

PCE Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: April 11, 2014

E. Crabbe  
Google, Inc.  
J. Medved  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
I. Minei  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
R. Varga  
Pantheon Technologies SRO  
X. Zhang  
D. Dhody  
Huawei Technologies  
October 8, 2013

Optimizations of State Synchronization Procedures for Stateful PCE  
draft-minei-pce-stateful-sync-optimizations-00

Abstract

A stateful Path Computation Element (PCE) has access to not only the information carried by the network's IGP, but also to the set of active paths and their reserved resources for its computations. The additional state allows the PCE to compute constrained paths while considering individual LSPs and their interactions. This requires reliable state synchronization mechanisms between the PCE and the network, PCE and path computation clients (PCCs), and between cooperating PCEs. The basic mechanism for state synchronization is part of the Stateful PCE specification. This draft specifies optimizations related to state synchronization procedures.

Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any

time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 11, 2014.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	4
2. Terminology . . . . .	4
3. State synchronization avoidance . . . . .	4
3.1. Motivation . . . . .	4
3.2. State Synchronization Avoidance procedures . . . . .	5
3.3. LSP State Database Version Number TLV . . . . .	9
3.3.1. Use of the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the OPEN object . . . . .	10
3.3.2. Use of the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the LSP object . . . . .	10
3.4. Speaker Entity Identifier TLV . . . . .	10
4. PCE-triggered State Synchronization . . . . .	11
4.1. Motivation . . . . .	11
4.2. PCE-triggered State Synchronization Procedures . . . . .	11
5. Incremental State Synchronization . . . . .	12
5.1. Motivation . . . . .	12
5.2. Incremental synchronization procedures . . . . .	14
6. Advertising support of the synchronization optimizations . . . . .	16
7. IANA Considerations . . . . .	17
7.1. PCEP-Error Object . . . . .	17
7.2. PCEP TLV Type Indicators . . . . .	17
7.3. STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV . . . . .	17
8. Security Considerations . . . . .	18
9. Acknowledgements . . . . .	18
10. Contributors . . . . .	18
11. Normative References . . . . .	18
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	19

## 1. Introduction

The Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) provides mechanisms for Path Computation Elements (PCEs) to perform path computations in response to Path Computation Clients (PCCs) requests.

[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] describes a set of extensions to PCEP to provide stateful control. A stateful PCE has access to not only the information carried by the network's IGP, but also to the set of active paths and their reserved resources for its computations. The additional state allows the PCE to compute constrained paths while considering individual LSPs and their interactions. This requires reliable state synchronization mechanisms between the PCE and the network, PCE and PCC, and between cooperating PCEs.

[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] describes the basic mechanism for state synchronization. This draft specifies optimizations for state synchronization.

## 2. Terminology

This document uses the following terms defined in [RFC5440]: PCC, PCE, PCEP Peer.

This document uses the following terms defined in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] : Passive Stateful PCE, Active Stateful PCE, Delegation, Delegation Timeout Interval, LSP State Report, LSP Update Request, LSP Priority, LSP State Database, Revocation.

Within this document, when describing PCE-PCE communications, the requesting PCE fills the role of a PCC. This provides a saving in documentation without loss of function.

The message formats in this document are specified using Routing Backus-Naur Format (RBNF) encoding as specified in [RFC5511].

## 3. State synchronization avoidance

### 3.1. Motivation

The purpose of State Synchronization is to provide a checkpoint-in-time state replica of a PCC's LSP state in a PCE. State Synchronization is performed immediately after the Initialization phase ([RFC5440]). [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] describes the basic mechanism for state synchronization.

State synchronization is not always necessary following a PCEP

session restart. If the state of both PCEP peers did not change, the synchronization phase may be skipped. This can result in significant savings in both control-plane data exchanged and the time it takes for the session to become fully operational.

### 3.2. State Synchronization Avoidance procedures

State Synchronization MAY be skipped following a PCEP session restart if the state of both PCEP peers did not change during the period prior to session re-initialization. To be able to make this determination, state must be exchanged and maintained by both PCE and PCC during normal operation. This is accomplished by keeping track of the changes to the LSP State Database, using a version tracking field called the LSP State Database Version Number.

