

Composite Link

Requirements for MPLS Over a Composite Link
Composite Link Use Cases and Design Considerations
Composite Link Framework in
Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS)

Ning So (Tata Communications)

Andrew Malis (Verizon)

Dave McDysan (Verizon)

Lucy Yong (Huawei USA)

Curtis Villamizar (OCCNC)

Eric Osborne (Cisco)

Status of Composite Link Documents

- Three Composite Link documents are all WG items.
 1. Requirements for MPLS Over a Composite Link
draft-ietf-rtgwg-cl-requirement-08
 - completed WG last call
 - started second WGLC
 2. Composite Link Use Cases and Design Considerations
draft-ietf-rtgwg-cl-use-cases-01
 - need comments from WG - may need some change
 3. Composite Link Framework in Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS)
draft-ietf-rtgwg-cl-framework-02
 - appears stalled on referenced work
- There has been almost no discussion on the WG mailing list of these drafts in a few meetings.
- Greatest concern is stall of work referenced by CL Framework.

Stalled Work Referenced by CL Framework

- Conflicting sets of express-path drafts being circulated in multiple WGs. Suggest going with:
 1. draft-atlas-mpls-te-express-path-02
 2. draft-ietf-ospf-te-metric-extensions
 3. draft-previdi-isis-te-metric-extensions
- No draft for heterogeneous component link groups. Expired work by Eric Osborne could be basis (draft-ospf-cc-stlv-00) but needs work.
- No candidates for a lot of other topics discussed in CL Framework.

CL Requirements Changes since Mar 2011

1. Shortenned two paragraphs in Introduction
2. Better clarity in Component Link definition
3. Added paragraph with forward reference on scalability and stability for clarity.
4. Change in precision of latency reporting (was 10%, now configurable)
5. New paragraph on sources of latency and reasons to consider excluding queuing delay.
6. Moved discussion of minimally disruptive changes in FR#12 to outside of requirements list.
7. Added power aware load balance requirement as a MAY (FR#13).
8. Added three paragraphs explaining what is meant by "minimally disruptive change", "delay discontinuity", and discussing disruption due to fault.
9. Drop discussion paragraph from DR#1.
10. Added Management Requirements section (moved from CL Framework).
11. Minor:
 - (a) Appendices A & B moved to CL Use Cases
 - (b) Updated acknowledgements
 - (c) Other CL docs become WG docs
 - (d) Fat PW and Entropy Label becomes RFC
 - (e) Author affiliation changes

A few thoughts on CL Requirements WGLC

This is the second WGLC.

There has been very little discussion after the first WGLC.

Changes since Mar 2011 (just after close of first WGLC) are mostly benign and were explicitly provided to the mailing list as small diffs with some discussion regarding some of them.

Perhaps there are so few comments this WGLC because so little changed since last WGLC and each small change since then was brought up on the RTGWG mailing list. Opinions?

A few thoughts on CL Framework

Figuring out which delay/jitter drafts to reference would help.

Initial focus should be on draft-atlas-mpls-te-express-path but keeping an achievable goal.

Problems not addressed in draft-atlas-mpls-te-express-path (such as multi-domain) can be taken up by authors of draft-fuxh-mpls-delay-loss-*, avoiding overlap.

Reviving or replacing draft-ospf-cc-stlv-00 is a good next step.

Other documents filling in CL framework details can follow.

CL may now be a victim of its own grandiose requirements.

Questions? / Comments?