardization and the possible gaps will help assess the feasibility of integration between IP and Optical DWDM domain (and optionally OTN layer) in an end-to-end multi-vendor service provisioning perspective.

2. Reference architecture and network scenario

This document analyses several deployment scenarios for Packet and Optical Integration (POI) in which ACTN hierarchy is deployed to control a multi-layer and multi-domain network, with two Optical domains and two Packet domains, as shown in Figure 1:




Figure 1 - Reference Scenario

The ACTN architecture, defined in [RFC8453], is used to control this multi-domain network where each Packet PNC (P-PNC) is responsible for controlling its IP domain, which can be either an Autonomous System (AS), [RFC1930], or an IGP area within the same operator network. Each Optical PNC (O-PNC) in the above topology is responsible for controlling its Optical Domain.

The routers between IP domains can be either AS Boundary Routers (ASBR) or Area Border Router (ABR): in this document, the generic term Border Router (BR) is used to represent either an ASBR or a ABR.

The MDSC is responsible for coordinating the whole multi-domain multi-layer (Packet and Optical) network. A specific standard

interface (MPI) permits MDSC to interact with the different Provisioning Network Controller (O/P-PNCs).

The MPI interface presents an abstracted topology to MDSC hiding technology-specific aspects of the network and hiding topology details depending on the policy chosen regarding the level of abstraction supported. The level of abstraction can be obtained based on P-PNC and O-PNC configuration parameters (e.g. provide the potential connectivity between any PE and any BR in an MPLS-TE network).

In the network scenario of Figure 1, it is assumed that:

- o The domain boundaries between the IP and Optical domains are congruent. In other words, one Optical domain supports connectivity between Routers in one and only one Packet Domain;
- o Inter-domain links exist only between Packet domains (i.e., between BR routers) and between Packet and Optical domains (i.e., between routers and Optical NEs). In other words, there are no inter-domain links between Optical domains;
- o The interfaces between the Routers and the Optical NEs are "Ethernet" physical interfaces;
- o The interfaces between the Border Routers (BRs) are "Ethernet" physical interfaces.

This version of the document assumes that the IP link supported by the Optical network are always intra-AS (PE-BR, intra-domain BR-BR, PE-P, BR-P, or P-P) and that the BRs are co-located and connected by an IP link supported by an Ethernet physical link.

The possibility to setup inter-AS/inter-area IP links (e.g., inter-domain BR-BR or PE-PE), supported by optical network, is for further study.

Therefore, if inter-domain links between the Optical domains exist, they would be used to support multi-domain Optical services, which are outside the scope of this document.

The Optical NEs within the optical domains can be ROADMs or OTN switches, with or without a ROADM.

The MDSC in Figure 1 is responsible for multi-domain and multi-layer coordination across multiple Packet and Optical domains, as well as to provide L2/L3VPN services.

Although the new optical technologies (e.g. QSFP-DD ZR 400G) providing DWDM pluggable interfaces on the Routers, the deployment of those pluggable optics is not yet widely adopted by the operators. The reason is that most operators are not yet ready to manage Packet and Transport networks in a single unified domain. As a consequence, this draft is not addressing the unified scenario. Instead, the unified use case will be described in a different draft.

From an implementation perspective, the functions associated with MDSC and described in [[RFC8453](#)] may be grouped in different ways.

1. Both the service- and network-related functions are collapsed into a single, monolithic implementation, dealing with the end customer service requests received from the CMI (Customer MDSC Interface) and adapting the relevant network models. An example is represented in Figure 2 of [[RFC8453](#)]
2. An implementation can choose to split the service-related and the network-related functions into different functional entities, as described in [[RFC8309](#)] and in [section 4.2 of \[\[RFC8453\]\(#\)\]](#). In this case, MDSC is decomposed into a top-level Service Orchestrator, interfacing the customer via the CMI, and into a Network Orchestrator interfacing at the southbound with the PNCs. The interface between the Service Orchestrator and the Network Orchestrator is not specified in [[RFC8453](#)].
3. Another implementation can choose to split the MDSC functions between an "higher-level MDSC" (MDSC-H) responsible for packet-optical multi-layer coordination, interfacing with one Optical "lower-level MDSC" (MDSC-L), providing multi-domain coordination between the O-PNCs and one Packet MDSC-L, providing multi-domain coordination between the P-PNCs (see for example Figure 9 of [[RFC8453](#)]).
4. Another implementation can also choose to combine the MDSC and the P-PNC functions together.

Please note that in the current service provider's network deployments, at the North Bound of the MDSC, instead of a CNC, typically there is an OSS/Orchestration layer. In this case, the MDSC would implement only the Network Orchestration functions, as in [[RFC8309](#)] and described in point 2 above. In this case, the MDSC is dealing with the network services requests received from the OSS/Orchestration layer.

[Editors'note:] Check for a better term to define the network services. It may be worthwhile defining what are the customer and network services.

The OSS/Orchestration layer is a vital part of the architecture framework for a service provider:

- o to abstract (through MDSC and PNCs) the underlying transport network complexity to the Business Systems Support layer;
- o to coordinate NFV, Transport (e.g. IP, Optical and Microwave networks), Fixed Access, Core and Radio domains enabling full automation of end-to-end services to the end customers;
- o to enable catalogue-driven service provisioning from external applications (e.g. Customer Portal for Enterprise Business services), orchestrating the design and lifecycle management of these end-to-end transport connectivity services, consuming IP and/or Optical transport connectivity services upon request.

The functionality of the OSS/Orchestration layer and the interface toward the MDSC are usually operator-specific and outside the scope of this draft. For example, this document assumes that the OSS/Orchestrator requests MDSC to set up L2VPN/L3VPN services through mechanisms that are outside the scope of this document.

There are two prominent cases when MDSC coordination of underlying PNCs for POI networking is initiated:

- o Initiated by a request from the OSS/Orchestration layer to setup L2VPN/L3VPN services that requires multi-layer/multi-domain coordination;
- o Initiated by the MDSC itself to perform multi-layer/multi-domain optimizations and/or maintenance activities (e.g. rerouting LSPs with their associated services when putting a resource, like a fibre, in maintenance mode during a maintenance window). Unlike service fulfillment, these workflows are not related to a service provisioning request being received from the OSS/Orchestration layer.

The two aforementioned MDSC workflow cases are in the scope of this draft. The workflow initiation is transparent at the MPI.

2.1. L2/L3VPN Service Request North Bound of MDSC

As explained in [section 2](#), the OSS/Orchestration layer can request the MDSC to setup L2/L3VPN services (with or without TE requirements).

Although the OSS/Orchestration layer interface is usually operator-specific, typically it would be using a RESTCONF/YANG interface with a more abstracted version of the MPI YANG data models used for network configuration (e.g. L3NM, L2NM).