The LSP State Database Version Number is an unsigned 64-bit value that MUST be incremented by 1 for each successive change in the LSP state database. The LSP State Database Version Number MUST start at 1 and may wrap around. Values 0 and 0xFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF are reserved. The PCC is the owner of the LSP State Database Version Number, which is incremented each time a change is made to the PCC's local LSP State Database. Operations that trigger a change to the local LSP State database include a change in the LSP operational state, delegation of an LSP, removal or addition of an LSP or change in any of the LSP attributes that would trigger a report to the PCE. When State Synchronization avoidance is enabled on a PCEP session, a PCC includes the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the LSP Object on each LSP State Report. The LSP-DB-VERSION TLV contains a PCC's LSP State Database version.

State Synchronization Avoidance is advertised on a PCEP session during session startup using the INCLUDE-DB-VERSION bit in the capabilities TLV (see Section 6). The peer may move in the network, either physically or logically, which may cause its connectivity details and transport-level identity (such as IP address) to change. To ensure that a PCEP peer can recognize a previously connected peer even in face of such mobility, each PCEP peer includes the SPEAKER-ENTITY-ID TLV described in Section 3.4 in the OPEN message.

If both PCEP speakers set the INCLUDE-DB-VERSION Flag in the OPEN object's STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV to 1, the PCC will include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in each LSP Object. The TLV will contain the PCC's latest LSP State Database Version Number.

If a PCE's LSP State Database survived the restart of a PCEP session, the PCE will include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in its OPEN object, and the TLV will contain the last LSP State Database Version Number received on an LSP State Report from the PCC in a previous PCEP

session. If a PCC's LSP State Database survived the restart of a PCEP session, the PCC will include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in its OPEN object and the TLV will contain the latest LSP State Database Version Number sent on an LSP State Report from the PCC in the previous PCEP session. If a PCEP Speaker's LSP State Database did not survive the restart of a PCEP session, the PCEP Speaker MUST NOT include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the OPEN Object.

If both PCEP Speakers include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the OPEN Object and the TLV values match, the PCC MAY skip State Synchronization. Otherwise, the PCC MUST perform State Synchronization. If the PCC attempts to skip State Synchronization (i.e. the SYNC Flag = 0 on the first LSP State Report from the PCC), the PCE MUST send back a PCErrror with Error-type 20 Error-value 2 'LSP Database version mismatch', and close the PCEP session.

If state synchronization is required, then prior to completing the Initialization phase, the PCE MUST mark any LSPs in the LSP database that were previously reported by the PCC as stale. When the PCC reports an LSP during state synchronization, if the LSP already exists in the LSP database, the PCE MUST update the LSP database and clear the stale marker from the LSP. When it has finished state synchronization, the PCC MUST immediately send an end of synchronization marker. The end of synchronization marker is a PCRpt message with an LSP object containing a PLSP-ID of 0 and with the SYNC flag set to 0 ([I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce]). The LSP-DB-VERSION TLV MUST be included and contain the PCC's latest LSP State Database Version Number. On receiving this state report, the PCE MUST purge any LSPs from the LSP database that are still marked as stale.

Note that a PCE/PCC MAY force State Synchronization by not including the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in its OPEN object.

Figure 1 shows an example sequence where State Synchronization is skipped. In the figure, IDB stands for INCLUDE-DB-VERSION.




Figure 1: State Synchronization skipped

Figure 2 shows an example sequence where State Synchronization is performed due to LSP State Database version mismatch during the PCEP session setup. Note that the same State Synchronization sequence would happen if either the PCC or the PCE would not include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in their respective Open messages. In the figure, IDB stands for INCLUDE-DB-VERSION.




Figure 2: State Synchronization performed

Figure 3 shows an example sequence where State Synchronization is skipped, but because one or both PCEP Speakers set the INCLUDE-DB-VERSION Flag to 0, the PCC does not send LSP-DB-VERSION TLVs to the PCE. If the current PCEP session restarts, the PCEP Speakers will have to perform State Synchronization, since the PCE will not know the PCC's latest LSP State Database Version Number. In the figure IDB stands for INCLUDE-DB-VERSION.






Figure 3: State Synchronization skipped, no LSP-DB-VERSION TLVs sent from PCC

### 3.3. LSP State Database Version Number TLV

The LSP State Database Version Number (LSP-DB-VERSION) TLV is an optional TLV that MAY be included in the OPEN object and the LSP object.

The format of the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV is shown in the following figure:




Figure 4: LSP-DB-VERSION TLV format

The type of the TLV is [TBD] and it has a fixed length of 8 octets. The value contains a 64-bit unsigned integer.

