

Networking Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: May 21, 2009

JP. Vasseur, Ed.  
Cisco Systems  
JL. Le Roux, Ed.  
France Telecom  
November 17, 2008

Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)  
draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

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/lid-abstracts.txt>.

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on May 21, 2009.

Abstract

This document specifies the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) for communications between a Path Computation Client (PCC) and a Path Computation Element (PCE), or between two PCEs. Such interactions include path computation requests and path computation replies as well as notifications of specific states related to the use of a PCE in the context of Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) and Generalized (GMPLS) Traffic Engineering. PCEP is designed to be flexible and extensible so as to easily allow for the addition of further messages and objects, should further requirements be expressed in the future.

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

## Requirements Language

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](#)].

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Terminology</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Assumptions</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Architectural Protocol Overview (Model)</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Problem</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Architectural Protocol Overview</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Initialization Phase</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">Session Keepalive</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">4.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">Path Computation Request Sent By a PCC to a PCE</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.2.4.</a>	<a href="#">Path Computation Reply Sent By The PCE to a PCC</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.2.5.</a>	<a href="#">Notification</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">4.2.6.</a>	<a href="#">Error</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">4.2.7.</a>	<a href="#">Termination of the PCEP Session</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">4.2.8.</a>	<a href="#">Intermittent versus Permanent PCEP Session</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Transport Protocol</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP Messages</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	<a href="#">Common header</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	<a href="#">Open Message</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">6.3.</a>	<a href="#">Keepalive Message</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">6.4.</a>	<a href="#">Path Computation Request (PCReq) Message</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">6.5.</a>	<a href="#">Path Computation Reply (PCRep) Message</a>	<a href="#">21</a>
<a href="#">6.6.</a>	<a href="#">Notification (PCNtf) Message</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">6.7.</a>	<a href="#">Error (PCErr) Message</a>	<a href="#">23</a>
<a href="#">6.8.</a>	<a href="#">Close Message</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">6.9.</a>	<a href="#">Reception of Unknown Messages</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Object Formats</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	<a href="#">PCE TLV Format</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	<a href="#">Common Object Header</a>	<a href="#">25</a>
<a href="#">7.3.</a>	<a href="#">OPEN Object</a>	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">7.4.</a>	<a href="#">RP Object</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
<a href="#">7.4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Object Definition</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
<a href="#">7.4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Handling of the RP Object</a>	<a href="#">31</a>
<a href="#">7.5.</a>	<a href="#">NO-PATH Object</a>	<a href="#">32</a>
<a href="#">7.6.</a>	<a href="#">END-POINT Object</a>	<a href="#">35</a>

<a href="#">7.7.</a>	<a href="#">BANDWIDTH Object</a>	<a href="#">36</a>
<a href="#">7.8.</a>	<a href="#">METRIC Object</a>	<a href="#">37</a>
<a href="#">7.9.</a>	<a href="#">Explicit Route Object</a>	<a href="#">40</a>
<a href="#">7.10.</a>	<a href="#">Reported Route Object</a>	<a href="#">41</a>
<a href="#">7.11.</a>	<a href="#">LSPA Object</a>	<a href="#">41</a>

<a href="#">7.12.</a>	<a href="#">Include Route Object Object</a>	<a href="#">43</a>
<a href="#">7.13.</a>	<a href="#">SVEC Object</a>	<a href="#">43</a>
7.13.1.	Notion of Dependent and Synchronized Path Computation Requests	<a href="#">43</a>
<a href="#">7.13.2.</a>	<a href="#">SVEC Object</a>	<a href="#">45</a>
<a href="#">7.13.3.</a>	<a href="#">Handling of the SVEC Object</a>	<a href="#">46</a>
<a href="#">7.14.</a>	<a href="#">NOTIFICATION Object</a>	<a href="#">47</a>
<a href="#">7.15.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP-ERROR Object</a>	<a href="#">50</a>
<a href="#">7.16.</a>	<a href="#">LOAD-BALANCING Object</a>	<a href="#">54</a>
<a href="#">7.17.</a>	<a href="#">CLOSE Object</a>	<a href="#">55</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">Manageability Considerations</a>	<a href="#">56</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	<a href="#">Control of Function and Policy</a>	<a href="#">57</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	<a href="#">Information and Data Models</a>	<a href="#">58</a>
<a href="#">8.3.</a>	<a href="#">Liveness Detection and Monitoring</a>	<a href="#">58</a>
<a href="#">8.4.</a>	<a href="#">Verifying Correct Operation</a>	<a href="#">58</a>
8.5.	Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components	<a href="#">59</a>
<a href="#">8.6.</a>	<a href="#">Impact on Network Operation</a>	<a href="#">59</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations</a>	<a href="#">59</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	<a href="#">TCP Port</a>	<a href="#">60</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP Messages</a>	<a href="#">60</a>
<a href="#">9.3.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP Object</a>	<a href="#">60</a>
<a href="#">9.4.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP Message Common Header</a>	<a href="#">61</a>
<a href="#">9.5.</a>	<a href="#">Open Object Flag Field</a>	<a href="#">62</a>
<a href="#">9.6.</a>	<a href="#">RP Object</a>	<a href="#">62</a>
<a href="#">9.7.</a>	<a href="#">NO-PATH Object Flag Field</a>	<a href="#">63</a>
<a href="#">9.8.</a>	<a href="#">METRIC Object</a>	<a href="#">63</a>
<a href="#">9.9.</a>	<a href="#">LSPA Object Flag Field</a>	<a href="#">64</a>
<a href="#">9.10.</a>	<a href="#">SVEC Object Flag Field</a>	<a href="#">65</a>
<a href="#">9.11.</a>	<a href="#">Notification Object</a>	<a href="#">65</a>
<a href="#">9.12.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP-ERROR Object</a>	<a href="#">66</a>
<a href="#">9.13.</a>	<a href="#">LOAD-BALANCING Object Flag Field</a>	<a href="#">68</a>
<a href="#">9.14.</a>	<a href="#">CLOSE Object</a>	<a href="#">68</a>
<a href="#">9.15.</a>	<a href="#">PCEP TLV Type Indicators</a>	<a href="#">69</a>
<a href="#">9.16.</a>	<a href="#">NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV</a>	<a href="#">69</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations</a>	<a href="#">69</a>

<a href="#">10.1.</a>	Vulnerability . . . . .	<a href="#">69</a>
<a href="#">10.2.</a>	TCP Security Techniques . . . . .	<a href="#">70</a>
<a href="#">10.3.</a>	PCEP Authentication and Integrity . . . . .	<a href="#">71</a>
<a href="#">10.4.</a>	PCEP Privacy . . . . .	<a href="#">71</a>
<a href="#">10.5.</a>	Key Configuration and Exchange . . . . .	<a href="#">72</a>
<a href="#">10.6.</a>	Access Policy . . . . .	<a href="#">73</a>
<a href="#">10.7.</a>	Protection Against Denial of Service Attacks . . . . .	<a href="#">74</a>
<a href="#">10.7.1.</a>	Protection Against TCP DoS Attacks . . . . .	<a href="#">74</a>
<a href="#">10.7.2.</a>	Request Input Shaping/Policing . . . . .	<a href="#">75</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">75</a>
<a href="#">12.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">76</a>
<a href="#">13.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">77</a>

<a href="#">13.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">77</a>
<a href="#">13.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">77</a>
<a href="#">13.3.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">80</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	PCEP Finite State Machine (FSM) . . . . .	<a href="#">80</a>
<a href="#">Appendix B.</a>	PCEP Variables . . . . .	<a href="#">87</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">88</a>
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">89</a>

## 1. Introduction

[RFC4655] describes the motivations and architecture for a Path Computation Element (PCE) based model for the computation of Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) and Generalized (GMPLS) Traffic Engineering Label Switch Paths (TE LSPs). The model allows for the separation of PCE from Path Computation Client (PCC), and allows for the cooperation between PCEs. This necessitates a communication protocol between PCC and PCE, and between PCEs. [RFC4657] states the generic requirements for such a protocol including the requirement for using the same protocol between PCC and PCE, and between PCEs. Additional application-specific requirements (for scenarios such as inter-area, inter-AS, etc.) are not included in [RFC4657], but there is a requirement that any solution protocol must be easily extensible to handle other requirements as they are introduced in application-specific requirements documents. Examples of such application-specific requirements are [RFC4927], [I-D.ietf-pce-interas-pcecp-reqs] and [I-D.ietf-pce-inter-layer-req].

This document specifies the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) for communications between a PCC and a PCE, or between two PCEs, in compliance with [RFC4657]. Such interactions

include path computation requests and path computation replies as well as notifications of specific states related to the use of a PCE in the context of MPLS and GMPLS Traffic Engineering.

PCEP is designed to be flexible and extensible so as to easily allow for the addition of further messages and objects, should further requirements be expressed in the future.

## 2. Terminology

Terminology used in this document

AS: Autonomous System.

Explicit path: Full explicit path from start to destination made of a list of strict hops where a hop may be an abstract node such as an AS.

IGP area: OSPF area or IS-IS level.

Inter-domain TE LSP: A TE LSP whose path transits at least two different domains where a domain can be an IGP area, an Autonomous System or a sub-AS (BGP confederations).

PCC: Path Computation Client: any client application requesting a

path computation to be performed by a Path Computation Element.

PCE: Path Computation Element: an entity (component, application or network node) that is capable of computing a network path or route based on a network graph and applying computational constraints.

PCEP Peer: an element involved in a PCEP session (i.e. a PCC or a PCE).

TED: Traffic Engineering Database that contains the topology and resource information of the domain. The TED may be fed by IGP extensions or potentially by other means.

TE LSP: Traffic Engineering Label Switched Path.

Strict/loose path: mix of strict and loose hops comprising at least one loose hop representing the destination where a hop may be an abstract node such as an AS.

Within this document, when describing PCE-PCE communications, the requesting PCE fills the role of a PCC. This provides a saving in documentation without loss of function.

The message formats in this document are specified using Backus Naur Format (BNF) encoding as specified in [[I-D.farrel-rtg-common-bnf](#)].

### [3.](#) Assumptions

[RFC4655] describes various types of PCE. PCEP does not make any assumption and thus does not impose any constraint on the nature of the PCE.

Moreover, it is assumed that the PCE has the required information (usually including network topology and resource information) so as to perform the computation of a path for a TE LSP. Such information can be gathered by routing protocols or by some other means. The way in which the information is gathered is out of the scope of this document.

Similarly, no assumption is made about the discovery method used by a PCC to discover a set of PCEs (e.g., via static configuration or dynamic discovery) and on the algorithm used to select a PCE. For reference, [[RFC4674](#)] defines a list of requirements for dynamic PCE discovery and IGP-based solutions for such PCE discovery are specified in [[RFC5088](#)] and [[RFC5089](#)].

### [4.](#) Architectural Protocol Overview (Model)

The aim of this section is to describe the PCEP model in the spirit of [[RFC4101](#)]. An architecture protocol overview (the big picture of the protocol) is provided in this section. Protocol details can be found in further sections.

#### [4.1.](#) Problem

The PCE-based architecture used for the computation of path for MPLS and GMPLS TE LSPs is described in [[RFC4655](#)]. When the PCC and the PCE are not collocated, a communication protocol between the PCC and the PCE is needed. PCEP is such a protocol designed specifically for communications between a PCC and a PCE or between two PCEs in compliance with [[RFC4657](#)]: a PCC may use PCEP to send a path computation request for one or more TE LSPs to a PCE and the PCE may reply with a set of computed paths if one or more paths can be found that satisfies the set of constraints.

## [4.2.](#) Architectural Protocol Overview

PCEP operates over TCP, which fulfils the requirements for reliable messaging and flow control without further protocol work.

Several PCEP messages are defined:

- Open and Keepalive messages are used to initiate and maintain a PCEP session respectively.
- PCReq: a PCEP message sent by a PCC to a PCE to request a path computation.
- PCRep: a PCEP message sent by a PCE to a PCC in reply to a path computation request. A PCRep message can either contain a set of computed paths if the request can be satisfied, or a negative reply if not. The negative reply may indicate the reason why no path could be found.
- PCNtf: a PCEP notification message either sent by a PCC to a PCE or a PCE to a PCC to notify of a specific event.
- PCErr: a PCEP message sent upon the occurrence of a protocol error condition.
- Close message: a message used to close a PCEP session.

The set of available PCEs may be either statically configured on a PCC or dynamically discovered. The mechanisms used to discover one

or more PCEs and to select a PCE are out of the scope of this



document.

A PCC may have PCEP sessions with more than one PCE and similarly a PCE may have PCEP sessions with multiple PCCs.

Each PCEP message is regarded as a single transmission unit and parts of messages MUST NOT be interleaved. So, for example, a PCC sending a PCReq and wishing to close the session, must complete sending the request message before starting to send a Close message.

#### [4.2.1.](#) Initialization Phase

The initialization phase consists of two successive steps (described in a schematic form in Figure 1):

- 1) Establishment of a TCP connection (3-way handshake) between the PCC and the PCE.

- 2) Establishment of a PCEP session over the TCP connection.

Once the TCP connection is established, the PCC and the PCE (also referred to as "PCEP peers") initiate PCEP session establishment during which various session parameters are negotiated. These parameters are carried within Open messages and include the Keepalive timer, the Deadtimer and potentially other detailed capabilities and policy rules that specify the conditions under which path computation requests may be sent to the PCE. If the PCEP session establishment phase fails because the PCEP peers disagree on the session parameters or one of the PCEP peers does not answer after the expiration of the establishment timer, the TCP connection is immediately closed. Successive retries are permitted but an implementation should make use of an exponential back-off session establishment retry procedure.

Keepalive messages are used to acknowledge Open messages, and once the PCEP session has been successfully established.

Only one PCEP session can exist between a pair of PCEP peers at any one time. Only one TCP connection on the PCEP port can exist between a pair of PCEP peers at any one time.

Details about the Open message and the Keepalive message can be found in [Section 6.2](#) and [Section 6.3](#) respectively.




Figure 1: PCEP Initialization phase (initiated by a PCC)

(Note that once the PCEP session is established, the exchange of Keepalive messages is optional)

#### [4.2.2.](#) Session Keepalive

Once a session has been established, a PCE or PCC may want to know that its PCEP peer is still available for use.

It can rely on TCP for this information, but it is possible that the remote PCEP function has failed without disturbing the TCP connection. It is also possible to rely on the mechanisms built into the TCP implementations, but these might not provide sufficiently timely notifications of failures. Lastly, a PCC could wait until it has a path computation request to send and use its failed transmission or the failure to receive a response as evidence that the session has failed, but this is clearly inefficient.

In order to handle this situation, PCEP includes a keepalive mechanism based on a Keepalive timer, a Dead timer, and a Keepalive message.

Each end of a PCEP session runs a Keepalive timer. It restarts the timer every time it sends a message on the session. When the timer

expires, it sends a Keepalive message. Other traffic may serve as Keepalive (see [Section 6.3](#)).

The ends of the PCEP session also run Dead timers, and they restart them whenever a message is received on the session. If one end of the session receives no message before the Dead timer expires, it declares the session dead.

