Explicit Tracking with Wild Card Routes in Multicast VPN
draft-ietf-bess-mvpn-expl-track-04

Abstract

   The MVPN specifications provide procedures to allow a multicast
   ingress node to invoke "explicit tracking" for a multicast flow or
   set of flows, thus learning the egress nodes for that flow or set of
   flows. However, the specifications are not completely clear about
   how the explicit tracking procedures work in certain scenarios. This
   document provides the necessary clarifications. It also specifies a
   new, optimized explicit tracking procedure. This new procedure
   allows an ingress node, by sending a single message, to request
   explicit tracking of each of a set of flows, where the set of flows
   is specified using a wildcard mechanism. This document updates
   RFC6625.

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 July 20, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

[RFC6513] and [RFC6514] define the "Selective Provider Multicast
Service Interface Auto-Discovery route" (S-PMSI A-D route).

Per those RFCs, the S-PMSI A-D route contains a Network Layer
Reachability Information (NLRI) field that identifies a particular
multicast flow. In the terminology of those RFCs, each flow is
denoted by (C-S,C-G), where C-S is an IP source address and C-G is an
IP multicast address, both in the address space of a VPN customer.
The (C-S,C-G) of the multicast flow is encoded into the NLRI field.

An S-PMSI A-D route also carries a PMSI Tunnel attribute (PTA).
Typically, the PTA is used to identify a tunnel through the provider
backbone network (a "P-tunnel").

By originating an S-PMSI A-D route identifying a particular multicast
flow and a particular P-tunnel, a node is advertising the following:

      if the node has to transmit packets of the identified flow over
      the backbone, it will transmit them through the identified tunnel.

   [RFC6513] and [RFC6514] also define a procedure that allows an
   ingress node of particular multicast flow to determine the set of
   egress nodes that have requested to receive that flow from that
   ingress node. The ability of an ingress node to identify the egress
   nodes for a particular flow is known as "explicit tracking". An
   ingress node requests explicit tracking by setting a flag (the "Leaf
   Information Required" flag, or LIR) in the PTA. When an egress node
   receives an S-PMSI A-D route with LIR set, the egress node originates
   a Leaf A-D route whose NLRI field contains the NLRI from the
   corresponding S-PMSI A-D route. In this way, the egress node
   advertises that it has requested to receive the particular flow
   identified in the NLRI of that S-PMSI A-D route.

   [RFC6513] and [RFC6514] also allow an ingress node to originate an
   S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA has LIR set, but which does not identify
   any P-tunnel. This mechanism can be used when it is desired to do
   explicit tracking of a flow without at the same time binding that
   flow to a particular P-tunnel.

   [RFC6625] (and other RFCs that update it) extends the specification
   of S-PMSI A-D routes, and allows an S-PMSI A-D route to encode a
   wildcard in its NLRI. Either the C-S or the C-G or both can be
   replaced by wildcards. These routes are known as (C-*,C-S) S-PMSI
   A-D routes, or as (C-S,C-*) S-PMSI A-D routes, or as (C-*,C-*) S-PMSI
   A-D routes, depending on whether the C-S or C-G or both have been
   replaced by wildcards. These routes are known jointly as "wildcard
   S-PMSI A-D routes".

   One purpose of this document is to clarify the way that the explicit
   tracking procedures of [RFC6513] and [RFC6514] are applied when
   wildcard S-PMSI A-D routes are used.

   In addition, this document addresses the following scenario, which is
   not addressed in [RFC6513], [RFC6514], or [RFC6625]. Suppose an
   ingress node originates an S-PMSI A-D route whose NLRI specifies, for
   example, (C-*,C-*) (i.e., both C-S and C-G are replaced by
   wildcards), and whose PTA identifies a particular P-tunnel. Now
   suppose that the ingress node wants explicit tracking for each
   individual flow that it transmits (following the procedures of
   [RFC6625]) on that P-tunnel.

