

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 3, 2018

H. Chen
Huawei Technologies
A. Liu
Ciena
T. Saad
Cisco Systems
F. Xu
Verizon
L. Huang
China Mobile
March 2, 2018

Extensions to RSVP-TE for LSP Egress Local Protection
draft-ietf-teas-rsvp-egress-protection-14.txt

Abstract

This document describes extensions to Resource Reservation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) for locally protecting the egress node(s) of a Point-to-Point (P2P) or Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) Traffic Engineered (TE) Label Switched Path (LSP).

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). 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 September 3, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of

publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Egress Local Protection	3
2.	Conventions Used in This Document	4
3.	Terminologies	4
4.	Protocol Extensions	5
4.1.	Extensions to SERO	5
4.1.1.	Primary Egress Subobject	7
4.1.2.	P2P LSP ID Subobject	8
5.	Egress Protection Behaviors	9
5.1.	Ingress Behavior	9
5.2.	Primary Egress Behavior	10
5.3.	Backup Egress Behavior	10
5.4.	Transit Node and PLR Behavior	10
5.4.1.	Signaling for One-to-One Protection	11
5.4.2.	Signaling for Facility Protection	12
5.4.3.	Signaling for S2L Sub LSP Protection	13
5.4.4.	PLR Procedures during Local Repair	13
6.	Considering Application Traffic	14
6.1.	A Typical Application	14
6.2.	PLR Procedure for Applications	16
6.3.	Egress Procedures for Applications	16
7.	Security Considerations	16
8.	IANA Considerations	17
9.	Co-authors and Contributors	17
10.	Acknowledgement	18
11.	References	19
11.1.	Normative References	19
11.2.	Informative References	19
	Authors' Addresses	20

1. Introduction

[RFC 4090](#) describes two methods for locally protecting the transit nodes of a P2P LSP: one-to-one and facility protection. [RFC 4875](#) specifies how these methods can be used to protect the transit nodes of a P2MP LSP. These documents do not discuss the procedures for locally protecting the egress node(s) of an LSP.

This document fills that void and specifies extensions to RSVP-TE for local protection of the egress node(s) of an LSP.

1.1. Egress Local Protection

Figure 1 shows an example of using backup LSPs to locally protect egresses L1 and L2 of a primary P2MP LSP from ingress R1 to two egresses L1 and L2. La and Lb are the designated backup egresses for primary egresses L1 and L2 respectively. The backup LSP for protecting L1 is from its upstream node R3 to backup egress La and the backup LSP for protecting L2 is from R5 to Lb.




Figure 1: Backup LSP for Locally Protecting Egress

During normal operations, the traffic carried by the P2MP LSP is sent through R3 to L1, which delivers the traffic to its destination CE1. When R3 detects the failure of L1, R3 switches the traffic to the backup LSP to backup egress La, which delivers the traffic to CE1. The time for switching the traffic is within tens of milliseconds.

The exact mechanism by which the failure of the primary egress is detected by the upstream node is out of the scope of this document.

In the beginning, the primary P2MP LSP from ingress R1 to primary egresses L1 and L2 is configured. It may be used to transport the traffic from source S connected to R1 to destinations CE1 and CE2 connected to L1 and L2 respectively.

When we want to protect the primary egresses L1 and L2, we may configure on the ingress R1 a backup egress for L1, another backup egress for L2 and other options. After the configuration, the ingress sends a Path message for the LSP with the information such as SEROs (refer to [section 4.1](#)) containing the backup egresses for protecting the primary egresses.

After receiving the Path message with the information, the upstream node of a primary egress sets up a backup LSP to the corresponding backup egress for protecting the primary egress.

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](#).

3. Terminologies

The following terminologies are used in this document.

LSP: Label Switched Path

TE: Traffic Engineering

P2MP: Point-to-MultiPoint

P2P: Point-to-Point

LSR: Label Switching Router

RSVP: Resource ReSerVation Protocol

S2L: Source-to-Leaf

SERO: Secondary Explicit Route Object

RR0: Record Route Object

BFD: Bidirectional Forwarding Detection

VPN: Virtual Private Network

L3VPN: Layer 3 VPN

VRF: Virtual Routing and Forwarding

LFIB: Label Forwarding Information Base

UA: Upstream Assigned

PLR: Point of Local Repair

BGP: Border Gateway Protocol

CE: Customer Edge

PE: Provider Edge

4. Protocol Extensions

4.1. Extensions to SERO

The Secondary Explicit Route object (SERO) is defined in [RFC 4873](#). The format of the SERO is re-used.