#### 3.3.1. Use of the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the OPEN object

The LSP-DB-VERSION TLV is included as an optional TLV in the OPEN object when a PCEP Speaker wishes to determine if State Synchronization can be skipped when a PCEP session is restarted. If sent from a PCE, the TLV contains the local LSP State Database Version Number from the last valid LSP State Report received from a PCC. If sent from a PCC, the TLV contains the PCC's local LSP State Database Version Number, which is incremented each time the LSP State Database is updated.

#### 3.3.2. Use of the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the LSP object

The LSP-DB-VERSION TLV can be included as an optional TLV in the LSP object.

If State Synchronization Avoidance has been enabled on a PCEP session (as described in Section 3.2), a PCC MUST include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in each LSP Object sent out on the session. If the TLV is missing, the PCE will generate an error with error-type 6 (mandatory object missing) and Error Value 12 (LSP-DB-VERSION TLV missing) and close the session. If State Synchronization Avoidance has not been enabled on a PCEP session, the PCC SHOULD NOT include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the LSP Object and the PCE SHOULD ignore it were it to receive one.

Since a PCE does not make changes to the LSP State Database Version Number, a PCC should never encounter this TLV in a message from the PCE (other than the OPEN message). A PCC SHOULD ignore the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV, were it to receive one from a PCE.

If State Synchronization Avoidance is enabled, a PCC MUST increment its LSP State Database Version Number when the 'Redelegation Timeout Interval' timer expires (see [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] for the use of the Redelegation Timeout Interval).

#### 3.4. Speaker Entity Identifier TLV

SPEAKER-ENTITY-ID is an optional TLV that MAY be included in the OPEN Object when a PCEP Speaker wishes to determine if State Synchronization can be skipped when a PCEP session is restarted. It contains a unique identifier for the node that does not change during the life time of the PCEP Speaker. It identifies the PCEP Speaker to its peers if the Speaker's IP address changed.

The format of the SPEAKER-ENTITY-ID TLV is shown in the following figure:




Figure 5: SPEAKER-ENTITY-ID TLV format

The type of the TLV is [TBD] and it has a variable length, which MUST be greater than 0. The value contains the entity identifier of the speaker transmitting this TLV. This identifier is required to be unique within its scope of visibility, which is usually limited to a single domain. It MAY be configured by the operator. Alternatively it can be derived automatically from a suitably-stable unique identifier, such as a MAC address, serial number, Traffic Engineering Router ID, or similar. In the case of inter-domain connections, the speaker SHOULD prefix its usual identifier with the domain identifier of its residence, such as Autonomous System number, IGP area identifier, or similar.

The relationship between this identifier and entities in the Traffic Engineering database is intentionally left undefined.

From a manageability point of view, a PCE or PCC implementation SHOULD allow the operator to configure a SPEAKER-ENTITY-ID.

#### 4. PCE-triggered State Synchronization

##### 4.1. Motivation

The accuracy of the computations performed by the PCE is tied to the accuracy of the view the PCE has on the state of the LSPs. Therefore, it can be beneficial to be able to resynchronize this state even after the session has established. The PCE may use this approach to continuously sanity check its state against the network, or to recover from error conditions without having to tear down sessions.

##### 4.2. PCE-triggered State Synchronization Procedures

Support of PCE-triggered state synchronization is advertised on a PCEP session during session startup using the TRIGGERED-SYNC (T) bit in the capabilities TLV. The PCE can choose to resynchronize its

entire LSP database, or a single LSP.

To trigger resynchronization for an LSP, the PCE MUST first mark the LSP as stale and then send a PCUpd for it, with the SYNC flag set to 1. The PCE SHOULD NOT include any parameter updates for the LSP, and the PCC SHOULD ignore such updates if the SYNC flag is set. The PCC MUST reply with a PCRpt and SHOULD include the SRP-ID-number of the PCUpd that triggered the report.

The PCE can also trigger resynchronization of the entire LSP database. The PCE MUST first mark any LSPs in the LSP database that were previously reported by the PCC as stale and then send a PCUpd for an LSP object containing a PLSP-ID of 0 and with the SYNC flag set to 1. This PCUpd message is the trigger for the PCC to enter the synchronization phase as described in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] and start sending PCRpt messages. After the receipt of the end-of-synchronization marker, the PCE will purge LSPs which were not refreshed. The SRP-ID-number of the PCUpd that triggered the report SHOULD be included in each of the PCRpt messages.