   In this example, if the ingress node sets LIR in the PTA of the
   wildcard S-PMSI A-D route, each egress node that needs to receive a
   flow from the ingress node will respond with a Leaf A-D route whose
   NLRI specifies contains the (C-*,C-*) wildcard. This allows the

ingress node to determine the set of egress nodes that are interested in receiving flows from the ingress node. However, it does not allow the ingress node to determine exactly which flows are of interest to which egress nodes.

If the ingress node needs to determine which egress nodes are interested in receiving which flows, it needs to originate an S-PMSI A-D route for each individual (C-S,C-G) flow that it is transmitting, and it needs to set LIR in the PTA of each such route. However, since all the flows are being sent through the tunnel identified in the (C-*,C-*) S-PMSI A-D route, there is no need to identify a tunnel in the PTA of each (C-S,C-G) S-PMSI A-D route. Per [RFC6514], the PTA of the (C-S,C-G) S-PMSI A-D routes can specify "no tunnel information". This procedure allows explicit tracking of individual flows, even though all those flows are assigned to tunnels in wildcard S-PMSI A-D routes.

However, this procedure requires several clarifications:

o The procedures of [RFC6625] do not clearly state how to handle an S-PMSI A-D route if its NLRI contains wild cards, but its PTA specifies "no tunnel info".

o If it is desired to send a set of flows through the same tunnel (where that tunnel is advertised in a wildcard S-PMSI A-D route), but it is also desired to explicitly track each individual flow transmitted over that tunnel, one has to send an S-PMSI A-D route (with LIR set in the PTA) for each individual flow. It would be more optimal if the ingress node could just send a single wildcard S-PMSI A-D route binding the set of flows to a particular tunnel, and have the egress nodes respond with Leaf A-D routes for each individual flow.

o [RFC6513] and [RFC6514] support the notion of "segmented P-tunnels", where "segmentation" occurs at Autonomous System Border Routers (ASBRs); [RFC7524] extends the notion of segmented P-tunnels so that segmentation can occur at Area Border Routers (ABRs). One can think of a segmented P-tunnel as passing through a number of "segmentation domains". In each segmentation domain, a given P-tunnel has an ingress node and a set of egress nodes. The explicit tracking procedures allow an ingress node of a particular segmentation domain to determine, for a particular flow or set of flows, the egress nodes of that segmentation domain. This has given rise to two further problems:

   * The explicit tracking procedures do not allow an ingress node to "see" past the boundaries of the segmentation domain.

> * The prior specifications do not make it very clear whether a
>   segmented tunnel egress node, upon receiving an S-PMSI A-D
>   route whose PTA specifies "no tunnel information", is expected
>   to forward the S-PMSI A-D route, with the same PTA, to the next
>   segmentation domain.

> These problems are resolved in Section 5.3.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT",
"SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and
"OPTIONAL", when and only when appearing in all capital letters, are
to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

2. The Explicit Tracking Flags

[RFC6514] defines one flag in the PTA, the "Leaf Info Required" (LIR)
flag, that is used for explicit tracking.

This document defines a new flag in the flags field of the PMSI
Tunnel attribute. This new flag is known as the "Leaf Info Required
per Flow" bit (LIR-pF). This flag MAY be set in the PTA of a
(C-*,C-*), (C-*,C-G), or (C-S,C-*) S-PMSI A-D route. (Use of this
flag in a PTA carried by other routes is outside the scope of this
document.) Support for this flag is OPTIONAL.

The action taken by an egress node when the LIR-pF bit is set is
detailed in Section 5.

If the LIR-pF flag is set in a given PTA, the LIR flag of that PTA
SHOULD also be set. (By setting LIR as well as LIR-pF, one forces a
a response to be sent by an egress node that does not support LIR-pF,
and it is possible to tell from that response that the egress node
does not support LIR-pF.)

3. Match for Tracking vs. Match for Reception

Section 3.2 of [RFC6625] specifies a set of rules for finding the
S-PMSI A-D route that is the "match for data reception" (or more
simply, the "match for reception") of a given (C-S,C-G) or (C-*,C-G)
state. These rules do not take into account the fact that some
S-PMSI A-D routes may not be carrying PTAs at all, or may be carrying
PTAs that do not identify any P-tunnel. (A PTA that does not
identify any P-tunnel is one whose "tunnel type" field has been set
to "no tunnel information", as specified in Section 5 of [RFC6514].)

