TEAS Working Group   A.Wang
Internet Draft   China Telecom
                                                        Boris Khasanov
                                                    Huawei Technologies
                                                     Sudhir Cheruathur
                                                       Juniper Networks
                                                              Chun Zhu
                                                            ZTE Company

Intended status: Standard Track   February 14, 2018
Expires: August 13, 2018

PCEP Extension for Native IP Network
draft-wang-pce-pcep-extension-native-ip-01.txt

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

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-ietf-teas-native-ip-scenarios] and [draft-
   ietf-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

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

Different object-class, object type and the corresponding object body is defined separated in the following section.

4.1. Peer Address List object.

The Peer Address List object is used in a PCE Initiate message [draft-ietf-pce-pce-initiated-lsp] to specify the ip address of peer that the received network device should establish the BGP relationship with.

This Object should only be sent to the head and end router of the end2end path in case there is no RR involved. If the RR is used

   between the head end routers, then such information should be sent
   to head router/RR and end router/RR respectively.

   Peer Address List object Object-Class is **

   Peer Address List object Object-Type is **

```
 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

+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

|   Peer Num    |   Peer-Id    |     AT        |     Resv.

+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

|                  Local IP Address(4/16 Bytes)                 |

//                  Peer IP Address(4/16 Bytes)                 //

+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

   Peer Num (8 bits): Peer Address Number on the advertised router.

    Peer-Id(8 bits): To distinguish the different peer pair, will be
      referenced in Peer Prefix Association, if the PCE use multi-BGP
      solution for different QoS assurance requirement.

   AT(8 bits): Address Type. To indicate the address type of Peer.
      Equal to 4, if the following IP address of peer is belong to IPv4;
      Equal to 6 if the following IP address of peer is belong to IPv6.

   Resv(8 bits): Reserved for future use.

   Local IP Address(4/16 Bytes): IPv4 address of the local router, used
      to peer with other end router. When AT equal to 4, length is
      32bit; when AT equal to 16, length is 128bit;

   Peer IP Address(4/16 Bytes): IPv4 address of the peer router, used
      to peer with the local router. When AT equal to 4, length is 32bit;
      IPv6 address of the peer when AT equal to 16, length is 128bit;

4.2. Peer Prefix Association

   THE Peer Prefix Association object is carried within in a PCE
   Initiate message [draft-ietf-pce-pce-initiated-lsp] to specify the
   IP prefixes that should be advertised by the corresponding Peer.

   This Object should only be sent to the head and end router of the
   end2end path in case there is no RR involved. If the RR is used
   between the head end routers, then such information should be sent
   to head router/RR and end router/RR respectively.

   Peer Prefix Association object Object-Class is **

   Peer Prefix Association object Object-Type is **

```
 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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Peer-Id    |     AT      |     Resv.    | Prefixes Num.
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|             Peer Associated IP Prefix TLV                    |
//            Peer Associated IP Prefix TLV                   //
|             Peer Associated IP Prefix TLV                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

   Peer-Id(8 bits): To indicate which peer should be used to advertise
      the following IP Prefix TLV. This value is assigned in the Peer
      Address List object and is referred in this object.

   AT(8 bits): Address Type. To indicate the address type of Peer.
      Equal to 4, if the following IP address of peer is belong to IPv4;
      Equal to 6 if the following IP address of peer is belong to IPv6.

   Resv(8 bits): Reserved for future use.

    Prefixes Num(8 bits): Number of prefixes that advertised by the
      corresponding Peer. It should be equal to num of the following IP
      prefix TLV.

    Peer Associated IP Prefix TLV: Variable Length, use the TLV format
      to indicate the advertised IP Prefix.

4.3. **EXPLICIT PEER ROUTE Object**

   THE EXPLICIT PEER ROUTE Object is carried in a PCE Initiate message
   [draft-ietf-pce-pce-initiated-lsp] to specify the explicit peer
   route to the corresponding peer address on each device that is on
   the end2end assurance path.

   This Object should be sent to all the devices that locates on the
   end2end assurance path that calculated by PCE.

   EXPLICIT PEER ROUTE Object Object-Class is **

   EXPLICIT PEER ROUTE Object Object-Type is **

```
 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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Peer-Id     |      AT       |      Resv.                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|          Next Hop Address to the Peer (IPv4/IPv6)            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

   Peer-Id(8 bits): To indicate the peer that the following next hop
      address point to. This value is assigned in the Peer Address List
      object and is referred in this object.

   AT(8 bits): Address Type. To indicate the address type of explicit
      peer route. Equal to 4, if the following next hop address to the
      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>.

[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]
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-ietf-teas-native-ip-scenarios]
Wang, X.Huang et al. "CCDR Scenario, Simulation and Suggestion"
https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-teas-native-ip-
scenarios/ (work in progress), February, 2018

[I-D. draft-ietf-teas-pce-native-ip]
Aijun Wang, Quintin Zhao, Boris Khasanov, Huaimo Chen,Raghavendra
Mallya, Shaofu Peng "PCE in Native IP Network",
https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-teas-pce-native-ip/

(work in progress), February, 2018

      [I-D.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

   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