Figure 2 shows an example of possible control flow between the OSS/Orchestration layer and the MDSC to instantiate L2/L3VPN services, using the YANG models under the definition in [\[VN\]](#), [\[L2NM\]](#), [\[L3NM\]](#) and [\[TSM\]](#).




Figure 2 Service Request Process

- o The VN YANG model [\[VN\]](#), whose primary focus is the CMI, can also provide VN Service configuration from an orchestrated connectivity service point of view when the L2/L3VPN service has TE requirements. However, this model is not used to setup L2/L3VPN service with no TE requirements.

- o It provides the profile of VN in terms of VN members, each of which corresponds to an edge-to-edge link between customer end-points (VNAPs). It also provides the mappings between the VNAPs with the LTPs and the connectivity matrix with the VN member. The associated traffic matrix (e.g., bandwidth, latency, protection level, etc.) of VN member is expressed (i.e., via the TE-topology's connectivity matrix).
- o The model also provides VN-level preference information (e.g., VN member diversity) and VN-level admin-status and operational-status.
- o The L2NM YANG model [[L2NM](#)], whose primary focus is the MPI, can also be used to provide L2VPN service configuration and site information, from a orchestrated connectivity service point of view.
- o The L3NM YANG model [[L3NM](#)], whose primary focus is the MPI, can also be used to provide all L3VPN service configuration and site information, from a orchestrated connectivity service point of view.
- o The TE & Service Mapping YANG model [[TSM](#)] provides TE-service mapping as well as site mapping.
 - o TE-service mapping provides the mapping between a L2/L3VPN instance and the corresponding VN instances.
 - o The TE-service mapping also provides the service mapping requirement type as to how each L2/L3VPN/VN instance is created concerning the underlay TE tunnels (e.g., whether they require a new and isolated set of TE underlay tunnels or not). See [Section 2.2](#) for a detailed discussion on the mapping requirement types.
 - o Site mapping provides the site reference information across L2/L3VPN Site ID, VN Access Point ID, and the LTP of the access link.

[2.2. Service and Network Orchestration](#)

From a functional standpoint, MDSC represented in Figure 2 interfaces with the OSS/Orchestration layer and decoupled L2/L3VPN service configuration functions from network configuration functions. Therefore in this document, the MDSC performs the functions of the Network Orchestrator, as defined in [[RFC8309](#)].

One of the important MDSC functions is to identify which TE Tunnels should carry the L2/L3VPN traffic (e.g., from TE & Service Mapping configuration) and to relay this information to the P-PNCs, to ensure the PEs' forwarding tables (e.g., VRF) are properly populated, according to the TE binding requirement for the L2/L3VPN.

TE binding requirement types [[TSM](#)] are:

1. Hard Isolation with deterministic latency: The L2/L3VPN service requires a set of dedicated TE Tunnels providing deterministic latency performances and that cannot be not shared with other services, nor compete for bandwidth with other Tunnels.
2. Hard Isolation: This is similar to the above case without deterministic latency requirements.
3. Soft Isolation: The L2/L3VPN service requires a set of dedicated MPLS-TE tunnels that cannot be shared with other services, but which could compete for bandwidth with other Tunnels.
4. Sharing: The L2/L3VPN service allows sharing the MPLS-TE Tunnels supporting it with other services.

There could be additional TE binding requirements for the first three types with respect to different VN members of the same VN (on how different VN members, belonging to the same VN, can share or not network resources). For the first two cases, VN members can be hard-isolated, soft-isolated, or shared. For the third case, VN members can be soft-isolated or shared.

In order to fulfil the L2/L3VPN end-to-end TE requirements, including the TE binding requirements, the MDSC needs to perform multi-layer/multi-domain path computation to select the BRs, the intra-domain MPLS-TE Tunnels and the intra-domain Optical Tunnels.

Depending on the knowledge that MDSC has of the topology and configuration of the underlying network domains, three models for performing path computation are possible:

1. Summarization: MDSC has an abstracted TE topology view of all of the underlying domains, both packet and optical. MDSC does not have enough TE topology information to perform multi-layer/multi-domain path computation. Therefore MDSC delegates the P-PNCs and O-PNCs to perform a local path computation within their controlled domains and it uses the information returned by the P-PNCs and O-PNCs to compute the optimal multi-domain/multi-layer path. This model presents an issue to P-PNC, which does not have the capability of performing a single-domain/multi-layer path computation (that is, P-PNC does not have any possibility to retrieve the topology/configuration information from the Optical controller). A possible solution could be to include a CNC function in the P-PNC to request the MDSC multi-domain Optical path computation, as shown in Figure 10 of [\[RFC8453\]](#). Another possible solution could be to rely on the MDSC recursive hierarchy, as defined in [section 4.1 of \[RFC8453\]](#), where, for each IP and Optical domain pair, a "lower-level MDSC" (MDSC-L) provides the essential multi-layer correlation and the "higher-level MDSC" (MDSC-H) provides the multi-domain coordination. In this case, the MDSC-H can get an abstract view of the underlying multi-layer domain topologies from its underlying MDSC-L. Each MDSC-L gets the full view of the IP domain topology from P-PNC and can get an abstracted view of the optical domain topology from its underlying O-PNC. In other words, topology abstraction is possible at the MPIs between MDSC-L and O-PNC and between MDSC-L and MDSC-H.
2. Partial summarization: MDSC has full visibility of the TE topology of the packet network domains and an abstracted view of the TE topology of the optical network domains. MDSC then has only the capability of performing multi-domain/single-layer path computation for the packet layer (the path can be computed optimally for the two packet domains). Therefore MDSC still needs to delegate the O-PNCs to perform local path computation within their respective domains and it uses the information received by the O-PNCs, together with its TE topology view of the multi-domain packet layer, to perform multi-layer/multi-domain path computation. The role of P-PNC is minimized, i.e. is limited to management.

3. Full knowledge: MDSC has the complete and enough detailed view of the TE topology of all the network domains (both optical and packet). In such case MDSC has all the information needed to perform multi-domain/multi-layer path computation, without relying on PNCs.

This model may present, as a potential drawback, scalability issues and, as discussed in section 2.2. of [\[PATH-COMPUTE\]](#), performing path computation for optical networks in the MDSC is quite challenging because the optimal paths depend also on vendor-specific optical attributes (which may be different in the two domains if they are provided by different vendors).

The current version of this draft assumes that MDSC supports at least model #2 (Partial summarization).

[Note: check with operators for some references on real deployment]

2.2.1. Hard Isolation

For example, when "Hard Isolation with, or without, deterministic latency" TE binding requirement is applied for a L2/L3VPN, new Optical Tunnels need to be setup to support dedicated IP links between PEs and BRs.

