PCEP Extensions for Stateful PCE Usage in GMPLS Networks

PCE WG, IETF 90th, Toronto, Canada

draft-ietf-pce-pcep-stateful-pce-gmpls-01.txt

Fatai Zhang (zhangfatai@huawei.com)
Xian Zhang (zhang.xian@huawei.com)
Young Lee (leeyong@huawei.com)
Ramon Casellas (ramon.casellas@cttc.es)
Oscar Gonzalez de Dios (ogondio@tid.es)
Zafar Ali (zali@cisco.com)
Dhruv Dhody (dhruv.dhody@huawei.com)

Changes from Version 00

1) Added <END-POINTS> in PCRpt;
   - ✓ Reason: Endpoints， which can be unnumbered interfaces, may not be reported via <ERO> or TLV within LSP object.
2) Added IS-IS PCED TLV extensions;
3) Updated all the texts, according to the changes made to the *draft-ietf-pce-gmpls-pcep-extensions-09*.
   - ✓ Not new object Class, but only new types;
4) Filled two TBD parts with texts:
   - ✓ IANA section; (TBD + suggested value)
   - ✓ The paragraph mentioning multi-domain issue

Open Issue Summary

- **Issue 1**: Extensions for stateful PCE capability advertisement in multi-layer networks:
  - Requirement: the PCCs should be informed of which PCEs they should synchronize their LSP states with, as well as send path computation requests to
  - Solutions:
    - Negotiation capability through Open object (to be discussed and taken action)
      - Option 1: Define extension to OPEN object in [INTER-LAYER] draft to negotiate this capability
      - Option 2: Define extension OPEN object in this draft

      Question: Which option is preferred by the WG?
    - Discovery capability: defined OSPF/ISIS PCED TLV in this draft(already addressed in this draft)

Next Step

- Welcome feedback from the meeting or mailing list and further revision