

PCE working group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: September 29, 2017

D. Lopez  
Telefonica I+D  
Q. Wu  
D. Dhody  
Z. Wang  
Huawei  
D. King  
Old Dog Consulting

March 28, 2017

IGP extension for PCEP security capability support in the PCE discovery  
[draft-wu-pce-discovery-pceps-support-07](#)

## Abstract

When a Path Computation Element (PCE) is a Label Switching Router (LSR) participating in the Interior Gateway Protocol (IGP), or even a server participating in IGP, its presence and path computation capabilities can be advertised using IGP flooding. The IGP extensions for PCE discovery ([RFC 5088](#) and [RFC 5089](#)) define a method to advertise path computation capabilities using IGP flooding for OSPF and IS-IS respectively. However these specifications lack a method to advertise PCEP security (e.g., Transport Layer Security(TLS),TCP Authentication Option (TCP-AO)) support capability.

This document proposes new capability flag bits for PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub- TLV that can be announced as attribute in the IGP advertisement to distribute PCEP security support information.

## 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 September 29, 2017

Internet-Draft

IGP discovery for PCEP Security

March 2017

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Conventions used in this document . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	IGP extension for PCEP security capability support . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
3.1.	Use of PCEP security capability support for PCE discovery	4
<a href="#">4.</a>	Backward Compatibility Consideration . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Management Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
8.1.	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
8.2.	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	<a href="#">Appendix A</a> : No MD5 Capability Support . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>

[1.](#) Introduction

As described in [[RFC5440](#)], PCEP communication privacy is one importance issue, as an attacker that intercepts a Path Computation Element (PCE) message could obtain sensitive information related to computed paths and resources.

Among the possible solutions mentioned in these documents, Transport Layer Security (TLS) [[RFC5246](#)] provides support for peer authentication, and message encryption and integrity while TCP Authentication Option (TCP-AO) offer significantly improved security for applications using TCP. In order for a Path Computation

Client(PCC) to begin a connection with a PCE server using TLS or TCP-AO, PCC SHOULD know whether PCE server supports TLS or TCP-AO as a secure transport.

[RFC5088] and [RFC5089] define a method to advertise path computation capabilities using IGP flooding for OSPF and IS-IS respectively. However [RFC5088] and [RFC5089] lacks a method to advertise PCEP security (e.g., TLS) support capability.

This document proposes new capability flag bits for PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV that can be announced as attributes in the IGP advertisement (defined in [RFC5088] and [RFC5089]) to distribute PCEP security support information.

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

## 3. IGP extension for PCEP security capability support

The PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV is defined in [section 4.5 of \[RFC5088\]](#) and [RFC5089] as an optional sub-TLV used to advertise PCE capabilities. In this section, we extend the PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV to include the capability and indications that are described for PCEP security (e.g., TLS) support in the current document.

In the PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV defined in [RFC5088] and [RFC5089], nine capability flags defined in [RFC5088] (as per [RFC4657]) and two capability flags defined [RFC5557], [RFC6006] are included and follows the following format:

- o TYPE: 5
- o LENGTH: Multiple of 4
- o VALUE: This contains an array of units of 32 bit flags with the most significant bit as 0. Each bit represents one PCE capability.

and the processing rule of these flag bits are defined in [RFC5088]

and [[RFC5089](#)]. In this document, we define two new capability flag bits that indicate TCP Authentication Option (TCP-AO) support, PCEP over TLS support respectively as follows:

Bit	Capability Description
xx	TCP AO Support
xx	PCEP over TLS support

### [3.1.](#) Use of PCEP security capability support for PCE discovery

TCP-AO, PCEP over TLS support flag bits are advertised using IGP flooding.

- o PCE supports TCP-AO: IGP advertisement SHOULD include TCP-AO support flag bit.
- o PCE supports TLS: IGP advertisement SHOULD include PCEP over TLS support flag bit.

If PCE supports multiple security mechanisms, it SHOULD include all corresponding flag bits in IGP advertisement.

