

# Time Scheduled TE Resource Reservation Work Update

draft-zhuang-teas-scheduled-resources-02

IETF 96, Berlin, Germany

Yan Zhuang ([zhuangyan.zhuang@huawei.com](mailto:zhuangyan.zhuang@huawei.com))

Qin Wu ([bill.wu@huawei.com](mailto:bill.wu@huawei.com))

Huaimo Chen ([huaimo.chen@huawei.com](mailto:huaimo.chen@huawei.com))

Adrian Farrel ([adrian@olddog.co.uk](mailto:adrian@olddog.co.uk))

# Background

- Services discussed in the draft:
  - LSPs that reserve bandwidth
    - Any type of LSP
    - Bandwidth is basically “network resources”
  - The value-add is that services can be booked for a time-slot in the future
    - “Guaranteed” to be provided
    - Unless something changes!
- Further option is to vary an existing or booked service during a time window in the future
  - Add or reduce bandwidth for a period

# Conclusions in IETF 94

- Initial draft was presented and discussed in IETF 94
- Summary of the IETF discussion
  - There is general interest in working on this problem in the WG.
  - The group is more interested in focusing on a limited, preferably single, approach rather than cataloging all possible approaches.
  - Centralized model is preferred.

# Update in revision -02

- Merge with draft-chen-teas-frmwk-tts to provide centralized model:
  - Incorporate contents from draft-chen-teas-frmwk-tts.
  - Add Huaimo Chen as new author.
- Editorial changes.
- Generate -02 version.

# Resolve some offline comments

- Why it is needed to have a time aware LSP-DB while a time aware TED is not enough.
- In section 3.2, why decide to have the time indicated as a discrete number of slots?
- In section 4.2, is it a good idea to leave the recovery out of scope as implementation specific? Some options may need dedicated protocol extensions. E.g. if we want a PCE from vendor A to speak with a network from vendor B we need to state how the PCE builds the Time based TED.

# Next Step

- This is clearly in scope for TEAS
  - It is a Traffic Engineering Technique
  - This is an architecture, not protocol extensions
- There has been interested demonstrated through two I-Ds
  - Discussion has been slow, but based on agreement at IETF-94
- Ready for adoption by the WG
  - What do the chairs recommend?