

CCAMP Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: April 15, 2013

F. Zhang
ZTE Corporation
M. Venkatesan
Dell Inc.
Y. Xu
CATR
R. Gandhi
Cisco Systems
October 12, 2012

RSVP-TE Identification of MPLS-TP Co-Routed Bidirectional LSP
draft-zhang-ccamp-mpls-tp-rsvp-te-ext-tunnel-num-05

Abstract

The MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) identifiers document [[RFC6370](#)] specifies an initial set of identifiers, including the local assigned Z9-Tunnel_Num for co-routed bidirectional LSP, which is not covered by the current specifications, like [[RFC3209](#)], [[RFC3473](#)]. This document defines Resource ReserVation Protocol Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) identification of MPLS-TP co-routed bidirectional LSP.

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 15, 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

Internet-Draft RSVP-TE ID of MPLS-TP Co-Routed Bi LSP October 2012

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

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Conventions used in this document	3
3.	MPLS-TP Co-Routed Bidirectional LSP Identification	3
3.1.	Signaling Procedures	3
3.2.	Association Object	4
3.3.	Compatibility	5
4.	IANA Considerations	5
5.	Security Considerations	6
6.	Acknowledgement	6
7.	References	6
7.1.	Normative references	6
7.2.	Informative References	7
	Authors' Addresses	7

Internet-Draft RSVP-TE ID of MPLS-TP Co-Routed Bi LSP October 2012

1. Introduction

The MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) identifiers document [[RFC6370](#)] specifies a initial set of identifiers, such as the LSP_ID of of the MPLS-TP co-routed bidirectional LSP, which is A1-
{Node_ID::Tunnel_Num}::Z9-{Node_ID::Tunnel_Num}::LSP_Num. The mapping from an MPLS-TP LSP_ID to Resource ReserVation Protocol Traffic Engnieering (RSVP-TE) is also descirbed in [[RFC6370](#)], except the local assigned Z9-Tunnel_Num, which is not covered by the current specifications, like [[RFC3209](#)], [[RFC3473](#)]. However, the Z9-Tunnel_Num is a part of the Maintenance Entity Point Identifier (MEP_ID), and the two MEP nodes must pre-store each other's MEP-IDs before sending some Operation, Administration and Maintenance (OAM) packets, such as Connectivity Verification (CV) [[RFC6428](#)]. In this way the peer endpoint can compare the received and expected MEP-IDs to judge whether there is a mis-connectivity defect [[RFC6371](#)]. In other words, A1/Z9 nodes need to know each other's Tunnel_Num.

This document defines Resource ReserVation Protocol Traffic Engnieering (RSVP-TE) identification of MPLS-TP co-routed bidirectional LSP. Since the LSP identifiers can be carried in an ASSOCIATION object [[I-D.ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext](#)], it is naturally to define the signaling extensions based on the ASSOCIATION object.

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](#)].

3. MPLS-TP Co-Routed Bidirectional LSP Identification

3.1. Signaling Procedures

Consider that LSP1 is initialized at A1 node with an ASSOCIATION object inserted in Path message. Association Type is set to "LSP Identifiers", Association ID set to A1-Tunnel_Num, Association Source set to A1-Node_ID. Upon receipt of the Association Object, the egress node Z9 checks the Association Type field. If it is "LSP Identifiers", the ASSOCIATION object MUST be carried in the Resv message also. Similarly, Association Type is set to "LSP Identifiers", Association ID set to Z9-Tunnel_Num, Association Source set to Z9-Node_ID. In this way, the ingress LSR can get the Z9-Tunnel_Num, which MAY be used for identifying a mis-connectivity defect of the proactive CV OAM function.

If LSP1 is across different domains, A1 and Z9 nodes MAY need to know each other's Global_ID also. When an Extended ASSOCIATION object with Association Type "LSP Identifiers" is inserted in the initialized LSP Path message, Global Association Source is set to A1-Global_ID. Similarly, this field will be set to Z9-Global_ID in the Resv message.

3.2. Association Object

Within the current document, a new Association Type is defined in the ASSOCIATION object, which MAY be used with any ASSOCIATION object type. For example, the Extended ASSOCIATION object defined in [[I-D.ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext](#)] can be used when Global_ID based identification is desired.

Value	Type
-----	-----
6 (TBD)	LSP Identifiers (L)

Association ID: 16 bits

For Path message, Association ID is the Tunnel_Num of the node sending out the Path message, and can be ignored by the receiver.

For Resv message, Association ID is the Tunnel_Num of the node sending out the Resv message.

Association Source: 4 or 16 bytes

Same as for IPv4 and IPv6 ASSOCIATION objects, see [[RFC4872](#)].

