

PCE
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: 8 November 2026

Q. Xiong
S. Peng
ZTE Corporation
F. Qin
China Mobile
J. Zhao
CAICT
7 May 2026

Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extension for SR-
MPLS Entropy Label Positions
draft-ietf-pce-entropy-label-position-05

Abstract

Entropy label (EL) can be used in the SR-MPLS data plane to improve load-balancing and multiple Entropy Label Indicator (ELI)/EL pairs may be inserted in the SR-MPLS label stack as per RFC8662.

This document proposes a set of extensions for Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) to configure the Entropy Label Positions (ELP) for SR-MPLS networks.

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). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 8 November 2026.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2026 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 (<https://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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Conventions used in this document	4
2.1. Terminology	4
2.2. Requirements Language	4
3. Entropy Labels in SR-MPLS Scenario with PCE	4
4. PCEP Extensions	5
4.1. The OPEN Object	5
4.2. The LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV	5
4.3. The SR-ERO Object	6
5. Operation	6
6. Implementation Status	6
7. Security Considerations	7
8. IANA Considerations	7
8.1. New SR PCE Capability Flag Registry	7
8.2. New LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG Flag Registry	7
8.3. New SR-ERO Flag Registry	7
9. Manageability Considerations	8
9.1. Control of Function and Policy	8
9.2. Information and Data Models	8
9.3. Liveness Detection and Monitoring	8
9.4. Verify Correct Operations	8
9.5. Requirements On Other Protocols	9
9.6. Impact On Network Operations	9
10. Operational Considerations	9
11. Acknowledgements	9
12. References	9
12.1. Normative References	9
12.2. Informative References	11
Authors' Addresses	11

1. Introduction

[RFC5440] describes the Path Computation Element Computation Protocol (PCEP) which is used between a Path Computation Element (PCE) and a Path Computation Client (PCC) (or other PCE) to enable computation of Multi-protocol Label Switching (MPLS) for Traffic Engineering Label Switched Path (TE LSP). PCEP Extensions for the Stateful PCE Model [RFC8231] describes a set of extensions to PCEP to enable active control of MPLS-TE and Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) tunnels. [RFC8281] describes the setup and teardown of PCE-initiated LSPs under the active stateful PCE model, without the need for local configuration on the PCC, thus allowing for dynamic centralized control of a network.

Segment Routing (SR) leverages the source routing paradigm. Segment Routing can be instantiated on MPLS data plane which is referred to as SR-MPLS [RFC8660]. SR-MPLS leverages the MPLS label stack to construct the SR path. PCEP Extensions for Segment Routing [RFC8664] specifies extensions to the PCEP that allow a stateful PCE to compute and initiate TE paths, as well as a PCC to request a path subject to certain constraint(s) and optimization criteria in SR networks.

Entropy label (EL) [RFC6790] is a technique used in the MPLS data plane to improve load-balancing. Entropy Label Indicator (ELI) can be immediately preceding an EL in the MPLS label stack. The idea behind the EL is that the ingress router computes a hash based on several fields from a given packet and places the result in an additional label, named "entropy label". Then, this entropy label can be used as part of the hash keys used by an Label Switch Router (LSR). Using the entropy label as part of the hash keys reduces the need for deep packet inspection in the LSR while keeping a good level of entropy in the load-balancing. When the entropy label is used, the keys used in the hashing functions are still a local configuration matter and an LSR may use solely the entropy label or a combination of multiple fields from the incoming packet.

[RFC8662] proposes to use entropy labels for SR-MPLS networks and multiple <ELI, EL> pairs SHOULD be inserted in the SR-MPLS label stack. The ingress node may decide the number and place of the ELI/ELs which need to be inserted into the label stack. The Entropy Label Position (ELP) is used to indicate the positions of the ELI/ELs which need to be inserted into the label stack as per [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-srmpls-elp].

In some cases, the controller(e.g. PCE) could be used to perform the TE path computation as well as ELP information which is useful for inter-domain scenarios. This document proposes a set of extensions for PCEP to configure the ELP information for SR-MPLS networks.