The SERO used for protecting a primary egress node of a primary LSP may be added into the Path messages for the LSP and sent from the ingress node of the LSP to the upstream node of the egress node. It contains three subobjects.

The first subobject (refer to [RFC 4873](#)) indicates the branch node that is to originate the backup LSP (to a backup egress node). The branch node is the direct upstream node of the primary egress node of the primary LSP if it can provide fast local protection for the primary egress node. The branch node can be a (upstream) node on the primary LSP, but not the direct upstream node if the direct upstream node does not provide any fast local protection against the failure of the primary egress node. In this case, the backup LSP from the branch node to the backup egress node protects against failures on the segment of the primary LSP from the branch node to the primary egress node, including the primary egress node.

After the upstream node of the primary egress node as the branch node receives the SERO and determines a backup egress node for the primary egress, it computes a path from itself to the backup egress node and sets up a backup LSP along the path for protecting the primary egress node according to the information in the FAST_REROUTE object in the Path message. For example, if facility protection is desired, facility protection is provided for the primary egress node.

The upstream node constructs a new SERO based on the SERO received and adds the new SERO into the Path message for the backup LSP. The new SERO also contains three subobjects as the SERO for the primary LSP. The first subobject in the new SERO indicates the upstream node, which may be copied from the first subobject in the SERO received. The second subobject in the new SERO includes a primary egress, which indicates the address of the primary egress node. The third one contains the backup egress.

The upstream node updates the SERO in the Path message for the primary LSP. The egress protection subobject in the SERO contains a subobject called a P2P LSP ID subobject, which contains the information for identifying the backup LSP. The final subobject in the SERO indicates the address of the backup egress node.

4.1.1.1. Primary Egress Subobject

There are two primary egress subobjects. One is IPv4 primary egress subobject and the other is IPv6 primary egress subobject.

The Type of an IPv4 primary egress subobject is 1, and the body of the subobject is given below:

```

      0                               1                               2                               3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                               IPv4 address (4 bytes)                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

o IPv4 address: IPv4 address of the primary egress node

The Type of an IPv6 primary egress subobject is 2, and the body of the subobject is shown below:

[illegible]

- o IPv6 address: The IPv6 address of the primary egress node

4.1.2. P2P LSP ID Subobject

A P2P LSP ID subobject contains the information for identifying a backup point-to-point (P2P) LSP tunnel.

4.1.2.1. IPv4 P2P LSP ID Subobject

The Type of an IPv4 P2P LSP ID subobject is 3, and the body of the subobject is shown below:

[illegible]

- o P2P LSP Tunnel Egress IPv4 Address:
 - IPv4 address of the egress of the tunnel
- o Tunnel ID (ref to [RFC 4875](#) and [RFC 3209](#)):
 - A 16-bit identifier being constant over the life of the tunnel occupies the least significant 16 bits of the 32 bit word.
- o Extended Tunnel ID (ref to [RFC 4875](#) and [RFC 3209](#)):
 - A 4-byte identifier being constant over the life of the tunnel

4.1.2.2. IPv6 P2P LSP ID Subobject

The Type of an IPV6 P2P LSP ID subobject is 4, and the body of the subobject is illustrated below:


