

Workgroup: BESS
Internet-Draft:
draft-ietf-bess-extended-evpn-optimized-ir-02
Published: 8 July 2022
Intended Status: Standards Track
Expires: 9 January 2023
Authors: W. Lin, Ed. S. Sivaraj
 Juniper Networks, Inc. Juniper Networks, Inc.
 V. Garg J. Rabadan
 Juniper Networks, Inc. Nokia

Extended Procedures for EVPN Optimized Ingress Replication

Abstract

[[EVPN-AR](#)] specifies an optimized ingress replication solution for more efficient multicast and broadcast delivery in a Network Virtualization Overlay (NVO) network for EVPN.

This document extends the optimized ingress replication procedures specified in [[EVPN-AR](#)] to overcome the limitation that an AR-REPLICATOR may have. An AR-REPLICATOR may be unable to retain the source IP address or include the expected ESI label that is required for EVPN split horizon filtering when replicating the packet on behalf of its multihomed AR-LEAF. Under this circumstance, the extended procedures specified in this document allows the support of EVPN multihoming on the AR-LEAFs as well as optimized ingress replication for the rest of the EVPN overlay network.

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.

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 9 January 2023.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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. Terminology](#)
- [2. Introduction](#)
 - [2.1. Background](#)
 - [2.1.1. EVPN Multihoming and Split Horizon Filtering Rule](#)
 - [2.2. Optimized-IR and the Need to Maintain the Original Source IP address or Include the ESI Label](#)
- [3. Solution](#)
 - [3.1. AR-REPLICATOR Announcing Multihoming Assistant Capability for Optimized-IR](#)
 - [3.2. Multihomed AR-LEAF and Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR](#)
 - [3.3. The Benefit of the Extended Optimized-IR Procedure](#)
 - [3.4. Support for Mixed AR-REPLICATORS](#)
- [4. Extended Optimized-IR Procedure for Supporting Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR](#)
 - [4.1. AR-LEAF Procedure](#)
 - [4.1.1. Control Plane Procedure for AR-LEAF](#)
 - [4.1.2. Forwarding Procedure for AR-LEAF](#)
 - [4.2. AR-REPLICATOR Procedure](#)
 - [4.2.1. Control Plane Procedure for AR-REPLICATOR](#)
 - [4.2.2. Forwarding Procedure for AR-REPLICATOR](#)
 - [4.3. RNVE Procedure](#)
- [5. AR-LEAF's Peer multihomed NVE in the Extended Optimized-IR Procedure](#)
- [6. Multicast Flags Extended Community](#)
- [7. IANA Considerations](#)
- [8. Security Considerations](#)
- [9. Acknowledgements](#)

[10. Normative References](#)
[Authors' Addresses](#)

1. Terminology

AR-IP Tunnel

An overlay tunnel with a destination IP address of AR-IP that an AR-REPLICATOR advertises in its REPLICATE-AR route.

This document heavily uses the terminology specified in [[EVPN-AR](#)]. It also uses the terminology specified in [[RFC7432](#)] and [[RFC8365](#)].

2. Introduction

2.1. Background

2.1.1. EVPN Multihoming and Split Horizon Filtering Rule

This section gives a brief overview of the existing split horizon filtering rules used for EVPN multihoming.

[[RFC7432](#)] defines the split-horizon filtering rule based on ESI label for EVPN multihoming with MPLS encapsulation, and this filtering rule also applies for EVPN with IP-based encapsulation for MPLS, such as MPLS over GRE or MPLS over UDP. [[RFC8365](#)] defines the split horizon filtering rule based on "Local-Bias" for EVPN multihoming with VXLAN encapsulation.

When EVPN is used in an NVO network, a Tenant System (TS) may connect to a set of Network Virtualization Edge (NVE) devices through a multihomed Ethernet segment (ES). The split-horizon filtering rule for EVPN all-active multihoming ensures that a Broadcast, Unknown unicast or Multicast (BUM) packet received from an ES that is a part of a multihomed ES is not looped back to the multihomed TS through an egress NVE connected to the same multihomed ES. For EVPN with VXLAN encapsulation, the split-horizon filtering rule is based on the egress NVE examining the source IP address of the BUM packet received from an overlay tunnel. The egress PE identifies the ingress NVE through the source IP address. The egress NVE does not forward the BUM packet received from an overlay tunnel to the multihomed Ethernet segment that it has in common with the ingress NVE.

