

Network Working Group  
Internet Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track

H. Long, M. Ye  
Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd  
G. Mirsky  
ZTE  
A.D'Alessandro  
Telecom Italia S.p.A  
H. Shah  
Ciena

Expires: July 2019

January 17, 2019

**Ethernet Traffic Parameters with Availability Information**  
**draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-bandwidth-availability-13.txt**

**Abstract**

A packet switching network may contain links with variable bandwidth, e.g., copper, radio, etc. The bandwidth of such links is sensitive to external environment (e.g., climate). Availability is typically used for describing these links when during network planning. This document introduces an optional Availability TLV in Resource ReSerVation Protocol - Traffic Engineer (RSVP-TE) signaling. This extension can be used to set up a Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Label Switched Path (LSP) using the Ethernet SENDER\_TSPEC object.

**Status of this Memo**

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 17, 2019.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the [Trust Legal Provisions](#) and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction .....	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Overview .....	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Extension to RSVP-TE Signaling.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Availability TLV.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Signaling Process.....	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Security Considerations.....	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	IANA Considerations .....	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.1</a>	Ethernet Sender TSpec TLVs .....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	References .....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	Normative References.....	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	Informative References.....	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Appendix: Bandwidth Availability Example.....	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Acknowledgments .....	<a href="#">10</a>

## Conventions used in this document

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#) [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

The following acronyms are used in this draft:

RSVP-TE    Resource Reservation Protocol-Traffic Engineering

LSP        Label Switched Path

SNR          Signal-to-noise Ratio

TLV          Type Length Value

LSA          Link State Advertisement

## **1. Introduction**

The RSVP-TE specification [[RFC3209](#)] and GMPLS extensions [[RFC3473](#)] specify the signaling message including the bandwidth request for setting up a Label Switched Path in a packet switching network.

Some data communication technologies allow seamless change of maximum physical bandwidth through a set of known discrete values. The parameter availability [[G.827](#)], [[F.1703](#)], [[P.530](#)] is often used to describe the link capacity during network planning. The availability is based on a time scale, which is a proportion of the operating time that the requested bandwidth is ensured. A more detailed example on the bandwidth availability can be found in [Appendix A](#). Assigning different bandwidth availability classes to different types of services over such kind of links provides for a more efficient planning of link capacity. To set up an LSP across these links, bandwidth availability information is required for the nodes to verify bandwidth satisfaction and make bandwidth reservation. The bandwidth availability information should be inherited from the bandwidth availability requirements of the services expected to be carried on the LSP. For example, voice service usually needs "five nines" bandwidth availability, while non-real time services may adequately perform at four or three nines bandwidth availability. Since different service types may need different availabilities guarantees, multiple <availability, bandwidth> pairs may be required when signaling.

If the bandwidth availability requirement is not specified in the signaling message, the bandwidth will be reserved as the highest bandwidth availability. For example, the bandwidth with 99.999% availability of a link is 100 Mbps; the bandwidth with 99.99% availability is 200 Mbps. When a video application requests for 120 Mbps without bandwidth availability requirement, the system will consider the request as 120 Mbps with 99.999% bandwidth availability, while the available bandwidth with 99.999% bandwidth availability is only 100 Mbps, therefore the LSP path cannot be set up. But, in fact, the video application doesn't need 99.999% bandwidth availability; 99.99% bandwidth availability is enough. In this case, the LSP could be set up if bandwidth availability is also specified in the signaling message.

To fulfill LSP setup by signaling in these scenarios, this document specifies an Availability TLV. The Availability TLV can be applicable to any kind of physical links with variable discrete bandwidth, such as microwave or DSL. Multiple Availability TLVs together with multiple Ethernet Bandwidth Profiles can be carried by the Ethernet SENDER\_TSPEC object [RFC6003]. Since the Ethernet FLOWSPEC object has the same format as the Ethernet SENDER\_TSPEC object [RFC6003], the Availability TLV can also be carried by the Ethernet FLOWSPEC object.

## 2. Overview

A tunnel in a packet switching network may span one or more links in a network. To setup a Label Switched Path (LSP), a node may collect link information which is advertised in a routing message, e.g., OSPF TE LSA message, by network nodes to obtain network topology information, and then calculate an LSP route based on the network topology. The calculated LSP route is signaled using a PATH/RESV message for setting up the LSP.

