

CCAMP
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: April 24, 2013

C. Margaria, Ed.
Nokia Siemens Networks
D. Schroetter
NUTS:iX GmbH
G. Martinelli
Cisco
S. Balls
B. Wright
Metaswitch
October 21, 2012

LSP Attribute in ERO
draft-margaria-ccamp-lsp-attribute-ero-02

Abstract

LSP attributes can be specified or recorded for whole path, but they cannot be targeted to a specific hop. This document proposes alternative ways to extend the semantic for RSVP ERO object to target LSP attributes to a specific hop.

Status of this Memo

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

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 24, 2013.

Copyright Notice

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

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

Internet-Draft

General ERO LSP parameters

October 2012

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.	Contributing Authors	3
1.2.	Requirements Language	3
2.	Requirements	4
3.	Solutions	5
3.1.	Non solution	5
3.2.	Extended ERO Object	5
3.2.1.	Semantic of the Extended ERO object	5
3.2.2.	Procedures	5
3.2.3.	Subobjects	6
3.2.4.	Processing	9
4.	IANA Considerations	11
5.	Security Considerations	12
6.	Acknowledgments	13
7.	References	14
7.1.	Normative References	14
7.2.	Informative References	14
	Authors' Addresses	15

Internet-Draft

General ERO LSP parameters

October 2012

1. Introduction

Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) Traffic Engineering (TE) Label Switched Paths (LSPs) can be route-constrained by making use of the Explicit Route (ERO) object and related sub-objects as defined in [[RFC3209](#)], [[RFC3473](#)], [[RFC3477](#)], [[RFC4873](#)], [[RFC4874](#)], [[RFC5520](#)] and [[RFC5553](#)]. This document proposes mechanisms to target LSP attributes at a specific hop. This document presents several solutions for discussion, final document will contains only one document after WG consensus.

1.1. Contributing Authors

1.2. Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

2. Requirements

The requirement is to provide a generic mechanism to carry information related to specific nodes when signaling an LSP. This document does not restrict what that information can be used for. LSP attribute defined [[RFC5420](#)] should be expressed in ERO and SERO objects.


```

|      Type      |      Length      | (Subobject contents) |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

```

The Type indicates the type of contents of the subobject. Currently defined values are:

- 1 Hop identifier subobject containing an ERO subobject:
 - IPv4 prefix
 - IPv6 prefix
 - Unnumbered Interface ID
 - Autonomous system number
 - Path Key with 32-bit PCE ID
 - Path Key with 128-bit PCE ID

Per-hop attributes:


XX LSP Attribute

Length The Length contains the total length of the subobject in bytes, including the Type and Length . The Length MUST be at least 4, and MUST be a multiple of 4.

3.2.3.1. Hop identifier

The Hop identifier subobject contains exactly one ERO subobject identifying a hop. The value of the subobject is a copy of the ERO

subobject definition. The format of the subobject is as follow:



+-----+

Type 0x01 Hop Identifier

Length The Length contains the total length of the subobject in bytes, including the Type and Length fields.


Sub type The ERO subobject type, the same as the ERO subobject type. the ERO type defined are :

- 1 IPv4 prefix
- 2 IPv6 prefix
- 3 Reserved
- 4 Unnumbered Interface ID
- 32 Autonomous system number
- 33 Reserved
- 37 Reserved
- 64 Path Key with 32-bit PCE ID
- 65 Path Key with 128-bit PCE ID

Sub length The ERO subobject type, the same as the ERO subobject length. It its unchanged compared to the ERO subobject definition.

Subobject contents The ERO subobject content, it its unchanged compared to the ERO subobject definition.

The LSP attribute subobject contains information targeted at the hop identified by the preceding hop identifier subobject.



The attributes TLV are encoded as defined in [\[RFC5420\] section 3](#).

Type x TBD by IANA.

Length The Length contains the total length of the subobject in bytes, including the Type and Length fields. The Length MUST be always divisible by 4.

Reserved Reserved, must be set to 0 when the subobject is inserted in the ERO, MUST NOT be changed when a node process the ERO and must be ignored on the node addressed by the preceding ERO subobjects

R This bit reflects the LSP_REQUIRED_ATTRIBUTE and LSP_ATTRIBUTE semantic. When set indicates required LSP attributes to be processed by the node, when cleared the LSP attributes are not required as described in [Section 3.2.3.3](#).

3.2.3.3. Processing

Following [\[RFC3209\]](#) and [\[RFC3473\]](#) the Extended ERO is managed as a list where each hop information starts with a subobject identifying an abstract node or link. The LSP attribute subobject must be appended after the hop identifier subobject (which follows the formatting of the objects defined in [\[RFC3209\]](#), [\[RFC3473\]](#), [\[RFC3477\]](#), [\[RFC4873\]](#), [\[RFC4874\]](#), [\[RFC5520\]](#) and [\[RFC5553\]](#). Several LSP attribute subobject MAY be present for each hop identification object.