For EVPN with MPLS over IP tunnel, the split-horizon filtering rule is based on the ESI label. For ingress replication, an ESI label is downstream assigned per multihomed ES. The ingress NVE MUST include the ESI label, assigned by the egress PE, when it forwards a BUM packet to the egress NVE if the BUM traffic is from the AC that is part of the multihomed ES associated with that ESI label. The egress

NVE does not forward the BUM packet it received from an overlay tunnel to the multihomed ES if the ESI label is allocated by the egress NVE for that multihomed ES.

2.2. Optimized-IR and the Need to Maintain the Original Source IP address or Include the ESI Label

[[EVPN-AR](#)] specifies an optimized ingress replication procedures for the delivery of Multicast and Broadcast (BM) traffic within a bridge domain. It defines the control plane and forwarding plane procedures for AR-REPLICATOR, AR-LEAF and RNVE. To support EVPN AR-LEAF multihoming, [[EVPN-AR](#)] recommends that split horizon filtering rule based on "Local-Bias" procedures is used for EVPN NVO network using either 24-bit VNI or MPLS label.

To support EVPN all-active multihoming based on "Local-Bias" procedures, when an AR-REPLICATOR performs assisted replication on behalf of a multihomed AR-LEAF, the AR-REPLICATOR shall use the source IP address of the ingress AR-LEAF for packet received on the AR-IP tunnel. This ensures that other remote NVEs, when receiving a packet from its AR-REPLICATOR, can perform the regular split horizon filtering based on the source IP address.

To support EVPN all-active multihoming with MPLSoGRE or MPLSoUDP, sometimes it is desirable to continue using the existing split horizon filtering rule based on [RFC7432] procedures. In this case, when performing assisted replication on behalf of a multihomed AR-LEAF, an AR-REPLICATOR shall include the ESI label advertised by a remote NVE for that multihomed ES.

Due to either implementation complexity or hardware limitation, an AR-REPLICATOR may be unable to retain the source IP address or include the ESI label when replicating the packet to the remote NVEs on behalf of a multihomed AR-LEAF. Under this circumstance, when receiving the packet, a remote NVE is unable to use the existing split horizon filtering rules to prevent the looping of BM traffic required for all-active multihoming.

For example, with VXLAN encapsulation, consider a case where TS1 is multihomed to AR-LEAF1 and AR-LEAF2 through a multihomed ES. When AR-LEAF1 receives an IP multicast packet from TS1, AR-LEAF1 sends the packet to its AR-REPLICATOR with the source IP address set to AR-LEAF1's IR-IP and the destination IP address set to the AR-IP of the AR-REPLICATOR. Since the AR-REPLICATOR is unable to retain the source IP address for the packet it received on the AR-IP tunnel, the AR-REPLICATOR uses one of its own IP addresses as the source IP address when it replicates the packet to other NVEs. When AR-LEAF2 receives the packet from the AR-REPLICATOR, it checks for the source IP address. AR-LEAF2 is unable to detect that this packet was

originally sent by AR-LEAF1. If AR-LEAF2 is the DF for the multihomed ES connected to TS1, AR-LEAF2 forwards the packet to TS1. This causes the same IP multicast packet to be looped back to TS1.

The same problem can also happen to EVPN with MPLS over IP network if an AR-REPLICATOR cannot include the ESI label to the remote NVE for the multihomed ES when the split horizon filtering rule based on [RFC7432] is used.

3. Solution

This document extends the procedures defined in the [EVPN-AR] to support EVPN multihoming on AR-LEAFs when an NVE acts as an AR-REPLICATOR is incapable of retaining the source IP address or including an ESI label for its AR-LEAF either due to its hardware limitation or implementation complexity. The solution specified in this document is intended to work for EVPN over IP-based network with NVO tunnel using either 24-bit VNI or MPLS label. The solution relies on either [RFC7432] or "Local-Bias" split-horizon filtering rules to prevent the looping of BUM traffic. We refer to the procedures specified in this document as the extended Optimized-IR procedures. The extended Optimized-IR procedures also work with RNVE. The extended Optimized-IR procedures apply to the Network Virtualization Overlay networks using EVPN. It is independent of the encapsulation type used in a Network Virtualization Overlay networks for EVPN.