```

      0               1               2               3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
~      P2P LSP Tunnel Egress IPv6 Address (16 bytes)      ~
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
|      Reserved (MUST be zero)      |      Tunnel ID      |
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
~      Extended Tunnel ID (16 bytes)      ~
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+

```

- o P2P LSP Tunnel Egress IPv6 Address:
IPv6 address of the egress of the tunnel
- o Tunnel ID (ref to [RFC 4875](#) and [RFC 3209](#)):
A 16-bit identifier being constant over the life of the tunnel occupies the least significant 16 bits of the 32 bit word.
- o Extended Tunnel ID (ref to [RFC 4875](#) and [RFC 3209](#)):
A 16-byte identifier being constant over the life of the tunnel

5. Egress Protection Behaviors

5.1. Ingress Behavior

To protect a primary egress of an LSP, the ingress MUST set the "label recording desired" flag and the "node protection desired" flag in the SESSION_ATTRIBUTE object.

If one-to-one backup or facility backup is desired to protect a primary egress of an LSP, the ingress MUST include a FAST_REROUTE object and set the "One-to-One Backup Desired" or "Facility Backup Desired" flag respectively.

If S2L Sub LSP backup is desired to protect a primary egress of a P2MP LSP, the ingress MUST set the "S2L Sub LSP Backup Desired" flag in an SERO object.

A backup egress MUST be configured on the ingress of an LSP to protect a primary egress of the LSP if and only if the backup egress is not configured on the primary egress (refer to [section 5.2](#)).

The ingress MUST send a Path message for the LSP with the objects above and the SEROs for protecting egresses of the LSP if protection of the egresses is desired. For each primary egress of the LSP to be protected, the ingress MUST add an SERO object into the Path message if the backup egress or some options are given. If the backup egress is given, then the final subobject in the SERO contains it; otherwise the address in the final subobject is zero.

5.2. Primary Egress Behavior

To protect a primary egress of an LSP, a backup egress **MUST** be configured on the primary egress of the LSP to protect the primary egress if and only if the backup egress is not configured on the ingress of the LSP (refer to [section 5.1](#)).

If the backup egress is configured on the primary egress of the LSP, the primary egress **MUST** send its upstream node a Resv message for the LSP with an SERO for protecting the primary egress. It sets the flags in the SERO in the same way as an ingress.

If the LSP carries the service traffic with a service label, the primary egress sends its corresponding backup egress the information about the service label as a UA label and the related forwarding.

5.3. Backup Egress Behavior

When a backup egress node receives a Path message for an LSP, it determines whether the LSP is used for egress local protection through checking the SERO with egress protection subobject in the message. If there is an egress protection subobject in the Path message for the LSP and the Egress local protection flag in the object is set to one, the LSP is the backup LSP for egress local protection. The primary egress to be protected is in the primary egress subobject in the SERO.

When the backup egress receives the information about a UA label and its related forwarding from the primary egress, it uses the backup LSP label as a context label and creates a forwarding entry using the information about the UA label and the related forwarding. This forwarding entry is in a forwarding table for the primary egress node.

When the primary egress node fails, its upstream node switches the traffic from the primary LSP to the backup LSP to the backup egress node, which delivers the traffic to its receiver such as CE using the backup LSP label as a context label to get the forwarding table for the primary egress node and the service label as UA label to find the forwarding entry in the table to forward the traffic to the receiver.

5.4. Transit Node and PLR Behavior

If a transit node of an LSP receives the Path message with the SEROs and it is not an upstream node of any primary egress of the LSP as a branch node, it **MUST** forward them unchanged.

If the transit node is the upstream node of a primary egress to be

protected as a branch node, it determines the backup egress, obtains a path for the backup LSP and sets up the backup LSP along the path. If the upstream node receives the Resv message with an SERO object, it MUST send its upstream node the Resv message without the object.

The PLR (upstream node of the primary egress as the branch node) MUST extract the backup egress from the respective SERO object in either a Path or a Resv message. If no matching SERO object is found, the PLR tries to find the backup egress, which is not the primary egress but has the same IP address as the destination IP address of the LSP.

Note that if a backup egress is not configured explicitly for protecting a primary egress, the primary egress and the backup egress SHOULD have a same local address configured, and the cost to the local address on the backup egress SHOULD be much bigger than the cost to the local address on the primary egress. Thus primary egress and backup egress is considered as a virtual node. Note that the backup egress is different from this local address (e.g., from the primary egress' view). In other words, it is identified by an address different from this local address.