Note that this means that the Keepalive message is unresponded and does not form part of a two-way keepalive handshake as used in some protocols. Also note that the mechanism is designed to reduce to a minimum the amount of keepalive traffic on the session.

The keepalive traffic on the session may be unbalanced according to the requirements of the session ends. Each end of the session can specify (on an Open message) the Keepalive timer that it will use (i.e., how often it will transmit a Keepalive message if there is no other traffic) and a Dead timer that it recommends its peer to use (i.e., how long the peer should wait before declaring the session dead if it receives no traffic). The session ends may use different Keepalive timer values.

The minimum value of the Keepalive timer is 1 second, and it is specified in units of 1 second. The recommended default value is 30 seconds. The timer may be disabled by setting it to zero.

The recommended default for the Dead timer is 4 times the value of the Keepalive timer used by the remote peer. This means that there is never any risk of congesting TCP with excessive Keepalive messages.

#### [4.2.3](#). Path Computation Request Sent By a PCC to a PCE




Figure 2: Path Computation request

Once a PCC has successfully established a PCEP session with one or more PCEs, if an event is triggered that requires the computation of a set of paths, the PCC first selects one or more PCE. Note that the PCE selection decision process may have taken place prior to the PCEP session establishment.

Once the PCC has selected a PCE, it sends the PCE a path computation request to the PCE (PCReq message) that contains a variety of objects that specify the set of constraints and attributes for the path to be computed. For example "Compute a TE LSP path with source IP address=x.y.z.t, destination IP address=x'.y'.z'.t', bandwidth=B Mbit/s, Setup/Hold priority=P, ...". Additionally, the PCC may desire to specify the urgency of such request by assigning a request priority. Each request is uniquely identified by a request-id number and the PCC-PCE address pair. The process is shown in a schematic form in Figure 2.

Note that multiple path computation requests may be outstanding from one PCC to a PCE at any time.

Details about the PCReq message can be found in [Section 6.4](#)

#### [4.2.4.](#) Path Computation Reply Sent By The PCE to a PCC




Figure 3a: Path Computation Request With Successful Path Computation






Figure 3b: Path Computation Request With Unsuccessful Path Computation

Upon receiving a path computation request from a PCC, the PCE triggers a path computation, the result of which can either be:


- o Positive (Figure 3-a): the PCE manages to compute a path that satisfies the set of required constraints, in which case the PCE returns the set of computed paths to the requesting PCC. Note that PCEP supports the capability to send a single request that requires the computation of more than one path (e.g., computation of a set of link-diverse paths).
- o Negative (Figure 3-b): no path could be found that satisfies the set of constraints. In this case, a PCE may provide the set of constraints that led to the path computation failure. Upon receiving a negative reply, a PCC may decide to resend a modified request or take any other appropriate action.

Details about the PCRep message can be found in [Section 6.5](#).

#### [4.2.5](#). Notification

There are several circumstances in which a PCE may want to notify a

PCC of a specific event. For example, suppose that the PCE suddenly gets overloaded, potentially leading to unacceptable response times. The PCE may want to notify one or more PCCs that some of their requests (listed in the notification) will not be satisfied or may experience unacceptable delays. Upon receiving such notification, the PCC may decide to redirect its path computation requests to another PCE should an alternate PCE be available. Similarly, a PCC may desire to notify a PCE of a particular event such as the cancellation of pending requests.






Figure 4: Example of PCC Notification (Cancellation Notification) Sent To a PCE




Figure 5: Example of PCE Notification (Cancellation Notification) Sent To a PCC

Details about the PCNtf message can be found in [Section 6.6](#).

#### [4.2.6.](#) Error

The PCEP Error message (also referred to as a PCErr message) is sent in several situations: when a protocol error condition is met or when



the request is not compliant with the PCEP specification (e.g., capability not supported, reception of a message with a mandatory missing object, policy violation, unexpected message, unknown request reference, ...).




Figure 6: Example of Error message Sent By a PCE To a PCC In Reply To The Reception Of a Malformed Object

Details about the PCErr message can be found in [Section 6.7](#).

#### 4.2.7. Termination of the PCEP Session

When one of the PCEP peers desires to terminate a PCEP session it first sends a PCEP Close message and then closes the TCP connection. If the PCEP session is terminated by the PCE, the PCC clears all the states related to pending requests previously sent to the PCE. Similarly, if the PCC terminates a PCEP session the PCE clears all pending path computation requests sent by the PCC in question as well as the related states. A Close message can only be sent to terminate a PCEP session if the PCEP session has previously been established.

In case of TCP connection failure, the PCEP session is immediately terminated.

Details about the Close message can be found in [Section 6.8](#).

#### [4.2.8.](#) Intermittent versus Permanent PCEP Session

An implementation may decide to keep the PCEP session alive (and thus the corresponding TCP connection) for an unlimited time (this may for instance be appropriate when path computation requests are sent on a frequent basis so as to avoid to open a TCP connection each time a path computation request is needed, which would incur additional processing delays). Conversely, in some other circumstances, it may be desirable to systematically open and close a PCEP session for each PCEP request (for instance when sending a path computation request is a rare event).

### [5.](#) Transport Protocol

PCEP operates over TCP using a registered TCP port (to be assigned by IANA). This allows the requirements of reliable messaging and flow control to be met without further protocol work. All PCEP message MUST be sent using the registered TCP port for the source and destination TCP port.

### [6.](#) PCEP Messages

A PCEP message consists of a common header followed by a variable length body made of a set of objects that can either be mandatory or optional. In the context of this document, an object is said to be mandatory in a PCEP message when the object MUST be included for the message to be considered as valid. A PCEP message with a missing mandatory object MUST trigger an Error message (see [Section 7.15](#)). Conversely, if an object is optional, the object may or may not be present.

A flag referred to as the P flag is defined in the common header of each PCEP object (see [Section 7.2](#)). When this flag is set in an object in a PCReq, the PCE MUST take the information carried in the object into account during the path computation. For example, the METRIC object defined in [Section 7.8](#) allows a PCC to specify a bounded acceptable path cost. The METRIC object is optional, but a PCC may set a flag to ensure that the constraint is taken into account. In this case, if the constraint cannot be taken into account by the PCE, the PCE MUST trigger an Error message.

For each PCEP message type, rules are defined that specify the set of objects that the message can carry. We use the Backus-Naur Form (BNF) (see [[I-D.farrel-rtg-common-bnf](#)]) to specify such rules. Square brackets refer to optional sub-sequences. An implementation

MUST form the PCEP messages using the object ordering specified in

this document.

### [6.1.](#) Common header




Figure 7: PCEP Message Common Header

Ver (Version - 3 bits): PCEP version number. Current version is version 1.

Flags (5 bits): no flags are currently defined. Unassigned bits are considered as reserved. They MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Message-Type (8 bits):

The following message types are currently defined (to be confirmed by IANA).

Value	Meaning
1	Open
2	Keepalive
3	Path Computation Request
4	Path Computation Reply
5	Notification
6	Error
7	Close

Message-Length (16 bits): total length of the PCEP message expressed in bytes including the common header.

### [6.2.](#) Open Message

The Open message is a PCEP message sent by a PCC to a PCE and a PCE to a PCC in order to establish a PCEP session. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header for the Open message is set to 1 (To

be confirmed by IANA).

Once the TCP connection has been successfully established, the first message sent by the PCC to the PCE or by the PCE to the PCC MUST be an Open message as specified in [Appendix A](#).

Any message received prior to an Open message MUST trigger a protocol error condition causing a PCErr message to be sent with Error-Type

Vasseur &amp; Le Roux

Expires May 21, 2009

[Page 17]

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

'PCEP session establishment failure' and Error-Value 'reception of an invalid Open message or a non Open message' and the PCEP session establishment attempt MUST be terminated by closing the TCP connection.

The Open message is used to establish a PCEP session between the PCEP peers. During the establishment phase the PCEP peers exchange several session characteristics. If both parties agree on such characteristics the PCEP session is successfully established.

Open message

```
<Open Message> ::= <Common Header>  
                    <OPEN>
```

The Open message MUST contain exactly one OPEN object (see [Section 7.3](#)).

Various session characteristics are specified within the OPEN object. Once the TCP connection has been successfully established the sender MUST start an initialization timer called OpenWait after the expiration of which if no Open message has been received it sends a PCErr message and releases the TCP connection (see [Appendix A](#) for details).

Once an Open message has been sent to a PCEP peer, the sender MUST start an initialization timer called KeepWait after the expiration of which if neither a Keepalive message has been received nor a PCErr message in case of disagreement of the session characteristics, a PCErr message MUST be sent and the TCP connection MUST be released (see [Appendix A](#) for details).

The KeepWait timer has a fixed value of 1 minute.

Upon the receipt of an Open message, the receiving PCEP peer MUST

determine whether the suggested PCEP session characteristics are acceptable. If at least one of the characteristics is not acceptable by the receiving peer, it MUST send an Error message. The Error message SHOULD also contain the related Open object: for each unacceptable session parameter, an acceptable parameter value SHOULD be proposed in the appropriate field of the Open object in place of the originally proposed value. The PCEP peer MAY decide to resend an Open message with different session characteristics. If a second Open message is received with the same set of parameters or with parameters that are still unacceptable, the receiving peer MUST send an Error message and it MUST immediately close the TCP connection. Details about error message can be found in [Section 7.15](#). Successive retries are permitted but an implementation SHOULD make use of an exponential back-off session establishment retry procedure.

If the PCEP session characteristics are acceptable, the receiving PCEP peer MUST send a Keepalive message (defined in [Section 6.3](#)) that serves as an acknowledgment.

The PCEP session is considered as established once both PCEP peers have received a Keepalive message from their peer.

A PCEP implementation is free to process received requests in any order. For example, the requests may be processed in the order they are received, re-ordered and assigned priority according to local policy, re-ordered according to the priority encoded in the RP Object ([Section 7.4.1](#)), or processed in parallel.

### [6.3](#). Keepalive Message

A Keepalive message is a PCEP message sent by a PCC or a PCE in order to keep the session in active state. The Keepalive message is also used in response to an Open message to acknowledge that an Open message has been received and that the PCEP session characteristics are acceptable. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header for the Keepalive message is set to 2 (To be confirmed by IANA). The Keepalive message does not contain any object.

PCEP has its own keepalive mechanism used to ensure of the liveness of the PCEP session. This requires the determination of the frequency at which each PCEP peer sends Keepalive messages.

Asymmetric values may be chosen; thus there is no constraint mandating the use of identical keepalive frequencies by both PCEP peers. The DeadTimer is defined as the period of time after the expiration of which a PCEP peer declares the session down if no PCEP message has been received (Keepalive or any other PCEP message: thus, any PCEP message acts as a Keepalive message). Similarly, there is no constraints mandating the use of identical DeadTimers by both PCEP peers. The minimum Keepalive timer value is 1 second. Deployments SHOULD consider carefully the impact of using low values for the Keepalive timer as these might not give rise to the expected results in periods of temporary network instability.

Keepalive messages are sent at the frequency specified in the OPEN object carried within an Open message according to the rules specified in [Section 7.3](#). Because any PCEP message may serve as Keepalive, an implementation may either decide to send Keepalive messages at fixed intervals regardless on whether other PCEP messages might have been sent since the last sent Keepalive message, or may decide to differ the sending of the next Keepalive message based on the time at which the last PCEP message (other than Keepalive) was sent.

Note that sending Keepalive messages to keep the session alive is optional and PCEP peers may decide to not send Keepalive messages once the PCEP session is established in which case the peer that does not receive Keepalive messages does not expect to receive them and MUST NOT declare the session as inactive.

Keepalive message

<Keepalive Message>::= <Common Header>

#### [6.4](#). Path Computation Request (PCReq) Message

A Path Computation Request message (also referred to as a PCReq message) is a PCEP message sent by a PCC to a PCE to request a path computation. A PCReq message may carry more than one path computation request. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header for the PCReq message is set to 3 (To be confirmed by IANA).

There are two mandatory objects that MUST be included within a PCReq message: the RP and the END-POINTS objects (see section [Section 7](#)).

If one or both of these objects is missing, the receiving PCE MUST send an error message to the requesting PCC. Other objects are optional.

The format of a PCReq message is as follows:

```
<PCReq Message> ::= <Common Header>
                        [<SVEC-list>]
                        <request-list>
```

where:

```
<svec-list> ::= <SVEC> [<svec-list>]
<request-list> ::= <request> [<request-list>]
```

```
<request> ::= <RP>
                <END-POINTS>
                [<LSPA>]
                [<BANDWIDTH>]
                [<metric-list>]
                [<RRO> [<BANDWIDTH>]]
                [<IRO>]
                [<LOAD-BALANCING>]
```

where:

```
<metric-list> ::= <METRIC> [<metric-list>]
```

The SVEC, RP, END-POINTS, LSPA, BANDWIDTH, METRIC, RRO, IRO and LOAD-BALANCING objects are defined in [Section 7](#). The special case of two BANDWIDTH objects is discussed in detail in [Section 7.7](#).

## [6.5](#). Path Computation Reply (PCRep) Message

The PCEP Path Computation Reply message (also referred to as a PCRep message) is a PCEP message sent by a PCE to a requesting PCC in response to a previously received PCReq message. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header is set to 4 (To be confirmed by IANA).

The bundling of multiple replies to a set of path computation requests within a single PCRep message is supported by PCEP. If a PCE receives non-synchronized path computation requests by means of one or more PCReq messages from a requesting PCC it MAY decide to

bundle the computed paths within a single PCRep message so as to reduce the control plane load. Note that the counter side of such an approach is the introduction of additional delays for some path computation requests of the set. Conversely, a PCE that receives multiple requests within the same PCReq message MAY decide to provide each computed path in separate PCRep messages or within the same PCRep message. A PCRep message may contain positive and negative replies.

A PCRep message may contain a set of computed paths corresponding to either a single path computation request with load-balancing (see [Section 7.16](#)) or multiple path computation requests originated by a requesting PCC. The PCRep message may also contain multiple acceptable paths corresponding to the same request.

The PCRep message MUST contain at least one RP object. For each reply that is bundled into a single PCReq message, an RP object MUST be included that contains a Request-ID-number identical to the one specified in the RP object carried in the corresponding PCReq message (see [Section 7.4](#) for the definition of the RP object).

If the path computation request can be satisfied (the PCE finds a set of paths that satisfy the set of constraints), the set of computed paths specified by means of ERO objects is inserted in the PCRep message. The ERO is defined in [Section 7.9](#). The situation where multiple computed paths are provided in a PCRep message is discussed in detail in [Section 7.13](#). Furthermore, when a PCC requests the computation of a set of paths for a total amount of bandwidth by means of a LOAD-BALANCING object carried within a PCReq message, the ERO of each computed path may be followed by a BANDWIDTH object as discussed in section [Section 7.16](#).

If the path computation request cannot be satisfied, the PCRep message MUST include a NO-PATH object. The NO-PATH object (described in [Section 7.5](#)) may also contain other information (e.g, reasons for the path computation failure).