The MDSC needs to identify the set of IP/MPLS domains and their BRs. This requires the MDSC to request each O-PNC to compute the intra-domain optical paths between each PEs/BRs pairs.

When requesting optical path computation to the O-PNC, the MDSC needs to take into account the inter-layer peering points, such as the interconnections between the PE/BR nodes and the edge Optical nodes (e.g., using the inter-layer link or the transitional link information, defined in [\[RFC8795\]](#)).

When the optimal multi-layer/multi-domain path has been computed, the MDSC requests each O-PNC to setup the selected Optical Tunnels and P-PNC to setup the intra-domain MPLS-TE Tunnels, over the selected Optical Tunnels. MDSC also properly configures its BGP speakers and PE/BR forwarding tables to ensure that the VPN traffic is properly forwarded.

2.2.2. Shared Tunnel Selection

In case of shared tunnel selection, the MDSC needs to check if there is a multi-domain path which can support the L2/L3VPN end-to-end TE

service requirements (e.g., bandwidth, latency, etc.) using existing intra-domain MPLS-TE tunnels.

If such a path is found, the MDSC selects the optimal path from the candidate pool and request each P-PNC to setup the L2/L3VPN service using the selected intra-domain MPLS-TE tunnel, between PE/BR nodes.

Otherwise, the MDSC should detect if the multi-domain path can be setup using existing intra-domain MPLS-TE tunnels with modifications (e.g., increasing the tunnel bandwidth) or setting up new intra-domain MPLS-TE tunnel(s).

The modification of an existing MPLS-TE Tunnel and the setup of a new MPLS-TE Tunnel may also require multi-layer coordination e.g., in case the available bandwidth of underlying Optical Tunnels is not sufficient. Based on multi-domain/multi-layer path computation, the MDSC can decide for example to modify the bandwidth of an existing Optical Tunnel (e.g., ODUflex bandwidth increase) or to setup new Optical Tunnels to be used as additional LAG members of an existing IP link or as new IP links to re-route the MPLS-TE Tunnel.

In all the cases, the labels used by the end-to-end tunnel are distributed in the PE and BR nodes by BGP. The MDSC is responsible to configure the BGP speakers in each P-PNC, if needed.

2.3. IP/MPLS Domain Controller and NE Functions

IP/MPLS networks are assumed to have multiple domains. Each domain, corresponding to either an IGP area or an Autonomous System (AS) within the same operator network, is controlled by an IP/MPLS domain controller (P-PNC).

Among the functions of the P-PNC, there are the setup or modification of the intra-domain MPLS-TE Tunnels, between PEs and BRs, and the configuration of the VPN services, such as the VRF in the PE nodes, as shown in Figure 3:




Figure 3 IP/MPLS Domain Controller & NE Functions

It is assumed that BGP is running in the inter-domain IP/MPLS networks for L2/L3VPN. The P-PNC controller is also responsible for configuring the BGP speakers within its control domain, if necessary.

The BGP would be responsible for the end-to-end tunnel label distribution on PE and BR nodes. The MDSC is responsible for selecting the BRs and the intra-domain MPLS-TE Tunnels between PE/BR nodes.

If new MPLS-TE Tunnels are needed or modifications (e.g., bandwidth increase) to existing MPLS-TE Tunnels are needed, as outlined in [section 2.2](#), the MDSC would request their setup or modifications to the P-PNCs (step 1 in Figure 3). Then the MDSC would request the P-PNC to configure the VPN, including selecting the intra-domain TE Tunnel (step 2 in Figure 3).

The P-PNC should configure, using mechanisms outside the scope of this document, the ingress PE forwarding table, e.g., the VRF, to forward the VPN traffic, received from the CE, with the following three labels:

- o VPN label: assigned by the egress PE and distributed by BGP;

- o end-to-end LSP label: assigned by the egress BR, selected by the MDSC, and distributed by BGP;
- o MPLS-TE tunnel label, assigned by the next hop P node of the tunnel selected by the MDSC and distributed by mechanism internal to the IP/MPLS domain (e.g., RSVP-TE).

2.4. Optical Domain Controller and NE Functions

The optical network provides the underlay connectivity services to IP/MPLS networks. The coordination of Packet/Optical multi-layer is done by the MDSC, as shown in Figure 1.

The O-PNC is responsible to:

- o provide to the MDSC an abstract TE topology view of its underlying optical network resources;
- o perform single-domain local path computation, when requested by the MDSC;
- o perform Optical Tunnel setup, when requested by the MDSC.

The mechanisms used by O-PNC to perform intra-domain topology discovery and path setup are usually vendor-specific and outside the scope of this document.

Depending on the type of optical network, TE topology abstraction, path computation and path setup can be single-layer (either OTN or WDM) or multi-layer OTN/WDM. In the latter case, the multi-layer coordination between the OTN and WDM layers is performed by the O-PNC.

3. Interface protocols and YANG data models for the MPIs

This section describes general assumptions applicable at all the MPI interfaces, between each PNC (Optical or Packet) and the MDSC, and all the scenarios discussed in this document.

3.1. RESTCONF protocol at the MPIs

The RESTCONF protocol, as defined in [RFC8040], using the JSON representation defined in [RFC7951], is assumed to be used at these interfaces. In addition, extensions to RESTCONF, as defined in [RFC8527], to be compliant with Network Management Datastore

Architecture (NMDA) defined in [[RFC8342](#)], are assumed to be used as well at these MPI interfaces and also at CMI interfaces.

3.2. YANG data models at the MPIs

The data models used on these interfaces are assumed to use the YANG 1.1 Data Modeling Language, as defined in [[RFC7950](#)].

3.2.1. Common YANG data models at the MPIs

As required in [[RFC8040](#)], the "ietf-yang-library" YANG module defined in [[RFC8525](#)] is used to allow the MDSC to discover the set of YANG modules supported by each PNC at its MPI.

Both Optical and Packet PNCs use the following common topology YANG models at the MPI to report their abstract topologies:

- o The Base Network Model, defined in the "ietf-network" YANG module of [[RFC8345](#)];
- o The Base Network Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-network-topology" YANG module of [[RFC8345](#)], which augments the Base Network Model;
- o The TE Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-te-topology" YANG module of [[RFC8795](#)], which augments the Base Network Topology Model with TE specific information.

These common YANG models are generic and augmented by technology-specific YANG modules as described in the following sections.

Both Optical and Packet PNCs must use the following common notifications YANG models at the MPI so that any network changes can be reported almost in real-time to MDSC by the PNCs:

- o Dynamic Subscription to YANG Events and Datastores over RESTCONF as defined in [[RFC8650](#)];
- o Subscription to YANG Notifications for Datastores updates as defined in [[RFC8641](#)].