If the TRIGGERED-SYNC capability was not advertised and the PCC receives a PCUpd with the SYNC flag set to 1, it MUST send a PCErr with the SRP-ID-number of the PCUpd, error-type 20 and error-value 4.(see Section 7.1)

## 5. Incremental State Synchronization

[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] describes LSP state synchronization mechanism between PCCs and PCEs for a stateful PCE. After PCEP session set up, PCC compares the LSP State Database version with the PCE as described in Section 3. If the database version is mismatched, state synchronization will be performed. During state synchronization, a PCC sends the information of all its LSPs (full LSP-DB) to the stateful PCE. This section proposes a mechanism for incremental (Delta) LSP Database (LSP-DB) synchronization as well as allowing PCE to control the timing of the LSP-DB synchronization process during incremental synchronization.

### 5.1. Motivation

If a PCE restarts and its LSP-DB survived, all PCCs with mismatched LSP State Database version will send all their LSPs information (full LSP-DB) to the stateful PCE, even if only a small number of LSPs underwent state change. It can take a long time and consume large communication channel bandwidth. Moreover, the stateful PCE can get overloaded with all the PCC performing full synchronization with it at the same time. Figure 6 shows an example of LSP state

synchronization.




Figure 6: Topology Example

Assuming there are 320 LSPs in the network, with each PCC having 80 LSPs. During the time when the PCEP session is down, 20 LSPs of each PCC (i.e., 80 LSPs in total), are changed. Hence when PCEP session restarts, the stateful PCE needs to synchronize 320 LSPs with all PCCs. But actually, 240 LSPs stay the same. If performing full LSP state synchronization, it can take a long time to carry out the synchronization of all LSPs. It is especially true when only a low bandwidth communication channel is available and there is a substantial number of LSPs in the network. Another disadvantage of full LSP synchronization is that it is a waste of communication bandwidth to perform full LSP synchronization given the fact that the number of LSP changes can be small during the time when PCEP session is down.

An incremental (Delta) LSP Database (LSP-DB) state synchronization is described in this section, where only the LSPs underwent state change are synchronized between the session restart. This may include new/modify/deleted LSPs. Furthermore, to avoid overloading the PCE, the proposed method enable a stateful PCE to trigger the LSP synchronization (similar to Section 4).

PCEP extensions for stateful PCEs to perform LSP synchronization SHOULD allow:

- o Incremental LSP state synchronization between session restarts. Note this does not exclude the need for a stateful PCE to request a full LSP DB synchronization.

- o A stateful PCE to control the timing of PCC synchronizing its LSP state with the PCE during incremental synchronisation.

## 5.2. Incremental synchronization procedures

[I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] describes state synchronization and Section 3 describes state synchronization avoidance by using LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in its OPEN object. This section extends this idea to only synchronize the delta (changes) in case of version mismatch as well as to allow a stateful PCE to control the timing of this process.

If both PCEP speakers include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in the OPEN Object and the TLV values match, the PCC MAY skip state synchronization. Otherwise, the PCC MUST perform state synchronization. Instead of dumping full LSP-DB to PCE again, the PCC synchronizes the delta (changes) as described in Figure 7 when D flag is set to 1 by both PCC and PCE. Other combinations of D flag setting by PCC and PCE result in full LSP-DB synchronization procedure as described in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce].




Figure 7: Incremental synchronization procedures

A stateful PCE MAY choose to control the LSP-DB synchronization process. To allow PCE to do so, PCEP speakers MUST set T bit to 1 to indicate this as described in Section 4. If the LSP DB version is mis-matched, it can send a PCUpd message with PLSP-ID = 0 and S = 1 in order to trigger the LSP-DB synchronization process. In this way, the PCE can control the sequence of LSP synchronization among all the PCCs that re-establishing PCEP sessions with it. When the capability of PCE control is enable, only after a PCC receives this message, it will then start sending information that PCE does not possess, which is inferred from the LSP DB Version information exchange in the OPEN message. Note that the PCE should not mark the existing LSPs as stale for incremental state synchronisation

procedure.

As per Section 3, the LSP State Database version is incremented each time a change is made to the PCC's local LSP State Database. Each LSP is associated with the DB version at the time of its state change. This is needed to determine which LSP and what information needs to be synchronized in incremental state synchronization.

In the example shown in Figure 7, PCC synchronizes all LSPs that are updated between DB Version 43 to 46. A PCC SHOULD remember the deleted LSP as well, so that PCRpt message with deleted status can be sent to the stateful PCE.

## 6. Advertising support of the synchronization optimizations

Support for each of the optimizations described in this document requires advertising support of the capability at session establishment time.