The rules for finding a "match for reception" in [RFC6625] are hereby
modified as follows:

When applying the rules of Section 3.2.1 or 3.2.2 of [RFC6625], it is REQUIRED to ignore any S-PMSI A-D route that has no PTA, or whose PTA specifies "no tunnel information".

There are other RFCS that update [RFC6625] and that modify the rules for finding a "match for reception". See, e.g., [RFC7582] and [RFC7900]. When applying those modified rules, it is REQUIRED to ignore any S-PMSI A-D route that has no PTA, or whose PTA specifies "no tunnel information".

We also introduce a new notion: the "match for tracking". This differs from the "match for reception" as follows:

For a given C-flow ((C-S,C-G) or (C-*,C-G)) the "match for tracking" is chosen as follows. Ignore any S-PMSI A-D route that has no PTA. Also ignore any S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA specifies "no tunnel information", but does not have either LIR or LIR-pF set. (That is, DO NOT ignore an S-PMSI A-D route that has a PTA specifying "no tunnel information" unless its LIR and LIR-pF bits are both clear). Then apply the rules (from [RFC6625] and other documents that that update it) for finding the "match for reception". The result (if any) is the match for tracking".

We will clarify this with a few examples. In these examples, we assume that there is only one segmentation domain. In this case, the ingress and egress nodes are Provider Edge (PE) routers.

Suppose a given PE router, PE1, has chosen PE2 as the "upstream PE" ([RFC6513]) for a given flow (C-S1,C-G1). And suppose PE1 has installed the following two routes that were originated by PE2:

o Route1: A (C-*,C-*) S-PMSI A-D route, whose PTA specifies a tunnel.

o Route2: A (C-S1,C-G1) S-PMSI A-D route, whose PTA specifies "no tunnel info" and has LIR set.

Route1 is (C-S1,C-G1)'s match for reception, and Route2 is (C-S1,C-G1)'s match for tracking.

Continuing this example, suppose:

o PE1 has chosen PE2 as the upstream PE for a different flow, (C-S2,C-G2).

o PE2 has not originated an S-PMSI A-D route for (C-S2,C-G2).

In this case, PE1 would consider Route1 to be (C-S2,C-G2)'s match for
tracking as well as its match for reception.

Also note that if a match for tracking does not have the LIR flag or
the LIR-pF flag set, no explicit tracking information will be
generated. See Section 5.

As another example, suppose PE1 has installed the following two
routes that were originated by PE2:

o Route1: A (C-*,C-*) S-PMSI A-D route (irrespective of whether the
   PTA specifies a tunnel)

o Route2: A (C-S1,C-G1) S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA specifies a
   tunnel.

Then Route2 is both the "match for reception" and the "match for
tracking" for (C-S1,C-G1).

Note that for a particular C-flow, PE1's match for reception might be
the same route as its match for tracking, or its match for reception
might be a "less specific" route than its match for tracking. But
its match for reception can never be a "more specific" route than its
match for tracking.

4. Ingress Node Initiation of Tracking

An ingress node that needs to initiate explicit tracking for a
particular flow or set of flows can do so by performing one of the
following procedures:

1. An ingress node can initiate explicit tracking for (C-S1,C-G1) by
    originating an S-PMSI A-D route that identifies (C-S1,C-G1) in
    its NLRI, including a PTA in that route, and setting the LIR flag
    in that PTA. The PTA may specify a particular tunnel, or may
    specify "no tunnel info".

    However, the PTA of the (C-S1,C-G1) S-PMSI A-D route SHOULD NOT
    specify "no tunnel info" unless the ingress node also originates
    an A-D route carrying a PTA that specifies the tunnel to be used
    for carrying (C-S1,C-G1) traffic. Such a route could be an
    I-PMSI A-D route, a (C-*,C-G1) S-PMSI A-D route, a (C-S1,C-*)
    S-PMSI A-D route, or a (C-*,C-*) S-PMSI A-D route. (There is no
    point in requesting explicit tracking for a given flow if there
    is no tunnel on which the flow is being carried.)

