Mutually Exclusive Link Group [MELG]
draft-beeram-ccamp-melg-02

Vishnu Pavan Beeram (Ed), John Drake, Gert Grammel (Juniper Networks)

Igor Bryskin (Ed) (ADVA Optical Networking)

Manuel Paul, Ruediger Kunze (Deutsche Telekom)

Friedrich Armbruster (Coriant GmbH)

Oscar Gonzalez de Dios (Telefonica)

Fatai Zhang (Huawei Technologies)

Daniele Ceccarelli (Ericsson)

Wes Doonan

Cyril Margaria

Recap

- Presented ['01] in IETF 87
  - Discussed Static Mutual Exclusivity and Dynamic Mutual Exclusivity.

['02] Changes

- Clarify the semantics of "Virtual TE-Link" used in the draft.

- Discuss the rationale behind using 2 separate constructs - one for each mutual exclusivity type.

Virtual TE Link - Semantics

- Virtual TE-Link – Limitations with existing definition(s).
  - No strict guidelines on how the underlying server LSP needs to get set up.
  - Characteristics of the underlying server path not determined until the Virtual TE-Link gets committed.
    - Some key constraints of the Virtual TE-Link (e.g. shared-risk, delay) not known to the client until the corresponding server LSP is set up.

- Virtual TE-Link – An enhanced view
  - Aware of the key characteristics of the underlying server-path (while still uncommitted)
  - Creation/Maintenance is driven by policy
    - Policy determines which Virtual TE-Link to create (which end-points) and how the underling server LSP (what path) needs to get set up.
  - A Virtual TE-Link remains a Virtual TE-Link through-out its life-time
    - It may get committed and uncommitted from time to time – but never loses its "Virtual" property.

Construct Requirements - Static vs. Dynamic Mutual Exclusivity

- The advertisement paradigm of the TE construct required to carry static mutual exclusivity information is quite different from that of the TE construct required to carry dynamic mutual exclusivity information.
  - Static mutual exclusivity information can get advertised per TE-Link using a simple sub-TLV construct.
    - No scaling issues with this approach.
  - Advertising dynamic mutual exclusivity information per TE-link poses serious scaling concerns and hence requires a different type of construct/paradigm.
  - The TE construct for carrying static mutual exclusivity information is introduced in [DRAFT-MELG]; The construct for carrying the dynamic mutual exclusivity information is discussed in [DRAFT-SRcLG].

Next Steps

- Initiate discussion.
- Get consensus on the solution aspects.