#### **Updated IETF TE Types**

#### TEAS WG, IETF 118, Prague

#### draft-ietf-teas-rfc8776-update-07

#### Authors:

Italo Busi (Huawei) Aihua Guo (Futurewei) Xufeng Liu (Alef Edge) Tarek Saad (Cisco) Igor Bryskin

#### **Contributors:**

Vishnu Pavan Beeram (Juniper) Rakesh Gandhi (Cisco)

### Changes from -02

- Rev 07 published [Sep 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023]
  - Allow using RFC8345 or RFC8796 identifiers (address Chaode WG LC comments on te-tunnel)
  - Clean up on path-computation-error-reason derived identities
  - Added updated te-packet-types from draft-ietf-teas-yang-I3-tetopo
  - Aligned bandwidth and burst size definitions with other IETF RFCs
    - Removed bandwidth-scientific-notation
  - Updated authors list to comply with RFC 7322

# Mailing list Comment

- Comment from Tom Petch (mail on Sep 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023): appendix with changes from RFC 8776
  - Some YANG RFC-bis provides this appendix
  - Is this appendix needed?
    - No guidelines found in RFC8407
- Proposed resolution
  - Authors prefers not to add this appendix, if not required by IETF process/guidelines
- See: <u>https://github.com/tsaad-dev/te/issues/220</u>

### WG LC comment for ietf-te

- Path loss and delay variation metrics
  - Metrics defined in RFC7471 for OSPF, and RFC8570 for ISIS
    - Path loss metric defined in ietf-te-mpls
  - Generic metrics for any packet technologies
- Proposed Resolution
  - On this draft
    - Move from te-mpls to path loss metric to te-packet-types
    - Add path delay variation metric to te-packet-types
  - On both draft-ietf-teas-yang-te and this draft
    - Move clarification that the unit of path metric bound is interpreted in the context of the metric-type from te to this draft
- See: <u>https://github.com/tsaad-dev/te/issues/103</u>

## WG LC comment for ietf-te

- Restoration scheme for "full LSP rerouting"
  - Missing identity to configure a tunnel with full LSP rerouting capability (RFC4872)
- Possible Resolution
  - On this draft
    - Deprecate or obsolete 'lsp-protection-reroute-extra' and 'lspprotection-reroute' identities
    - Add new identity for restoration-scheme
  - On draft-ietf-teas-yang-te
    - Remove default values for restoration-type and the restoration-scheme since technology-specific
- See: <u>https://github.com/tsaad-dev/te/issues/243</u>

#### Next Step

- Ready for WG LC
  - Consider dependencies from other I-Ds already in WG LC



#### Backup

## WG LC Comment from Chaode

- Different identifiers for networks, nodes, links and termination points in network topology and TE topology models
  - For example:
    - node-id is an URI
    - te-node-id is a dotted-quad
- Resolution: allows using RFC8345 or RFC8795 identifiers
  - Aded MUST statements when needed to mandate the presence of one of the two identifier

+rw network-id?	nw:network-id	
+rw te-topology-identifier		
+rw provider-id?	te-global-id	
+rw client-id?	te-global-id	
+rw topology-id?	te-topology-id	

+rw node-id-uri?	nw:node-id
+rw node-id?	te-node-id

+rw	<pre>link-tp-id-uri?</pre>	nt:tp-id
+rw	link-tp-id?	te-tp-id

#### Path Computation Error Reasons

- Aligned with the error reasons defined in IANA
  - Added a reference to the IANA assignment when applicable
  - Removed path-computation-error-no-server identity (duplicated)
- Additional error reasons not defined in IANA but applicable to YANG added
  - A 'no-dependent-server' can be used to represent either a 'child PCE unresponsive' or 'BRPC chain unavailable' error without being specific
    - Identity hierarchy used to represent the relationship

#### **Bandiwth and Burst Size**

- Defined as uint64 (not as bandwidth-scientific-notation)
- Units are "bits/second" (bandwidth/rates) or "bytes" (burst size)

grouping te-packet-path-bandwidth:		
+ bandwidth-profile-name?	' string	
+ bandwidth-profile-type?	dentityref	
+ cir	uint64	
+ cbs	uint64	
+ eir?	uint64	
+ ebs?	uint64	
+ pir?	uint64	
+ pbs?	uint64	
grouping te-packet-link-bandwidth:		
+ packet-bandwidth?		