After obtaining the backup egress, the PLR computes a backup path from itself to the backup egress and sets up a backup LSP along the path. It excludes the segment including the primary egress to be protected when computing the path. The PLR sends the primary egress a Path message with an SERO for the primary LSP, which indicates the backup egress by the final subobject in the SERO. The PLR puts an SERO into the Path messages for the backup LSP, which indicates the primary egress.

The PLR MUST provide one-to-one backup protection for the primary egress if the "One-to-One Backup Desired" flag is set in the message; otherwise, it MUST provide facility backup protection if the "Facility Backup Desired flag" is set.

The PLR MUST set the protection flags in the RRO Sub-object for the primary egress in the Resv message according to the status of the primary egress and the backup LSP protecting the primary egress. For example, it sets the "local protection available" and the "node protection" flag indicating that the primary egress is protected when the backup LSP is up and ready for protecting the primary egress.

5.4.1. Signaling for One-to-One Protection

The behavior of the upstream node of a primary egress of an LSP as a PLR is the same as that of a PLR for one-to-one backup described in [RFC 4090](#) except for that the upstream node as a PLR creates a backup LSP from itself to a backup egress in a session different from the

primary LSP.

If the LSP is a P2MP LSP and a primary egress of the LSP is also a transit node (i.e., bud node), the upstream node of the primary egress as a PLR creates a backup LSP from itself to each of the next hops of the primary egress.

When the PLR detects the failure of the primary egress, it switches the packets from the primary LSP to the backup LSP to the backup egress. For the failure of the bud node of a P2MP LSP, the PLR also switches the packets to the backup LSPs to the bud node's next hops, where the packets are merged into the primary LSP.

5.4.2. Signaling for Facility Protection

Except for backup LSP and downstream label, the behavior of the upstream node of the primary egress of a primary LSP as a PLR follows the PLR behavior for facility backup described in [RFC 4090](#).

For a number of primary P2P LSPs going through the same PLR to the same primary egress, the primary egress of these LSPs MAY be protected by one backup LSP from the PLR to the backup egress designated for protecting the primary egress.

The PLR selects or creates a backup LSP from itself to the backup egress. If there is a backup LSP that satisfies the constraints given in the Path message, then this one is selected; otherwise, a new backup LSP to the backup egress is created.

After getting the backup LSP, the PLR associates the backup LSP with a primary LSP for protecting its primary egress. The PLR records that the backup LSP is used to protect the primary LSP against its primary egress failure and MUST include an SERO object in the Path message for the primary LSP. The object MUST contain the backup LSP ID. It indicates that the primary egress MUST send the backup egress the service label as UA label and the information about forwarding the traffic to its destination using the label if there is a service carried by the LSP and the primary LSP label as UA label if the label is not implicit null. How UA label is sent is out of scope for this document.

When the PLR detects the failure of the primary egress, it redirects the packets from the primary LSP into the backup LSP to backup egress and keeps the primary LSP label from the primary egress in the label stack if the label is not implicit null. The backup egress delivers the packets to the same destinations as the primary egress using the backup LSP label as context label and the labels under as UA labels.

5.4.3. Signaling for S2L Sub LSP Protection

The S2L Sub LSP Protection uses a S2L Sub LSP (ref to [RFC 4875](#)) as a backup LSP to protect a primary egress of a P2MP LSP. The PLR MUST determine to protect a primary egress of a P2MP LSP via S2L sub LSP protection when it receives a Path message with flag "S2L Sub LSP Backup Desired" set.

The PLR MUST set up the backup S2L sub LSP to the backup egress, create and maintain its state in the same way as of setting up a source to leaf (S2L) sub LSP defined in [RFC 4875](#) from the signaling's point of view. It computes a path for the backup LSP from itself to the backup egress, constructs and sends a Path message along the path, receives and processes a Resv message responding to the Path message.

After receiving the Resv message for the backup LSP, the PLR creates a forwarding entry with an inactive state or flag called inactive forwarding entry. This inactive forwarding entry is not used to forward any data traffic during normal operations.

When the PLR detects the failure of the primary egress, it changes the forwarding entry for the backup LSP to active. Thus, the PLR forwards the traffic to the backup egress through the backup LSP, which sends the traffic to its destination.

5.4.4. PLR Procedures during Local Repair

When the upstream node of a primary egress of an LSP as a PLR detects the failure of the primary egress, it follows the procedures defined in [section 6.5 of RFC 4090](#). It SHOULD notify the ingress about the failure of the primary egress in the same way as a PLR notifies the ingress about the failure of a transit node.

