Update on PCEP-SDN discussion

IETF 101 - London

Jonathan Hardwick (jonathan.hardwick@metaswitch.com)
Julien Meuric (julien.meuric@orange.com)

Should PCEP have full-fledged SDN capabilities?

- Discussion on-list last year

- What did we conclude?
  - Using PCEP for SDN-like function is reasonable and has already happened
  - PCEP-SDN offers an alternative to other SBI protocols (e.g. netconf, OpenFlow)
  - PCEP-SDN is not "replacing" anyone's control plane

What is happening?

- Some SDN features are already adopted / published
  - Stateful PCE
  - PCE-initiated LSP
  - LSP control request
  - PCE-CC work in TEAS
  - PCEP flowspec

- There is disagreement about the scope of the SDN features we should take on
  - PCEP-LS is particularly unclear

What about PCEP-LS?

- We need to clarify the situation w.r.t. PCEP-LS and take a final decision

- Polling right now would just lead to the same arguments on either side being repeated
  - That would not be progress
  - Instead, we need to finish the debate on the reasons why PCEP-LS is or isn't valid

- We need more discussion of the objections raised to PCEP-LS
  - We will summarize the key objections here
  - The chairs will also send a summary to the list so that discussion can take place there

What is blocking PCEP-LS?

- Significant doubts raised over the technical requirement
  - There are (at least) three other ways to send link state to a controller (IGP / BGP-LS / netconf)
  - Is there a real, operational context in which none of those other methods can be used?

- Is a multi-vendor, interoperable solution required?
  - Can the requirement be satisfied with experimental code points c/f RFC 8356?

- Does PCEP have the right scalability properties for this purpose?

Discussion Time

- Is this a fair summary of where we have got to?

- Can we progress the PCEP-LS debate?