    Note that if the ingress node originates a wildcard S-PMSI A-D
    route carrying a PTA specifying the tunnel to be used for

carrying (C-S1,C-G1) traffic, and if that PTA has the LIR-pF bit
set, then explicit tracking for (C-S1,C-G1) is requested by that
S-PMSI A-D route. In that case, the ingress node SHOULD NOT
originate a (C-S1,C-G1) S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA specifies "no
tunnel info"; such a route would not provide any additional
functionality.

To terminate explicit tracking that has been initiated by an
S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA specifies "no tunnel info", the
ingress node withdraws the route.

To terminate explicit tracking that has been initiated by an
S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA specifies a tunnel, the ingress node
re-originates the route without the LIR flag set.

2. The following procedure can be used if and only if it is known
    that the egress nodes support the optional LIR-pF flag. If the
    ingress node originates a wildcard S-PMSI A-D route, it can
    initiate explicit tracking for the individual flows that match
    the wildcard route by setting the LIR-pF flag in the PTA of the
    wildcard route. If an egress node needs to receive one or more
    flows for which that wildcard route is a match for tracking, the
    egress node will originate a Leaf A-D route for each such flow,
    as specified in Section 5.2).

    When following this procedure, the PTA of the S-PMSI A-D route
    may specify a tunnel, or may specify "no tunnel info". The
    choice between these two options is determined by considerations
    that are outside the scope of this document.

    To terminate explicit tracking that has been initiated by an
    S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA specifies "no tunnel info", the
    ingress node withdraws the route.

    To terminate explicit tracking that has been initiated by an
    S-PMSI A-D route whose PTA specifies a tunnel, the ingress node
    re-originates the route without either the LIR or LIR-pF flags
    set.

    Note that this procedure (procedure 2 of Section 4) may not yield
    the expected results if there are egress nodes that do not
    support the LIR-pF flag, and hence SHOULD NOT be used in that
    case.

5. Egress Node Response to the Match for Tracking

5.1. General Egress Node Procedures

   There are four cases to consider:

   1. With regard to a particular (C-S,C-G) or (C-*,C-G) multicast
       state, the egress node's match for tracking is same as its match
       for reception, and neither LIR nor LIR-pF flags are on.

       In this case, the egress node does not originate a Leaf A-D route
       in response to the match for reception/tracking, and there is no
       explicit tracking of the flow. This document specifies no new
       procedures for this case.

   2. With regard to a particular (C-S,C-G) or (C-*,C-G) multicast
       state, the egress node's match for tracking is the same as its
       match for reception, LIR is set, but LIR-pF is not set.

       In this case, a Leaf A-D route is originated by the egress node,
       corresponding to the S-PMSI A-D route that is the match for
       reception/tracking. Construction of the Leaf A-D route is as
       specified in [RFC6514]; this document specifies no new procedures
       for this case.

   3. With regard to a particular (C-S,C-G) or (C-*,C-G) multicast
       state, the egress node's match for tracking is the same as its
       match for reception, and LIR-pF is set. The egress node MUST
       follow whatever procedures are required by other specifications,
       based on the match for reception. If the egress node supports
       the LIR-pF flag, it MUST also follow the procedures of
       Section 5.2.

   4. With regard to a particular (C-S,C-G) or (C-*,C-G) multicast
       state, the egress node's match for tracking is not the same as
       its match for reception. This can only happen if the match for
       tracking has a PTA specifying "no tunnel info", with either LIR
       or LIR-pF set. In this case, the egress node must respond,
       separately, BOTH to the match for tracking and to the match for
       reception.

       When responding to the match for reception, the egress node MUST
       ignore the LIR-pF flag. However, the LIR flag is processed
       normally per the procedures for the match for reception.

       If the match for tracking has LIR set and if either (a) the
       egress node does not support LIR-pF, or (b) LIR-pF is not set,
       then the egress node must respond to the match for tracking,

following procedures specified in other documents for the case
where LIR is set.