PNCs and MDSCs must be compliant with subscription requirements as stated in [[RFC7923](#)].

3.2.2. YANG models at the Optical MPIs

The Optical PNC also uses at least the following technology-specific topology YANG models, providing WDM and Ethernet technology-specific augmentations of the generic TE Topology Model:

- o The WSON Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-wson-topology" YANG modules of [[RFC9094](#)], or the Flexi-grid Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-flexi-grid-topology" YANG module of [[Flexi-TOPO](#)];
- o Optionally, when the OTN layer is used, the OTN Topology Model, as defined in the "ietf-otn-topology" YANG module of [[OTN-TOPO](#)];
- o The Ethernet Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-eth-te-topology" YANG module of [[CLIENT-TOPO](#)];
- o Optionally, when the OTN layer is used, the network data model for L1 OTN services (e.g. an Ethernet transparent service) as defined in "ietf-trans-client-service" YANG module of [draft-ietf-ccamp-client-signal-yang](#) [[CLIENT-SIGNAL](#)];
- o The WSON Topology Model or, alternatively, the Flexi-grid Topology model is used to report the DWDM network topology (e.g., ROADMs and links) depending on whether the DWDM optical network is based on fixed grid or flexible-grid.

The Ethernet Topology is used to report the cross-layer links between the IP routers and the edge ROADMs.

The optical PNC uses at least the following YANG models:

- o The TE Tunnel Model, defined in the "ietf-te" YANG module of [[TE-TUNNEL](#)];
- o The WSON Tunnel Model, defined in the "ietf-wson-tunnel" YANG modules of [[WSON-TUNNEL](#)], or the Flexi-grid Media Channel Model, defined in the "ietf-flexi-grid-media-channel" YANG module of [[Flexi-TUNNEL](#)];
- o Optionally, when the OTN layer is used, the OTN Tunnel Model, defined in the "ietf-otn-tunnel" YANG module of [[OTN-TUNNEL](#)];
- o The Ethernet Client Signal Model, defined in the "ietf-eth-trans-service" YANG module of [[CLIENT-SIGNAL](#)].

The TE Tunnel model is generic and augmented by technology-specific models such as the WSON Tunnel Model and the Flexi-grid Media Channel Model.

The WSON Tunnel Model, or the Flexi-grid Media Channel Model, may be used to setup connectivity within the DWDM network depending on whether the DWDM optical network is based on fixed grid or flexible-grid.

The Ethernet Client Signal Model is used to configure the steering of the Ethernet client traffic between Ethernet access links and TE Tunnels, which in this case could be either WSON Tunnels or Flexi-Grid Media Channels. This model is generic and applies to any technology-specific TE Tunnel: technology-specific attributes are provided by the technology-specific models which augment the generic TE-Tunnel Model.

3.2.3. YANG data models at the Packet MPIs

The Packet PNC also uses at least the following technology-specific topology YANG models, providing IP and Ethernet technology-specific augmentations of the generic Topology Models described in [section 3.2.1](#):

- o The L3 Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-l3-unicast-topology" YANG module of [[RFC8346](#)], which augments the Base Network Topology Model;
- o The L3 specific data model including extended TE attributes (e.g. performance derived metrics like latency), defined in "ietf-l3-te-topology" and in "ietf-te-topology-packet" YANG modules of [[L3-TE-TOP0](#)];
- o When SR-TE is used, the SR Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-sr-mpls-topology" YANG module of [[SR-TE-TOP0](#)]: this YANG module is used together with other YANG modules to provide the SR-TE topology view as described in figure 2 of [[SR-TE-TOP0](#)];
- o The Ethernet Topology Model, defined in the "ietf-eth-te-topology" YANG module of [[CLIENT-TOP0](#)], which augments the TE Topology Model.

The Ethernet Topology Model is used to report the cross-layer links between the IP routers and the edge ROADMs as well as the inter-domain links between ASBRs, while the L3 Topology Model is used to report the IP network topology (e.g., IP routers and links).

- o The User Network Interface (UNI) Topology Model, being defined in the "ietf-uni-topology" module of the [draft-ogondio-opsawg-uni-topology](#) [UNI-TOPO] which augment "ietf-network" module defined in [RFC8345] adding service attachment points to the nodes to which L2VPN/L3VPN IP/MPLS services can be attached.
- o L3VPN network data model defined in "ietf-l3vpn-ntw" module of [draft-ietf-opsawg-l3sm-l3nm](#) [L3NM] used for non-ACTN MPI for L3VPN service provisioning
- o L2VPN network data model defined in "ietf-l2vpn-ntw" module of [draft-ietf-barguil-opsawg-l2sm-l2nm](#) [L2NM] used for non-ACTN MPI for L2VPN service provisioning

[Editor's note:] Add YANG models used for tunnel and service configuration.

3.3. PCEP

[RFC8637] examines the applicability of a Path Computation Element (PCE) [RFC5440] and PCE Communication Protocol (PCEP) to the ACTN framework. It further describes how the PCE architecture applies to ACTN and lists the PCEP extensions that are needed to use PCEP as an ACTN interface. The stateful PCE [RFC8231], PCE-Initiation [RFC8281], stateful Hierarchical PCE (H-PCE) [RFC8751], and PCE as a central controller (PCECC) [RFC8283] are some of the key extensions that enable the use of PCE/PCEP for ACTN.

Since the PCEP supports path computation in the packet and optical networks, PCEP is well suited for inter-layer path computation. [RFC5623] describes a framework for applying the PCE-based architecture to interlayer (G)MPLS traffic engineering. Furthermore, the [section 6.1 of \[RFC8751\]](#) states the H-PCE applicability for inter-layer or POI.

[RFC8637] lists various PCEP extensions that apply to ACTN. It also list the PCEP extension for optical network and POI.

Note that the PCEP can be used in conjunction with the YANG models described in the rest of this document. Depending on whether ACTN is deployed in a greenfield or brownfield, two options are possible:

1. The MDSC uses a single RESTCONF/YANG interface towards each PNC to discover all the TE information and request TE tunnels. It may either perform full multi-layer path computation or delegate path computation to the underneath PNCs.

This approach is desirable for operators from an multi-vendor integration perspective as it is simple, and we need only one type of interface (RESTCONF) and use the relevant YANG data models depending on the operator use case considered. Benefits of having only one protocol for the MPI between MDSC and PNC have been already highlighted in [[PATH-COMPUTE](#)].

2. The MDSC uses the RESTCONF/YANG interface towards each PNC to discover all the TE information and requests the creation of TE tunnels. However, it uses PCEP for hierarchical path computation.

As mentioned in Option 1, from an operator perspective, this option can add integration complexity to have two protocols instead of one, unless the RESTCONF/YANG interface is added to an existing PCEP deployment (brownfield scenario).

