

# Path Computation Element WG Status

Jean-Philippe Vasseur ([jvasseur@cisco.com](mailto:jvasseur@cisco.com))

Julien Meuric ([julien.meuric@orange-ftgroup.com](mailto:julien.meuric@orange-ftgroup.com))

# Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include **oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications** made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- \* The IETF plenary session
- \* The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
- \* **Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices**
- \* **Any IETF working group or portion thereof**
- \* The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
- \* The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.

Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

# Administrivia

- Apologies for being unable to attend
  - from Julien, co-chair
  - from Dan, secretary
- Blue sheets; backup scribe (thanks Meral)
- Presenters
  - stick to your timeslot
  - focus on solving issues (otherwise use the list!)
- People at the mic: please state your name
  - people above might try to follow remotely

# Agenda Bashing

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. Administrivia, Agenda Bashing (chairs, 5 min)
- 1.2. WG Status (chairs, 10 min)

## **2. GMPLS**

- 2.1. PCEP Extensions for GMPLS (Cyril Margaria, 10 min)
- 2.2. PCEP Requirement for RWA (Young Lee, 5 min)

## **3. Multi-Layer / Multi-Domain**

- 3.1. Inter-Layer Extensions (Fatai Zang, 5 min)
- 3.2. OSPF Extension for Area IDs (Wenhu Lu, 10 min)

## **4. Miscellaneous**

- 4.1. Per-Destination Explicit Path (Dhruv Dhody, 5 min)
- 4.2. Data Structure (Dhruv Dhody, 5 min)

# Milestones (as proposed to AD)

Oct 2011 Submit WSON requirements to the IESG to be considered as an Informational RFC

Dec 2011 Submit extensions for hierarchical PCE path computation model as WG document

Jan 2012 Submit the PCEP MIB to the IESG to be considered as a Proposed Standard

Jan 2012 Submit P2MP MIB as a WG document

Feb 2012 Submit the discovery MIB to the IESG to be considered as a Proposed Standard

Feb 2012 Submit inter-layer extensions to the IESG to be considered as a Proposed Standard

Mar 2012 Submit inter-area/AS applicability statement to the IESG as an informational RFC

Mar 2012 Submit PCEP extensions for WSON as a WG document

Apr 2012 Submit the GMPLS requirements to the IESG to be considered as an Informational RFC

June 2012 Submit PCEP extensions for GMPLS to the IESG to be considered as a Proposed Standard

Aug 2012 Submit PCEP extensions for WSON to the IESG to be considered as a Proposed Standard

Oct 2012 Submit P2MP MIB to the IESG to be considered as a Proposed Standard

Feb 2013 Submit extensions for hierarchical model to the IESG to be considered as a Proposed Standard

Mar 2013 Evaluate WG progress, recharter or close

# Good News Everyone!

- The source TCP port of a PCEP session in RFC 5440
  - discussed on the mailing list (first!)
  - presented during IETF 80 (issue to solve)
  - has since been discussed with...
    - the IESG member who triggered the change
    - the Transport Area Directors
    - the Security Directorate
- Everyone agrees: no reason to have this constraint
  - PCEP source port will be moved to “dynamically allocated”
  - maybe using RFC Errata (chairs & AD in charge)

# Documents

- No new RFC since Prague
- IESG Processing
  - Inter-layer Requirements: write-up needed
- Expired
  - draft-ietf-pce-pcep-mib
  - draft-ietf-pce-disc-mib
  - draft-ietf-pce-tc-mib
  - draft-ietf-pce-vpn-req

# Not on the Agenda

- draft-ietf-pce-gmpls-aps-req
  - solution draft on the agenda
- draft-ietf-pce-inter-area-as-applicability
  - WG feedback required
- draft-ietf-pce-vendor-constraints
  - few messages on the list