The format of a PCRep message is as follows:

```
<PCRep Message> ::= <Common Header>  
                    <response-list>
```

where:



<response-list>::=<response>[<response-list>]

<response>::=<RP>  
    [<NO-PATH>]  
    [<attribute-list>]  
    [<path-list>]

<path-list>::=<path>[<path-list>]

<path>::= <ERO><attribute-list>

where:

<attribute-list>::=[<LSPA>]  
                  [<BANDWIDTH>]  
                  [<metric-list>]  
                  [<IRO>]

<metric-list>::=<METRIC>[<metric-list>]

## [6.6.](#) Notification (PCNtf) Message

The PCEP Notification message (also referred to as the PCNtf message) can be sent either by a PCE to a PCC, or by a PCC to a PCE, to notify of a specific event. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header is set to 5 (To be confirmed by IANA).

The PCNtf message MUST carry at least one NOTIFICATION object and MAY contain several NOTIFICATION objects should the PCE or the PCC intend to notify of multiple events. The NOTIFICATION object is defined in [Section 7.14](#). The PCNtf message MAY also contain RP objects (see [Section 7.4](#) when the notification refers to particular path computation requests.

The PCNtf message may be sent by a PCC or a PCE in response to a request or in an unsolicited manner.

The format of a PCNtf message is as follows:

```
<PCNtf Message> ::= <Common Header>
                        <notify-list>
```

```
<notify-list> ::= <notify> [<notify-list>]
```

```
<notify> ::= [<request-id-list>]
            <notification-list>
```

```
<request-id-list> ::= <RP> [<request-id-list>]
```

```
<notification-list> ::= <NOTIFICATION> [<notification-list>]
```

## [6.7.](#) Error (PCErr) Message

The PCEP Error message (also referred to as a PCErr message) is sent in several situations: when a protocol error condition is met or when the request is not compliant with the PCEP specification (e.g., reception of a malformed message, reception of a message with a mandatory missing object, policy violation, unexpected message, unknown request reference, ...). The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header is set to 6 (To be confirmed by IANA).

The PCErr message is sent by a PCC or a PCE in response to a request or in an unsolicited manner. If the PCErr message is sent in response to a request, the PCErr message MUST include the set of RP objects related to the pending path computation requests that triggered the error condition. In the later case (unsolicited), no RP object is inserted in the PCErr message. For example, no RP object is inserted in a PCErr when the error condition occurred during the initialization phase. A PCErr message MUST contain a PCEP-ERROR object specifying the PCEP error condition. The PCEP-ERROR object is defined in section [Section 7.15](#).

The format of a PCErr message is as follows:

```
<PCErr Message> ::= <Common Header>
                    ( <error-object-list> [<Open>] ) | <error>
                    [<error-list>]
```

```
<error-obj-list> ::= <PCEP-ERROR> [<error-obj-list>]
```

```
<error> ::= [<request-id-list>]
           <error-obj-list>
```

```
<request-id-list> ::= <RP> [<request-id-list>]
```

```
<error-list> ::= <error> [<error-list>]
```

The procedure upon the receipt of a PCErr message is defined in [Section 7.15](#).

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

## [6.8.](#) Close Message

The Close message is a PCEP message that is either sent by a PCC to a PCE or by a PCE to a PCC in order to close an established PCEP session. The Message-Type field of the PCEP common header for the Close message is set to 7 (To be confirmed by IANA).

Close message

```
<Close Message>::= <Common Header>
                     <CLOSE>
```

The Close message MUST contain exactly one CLOSE object (see [Section 6.8](#)). If more than one CLOSE object is present, the first MUST be processed and subsequent objects ignored.

Upon the receipt of a valid Close message, the receiving PCEP peer MUST cancel all pending requests, it MUST close the TCP connection and MUST NOT send any further PCEP messages on the PCEP session.

## [6.9.](#) Reception of Unknown Messages

A PCEP implementation that receives an unrecognized PCEP message MUST send a PCErr message with Error-value=2 (capability not supported).

If a PCC/PCE receives unrecognized messages at a rate equal of greater than MAX-UNKNOWN-MESSAGES unknown message requests per minute, the PCC/PCE MUST send a PCEP CLOSE message with close value="Reception of an unacceptable number of unknown PCEP message". A RECOMMENDED value for MAX-UNKNOWN-MESSAGES is 5. The PCC/PCE MUST close the TCP session and MUST NOT send any further PCEP messages on the PCEP session.

## [7.](#) Object Formats

PCEP objects have a common format. They begin with a common object header (see [Section 7.2](#)). This is followed by object-specific fields defined for each different object. The object may also include one or more type-length-value (TLV) encoded data sets. Each TLV has the same structure as described in [Section 7.1](#).

### [7.1.](#) PCE TLV Format

A PCEP object may include a set of one or more optional TLVs.

Type: 2 bytes

The Length field defines the length of the value portion in bytes. The TLV is padded to 4-bytes alignment; padding is not included in the Length field (so a three byte value would have a length of three, but the total size of the TLV would be eight bytes).

Unrecognized TLVs MUST be ignored.

IANA management of the PCEP Object TLV type identifier codespace is described in [Section 9](#).

## 7.2. Common Object Header

A PCEP object carried within a PCEP message consists of one or more 32-bit words with a common header which has the following format:




Figure 8: PCEP common object header

Object-Class (8 bits): identifies the PCEP object class.

OT (Object-Type - 4 bits): identifies the PCEP object type.

The Object-Class and Object-Type fields are managed by IANA.

The Object-Class and Object-Type fields uniquely identify each PCEP object.

Res flags (2 bits). Reserved field. This field MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

- o P flag (Processing-Rule - 1-bit): the P flag allows a PCC to specify in a PCReq message sent to a PCE whether the object must be taken into account by the PCE during path computation or is just optional. When the P flag is set, the object MUST be taken

into account by the PCE. Conversely, when the P flag is cleared, the object is optional and the PCE is free to ignore it.

- o I flag (Ignore - 1 bit): the I flag is used by a PCE in a PCRep message to indicate to a PCC whether or not an optional object was processed. The PCE MAY include the ignored optional object in its reply and set the I flag to indicate that the optional object was ignored during path computation. When the I flag is cleared, the PCE indicates that the optional object was processed during the path computation. The setting of the I flag for optional objects is purely indicative and optional. The I flag has no meaning in a PCRep message when the P flag has been set in the corresponding PCReq message.

If the PCE does not understand an object with the P flag set or understands the object but decides to ignore the object, the entire PCEP message MUST be rejected and the PCE MUST send a PCErr message with Error-Type="Unknown Object" or "Not supported Object" along with the corresponding RP object. Note that if a PCReq includes multiple requests, only requests for which an object with the P flag set is unknown/unrecognized MUST be rejected.

Object Length (16 bits). Specifies the total object length including the header, in bytes. The Object Length field MUST always be a multiple of 4, and at least 4. The maximum object content length is 65528 bytes.

### [7.3.](#) OPEN Object

The OPEN object MUST be present in each Open message and MAY be present in a PCErr message. There MUST be only one OPEN object per Open or PCErr message.

The OPEN object contains a set of fields used to specify the PCEP version, Keepalive frequency, DeadTimer, PCEP session ID along with various flags. The OPEN object may also contain a set of TLVs used to convey various session characteristics such as the detailed PCE capabilities, policy rules and so on. No TLVs are currently defined.

OPEN Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

OPEN Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the OPEN object body is as follows:




Figure 9: OPEN Object format

Ver (3 bits): PCEP version. Current version is 1.

Flags (5 bits): No Flags are currently defined. Unassigned bits are considered as reserved. They MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Keepalive (8 bits): maximum period of time (in seconds) between two

consecutive PCEP messages sent by the sender of this message. The minimum value for the Keepalive is 1 second. When set to 0, once the session is established, no further Keepalive messages are sent to the remote peer. A RECOMMENDED value for the keepalive frequency is 30 seconds.

DeadTimer (8 bits): specifies the amount of time after the expiration of which the PCEP peer can declare the session with the sender of the Open message down if no PCEP message has been received. The DeadTimer SHOULD be set to 0 and MUST be ignored if the Keepalive is set to 0. A RECOMMENDED value for the DeadTimer is 4 times the value of the Keepalive.

Example:

A sends an Open message to B with Keepalive=10 seconds and Deadtimer=40 seconds. This means that A sends Keepalive messages (or any other PCEP message) to B every 10 seconds and B can declare the PCEP session with A down if no PCEP message has been received from A within any 40 second period.

SID (PCEP session-ID - 8 bits): unsigned PCEP session number that identifies the current session. The SID MUST be incremented each time a new PCEP session is established and is used for logging and troubleshooting purposes. Each increment SHOULD have a value of 1 and may cause a wrap back to zero.

The SID is used to disambiguate instances of sessions to the same peer. A PCEP implementation could use a single source of SIDs across all peers, or one source for each peer. The former might constrain the implementation to only 256 concurrent sessions. The latter potentially requires more states. There is one SID number in each direction.

Optional TLVs may be included within the OPEN object body to specify PCC or PCE characteristics. The specification of such TLVs is outside the scope of this document.

When present in an Open message, the OPEN object specifies the proposed PCEP session characteristics. Upon receiving unacceptable PCEP session characteristics during the PCEP session initialization

phase, the receiving PCEP peer (PCE) MAY include an OPEN object within the PCErr message so as to propose alternative acceptable session characteristic values.

#### [7.4.](#) RP Object

The RP (Request Parameters) object MUST be carried within each PCReq and PCRep messages and MAY be carried within PCNtf and PCErr messages. The RP object is used to specify various characteristics of the path computation request.

The P flag of the RP object MUST be set in PCReq and PCReq messages and MUST be cleared in PCNtf and PCErr messages. If the RP object is received with the P flag set incorrectly according to the rules states above, the receiving peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=10 and Error-value=1. The corresponding path computation request MUST be cancelled by the PCE without further notification.

##### [7.4.1.](#) Object Definition

RP Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=2)

RP Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the RP object body is as follows:

```

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
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                               Flags                               |0|B|R| Pri |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
```






Figure 10: RP object body format

The RP object body has a variable length and may contain additional TLVs. No TLVs are currently defined.

Flags (32 bits)

The following flags are currently defined:

- o **Pri (Priority - 3 bits):** the Priority field may be used by the requesting PCC to specify to the PCE the request's priority from 1 to 7. The decision of which priority should be used for a specific request is of a local matter and **MUST** be set to 0 when unused. Furthermore, the use of the path computation request priority by the PCE's scheduler is implementation specific and out of the scope of this document. Note that it is not required for a PCE to support the priority field: in this case, it is **RECOMMENDED** that the PCC set the priority field to 0 in the RP object. If the PCE does not take into account the request priority, it is **RECOMMENDED** to set the priority field to 0 in the RP object carried within the corresponding PCRep message, regardless of the priority value contained in the RP object carried within the corresponding PCReq message. A higher numerical value of the priority field reflects a higher priority. Note that it is the responsibility of the network administrator to make use of the priority values in a consistent manner across the various PCCs. The ability of a PCE to support request prioritization **MAY** be dynamically discovered by the PCCs by means of PCE capability discovery. If not advertised by the PCE, a PCC may decide to set the request priority and will learn the ability of the PCE to support request prioritization by observing the Priority field of the RP object received in the PCRep message. If the value of the Pri field is set to 0, this means that the PCE does not support the handling of request priorities: in other words, the path

computation request has been honoured but without taking the request priority into account.

- o R (Reoptimization - 1 bit): when set, the requesting PCC specifies that the PCReq message relates to the reoptimization of an existing TE LSP. For all TE LSPs except 0-bandwidth LSPs, when the R bit is set, an RRO (see [Section 7.10](#)) MUST be included in the PCReq message to show the path of the existing TE LSP. Also, for all TE LSPs except 0-bandwidth LSPs, then the R bit is set, the existing bandwidth of the TE LSP to be reoptimized MUST be supplied in a BANDWIDTH object (see [Section 7.7](#)). This BANDWIDTH object is in addition to the instance of that object used to describe the desired bandwidth of the reoptimized LSP. For 0-bandwidth LSPs, the RRO and BANDWIDTH objects that report the characteristics of the existing TE LSP are optional.
- o B (Bi-directional - 1 bit): when set, the PCC specifies that the path computation request relates to a bidirectional TE LSP that has the same traffic engineering requirements including fate sharing, protection and restoration, LSRs, TE Links, and resource requirements (e.g., latency and jitter) in each direction. When cleared, the TE LSP is unidirectional.
- o O (strict/loose - 1 bit): when set, in a PCReq message, this indicates that a loose path is acceptable. Otherwise, when cleared, this indicates to the PCE that a path exclusively made of strict hops is required. In a PCRep message, when the O bit is set this indicates that the returned path is a loose path, otherwise (the O bit is cleared), the returned path is made of strict hops.

Unassigned bits are considered as reserved. They MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Request-ID-number (32 bits). The Request-ID-number value combined with the source IP address of the PCC and the PCE address uniquely identify the path computation request context. The Request-ID-number is used for disambiguation between pending requests and thus it MUST be changed (such as by incrementing it) each time a new request is sent to the PCE, and may wrap.

The value 0x00000000 is considered as invalid.

If no path computation reply is received from the PCE (e.g. request dropped by the PCE because of memory overflow), and the PCC wishes to resend its request, the same Request-ID-number MUST be used. Upon receiving a path computation request from a PCC with the same Request-ID-number the PCE SHOULD treat the request as a new request

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

but an implementation MAY choose to catch path computation replies in order to quickly handle retransmission without having to handle twice a path computation request should have the first request been dropped or lost. Upon receiving a path computation reply from a PCE with the same Request-ID-number the PCC SHOULD silently discard the path computation reply.

Conversely, different Request-ID-number MUST be used for different requests sent to a PCE.

The same Request-ID-number MAY be used for path computation requests sent to different PCEs. The path computation reply is unambiguously identified by the IP source address of the replying PCE.

#### [7.4.2.](#) Handling of the RP Object

If a PCReq message is received that does not contain an RP object, the PCE MUST send a PCErr message to the requesting PCC with Error-type="Required Object missing" and Error-value="RP Object missing".

If the 0 bit of the RP message carried within a PCReq message is cleared and local policy has been configured on the PCE to not provide explicit paths (for instance, for confidentiality reasons), a PCErr message MUST be sent by the PCE to the requesting PCC and the pending path computation request MUST be discarded. The Error-type is "Policy Violation" and Error-value is "0 bit cleared".

R bit: when the R bit of the RP object is set in a PCReq message, this indicates that the path computation request relates to the reoptimization of an existing TE LSP. In this case, the PCC MUST also provide the strict/loose path by including an RRO object in the PCReq message so as to avoid/limit double bandwidth counting if and only if the TE LSP is a non-0-bandwidth TE LSP. If the PCC has not requested a strict path (0 bit set), a reoptimization can still be requested by the PCC but this requires that the PCE either be stateful (keep track of the previously computed path with the associated list of strict hops), or have the ability to retrieve the complete required path segment. Alternatively the PCC MUST inform the PCE of the working path with the associated list of strict hops in PCReq. The absence of an RRO in the PCReq message for a non-0-bandwidth TE LSP when the R bit of the RP object is set MUST trigger the sending of a PCErr message with Error-type="Required Object Missing" and Error-value="RRO Object missing for reoptimization".