If the match for tracking has LIR-pF set, and the egress node
supports the LIR-pF flag, the egress node must originate one or
more Leaf A-D routes, as specified in Section 5.2.

Note that if LIR is set in the PTA of the match for reception,
the egress node may need to originate one or more Leaf A-D routes
corresponding to the match for tracking, as well as originating a
Leaf A-D route corresponding to the match for reception.

5.2. Responding to the LIR-pF Flag

To respond to a match for tracking that has LIR-pF set, an egress
node originates one or more Leaf A-D routes.

Suppose the egress node has multicast state for a (C-S,C-G) or a
(C-*,C-G) flow, and has determined a particular S-PMSI A-D route,
which has the LIR-pF flag set, to be the match for tracking for that
flow. Then if the egress node supports the LIR-pF flag, it MUST
originate a Leaf A-D route whose NLRI identifies that particular
flow. Note that if a single S-PMSI A-D route (with wild cards) is
the match for tracking for multiple flows, the egress node may need
to originate multiple Leaf A-D routes, one for each such flow. We
say that, from the perspective of a given egress node, a given S-PMSI
A-D route tracks the set of flows for which it is the match for
tracking. Each of the Leaf A-D routes originated in response to that
S-PMSI A-D route tracks a single such flow.

The NLRI of each the Leaf A-D route that tracks a particular flow is
constructed as follows. The "route key" field of the NLRI will have
the following format:

```
+-----------------------------------+
|      RD   (8 octets)              |
+-----------------------------------+
| Multicast Source Length (1 octet) |
+-----------------------------------+
|  Multicast Source (Variable)      |
+-----------------------------------+
| Multicast Group Length (1 octet)  |
+-----------------------------------+
|  Multicast Group   (Variable)     |
+-----------------------------------+
|  Ingress PE's IP address          |
+-----------------------------------+
```

Figure 1: NLRI of S-PMSI A-D Route

o The "ingress PE" address is taken from the "originating router"
   field of the NLRI of the S-PMSI A-D route that is the match for
   tracking.

o The multicast source and group fields specify the S and G of one
   of the flow being tracked by this Leaf A-D route. If a (C-*,C-G)
   is being tracked by this Leaf A-D route, the source field is
   omitted, and its length is set to 0.

o The Route Distinguisher (RD) field is constructed as follows:

   * Take the RD value from the NLRI of the S-PMSI A-D route.

   * Per [RFC4364], every RD begins with a two-octet type field that
      is either 0, 1, or 2. Change the value of this two-octet type
      field to TBD1, TBD2, or TBD3, respectively. (See Section 7,
      IANA Considerations.)

      The presence of one of these values will indicate that the Leaf
      A-D route was constructed in response to a less specific S-PMSI
      A-D route that had the LIR-pF bit set. (That is, it
      distinguishes the routes from "ordinary" MVPN Leaf A-D routes.)

The encoding of these Leaf A-D routes is similar to the encoding of
the Leaf A-D routes described in section 6.2.2 of [RFC7524], which
were designed for the support of "global table multicast". However,
that document sets the RD to either 0 or -1; following the procedures
of this document, the RD will never be 0 or -1. Therefore Leaf A-D
routes constructed according to the procedures of this section can
always be distinguished from the Leaf A-D routes constructed
according to the procedures of section 6.2.2 of [RFC7524]. Also,

Leaf A-D routes constructed according to the procedures of this
section are VPN-specific routes, and will always carry an IP-address-
specific Route Target, as specified in [RFC6514].

If a Leaf A-D route is originated as a response to a match for
tracking whose PTA specifies "no tunnel info", a PTA SHOULD NOT be
attached to the Leaf A-D route; if a PTA is attached, it MUST specify
"no tunnel info".

In the case where the match for tracking and the match for reception
are the same, the PTA of the match may have both the LIR and the LIR-
pF flags set. This may cause the egress node to originate one Leaf
A-D route in response to the LIR bit, and one or more Leaf A-D routes
in response to the LIR-pF bit. A PTA SHOULD NOT be attached to the
Leaf A-D routes that are originated in response to the LIR-pF bit.

