

RSVP-TE Extensions to Exchange MPLS-TP LSP Identifiers

CCAMP WG, IETF 83th, Paris

[draft-zhang-ccamp-mpls-tp-rsvpte-ext-tunnel-num-02](#)

Fei Zhang
Xiao Bao

Update from V01 to V02

□ The Extended Association object is reused

- ✓ The “LSP identifiers” are already defined in the Extended Association object
- ✓ The object can be used without matching Path or Resv states

□ A new Association Type is defined

- ✓ “LSP Identifiers” , used without matching Path or Resv States
- ✓ Association Type -Specific rules: the object can appear in Path or Resv messages across sessions or in a single session, and the values can be different

Signaling Procedures

❑ Co-routed bidirectional LSPs

- ✓ Optional
- ✓ Path /Resv messages

❑ Associated Bidirectional LSPs

- ✓ Optional
- ✓ Path/ Path messages

| Extended Association Object | Co-routed Bidirectional LSPs | | Associated Bidirectional LSPs | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| | A1-Path | Z9-Resv | A1-Path (LSP1) | Z9-Path (LSP2) |
| Association Type | LSP Identifiers | LSP Identifiers | LSP Identifiers | LSP Identifiers |
| Association ID | A1-Tunnel_Num | Z9-Tunnel_Num | A1-Tunnel_Num | Z9-Tunnel_Num |
| Association Source | A1-Node_ID | Z9-Node_ID | A1-Node_ID | Z9-Node_ID |
| Global Association Source | A1-Global_ID | Z9-Global_ID | A1-Global_ID | Z9-Global_ID |
| Extended Association ID | Omitted | Omitted | Omitted | Omitted |

❑ Why a new Association Type

- ✓ The requirements are different from associated bidirectional LSPs
- ✓ The processing rules are different
- ✓ Easy implementation

Next Steps

- ❑ Adopted as a WG document?
 - ✓ Simple, but addressing the exact requirements
 - ✓ Discussed a lot in the meeting and mailinglist
- ❑ Comments?

Thanks