3.1. AR-REPLICATOR Announcing Multihoming Assistant Capability for Optimized-IR

An AR-REPLICATOR announces its AR-REPLICATOR role through the control plane. A REPLICATOR-AR route, as it is specified in the [EVPN-AR], is an Inclusive Multicast Ethernet Tag (IMET) route that an AR-REPLICATOR originates for its AR-IP and corresponding AR-replication tunnel.

If an AR-REPLICATOR cannot or chose not to retain the source IP address or include the expected ESI label for its multihomed AR-LEAFs, it MUST inform other NVEs in the control plane through the use of EVPN Multicast Flags Extended Community as follow: a) the AR-REPLICATOR MUST set the "Extended-MH-AR" flag, as it is specified in the section 6, in the multicast flags extended community, and b) it MUST attach this community to the REPLICATOR-AR route it originates. We call such an AR-REPLICATOR an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR.

An Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR supports extended Optimized-IR procedures defined in this document for its multihomed AR-LEAFs. An Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR keeps track of its AR-LEAF's multihomed peer. An Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR can perform assisted replication

for an AF-LEAF to other NVEs that are not attached to the same multihomed ES as the AR-LEAF. An Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR does not perform assisted replication for its AR-LEAF to other NVEs that have a multihomed ES in common with the AR-LEAF. The changes in the control plane and forwarding plan procedures for an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR is further explained in detail in section 5.2.

An AR-REPLICATOR originating a REPLICATOR-AR route without a multicast flags extended community or with the Extended-MH-AR flag unset is considered to be an MH-capable-assistant AR-REPLICATOR. An MH-capable-assistant AR-REPLICATOR can perform assisted replication for its single-homed AR-LEAF as well as multihomed AR-LEAF.

3.2. Multihomed AR-LEAF and Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR

An AR-LEAF follows the control plane and forwarding plane procedures specified in [[EVPN-AR](#)]. In addition, if a multihomed AR-LEAF detects that one of its AR-REPLICATORS is Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR based on the processing of its REPLICATOR-AR route, the multihomed AR-LEAF follows the extended Optimized-IR procedures specified in this document. With the extended Optimized-IR procedures, within the same BD, the multihomed AR-LEAF will use the regular ingress replication procedure to deliver a copy of a BUM packet received from its local AC to each of the remote NVEs that has a multihomed ES in common with it. In this way, the egress NVE can use the regular split horizon filtering rule defined in [RFC7432] or [RFC8365] to prevent the BUM traffic to be looped through the egress NVE to the source of origin. The extended procedures required for an AR-LEAF is further specified in detail in section 5.

For an AR-LEAF, please note that the additional forwarding procedures specified above apply to BM packets coming from any of its ACs in the same BD, whether that AC is a single homed ES or a part of a multihomed ES. It may also applies to Unknown unicast traffic. This is to further alleviate the burden of an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR as it may be unable to detect whether a packet received on its AR-IP tunnel was originally received from a single-homed or multihomed ES.

Consider an EVPN NVO network with a tenant domain consists of a set of m AR-LEAFs in BD X: AR-LEAF1, AR-LEAF2, AR-LEAF3, ..., AR-LEAF m . TS1 is multihomed to AR-LEAF1 and AR-LEAF2 in BD X through a multihomed ES ES1. TS2 is multihomed to AR-LEAF1 and AR-LEAF3 in BD X through another multihomed ES ES2. Also, suppose that there are two Extended-MH AR-REPLICATORS in the same tenant domain: AR-REPLICATOR1 and AR-REPLICATOR2. AR-LEAF1 will detect that its AR-REPLICATORS are Extended-MH AR-REPLICATORS. AR-LEAF1 will also detect that both AR-LEAF2 and AR-LEAF3 have a multihomed ES in common with it. AR-LEAF1 will use regular ingress replication to

send the BUM traffic it receives from its access to both AR-LEAF2 and AR-LEAF3. AR-LEAF1 will rely on one of its AR-REPLICATORS to send the BM traffic to AR-LEAF4, AR-LEAF5, ..., and AR-LEAFm.