[Section 4](#) of this draft analyses the case where a single RESTCONF/YANG interface is deployed at the MPI (i.e., option 1 above).

4. Multi-layer and multi-domain services scenarios

Multi-layer and multi-domain scenarios, based on reference network described in [section 2](#), and very relevant for Service Providers, are described in the next sections. For each scenario, existing IETF protocols and data models are identified with particular focus on the MPI in the ACTN architecture. Non-ACTN IETF data models required for L2/L3VPN service provisioning between MDSC and packet PNCs are also identified.

[4.1](#). Scenario 1: inventory, service and network topology discovery

In this scenario, the MDSC needs to discover through the underlying PNCs, the network topology, at both WDM and IP layers, in terms of nodes and links, including inter-AS domain links as well as cross-layer links but also in terms of tunnels (MPLS or SR paths in IP layer and OCh and optionally ODUK tunnels in optical layer).

In addition, the MDSC should discover the IP/MPLS transport services (L2VPN/L3VPN) deployed, both intra-domain and inter-domain wise.

The O-PNC and P-PNC could discover and report the inventory information of their equipment that is used by the different management layers. In the context of POI, the inventory information of IP and WDM equipment can complement the topology views and facilitate the IP-Optical multi-layer view.

The MDSC could also discover the whole inventory information of both IP and WDM equipment and correlate this information with the links reported in the network topology.

Each PNC provides to the MDSC an abstracted or full topology view of the WDM or the IP topology of the domain it controls. This topology can be abstracted in the sense that some detailed NE information is hidden at the MPI. All or some of the NEs and related physical links are exposed as abstract nodes and logical (virtual) links, depending on the level of abstraction the user requires. This information is key to understanding both the inter-AS domain links (seen by each controller as UNI interfaces but as I-NNI interfaces by the MDSC) and the cross-layer mapping between IP and WDM layer.

The MDSC should also maintain up-to-date inventory, service and network topology databases of both IP and WDM layers (and optionally OTN layer) through the use of IETF notifications through MPI with the PNCs when any inventory/topology/service change occurs.

It should be possible also to correlate information coming from IP and WDM layers (e.g., which port, lambda/OTSi, and direction, is used by a specific IP service on the WDM equipment).

In particular, for the cross-layer links, it is key for MDSC to automatically correlate the information from the PNC network databases about the physical ports from the routers (single link or bundle links for LAG) to client ports in the ROADMs.

It should be possible at MDSC level to easily correlate WDM and IP layers alarms to speed-up troubleshooting

Alarms and event notifications are required between MDSC and PNCs so that any network changes are reported almost in real-time to the MDSC (e.g. NE or link failure, MPLS tunnel switched from primary to back-up path etc.). As specified in [\[RFC7923\]](#), MDSC must subscribe to specific objects from PNC YANG datastores for notifications.

4.1.1. Inter-domain link discovery

In the reference network of Figure 1, there are two types of inter-domain links:

- o Inter-domain links between two IP domains (ASes)
- o Cross-layer links between an IP router and a ROADM

Both types of links are Ethernet physical links.

The inter-domain link information is reported to the MDSC by the two adjacent PNCs, controlling the two ends of the inter-domain link. The MDSC needs to understand how to merge these inter-domain Ethernet links together.

This document considers the following two options for discovering inter-domain links:

1. Static configuration
2. LLDP [IEEE 802.1AB] automatic discovery

Other options are possible but not described in this document.

The MDSC can understand how to merge these inter-domain links using the plug-id attribute defined in the TE Topology Model [[RFC8795](#)], as described in [section 4.3 of \[RFC8795\]](#).

A more detailed description of how the plug-id can be used to discover inter-domain links is also provided in section 5.1.4 of [[TNBI](#)].

Both types of inter-domain links are discovered using the plug-id attributes reported in the Ethernet Topologies exposed by the two adjacent PNCs. In addition, the MDSC can also discover an inter-domain IP link/adjacency between the two IP LTPs, reported in the IP Topologies exposed by the two adjacent P-PNCs, supported by the two ETH LTPs of an Ethernet link discovered between these two P-PNCs.

The static configuration requires an administrative burden to configure network-wide unique identifiers: it is therefore more viable for inter-AS links. For the cross-layer links between the IP routers and the Optical NEs, the automatic discovery solution based

on LLDP snooping is preferable when LLDP snooping is supported by the Optical NEs.

As outlined in [\[TNBI\]](#), the encoding of the plug-id namespace and the LLDP information within the plug-id value is implementation specific and needs to be consistent across all the PNCs.

[4.1.2. Multi-layer IP link discovery](#)

All the intra-domain IP links are discovered by P-PNC, using LLDP [\[IEEE 802.1AB\]](#) or any other mechanisms which are outside the scope of this document, and reported at the MPI within the L3 Topology.

In case of a multi-layer IP link, the P-PNC also reports the two inter-domain ETH LTPs that supports the two IP LTPs terminating the multi-layer IP link.

The MDSC can therefore discover which Ethernet access link supports the multi-layer IP link as described in [section 4.1.1](#).

The Optical Transponders, or the OTN access cards, are reported by the O-PNC as Trail Termination Points (TTPs), defined in [\[RFC8795\]](#), within the Optical Topology. The association between the Ethernet access link and the Optical TTP is reported using the Inter Layer Lock (ILL) identifiers, defined in [\[RFC8795\]](#), within the Ethernet Topology and Optical Topology, exposed by the O-PNC.

The MDSC can discover through the MPI the Optical Tunnels being setup by each O-PNC and in particular which Optical Tunnel has been setup between the two TTPs associated with the two Ethernet access links supporting an inter-domain IP link.

[4.1.3. Inventory discovery](#)

There are no YANG data models in IETF that could be used to report at the MPI the whole inventory information discovered by a PNC.

[\[RFC8345\]](#) has foreseen some work for inventory as an augmentation of the network model, but no YANG data model has been developed so far.

There are also no YANG data models in IETF that could be used to correlate topology information, e.g., a link termination point (LTP), with inventory information, e.g., the physical port supporting an LTP, if any.

Inventory information through MPI and correlation with topology information is identified as a gap requiring further work and outside of the scope of this draft.

4.1.4. SR-TE paths discovery

This version of the draft assumes that discovery of existing SR-TE paths, including their bandwidth, at the MPI is done using the generic TE tunnel YANG data model, defined in [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#), with SR-TE specific augmentations, as also outlined in section 1 of [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#).

To enable MDSC to discover the full end-to-end SR-TE path configuration, the SR-TE specific augmentation of the [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#) should allow the P-PNC to report the SID list assigned to an SR-TE path within its domain.