When a Leaf A-D route constructed according to the procedures of this
section is received, it MUST be processed by the node identified in
its IP-address-specific Route Target, even though its "route key"
field does not correspond to the NLRI of any S-PMSI A-D route.

Of course, an egress node that originates such Leaf A-D routes needs
to remember which S-PMSI A-D route caused these Leaf A-D routes to be
originated; if that S-PMSI A-D route is withdrawn, those Leaf A-D
routes MUST be withdrawn.

Similarly, a Leaf A-D route needs to be withdrawn (either implicitly
or explicitly) if the egress node changes its Upstream Multicast Hop
(UMH) ([RFC6513]) for the flow that is identified in the Leaf A-D
route's NLRI, or if the egress node that originated the route no
longer needs to receive the flow identified in the NLRI of the route.

Note that an egress node may acquire (C-S,C-G) state or (C-*,C-G)
state after it has already received the S-PMSI A-D that is the match
for tracking for that state. In this case, a Leaf A-D route needs to
be originated at that time, and the egress node must remember that
the new Leaf A-D route corresponds to that match for tracking.

Note that if a particular S-PMSI A-D route is a match for tracking
but not a match for reception, the LIR bit in its PTA is ignored if
the LIR-pF bit is set.

5.3. When the Egress Node is an ABR or ASBR

When segmented P-tunnels are used, the ingress and egress nodes may
be ABRs or ASBRs. An egress ABR/ASBR that receives and installs an
S-PMSI A-D route also forwards that route. If the PTA of an
installed S-PMSI A-D route specifies a tunnel, the egress ABR/ASBR

MAY change the PTA to specify a different tunnel type (as discussed in [RFC6514] and/or [RFC7524]).

However, if the PTA of the installed S-PMSI A-D route specifies "no tunnel info", the egress ABR/ASBR MUST pass the PTA along unchanged when it forwards the S-PMSI A-D route. (That is, a PTA specifying "no tunnel info" MUST NOT be changed into a PTA specifying a tunnel.) Furthermore, if the PTA specifies "no tunnel info", the LIR and LIR-pF flags in the PTA MUST be passed along unchanged.

In the case where the egress node of a given P-tunnel is a PE, it will know whether it needs to receive a given flow by virtue of its having received a PIM or IGMP Join for that flow from a Customer Edge (CE) router. In the case where the egress node is not a PE, but rather an ABR or ASBR, it will not know whether it needs to receive a given flow unless it receives a Leaf A-D route whose NLRI specifies that flow, and which carries an IP-address-specific Route Target (RT) Extended Community that specifies the address of the egress ABR/ASBR. Therefore an egress ABR/ASBR MUST NOT originate a Leaf A-D route for a given flow UNLESS it has an installed Leaf A-D route for that flow, received from further downstream.

This will ensure that an egress ABR/ASBR only sends a Leaf A-D route in response to a "match for tracking" if it is on the path to an egress PE for the flow(s) identified in the corresponding S-PMSI A-D route.

We can thus establish the following rule for egress ABRs/ASBRs. Suppose an egress ABR/ASBR receives an S-PMSI A-D route whose NLRI is X, and whose PTA (a) specifies "no tunnel info" and (b) has LIR set. The egress ABR/ASBR should not immediately originate a Leaf A-D route in response. Rather it should wait until it receives a Leaf A-D route whose NLRI contains X in the "route key" field. If it receives such a Leaf A-D route, it redistributes that route, but first it changes that route's RT. The "global administrator" field of the modified RT will be set to the IP address taken either from the S-PMSI A-D route's next hop field, or from its Segmented P2MP Next Hop Extended Community. (This is the same rule that is used for when the PTA does specify a tunnel type.)

6. Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Robert Kebler for his ideas and comments.