Moreover, the PLR MUST let the upstream part of the primary LSP stay alive after the primary egress fails through sending Resv message to its upstream node along the primary LSP. The downstream part of the primary LSP from the PLR to the primary egress SHOULD be removed.

When a bypass LSP from the PLR to a backup egress protects the primary egress, the PLR MUST NOT send any Path message for the primary LSP through the bypass LSP to the backup egress.

In the local revertive mode, the PLR will re-signal each of the primary LSPs that were routed over the restored resource once it detects that the resource is restored. Every primary LSP successfully re-signaled along the restored resource will be switched back.

Note that the procedure for protecting the primary egress is triggered on the PLR if the primary egress failure is determined. If link (from PLR to primary egress) failure and primary egress alive are determined, then link protection procedure is triggered on the PLR. How to determine these is out of scope for this document.

6. Considering Application Traffic

This section focuses on the application traffic carried by P2P LSPs.

6.1. A Typical Application

L3VPN is a typical application. Figure 2 below shows a simple VPN, which consists of two CEs CE1 and CE2 connected to two PEs R1 and L1 respectively. There is a P2P LSP from R1 to L1, which is represented by stars (****). This LSP is called primary LSP. R1 is the ingress of the LSP and L1 is the (primary) egress of the LSP. R1 sends the VPN traffic received from CE1 through the P2P LSP to L1, which delivers the traffic to CE2. R1 sends the VPN traffic with a LSP label and a VPN label via the LSP. When the traffic reaches the egress L1 of the LSP, L1 pops the LSP label and uses the VPN label to deliver the traffic to CE2.

To protect the VPN traffic against the failure of the egress L1 of the LSP, an existing solution (refer to Figure 2) includes:

1. A multi-hop BFD session between ingress R1 and egress L1 of primary LSP. The BFD session is represented by dots (...).
2. A backup LSP from ingress R1 to backup egress La, which is indicated by ands (&&&).
3. La sends R1 a VPN backup label and related information via BGP.
4. R1 has a VRF with two sets of routes for CE2: one set uses the primary LSP and L1 as next hop; the other uses the backup LSP and La as next hop.




Figure 2: Protect Egress for L3VPN Traffic

In normal operations, R1 sends the VPN traffic from CE1 through the primary LSP with the VPN label received from L1 as inner label to L1, which delivers the traffic to CE2 using the VPN label.

When R1 detects the failure of L1, R1 sends the traffic from CE1 via the backup LSP with the VPN backup label received from La as inner label to La, which delivers the traffic to CE2 using the VPN backup label.

A new solution (refer to Figure 3) with egress local protection for protecting L3VPN traffic includes:

1. A BFD session between R3 (i.e., upstream of L1) and egress L1 of the primary LSP. This is different from the BFD session in Figure 2, which is multi-hop between ingress R1 and egress L1. The PLR R3 is closer to L1 than the ingress R1. It may detect the failure of the egress L1 faster and more reliable. Thus we can have faster protection for egress.
2. A backup LSP from R3 to backup egress La. This is different from the backup LSP in Figure 2, which is an end to end LSP from ingress R1 to backup egress La.
3. Primary egress L1 sends backup egress La the VPN label as UA label and related information. The backup egress La uses the backup LSP label as a context label and creates a forwarding entry using the VPN label in a LFIB for the primary egress L1.
4. L1 and La is virtualized as one node (or address). R1 has a VRF with one set of routes for CE2, using the primary LSP from R1 to L1 and virtualized node as next hop. This can be achieved by configuring a same local address on L1 and La, using the address as a destination of the LSP and BGP next hop for the VPN traffic. The cost to L1 is configured to be less than the cost to La.




Figure 3: Locally Protect Egress for L3VPN Traffic

In normal operations, R1 sends the VPN traffic from CE1 via the primary LSP with the VPN label as inner label to L1, which delivers the traffic to CE2 using the VPN label.

When the primary egress L1 fails, its upstream node R3 detects it and switches the VPN traffic from the primary LSP to the backup LSP to La, which delivers the traffic to CE2 using the backup LSP label as a context label to get the LFIB for L1 and the VPN label as UA label to find the forwarding entry in the LFIB to forward the traffic to CE2.

6.2. PLR Procedure for Applications

When the PLR gets a backup LSP from itself to a backup egress for protecting a primary egress of a primary LSP, it includes an SERO object in the Path message for the primary LSP. The object contains the ID information of the backup LSP and indicates that the primary egress sends the backup egress the application traffic label (e.g., the VPN label) as UA label when needed.

6.3. Egress Procedures for Applications

When a primary egress of an LSP sends the ingress of the LSP a label for an application such as a VPN label, it sends the backup egress for protecting the primary egress the label as a UA label. Exactly how the label is sent is out of scope for this document.