If a PCC/PCE receives a PCRep/PCReq message that contains a RP object referring to an unknown Request-ID-Number, the PCC/PCE MUST send a PCErr message with Error-Type="Unknown request reference". This is used for debugging purposes. If a PCC/PCE receives PCRep/PCReq at a

rate equal of greater than MAX-UNKOWN-REQUESTS unknown requests per minute, the PCC/PCE MUST send a PCEP CLOSE message with close value="Reception of an unacceptable number of unknown requests/replies". A RECOMMENDED value for MAX-UNKOWN-REQUESTS is 5. The PCC/PCE MUST close the TCP session and MUST NOT send any further PCEP messages on the PCEP session.

The reception of a PCEP message that contains a RP object referring to a Request-ID-number=0x00000000 MUST be treated similarly to an unknown request.

#### [7.5.](#) NO-PATH Object

The NO-PATH object is used in PCRep messages in response to an unsuccessful path computation request (the PCE could not find a path satisfying the set of constraints). When a PCE cannot find a path satisfying a set of constraints, it MUST include a NO-PATH object in the PCRep message.

There are several categories of issue that can lead to a negative reply. For example, the PCE chain might be broken (should there be more than one PCE involved in the path computation) or no path obeying the set constraints could be found. The "NI (Nature of Issue)" field in the NO-PATH object is used to report the error category.

Optionally, if the PCE supports such capability, the NO-PATH object MAY contain an optional NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV defined below and used to provide more information on the reasons that led to a negative reply. The PCRep message MAY also contain a list of objects that specify the set of constraints that could not be satisfied. The PCE MAY just replicate the set of objects that was received that was the cause of the unsuccessful computation or MAY optionally report a suggested value for which a path could have been found (in which case the value differs from the value in the original request).

NO-PATH Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=3)

NO-PATH Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the NO-PATH object body is as follows:




Figure 11: NO-PATH Object Format

NI - Nature Of Issue (8bits): the NI field is used to report the nature of the issue that led to a negative reply. Two values are currently defined:

0x00: No path satisfying the set of constraints could be found

0x01: PCE chain broken

The Nature Of Issue field value can be used by the PCC for various purposes:

- o Constraint adjustment before re-issuing a new path computation request,
- o Explicit selection of a new PCE chain,

- o Logging of the error type for further action by the network administrator

IANA management of the NI field codespace is described in [Section 9](#).

Flags (16 bits).

The following flag is currently defined:

C flag (1 bit): when set, the PCE indicates the set of unsatisfied constraints (reasons why a path could not be found) in the PCRep message by including the relevant PCEP objects. When cleared, no failing constraints are specified. The C flag has no meaning and is ignored unless the NI field is set to 0x00.

Unassigned bits are considered as reserved. They MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Reserved (8 bits): This field MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

The NO-PATH object body has a variable length and may contain additional TLVs. The only TLV currently defined is the NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV defined below.

Example: consider the case of a PCC that sends a path computation request to a PCE for a TE LSP of X MBits/s. Suppose that PCE cannot find a path for X MBits/s. In this case, the PCE must include in the PCRep message a NO-PATH object. Optionally the PCE may also include the original BANDWIDTH object so as to indicate that the reason for the unsuccessful computation is the bandwidth constraint (in this case, the NI field value is 0x00 and C flag is set). If the PCE supports such capability it may alternatively include the BANDWIDTH Object and report a value of Y in the bandwidth field of the BANDWIDTH object (in this case, the C flag is set) where Y refers to the bandwidth for which a TE LSP with the same other characteristics could have been computed.

When the NO-PATH object is absent from a PCRep message, the path computation request has been fully satisfied and the corresponding

paths are provided in the PCRep message.

An optional TLV named NO-PATH-VECTOR MAY be included in the NO-PATH object in order to provide more information on the reasons that led to a negative reply.

The NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV is compliant with the PCEP TLV format defined in [section 7.1](#) and is comprised of 2 bytes for the type, 2 bytes specifying the TLV length (length of the value portion in bytes) followed by a fixed length value field of 32-bit flags field.

TYPE: To be assigned by IANA (suggested value=1)

LENGTH: 4

VALUE: 32-bit flags field

IANA is requested to manage the space of flags carried in the NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV (see [Section 9](#)).

The following flags are currently defined:

- o Bit number: 31 - PCE currently unavailable
- o Bit number: 30 - Unknown destination
- o Bit number: 29 - Unknown source

## [7.6.](#) END-POINT Object

The END-POINTS object is used in a PCReq message to specify the source IP address and the destination IP address of the path for which a path computation is requested. The P flag of the END-POINT object MUST be set. If the END-POINT object is received with the P flag cleared, the receiving peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=10 and Error-value=1. The corresponding path computation request MUST be cancelled by the PCE without further notification.

Note that the source and destination addresses specified in the END-POINTS object may or may not correspond to the source and destination IP address of the TE LSP but rather to a path segment. Two END-POINTS objects (for IPv4 and IPv6) are defined.








Figure 12: END-POINTS Object Body Format for IPv4

The format of the END-POINTS object for IPv6 (Object-Type=2) is as follows:




Figure 13: END-POINTS Object Body Format for IPv6

The END-POINTS object body has a fixed length of 8 bytes for IPv4 and 32 bytes for IPv6.

If more than one END-POINTS object is present, the first MUST be processed and subsequent objects ignored.

### 7.7. BANDWIDTH Object

The BANDWIDTH object is used to specify the requested bandwidth for a TE LSP. The notion of bandwidth is similar to the one used for RSVP signaling in [[RFC2205](#)], [[RFC3209](#)] and [[RFC3473](#)].

If the requested bandwidth is equal to 0, the BANDWIDTH object is optional. Conversely, if the requested bandwidth is non equal to 0, the PCReq message MUST contain a BANDWIDTH object.

In the case of the reoptimization of a TE LSP, the bandwidth of the

existing TE LSP MUST also be included in addition to the requested

bandwidth if and only if the two values differ. Consequently, two Object-Type values are defined that refer to the requested bandwidth and the bandwidth of the TE LSP for which a reoptimization is being performed.

The BANDWIDTH object may be carried within PCReq and PCRep messages.

BANDWIDTH Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=5)

Two Object-Type values are defined for the BANDWIDTH object:

- o Requested bandwidth: BANDWIDTH Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)
- o Bandwidth of an existing TE LSP for which a reoptimization is requested. BANDWIDTH Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=2)

The format of the BANDWIDTH object body is as follows:




Figure 14: BANDWIDTH Object Body Format

Bandwidth: 32 bits. The requested bandwidth is encoded in 32 bits in IEEE floating point format (see [[IEEE.754.1985](#)]), expressed in bytes per second. Refer to [Section 3.1.2 of \[RFC3471\]](#) for a table of commonly used values.

The BANDWIDTH object body has a fixed length of 4 bytes.

## 7.8. METRIC Object

The METRIC object is optional and can be used for several purposes.

In a PCReq message, a PCC MAY insert one of more METRIC objects:

- o To indicate the metric that MUST be optimized by the path computation algorithm (IGP metric, TE metric, Hop counts). Currently, three metrics are defined: the IGP cost, the TE metric (see [[RFC3785](#)]) and the number of hops traversed by a TE LSP.

- o To indicate a bound on the path cost that MUST NOT be exceeded for the path to be considered as acceptable by the PCC.

In a PCRep message, the METRIC object MAY be inserted so as to provide the cost for the computed path. It MAY also be inserted within a PCRep with the NO-PATH object to indicate that the metric constraint could not be satisfied.

The path computation algorithmic aspects used by the PCE to optimize a path with respect to a specific metric are outside the scope of this document.

It must be understood that such path metrics are only meaningful if used consistently: for instance, if the delay of a computed path segment is exchanged between two PCEs residing in different domains, consistent ways of defining the delay must be used.

The absence of the METRIC object MUST be interpreted by the PCE as a path computation request for which no constraints need be applied to any of the metrics.

METRIC Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=6)

METRIC Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the METRIC object body is as follows:




Figure 15: METRIC Object Body Format

The METRIC object body has a fixed length of 8 bytes.

Reserved (16 bits): This field MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

T (Type - 8 bits): Specifies the metric type.

Three values are currently defined:

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

- o T=1: IGP metric
- o T=2: TE metric
- o T=3: Hop Counts

Flags (8 bits): Two flags are currently defined:

- o B (Bound - 1 bit): When set in a PCReq message, the metric-value indicates a bound (a maximum) for the path metric that must not be exceeded for the PCC to consider the computed path as acceptable. The path metric must be less than or equal to the value specified in the Metric-value field. When the B flag is cleared, the metric-value field is not used to reflect a bound constraint.
- o C (Computed Metric - 1 bit): When set in a PCReq message, this indicates that the PCE MUST provide the computed path metric value (should a path satisfying the constraints be found) in the PCRep message for the corresponding metric.

Unassigned flags MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Metric-value (32 bits): metric value encoded in 32 bits in IEEE floating point format (See [[IEEE.754.1985](#)]).

Multiple METRIC Objects MAY be inserted in a PCRep or the PCReq message. There MUST be at most one instance of the METRIC object for each metric type with the same B flag value. If two or more instances of a METRIC object with the same B flag value are present for a metric type, only the first instance MUST be considered and other instances MUST be ignored.

The presence of two METRIC objects of the same type with a different value of the B-Flag in a PCReq message is allowed. Furthermore, it is also allowed to insert in a PCReq message two METRIC objects with different types that have both their B-Flag cleared: in this case, an objective function must be used by the PCE to solve a multi-parameter constraint problem.

A METRIC object used to indicate the metric to optimize during the path computation MUST have the B-Flag cleared and the C-Flag set to the appropriate value. When the path computation relates to the reoptimization of an existing TE LSP (in which case R-Flag of the RP object is set) an implementation MAY decide to set the metric-value field to the computed value of the metric of the TE LSP to be reoptimized with regards to a specific metric type.

A METRIC object used to reflect a bound MUST have the B-Flag set, the C-Flag and metric-value field set to the appropriate values.

In a PCRep message, unless not allowed by PCE policy, at least one METRIC object MUST be present that reports the computed path metric if the C bit of the METRIC object was set in the corresponding path computation request (the B-flag MUST be cleared). The C-flag has no meaning in a PCRep message. Optionally the PCRep message MAY contain additional METRIC objects that correspond to bound constraints, in which case the metric-value MUST be equal to the corresponding computed path metric (the B-flag MUST be set). If no path satisfying the constraints could be found by the PCE, the METRIC objects MAY also be present in the PCRep message with the NO-PATH object to indicate the constraint metric that could be satisfied.

Example: if a PCC sends a path computation request to a PCE where the metric to optimize is the IGP metric and the TE metric must not exceed the value of M, two METRIC object are inserted in the PCReq message:

- o First METRIC Object with B=0, T=1, C=1, metric-value=0x0000
- o Second METRIC Object with B=1, T=2, metric-value=M

If a path satisfying the set of constraints can be found by the PCE and there is no policy that prevents the return of the computed metric, the PCE inserts one METRIC object with B=0, T=1, metric-value= computed IGP path cost. Additionally, the PCE may insert a second METRIC object with B=1, T=2, metric-value= computed TE path cost.

## [7.9.](#) Explicit Route Object

The ERO is used to encode the path of a TE LSP through the network. The ERO is carried within a PCRep message to provide the computed TE LSP should the path computation have been successful.

The contents of this object are identical in encoding to the contents of the Resource Reservation Protocol Traffic Engineering Extensions (RSVP-TE) Explicit Route Object (ERO) defined in [\[RFC3209\]](#), [\[RFC3473\]](#) and [\[RFC3477\]](#). That is, the object is constructed from a series of sub-objects. Any RSVP-TE ERO sub-object already defined or that could be defined in the future for use in the RSVP-TE ERO is acceptable in this object.

PCEP ERO sub-object types correspond to RSVP-TE ERO sub-object types.

Since the explicit path is available for immediate signaling by the

MPLS or GMPLS control plane, the meanings of all of the sub-objects and fields in this object are identical to those defined for the ERO.

ERO Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=7)

ERO Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

#### [7.10.](#) Reported Route Object

The RRO is exclusively carried within a PCReq message so as to report the route followed by a TE LSP for which a reoptimization is desired.

The contents of this object are identical in encoding to the contents of the Route Record Object defined in [\[RFC3209\]](#), [\[RFC3473\]](#) and [\[RFC3477\]](#). That is, the object is constructed from a series of sub-objects. Any RSVP-TE RRO sub-object already defined or that could be defined in the future for use in the RSVP-TE RRO is acceptable in this object.

The meanings of all of the sub-objects and fields in this object are identical to those defined for the RSVP-TE RRO.

PCEP RRO sub-object types correspond to RSVP-TE RRO sub-object types.

RRO Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=8)

RRO Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

### 7.11. LSPA Object

The LSPA object is optional and specifies various TE LSP attributes to be taken into account by the PCE during path computation. The LSPA (LSP Attributes) object can be carried within a PCReq message, or a PCRep message in case of unsuccessful path computation (in this case, the PCRep message also contains a NO-PATH object and the LSPA object is used to indicate the set of constraints that could not be satisfied). Most of the fields of the LSPA object are identical to the fields of the SESSION-ATTRIBUTE (C-Type = 7) object defined in [\[RFC3209\]](#) and [\[RFC4090\]](#). When absent from the PCReq message, this means that the Setup and Holding priorities are equal to 0, and there are no affinity constraints. See [section 4.7.4 of \[RFC3209\]](#) for a detailed description of the use of resource affinities.