If the client is looking for connecting with PCE server with TCP-AO support, the client MUST check if TCP-AO support flag bit in the PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV is set. If not, the client SHOULD NOT consider this PCE. If the client is looking for connecting with PCE server using TLS, the client MUST check if PCEP over TLS support flag bit in the PCE-CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV is set. If not, the client SHOULD NOT consider this PCE.

## [4.](#) Backward Compatibility Consideration

An LSR that does not support the new IGP PCE capability bits specified in this document silently ignores those bits.

IGP extensions defined in this document do not introduce any new interoperability issues.

## [5.](#) Management Considerations

A configuration option may be provided for advertising and withdrawing PCE security capability via IGP.

## [6.](#) Security Considerations

This document raises no new security issues beyond those described in [\[RFC5088\]](#) and [\[RFC5089\]](#).

## [7.](#) IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate a new bit in "PCE Security Capability Flags" registry for PCEP Security support capability.

Bit	Meaning	Reference
xx	TCP-AO Support	<a href="#">[This.I.D]</a>
xx	PCEP over TLS support	<a href="#">[This.I.D]</a>

Lopez, et al.

Expires September 29, 2017

[Page 4]

---

Internet-Draft

IGP discovery for PCEP Security

March 2017

## [8.](#) References

### [8.1.](#) Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", March 1997.
- [RFC5088] Le Roux, JL., "OSPF Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", [RFC 5088](#), January 2008.
- [RFC5089] Le Roux, JL., "IS-IS Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", [RFC 5089](#), January 2008.

### [8.2.](#) Informative References

- [RFC4657] Ash, J. and J. Le Roux, "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol Generic Requirements", [RFC 4657](#), September 2006.
- [RFC5246] Dierks, T., "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol

Version 1.2", [RFC 5246](#), August 2008.

- [RFC5440] Le Roux, J.L., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", [RFC 5440](#), March 2009.
- [RFC5557] Lee, Y., Le Roux, J.L., King, D., and E. Oki, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Requirements and Protocol Extensions in Support of Global Concurrent Optimization", [RFC 5557](#), July 2009.
- [RFC6006] Zhao, Q., King, D., Verhaeghe, F., Takeda, T., Ali, Z., and J. Meuric, "Extensions to the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) for Point-to-Multipoint Traffic Engineering Label Switched Paths", [RFC 6006](#), September 2010.

#### [Appendix A](#). [Appendix A](#): No MD5 Capability Support

To be compliant with [Section 10.2 of RFC5440](#), this document doesn't consider to add capability for TCP-MD5. Therefore by default, PCEP Speaker in communication supports capability for TCP-MD5 (See [section 10.2](#), [RFC5440] ). A method to advertise TCP-MD5 Capability support using IGP flooding is not required. If the client is looking for connecting with PCE server with other Security capability support (e.g., TLS support) than TCP-MD5, the client MUST check if flag bit

Lopez, et al.

Expires September 29, 2017

[Page 5]

---

Internet-Draft

IGP discovery for PCEP Security

March 2017

in the PCE- CAP-FLAGS sub-TLV for specific capability is set (See [section 3.1](#)).

#### Authors' Addresses

Diego R. Lopez  
Telefonica I+D  
Spain

Email: [diego.r.lopez@telefonica.com](mailto:diego.r.lopez@telefonica.com)

Qin Wu  
Huawei Technologies  
12 Mozhou East Road, Jiangning District  
Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012

China

Email: bill.wu@huawei.com

Dhruv Dhody  
Huawei Technologies  
Divyashree Techno Park, Whitefield  
Bangalore, Karnataka 560037  
India

Email: dhruv.ietf@gmail.com

Michael Wang  
Huawei  
12 Mozhou East Road, Jiangning District  
Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012  
China

Email: wangzitao@huawei.com

Daniel King  
Old Dog Consulting  
UK

Email: daniel@olddog.co.uk