3.3. The Benefit of the Extended Optimized-IR Procedure

The extended Optimized-IR procedures specified in this document greatly reduces the implementation complexity of an AR-REPLICATOR or helps to overcome the limitation of an AR-REPLICATOR. It frees all AR-REPLICATORS from performing multihoming assisted replication while at the same time, it allows the support of EVPN multihoming on the AR-LEAFs with the existing multihoming procedures and split horizon filtering rules. For EVPN with MPLS over IP-based encapsulation, an NVE can continue to use the split horizon filtering rule based on the ESI label. Furthermore, it still allows the support of efficient Optimized-IR for the rest of an EVPN NVO network.

For example, in a typical NVO network, a TS is most likely multihomed to two or a small set of NVEs for redundancy. In an NVO network consisting of many NVEs, the AR-REPLICATOR is still responsible for replicating the BM packet to the most of NVEs for its AR-LEAF and thus it inherits the benefit of optimized ingress replication for the most of its NVO network.

3.4. Support for Mixed AR-REPLICATORS

When there are mixed MH-capable-assistant AR-REPLICATORS and Extended-MH AR-REPLICATORS in the same tenant domain, all AR capable NVEs MUST follow the extended Optimized-IR procedures as long as one of the AR-REPLICATORS is an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR.

When there are mixed AR-REPLICATORS, this document recommends that all MH-capable-assistant AR-REPLICATORS to be administratively provisioned to behave as Extended-MH AR-REPLICATORS. In this case, each AR-REPLICATOR originates its REPLICATOR-AR route with the Extended-MH-AR flag set in the multicast flags extended community.

The procedure for using mixed AR-REPLICATORS is beyond the scope of this document.

4. Extended Optimized-IR Procedure for Supporting Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR

4.1. AR-LEAF Procedure

This section covers the extended Optimized-IR procedures required for an AR-LEAF in further detail when at least one of the AR-REPLICATORS is an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR. It is assumed that an

AR-LEAF follows the procedures defined in [\[EVPN-AR\]](#) unless it is specified otherwise.

4.1.1. Control Plane Procedure for AR-LEAF

An AR-LEAF detects whether an AR-REPLICATOR is capable of performing multihoming assisted replication through the Extended-MH-AR flag in the multicast flags extended community carried in the REPLICATOR-AR route. An AR-REPLICATOR originating a REPLICATOR-AR route without a multicast flags extended community or with the Extended-MH-AR flag unset is considered to be multihoming assistant capable.

If an AR-LEAF does not have any locally attached segment that is a part of a multihomed ES, then there is no additional extended Optimized-IR procedure for an AR-LEAF to follow and we can go directly to section 4.2.

If selective assistant-replication is used for the EVI, selective AR-LEAFs that share the same multihomed ES MUST select the same primary AR-REPLICATOR and the same backup AR-REPLICATOR, if there is one. This can be achieved through either manual configuration on each multihomed selective AR-LEAF or by other methods that are beyond the scope of this document. Each selective AR-LEAF follows the procedures defined in the [\[EVPN-AR\]](#) to send its corresponding leaf-AD routes to its AR-REPLICATOR.

An AR-LEAF follows the normal procedures defined in [\[RFC7432\]](#) when it originates a type-4 ES route and type-1 Ethernet A-D routes for its locally attached segment that is a part of a multihomed ES.

In addition, an AR-LEAF builds a peer-multihomed-flood-list for each BD it attaches. Per normal EVPN procedures defined in [\[RFC7432\]](#), an AR-LEAF discovers the ESI of each multihomed ES that every remote NVE connects to. For a given BD, an AR-LEAF constructs a peer-multihomed-flood-list that consists of its peer multihomed NVEs in that BD that have at least one multihomed ES in common with it. An AR-LEAF may consider a common multihomed ES that it shares with a remote NVE in a BD specific scope or an EVI scope. Please section 5 for detail.

4.1.2. Forwarding Procedure for AR-LEAF

Suppose that a multihomed AR-LEAF detects through the control plane procedure that at least one of its AR-REPLICATORS is an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR, then in addition to follow the forwarding procedures defined in [\[EVPN-AR\]](#), the AR-LEAF will use regular ingress replication to send the BUM packet, received from one of its ACs, to each NVE in that BD's peer-multihomed-flood-list.