New flags are defined for the STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV defined in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce]. Its format is shown in the following figure:




Figure 8: STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV format

The value comprises a single field - Flags (32 bits):

U (LSP-UPDATE-CAPABILITY - 1 bit): defined in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce]

S (INCLUDE-DB-VERSION - 1 bit): if set to 1 by both PCEP Speakers, the PCC will include the LSP-DB-VERSION TLV in each LSP Object.

I (LSP-INSTANTIATION-CAPABILITY - 1 bit): defined in [I-D.crabbe-pce-pce-initiated-lsp]



T (TRIGGERED-SYNC - 1 bit): if set to 1 by both PCEP Speakers, the PCE can trigger synchronization of LSPs at any point in the life of the session. The flag must be advertised by both PCC and PCE for PCUpd messages with the SYNC flag set to be allowed on a PCEP session.

D (DELTA-LSP-SYNC-CAPABILITY - 1 bit): if set to 1 by a PCEP speaker, the D Flag indicates that the PCEP speaker allows delta or incremental state synchronization.

## 7. IANA Considerations

This document requests IANA actions to allocate code points for the protocol elements defined in this document. Values shown here are suggested for use by IANA.

### 7.1. PCEP-Error Object

This document defines new Error-Value values for the LSP State synchronization error defined in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce].

Error-Type	Meaning
6	Mandatory Object missing Error-value=12: LSP-DB-VERSION TLV missing
20	LSP State synchronization error. Error-value=2: LSP Database version mismatch. Error-value=3: The LSP-DB-VERSION TLV Missing when State Synchronization Avoidance enabled. Error-value=4: Attempt to trigger a synchronization when the TRIGGERED-SYNC capability has not been advertised.

### 7.2. PCEP TLV Type Indicators

This document defines the following new PCEP TLVs:

Value	Meaning	Reference
23	LSP-DB-VERSION	This document
24	SPEAKER-ENTITY-ID	This document

### 7.3. STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY TLV

The following values are defined in this document for the Flags field in the STATEFUL-PCE-CAPABILITY-TLV in the OPEN object:

Bit	Description	Reference
28	DELTA-LSP-SYNC-CAPABILITY	This document
29	TRIGGERED-SYNC	This document
30	INCLUDE-DB-VERSION	This document

## 8. Security Considerations

The security considerations listed in [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce] apply to this document as well.

## 9. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Young Lee for his contributions.

## 10. Contributors

Gang Xie  
Huawei Technologies  
F3-5-B R&D Center, Huawei Industrial Base, Bantian, Longgang District  
Shenzhen, Guangdong 518129  
P.R.China  
Email: xiegang09@huawei.com

## 11. Normative References

- [I-D.crabbe-pce-pce-initiated-lsp]  
Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Sivabalan, S., and R. Varga, "PCEP Extensions for PCE-initiated LSP Setup in a Stateful PCE Model", draft-crabbe-pce-pce-initiated-lsp-02 (work in progress), July 2013.
- [I-D.ietf-pce-stateful-pce]  
Crabbe, E., Medved, J., Minei, I., and R. Varga, "PCEP Extensions for Stateful PCE", draft-ietf-pce-stateful-pce-06 (work in progress), August 2013.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP. and JL. Le Roux, "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", RFC 5440, March 2009.

[RFC5511] Farrel, A., "Routing Backus-Naur Form (RBNF): A Syntax  
Used to Form Encoding Rules in Various Routing Protocol  
Specifications", RFC 5511, April 2009.

Authors' Addresses

Edward Crabbe  
Google, Inc.  
1600 Amphitheatre Parkway  
Mountain View, CA 94043  
US

Email: [edc@google.com](mailto:edc@google.com)

Jan Medved  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
170 West Tasman Dr.  
San Jose, CA 95134  
US

Email: [jmedved@cisco.com](mailto:jmedved@cisco.com)

Ina Minei  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
1194 N. Mathilda Ave.  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089  
US

Email: [ina@juniper.net](mailto:ina@juniper.net)

Robert Varga  
Pantheon Technologies SRO  
Mlynske Nivy 56  
Bratislava 821 05  
Slovakia

Email: [robert.varga@pantheon.sk](mailto:robert.varga@pantheon.sk)

Xian Zhang  
Huawei Technologies  
F3-5-B R&D Center, Huawei Industrial Base, Bantian, Longgang District  
Shenzhen, Guangdong 518129  
P.R.China

Email: zhang.xian@huawei.com

Dhruv Dhody  
Huawei Technologies  
Leela Palace  
Bangalore, Karnataka 560008  
INDIA

Email: dhruv.ietf@gmail.com

