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Problem Statement

• Being capable of sending Ethernet PW packets with the CW when at least one T-PE is not capable to insert the CW in already deployed networks
• draft-ietf-pals-ethernet-cw describes why use of the CW is RECOMMENDED for Ethernet PWs
  – Use of the PW CW is not possible when at least one T-PE is not capable to use it
• Replacing the old piece of equipment is a possible solution but not always viable
  – This draft does not preclude the possibility of replacing the old piece of equipment but provides an alternative option in case replacement is not viable/desired
Proposal

• Introduce a new S-PE type which is capable to switch an Ethernet PW segment, using the CW, with an Ethernet PW segment, not using the CW
  – It is easier to ensure control no ECMP behavior over a Link or a small-sized network
  – It is expected that T-PE1 and S-PE1 are one-hop away at the MPLS layer
• This new S-PE can be added to the network with minimum or no service disruption
  – PW redundancy can be used to move the traffic from the original SS-PW to the new MS-PW (using CW on the PW segment setup over an MPLS network with ECMP)
• It is assumed that T-PE1 is able to operate without being aware of whether it is terminating SS-PW or MS-PW (RFC 6073)
CW Stitching procedure

No changes are required in T-PE1 and T-PE2 nor in intermediate P nodes
VCCV Stitching procedure for CC Type 3

[1] S-PE1 needs to know the TTL distance in the PW layer to T-PE1 and T-PE2 to differentiate between VCCV messages and data packets

[2] ACH Channel Type is set based on the IP version in the IP header
**Protocol rules implemented by S-PE1 to be updated**

- S-PE1 behaves on one PW segment as if support for CW has been always signalled on the other PW segment.

**No protocol changes needed on T-PE1 and T-PE2**
Protocol rules implemented by S-PE1 to be updated

- S-PE1 advertises support for CC Type 1 to T-PE2 only if T-PE1 has advertised support for a CC Type S-PE1 is capable to stitch to CC Type 1
- S-PE1 advertises to T-PE1 support for all the CC Types it is capable stitch to CC Type 1 only if T-PE2 advertises support for CC Type 1
- S-PE1 can advertise support for ACH-based CV types if and only if it supports VCCV stitching for CC Type 4

No protocol changes needed on T-PE1 and T-PE2
Other Deployment Scenarios

MPLS Network with ECMP

T-PE1

S-PE1

PW Segment (w/o CW) over an LSP without ECMP

S-PE2

PW Segment (w/o CW) over an LSP without ECMP

S-PE3

PW Segment (with CW) over an LSP with or without ECMP

S-PE4

PW Segment (with CW) over an LSP with or without ECMP

T-PE2
History

• Draft presented at IETF 102 (MPLS WG)
  – Thanks to Himanshu and Jeff for their online and offline comments
• Comments addressed by clarifying
  – targeting existing deployments
  – not change/impact to other PE or P nodes
  – sequence number MAY be used (RFC4448)
Next Steps

• Validate the current assumptions
  – How many devices not being capable to use the PW CW exist in the network?
  – What are their capabilities in terms of CC/CV types and (re-)configuration of TTL?

• Further comments to improve the proposal are welcome

• The authors believe the document is ready for WG adoption