

PCE Working Group
Internet Draft

A.Wang
China Telecom
Boris Khasanov
Huawei Technologies
Sudhir Cheruathur
Juniper Networks
Chun Zhu
ZTE Company

Intended status: Standard Track
Expires: April 23, 2018

October 23, 2017

**PCEP Extension for Native IP Network
draft-wang-pce-pcep-extension-native-ip-00.txt**

Status of this Memo

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

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#). This document may not be modified, and derivative works of it may not be created, and it may not be published except as an Internet-Draft.

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#). This document may not be modified, and derivative works of it may not be created, except to publish it as an RFC and to translate it into languages other than English.

It is for publication as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

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>

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 23, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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.

Abstract

This document defines the PCEP extension for CCDR application in Native IP network. The scenario and architecture of CCDR in native IP is described in [[draft-wang-teas-ccdr](#)] and [[draft-wang-teas-pce-native-ip](#)]. This draft describes the key information that is transferred between PCE and PCC to accomplish the end2end traffic assurance in Native IP network under central control mode.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Conventions used in this document	3
3.	New Objects Extension	3
4.	Object Formats	3
4.1.	Peer Address List object	4
4.2.	Peer Prefix Association	5
4.3.	EXPLICIT PEER ROUTE Object	6
5.	Management Consideration	7
6.	Security Considerations	7
7.	IANA Considerations	7
8.	Conclusions	7
9.	References	7
9.1.	Normative References	7
9.2.	Informative References	8
10.	Acknowledgments	8

[1. Introduction](#)

Traditionally, MPLS-TE traffic assurance requires the corresponding network devices support MPLS or the complex RSVP/LDP/Segment Routing

Internet-Draft PCE Extension for Native IP Network October 24, 2017
 etc. technologies to assure the end-to-end traffic performance. But
 in native IP network, there will be no such signaling protocol to
 synchronize the action among different network devices. It is
 necessary to use the central control mode that described in [[draft-ietf-teas-pce-control-function](#)] to correlate the forwarding behavior
 among different network devices. Draft [[draft-wang-teas-pce-native-ip](#)]
 describes the architecture and solution philosophy for the
 end2end traffic assurance in Native IP network via Dual/Multi BGP
 solution. This draft describes the corresponding PCEP extension to
 transfer the key information about peer address list, peer prefix
 association and the explicit peer route on on-path router.

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](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

3. New Objects Extension

Three new objects are defined in this draft; they are Peer Address
 List Object (PAL Object), Peer Prefix Association Object (PPA
 Object)
 and Explicit Peer Route object (EPR Object).

Peer Address List object is used to tell the network device which
 peer it should be peered with dynamically, Peer Prefix Association
 is used to tell which prefixes should be advertised via the
 corresponding peer and Explicit Peer Route object is used to point
 out which route should be to taken to arrive to the peer.

4. Object Formats.

Each extension object takes the similar format, that is to say, it
 began with the common object header defined in [[RFC5440](#)] as the
 following:

```

      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
      +--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
      | Object-Class |  OT  |Res|P|I|  Object Length (bytes)  |
      +--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
      |
      //                (Object body)                //
  
```


Internet-Draft PCE Extension for Native IP Network October 24, 2017
peer is belong to IPv4; Equal to 6 if the following next hop
address to the peer is belong to IPv6.

Resv(16 bits): Reserved for future use.

Next Hop Address to the Peer TLV: Variable Length, use the TLV
format to indicate the next hop address to the corresponding peer
that indicated by the Peer-Id.

5. Management Consideration.

6. Security Considerations

TBD

7. IANA Considerations

TBD

8. Conclusions

TBD

9. References

9.1. Normative References

[RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J.-P., and J. Ash, "A Path
Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", RFC
4655, August 2006, <[http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/
rfc4655](http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4655)>.

[[RFC5440](#)] Vasseur, JP., Ed., and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path
Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol
(PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), March 2009,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5440>>.

9.2. Informative References

[I-D.[draft-ietf-pce-pce-initiated-lsp-07](https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-pce-pce-initiated-lsp-07)]

E.Crabbe, I.Minei, S.Sivabalan, R.Varga, "PCEP Extensions for PCE-initiated LSP Setup in a Stateful PCE Model", <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-pce-pce-initiated-lsp-07> (work in progress), July, 2016

[I-D.[draft-wang-teas-ccdr](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-wang-teas-ccdr/)]

Wang, X.Huang et al. "CCDR Scenario, Simulation and Suggestion" <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-wang-teas-ccdr/>

[I-D.[draft-wang-teas-pce-native-ip](https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-wang-teas-pce-native-ip)]

Aijun Wang, Quintin Zhao, Boris Khasanov, Raghavendra Mallya, Shaofu Peng "PCE in Native IP Network", <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-wang-teas-pce-native-ip-02>(work in progress), March, 2017

[I-D.[draft-ietf-teas-pce-control-function](https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-teas-pce-control-function)]

Farrel, Q.Zhao "An Architecture for use of PCE and PCEP in a Network with Central Control" <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-teas-pce-central-control-01>

(work in progress),December, 2016

10. Acknowledgments

TBD

Authors' Addresses

Aijun Wang
China Telecom
Beiqijia Town, Changping District
Beijing,China

Email: wangaj.bri@chinatelecom.cn

Internet-Draft PCE Extension for Native IP Network October 24, 2017

Boris Khasanov
Huawei Technologies
Moskovskiy Prospekt 97A
St.Petersburg 196084
Russia

Email: khasanov.boris@huawei.com

Sudhir Cheruathur
Juniper Networks
1133 Innovation Way
Sunnyvale, California 94089 USA

Email: scheruathur@juniper.net

Chun Zhu
ZTE Corporation
50 Software Avenue, Yuhua District
Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012
China
Email:zhu.chun1@zte.com.cn