

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: April 27, 2020

A. Stone
M. Aissaoui
Nokia
October 25, 2019

Path Protection Enforcement in PCEP
draft-stone-pce-path-protection-enforcement-00

Abstract

This document aims to clarify existing usage of the local protection desired bit signalled in Path Computation Element Protocol (PCEP). This document also introduces a new flag for signalling protection strictness in PCEP.

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 <https://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 27, 2020.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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 (<https://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.

Internet-Draft

I-D

October 2019

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
1.1.	Requirements Language	3
1.2.	Terminology	3
2.	Protection Enforcement Flag (E-Flag)	4
3.	Security Considerations	5
4.	IANA Considerations	6
4.1.	LSP Attributes Protection Enforcement Flag	6
5.	Normative References	6
	Authors' Addresses	7

[1.](#) Introduction

Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP) [[RFC5440](#)] enables the communication between a Path Computation Client (PCC) and a Path Control Element (PCE), or between two PCEs based on the PCE architecture [[RFC4655](#)] .

PCEP [[RFC5440](#)] utilizes flags, values and concepts previously defined in RSVP-TE Extensions [[RFC3209](#)] and Fast Reroute Extensions to RSVP-TE [[RFC4090](#)] . One such concept in PCEP is the "Local Protection Desired" (L-flag in the LSPA Object in [RFC5440](#)), which was originally defined in the SESSION-ATTRIBUTE Object in [RFC3209](#). In RSVP, this flag signals to downstream routers that local protection is desired, which indicates to transit routers that they may use a local repair mechanism. The headend router calculating the path does not know whether a downstream router will or will not protect a hop during it's calculation. Therefore, a local protection desired does not require the transit router to satisfy protection in order to establish the RSVP signalled path. This flag is signalled in PCEP as an attribute of the LSP via the LSP Attributes object.

PCEP Extensions for Segment Routing ([draft-ietf-pce-segment-routing](#)) extends support in PCEP for Segment Routed LSPs (SR-LSPs) as defined in the Segment Routing Architecture [[RFC8402](#)] . As per the Segment Routing Architecture, Adjacency Segment Identifiers(Adj-SID) may be eligible for protection (using IPFRR or MPLS-FRR). The protection eligibility is advertised into IGP ([draft-ietf-ospf-segment-routing-extensions](#) and [draft-ietf-isis-segment-routing-extensions](#)) as the B-Flag part of the Adjacency SID sub-tlv and can be discovered by a PCE via BGP-LS [[RFC7752](#)] using the BGP-LS Segment Routing Extensions ([draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-segment-routing-ext](#)). An Adjacency SID may or

may not have protection eligibility and for a given adjacency between two routers there may be multiple Adjacency SIDs, some of which are protected and some which are not.

A Segment Routed path calculated by PCE may contain various types of segments, as defined in [[RFC8402](#)] such as Adjacency, Node or Binding. The protection eligibility for Adjacency SIDs can be discovered by PCE, so therefore the PCE can take the protection eligibility into consideration as a path constraint. If a path is calculated to include other segment identifiers which are not applicable to having their protection state advertised, as they may only be locally significant for each router processing the SID such as Node SIDs, it may not be possible for PCE to include the protection constraint as part of the path calculation.

It is desirable for an operator to define the enforcement, or strictness of the protection requirement when it can be applied.

As defined in [[RFC5440](#)] the mechanism to signal protection enforcement in PCEP is with the previously mentioned L-flag defined in the LSPA Object. The name of the flag uses the term "Desired", which by definition means "strongly wished for or intended" and is rooted in the RSVP use case. For RSVP, this is not within control of the PCE. However, [[RFC5440](#)] does state "When set, this means that the computed path must include links protected with Fast Reroute as defined in [[RFC4090](#)]." Implementations of [[RFC5440](#)] have either interpreted the L-Flag as PROTECTION MANDATORY or PROTECTION PREFERRED, leading to operational differences. The boolean bit flag is unable to distinguish between the the different options of PROTECTION MANDATORY, UNPROTECTED MANDATORY, PROTECTION PREFERRED and UNPROTECTED PREFERRED.

[1.1.](#) 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](#)].

[1.2.](#) Terminology

This document uses the following terminology:

PROTECTION MANDATORY: path MUST have protection eligibility on all links.

UNPROTECTED MANDATORY: path MUST NOT have protection eligibility on all links.

PROTECTION PREFERRED: path SHOULD have protection eligibility on all links but MAY contain links which do not have protection eligibility.

UNPROTECTED PREFERRED: path SHOULD NOT have protection eligibility on all links but MAY contain links which have protection eligibility.

