Internet Engineering Task Force   E. Rosen, Ed.
Internet-Draft   Juniper Networks, Inc.
Intended status: Experimental   M. Sivakumar
Expires: April 19, 2018   Cisco Systems, Inc.
                                                              S. Aldrin
                                                            Google, Inc.
                                                            A. Dolganow
                                                                  Nokia
                                                          T. Przygienda
                                                   Juniper Networks, Inc.
                                                        October 16, 2017

Multicast VPN Using BIER
draft-ietf-bier-mvpn-08

Abstract

   The Multicast Virtual Private Network (MVPN) specifications require
   the use of multicast tunnels ("P-tunnels") that traverse a Service
   Provider's backbone network. The P-tunnels are used for carrying
   multicast traffic across the backbone. A variety of P-tunnel types
   are supported. Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER) is a new
   architecture that provides optimal multicast forwarding through a
   "multicast domain", without requiring intermediate routers to
   maintain any per-flow state or to engage in an explicit tree-building
   protocol. This document specifies the protocol and procedures that
   allow MVPN to use BIER as the method of carrying multicast traffic
   over an SP backbone network.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   [RFC6513] and [RFC6514] specify the protocols and procedures that a
   Service Provider (SP) can use to provide Multicast Virtual Private
   Network (MVPN) service to its customers. Multicast tunnels are
   created through an SP's backbone network; these are known as
   "P-tunnels". The P-tunnels are used for carrying multicast traffic
   across the backbone. The MVPN specifications allow the use of
   several different kinds of P-tunnel technology.

Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER) ([BIER_ARCH]) is an
architecture that provides optimal multicast forwarding through a
"multicast domain", without requiring intermediate routers to
maintain any per-flow state or to engage in an explicit tree-building
protocol. The purpose of the current document is to specify the
protocols and procedures needed in order to provide MVPN service
using BIER to transport the multicast traffic over the backbone.

Although BIER does not explicitly build and maintain multicast
tunnels, one can think of BIER as using a number of implicitly
created tunnels through a "BIER domain". In particular, one can
think of there as being one Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) tunnel from
each "Bit Forwarding Ingress Router" (BFIR) to all the "Bit
Forwarding Egress Routers" (BFERs) in the BIER domain, where a BIER
domain is generally co-extensive with an IGP network. These
"tunnels" are not specific to any particular VPN. However, the MVPN
architecture provides protocols and procedures that allow the traffic
of multiple MVPNs to be aggregated on a single P-tunnel. In this
document, we specify how to use these multi-VPN aggregation
procedures to enable BIER to transport traffic from multiple MVPNs.

MVPN traffic must sometimes traverse more than one IGP domain,
whereas BIER only carries multicast traffic within a single IGP
domain. However, the MVPN specifications allow P-tunnels to be
"segmented", where the segmentation points may either be Autonomous
System Border Routers (ASBRs), as described in [RFC6514], or Area
Border Routers (ABRs), as described in [RFC7524]. As long as the
segmentation points are capable of acting as BFIRs and BFERs, BIER
can be used to provide some or all of the segments of a P-tunnel.

Procedures to support MVPN customers who are using BIDIR-PIM are
outside the scope of this document.

This document uses the following terminology from [BIER_ARCH]:

o BFR: Bit-Forwarding Router.

o BFIR: Bit-Forwarding Ingress Router.

o BFER: Bit-Forwarding Egress Router.

This document uses the following terminology from [RFC6513]:

o MVPN: Multicast Virtual Private Network -- a VPN [RFC4364] in
   which multicast service is offered.

o P-tunnel. A multicast tunnel through the network of one or more
   SPs. P-tunnels are used to transport MVPN multicast data

o PMSI: Provider Multicast Service Interface. PMSI is an
   abstraction that represents a multicast service for carrying
   packets. A PMSI is instantiated via one or more P-tunnels.

o C-S: A multicast source address, identifying a multicast source
   located at a VPN customer site.

o C-G: A multicast group address used by a VPN customer.

o C-flow: A customer multicast flow. Each C-flow is identified by
   the ordered pair (source address, group address), where each
   address is in the customer's address space. The identifier of a
   particular C-flow is usually written as (C-S,C-G).

