PCEP ASSOCIATION GROUP
& the “associated” drafts!

Dhruv Dhody, Huawei
The Association Landscape...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>draft-ietf-pce-association-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

WG I-Ds

On agenda (separately)

Individual I-Ds
Status: WG LC done

Last update: One pending comment from Cyril to add “capability advertisement/discovery” for the associations is handled.

Discovery of Supported Association Types

- A new PCEP ASSOC-Type-List (Association Types list) TLV is defined to be carried in OPEN.
- The use of ASSOC-Type-List TLV is OPTIONAL.
  - Thus the absence of the ASSOC-Type-List TLV in an OPEN object MUST be interpreted as an absence of information on the list of supported association types (rather than the association-type is not supported).
- Association type can be marked as ‘mandatory’
  - A missing Assoc-type in the ASSOC-Type-List TLV (or missing ASSOC-Type-List TLV) is to be interpreted as the association type is not supported by the PCE speaker.
Now, any I-D that defines a new association type should...

...specify if the association type advertisement is mandatory

- or not!

...state if the association type is dynamic, operator-configured or both!

- Operator-configured Association Range needs to be set for ‘both’!
Update to the WG I-Ds

draft-ietf-pce-association-diversity-04

- Capability advertisement (mandatory)
- Dynamic and Operator-Configured
  - Operator-configured Association Range must be set
- Other editorial changes...

draft-ietf-pce-association-policy-03

- Capability advertisement (mandatory)
- Operator-configured
Update to the WG I-Ds

draft-ietf-pce-stateful-path-protection-02
• Capability advertisement (optional)
• Dynamic
• PT field (protection type) – as per RFC 4872

draft-ietf-pce-association.bidir-01
• Update done by Rakesh based on the comments received during WG adoption
• Figures and description added for single/double-sided initiation
• Error handling!

The format of the Path Protection Association TLV (Figure 1) is as follows:

```
0 1
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
| Type - TBD2 | Length |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
| PT | Path Protection Association Flags | S|P|
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
```

PT (Protection Type 6 bits) Flags - Indicates the Protection Type as per [RFC4872]. Following values are currently defined:

* 0x00: Unprotected
* 0x01: (Full) Rerouting
* 0x02: Rerouting without Extra-Traffic
* 0x04: 1:N Protection with Extra-Traffic
* 0x08: 1+1 Unidirectional Protection
* 0x10: 1+1 Bidirectional Protection
Others

**draft-zhang-pce-resource-sharing-06**
- No update

**draft-tanaka-pce-stateful-pce-mbb-06**
- Capability advertisement (mandatory)
- Dynamic
- Error Handling
- Editorial Changes

**draft-barth-pce-segment-routing-policy-cp-00**
- New I-D for associating various candidate SR path belonging to a SR-TE policy
- SR Candidate Path Association Group
  - with a TLV to identify SR-TE policy (Color, Destination end-point, Preference)
Next Step

- This is quite a useful feature...
  - Evident from the list of association types being specified...
- Let get the shepherd reviews done for association group and ship to the IESG
  - We could then decide the order for other association types!
THANKS!