IRO and Domain Sequence

draft-dhody-pce-iro-survey-01

draft-dhody-pce-iro-update-01

draft-ietf-pce-pcep-domain-sequence-06

Dhruv Dhody

Huawei Technologies

Background

IRO is defined in RFC5440, it

- doesn't mention ordering of sub-objects;
- ask to ignore the L (loose bit);

Earlier version of Domain Sequence Draft [draft-ietf-pce-pcep-domain-sequence-05] suggested several IRO encoding options

- including a new "ordered" IRO type to specify ordering and use of loose bit.

Discussion on the mailing list suggested doing a survey to find out how people have implemented existing IRO

- What implications would be for clarifying the IRO definition

IRO Survey

draft-dhody-pce-iro-survey-01

- Informal Survey into IRO Implementations in PCEP

Conclusion

- Most implementations would be fine with updating RFC 5440 to specify IRO as an ordered list
  - *with no impact on the shipping or under-development products.*
- It would be helpful to update RFC 5440 to enable support for loose bit (L-bit) in the IRO subobjects.

IRO Update

draft-dhody-pce-iro-update-01

- Update to IRO specification in PCEP

Update

- Order
  - The content of an IRO object is an ordered list of subobjects.
- Loose Bit
  - Each subobject has an attribute called 'L-bit', which is set if the subobject represents a loose hop. If the bit is not set, the subobject represents a strict hop.
    - The interpretation of L-bit is as per RFC 3209 (ERO).

Domain Sequence

draft-ietf-pce-pcep-domain-sequence-06

- Standard Representation Of Domain-Sequence

Changes in this version

- Based on updated IRO specification
  - IRO encoding options removed from draft

Next Step

IRO-Survey

Should this informational survey be adopted and moved towards RFC?

- Or just dropped…

IRO-Update

Adoption Call

- A simple I-D, should be fast tracked?

Domain-Sequence

Any comments?

- WG happy with the latest version?
- Ready to be moved along towards publication..

Thanks!