   Sets of C-flows can be identified by the use of the "C-*" wildcard
   (see [RFC6625]), e.g., (C-*,C-G).

o I-PMSI A-D Route: Inclusive PMSI Auto-Discovery route. Carried in
   BGP Update messages, these routes are used to advertise the
   "default" P-tunnel for a particular MVPN.

o S-PMSI A-D route: Selective PMSI Auto-Discovery route. Carried in
   BGP Update messages, these routes are used to advertise the fact
   that particular C-flows are bound to (i.e., are traveling through)
   particular P-tunnels.

o x-PMSI A-D route: a route that is either an I-PMSI A-D route or an
   S-PMSI A-D route.

o Leaf A-D route: a route that a multicast egress node sends in
   order to join a particular P-tunnel.

o PMSI Tunnel attribute (PTA). In an x-PMSI A-D route, the NLRI of
   the route identifies a PMSI. The BGP attribute known as the PMSI
   Tunnel attribute is attached to such a route in order to identify
   a particular P-tunnel that is associated with the PMSI. When
   C-flows of multiple VPNs are carried in a single P-tunnel, this
   attribute also carries the information needed to multiplex and
   demultiplex the C-flows. A PTA can also be carried by a Leaf A-D
   root. In this case, it contains information that is needed in
   order for the originator of the route to join the specified
   P-tunnel.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT",
"SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this
document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

2. Use of the PMSI Tunnel Attribute in x-PMSI A-D Routes

   As defined in [RFC6514], the PMSI Tunnel attribute (PTA) carried by
   an x-PMSI A-D route identifies the P-tunnel that is used to
   instantiate a particular PMSI. If a PMSI is to be instantiated by
   BIER, the PTA is constructed by a BFIR.

   If segmented P-tunnels are not being used, the PTA attached to a
   given x-PMSI A-D route is constructed by the router that originated
   the route (typically by the ingress PE), and the PTA is not changed
   as the route is propagated.

   If segmented P-tunnels are being used, the PTA attached to a given
   x-PMSI A-D route by the route's originator may replaced, at a
   segmentation point (a BFER), by a PTA identifying the next segment of
   the P-tunnel. If the next segment of the P-tunnel is instantiated by
   BIER, the segmentation point serves as the BFIR for that next
   segment.

   In either case, a PTA is constructed by a BFIR as follows (see
   Figure 1):

   The PTA contains the following fields:

   o "Tunnel Type". IANA has assigned 0x0B as the tunnel type
      codepoint for "BIER" in the "P-Multicast Service Interface Tunnel
      (PMSI Tunnel) Tunnel Types" registry. This codepoint is used to
      indicate that the PMSI is instantiated by BIER.

      Although BIER does not actually create tunnels, the MVPN
      procedures treat BIER as if it were a type of tunnel.

   o "Tunnel Identifier". When the "tunnel type" is "BIER", this field
      contains three subfields:

      1. The first subfield is a single octet, containing a BIER
          sub-domain-id. (See [BIER_ARCH].) This indicates that
          packets sent on the PMSI will be sent on the specified BIER
          sub-domain. How that sub-domain is chosen is outside the
          scope of this document.

      2. The second subfield is a two-octet field containing the
          BFR-id, in the sub-domain identified in the first subfield, of
          the router that is constructing the PTA.

      3. The third subfield is the BFR-Prefix (see [BIER_ARCH]) of the
          router (a BFIR) that is constructing the PTA. The BFR-Prefix
          will either be a /32 IPv4 address or a /128 IPv6 address.

          Whether the address is IPv4 or IPv6 can be inferred from the
          total length of the PTA.

          The BFR-Prefix need not be the same IP address that is carried
          in any other field of the x-PMSI A-D route, even if the BFIR
          is the originating router of the x-PMSI A-D route.

     Failure to properly set the Tunnel Identifier field cannot be
     detected by the protocol, and will result in improper delivery of
     the data packets sent on the PMSI.

   o "MPLS Label". This field MUST contain an upstream-assigned non-
      zero MPLS label. It is assigned by the router (a BFIR) that
      constructs the PTA. Constraints on the way in which a BFIR
      selects this label are discussed in Section 2.1.

      Failure to follow the constraints on label assignment cannot be
      detected by the protocol, and may result in improper handling of
      data packets by the egress PE routers.

   o "Flags". When the tunnel type is BIER, two of the flags in the
      PTA Flags field are meaningful. Details about the use of these
      flags can be found in Section 2.2.