When the backup egress receives a UA label from the primary egress, it adds a forwarding entry with the label into the LFIB for the primary egress. When the backup egress receives a packet from the backup LSP, it uses the top label as a context label to find the LFIB for the primary egress and the inner label to deliver the packet to the same destination as the primary egress according to the LFIB.

7. Security Considerations

This document builds upon existing work, so in particular the

security considerations of RFCs 4090, 4875, 3209 and 2205 continue to apply. Additionally, protecting a primary egress of a P2P LSP carrying service traffic through a backup egress requires an out-of-band communication between the primary egress and the backup egress, in order for the primary egress to convey a service label as UA label and its related forwarding information to the backup egress. It is important to confirm that the identifiers used to identify the primary and backup egress nodes in the LSP are verified to match with the identifiers used in the out-of-band protocol (such as BGP).

8. IANA Considerations

IANA maintains a registry called "Class Names, Class Numbers, and Class Types" under "Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) Parameters". IANA is to assign a new C-Type under PROTECTION object class, Class Number 37:

Value	Description	Definition
-----	-----	-----
3	Egress Protection	Section 4.1.1

IANA is to create and maintain a new registry under PROTECTION object class (Class Number 37) and Egress Protection (C-Type 3). Initial values for the registry are given below. The future assignments are to be made through IETF Review ([RFC 8216](#)).

Value	Name	Definition
-----	----	-----
0	Reserved	
1	IPv4_PRIMARY_EGRESS	Section 4.1.1
2	IPv6_PRIMARY_EGRESS	Section 4.1.1
3	IPv4_P2P_LSP_ID	Section 4.1.2
4	IPv6_P2P_LSP_ID	Section 4.1.2
5-127	Unassigned	
128-255	Reserved	

9. Co-authors and Contributors

1. Co-authors

Ning So
Tata
E-mail: ningso01@gmail.com

Mehmet Toy
Verizon
E-mail: mehmet.toy@verizon.com

Lei Liu
Fujitsu
E-mail: lliu@us.fujitsu.com

Zhenbin Li
Huawei Technologies
Email: lizhenbin@huawei.com

2. Contributors

Boris Zhang
Telus Communications
Email: Boris.Zhang@telus.com

Nan Meng
Huawei Technologies
Email: mengnan@huawei.com

Prejeeth Kaladharan
Huawei Technologies
Email: prejeeth@gmail.com

Vic Liu
China Mobile
Email: liu.cmri@gmail.com

[10.](#) Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Richard Li, Nobo Akiya, Lou Berger, Jeffrey Zhang, Lizhong Jin, Ravi Torvi, Eric Gray, Olufemi Komolafe, Michael Yue, Daniel King, Rob Rennison, Neil Harrison, Kannan Sampath, Yimin Shen, Ronhazli Adam and Quintin Zhao for their valuable comments and suggestions on this draft.

[11.](#) References

11.1. Normative References

- [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, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3209>>.
- [RFC4090] Pan, P., Ed., Swallow, G., Ed., and A. Atlas, Ed., "Fast Reroute Extensions to RSVP-TE for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 4090](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4090, May 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4090>>.
- [RFC4875] Aggarwal, R., Ed., Papadimitriou, D., Ed., and S. Yasukawa, Ed., "Extensions to Resource Reservation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) for Point-to-Multipoint TE Label Switched Paths (LSPs)", [RFC 4875](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4875, May 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4875>>.
- [RFC4873] Berger, L., Bryskin, I., Papadimitriou, D., and A. Farrel, "GMPLS Segment Recovery", [RFC 4873](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4873, May 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4873>>.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

11.2. Informative References

- [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, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2205>>.
- [RFC5331] Aggarwal, R., Rekhter, Y., and E. Rosen, "MPLS Upstream Label Assignment and Context-Specific Label Space", [RFC 5331](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5331, August 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5331>>.
- [RFC4872] Lang, J., Ed., Rekhter, Y., Ed., and D. Papadimitriou, Ed., "RSVP-TE Extensions in Support of End-to-End Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Recovery", [RFC 4872](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4872, May 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4872>>.
- [RFC3473] Berger, L., Ed., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Resource ReserVation Protocol-

Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Extensions", [RFC 3473](#),
DOI 10.17487/RFC3473, January 2003,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3473>>.

[FRAMEWK] Shen, Y., Jeyanthan, M., Decraene, B., and H. Gredler,
"MPLS Egress Protection Framework",
[draft-shen-mpls-egress-protection-framework](#) ,
October 2016.

Authors' Addresses

Huaimo Chen
Huawei Technologies
Boston, MA
USA

Email: huaimo.chen@huawei.com

Autumn Liu
Ciena
USA

Email: hliu@ciena.com

Tarek Saad
Cisco Systems

Email: tsaad@cisco.com

Fengman Xu
Verizon
2400 N. Glenville Dr
Richardson, TX 75082
USA

Email: fengman.xu@verizon.com

Lu Huang
China Mobile
No.32 Xuanwumen West Street, Xicheng District
Beijing, 100053
China

Email: huanglu@chinamobile.com