2. Conventions used in this document

2.1. Terminology

The terminology is defined as [RFC5440], [RFC6790], [RFC8664] and [RFC8662].

2.2. Requirements Language

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.

3. Entropy Labels in SR-MPLS Scenario with PCE

[RFC8662] proposes to use entropy labels for SR-MPLS networks. The Entropy Readable Label Depth (ERLD) is defined as the number of labels which means that the router will perform load-balancing using the ELI/EL in [RFC8662] section 4.

As described in [RFC8662] section 7.2.1, the ERLD value is an important consideration when inserting ELI/EL and the minimum ERLD must be evaluated for each node along a computed path. This necessary step adds additional complexity in the ELI/EL insertion process and it may not be feasible for an ingress router to compute the appropriate ERLD for each node in the path, since a SR-MPLS path may contain segments the ingress router can resolve such as inter-domain scenarios. As the Figure 1 shown, in SR-MPLS inter-domain scenario, the ingress node of the first domain could not get the ERLD information of other nodes of other domains.




Figure 1: Entropy Labels in SR-MPLS Inter-Domain Scenario

The PCEs can compute the ELP information including the number and the places of the ELI/ELs. Then the ingress nodes MAY be required to support the capabilities of inserting multiple ELI/ELs and need to advertise the capabilities to the PCEs.

This document proposes the extensions for PCE to perform the computation of the end-to-end path as well as the positions of entropy labels in SR-MPLS networks. The ingress nodes can directly insert the ELI/ELs based on the positions.

4. PCEP Extensions

4.1. The OPEN Object

As defined in [RFC8664], PCEP speakers use SR PCE Capability sub-TLV to exchange information about their SR capability when PST=1 in the PST List of the PATH-SETUP-TYPE-CAPABILITY TLV carried in Open object. This document defines a new flag (E-flag) for SR PCE Capability sub-TLV.

E (ELP Configuration is supported) : A PCE sets this flag bit to 1 carried in Open message to indicate that it supports the computation of SR path with ELP information. A PCC sets this flag to 1 to indicate that it supports the capability of inserting multiple ELI/EL pairs and supports the results of SR path with ELP from PCE.

4.2. The LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV

The LSP Object is defined in Section 7.3 of [RFC8231]. This document defines a new flag (E-flag) for the LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV carried in LSP Object as defined in [RFC9357].

E (Request for ELP Configuration) : If the bit is set to 1, it indicates that the PCC requests PCE to compute the SR path with ELP information. The PCE SHOULD set this bit to 1 to indicate that the ELP information is included by PCE and encoded in the Path Computation Reply (PCRep) message as per [RFC5440]. And in a stateful PCE model, it also can be carried in Path Computation Update Request (PCUpd) message as per [RFC8231] or LSP Initiate Request (PCInitiate) message as per [RFC8281].

4.3. The SR-ERO Object

SR-ERO subobject is used for SR-TE path which consists of one or more SIDs as defined in [RFC8664]. This document defined a new flag (E-flag) for the SR-ERO subobject.

E (ELP Configuration) : If this flag is set, the PCC SHOULD insert <ELI, EL> into the position after this SR-ERO subobject, otherwise it SHOULD not insert <ELI, EL> after this segment.

5. Operation

A PCC can request the computation of SR path and a PCE may respond with PCRep message. And the SR path can also be initiated by PCE with PCInitiate or PCUpd message in stateful PCE mode. When the E bit in LSP object is set to 1 within the message, it indicates to request the ELP configuration with the SR path. The SR path being received by PCC encoded in SR-ERO, for example, <S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6>, especially S3 and S6 with E-flag set. It indicates that two <ELI, EL> pairs SHOULD be inserted into the label stack of the SR forwarding entry, respectively after the label for S3 and label for S6. With EL information, the label stack for SR-MPLS would be <label1, label2, label3, ELI, EL, label4, label5, label6, ELI, EL>.