PCC: Path Computation Client. Any client application requesting a path computation to be performed by a Path Computation Element.

PCE: Path Computation Element. An entity (component, application, or network node) that is capable of computing a network path or route based on a network graph and applying computational constraints.

PCEP: Path Computation Element Protocol.

2. Protection Enforcement Flag (E-Flag)

[Section 7.11](#) in Path Computation Element Protocol [[RFC5440](#)] describes the encoding of the Local Protection Desired (L-Flag). A new flag is proposed in this document in the LSP Attributes Object which extends the L-Flag to identify the protection enforcement.


The flag bit is to be allocated by IANA following IETF Consensus.

This draft version proposes using bit 6.

Codespace of the Flag field (LSPA Object)

Bit	Description	Reference
7	Local Protection Desired	RFC5440

The format of the LSPA Object as defined in [RFC5440] is:



Flags (8 bits)

- o L flag: As defined in [RFC5440] and further updated by this document. When set, protection is desired. When not set, protection is not desired. The enforcement of the protection is identified via the E-Flag.
- o E flag (Protection Enforcement): When set, the value of the L-Flag MUST be treated as a MUST constraint where applicable, when protection state of a SID is known. When E flag is not set, the value of the L-Flag MUST be treated as a MAY constraint.

When L-flag is set and E-flag is set then PCE MUST consider the protection eligibility as PROTECTION MANDATORY constraint.

When L-flag is set and E-flag is not set then PCE MUST consider the protection eligibility as PROTECTION PREFERRED constraint.

When L-flag is not set and E-flag is not set then PCE SHOULD consider the protection eligibility as UNPROTECTED PREFERRED but MAY consider protection eligibility as UNPROTECTED MANDATORY constraint.

When L-flag is not set and E-flag is set then PCE MUST consider the protection eligibility as UNPROTECTED MANDATORY constraint.

For a PCC which does not yet support this draft, the E-flag bit is always set to zero as per [[RFC5440](#)]. Therefore, a PCE communicating with a PCC which does not support this draft would treat the L-Flag set as being PROTECTION PREFERRED.

The protection constraint can only be applied to resource selection in which the protection state is known to PCE. A PCE calculating a path that includes resources which does not support the protection state being known to PCE (such as Node SID), then the protection state MAY ignore the protection enforcement constraint.

UNPROTECTED PREFERRED and PROTECTED PREFERRED may seem similar but they indicate the preference of selection if PCE has an option of either protected or unprotected available for a link. When presented with either option, PCE SHOULD select the SID which has a protection state matching the state of the L-Flag.

[3.](#) Security Considerations

This document clarifies the behaviour of an existing flag and introduces a new flag to provide further control of that existing behaviour. The introduction of this new flag and behaviour

clarification does not create any new sensitive information. No additional security measure is required.

Securing the PCEP session using Transport Layer Security (TLS) [[RFC8253](#)], as per the recommendations and best current practices in [[RFC7525](#)], is RECOMMENDED.

[4.](#) IANA Considerations

[4.1.](#) LSP Attributes Protection Enforcement Flag

This document defines a new LSP Attribute Flag; IANA is requested to make the following bit allocation from the "LSPA Object" sub registry of the PCEP Numbers registry, as follows:

Value	Name	Reference
6	PROTECTION-ENFORCEMENT	This document

5. 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](#), 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>>.
- [RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", [RFC 4655](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4655, August 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4655>>.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP., Ed. and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5440, March 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5440>>.

- [RFC7525] Sheffer, Y., Holz, R., and P. Saint-Andre, "Recommendations for Secure Use of Transport Layer Security (TLS) and Datagram Transport Layer Security (DTLS)", [BCP 195](#), [RFC 7525](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7525, May 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7525>>.
- [RFC7752] Gredler, H., Ed., Medved, J., Previdi, S., Farrel, A., and S. Ray, "North-Bound Distribution of Link-State and

Traffic Engineering (TE) Information Using BGP", [RFC 7752](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7752, March 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7752>>.

[RFC8253] Lopez, D., Gonzalez de Dios, O., Wu, Q., and D. Dhody, "PCEPS: Usage of TLS to Provide a Secure Transport for the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 8253](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8253, October 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8253>>.

[RFC8402] Filsfils, C., Ed., Previdi, S., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing Architecture", [RFC 8402](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8402, July 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8402>>.

Authors' Addresses

Andrew Stone
Nokia

Email: andrew.stone@nokia.com

Mustapha Aissaoui
Nokia

Email: mustapha.aissaoui@nokia.com