

### PCEP Operational Clarification

M. Koldychev – Cisco Systems (<u>mkoldych@cisco.com</u>) – Presenter M. Sivabalan – Ciena Corporation (<u>ssivabal@ciena.com</u>)
S. Peng – Huawei Technologies (<u>pengshuping@Huawei.com</u>)
Diego Achaval – Nokia (<u>diego.achaval@nokia.com</u>)
Hari Kotni – Juniper Networks (<u>hkotni@juniper.net</u>)

## Summary of the draft

- 1. Introduce stateful LSP bringup mechanism
  - Simplify LSP bringup, do not require PCReq/PCRep messages for bringup
  - Update to RFC 8231
- Clearly separate PCEP Tunnel vs PCEP LSP
  - Tunnel is identified by PLSP-ID/Symbolic-name
  - LSP is identified by LSP-IDENTIFIERS TLV
  - LSPs are "instances" of the Tunnel used for make-before-break
- 3. Clarify that ASSOCIATION contains LSPs, not Tunnels
  - Tunnel can still be in an ASSOCIATION when all of its LSPs are
- 4. Walk-through of various LSP and ASSOCIATION operations
  - Give examples of basic operations and internal database state
- 5. Clarify constraint removal for objects without an explicit "removal" flag
  - For such objects, absence of object indicates removal of the constraint
  - Examples: LSPA, METRIC, BANDWIDTH, etc.
- 6. Discourage the use of SR-RRO/SRv6-RRO
  - RRO is an RSVP-TE concept that currently does not have a parallel in SR-TE

# History

Version 00 (July 2019)

• Stateful bringup, Tunnel vs LSP, etc.

Version 01 (February 2020)

Constraint removal clarification

Version 03 (February 2021)

• Discourage the use of SR-RRO/SRv6-RRO

Version 06 (June 2022)

Address the good comments from Adrian Farrel

#### Next steps

This draft has both Informational and Standards content. We have 3 options:

- 1. Keep single draft, but clearly separate the two types of content
- 2. Break it up into 2 drafts
- 3. Keep as-is

#### **Next Steps:**

- Decide on the above question
- We believe the draft is ready for WG adoption