

YANG Data Models for TE and RSVP

draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-21

draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-11

draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-te-07

Tarek Saad, Juniper Networks

Rakesh Gandhi, Cisco Systems

Vishnu Pavan Beeram, Juniper Networks

Xufeng Liu, Volta Networks

Igor Bryskin, Huawei

Himanshu Shah, Ciena

IETF-105, July 2019, Montreal

Agenda

- Updates to I-Ds (since IETF-104)
- Open issues and next steps

I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-21>

- I-D contains following YANG modules
 - ietf-te.yang
 - ietf-te-device.yang
- Models cover:
 - TE tunnel(s), TE path(s), LSP(s) constructs and attributes
 - On device and on controller specific attributes

Open Issue # 1

I-D: < draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-21>



YANGDOCTORS Comments

- Received feedback from YANG Dr. review (On the Right Track) and comments
- Authors are working on addressing those

Open Issue # 2

I-D: < draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-21>

Tunnel Name Collisions

- Tunnel List:
 - Currently keyed by tunnel name (string)
- Tunnels can be:
 - Configured on the device
 - Configured on the controller
 - Learnt (state) on controller (ephemeral)
 - Learnt (state) on device (ephemeral or auto-created)
- A solution was discussed on the list

Open Issue # 2

I-D: < draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-21 >

Tunnel Name Collisions – Solution

- Tunnel name collision can occur:
 - On controller: controller learns tunnels from different devices with same name
 - Proposed solution:
Ephemeral learnt tunnels on controller are implicitly prepended with the tunnel ingress identity (e.g. R1-foo, R2-foo, etc.)
 - Operator configures a tunnel name matching an auto-created tunnel on device
 - Proposed solution:
Introduce a configurable prefix “e.g. auto” for auto created tunnels
Example: Tunnel=auto-bypass-Link1, vs. Tunnel=bypass-Link1
 - Controller learns of a tunnel on a device whose name matches a locally configured one on controller
 - Proposed solution:
Use the configurable prefix (e.g. “**remote-**”) to distinguish locally configured from remote learnt Tunnels.
For example: remote tunnels learnt on controller appear like: remote-R1-foo, remote-R2-foo

I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-11>

- I-D contains following YANG modules
 - ietf-rsvp.yang
 - ietf-rsvp-extended.yang
- Model covers:
 - RSVP protocol base and extended attributes: signaling parameters, timers, counters, feature enablement (authentication, bundling, Srefresh, Hello) etc.
 - Per session, neighbor and interface RSVP attributes

Update # 1

I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-11>

Addressed YANG Dr. Review Comments

- Edit nits
- NMDA and use of “state” container
- Expansion of leaf names (e.g. packet-len)
- Pluralization of counters names: e.g. 'in-error' vs. 'in-errors'
- Added normative references for imported modules

Update # 2

RSVP Sessions list

I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-11>
 I-D: < draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-te-05>

-	769	+	list session-ip {
-	770	+	key "destination protocol-id destination-port";
	771		config false;
	772		description
	773		"List of RSVP sessions";
	774		
-	775	+	uses session-attributes-state;

/* add augmentation for sessions and neighbors */	377	/* add augmentation for sessions and neighbors */
augment "/rt:routing/rt:control-plane-protocols/"	378	augment "/rt:routing/rt:control-plane-protocols/"
+ "rt:control-plane-protocol/rsvp:rsvp/rsvp:globals/"	379	+ "rt:control-plane-protocol/rsvp:rsvp/rsvp:globals/"
- + "rsvp:sessions/rsvp:session/rsvp:state/rsvp:psbs/rsvp:psb" {	380	+ + "rsvp:sessions" {
	381	+ description
	382	+ "RSVP-TE generic data augmentation pertaining to session";
	383	+ list session-te {
	384	+ key "tunnel-endpoint tunnel-id extended-tunnel-id";

- RSVP sessions list:
 - RSVP base model covers RSVP IP sessions as defined in RFC2205
 - RSVP-TE model covers RSVP-TE sessions as defined in RFC3209
- Before update:
 - Single list that includes both keyed by a locally generated unique index
 - Makes looking up a matching session tedious (walk is needed)
 - Does not perform well under scale
- After update:
 - Split RSVP IP sessions and RSVP-TE sessions into separate lists
 - RSVP-IP sessions list keyed by “destination protocol-id destination-port”
 - RSVP-TE sessions list keyed by “tunnel-endpoint tunnel-id extended-tunnel-id”

Update # 3

I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-11>

New RPCs and notifications

```

rpcs:
+---x clear-session
  +---w input
    +---w routing-protocol-instance-name  leafref
    +---w (filter-type)
      +---:(match-all)
        | +---w all  empty
      +---:(match-one)
        +---w session-info
          +---w (session-type)
            +---:(rsvp-session-ip)
              +---w destination  leafref
              +---w protocol-id  uint8
              +---w destination-port  inet:ip-address
+---x clear-neighbor
  +---w input
    +---w routing-protocol-instance-name  leafref
    +---w (filter-type)
      +---:(match-all)
        | +---w all  empty
      +---:(match-one)
        +---w neighbor-address  leafref
  
```

- RPCs: added two new RPCs:
 - clear rsvp session:
 - Match single session or all
 - clear rsvp neighbor
 - Match single session or all
- Notifications:
 - Added section describing leveraging [I-D.ietf-netconf-subscribed-notifications] and [I-D.ietf-netconf-yang-push] to subscribe on specific data nodes

Next Steps

- I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-11>:
 - YANGDOCTORS Review comments addressed
 - Another round of internal review and progress to WGLC
- I-D <draft-ietf-teas-yang-te>:
 - Address YANGDOCTORS review comments
 - Progress to WGLC
- I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-rsvp-te-05> and
I-D: <draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-mpls-01>
 - Another round of review calling for YANGDOCTORS review

Thank You