6. Implementation Status

[NOTE TO RFC EDITOR : This whole section and the reference to RFC 7942 is to be removed before publication as an RFC]

This section records the status of known implementations of the protocol defined by this specification at the time of posting of this Internet-Draft, and is based on a proposal described in [RFC7942]. The description of implementations in this section is intended to assist the IETF in its decision processes in progressing drafts to RFCs. Please note that the listing of any individual implementation here does not imply endorsement by the IETF. Furthermore, no effort has been spent to verify the information presented here that was supplied by IETF contributors. This is not intended as, and must not be construed to be, a catalog of available implementations or their features. Readers are advised to note that other implementations may exist.

According to [RFC7942], "this will allow reviewers and working groups to assign due consideration to documents that have the benefit of running code, which may serve as evidence of valuable experimentation and feedback that have made the implemented protocols more mature. It is up to the individual working groups to use this information as they see fit".

At the time of posting this version of this document, there are no known implementations of this mechanism. It is believed that some vendor are considering prototype implementations, but these plans are too vague to make any further assertions.

7. Security Considerations

This document defines a new E bit for entropy label, which do not introduce any new security considerations beyond those already listed in [RFC9357], [RFC8662] and [RFC8664].

8. IANA Considerations

8.1. New SR PCE Capability Flag Registry

SR PCE Capability TLV is defined in [RFC8664], and the registry to manage the Flag field of the SR PCE Capability TLV is requested in [RFC8664]. IANA is requested to make allocations from the registry, as follows:

Value	Name	Reference
TBD1	ELP Configuration is supported (E)	[this document]

Table 1

8.2. New LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG Flag Registry

[RFC9357] defines the LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV. IANA is requested to make allocations from the Flag field registry, as follows:

Value	Name	Reference
TBD2	Request for ELP Configuration (E)	[this document]

Table 2

8.3. New SR-ERO Flag Registry

SR-ERO subobject is defined in [RFC8664], and the registry to manage the Flag field of SR-ERO is requested in [RFC8664]. IANA is requested to make allocations from the registry, as follows:

Value	Name	Reference
TBD3	ELP Configuration (E)	[this document]

Table 3

9. Manageability Considerations

All manageability requirements and considerations listed in [RFC5440], [RFC8231], and [RFC8664] apply to PCEP protocol extensions defined in this document. In addition, requirements and considerations listed in this section also should be applied.

9.1. Control of Function and Policy

A PCEP implementation supporting this document SHOULD allow configuration of the capability to support the entropy label position in the stateful PCEP message exchange.

A PCC implementation SHOULD allow the operator to configure the policy the PCC needs to apply when configuring the entropy label position.

9.2. Information and Data Models

A PCEP implementation supporting this document SHOULD allow the operator to view the entropy label position capability defined in this document.

The PCEP YANG module is defined in [I-D.ietf-pce-pcep-yang]. In future, this YANG module should be extended or augmented to provide the following additional information relating to entropy label position.

9.3. Liveness Detection and Monitoring

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new liveness detection and monitoring requirements in addition to those already listed in [RFC5440].

9.4. Verify Correct Operations

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new operation verification requirements in addition to those already listed in [RFC5440], [RFC8231], and [RFC8664] .

9.5. Requirements On Other Protocols

Mechanisms defined in this document do not imply any new requirements on other protocols.

9.6. Impact On Network Operations

Mechanisms defined in this document do not have any impact on network operations in addition to those already listed in [RFC5440], [RFC8231], and [RFC8664].

10. Operational Considerations

When computing the ELI/EL positions, the PCE MUST take into consideration Maximum SID Depth (MSD) imposition. The PCEs SHOULD get the information of all nodes such as MSD (e.g. Base MPLS Imposition MSD (BMI-MSD) or ERLD-MSD) through Interior Gateway Protocol (IGP) and compute the minimum ERLD along the end-to-end path based on these topology information.

The PCEP extensions defined in this document do not impose any new requirements on other protocols but rely on the MSD information advertised from IS-IS [RFC8491] and OSPF [RFC8476] and the ERLD value collected via IS-IS [RFC9088], and OSPF [RFC9089].

11. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Stephane Litkowski, Dhruv Dhody, Tarek Saad, Zhenbin Li, Jeff Tantsura, Andrew Stone, Xuesong Geng, Ran Chen, Gyan Mishra, Weiqiang Cheng and Samuel Sidor for their review, suggestions and comments to this document.