      * "Leaf Info Required per Flow (LIR-pF)". This flag is
         introduced in [EXPLICIT_TRACKING]. A BFIR SHOULD NOT set this
         flag UNLESS it knows that all the BFERs in the BIER domain (or
         at least all the BFERs to which it needs to transmit) support
         this flag. (How this is known is outside the scope of this
         document.) Procedures for the use of this flag are given in
         Section 2.2.2. Support for this flag is OPTIONAL.

      * "Leaf Info Required Bit". See Section 2.2.1.

```
       +--------------------------------+
       |  Flags (1 octet)               |
       +--------------------------------+
       |  Tunnel Type = 0x0B (1 octet)  |
       +--------------------------------+
       |  MPLS Label (3 octets)         |
       +--------------------------------+
       |  Sub-domain-id (1 octet)       | <---
       +--------------------------------+    |
       |  BFIR-id (2 octets)            |    |-- Tunnel
       +--------------------------------+    |   Identifier
       |  BFIR-Prefix (4 or 16 octets)  | <---
       +--------------------------------+
```

                 Figure 1: PMSI Tunnel Attribute for BIER

   If a PTA specifying tunnel type "BIER" is attached to an x-PMSI A-D
   route, the route MUST NOT be distributed beyond the boundaries of a
   BIER domain. That is, any routers that receive the route must be in
   the same BIER domain as the originator of the route. If the
   originator is in more than one BIER domain, the route must be
   distributed only within the BIER domain in which the BFR-Prefix in
   the PTA uniquely identifies the originator. As with all MVPN routes,
   distribution of these routes is controlled by the provisioning of
   Route Targets. Thus the requirement expressed in this paragraph is
   really a requirement on the way the Route Targets are provisioned.

2.1. MPLS Label

   The MPLS Label carried in the PTA is an upstream-assigned label.

   If two PTAs contain the same BFR-prefix in their respective Tunnel
   Identifier fields, then the labels carried in those PTAs MUST come
   from the same label space. (See section 7 of [RFC5331].) An
   implementation may choose to use this fact when setting up the tables
   it uses to interpret the upstream-assigned labels.

   Suppose a BFIR attaches a PTA to each of two x-PMSI A-D routes, and
   both PTAs specify a tunnel type of "BIER".

   o If the two routes do not carry the same set of Route Targets
      (RTs), then their respective PTAs MUST contain different MPLS
      label values.

   o If the two routes do not have the same Address Family Identifier
      (AFI) value, then their respective PTAs MUST contain different
      MPLS label values. This ensures that when an egress PE receives a

data packet with the given label, the egress PE can infer from the
label whether the payload is an IPv4 packet or an IPv6 packet.

o If the BFIR is an ingress PE supporting MVPN extranet ([RFC7900])
   functionality, and if the two routes originate from different VRFs
   on this ingress PE, then the respective PTAs of the two routes
   MUST contain different MPLS label values.

o If the BFIR is an ingress PE supporting the "Extranet Separation"
   feature of MVPN extranet (see Section 7.3 of [RFC7900]), and if
   one of the routes carries the "Extranet Separation" extended
   community but the other does not, then the respective PTAs of the
   two routes MUST contain different MPLS label values.

o If segmented P-tunnels are being used, then the respective PTAs of
   the two routes MUST contain different MPLS label values whenever
   the respective NLRIs of the two routes are not identical. The
   MPLS label can then be used at the next segmentation point to
   switch packets from one P-tunnel segment directly to the next,
   without requiring the segmentation points to contain any other
   multicast forwarding state. This is explained further below. See
   also Section 4.

When segmented P-tunnels are being used, a segmentation point, call
it "B1", may receive, from within a given BIER domain, an x-PMSI A-D
route whose PTA specifies "BIER". This means that BIER is being used
for the previous segment of a segmented P-tunnel. If the next
segment is also of type "BIER", B1 will be the BFIR for the next
segment. That is, B1 is a BFER of one BIER domain (corresponding to
the previous segment), and a BFIR of another BIER domain
(corresponding to the next segment). B1 needs to replace the PTA of
the x-PMSI A-D route with a new PTA, specifying its own BFR-Prefix,
and specifying an upstream-assigned label assigned by B1 itself.

Suppose B1 has received two x-PMSI A-D routes, R1 and R2, where:

o R1 and R2 each have a PTA specifying BIER,

o R1's PTA specifies BFR-Prefix B2 and Label L2.

o R2's PTA specifies BFR-Prefix B3 and Label L3.