LSPA Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=9)

LSPA Object-Types is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the LSPA object body 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
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                               Exclude-any                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                               Include-any                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                               Include-all                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
| Setup Prio  | Holding Prio |      Flags      |L|  Reserved  |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|                                                     Optional TLVs                                                     |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
```

### Figure 16: LSPA Object Body Format

Setup Prio (Setup Priority - 8 bits). The priority of the TE LSP with respect to taking resources, in the range of 0 to 7. The value 0 is the highest priority. The Setup Priority is used in deciding whether this session can preempt another session.

Holding Prio (Holding Priority - 8 bits). The priority of the TE LSP with respect to holding resources, in the range of 0 to 7. The value 0 is the highest priority. Holding Priority is used in deciding whether this session can be preempted by another session.

Flags (8 bits)

The flag L corresponds to the "Local protection desired" bit ([[RFC3209](#)]) of the SESSION-ATTRIBUTE Object.

L Flag (Local protection desired). When set, this means that the computed path must include links protected with Fast Reroute as defined in [[RFC4090](#)].

Unassigned flags MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Reserved (8 bits): This field MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Note that Optional TLVs may be defined in the future to carry additional TE LSP attributes such as those defined in [[RFC4420](#)].

#### [7.12](#). Include Route Object Object

The IRO (Include Route Object) is optional and can be used to specify that the computed path MUST traverse a set of specified network elements. The IRO MAY be carried within PCReq and PCRep messages. When carried within a PCRep message with the NO-PATH object, the IRO indicates the set of elements that cause de PCE to fail to find a path.

IRO Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=10)



IRO Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)




Figure 17: IRO Body Format

Subobjects: The IRO is made of subobjects identical to the ones defined in [RFC3209], [RFC3473] and [RFC3477] where the IRO subobject type is identical to the subobject type defined in the related documents.

The following subobject types are supported.

Type	Subobject
1	IPv4 prefix
2	IPv6 prefix
4	Unnumbered Interface ID
32	Autonomous system number

The L bit of such sub-object has no meaning within an IRO.

### [7.13. SVEC Object](#)

#### [7.13.1. Notion of Dependent and Synchronized Path Computation Requests](#)

Independent versus dependent path computation requests: path computation requests are said to be independent if they are not related to each other. Conversely a set of dependent path computation requests is such that their computations cannot be performed independently of each other (a typical example of dependent requests is the computation of a set of diverse paths).

Synchronized versus non-synchronized path computation requests: a set of path computation requests is said to be non-synchronized if their respective treatment (path computations) can be performed by a PCE in a serialized and independent fashion.

There are various circumstances where the synchronization of a set of path computations may be beneficial or required.

Consider the case of a set of  $N$  TE LSPs for which a PCC needs to send path computation requests to a PCE. The first solution consists of sending  $N$  separate PCReq messages to the selected PCE. In this case, the path computation requests are non-synchronized. Note that the PCC may choose to distribute the set of  $N$  requests across  $K$  PCEs for load balancing purposes. Considering that  $M$  (with  $M < N$ ) requests are sent to a particular PCE <sub>$i$</sub> , as described above, such  $M$  requests can be sent in the form of successive PCReq messages destined to PCE <sub>$i$</sub>  or bundled within a single PCReq message (since PCEP allows for the bundling of multiple path computation requests within a single PCReq message). That said, even in the case of independent requests, it can be desirable to request from the PCE the computation of their paths in a synchronized fashion that is likely to lead to more optimal path computations and/or reduced blocking probability if the PCE is a stateless PCE. In other words, the PCE should not compute the corresponding paths in a serialized and independent manner but it should rather "simultaneously" compute their paths. For example, trying to "simultaneously" compute the paths of  $M$  TE LSPs may allow the PCE to improve the likelihood to meet multiple constraints.

Consider the case of two TE LSPs requesting  $N_1$  Mbits/s and  $N_2$  Mbits/s respectively and a maximum tolerable end-to-end delay for each TE LSP of  $X$  ms. There may be circumstances where the computation of the first TE LSP irrespectively of the second TE LSP may lead to the impossibility to meet the delay constraint for the second TE LSP.

A second example is related to the bandwidth constraint. It is quite straightforward to provide examples where a serialized independent path computation approach would lead to the impossibility to satisfy both requests (due to bandwidth fragmentation) while a synchronized path computation would successfully satisfy both requests.

A last example relates to the ability to avoid the allocation of the same resource to multiple requests thus helping to reduce the call set up failure probability compared to the serialized computation of independent requests.

Dependent path computation are usually synchronized. For example, in the case of the computation of  $M$  diverse paths, if such paths are computed in a non-synchronized fashion this seriously increases the

probability of not being able to satisfy all requests (sometimes also referred to as the well-know "trapping problem").

Furthermore, this would not allow a PCE to implement objective functions such as trying to minimize the sum of the TE LSP costs. In such a case, the path computation requests must be synchronized: they cannot be computed independently of each other.

Conversely a set of independent path computation requests may or may not be synchronized.

The synchronization of a set of path computation requests is achieved by using the SVEC object that specifies the list of synchronized requests that can either be dependent or independent.

PCEP supports the following three modes:

- o Bundle of a set of independent and non-synchronized path computation requests,
- o Bundle of a set of independent and synchronized path computation requests (SVEC object defined below required),
- o Bundle of a set of dependent and synchronized path computation requests (SVEC object defined below required).

#### [7.13.2.](#) SVEC Object

[Section 7.13.1](#) details the circumstances under which it may be desirable and/or required to synchronize a set of path computation requests. The SVEC (Synchronization VECtor) object allows a PCC to request the synchronization of a set of dependent or independent path computation requests. The SVEC object is optional and may be carried within a PCReq message.

The aim of the SVEC object carried within a PCReq message is to request the synchronization of M path computation requests. The SVEC object is a variable length object that lists the set of M path computation requests that must be synchronized. Each path computation request is uniquely identified by the Request-ID-number carried within the respective RP object. The SVEC object also contains a set of flags that specify the synchronization type.

SVEC Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=11)

SVEC Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the SVEC object body is as follows:




Figure 18: SVEC Body Object Format

**Reserved (8 bits):** This field **MUST** be set to zero on transmission and **MUST** be ignored on receipt.

**Flags (24 bits):** Defines the potential dependency between the set of path computation requests.

- o **L (Link diverse) bit:** when set, this indicates that the computed paths corresponding to the requests specified by the following RP objects **MUST NOT** have any link in common.
- o **N (Node diverse) bit:** when set, this indicates that the computed paths corresponding to the requests specified by the following RP objects **MUST NOT** have any node in common.
- o **S (SRLG diverse) bit:** when set, this indicates that the computed paths corresponding to the requests specified by the following RP objects **MUST NOT** share any SRLG (Shared Risk Link Group).

In case of a set of M synchronized independent path computation requests, the bits L, N and S are cleared.

Unassigned flags **MUST** be set to zero on transmission and **MUST** be ignored on receipt.

The flags defined above are not exclusive.

### 7.13.3. Handling of the SVEC Object

The SVEC object allows a PCC to specify a list of M path computation requests that **MUST** be synchronized along with a potential dependency. The set of M path computation requests may be sent within a single PCReq message or multiple PCReq messages. In the later case, it is **RECOMMENDED** for the PCE to implement a local timer activated upon the receipt of the first PCReq message that contains the SVEC object

Vasseur &amp; Le Roux

Expires May 21, 2009

[Page 46]

Internet-Draft

draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt

November 2008

after the expiration of which, if all the M path computation requests have not been received, a protocol error is triggered (this timer is called the SyncTimer). When a PCE receives a path computation request that cannot be satisfied (for example, because the PCReq message contains an object with the P bit set that is not supported), the PCE sends a PCErr message for this request (see [Section 7.2](#), the PCE MUST cancel the whole set of related path computation requests and MUST send a PCErr message with Error-Type="Synchronized path computation request missing").

Note that such PCReq message may also contain non-synchronized path computation requests. For example, the PCReq message may comprise N synchronized path computation requests related to RP 1, ... , RP N listed in the SVEC object along with any other path computation requests that are processed as normal.

### 7.14. NOTIFICATION Object

The NOTIFICATION object is exclusively carried within a PCNtf message and can either be used in a message sent by a PCC to a PCE or by a PCE to a PCC so as to notify of an event.

NOTIFICATION Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=12)

NOTIFICATION Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the NOTIFICATION body object is as follows:

[illegible]




Figure 19: NOTIFICATION Body Object Format

Reserved (8 bits): This field MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Flags (8 bits): no flags are currently defined. Unassigned flags MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

NT (Notification Type - 8 bits): the Notification-type specifies the class of notification

NV (Notification Value - 8 bits): the Notification-value provides addition information related to the nature of the notification.

Both the Notification-type and Notification-value should be managed by IANA.

The following Notification-type and Notification-value values are currently defined:

- o Notification-type=1: Pending Request cancelled
  - \* Notification-value=1: PCC cancels a set of pending requests. A Notification-type=1, Notification-value=1 indicates that the PCC wants to inform a PCE of the cancellation of a set of pending requests. Such an event could be triggered because of external conditions such as the receipt of a positive reply from another PCE (should the PCC have sent multiple requests to a set of PCEs for the same path computation request), a network event such as a network failure rendering the request obsolete, or any other events local to the PCC. A NOTIFICATION object with Notification-type=1, Notification-value=1 is carried within a PCNtf message sent by the PCC to the PCE. The RP object corresponding to the cancelled request MUST also be

present in the PCNtf message. Multiple RP objects may be carried within the PCNtf message in which case the notification applies to all of them. If such a notification is received by a PCC from a PCE, the PCC MUST silently ignore the notification and no errors should be generated.

- \* Notification-value=2: PCE cancels a set of pending requests. A Notification-type=1, Notification-value=2 indicates that the PCE wants to inform a PCC of the cancellation of a set of pending requests. A NOTIFICATION object with Notification-type=1, Notification-value=2 is carried within a PCNtf message sent by a PCE to a PCC. The RP object corresponding to the cancelled request MUST also be present in the PCNtf message. Multiple RP objects may be carried within the PCNtf message in which case the notification applies to all of them. If such notification is received by a PCE from a PCC, the PCE MUST silently ignore the notification and no errors should be generated.

- o Notification-type=2: Overloaded PCE

- \* Notification-value=1: A Notification-type=2, Notification-value=1 indicates to the PCC that the PCE is currently in an overloaded state. If no RP objects are included in the PCNtf message, this indicates that no other requests SHOULD be sent to that PCE until the overloaded state is cleared: the pending requests are not affected and will be served. If some pending requests cannot be served due to the overloaded state, the PCE MUST also include a set of RP objects that identifies the set of pending requests that are cancelled by the PCE and will not be honored. In this case, the PCE does not have to send an additional PCNtf message with Notification-type=1 and Notification-value=2 since the list of cancelled requests is specified by including the corresponding set of RP objects. If such notification is received by a PCE from a PCC, the PCE MUST silently ignore the notification and no errors should be generated.
- \* A PCE implementation SHOULD use a dual threshold mechanism used to determine whether it is in a congestion state with regards

to specific resources monitoring (e.g. CPU, memory, ...). The use of such thresholds is to avoid oscillations between overloaded/non-overloaded state that may result in oscillations of request targets by the PCCs."

★

Optionally, a TLV named OVERLOADED-DURATION may be included in the NOTIFICATION object that specifies the period of time during which no further request should be sent to the PCE. Once this period of time has elapsed, the PCE should no longer be considered in congested state.

The OVERLOADED-DURATION TLV is compliant with the PCEP TLV format defined in [section 7.1](#) and is comprised of 2 bytes for the type, 2 bytes specifying the TLV length (length of the value portion in bytes) followed by a fix length value field of 32-bits flags field.

TYPE: To be assigned by IANA (suggested value=2)

LENGTH: 4

VALUE: 32-bits flags field indicates the estimated PCE congestion duration in seconds.

- ★ Notification-value=2: A Notification-type=2, Notification-value=2 indicates that the PCE is no longer in overloaded state and is available to process new path computation requests. An implementation SHOULD make sure that a PCE sends such notification to every PCC to which a Notification message (with Notification-type=2, Notification-value=1) has been sent unless

an OVERLOADED-DURATION TLV has been included in the corresponding message and the PCE wishes to wait for the expiration of that period of time before receiving new requests. If such notification is received by a PCE from a PCC, the PCE MUST silently ignore the notification and no errors should be generated. It is RECOMMENDED to support some dampening notification procedure on the PCE so as to avoid too frequent congestion state and congestion state release notifications. For example, an implementation could make use of an hysteresis approach using a dual-thresholds mechanism triggering the sending of congestion state notifications. Furthermore, in case of high instabilities of the PCE



resources, an additional dampening mechanism SHOULD be used (linear or exponential) to pace the notification frequency and avoid path computation requests oscillation.

When a PCC receives an overload indication from a PCE it should consider the impact on the entire network. It must be remembered that other PCCs may also receive the notification and so many path computation requests could be redirected to other PCEs. This may, in turn, cause further overloading at PCEs in the network. Therefore, an application at a PCC receiving an overload notification should consider applying some form of back-off (e.g. exponential) to the rate at which it generates path computation requests into the network. This is especially the case as the number of PCEs reporting overload grows.

### 7.15. PCEP-ERROR Object

The PCEP-ERROR object is exclusively carried within a PCErr message to notify of a PCEP error.

PCEP-ERROR Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=13)

PCEP-ERROR Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the PCEP-ERROR object body is as follows:

[illegible]




Figure 20: PCEP-ERROR Object Body Format

A PCEP-ERROR object is used to report a PCEP error and is characterized by an Error-Type that specifies the type of error and an Error-value that provides additional information about the error type. Both the Error-Type and the Error-Value should be managed by IANA (see the IANA section).

Reserved (8 bits): This field MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Flags (8 bits): no flag is currently defined. This flag MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Error-type (8 bits): defines the class of error.

Error-value (8 bits): provides additional details about the error.

Optionally the PCEP-ERROR object may contain additional TLV so as to provide further information about the encountered error.

A single PCErr message may contain multiple PCEP-ERROR objects.

For each PCEP error, an Error-type and an Error-value are defined.

Error-Type	Meaning
