

# RSVP-TE Extensions for Collecting SRLG Information

CCAMP WG, IETF 90th, Vancouver

draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-srlg-collect-05

Fatai Zhang ([zhangfatai@huawei.com](mailto:zhangfatai@huawei.com))

Oscar Gonzalez de Dios ([ogondio@tid.es](mailto:ogondio@tid.es))

Dan Li ([danli@huawei.com](mailto:danli@huawei.com))

Cyril Margaria ([cyril.margaria@nln.nl](mailto:cyril.margaria@nln.nl))

Matt Hartley ([mhartley@cisco.com](mailto:mhartley@cisco.com))

Zafar Ali ([zali@cisco.com](mailto:zali@cisco.com))

# Changes from -04 (I)

- No idnits in -05 version (as per <http://tools.ietf.org/idnits?url=http://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-srlg-collect-05.txt>)
- Rewording changes (e.g. explaining collection procedure)
- Terminology changes:
  - head -> ingress
  - tail -> egress
- Encodings
  - Description of Reserved & length fields
- RFC 2119 language.
- References fixed
  - Normative/informative

# Changes from -04 (II)

- RRO ordering discussed:
  - The SRLG sub-object SHOULD be pushed by the node before the node IP address or link identifier.
  - The SRLG-sub-object SHOULD be pushed after the Attribute subobject, if present, and after the LABEL subobject, if requested.
- Compatibility discussion added:
- A node that does not recognize the SRLG Collection Flag:
  - Proceed as per RFC 5420:
  - pass the TLV on unaltered if it appears in LSP\_ATTRIBUTES
  - reject the Path message if in LSP\_REQUIRED\_ATTRIBUTES.
- A node that does not recognize the SRLG RRO sub-object:
  - Behave as specified in RFC 3209 unrecognized subobjects are to be ignored and passed on unchanged.

# Security discussions

- Pending discussion:
  - security related considerations of the policy decision in the border.

# Next Steps

- Comments from the mailing list have been addressed.
- Authors believe document is ready for last call