Suppose B1 decides to propagate both R1 and R2, replacing each PTA
with a new PTA specifying BIER. Suppose these new PTAs specify
labels L4 and L5 respectively. Then L4 and L5 MUST be different
(upstream-assigned) label values, UNLESS both of the following
conditions hold:

   o R1 and R2 have the same value in the Originating Router field of
      their respective NLRIs, and

   o B2 is equal to B3, and

   o L2 is equal to L3.

   The segmentation point (B1 in this example) MUST also program its
   dataplane appropriately. For example, when:

   o B1 receives a BIER packet for which it is a BFER, and

   o the BIER header specifies the BFIR-id that corresponds to B2,and

   o the BIER payload is an MPLS packet with upstream-assigned label,
      and

   o the top label value is L2,

   then the dataplane must be programmed to replace L2 with L4, and to
   reencapsulate the packet in a BIER header, with B1's BFIR-id in the
   BFIR-id field. The BitString of the new BIER header is determined by
   the MVPN explicit tracking procedures (see Section 2.2 in the BIER
   domain of the next segment.

2.2. Explicit Tracking

   When using BIER to transport an MVPN data packet through a BIER
   domain, an ingress PE functions as a BFIR (see [BIER_ARCH]). The
   BFIR must determine the set of BFERs to which the packet needs to be
   delivered. This can be done in either of two ways:

   1. Using the explicit tracking mechanism based on the "Leaf Info
       Required" flag specified in [RFC6513] and [RFC6514]. This method
       is further described in Section 2.2.1.

   2. Using the OPTIONAL explicit tracking mechanism based on the
       LIR-pF flag specified in [EXPLICIT_TRACKING]. This method,
       further described in Section 2.2.2, may be used if (and only if)
       segmented P-tunnels are not being used.

2.2.1. Using the LIR Flag

   To determine the set of BFERs to which the packets of a given C-flow
   must be sent, a BFIR MUST originate a (C-S,C-G) S-PMSI A-D route for
   the given C-flow. It MUST attach a PTA to that route, and MUST set
   the LIR flag in the PTA. Per [RFC6514], the BFERs that need to
   receive that C-flow will respond with (C-S,C-G) Leaf A-D routes. By

matching the received Leaf A-D routes to the originated S-PMSI A-D
routes, the originator of the S-PMSI A-D route determines the set of
BFERs that need to receive the multicast data flow that is identified
in the NLRI of S-PMSI A-D route.

Suppose an ingress PE has originated an I-PMSI A-D route or a
wildcard S-PMSI A-D route [RFC6625] with a PTA specifying a tunnel
type of BIER. Now suppose the ingress PE originates an S-PMSI A-D
route specifying (C-S, C-G), where (C-S, C-G) "matches" (according to
the rules of [RFC6625]) the wildcard S-PMSI A-D route or the I-PMSI
A-D route. Instead of attaching to the (C-S, C-G) route a PTA
specifying BIER, the ingress PE MAY attach a PTA specifying a tunnel
type of "no tunnel information". This is equivalent to attaching the
same PTA attached to the matching "less specific" route.

2.2.2. Using the LIR-pF Flag

If segmented P-tunnels are not being used, the BFIR can determine the
set of BFERs that need to receive the packets of a given (C-S,C-G)
C-flow as follows. The BFIR MUST originate a wildcard S-PMSI A-D
route (either (C-*,C-*), (C-*,C-G), or (C-S,C-G)) and the PTA of that
route MUST the following settings:

o The LIR-pF flag MUST be set;

o The tunnel type MUST be set to "BIER";

o A non-zero MPLS label MUST be specified.

Per [EXPLICIT_TRACKING], a BFER that needs to receive (C-S,C-G)
traffic from the BFIR will respond with a Leaf A-D route.

A BFIR MUST NOT use this method of finding the set of BFERs needing
to receive a given C-flow unless it knows that all those BFERs
support the LIR-pF flag. How this is known is outside the scope of
this document.

This method greatly reduces the number of S-PMSI A-D routes that a
BFIR needs to originate; it can now originate as few as one such
route (a (C-*,C-*) S-PMSI A-D route), rather than one for each
C-flow. However, the method does not provide a way for the BFIR to
assign a distinct label to each C-flow. Therefore it cannot be used
when segmented P-tunnels are in use (see Section 4 for an
explanation).