In case that there is (are) link(s) with variable discrete bandwidth in a network, a <bandwidth, availability> requirement list should be specified for an LSP at setup. Each <bandwidth, availability> pair in the list means the listed bandwidth with specified availability is required. The list could be derived from the results of service planning for the LSP.

A node which has link(s) with variable discrete bandwidth attached should contain a <bandwidth, availability> information list in its OSPF TE LSA messages. The list provides the mapping between the link nominal bandwidth and its availability level. This information can then be used for path calculation by the node(s). The routing extension for availability can be found in [RFC8330].

When a node initiates a PATH/RESV signaling to set up an LSP, the PATH message should carry the <bandwidth, availability> requirement list as a bandwidth request. Intermediate node(s) will allocate the bandwidth resource for each availability requirement from the remaining bandwidth with corresponding availability. An error message may be returned if any <bandwidth, availability> request cannot be satisfied.



The intermediate and destination nodes check whether they can satisfy the bandwidth requirements by comparing each bandwidth request inside the SENDER\_TSPEC objects with the remaining link sub-bandwidth resource with respective availability guarantee on the local link when the PATH message is received.

- o When all <bandwidth, availability> requirement requests can be satisfied (the requested bandwidth under each availability parameter is smaller than or equal to the remaining bandwidth under the corresponding availability parameter on its local link), it SHOULD reserve the bandwidth resource from each remaining sub-bandwidth portion on its local link to set up this LSP. Optionally, the higher availability bandwidth can be allocated to lower availability request when the lower availability bandwidth cannot satisfy the request.
- o When at least one <bandwidth, availability> requirement request cannot be satisfied, it SHOULD generate PathErr message with the error code "Admission Control Error" and the error value "Requested Bandwidth Unavailable" (see [[RFC2205](#)]).

When two LSPs request bandwidth with the same availability requirement, contention MUST be resolved by comparing the node IDs, with the LSP with the higher node ID being assigned the reservation. This is consistent with general contention resolution mechanism provided in [section 3.2 of \[RFC3473\]](#).

When a node does not support the Availability TLV, it SHOULD generate PathErr message with the error code "Extended Class-Type Error" and the error value "Class-Type mismatch" (see [[RFC2205](#)]).

#### **4. Security Considerations**

This document does not introduce any new security considerations to the existing RSVP-TE signaling protocol. [[RFC5920](#)] provides an overview of security vulnerabilities and protection mechanisms for the GMPLS control plane.

#### **5. IANA Considerations**

IANA maintains registries and sub-registries for RSVP-TE used by GMPLS. IANA is requested to make allocations from these registries as set out in the following sections.

## 5.1 Ethernet Sender TSpec TLVs

IANA maintains a registry of GMPLS parameters called "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Parameters".

IANA has created a sub-registry called "Ethernet Sender TSpec TLVs / Ethernet Flowspec TLVs" to contain the TLV type values for TLVs carried in the Ethernet SENDER\_TSPEC object. The sub-registry needs to be updated to include the Availability TLV which is defined as follow. This document proposes a suggested value for the Availability sub-TLV; it is requested that the suggested value be granted by IANA.

Type	Description	Reference
-----	-----	-----
0x04	Availability	[This ID]

The registration procedure for this registry is Standards Action as defined in [[RFC8126](#)].

## 6. References

### 6.1. Normative References

- [RFC2205] Braden, R., Ed., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S., and S.Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) - Version 1 Functional Specification", [RFC 2205](#), September 1997.
- [RFC3209] Awduche, D., Berger, L., Gan, D., Li, T., Srinivasan, V., and G. Swallow, "RSVP-TE: Extensions to RSVP for LSP Tunnels", [RFC 3209](#), December 2001.
- [RFC3473] Berger, L., "Generalized Multi-Protocol Label Switching (GMPLS) Signaling Resource ReserVation Protocol-Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) Extensions", [RFC 3473](#), January 2003.
- [RFC6003] Papadimitriou, D. "Ethernet Traffic Parameters", [RFC 6003](#), October 2010.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), May 2017.