7. IANA Considerations

   The LIR-pF flag needs to be added to the "P-Multicast Service
   Interface Tunnel (PMSI Tunnel) Attribute Flags" in the "Border
   Gateway Protocol (BGP) Parameters" registry. This registry is
   defined in [RFC7902]. The requested value is Bit Position 2. This
   document should be the reference.

   IANA is requested to allocate three new types from the Route
   Distinguisher Type Field registry:

   o TBD1: Administrator field is two-byte Autonomous System Number.
      To be used only in certain MCAST-VPN Leaf A-D routes.

   o TBD2: Administrator field is four-byte IP Address. To be used
      only in certain MCAST-VPN Leaf A-D routes.

   o TBD3: Administrator field is four-byte Autonomous System Number.
      To be used only in certain MCAST-VPN Leaf A-D routes.

   The requested values are 16, 17, and 18 respectively.

8. Security Considerations

   The Security Considerations of [RFC6513] and [RFC6514] apply.

   By setting the LIR-pF flag in a single wildcard S-PMSI A-D route, a
   large number of Leaf A-D routes can be elicited. If this flag is set
   when not desired (through either error or malfeasance), a significant
   increase in control plane overhead can result.

9. References

9.1. 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>.

   [RFC4364] Rosen, E. and Y. Rekhter, "BGP/MPLS IP Virtual Private
              Networks (VPNs)", RFC 4364, DOI 10.17487/RFC4364, February
              2006, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4364>.

   [RFC6513] Rosen, E., Ed. and R. Aggarwal, Ed., "Multicast in MPLS/
              BGP IP VPNs", RFC 6513, DOI 10.17487/RFC6513, February
              2012, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6513>.

   [RFC6514] Aggarwal, R., Rosen, E., Morin, T., and Y. Rekhter, "BGP
              Encodings and Procedures for Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP
              VPNs", RFC 6514, DOI 10.17487/RFC6514, February 2012,
              <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6514>.

   [RFC6625] Rosen, E., Ed., Rekhter, Y., Ed., Hendrickx, W., and R.
              Qiu, "Wildcards in Multicast VPN Auto-Discovery Routes",
              RFC 6625, DOI 10.17487/RFC6625, May 2012,
              <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6625>.

   [RFC7524] Rekhter, Y., Rosen, E., Aggarwal, R., Morin, T.,
              Grosclaude, I., Leymann, N., and S. Saad, "Inter-Area
              Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) Segmented Label Switched Paths
              (LSPs)", RFC 7524, DOI 10.17487/RFC7524, May 2015,
              <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7524>.

   [RFC7902] Rosen, E. and T. Morin, "Registry and Extensions for
              P-Multicast Service Interface Tunnel Attribute Flags",
              RFC 7902, DOI 10.17487/RFC7902, June 2016,
              <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7902>.

9.2. Informative References

   [RFC7582] Rosen, E., Wijnands, IJ., Cai, Y., and A. Boers,
              "Multicast Virtual Private Network (MVPN): Using
              Bidirectional P-Tunnels", RFC 7582, DOI 10.17487/RFC7582,
              July 2015, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7582>.

   [RFC7900] Rekhter, Y., Ed., Rosen, E., Ed., Aggarwal, R., Cai, Y.,
              and T. Morin, "Extranet Multicast in BGP/IP MPLS VPNs",
              RFC 7900, DOI 10.17487/RFC7900, June 2016,
              <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7900>.

Authors' Addresses

   Andrew Dolganow
   Nokia
   438B Alexandra Rd #08-07/10
   Alexandra Technopark
   Singapore 119968
   Singapore

   Email: andrew.dolganow@nokia.com

   Jayant Kotalwar
   Nokia
   701 East Middlefield Rd
   Mountain View, California 94043
   United States of America

   Email: jayant.kotalwar@nokia.com

   Eric C. Rosen (editor)
   Juniper Networks, Inc.
   10 Technology Park Drive
   Westford, Massachusetts 01886
   United States of America

   Email: erosen@juniper.net

   Zhaohui Zhang
   Juniper Networks, Inc.
   10 Technology Park Drive
   Westford, Massachusetts 01886
   United States of America

   Email: zzhang@juniper.net