Note: if a BFIR originates a (C-*,C-*) S-PMSI A-D route with the
LIR-pF flag set, but also originates a more specific wildcard route
that matches a particular (C-S,C-G), the BFERs will not originate

Leaf A-D routes for that (C-S,C-G) unless the LIR-pF flag is also set in the more specific wildcard route. If the BFIR also originates a (C-S,C-G) S-PMSI A-D route without the LIR flag set, the BFERs will not originate Leaf A-D routes for that (C-S,C-G) unless the LIR flag is also set in that route.

3. Use of the PMSI Tunnel Attribute in Leaf A-D routes

Before an egress PE can receive a (C-S,C-G) flow from a given ingress PE via BIER, the egress PE must have received one of the following x-PMSI A-D routes from the ingress PE:

o A (C-S,C-G) S-PMSI A-D route (i.e., an S-PMSI A-D route whose NLRI encodes (C-S,C-G) and whose PTA specifies a tunnel type of "BIER". If such a route is found, we refer to it as the "matching x-PMSI A-D route."

o A "less specific" x-PMSI A-D route (one specifying (C-*,C-*), (C-*,C-G), or (C-S,C-G)) whose PTA specifies a tunnel type of "BIER", and that is the egress PE's "match for reception" of (C-S,C-G).

   The rules for determining which x-PMSI A-D route is the match for reception are given in [RFC6625]. However, these rules are modified here to exclude any x-PMSI A-D route that does not have a PTA, or whose PTA specifies "no tunnel type".

   If such a route is found, we refer to it as the "matching x-PMSI A-D route."

If no matching x-PMSI A-D route for (C-S,C-G) is found, the egress PE cannot receive the (C-S,C-G) flow from the ingress PE via BIER until such time as a matching route is received.

When an egress PE determines that it needs to receive a (C-S,C-G) flow from a particular ingress PE via BIER, it originates a Leaf A-D route. Construction of the Leaf A-D route generally follows the procedures specified in [RFC6514], or optionally, the procedures specified in [EXPLICIT_TRACKING]. However, when BIER is being used, the Leaf A-D route MUST carry a PTA that is constructed as follows:

1. The tunnel type MUST be set to "BIER".

2. The MPLS Label field SHOULD be set to zero.

3. The Sub-domain-id subfield of the Tunnel Identifier field (as defined in Section 2) MUST be set to the corresponding value from the PTA of the matching x-PMSI A-D route.

4. The BFR-id subfield of the Tunnel Identifier field MUST be set to
    the BFR-id, in the sub-domain identified by the sub-domain-id
    subfield, of the egress PE.

5. The BFR-Prefix field of the Tunnel Identifier field (as defined
    in Section 2) MUST be set to the egress PE's BFR-Prefix.

    The BFR-Prefix need not be the same IP address that is carried in
    any other field of the Leaf A-D route.

When an ingress PE receives such a Leaf A-D route, it learns the
BFR-Prefix of the egress PE from the PTA. The ingress PE does not
make any use the value of the PTA's MPLS label field.

Failure to properly construct the PTA cannot always be detected by
the protocol, and will cause improper delivery of the data packets.

4. Data Plane

The MVPN application plays the role of the "multicast flow overlay"
as described in [BIER_ARCH].

4.1. Encapsulation and Transmission

To transmit an MVPN data packet, an ingress PE follows the rules of
[RFC6625] to find the x-PMSI A-D route that is a "match for
transmission" for that packet. (In applying the rules of [RFC6625],
any S-PMSI A-D route with a PTA specifying "no tunnel information" is
ignored.) If the matching route has a PTA specifying "BIER", the
(upstream-assigned) MPLS label from that PTA is pushed on the
packet's label stack. Then the packet is encapsulated in a BIER
header. That is, the ingress PE functions as a BFIR. The BIER sub-
domain used for transmitting the packet is specified in the PTA of
the abovementioned x-PMSI A-D route.

In order to create the proper BIER header for a given packet, the
BFIR must know all the BFERs that need to receive that packet. It
determines this by finding all the Leaf A-D routes that correspond to
the S-PMSI A-D route that is the packet's match for transmission.
There are two different cases to consider:

1. The S-PMSI A-D route that is the match for transmission carries a
    PTA that has the LIR flag set but does not have the LIR-pF flag
    set.

    In this case, the corresponding Leaf A-D routes are those whose
    "route key" field is identical to the NLRI of the S-PMSI A-D
    route.