For Path message, Association Source is the IP address of the node sending out the Path message, and can be ignored by the receiver.

For Resv message, Association Source is the IP address of the node sending out the Resv message, and can be ignored by the receiver.

Global Association Source: 4 bytes

Same as defined in [[I-D.ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext](#)] if Extended ASSOCIATION object is used.

For Path message, Global Association Source is filled with the Global_ID of the node sending out the Path message.

For Resv message, Global Association Source is the Global_ID of the node sending out the Resv message.

Extended Association ID:

Extended Association ID is not added in the Extended ASSOCIATION object when association type signaled is "LSP Identifiers".

The rules associated with the processing of the Extended ASSOCIATION objects in RSVP message are discussed in [[I-D.ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext](#)]. It said that in the absence of Association Type-specific rules for identifying association, the included ASSOCIATION objects MUST be identical. Since the Association Type "LSP Identifiers" used here is to carry LSP identifier, there is no need to associate Path state to Path state or Resv state to Resv state, one specific rule is added: when the Association Type is "LSP Identifiers", the ASSOCIATION object can appear in Path or Resv message across sessions or in a single session, and the values can be different.

[3.3](#). Compatibility

Per [[RFC4872](#)], the ASSOCIATION object uses an object class number of the form 11bbbbbb to ensure compatibility with non-supporting nodes. Per [[RFC2205](#)], such nodes will ignore the object but forward it without modification. This is also described in [[I-D.ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext](#)].

Per [[RFC4872](#)], transit nodes that support the ASSOCIATION object, but not the Extended Association C-Types, will "transmit, without modification, any received ASSOCIATION object in the corresponding outgoing Path message." Per [[RFC2205](#)], an egress node that supports the ASSOCIATION object, but not the Extended Association C-Types may generate an "Unknown object C-Type" error. This error will propagate to the ingress node for standard error processing.

Operators wishing to use a function supported by the association type "LSP Identifiers" should ensure that the type is supported on any node which is expected to act on the association.

4. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to administer assignment of new values for namespace defined in this document and summarized in this section.

One value ("LSP Identifiers") needs to be allocated in the Association Type Registry.

5. Security Considerations

A new Association Type is defined in this document, and except this, there are no security issues about the ASSOCIATION object and Extended ASSOCIATION object are introduced here. For Association object related security issues, see the documents [[RFC4872](#)], [[RFC4873](#)], and [[I-D.ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext](#)].

For a more comprehensive discussion on GMPLS security please see the Security Framework for MPLS and GMPLS Networks [[RFC5920](#)].

6. Acknowledgement

This document was prepared based on the discussion with George

Swallow, valuable comments and input were also received from Lou Berger, John E Drake, Jaihari Kalijanakiraman, Muliu Tao and Wenjuan He.

7. References

7.1. Normative references

- [I-D.ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext]
Berger, L., Faucheur, F., and A. Narayanan, "RSVP Association Object Extensions", [draft-ietf-ccamp-assoc-ext-06](#) (work in progress), September 2012.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2205] Braden, B., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S., and S. Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1 Functional Specification", [RFC 2205](#), September 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.

7.2. Informative References

- [RFC4872] Lang, J., Rekhter, Y., and D. Papadimitriou, "RSVP-TE Extensions in Support of End-to-End Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Recovery", [RFC 4872](#), May 2007.
- [RFC4873] Berger, L., Bryskin, I., Papadimitriou, D., and A. Farrel,

"GMPLS Segment Recovery", [RFC 4873](#), May 2007.

- [RFC5920] Fang, L., "Security Framework for MPLS and GMPLS Networks", [RFC 5920](#), July 2010.
- [RFC6370] Bocci, M., Swallow, G., and E. Gray, "MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) Identifiers", [RFC 6370](#), September 2011.
- [RFC6371] Busi, I. and D. Allan, "Operations, Administration, and Maintenance Framework for MPLS-Based Transport Networks", [RFC 6371](#), September 2011.
- [RFC6428] Allan, D., Swallow Ed. , G., and J. Drake Ed. , "Proactive Connectivity Verification, Continuity Check, and Remote Defect Indication for the MPLS Transport Profile", [RFC 6428](#), November 2011.

Authors' Addresses

Fei Zhang
ZTE Corporation

Email: zhang.feiz@zte.com.cn

Venkatesan Mahalingam
Dell Inc.

Email: venkat.mahalingams@gmail.com

Yunbin Xu
CATR

Email: xuyunbin@mail.ritt.com.cn

Cisco Systems

Email: rgandhi@cisco.com

Xiao Bao

ZTE Corporation

Email: bao.xiao1@zte.com.cn