12. References

12.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC5440] Vasseur, JP., Ed. and JL. Le Roux, Ed., "Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP)", RFC 5440, DOI 10.17487/RFC5440, March 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5440>>.

- [RFC6790] Kompella, K., Drake, J., Amante, S., Henderickx, W., and L. Yong, "The Use of Entropy Labels in MPLS Forwarding", RFC 6790, DOI 10.17487/RFC6790, November 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6790>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC8231] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Medved, J., and R. Varga, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for Stateful PCE", RFC 8231, DOI 10.17487/RFC8231, September 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8231>>.
- [RFC8281] Crabbe, E., Minei, I., Sivabalan, S., and R. Varga, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for PCE-Initiated LSP Setup in a Stateful PCE Model", RFC 8281, DOI 10.17487/RFC8281, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8281>>.
- [RFC8476] Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Aldrin, S., and P. Psenak, "Signaling Maximum SID Depth (MSD) Using OSPF", RFC 8476, DOI 10.17487/RFC8476, December 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8476>>.
- [RFC8491] Tantsura, J., Chunduri, U., Aldrin, S., and L. Ginsberg, "Signaling Maximum SID Depth (MSD) Using IS-IS", RFC 8491, DOI 10.17487/RFC8491, November 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8491>>.
- [RFC8660] Bashandy, A., Ed., Filsfils, C., Ed., Previdi, S., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing with the MPLS Data Plane", RFC 8660, DOI 10.17487/RFC8660, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8660>>.
- [RFC8662] Kini, S., Kompella, K., Sivabalan, S., Litkowski, S., Shakir, R., and J. Tantsura, "Entropy Label for Source Packet Routing in Networking (SPRING) Tunnels", RFC 8662, DOI 10.17487/RFC8662, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8662>>.
- [RFC8664] Sivabalan, S., Filsfils, C., Tantsura, J., Henderickx, W., and J. Hardwick, "Path Computation Element Communication Protocol (PCEP) Extensions for Segment Routing", RFC 8664, DOI 10.17487/RFC8664, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8664>>.

- [RFC9088] Xu, X., Kini, S., Psenak, P., Filsfils, C., Litkowski, S., and M. Bocci, "Signaling Entropy Label Capability and Entropy Readable Label Depth Using IS-IS", RFC 9088, DOI 10.17487/RFC9088, August 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9088>>.
- [RFC9089] Xu, X., Kini, S., Psenak, P., Filsfils, C., Litkowski, S., and M. Bocci, "Signaling Entropy Label Capability and Entropy Readable Label Depth Using OSPF", RFC 9089, DOI 10.17487/RFC9089, August 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9089>>.
- [RFC9357] Xiong, Q., "Label Switched Path (LSP) Object Flag Extension for Stateful PCE", RFC 9357, DOI 10.17487/RFC9357, February 2023, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9357>>.

12.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-idr-bgp-srmppls-elp]
Liu, Y. and S. Peng, "BGP Extension for SR-MPLS Entropy Label Position", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-idr-bgp-srmppls-elp-04, 4 August 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-idr-bgp-srmppls-elp-04>>.
- [I-D.ietf-pce-pcep-yang]
Dhody, D., Beeram, V. P., Hardwick, J., and J. Tantsura, "A YANG Data Model for Path Computation Element Communications Protocol (PCEP)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-pce-pcep-yang-30, 26 January 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-pce-pcep-yang-30>>.

Authors' Addresses

Quan Xiong
ZTE Corporation
No.6 Huashi Park Rd
Wuhan
Hubei, 430223
China
Email: xiong.quan@zte.com.cn

Shaofu Peng
ZTE Corporation
No.50 Software Avenue

Nanjing
Jiangsu, 210012
China
Email: peng.shaofu@zte.com.cn

Fengwei Qin
China Mobile
Beijing
China
Email: qinfengwei@chinamobile.com

Junfeng Zhao
CAICT
Beijing
China
Email: zhaojunfeng@caict.ac.cn