

Internet Draft
Updates: [3473](#)
Category: Standards Track
Expiration Date: February 2005

Lou Berger (Movaz Networks)

August 2004

GMPLS Signaling Procedure For Egress Control

[draft-ietf-ccamp-gmpls-egress-control-03.txt](#)

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, I certify that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which I am aware have been disclosed, or will be disclosed, and any of which I become aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [RFC 3668](#).

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 a "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/lid-abstracts.html>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

Abstract

This note clarifies the procedures for the control of the label used on a output/downstream interface of the egress node of a Label Switched Path (LSP). Such control is also known as "Egress Control". Support for Egress Control is implicit in Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling. This note is a clarification to the specification of GMPLS Signaling and does not modify GMPLS signaling mechanisms and procedures.

Internet Draft [draft-ietf-ccamp-gmpls-egress-control-03.txt](#) August 2004

1. Background

The ability to control the label used on the output/downstream interface of an egress node was one of the early requirements for GMPLS. In the initial GMPLS drafts, this was called "Egress Control". As the GMPLS drafts progressed, the ability to control a label on an egress interface was generalized to support control of a label on any interface. This generalization is seen in [Section 6 of \[RFC3471\]](#) and [Section 5.1 of \[RFC3473\]](#). In generalizing this functionality, the procedures to support control of a label at the egress were also generalized. While the result was intended to cover egress control, this intention is not clear to all. This note reiterates the procedures to cover control of a label used on an egress output/downstream interface.

For context, the following is the text from the GMPLS signaling draft dated June 2000:

6. Egress Control

The LSR at the head-end of an LSP can control the termination of the LSP by using the ERO. To terminate an LSP on a particular outgoing interface of the egress LSR, the head-end may specify the IP address of that interface as the last element in the ERO, provided that that interface has an associated IP address.

There are cases where the use of IP address doesn't provide enough information to uniquely identify the egress termination. One case is when the outgoing interface on the egress LSR is a component link of a link bundle. Another case is when it is desirable to "splice" two LSPs together, i.e., where the tail of the first LSP would be "spliced" into the head of the second LSP. This last case is more likely to be used in the non-PSC classes of links.

and

6.2. Procedures

The Egress Label subobject may appear only as the last subobject in the ERO/ER. Appearance of this subobject anywhere else in the ERO/ER is treated as a "Bad strict node" error.

During an LSP setup, when a node processing the ERO/RR performs Next Hop selection finds that the second subobject is an Egress Label Subobject, the node uses the information carried in this subobject to determine the handling of the data received over that LSP. Specifically, if the Link ID field of the subobject is non zero, then this field identifies a specific (outgoing) link of the

node that should be used for sending all the data received over the LSP. If the Label field of the subobject is not Implicit NULL label, this field specifies the label that should be used as an outgoing label on the data received over the LSP.

Procedures by which an LSR at the head-end of an LSP obtains the information needed to construct the Egress Label subobject are outside the scope of this document.

2. Egress Control Procedures

This section is intended to complement [Section 5.1.1](#) and 5.2.1 of [\[RFC3473\]](#). The procedures described in those sections are not modified. This section clarifies procedures related to the label used on an egress output/downstream interface.

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 [\[RFC2119\]](#).

2.1. ERO Procedures

Egress Control occurs when the node processing an ERO is the egress and the ERO contains one or more subobjects related to the output/downstream interface. In this case, the outgoing/downstream interface is indicated in the ERO as the last listed local interface. Note that an interface may be numbered or unnumbered.

To support Egress Control, an egress checks to see if the received

ERO contains an outgoing/downstream interface. If it does, the type of the subobject or subobjects following the interface are examined. If the associated LSP is unidirectional, one subobject is examined. Two subobjects are examined for bidirectional LSPs. If the U-bit of the subobject being examined is clear (0), then the value of the label MUST be used for transmitting traffic associated with the LSP on the indicated outgoing/downstream interface.

If the U-bit of the subobject being examined is set (1), then the value of the label is used for upstream traffic associated with the bidirectional LSP. Specifically, the label value will be used for the traffic associated with the LSP that will be received on the indicated outgoing/downstream interface.

Per [RFC3473], any errors encountered while processing the ERO, including if the listed label(s) are not acceptable or cannot be supported in forwarding, SHOULD result in the generation of a PathErr

message with the error code "Routing Error" and error value of "Bad Explicit Route Object" toward the sender.

2.2. RRO Procedures

In the case where an ERO is used to specify outgoing interface information at the egress and label recording is indicated for the LSP, the egress should include the specified interface information and the specified label or labels in the corresponding RRO.

3. Security Considerations

This note clarifies procedures defined in [RFC3473], but does not define any new procedures. As such, no new security considerations are introduced.

4. IANA Considerations

None.

5. Acknowledgments

Valuable comments and input were received from Adrian Farrel, Alan Kullberg, and Dimitri Papadimitriou.

6. References

6.1. Normative References

- [BCP78] Bradner, S., "IETF Rights in Contributions", [RFC 3667](#), February 2004.
- [BCP79] Bradner, S., "Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology", [RFC 3668](#), February 2004.
- [RFC3471] Berger, L., Editor, "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Functional Description", [RFC 3471](#), January 2003.
- [RFC3473] Berger, L., Editor "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label

Switching (GMPLS) Signaling - Resource ReserVation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Extensions", [RFC 3473](#), January 2003.

[6.2](#). Informative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels," [RFC 2119](#).

[7](#). Author's Address

Lou Berger
Movaz Networks, Inc.
7926 Jones Branch Drive
Suite 615
McLean VA, 22102
Phone: +1 703 847-1801
Email: lberger@movaz.com

Berger

[Page 5]

Internet Draft [draft-ietf-ccamp-gmpls-egress-control-03.txt](#) August 2004

[8](#). Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED,

INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

9. Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.