When the R bit is set a node MUST examine the attribute TLV present in the subobject following the rules described in [\[RFC5420\] section 5.2](#). When the R bit is not set a node MUST examine the attribute TLV present in the subobject following the rules described in [\[RFC5420\]](#)

[section 4.2](#). If more than one ERO LSP attribute subobject having the R bit set is present, the first one MUST be processed and the others SHOULD be ignored. If more than one ERO LSP attribute subject having the R bit cleared is present for the same hop identification object, then the first one MUST be processed and the others SHOULD be ignored.

[3.2.4](#). Processing

A node receiving a Path message containing an EXTENDED_EXPLICIT_ROUTE object must determine if the extended hop information is applicable for this node. The node performs the following steps:

1. The node receiving the RSVP message MUST first evaluate if the ERO object is present. If the ERO object is not present it has received the message in error and SHOULD return a pathError message.
2. Second the node MUST read the first subobject. If the node is not part of the abstract node described by the first subobject, the processing stops.
3. If there is no second subobject this indicates the end of the extended ERO. The extended ERO SHOULD be removed from the Path message. A new extended ERO MAY be added to the Path message.
4. Next the node evaluates the second subobject.
 - A. If the subobject identified an abstract node and the node is also part of the abstract node, then the node deletes the first subobject and continue processing with step 3.
 - B. If the subobject identified an abstract node and the node is not part of the abstract node, then the extended ERO is invalid and the node SHOULD return a PathErr with error code "Routing Error" and error value "Bad EXTENDED_EXPLICIT_ROUTE object" with the EXTENDED_EXPLICIT_ROUTE object included, truncated (on the left) to the offending unrecognized subobject
 - C. If the subobject is an LSP Attribute subobject it processes it according to the rules for that subobject and removes it from the extended ERO. If the extended ERO does not contain further subject it SHOULD be removed from the Path message. A new extended ERO MAY be added to the Path message.

If a node finds a hop identification object which matches the local router handling of the subobject it will behave as described in

Margaria, et al.

Expires April 24, 2013

[Page 9]

Internet-Draft

General ERO LSP parameters

October 2012

[RFC3209] when an unrecognized ERO subobject is encountered. This node will return a PathErr with error code "Routing Error" and error value "Bad EXTENDED_EXPLICIT_ROUTE object" with the EXTENDED_EXPLICIT_ROUTE object included, truncated (on the left) to the offending unrecognized subobject.

[4.](#) IANA Considerations

TBD once a final approach has been chosen.

Margaria, et al.

Expires April 24, 2013

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

General ERO LSP parameters

October 2012

[5.](#) Security Considerations

None.

6. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thanks Lou Berger for his directions and Attila Takacs for inspiring this [\[I-D.kern-ccamp-rsvpte-hop-attributes\]](#).

7. References

7.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC3209] Awduche, D., Berger, L., Gan, D., Li, T., Srinivasan, V., and G. Swallow, "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 3209](#), December 2001.

- [RFC3473] Berger, L., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Resource Reservation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Extensions", [RFC 3473](#), January 2003.
- [RFC3477] Kompella, K. and Y. Rekhter, "Signalling Unnumbered Links in Resource Reservation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 3477](#), January 2003.
- [RFC4873] Berger, L., Bryskin, I., Papadimitriou, D., and A. Farrel, "GMPLS Segment Recovery", [RFC 4873](#), May 2007.
- [RFC4874] Lee, CY., Farrel, A., and S. De Cnodder, "Exclude Routes - Extension to Resource Reservation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 4874](#), April 2007.
- [RFC5420] Farrel, A., Papadimitriou, D., Vasseur, JP., and A. Ayyangarps, "Encoding of Attributes for MPLS LSP Establishment Using Resource Reservation Protocol Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 5420](#), February 2009.
- [RFC5520] Bradford, R., Vasseur, JP., and A. Farrel, "Preserving Topology Confidentiality in Inter-Domain Path Computation Using a Path-Key-Based Mechanism", [RFC 5520](#), April 2009.
- [RFC5553] Farrel, A., Bradford, R., and JP. Vasseur, "Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) Extensions for Path Key Support", [RFC 5553](#), May 2009.

[7.2.](#) Informative References

- [I-D.kern-ccamp-rsvpte-hop-attributes]
Kern, A. and A. Takacs, "Encoding of Attributes of LSP intermediate hops using RSVP-TE",
[draft-kern-ccamp-rsvpte-hop-attributes-00](#) (work in progress), October 2009.

Authors' Addresses

Cyril Margaria (editor)
Nokia Siemens Networks

St Martin Strasse 76
Munich, 81541
Germany

Phone: +49 89 5159 16934
Email: cyril.margaria@nsn.com

Dirk Schroetter
NUTS:iX GmbH
Langer Weg 88
Eschborn, 65185
DE

Phone: +49 6173 39198411
Email: dirk.schroetter@nutsix.de

Giovanni Martinelli
Cisco
via Philips 12
Monza 20900
IT

Phone: +39 039 209 2044
Email: giomarti@cisco.com

Steve Balls
Metaswitch
100 Church Street
Enfield EN2 6BQ
UJ

Phone: +44 208 366 1177
Email: steve.balls@metaswitch.com

Internet-Draft

General ERO LSP parameters

October 2012

Ben Wright
Metaswitch
100 Church Street
Enfield EN2 6BQ
UJ

Phone: +44 208 366 1177

Email: Ben.Wright@metaswitch.com

