draft-brissette-pals-pw-fec-label-request-01

Patrice Brissette
Sami Boutros
Kamran Raza
[Cisco Systems]

Nick Del Regno
Matthew Turlington
[Verizon]

IETF 93
Prague, CZ

- First time presented at IETF 91, last November

- What's news?
  - Adjust some references to specific RFCs
  - "Requirements" section. Use the keyword MUST instead of SHOULD as suggested by few people.
  - Expand a bit on Procedures

- Acknowledgement:
  - Thanks to Alexander Vainshtein

What is this about? (recap)

- This document **clarifies the behavior** of an LSR PE upon receiving an **LDP Label Request** message for **Pseudowire (PW) FEC types**.

- Furthermore, this document **specifies** the **procedures** to be followed by the LSR PE in order **to answer such requests** for a given PW FEC type.

- For example, there are some implementations which do not honor and **do not respond** to an incoming **Label Request** for a PW FEC type, resulting in **functionality impact**. Some of these problems are very critical for the deployment of PW technologies.

This document recommends

- An LSR PE **MUST** respond to an incoming Label Request message for a PW FEC by sending its local binding for the PW via a Label Mapping message
- Same type of recommendations apply to Wildcard FEC [RFC5036] and for Typed Wildcard PW FEC [RFC6667]

Procedures

- This document re-enforces the Label Request generic procedures, as defined by [RFC5036](), for PW FEC types

- This documents describe procedures for PWid FEC (FEC128), Generalized PWiD (FEC129) and PW Type FEC wildcard

- FEC130 and FEC132 are for further study

Next steps

- Seeking for more comments.

Thank you