1	PCEP session establishment failure Error-value=1: reception of an invalid Open message or a non Open message. Error-value=2: no Open message received before the expiration of the OpenWait timer Error-value=3: unacceptable and non negotiable session characteristics Error-value=4: unacceptable but negotiable session characteristics Error-value=5: reception of a second Open message with still unacceptable session characteristics Error-value=6: reception of a PCErr message proposing unacceptable session characteristics Error-value=7: No Keepalive or PCErr message received before the expiration of the KeepWait timer
2	Capability not supported
3	Unknown Object Error-value=1: Unrecognized object class Error-value=2: Unrecognized object Type
4	Not supported object Error-value=1: Not supported object class Error-value=2: Not supported object Type
5	Policy violation Error-value=1: C bit of the METRIC object set (request rejected) Error-value=2: O bit of the RP object set (request rejected)
6	Mandatory Object missing Error-value=1: RP object missing Error-value=2: RRO object missing for a reoptimization request (R bit of the RP object set) when bandwidth is not equal to 0. Error-value=3: END-POINTS object missing
7	Synchronized path computation request missing
8	Unknown request reference
9	Attempt to establish a second PCEP session
10	Reception of an invalid object Error-value=1: reception of an object with P flag not set although the P-flag must be set according to this specification.

Error-Type=1: PCEP session establishment failure.

If a malformed message is received, the receiving PCEP peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=1, Error-value=1.

If no Open message is received before the expiration of the OpenWait

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

timer, the receiving PCEP peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=1, Error-value=2 (see [Appendix A](#) for details).

If one or more PCEP session characteristics are unacceptable by the receiving peer and are not negotiable, it MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=1, Error-value=3.

If an Open message is received with unacceptable session characteristics but these characteristics are negotiable, the receiving PCEP peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=1, Error-value=4 (see [Section 6.2](#) for details).

If a second Open message is received during the PCEP session establishment phase and the session characteristics are still unacceptable, the receiving PCEP peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=1, Error-value=5 (see [Section 6.2](#) for details).

If a PCErr message is received during the PCEP session establishment phase that contains an Open message proposing unacceptable session characteristics, the receiving PCEP peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=1, Error-value=6.

If neither a Keepalive message nor a PCErr message is received before the expiration of the KeepWait timer during the PCEP session establishment phase, the receiving PCEP peer MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=1, Error-value=7.

Error-Type=2: the PCE indicates that the path computation request cannot be honored because it does not support one or more required capability. The corresponding path computation request MUST be cancelled.

Error-Type=3 or Error-Type=4: if a PCEP message is received that carries a PCEP object (with the P flag set) not recognized by the PCE or recognized but not supported, then the PCE MUST send a PCErr message with a PCEP-ERROR object (Error-Type=3 and 4 respectively). In addition, the PCE MAY include in the PCErr message the unknown or not supported object. The corresponding path computation request MUST be cancelled by the PCE without further notification.

Error-Type=5: if a path computation request is received that is not compliant with an agreed policy between the PCC and the PCE, the PCE

MUST send a PCErr message with a PCEP-ERROR object (Error-Type=5). The corresponding path computation MUST be cancelled. Policy-specific TLVs carried within the PCEP-ERROR object may be defined in other documents to specify the nature of the policy violation.

Error-Type=6: if a path computation request is received that does not

contain a mandatory object, the PCE MUST send a PCErr message with a PCEP-ERROR object (Error-Type=6). If there are multiple mandatory objects missing, the PCErr message MUST contain one PCEP-ERROR object per missing object. The corresponding path computation MUST be cancelled.

Error-Type=7: if a PCC sends a synchronized path computation request to a PCE and the PCE does not receive all the synchronized path computation requests listed within the corresponding SVEC object after the expiration of the timer SyncTimer defined in [Section 7.13.3](#), the PCE MUST send a PCErr message with a PCEP-ERROR object (Error-Type=7). The corresponding synchronized path computation MUST be cancelled. It is RECOMMENDED for the PCE to include the REQ-MISSING TLVs (defined below) that identifies the missing requests.

The REQ-MISSING TLV is compliant with the PCEP TLV format defined in [section 7.1](#) and is comprised of 2 bytes for the type, 2 bytes specifying the TLV length (length of the value portion in bytes) followed by a fix length value field of 4 bytes.

TYPE: To be assigned by IANA (suggested value=3)

LENGTH: 4

VALUE: 4 bytes that indicates the request-id-number that corresponds to the missing request.

Error-Type=8: if a PCC receives a PCRep message related to an unknown path computation request, the PCC MUST send a PCErr message with a PCEP-ERROR object (Error-Type=8). In addition, the PCC MUST include in the PCErr message the unknown RP object.

Error-Type=9: if a PCEP peer detects an attempt from another PCEP peer to establish a second PCEP session, it MUST send a PCErr message with Error-type=9, Error-value=1. The existing PCEP session MUST be preserved and all subsequent messages related to the tentative

establishment of the second PCEP session MUST be silently ignored.

### 7.16. LOAD-BALANCING Object

There are situations where no TE LSP with a bandwidth of X could be found by a PCE although such bandwidth requirement could be satisfied by a set of TE LSPs such that the sum of their bandwidths is equal to X. Thus, it might be useful for a PCC to request a set of TE LSPs so that the sum of their bandwidth is equal to X MBits/s, with potentially some constraints on the number of TE LSPs and the minimum bandwidth of each of these TE LSPs. Such request is made by inserting a LOAD-BALANCING object in a PCReq message sent to a PCE.

The `LOAD-BALANCING` object is optional.

LOAD-BALANCING Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=14)

LOAD-BALANCING Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the LOAD-BALANCING object body is as follows:




Figure 21: LOAD-BALANCING Object Body Format

Reserved (16 bits): This field **MUST** be set to zero on transmission and **MUST** be ignored on receipt.

Flags (8 bits): No Flag is currently defined. The Flag field **MUST** be set to zero on transmission and **MUST** be ignored on receipt.

Max-LSP (8 bits): maximum number of TE LSPs in the set

Min-Bandwidth (32 bits). Specifies the minimum bandwidth of each element of the set of TE LSPs. The bandwidth is encoded in 32 bits in IEEE floating point format (see [[IEEE.754.1985](#)]), expressed in bytes per second.

The LOAD-BALANCING object body has a fixed length of 8 bytes.

If a PCC requests the computation of a set of TE LSPs so that the sum of their bandwidth is X, the maximum number of TE LSP is N and each TE LSP must at least have a bandwidth of B, it inserts a BANDWIDTH object specifying X as the required bandwidth and a LOAD-BALANCING object with the Max-LSP and Min-Bandwidth fields set to N and B respectively.

## 7.17. CLOSE Object

The CLOSE object MUST be present in each Close message. There MUST be only one CLOSE object per Close message. If a Close message is received that contains more than one CLOSE object, the first CLOSE object is the one that must be processed. Other CLOSE objects MUST

be silently ignored.

CLOSE Object-Class is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=15)

CLOSE Object-Type is to be assigned by IANA (recommended value=1)

The format of the CLOSE object body is as follows:




Figure 22: CLOSE Object Format

Reserved (16 bits): This field MUST be set to zero on transmission

and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Flags (8 bits): No Flags are currently defined. The Flag field MUST be set to zero on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

Reason (8 bits): specifies the reason for closing the PCEP session. The setting of this field is optional. IANA is requested to manage the codespace of the Reason field. The following values are currently defined (To be confirmed by IANA).

#### Reasons

Value	Meaning
1	No explanation provided
2	DeadTimer expired
3	Reception of a malformed PCEP message
4	Reception of an unacceptable number of unknown requests/replies
5	Reception of an unacceptable number of unrecognized PCEP messages

Optional TLVs may be included within the CLOSE object body. The specification of such TLVs is outside the scope of this document.

## 8. Manageability Considerations

This section follows the guidance of

[\[I-D.ietf-pce-manageability-requirements\]](#).

### 8.1. Control of Function and Policy

A PCEP implementation SHOULD allow configuring the following PCEP session parameters on the implementation:

- o The local Keepalive and DeadTimer (i.e., parameters sent by the PCEP peer in an Open message),
- o The maximum acceptable remote Keepalive and DeadTimer (i.e., parameters received from a peer in an Open message),
- o Negotiation enabled or disabled,



- o If negotiation is allowed, the minimum acceptable Keepalive and Deadtimer timers received from a PCEP peer,
- o The SyncTimer,
- o The maximum number of sessions that can be setup,
- o Request timer: amount of time a PCC waits for a reply before resending its path computation requests (potentially to an alternate PCE).
- o The MAX-UNKNOWN-REQUESTS
- o The MAX-UNKNOWN-MESSAGES

These parameters may be configured as default parameters for any PCEP session the PCEP speaker participates in, or may apply to a specific session with a given PCEP peer or a specific group of sessions with a specific group of PCEP peers. A PCEP implementation SHOULD allow configuring the initiation of a PCEP session with a selected subset of discovered PCEs. Note that PCE selection is a local implementation issue. A PCEP implementation SHOULD allow configuring a specific PCEP session with a given PCEP peer. This includes the configuration of the following parameters:

- o The IP address of the PCEP peer,
- o The PCEP speaker role: PCC, PCE or both,
- o Whether the PCEP speaker should initiate the PCEP session or wait for initiation by the peer,

- o The PCEP session parameters, as listed above, if they differ from the default parameters,
- o A set of PCEP policies including the type of operations allowed for the PCEP peer (e.g. diverse path computation, synchronization, etc.)

A PCEP implementation MUST allow restricting the set of PCEP peers that can initiate a PCEP session with the PCEP speaker (e.g., list of authorized PCEP peers, all PCEP peers in the area, all PCEP peers in the AS).

## [8.2.](#) Information and Data Models

A PCEP MIB module is defined in [[I-D.kkoushik-pce-pcep-mib](#)] that describes managed objects for modeling of PCEP communication including:

- o PCEP client configuration and status,
- o PCEP peer configuration and information,
- o PCEP session configuration and information,
- o Notifications to indicate PCEP session changes.

## [8.3.](#) Liveness Detection and Monitoring

PCEP includes a keepalive mechanism to check the liveness of a PCEP peer and a notification procedure allowing a PCE to advertise its overload state to a PCC. Also, procedures in order to monitor the liveness and performances of a given PCE chain (in case of Multiple-PCE path computation) are defined in [[I-D.ietf-pce-monitoring](#)].

## [8.4.](#) Verifying Correct Operation

Verifying the correct operation of a PCEP communication can be performed by monitoring various parameters. A PCEP implementation SHOULD provide the following parameters:

- o Response time (minimum, average and maximum), on a per PCE Peer basis,
- o PCEP Session failures,
- o Amount of time the session has been in active state,

- o Number of corrupted messages,
- o Number of failed computations,
- o Number of requests for which no reply has been received after the expiration of a configurable timer and by verifying that a returned path fit in with the requested TE parameters.

A PCEP implementation SHOULD log error events (e.g. corrupted messages, unrecognized objects, etc.).

#### 8.5. Requirements on Other Protocols and Functional Components

PCEP does not put any new requirements on other protocols. As PCEP relies on the TCP transport protocol, PCEP management can make use of TCP management mechanisms (such as the TCP MIB defined in [[RFC4022](#)]).

The PCE Discovery mechanisms ([[RFC5088](#)], [[RFC5089](#)]) may have an impact on PCEP. To avoid that a high frequency of PCE Discovery/Disappearance trigger high frequency of PCEP session setup/deletion, it is RECOMMENDED to introduce some dampening for establishment of PCEP sessions.

#### 8.6. Impact on Network Operation

In order to avoid any unacceptable impact on network operations, an implementation SHOULD allow a limit to be placed on the number of session that can be set up on a PCEP speaker, and MAY allow a limit to be placed on the rate of messages sent by a PCEP speaker and received from a peer. It MAY also allow sending a notification when a rate threshold is reached.

### 9. IANA Considerations

IANA assigns values to the PCEP protocol parameters (messages, objects, TLVs).

IANA is requested to establish a new top-level registry to contain all PCEP codepoints and sub-registries.

The allocation policy for each new registry is by IETF Consensus: new values are assigned through the IETF consensus process (see [[RFC5226](#)]). Specifically, new assignments are made via RFCs approved by the IESG. Typically, the IESG will seek input on prospective assignments from appropriate persons (e.g., a relevant Working Group if one exists).

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

### [9.1.](#) TCP Port

PCEP will use a registered TCP port to be assigned by IANA.

### [9.2.](#) PCEP Messages

IANA is requested to create a registry for PCEP messages. Each PCEP message has a message type value.

Value	Meaning	Reference
1	Open	This document
2	Keepalive	This document
3	Path Computation Request	This document
4	Path Computation Reply	This document
5	Notification	This document
6	Error	This document
7	Close	This document

### [9.3.](#) PCEP Object

IANA is requested to create a registry for PCEP objects. Each PCEP object has an Object-Class and an Object-Type.

Object-Class Value	Name	Reference
1	OPEN Object-Type 1	This document
2	RP Object-Type 1	This document
3	NO-PATH Object-Type 1	This document
4	END-POINTS Object-Type 1: IPv4 addresses 2: IPv6 addresses	This document
5	BANDWIDTH	This document

Object-Type

1: Requested bandwidth

2: Bandwidth of an existing TE LSP  
for which a reoptimization is performed.

Internet-Draft	<a href="#">draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt</a>	November 2008
6	METRIC Object-Type 1	This document
7	ERO Object-Type 1	This document
8	RRO Object-Type 1	This document
9	LSPA Object-Type 1	This document
10	IRO Object-Type 1	This document
11	SVEC Object-Type 1	This document
12	NOTIFICATION Object-Type 1	This document
13	PCEP-ERROR Object-Type 1	This document
14	LOAD-BALANCING Object-Type 1	This document

#### [9.4.](#) PCEP Message Common Header

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the Flag field of the PCEP Message Common Header.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

Vasseur & Le Roux

Expires May 21, 2009

[Page 61]

---

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

No Bits are currently for the PCEP message common header.

#### [9.5.](#) Open Object Flag Field

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the Flag field of the Open object.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

No Bits are currently for the Open object flag field.

#### [9.6.](#) RP Object

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

Several bits are defined for the RP Object flag field in this document. The following values have been assigned:

#### Codespace of the Flag field (RP Object)

Bit	Description	Reference
26	Strict/Loose	This document
27	Bi-directional	This document
28	Reoptimization	This document
29-31	Priority	This document

### [9.7.](#) NO-PATH Object Flag Field

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the codespace of NI field and the Flag field of the NO-PATH object.

Value	Meaning	Reference
0	No path satisfying the set of constraints could be found	This document
1	PCE chain broken	This document

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

One bit is defined for the NO-PATH Object flag field in this document:

Codespace of the Flag field (NO-PATH Object)

Bit	Description	Reference
0	Unsatisfied constrained indicated	This document

## [9.8.](#) METRIC Object

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the codespace of T field and the Flag field of the METRIC Object.

Codespace of the T field (Metric Object)

Value	Meaning	Reference
1	IGP metric	This document
2	TE metric	This document
3	Hop Counts	This document

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC



Several bits are defined in this document. The following values have been assigned:

Codespace of the Flag field (Metric Object)

Bit	Description	Reference
6	Computed metric	This document
7	Bound	This document

#### 9.9. LSPA Object Flag Field

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the Flag field of the LSPA object.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

One bit is defined for the LSPA Object flag field in this document:

Codespace of the Flag field (LSPA Object)

Bit	Description	Reference
7	Local Protection Desired	This document

#### 9.10. SVEC Object Flag Field

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the Flag field of the SVEC object.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

Three bits are defined for the SVEC Object flag field in this document:

#### Codespace of the Flag field (SVEC Object)

Bit	Description	Reference
21	Link Diverse	This document
22	Node Diverse	This document
23	SRLG Diverse	This document

### [9.11.](#) Notification Object

IANA is requested to create a registry for the Notification-type and Notification-value of the Notification Object and manage the code space.

Notification-type	Name	Reference
1	Pending Request cancelled Notification-value 1: PCC cancels a set of pending requests 2: PCE cancels a set of pending requests	This document
