

# **draft-brissette-pals-pw-fec-label-request-00**

**Patrice Brissette**

**Sami Boutros**

**Kamran Raza**

**[Cisco Systems]**

**Nick Del Regno**

**Matthew Turlington**

**[Verizon]**

**IETF 91, November 2014**

**Honolulu, USA**

# What is this about?

- This document **clarifies the behavior** of an LSR PE upon receiving an **LDP Label Request** message for **Pseudowire (PW) FEC types**. Furthermore, this document **specifies the procedures** to be followed by the LSR PE in order **to answer such requests** for a given PW FEC type.

# What problem are we solving?

- The **lack of specification** in the area of Label Request in [RFC 4447](#) has led to some **interoperability issues between vendors** due to different interpretation. For example, there are some implementations which do not honor and **do not respond** to an incoming **Label Request** for a PW FEC type, resulting in **functionality impact**. Some of these problems are very critical for the deployment of PW technologies.

# This document recommends

- An LSR PE **SHOULD** respond to an incoming Label Request message for a PW FEC by sending its local binding for the PW via a Label Mapping message
- Same type of recommendations apply to Wildcard FEC [RFC5036] and for Typed Wildcard PW FEC [RFC6667]

# Procedures

- This document re-enforces the Label Request generic procedures, as defined by [RFC5036](#), for PW FEC types
- This documents describe procedures for PWid FEC (FEC128), Generalized PWiD (FEC129) and PW Type FEC wildcard
- FEC130 and FEC132 are for further study

# IANA Considerations

- New LDP Status Code to be used in a Notification message to notify a peer LSR if lookup fails at receiving LSR for a PW FEC received in a Label Request message.
- Value = 0x32 -> Description = No PW

# Comments

- Already got good comments, they will be addressed very soon

## Next steps

- First draft and seeking for more comments.

Thank you