

PCEP Extensions for Enhanced Errors and Notifications

PCE WG, IETF96, Berlin, Germany

draft-ietf-pce-enhanced-errors-02.txt

H. Pouyllau (helia.pouyllau@thalesgroup.com)

R. Theillud (remi.theillaud@marben-products.com)

J. Meuric (julien.meuric@orange.com)

[Xian Zhang \(zhang.xian@huawei.com\)](mailto:zhang.xian@huawei.com)

Draft Objective + Status

- **Draft Objective:**
 - Identifying/classifying possible PCEP behaviors in case of error/notification;
 - Proposing extensions to PCEP so as to ensure pre-defined PCEP behaviors.
- **Draft history:**
 - Accepted as WG in July, 2010;
 - Updated to -01 in July, 2012;
 - Dormant since then;
 - Revived to -02;

Draft Recap

Behavior Classification

* In case of error

Error criticality\ Value	\ Propagation	0 (No Propagation)	1 (Propagation Required)
0 (low)		Type 1	Type 4
1 (medium)		Type 2	Type 5
2 (high)		Type 3	Type 6

* In case of notification

Notification\ type value	\ Propagation	0 (No Propagation)	1 (Propagation Required)
0 (non request-specific)		Type 1	Type 3
1 (request-specific)		Type 2	Type 4

Extensions Proposed

- **Time-to-Live object (TTL):** to limit the number of PCEP peer receiving this message;
- **Diffusion-LIST object (DLO):** specifying the list of peers or domains that this message must be propagated to;

Rules & Use cases

- **Section 5.5.3:** the new rules applying to existing RFCs;
- **Section 6:** Error and notification scenarios;

Diff: 02 from the last version(01)

- -v01 is technically sound;
- Updates are mainly efforts to increase readability;
 - Re-structured some of the sections;
 - Added Tables to different types of error/notif behaviors;
 - Other efforts: proof-reading, RFC2119 language tidy-up, resolved todo item(s);

Next Step

- Some work planned:
 - Some update on the scenario section is needed;
 - Final check on security, manageability and IANA section; (any volunteer on the first two?)
 - Get WG LC within a couple of IETF meetings
- Please review this draft and check:
 - If you have comments?
 - If your previous comments are not addressed properly?