2	PCE Congestion Notification-value 1: PCE in congested state 2: PCE no longer in congested state	This document

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the Flag field of the Notification object.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)

- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

No Bits are currently for the Flag Field of the Notification Object.

#### [9.12.](#) PCEP-ERROR Object

IANA is requested to create a registry for the Error-type and Error-value of the PCEP Error Object and manage the code space.

For each PCEP error, an Error-type and an Error-value are defined.

Error-Type	Meaning	Reference
1	PCEP session establishment failure Error-value=1: reception of an invalid Open message or a non Open message. Error-value=2: no Open message received before the expiration of the OpenWait timer Error-value=3: unacceptable and non negotiable session characteristics Error-value=4: unacceptable but negotiable session characteristics Error-value=5: reception of a second Open message with still unacceptable session characteristics Error-value=6: reception of a PCErr message proposing unacceptable session characteristics Error-value=7: No Keepalive or PCErr message received before the expiration of the KeepWait timer Error-value=8: PCEP version not supported	This document
2	Capability not supported	This document
3	Unknown Object Error-value=1: Unrecognized object class Error-value=2: Unrecognized object Type	This document
4	Not supported object Error-value=1: Not supported object class Error-value=2: Not supported object Type	This document
5	Policy violation Error-value=1: C bit of the METRIC object set (request rejected) Error-value=2: O bit of the RP object cleared (request rejected)	This document
6	Mandatory Object missing Error-value=1: RP object missing Error-value=2: RRO missing for a reoptimization request (R bit of the RP object set) Error-value=3: END-POINTS object missing	This document
7	Synchronized path computation request missing	This document
8	Unknown request reference	This document
9	Attempt to establish a second PCEP session	This document
10	Reception of an invalid object Error-value=1: reception of an object with P flag not set although the P-flag must be set according to this specification.	This document

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the Flag field of the PCEP-ERROR object.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)

- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

No Bits are currently for the Flag Field of the PCEP-ERROR Object.

#### [9.13.](#) LOAD-BALANCING Object Flag Field

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the Flag field of the LOAD-BALANCING object.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

No Bits are currently for the Flag Field of the LOAD-BALANCING Object.

#### [9.14.](#) CLOSE Object

The CLOSE object MUST be present in each Close message in order to close a PCEP session. The reason field of the CLOSE object specifies the reason for closing the PCEP session. The reason field of the CLOSE object is managed by IANA.

##### Reasons

Value	Meaning
1	No explanation provided
2	DeadTimer expired
3	Reception of a malformed PCEP message
4	Reception of an unacceptable number of unknown requests/replies
5	Reception of an unacceptable number of unrecognized PCEP messages

IANA is requested to create a registry to manage the flag field of the CLOSE object.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action. Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities:

- o Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)

- o Capability Description
- o Defining RFC

No Bits are currently for the Flag Field of the CLOSE Object.

#### [9.15.](#) PCEP TLV Type Indicators

IANA is requested to create a registry for the PCEP TLVs.

Value	Meaning	Reference
1	NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV	This document
2	OVERLOAD-DURATION TLV	This document
3	REQ-MISSING TLV	This document

#### [9.16.](#) NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV

IANA is requested to manage the space of flags carried in the NO-PATH-VECTOR TLV defined in this document, numbering them from 0 as the least significant bit.

New bit numbers may be allocated only by an IETF Consensus action.

Each bit should be tracked with the following qualities: - Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit) - Name flag - Reference

Bit Number	Name	Reference
31	PCE currently Unavailable	This document
30	Unknown Destination	This document

## 10. Security Considerations

### 10.1. Vulnerability

Attacks on PCEP may result in damage to active networks. If path computation responses are changed, the PCC may be encouraged to set up inappropriate LSPs. Such LSPs might deviate to parts of the network susceptible to snooping, or might transit congested or reserved links. Path computation responses may be attacked by modification of the PCRep message, by impersonation of the PCE, or by modification of the PCReq to cause the PCE to perform a different computation from that which was originally requested.

Vasseur &amp; Le Roux

Expires May 21, 2009

[Page 69]

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

It is also possible to damage the operation of a PCE through a variety of denial of service attacks. Such attacks can cause the PCE to become congested with the result that path computations are supplied too slowly to be of value for PCCs. This could lead to slower than acceptable recovery times or delayed LSP establishment. In extreme cases it may be that service requests are not satisfied.

PCEP could be the target of the following attacks:

- o Spoofing (PCC or PCE impersonation)
- o Snooping (message interception)
- o Falsification
- o Denial of Service

In inter-AS scenarios when PCE-to-PCE communication is required, attacks may be particularly significant with commercial as well as service-level implications.

Additionally, snooping of PCEP requests and responses may give an attacker information about the operation of the network. Simply by viewing the PCEP messages someone can determine the pattern of service establishment in the network, and can know where traffic is

being routed making the network susceptible to targeted attacks and the data within specific LSPs vulnerable.

The following sections identify mechanisms to protect PCEP against security attacks.

## [10.2.](#) TCP Security Techniques

At the time of writing, TCP-MD5 [[RFC2385](#)] is the only available security mechanism for securing the TCP connections that underly PCEP sessions.

As explained in [[RFC2385](#)], the use of MD5 faces some limitations and does not provide as high a level of security as was once believed. A PCEP implementation supporting TCP-MD5 SHOULD be designed so that stronger security keying techniques or algorithms that may be specified for TCP can be easily integrated in future releases.

The TCP Authentication Option [[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt](#)] (TCP-AO) specifies new security procedures for TCP, but is not yet complete. Since it is believed that [[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt](#)] will offer significantly improved security for applications using TCP. Implementers should expect to update their implementation as soon as

the TCP Authentication Option is published as an RFC.

Implementations MUST support TCP-MD5 and should make the security function available as a configuration option.

Operators will need to observe that some deployed PCEP implementations may pre-date the completion of [[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt](#)] and it will be necessary to configure policy for secure communication between PCEP speakers that support the TCP Authentication Option, and those that don't.

An alternative approach for security over TCP transport is to use the Transport Layer Security (TLS) protocol [[RFC5246](#)]. This provides protection against eavesdropping, tampering, and message forgery. But TLS doesn't protect the TCP connection itself, because it does not authenticate the TCP header. Thus it is vulnerable to attacks such as TCP reset attacks (something against which TCP-MD5 does protect). The use of TLS would, however, require the specification



of how PCEP initiates TLS handshaking and how it interprets the certificates exchanged in TLS. This specification is out of the scope of this document, but could be the subject of future work.

### 10.3. PCEP Authentication and Integrity

Authentication and integrity checks allow the receiver of a PCEP message to know that the message genuinely comes from the node that purports to have sent it and to know whether the message has been modified.

The TCP-MD5 mechanism [[RFC2385](#)] described in the previous section provides such a mechanism subject to the concerns listed in [[RFC2385](#)] and [[RFC4278](#)]. These issues will be addressed and resolved by [[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt](#)].

### 10.4. PCEP Privacy

Ensuring PCEP communication privacy is of key importance, especially in an inter-AS context, where PCEP communication end-points do not reside in the same AS, as an attacker that intercept a PCE message could obtain sensitive information related to computed paths and resources.

PCEP privacy can be ensured by encryption. TCP MAY be run over IPsec [[RFC4303](#)] tunnels to provide the required encryption. Note IPsec can also ensure authentication and integrity, in which case TCP-MD5 or TCP-AO would not be required. However, there is some concern that IPsec on this scale would be hard to configure and operate. Use of IPsec with PCEP is out of the scope of this document and may be

addressed in a separate document.

### 10.5. Key Configuration and Exchange

Authentication, tamper protection, and encryption all require the use of keys by sender and receiver.

Although key configuration per session is possible, it may be particularly onerous to operators (in the same way as for the Border Gateway Protocol (BGP) as discussed in [[I-D.ietf-rpsec-bgpsecrec](#)]). If there is a relatively small number of PCCs and PCEs in the network

manual key configuration MAY be consider as a valid choice by the operator, although it is important to be aware of the vulnerabilities introduced by such mechanisms as configuration errors, social engineering, and carelessness could all give rise to security breeches. Furthermore, manually configured keys are less likely to be regularly updated which also increases the security risk. Where there is a large number of PCCs and PCEs, the operator could find that key configuration and maintenance is a significant burden as each PCC needs to be configured to the PCE.

An alternative to individual keys is the use of a group key. A group key is common knowledge among all members of a trust domain. Thus, since the routers in an IGP area or an AS are part of a common trust domain [[I-D.ietf-mpls-mpls-and-gmpls-security-framework](#)], a PCEP group key MAY be shared among all PCCs and PCEs in an IGP area or AS. The use of a group key will considerably simplify the operator's configuration task while continuing to secure PCEP against attack from outside the network. However, it must be noted that the more entities that have access to a key, the greater the risk of that key becoming public.

With the use of a group key, separate keys would need to be configured for the PCE-to-PCE communications that cross trust domain (e.g., AS) boundaries, but the number of these relationships is likely to be very small.

PCE discovery ([[RFC5088](#)] and [[RFC5089](#)]) is a significant feature for the successful deployment of PCEP in large networks. This mechanism allows a PCC to discover the existence of suitable PCEs within the network without the necessity of configuration. It should be obvious that, where PCEs are discovered and not configured, the PCC cannot know the correct key to use. There are three possible approaches to this problem that retain some aspect of security:

- o The PCCs may use a group key as previously discussed,

- o The PCCs may use some form of secure key exchange protocol with the PCE (such as the Internet Key Exchange protocol v2 (IKE) [[RFC4306](#)]). The drawback to this is that IKE implementations on routers are not common and this may be a barrier to the deployment

of PCEP. Details are out of the scope of this document and may be addressed in a separate document.

- o The PCCs may make use of a key server to determine the key to use when talking to the PCE. To some extent, this is just moving the problem, since the PCC's communications with the key server must also be secure (for example using Kerberos [[RFC4120](#)]), but there may some (minor) benefit in scaling if the PCC is to learn about several PCEs and only need to know one key server. Note that key servers currently have very limited implementation. Details are out of the scope of this document and may be addressed in a separate document.

PCEP relationships are likely to be long-lived even if the PCEP sessions are repeatedly closed and re-established. Where protocol relationships persist for a large number of protocol interactions or over a long period of time, changes in the keys used by the protocol peers is RECOMMENDED [[RFC4107](#)]. Note that TCP-MD5 does not allow the key to be changed without closing and re-opening the TCP connection which would result in the PCEP session being terminated and needing to be restarted. That might not be an significant issue for PCEP. Note also that the plans for the TCP Authentication Option [[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt](#)] will allow dynamic key change (roll-over) for an active TCP connection.

If key exchange is used (for example through IKE) then it is relatively simple to support dynamic key updates and apply these to PCEP.

Note that inband key management for the TCP Authentication Option [[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt](#)] is currently unresolved.

[RFC3562] sets out some of the issues for the key management of secure TCP connections.

#### [10.6](#). Access Policy

Unauthorised access to PCE function represents a variety of potential attacks. Not only may this be a simple Denial of Service attack (see [Section 10.7](#)), but it would be a mechanism for an intruder to determine important information about the network and operational network policies simply by inserting bogus computation requests. Furthermore, false computation requests could be used to predict where traffic will be placed in the network when real requests are

made, allowing the attacker to target specific network resources.

PCEs SHOULD be configurable for access policy. Where authentication is used, access policy can be achieved through the exchange or configuration of keys as described in [Section 10.5](#). More simple policies MAY be configured on PCEs in the form of access lists where the IP addresses of the legitimate PCCs are listed. Policies SHOULD also be configurable to limit the type of computation requests that are supported from different PCCs.

It is RECOMMENDED that access policy violations are logged by the PCE and are available for inspection by the operator to determine whether attempts have been made to attack the PCE. Such mechanisms MUST be lightweight to prevent them from being used to support denial of service attacks (see [Section 10.7](#)).

#### [10.7](#). Protection Against Denial of Service Attacks

Denial of service (DoS) attacks could be mounted at the TCP level or at the PCEP level. That is, the PCE could be attacked through attacks on TCP or through attacks within established PCEP sessions.

##### [10.7.1](#). Protection Against TCP DoS Attacks

PCEP can be the target of TCP DoS attacks, such as for instance SYN attacks, as is the case for all protocols that run over TCP. Other protocol specifications have investigated this problem and PCEP can share their experience. The reader is referred to the specification of the Label Distribution Protocol (LDP) [[RFC5036](#)] for example. In order to protect against TCP DoS attacks, PCEP implementations can support the following techniques.

- o PCEP uses a single registered port for all communications. The PCE SHOULD listen for TCP connections only on ports where communication is expected.
- o The PCE MAY implement an access list to immediately reject (or discard) TCP connection attempts from unauthorized PCCs.
- o The PCE SHOULD NOT allow parallel TCP connections from the same PCC on the PCEP registered port.
- o The PCE MAY require the use of the MD5 option on all TCP connections rejecting (or discarding) any connection setup attempt that does not use MD5, and not accepting any SYN for which the MD5 segment checksum is invalid. Note, however, that the use of MD5 requires that the receiver use CPU resources to compute the

checksum before it can decide to discard an otherwise acceptable

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

SYN segment.

#### [10.7.2.](#) Request Input Shaping/Policing

A PCEP implementation may be subject to DoS attacks within a legitimate PCEP session. For example, a PCC might send a very large number of PCReq messages causing the PCE to become congested or causing requests from other PCCs to be queued.

Note that the direct use of the Priority field on the RP Object to prioritize received requests does not provide any protection since the attacker could set all requests to be of the highest priority.

Therefore, it is RECOMMENDED that PCE implementations include input shaping/policing mechanisms that either throttle the requests received from any one PCC, or apply queuing or priority-degradation techniques to over-communicative PCCs.

Such mechanisms MAY be set by default, but SHOULD be available for configuration. Such techniques may be considered particularly important in multi- service-provider environments to protect the resources of one service provider from unwarranted, over-zealous, or malicious use by PCEs in another service provider.

#### [11.](#) Authors' Addresses

The content of this document was contributed by the editors and the co-authors listed below:

Arthi Ayyangar  
Juniper Networks  
1194 N. Mathilda Ave  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
USA

Email: [arthi@juniper.net](mailto:arthi@juniper.net)

Adrian Farrel  
Old Dog Consulting

Phone: +44 (0) 1978 860944  
EMail: adrian@olddog.co.uk

Eiji Oki  
NTT  
Midori 3-9-11  
Musashino, Tokyo, 180-8585  
JAPAN

Vasseur & Le Roux

Expires May 21, 2009

[Page 75]

---

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

Email: oki.eiji@lab.ntt.co.jp

Alia Atlas  
British Telecom  
Email: akatlas@alum.mit.edu

Andrew Dolganow  
Alcatel  
600 March Road  
Ottawa, ON K2K 2E6  
CANADA

Email: andrew.dolganow@alcatel.com

Yuichi Ikejiri  