[Editors' note:] Need to check if SR-TE specific augmentation is required for SR-TE path discovery

For example, considering the L3VPN in Figure 4, the PE13-P16-PE14 SR-TE path and the SR-TE path in the reverse direction (between PE14 and PE13) could be reported by the P-PNC1 to the MDSC as TE paths of the same TE tunnel instance. The bandwidth of these TE paths represents the bandwidth allocated by P-PNC1 to the two SR-TE paths, which can be symmetric or asymmetric in the two directions.

4.2. Establishment of L2VPN/L3VPN with TE requirements

In this scenario the MDSC needs to setup a multi-domain L2VPN or a L3VPN with some SLA requirements.

Figure 4 provides an example of an hub&spoke L3VPN with three PEs where the hub PE (PE13) and one spoke PE (PE14) are within the same packet domain and the other spoke PE (PE23) is within a different packet domain.




Figure 4 Multi-domain L3VPN example

[Editors' note:] Update the SR policy paths to show the intra-domain PE13-P16-P14 and inter-domain PE13-BR11-BR12-P24-PE23 paths. No need to show the TI-LFA in this figure. Remove also the intra-domain TI-LFA.

There are many options to implement multi-domain L3VPN, including:

1. BGP-LU (seamless MPLS)
2. Inter-domain RSVP-TE
3. Inter-domain SR-TE

This version of the draft provides an analysis of the inter-domain SR-TE option. A future update of this draft will provide a high-level analysis of the BGP-LU option.

It is assumed that each packet domain in Figure 4 is implementing SR-TE and the stitching between two domains is done using end-to-end/multi-domain SR-TE. It is assumed that the bandwidth of each intra-domain SR-TE path is managed by its respective P-PNC and that binding SID is used for the end-to-end SR-TE path stitching. It is assumed that each packet domain in Figure 4 is using TI-LFA, with SRLG awareness, for local protection within each domain.

[Editor's note:] Analyze how TI-LFA can take into account multi-layer SRLG disjointness, providing that SRLG information is provided by the O-PNCs to the P-PNC through the MDSC.

It is assumed that the MDSC adopts the partial summarization model, described in [section 2.2](#), having full visibility of the packet layer TE topology and an abstract view of the underlay optical layer TE topology.

The MDSC needs to translate the L3VPN SLA requirements to TE requirements (e.g., bandwidth, TE metric bounds, SRLG disjointness, nodes/links/domains inclusion/exclusion) and find the SR-TE paths between PE13 (hub PE) and, respectively, PE23 and PE14 (spoke PEs) that meet these TE requirements.

For each SR-TE path required to support the L3VPN, it is possible that:

1. A SR-TE path that meets the TE requirements already exist in the network.
2. An existing SR-TE path could be modified (e.g., through bandwidth increase) to meet the TE requirements:
 - a. The SR-TE path characteristics can be modified only in the packet layer.

- b. One or more new underlay Optical tunnels need to be setup to support the requested changes of the overlay SR-TE paths (multi-layer coordination is required).
- 3. A new SR-TE path needs to be setup:
 - a. The new SR-TE path reuses existing underlay optical tunnels;
 - b. One or more new underlay Optical tunnels need to be setup to support the setup of the new SR-TE path (multi-layer coordination is required).

For example, considering the L3VPN in Figure 4, the MDSC discovers that:

- o a PE13-P16-PE14 SR-TE path already exists but have not enough bandwidth to support the new L3VPN, as described in [section 4.1.4](#);
- o the IP link(s) between P16 and PE14 has not enough bandwidth to support increasing the bandwidth of that SR-TE path, as described in [section 4.1](#);
- o a new underlay optical tunnel could be setup to increase the bandwidth IP link(s) between P16 and PE14 to support increasing the bandwidth of that overlay SR-TE path, as described in [section 4.2.1](#). The dimensioning of the underlay optical tunnel is decided by the MDSC based on the bandwidth requested by the SR-TE path and on its multi-layer optimization policy, which is an internal MDSC implementation issue.

The MDSC would therefore request:

- o the O-PNC1 to setup a new optical tunnel between the ROADMs connected to P16 and PE14, as described in [section 4.2.2](#);
- o the P-PNC1 to update the configuration of the existing IP link, in case of LAG, or configure a new IP link, in case of ECMP, between P16 and PE14, as described in [section 4.2.2](#);
- o the P-PNC1 to update the bandwidth of the selected SR-TE path between PE13 and PE14, as described in [section 4.2.3](#).

For example, considering the L3VPN in Figure 4, the MDSC can also decide that a new multi-domain SR-TE path needs to be setup between PE13 and PE23.

As described in [section 2.2](#), with partial summarization, the MDSC will use the TE topology information provided by the P-PNCs and the results of the path computation requests sent to the O-PNCs, as described in [section 4.2.1](#), to compute the multi-layer/multi-domain path between PE13 and PE23.

For example, the multi-layer/multi-domain performed by the MDSC could require the setup of:

- o a new underlay optical tunnel between PE13 and BR11, supporting a new IP link, as described in [section 4.2.2](#);
- o a new underlay optical tunnel between BR21 and P24 to increase the bandwidth of the IP link(s) between BR21 and P24, as described in [section 4.2.2](#).

After that, the MDSC requests P-PNC2 to setup an SR-TE path between BR21 and PE23, with an explicit path (BR21, P24, PE23) as described in [section 4.2.3](#). The P-PNC2, knowing the node and the adjacency SIDs assigned within its domain, can install the proper SR policy, or hierarchical policies, within BR21 and returns to the MDSC the assigned binding SID.

[Editor's Note] Further investigation is needed for the SR specific extensions to the TE tunnel model.

MDSC request P-PNC1 to setup an SR-TE path between PE13 and BR11, with an explicit path (PE13, BR11), specifying the inter-domain link toward BR21 and the binding SID to be used for the end-to-end SR-TE path stitching, as described in [section 4.2.3](#). The P-PNC1, knowing also the node and the adjacency SIDs assigned within its domain and the EPE SID assigned by BR11 to the inter-domain link toward BR21, installs the proper policy, or policies, within PE13.

Once the SR-TE paths have been selected and, if needed, setup/modified, the MDSC can request to both P-PNCs to configure the L3VPN and its binding with the selected SR-TE paths using the [\[L3NM\]](#) and [\[TSM\]](#) YANG models.

[Editor's Note] Further investigation is needed to understand how the binding between a L3VPN and this new end-to-end SR-TE path can be configured.

4.2.1. Optical Path Computation

As described in [section 2.2](#), the optical path computation is usually performed by the Optical PNC.

When performing multi-layer/multi-domain path computation, the MDSC can delegate the Optical PNCs for single-domain optical path computation.