In the case that there are no more AR-REPLICATORS in the tenant domain, the AR-LEAF reverts back to the regular IR behavior as it is defined in [RFC7432].

An AR-LEAF will follow the regular EVPN procedures when it receives a packet from an overlay tunnel and it will never send the packet back to the core.

4.2. AR-REPLICATOR Procedure

This section describes the additional procedures for an AR-REPLICATOR when there is at least one AR-REPLICATOR in the same tenant domain that is an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR.

It is also assumed that an AR-REPLICATOR follows the procedures defined in [EVPN-AR] unless specified otherwise.

4.2.1. Control Plane Procedure for AR-REPLICATOR

An NVE that performs an AR-REPLICATOR role follows the control plane procedures for AR-REPLICATOR defined in the [EVPN-AR].

In addition, if an AR-REPLICATOR is an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR or if it is administratively provisioned to behave as an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR, it SHALL attach a multicast flags extended community to its REPLICATOR-AR route with the Extended-MH-AR flag set.

An AR-REPLICATOR also discovers whether another AR-REPLICATOR is an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR based on the multicast flags extended community. If at least one AR-REPLICATOR is an Extended-MH AR replicator, then the rest of AR-REPLICATORS SHALL fall back to support the extended procedures specified in this document.

When there are mixed AR-REPLICATORS, this document recommends that all MH-capable-assistant AR-REPLICATORS SHOULD fall back to behave as Extended-MH AR-REPLICATORS through administrative provisioning.

An Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR builds a multihomed list for each BD that its AR-LEAF attaches to. We refer to such a multihomed list as an AR-LEAF's multihomed-list. Per normal EVPN procedures defined in [RFC7432], an AR-REPLICATOR imports the Ethernet A-D per EVI route, the alias route, originated by each remote NVE in the same tenant domain. For a given BD that an AR-LEAF belongs to, an AR-LEAF's multihomed-list consists of all the NVEs in that BD that have at least one multihomed ES in common with the said AR-LEAF. Please also refer to section 5 for the common multihomed ES an AR-LEAF shares with its remote NVE.

Consider an EVPN NVO network specified in the section 3.2. Both AR-LEAF1 and AR-LEAF2 originate its Ethernet A-D per EVI route for ES1

respectively. Both AR-LEAF1 and AR-LEAF3 originate its Ethernet A-D per EVI route for ES2 respectively. Per normal EVPN procedures, each AR-REPLICATOR imports and processes Ethernet A-D per EVI routes. Each AR-REPLICATOR builds an AR-LEAF1's multihomed-list for BD X that consists of AR-LEAF2 and AR-LEAF3. Each AR-REPLICATOR also builds AR-LEAF's multihomed-lists for other AR-LEAFs.

4.2.2. Forwarding Procedure for AR-REPLICATOR

When an AR-REPLICATOR determines that it is an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR or determines that it SHALL fall back to become an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR, it MUST follow the forwarding procedures described in this section.

For a given BD, when an AR-REPLICATOR replicates the packet, received from its AR-IP tunnel, to other overlay tunnels on behalf of its ingress AR-LEAF, the AR-REPLICATOR MUST skip any NVE that is in that ingress AR-LEAF's multihomed-list built for that said BD.

When replicating the traffic to other AR-REPLICATORS or other AR-LEAFs over an overlay tunnel, an AR-REPLICATOR does not set the source IP address to its ingress AR-LEAF's IR-IP. It is assumed under the scope of this document that an AR-LEAF does not share any common multihoming ES with any AR-REPLICATOR.

When replicating the traffic to other RNVEs, an AR-REPLICATOR should set the source IP address to its own IR-IP. This is because an RNVE does not recognize the AR-IP.

4.3. RNVE Procedure

There is no change to the RNVE control and forwarding procedures. RNVE follows the regular ingress replication procedure defined in [RFC7432].