NTT Communications Corporation  
1-1-6 Uchisaiwai-cho, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo, 100-819  
JAPAN

Email: y.ikejiri@ntt.com

Kenji Kumaki  
KDDI Corporation  
Garden Air Tower Iidabashi, Chiyoda-ku,  
Tokyo, 102-8460  
JAPAN

Email: ke-kumaki@kddi.com

## [12.](#) Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dave Oran, Dean Cheng, Jerry Ash, Igor Bryskin, Carol Iturrade, Siva Sivabalan, Rich Bradford, Richard Douville, Jon Parker, Martin German and Dennis Aristow for their very valuable input. The authors would also like to thank Fabien Verhaeghe for the very fruitful discussions and useful suggestions. David McGrew and Brian Weis provided valuable input to the Security Considerations section.

Ross Callon, Magnus Westerlund, Lars Eggert, Pasi Eronen, Tim Polk, Chris Newman, and Russ Housley provided important input during IESG review.

## [13.](#) References

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

- [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.
- [RFC3477] Kompella, K. and Y. Rekhter, "Signalling Unnumbered Links in Resource ReSerVation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 3477](#), January 2003.
- [RFC4090] Pan, P., Swallow, G., and A. Atlas, "Fast Reroute Extensions to RSVP-TE for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 4090](#), May 2005.

[RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), May 2008.

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

[I-D.farrel-rtg-common-bnf]  
Farrel, A., "Reduced Backus-Naur Form (RBNF) A Syntax Used in Various Protocol Specifications",  
[draft-farrel-rtg-common-bnf-07](#) (work in progress),  
November 2008.

[I-D.ietf-mpls-mpls-and-gmpls-security-framework]  
Fang, L. and M. Behringer, "Security Framework for MPLS and GMPLS Networks",  
[draft-ietf-mpls-mpls-and-gmpls-security-framework-04](#) (work in progress), November 2008.

[I-D.ietf-pce-inter-layer-req]  
Oki, E., Roux, J., Kumaki, K., Farrel, A., and T. Takeda,  
"PCC-PCE Communication and PCE Discovery Requirements for

Inter-Layer Traffic Engineering",  
[draft-ietf-pce-inter-layer-req-08](#) (work in progress),  
October 2008.

[I-D.ietf-pce-interas-pcecp-reqs]  
Bitar, N., Kumaki, K., and R. Zhang, "Inter-AS Requirements for the Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP)",  
[draft-ietf-pce-interas-pcecp-reqs-06](#) (work in progress),  
May 2008.

[I-D.ietf-pce-manageability-requirements]  
Farrel, A., "Inclusion of Manageability Sections in PCE Working Group Drafts",  
[draft-ietf-pce-manageability-requirements-05](#) (work in progress), October 2008.

[I-D.ietf-pce-monitoring]  
Vasseur, J., Roux, J., and Y. Ikejiri, "A set of



monitoring tools for Path Computation Element based Architecture", [draft-ietf-pce-monitoring-03](#) (work in progress), November 2008.

[I-D.ietf-rpsec-bgpsecrec]

Christian, B. and T. Tauber, "BGP Security Requirements", [draft-ietf-rpsec-bgpsecrec-10](#) (work in progress), November 2008.

[I-D.ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt]

Touch, J., Mankin, A., and R. Bonica, "The TCP Authentication Option", [draft-ietf-tcpm-tcp-auth-opt-02](#) (work in progress), November 2008.

[I-D.kkoushik-pce-pcep-mib]

Stephan, E. and K. Koushik, "PCE communication protocol(PCEP) Management Information Base", [draft-kkoushik-pce-pcep-mib-02](#) (work in progress), November 2008.

[RFC1321] Rivest, R., "The MD5 Message-Digest Algorithm", [RFC 1321](#), April 1992.

[RFC2385] Heffernan, A., "Protection of BGP Sessions via the TCP MD5 Signature Option", [RFC 2385](#), August 1998.

[RFC3471] Berger, L., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Functional Description", [RFC 3471](#), January 2003.

[RFC3562] Leech, M., "Key Management Considerations for the TCP MD5 Signature Option", [RFC 3562](#), July 2003.

[RFC3785] Le Faucheur, F., Uppili, R., Vedrenne, A., Merckx, P., and T. Telkamp, "Use of Interior Gateway Protocol (IGP) Metric as a second MPLS Traffic Engineering (TE) Metric", [BCP 87](#), [RFC 3785](#), May 2004.

[RFC4022] Raghunarayan, R., "Management Information Base for the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP)", [RFC 4022](#), March 2005.

- [RFC4101] Rescorla, E. and IAB, "Writing Protocol Models", [RFC 4101](#), June 2005.
- [RFC4107] Bellovin, S. and R. Housley, "Guidelines for Cryptographic Key Management", [BCP 107](#), [RFC 4107](#), June 2005.
- [RFC4120] Neuman, C., Yu, T., Hartman, S., and K. Raeburn, "The Kerberos Network Authentication Service (V5)", [RFC 4120](#), July 2005.
- [RFC4278] Bellovin, S. and A. Zinin, "Standards Maturity Variance Regarding the TCP MD5 Signature Option ([RFC 2385](#)) and the BGP-4 Specification", [RFC 4278](#), January 2006.
- [RFC4303] Kent, S., "IP Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP)", [RFC 4303](#), December 2005.
- [RFC4306] Kaufman, C., "Internet Key Exchange (IKEv2) Protocol", [RFC 4306](#), December 2005.
- [RFC4420] Farrel, A., Papadimitriou, D., Vasseur, J., and A. Ayyangar, "Encoding of Attributes for Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Switched Path (LSP) Establishment Using Resource ReserVation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE)", [RFC 4420](#), February 2006.
- [RFC4655] Farrel, A., Vasseur, J., and J. Ash, "A Path Computation Element (PCE)-Based Architecture", [RFC 4655](#), August 2006.
- [RFC4657] Ash, J. and J. Le Roux, "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol Generic Requirements", [RFC 4657](#), September 2006.
- [RFC4674] Le Roux, J., "Requirements for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", [RFC 4674](#), October 2006.

- [RFC4927] Le Roux, J., "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCECP) Specific Requirements for Inter-Area MPLS and GMPLS Traffic Engineering", [RFC 4927](#), June 2007.
- [RFC5036] Andersson, L., Minei, I., and B. Thomas, "LDP

Specification", [RFC 5036](#), October 2007.

- [RFC5088] Le Roux, JL., Vasseur, JP., Ikejiri, Y., and R. Zhang, "OSPF Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", [RFC 5088](#), January 2008.
- [RFC5089] Le Roux, JL., Vasseur, JP., Ikejiri, Y., and R. Zhang, "IS-IS Protocol Extensions for Path Computation Element (PCE) Discovery", [RFC 5089](#), January 2008.
- [RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", [RFC 5246](#), August 2008.

### [13.3.](#) References

- [IEEE.754.1985]  
IEEE Standard 754, "Standard for Binary Floating-Point Arithmetic", August 1985.

### [Appendix A.](#) PCEP Finite State Machine (FSM)

The section describes the PCEP Finite State Machine (FSM).

## PCEP Finite State Machine




Figure 23: PCEP Finite State Machine for the PCC

PCEP defines the following set of variables:

**Connect:** timer (in seconds) started after having initialized a TCP connection using the PCEP registered TCP port. The value of the TCPConnect timer is 60 seconds.

**ConnectRetry:** specifies the number of times the system has tried to establish a TCP connection with a PCEP peer without success.

**ConnectMaxRetry:** Maximum number of times the system tries to establish a TCP connection using the PCEP registered TCP port before going back to the Idle state. The value of the ConnectMaxRetry is 5.

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

OpenWait: timer that corresponds to the amount of time a PCEP peer will wait to receive an Open message from the PCEP peer after the expiration of which the system releases the PCEP resource and go back to the Idle state. The OpenWait timer has a fixed value of 60 seconds.

KeepWait: timer that corresponds to the amount of time a PCEP peer will wait to receive a Keepalive or a PCErr message from the PCEP peer after the expiration of which the system releases the PCEP resource and go back to the Idle state. The KeepWait timer has a fixed value of 60 seconds.

OpenRetry: specifies the number of times the system has received an Open message with unacceptable PCEP session characteristics.

The following two states variable are defined:

RemoteOK: the RemoteOK variable is a Boolean set to 1 if the system has received an acceptable Open message.

LocalOK: the LocalOK variable is a Boolean set to 1 if the system has received a Keepalive message acknowledging that the Open message sent to the peer was valid.

Idle State:

The idle state is the initial PCEP state where PCEP (also referred to as "the system") waits for an initialization event that can either be manually triggered by the user (configuration) or automatically triggered by various events. In Idle state, PCEP resources are allocated (memory, potential process, ...) but no PCEP messages are accepted from any PCEP peer. The system listens the registered PCEP TCP port.

The following set of variable are initialized:

TCPRetry=0,

LocalOK=0,

RemoteOK=0,

OpenRetry=0.

Upon detection of a local initialization event (e.g. user configuration to establish a PCEP session with a particular PCEP peer, local event triggering the establishment of a PCEP session with a PCEP peer such as the automatic detection of a PCEP peer, ...), the

system:

- o Initiates of a TCP connection with the PCEP peer,
- o Starts the Connect timer,
- o Moves to the TCPPending state.

Upon receiving a TCP connection on the registered PCEP TCP port, if the TCP connection establishment succeeds, the system:

- o Sends an Open message,
- o Starts the OpenWait timer,
- o Moves to the OpenWait state.

If the connection establishment fails, the system remains in the Idle state. Any other event received in the Idle state is ignored.

It is expected that an implementation will use an exponentially increasing timer between automatically generated Initialization events and between retries of TCP connection establishment.

#### TCPPending State

If the TCP connection establishment succeeds, the system:

- o Sends an Open message,
- o Starts the OpenWait timer,
- o Moves to the OpenWait state.

If the TCP connection establishment fails (an error is detected

during the TCP connection establishment) or the Connect timer expires:

- o If ConnectRetry = ConnectMaxRetry the system moves to the Idle State
- o If ConnectRetry < ConnectMaxRetry the system:
  1. Initiates of a TCP connection with the PCEP peer,
  2. Increments the ConnectRetry variable,

3. Restarts the Connect timer,
4. Stays in the TPCPending state.

In response to any other event the system releases the PCEP resources for that peer and moves back to the Idle state.

#### OpenWait State:

In the OpenWait state, the system waits for an Open message from its PCEP peer.

If the system receives an Open message from the PCEP peer before the expiration of the OpenWait timer, the system first examines all of its sessions that are in the OpenWait or KeepWait state. If another session with the same PCEP peer already exists (same IP address), then the system performs the following collision resolution procedure:

- o If the system has initiated the current session and it has a lower IP address than the PCEP Peer, the system closes the TCP connection, releases the PCEP resources for the pending session and moves back to the Idle state.
- o If the session was initiated by the PCEP peer and the system has a higher IP address than the PCEP Peer, the system closes the TCP connection, releases the PCEP resources for the pending session, and moves back to the Idle state.

- o Otherwise, the system checks the PCEP session attributes (Keepalive frequency, DeadTimer, ...).

If an error is detected (e.g. malformed Open message, reception of a message that is not an Open message, presence of two Open objects, ...), PCEP generates an error notification, the PCEP peer sends a PCErr message with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=1. The system releases the PCEP resources for the PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle state.

If no errors are detected, OpenRetry=1 and the session characteristics are unacceptable, the PCEP peer sends a PCErr with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=5, the system releases the PCEP resources for that peer and moves back to the Idle state.

If no errors are detected, and the session characteristics are acceptable to the local system, the system:

- o Sends a Keepalive message to the PCEP peer,
- o Starts the Keepalive timer,
- o Sets the RemoteOK variable to 1.

If LocalOK=1 the system clears the OpenWait timer and moves to the UP state.

If LocalOK=0 the system clears the OpenWait timer, starts the KeepWait timer and moves to the KeepWait state.

If no errors are detected, but the session characteristics are unacceptable and non-negotiable, the PCEP peer sends a PCErr with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=3, the system releases the PCEP resources for that peer, and moves back to the Idle state.

If no errors are detected, and OpenRetry is 0, and the session characteristics are unacceptable but negotiable (such as, the Keepalive period or the DeadTimer), then the system:



- o Increments the OpenRetry variable,
- o Sends a PCErr message with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=4 that contains proposed acceptable session characteristics,
- o If LocalOK=1, the system restarts the OpenWait timer and stays in the OpenWait state
- o If LocalOK=0, the system clears the OpenWait timer, starts the KeepWait timer and moves to the KeepWait state

If no Open message is received before the expiration of the OpenWait timer, the PCEP peer sends a PCErr message with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=2, the system releases the PCEP resources for the PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle state.

In response to any other event the system releases the PCEP resources for that peer and moves back to the Idle state.

#### KeepWait State

In the Keepwait state, the system waits for the receipt of a Keepalive from its PCEP peer acknowledging its Open message or a PCErr message in response to unacceptable PCEP session characteristics proposed in the Open message.

If an error is detected (e.g. malformed Keepalive message), PCEP

generates an error notification, the PCEP peer sends a PCErr message with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=1. The system releases the PCEP resources for the PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle state.

If a Keepalive message is received before the expiration of the KeepWait timer, then the system sets LocalOK=1 and:

- o If RemoteOK=1, the system clears the KeepWait timer and moves to the UP state.
- o If RemoteOK=0, the system clears the KeepWait timer, starts the OpenWait timer and moves to the OpenWait State.

If a PCErr message is received before the expiration of the KeepWait timer:

1. If the proposed values are unacceptable, the PCEP peer sends a PCErr message with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=6 and the system releases the PCEP resources for that PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle state.
2. If the proposed values are acceptable, the system adjusts its PCEP session characteristics according to the proposed values received in the PCErr message restarts the KeepWait timer and sends a new Open message. If RemoteOK=1, the system restarts the KeepWait timer and stays in the KeepWait state. If RemoteOK=0, the system clears the KeepWait timer, start the OpenWait timer and moves to the OpenWait state.

If neither a Keepalive nor a PCErr is received after the expiration of the KeepWait timer, the PCEP peer sends a PCErr message with Error-Type=1 and Error-value=7 and, system releases the PCEP resources for that PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle State.

In response to any other event the system releases the PCEP resources for that peer and moves back to the Idle state.

#### UP State

In the UP state, the PCEP peer starts exchanging PCEP messages according to the session characteristics.

If the Keepalive timer expires, the system restarts the Keepalive timer and sends a Keepalive message.

If no PCEP message (Keepalive, PCReq, PCRep, PCNtf) is received from

the PCEP peer before the expiration of the DeadTimer, the system terminates PCEP session according to the procedure defined in [Section 6.8](#), releases the PCEP resources for that PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle State.

If a malformed message is received, the system terminates the PCEP session according to the procedure defined in [Section 6.8](#), releases

the PCEP resources for that PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle State.

If the system detects that the PCEP peer tries to setup a second TCP connection, it stops the TCP connection establishment and sends a PCErr with Error-Type=9.

If the TCP connection fails, the system releases the PCEP resources for that PCEP peer, closes the TCP connection and moves to the Idle State.

## [Appendix B](#). PCEP Variables

PCEP defines the following configurable variables:

Keepalive timer: minimum period of time between the sending of PCEP messages (Keepalive, PCReq, PCRep, PCNtf) to a PCEP peer. A suggested value for the Keepalive timer is 30 seconds.

DeadTimer: period of timer after the expiration of which a PCEP peer declared the session down if no PCEP message has been received.

SyncTimer: the SYNC timer is used in the case of synchronized path computation request using the SVEC object defined in [Section 7.13.3](#). Consider the case where a PCReq message is received by a PCE that contains the SVEC object referring to M synchronized path computation requests. If after the expiration of the SYNC timer all the M path computation requests have not been received, a protocol error is triggered and the PCE MUST cancel the whole set of path computation requests. The aim of the SyncTimer is to avoid the storage of unused synchronized request should one of them get lost for some reasons (e.g a misbehaving PCC). Thus the value of the SyncTimer must be large enough to avoid the expiration of the timer under normal circumstances. A RECOMMENDED value for the SYNC timer is 60 seconds.

MAX-UNKNOWN-REQUESTS: A RECOMMENDED value is 5.

MAX-UNKNOWN-MESSAGES: A RECOMMENDED value is 5.

## Authors' Addresses

JP Vasseur (editor)  
Cisco Systems  
1414 Massachusetts Avenue  
Boxborough, MA 01719  
USA

Email: [jpv@cisco.com](mailto:jpv@cisco.com)

JL Le Roux (editor)  
France Telecom  
2, Avenue Pierre-Marzin  
Lannion, 22307  
FRANCE

Email: [jeanlouis.leroux@orange-ftgroup.com](mailto:jeanlouis.leroux@orange-ftgroup.com)

Internet-Draft

[draft-ietf-pce-pcep-19.txt](#)

November 2008

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2008).

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, THE IETF TRUST 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.

## 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](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