As discussed in [[PATH-COMPUTE](#)], there are two options to request an Optical PNC to perform optical path computation: either via a "compute-only" TE tunnel path, using the generic TE tunnel YANG data model defined in [[TE-TUNNEL](#)] or via the path computation RPC defined in [[PATH-COMPUTE](#)].

This draft assumes that the path computation RPC is used.

There are no YANG data models in IETF that could be used to augment the generic path computation RPC with technology-specific attributes.

Optical technology-specific augmentation for the path computation RPC is identified as a gap requiring further work outside of this draft's scope.

4.2.2. Multi-layer IP link Setup and Update

The MDSC requires the O-PNC to setup an Optical Tunnel (either a WSON Tunnel or a Flexi-grid Tunnel or an OTN Tunnel) within the Optical network between the two Optical Transponders (OTs), in case of DWDM network, or the two OTN access cards, in case of OTN networks, associated with the two access links.

The MDSC also requires the O-PNC to steer the Ethernet client traffic between the two access Ethernet links over the Optical Tunnel.

After the Optical Tunnel has been setup and the client traffic steering configured, the two IP routers can exchange Ethernet packets between themselves, including LLDP messages.

If LLDP [IEEE 802.1AB] is used between the two routers, the P-PNC can automatically discover the IP link being set up by the MDSC. The IP LTPs terminating this IP link are supported by the ETH LTPs terminating the two access links.

Otherwise, the MDSC needs to require the P-PNC to configure an IP link between the two routers: the MDSC also configures the two ETH LTPs which support the two IP LTPs terminating this IP link.

[Editor's Note] Add text for IP link update and clarify that the IP link bandwidth increase can be done either by LAG or by ECMP. Both options are valid and widely deployed and more or less the same from POI perspective.

4.2.3. SR-TE Path Setup and Update

This version of the draft assumes that SR-TE path setup and update at the MPI could be done using the generic TE tunnel YANG data model, defined in [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#), with SR TE specific augmentations, as also outlined in section 1 of [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#).

The MDSC can use the [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#) model to request the P-PNC to setup TE paths specifying the explicit path to force the P-PNC to setup the actual path being computed by MDSC.

The [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#) model supports requesting the setup of both end-to-end as well as segment TE paths (within one domain).

In the latter case, SR-TE specific augmentations of the [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#) model should be defined to allow the MDSC to configure the binding SIDs to be used for the end to-end SR-TE path stitching and to allow the P-PNC to report the binding SID assigned to the segment TE paths.

The assigned binding SID should be persistent in case router or P-PNC rebooting.

The MDSC can also use the [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#) model to request the P-PNC to increase the bandwidth allocated to an existing TE path, and, if needed, also on its reverse TE path. The [\[TE-TUNNEL\]](#) model supports both symmetric and asymmetric bandwidth configuration in the two directions.

SR-TE path setup and update (e.g., bandwidth increase) through MPI is identified as a gap requiring further work, which is outside of the scope of this draft.

5. Security Considerations

Several security considerations have been identified and will be discussed in future versions of this document.

6. Operational Considerations

Telemetry data, such as collecting lower-layer networking health and consideration of network and service performance from POI domain controllers, may be required. These requirements and capabilities will be discussed in future versions of this document.

7. IANA Considerations

This document requires no IANA actions.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

- [RFC7923] Voit, E. et al., "Requirements for Subscription to YANG Datastores", [RFC 7923](#), June 2016.
- [RFC7950] Bjorklund, M. et al., "The YANG 1.1 Data Modeling Language", [RFC 7950](#), August 2016.
- [RFC7951] Lhotka, L., "JSON Encoding of Data Modeled with YANG", [RFC 7951](#), August 2016.
- [RFC8040] Bierman, A. et al., "RESTCONF Protocol", [RFC 8040](#), January 2017.
- [RFC8342] Bjorklund, M. et al., "Network Management Datastore Architecture (NMDA)", [RFC 8342](#), March 2018.
- [RFC8345] Clemm, A., Medved, J. et al., "A Yang Data Model for Network Topologies", [RFC8345](#), March 2018.
- [RFC8346] Clemm, A. et al., "A YANG Data Model for Layer 3 Topologies", [RFC8346](#), March 2018.
- [RFC8453] Ceccarelli, D., Lee, Y. et al., "Framework for Abstraction and Control of TE Networks (ACTN)", [RFC8453](#), August 2018.
- [RFC8525] Bierman, A. et al., "YANG Library", [RFC 8525](#), March 2019.
- [RFC8527] Bjorklund, M. et al., "RESTCONF Extensions to Support the Network Management Datastore Architecture", [RFC 8527](#), March 2019.

- [RFC8641] Clemm, A. and E. Voit, "Subscription to YANG Notifications for Datastore Updates", [RFC 8641](#), September 2019.
- [RFC8650] Voit, E. et al., "Dynamic Subscription to YANG Events and Datastores over RESTCONF", [RFC 8650](#), November 2019.
- [RFC8795] Liu, X. et al., "YANG Data Model for Traffic Engineering (TE) Topologies", [RFC 8795](#), August 2020.
- [RFC9094] Zheng H., Lee, Y. et al., "A YANG Data Model for Wavelength Switched Optical Networks (WSONs)", [RFC 9094](#), August 2021.
- [IEEE 802.1AB] IEEE 802.1AB-2016, "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks - Station and Media Access Control Connectivity Discovery", March 2016.
- [Flexi-TOP0] Lopez de Vergara, J. E. et al., "YANG data model for Flexi-Grid Optical Networks", [draft-ietf-ccamp-flexigrid-yang](#), work in progress.
- [OTN-TOP0] Zheng, H. et al., "A YANG Data Model for Optical Transport Network Topology", [draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-topo-yang](#), work in progress.
- [CLIENT-TOP0] Zheng, H. et al., "A YANG Data Model for Client-layer Topology", [draft-zheng-ccamp-client-topo-yang](#), work in progress.
- [L3-TE-TOP0] Liu, X. et al., "YANG Data Model for Layer 3 TE Topologies", [draft-ietf-teas-yang-l3-te-topo](#), work in progress.
- [SR-TE-TOP0] Liu, X. et al., "YANG Data Model for SR and SR TE Topologies on MPLS Data Plane", [draft-ietf-teas-yang-sr-te-topo](#), work in progress.
- [TE-TUNNEL] Saad, T. et al., "A YANG Data Model for Traffic Engineering Tunnels and Interfaces", [draft-ietf-teas-yang-te](#), work in progress.
- [WSON-TUNNEL] Lee, Y. et al., "A Yang Data Model for WSON Tunnel", [draft-ietf-ccamp-wson-tunnel-model](#), work in progress.