5. AR-LEAF's Peer multihomed NVE in the Extended Optimized-IR Procedure

For the extended Optimized-IR procedures specified in this document, a multihomed AR-LEAF may keep track of the common multihomed ES it shares with other remote NVEs in a BD specific scope or in an EVI scope. Correspondingly, an Extended-MH AR-REPLICATOR MUST also use the same scheme to keep track of the common multihomed ES that its AR-LEAF shares with other remote NVEs. All multihomed AR-LEAFs and all AR-REPLICATORS within the same EVI MUST use the same scheme to keep track of the common multihomed ES that an AR-LEAF shares with other remote NVEs. This consistency can be enforced through a manual configuration.

A multihomed AR-LEAF maintains a peer-multihomed-flood-list for each BD it attaches. If the common multihomed ES is tracked in a per EVI scope, an AR-LEAF's peer-multihomed-flood-list for a given BD X contains all the NVEs in BD X that have at least one multihomed ES in common with it, regardless whether each common multihomed ES contains BD X or not. If the common multihomed ES is tracked in a BD specific scope, for a given BD X, each common multihomed ES must contain BD X. The same MUST be applied to the AR-LEAF's multihomed-list for BD X an AR-REPLICATOR maintains for its AR-LEAF.

When the Ethernet A-D per EVI route is advertised at the granularity of per ES, the common multihomed ES is tracked in a per EVI scope.

6. Multicast Flags Extended Community

The EVPN Multicast Flags Extended Community is defined in the [[EVPN-IGMP-PROXY](#)]. This transitive extended community has a bit vector for its Flags field. An AR Replicator uses one bit for the Extended-MH-AR flag, and it is shown as E in the Flags bit vector below.

```

      0                1                2                3
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
| Type=0x06   |Sub-Type=0x09 |   Flags (2 Octets)   |E|M|I|
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+
|                                     Reserved=0     |
+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+--+

```

The Extended-MH-AR flag is used by the AR-REPLICATOR. When this flag is set, the AR-REPLICATOR indicates to other NVEs that it is an Extended-MH AR Replicator and it supports the extended optimized-IR procedures defined in this document.

7. IANA Considerations

IANA has opened the Flags registry for EVPN multicast Extended Community. IANA has allocated bit 13 in the Flags registry field for the Extended-MH-AR flag specified in this document.

Bit Value	Name	Reference
13	Extended AR	This document

8. Security Considerations

This document inherits the same securities as they are defined in the [RFC7432], [RFC8365] and [[EVPN-AR](#)].

9. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Eric Rosen and Jeffrey Zhang for their valuable comments and feedbacks. The authors would also like to thank Aldrin Isaac for his useful discussion, insight on this subject.

10. Normative References

[EVPN-AR] Rabadan, J., Ed., "Optimized Ingress Replication solution for EVPN", internet-draft ietf-bess-evpn-optimized-ir-12.txt, January 2022, <<https://tools.ietf.org/id/ietf-bess-evpn-optimized-ir-12.txt>>.

[EVPN-IGMP-PROXY] Sajassi, A., Ed., "IGMP and MLD Proxy for EVPN", internet-draft ietf-bess-evpn-igmp-mld-proxy-14.txt, October 2021, <<https://tools.ietf.org/id/ietf-bess-evpn-igmp-mld-proxy-14.txt>>.

[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>>.

[RFC7432] Sajassi, A., Ed., Aggarwal, R., Bitar, N., Isaac, A., Uttaro, J., Drake, J., and W. Henderickx, "BGP MPLS-Based Ethernet VPN", RFC 7432, DOI 10.17487/RFC7432, February 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7432>>.

[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>>.

[RFC8365] Sajassi, A., Ed., Drake, J., Ed., Bitar, N., Shekhar, R., Uttaro, J., and W. Henderickx, "A Network Virtualization Overlay Solution Using Ethernet VPN (EVPN)", RFC 8365, DOI 10.17487/RFC8365, March 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8365>>.

Authors' Addresses

Wen Lin (editor)
Juniper Networks, Inc.

Email: wlin@juniper.net

Selvakumar Sivaraj
Juniper Networks, Inc.

Email: ssivaraj@juniper.net

Vishal Garg
Juniper Networks, Inc.

Email: vishalg@juniper.net

Jorge Rabadan
Nokia

Email: jorge.rabadan@nokia.com