## **6.2. Informative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M. and Leiba, B., and Narten T., "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [RFC 8126](#), June 2017.
- [RFC5920] Fang, L., "Security Framework for MPLS and GMPLS Networks", [RFC 5920](#), July 2010.
- [G.827] ITU-T Recommendation, "Availability performance parameters and objectives for end-to-end international constant bit-rate digital paths", September, 2003.
- [F.1703] ITU-R Recommendation, "Availability objectives for real digital fixed wireless links used in 27 500 km hypothetical reference paths and connections", January, 2005.
- [P.530] ITU-R Recommendation, "Propagation data and prediction methods required for the design of terrestrial line-of-sight systems", February, 2012
- [EN 302 217] ETSI standard, "Fixed Radio Systems; Characteristics and requirements for point-to-point equipment and antennas", April, 2009
- [RFC8330] H., Long, M., Ye, Mirsky, G., Alessandro, A., Shah, H., "OSPF Traffic Engineering (OSPF-TE) Link Availability Extension for Links with Variable Discrete Bandwidth", [RFC8330](#), February, 2018

## **7. Appendix: Bandwidth Availability Example**

In a mobile backhaul network, microwave links are very popular for providing connections of last hops. In case of heavy rain conditions, to maintain the link connectivity, the microwave link MAY lower the modulation level since demodulating to a lower modulation level provides for a lower Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) requirement. This is called adaptive modulation technology [EN 302 217]. However, a lower modulation level also means lower link bandwidth. When link bandwidth is reduced because of modulation down-shifting, high-priority traffic can be maintained, while lower-priority traffic is dropped. Similarly, copper links may change their link bandwidth due to external interference.



Presuming that a link has three discrete bandwidth levels:

The link bandwidth under modulation level 1, e.g., QPSK, is 100 Mbps;

The link bandwidth under modulation level 2, e.g., 16QAM, is 200 Mbps;

The link bandwidth under modulation level 3, e.g., 256QAM, is 400 Mbps.

On a sunny day, the modulation level 3 can be used to achieve 400 Mbps link bandwidth.

A light rain with  $X$  mm/h rate triggers the system to change the modulation level from level 3 to level 2, with bandwidth changing from 400 Mbps to 200 Mbps. The probability of  $X$  mm/h rain in the local area is 52 minutes in a year. Then the dropped 200 Mbps bandwidth has 99.99% availability.

A heavy rain with  $Y(Y > X)$  mm/h rate triggers the system to change the modulation level from level 2 to level 1, with bandwidth changing from 200 Mbps to 100 Mbps. The probability of  $Y$  mm/h rain in the local area is 26 minutes in a year. Then the dropped 100 Mbps bandwidth has 99.995% availability.

For the 100M bandwidth of the modulation level 1, only the extreme weather condition can cause the whole system to be unavailable, which only happens for 5 minutes in a year. So the 100 Mbps bandwidth of the modulation level 1 owns the availability of 99.999%.

Therefore, the maximum bandwidth is 400 Mbps. According to the weather condition, the sub-bandwidth and its availability are shown as follows:

Sub-bandwidth (Mbps)	Availability
-----	-----
200	99.99%
100	99.995%
100	99.999%

## **8. Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank Deborah Brungard, Khuzema Pithewan, Lou Berger, Yuji Tochio, Dieter Beller, and Autumn Liu for their comments and contributions on the document.

Authors' Addresses

Hao Long  
Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.  
No.1899, Xiyuan Avenue, Hi-tech Western District  
Chengdu 611731, P.R.China

Phone: +86-18615778750  
Email: longhao@huawei.com

Min Ye (editor)  
Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.  
No.1899, Xiyuan Avenue, Hi-tech Western District  
Chengdu 611731, P.R.China

Email: amy.yemin@huawei.com

Greg Mirsky (editor)  
ZTE

Email: gregimirsky@gmail.com

Alessandro D'Alessandro  
Telecom Italia S.p.A

Email: alessandro.dalessandro@telecomitalia.it

Himanshu Shah  
Ciena Corp.  
3939 North First Street  
San Jose, CA 95134  
US

Email: hshah@ciena.com