- [Flexi-TUNNEL] Lopez de Vergara, J. E. et al., "A YANG Data Model for Flexi-Grid Tunnels", [draft-ietf-ccamp-flexigrid-tunnel-yang](#), work in progress.
- [OTN-TUNNEL] Zheng, H. et al., "OTN Tunnel YANG Model", [draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-tunnel-model](#), work in progress.
- [PATH-COMPUTE] Busi, I., Belotti, S. et al., "Yang model for requesting Path Computation", [draft-ietf-teas-yang-path-computation](#), work in progress.
- [CLIENT-SIGNAL] Zheng, H. et al., "A YANG Data Model for Transport Network Client Signals", [draft-ietf-ccamp-client-signal-yang](#), work in progress.

8.2. Informative References

- [RFC1930] J. Hawkinson, T. Bates, "Guideline for creation, selection, and registration of an Autonomous System (AS)", [RFC 1930](#), March 1996.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP. et al., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), March 2009.
- [RFC5623] Oki, E. et al., "Framework for PCE-Based Inter-Layer MPLS and GMPLS Traffic Engineering", [RFC 5623](#), September 2009.
- [RFC8231] Crabbe, E. et al., "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for Stateful PCE", [RFC 8231](#), September 2017.
- [RFC8281] Crabbe, E. et al., "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for PCE-Initiated LSP Setup in a Stateful PCE Model", [RFC 8281](#), December 2017.
- [RFC8283] Farrel, A. et al., "An Architecture for Use of PCE and the PCE Communication Protocol (PCEP) in a Network with Central Control", [RFC 8283](#), December 2017.
- [RFC8309] Q. Wu, W. Liu, and A. Farrel, "Service Model Explained", [RFC 8309](#), January 2018.
- [RFC8637] Dhody, D. et al., "Applicability of the Path Computation Element (PCE) to the Abstraction and Control of TE Networks (ACTN)", [RFC 8637](#), July 2019.

- [RFC8751] Dhody, D. et al., "Hierarchical Stateful Path Computation Element (PCE)", [RFC 8751](#), March 2020.
- [L2NM] S. Barguil, et al., "A Layer 2 VPN Network YANG Model", [draft-ietf-opsawg-l2nm](#), work in progress.
- [L3NM] S. Barguil, et al., "A Layer 3 VPN Network YANG Model", [draft-ietf-opsawg-l3sm-l3nm](#), work in progress.
- [TSM] Y. Lee, et al., "Traffic Engineering and Service Mapping Yang Model", [draft-ietf-teas-te-service-mapping-yang](#), work in progress.
- [TNBI] Busi, I., Daniel, K. et al., "Transport Northbound Interface Applicability Statement", [draft-ietf-ccamp-transport-nbi-app-statement](#), work in progress.
- [VN] Y. Lee, et al., "A Yang Data Model for ACTN VN Operation", [draft-ietf-teas-actn-vn-yang](#), work in progress.
- [UNI-TOPO] Gonzalez de Dios O., et al., "A Network YANG Model for Service Attachment Points", [draft-dbwb-opsawg-sap](#), work in progress.

Appendix A. Multi-layer and multi-domain resiliency

A.1. Maintenance Window

Before planned maintenance operation on DWDM network takes place, IP traffic should be moved hitless to another link.

MDSC must reroute IP traffic before the events takes place. It should be possible to lock IP traffic to the protection route until the maintenance event is finished, unless a fault occurs on such path.

A.2. Router port failure

The focus is on client-side protection scheme between IP router and reconfigurable ROADM. Scenario here is to define only one port in the routers and in the ROADM muxponder board at both ends as back-up ports to recover any other port failure on client-side of the ROADM (either on router port side or on muxponder side or on the link between them). When client-side port failure occurs, alarms are raised to MDSC by IP-PNC and O-PNC (port status down, LOS etc.). MDSC checks with OP-PNC(s) that there is no optical failure in the optical layer.

There can be two cases here:

- a) LAG was defined between the two end routers. MDSC, after checking that optical layer is fine between the two end ROADMs, triggers the ROADM configuration so that the router back-up port with its associated muxponder port can reuse the OCh that was already in use previously by the failed router port and adds the new link to the LAG on the failure side.

While the ROADM reconfiguration takes place, IP/MPLS traffic is using the reduced bandwidth of the IP link bundle, discarding lower priority traffic if required. Once back-up port has been reconfigured to reuse the existing OCh and new link has been added to the LAG then original Bandwidth is recovered between the end routers.

Note: in this LAG scenario let assume that BFD is running at LAG level so that there is nothing triggered at MPLS level when one of the link member of the LAG fails.

- b) If there is no LAG then the scenario is not clear since a router port failure would automatically trigger (through BFD failure) first a sub-50ms protection at MPLS level :FRR (MPLS RSVP-TE case) or TI-LFA (MPLS based SR-TE case) through a protection port. At the same time MDSC, after checking that optical network connection is still fine, would trigger the reconfiguration of the back-up port of the router and of the ROADM muxponder to re-use the same OCh as the one used originally for the failed router port. Once everything has been correctly configured, MDSC Global PCE could suggest to the operator to trigger a possible re-optimization of the back-up MPLS path to go back to the MPLS primary path through the back-up port of the router and the original OCh if overall cost, latency etc. is improved. However, in this scenario, there is a need for protection port PLUS back-up port in the router which does not lead to clear port savings.

Acknowledgments

This document was prepared using 2-Word-v2.0.template.dot.

Some of this analysis work was supported in part by the European Commission funded H2020-ICT-2016-2 METRO-HAUL project (G.A. 761727).

Contributors

Sergio Belotti
Nokia

Email: sergio.belotti@nokia.com

Gabriele Galimberti
Cisco

Email: ggalimbe@cisco.com

Zheng Yanlei
China Unicom

Email: zhengyanlei@chinaunicom.cn

Anton Snitser
Sedona

Email: antons@sedonasys.com

Washington Costa Pereira Correia
TIM Brasil

Email: wcorreia@timbrasil.com.br

Michael Scharf
Hochschule Esslingen - University of Applied Sciences

Email: michael.scharf@hs-esslingen.de

Young Lee
Sung Kyun Kwan University

Email: younglee.tx@gmail.com

Jeff Tantsura
Apstra

Email: jefftant.ietf@gmail.com

Paolo Volpato
Huawei

Email: paolo.volpato@huawei.com

Brent Foster
Cisco

Email: brfoster@cisco.com

Authors' Addresses

Fabio Peruzzini
TIM

Email: fabio.peruzzini@telecomitalia.it

Jean-Francois Bouquier
Vodafone

Email: jeff.bouquier@vodafone.com

Italo Busi
Huawei

Email: Italo.busi@huawei.com

Daniel King
Old Dog Consulting

Email: daniel@olddog.co.uk

Daniele Ceccarelli
Ericsson

Email: daniele.ceccarelli@ericsson.com