2. The S-PMSI A-D route that is the match for transmission carries a
    PTA that has the LIR-pF flag.

    In this case, the corresponding Leaf A-D routes are those whose
    "route key" field is derived from the NLRI of the S-PMSI A-D
    route according to the procedures described in Section 5.2 of
    [EXPLICIT_TRACKING].

The Leaf A-D route from a given BFER will contain a PTA that
specifies the BFER's BFR-Prefix. With this information, the BFIR can
construct the BIER BitString.

However, if the PTA of the Leaf A-D route from a given BFER specifies
a sub-domain other than the one being used for transmitting the
packet, the bit for that BFER cannot be determined, and that BFER
will not receive the packet.

The BIER-encapsulated packet is then forwarded, according to the
procedures of [BIER_ARCH] and [BIER_ENCAPS]. (See especially
Section 4, "Imposing and Processing the BIER Encapsulation", of
[BIER_ENCAPS].)

4.2. Disposition

When a BFER receives an MVPN multicast data packet that has been
BIER-encapsulated, the BIER layer passes the following information to
the multicast flow overlay:

o The sub-domain-id and the BFIR-id from the BIER header. (As the
   sub-domain-id is inferred from the BIFT-id field of the BIER
   header, an implementation might choose to pass the BIFT-id rather
   than the sub-domain-id; this is an implementation matter.)

o The "payload", which is an MPLS packet whose top label is an
   upstream-assigned label. In the dataplane, the BFIR-id and the
   sub-domain-id provide the context in which the upstream-assigned
   label is interpreted.

By looking up the upstream-assigned label in the appropriate context,
the multicast flow overlay determines whether the BFER is an egress
PE for the packet.

Note that if segmented P-tunnels are in use, a BFER might be a
P-tunnel segmentation border router rather than an egress PE, or a
BFER might be both an egress PE and a P-tunnel segmentation border
router. Depending upon the role of the BFER for given packet, it may
need to follow the procedures of Section 4.2.1, the procedures of
Section 4.2.2, or both.

4.2.1. At a BFER that is an Egress PE

   From looking up the packet's upstream-assigned label in the context
   of the packet's BFIR-prefix, the egress PE determines the egress VRF
   for the packet. From the IP header of the payload, the multicast
   states of the VRF, the upstream-assigned label, and the BFR-prefix,
   the egress PE can determine whether the packet needs to be forwarded
   out one or more VRF interfaces.

4.2.2. At a BFER that is a P-tunnel Segmentation Boundary

   When segmented P-tunnels are being used, a BFER that receives a BIER-
   encapsulated MVPN multicast data packet may need to be forwarded on
   its next P-tunnel segment. The choice of the next P-tunnel segment
   for the packet depends upon the C-flow to which the packet belongs.
   As long as the BFIR has assigned the MPLS label according to the
   constraints specified in Section 2.1, the BFIR will have assigned
   distinct upstream-assigned MPLS labels to distinct C-flows. The BFER
   can thus select the proper "next P-tunnel segment" for a given packet
   simply by looking up the upstream-assigned label that immediately
   follows the BIER header.

5. Contributor Addresses

   Below is a list of other contributing authors in alphabetical order:

   IJsbrand Wijnands
   Cisco Systems, Inc.
   De Kleetlaan 6a
   Diegem 1831
   Belgium

   Email: ice@cisco.com

6. Acknowledgments

   The authors wish to thank Jeffrey Zhang for his ideas and
   contributions to this work. We also thank Stig Venaas for his review
   and comments.

7. IANA Considerations

   IANA has assigned the codepoint 0x0B to "BIER" in the "P-Multicast
   Service Interface Tunnel (PMSI Tunnel) Tunnel Types" registry.

8. Security Considerations

   The security considerations of [BIER_ARCH], [BIER_ENCAPS], [RFC6513]
   and [RFC6514] are applicable.

9. References

9.1. Normative References

   [BIER_ARCH]
            Wijnands, IJ., Rosen, E., Dolganow, A., Przygienda, T.,
            and S. Aldrin, "Multicast using Bit Index Explicit
            Replication", internet-draft draft-ietf-bier-architecture-
            07, June 2017.

   [BIER_ENCAPS]
            Wijnands, IJ., Rosen, E., Dolganow, A., Tantsura, J., and
            S. Aldrin, "Encapsulation for Bit Index Explicit
            Replication in MPLS Networks", internet-draft draft-ietf-
            bier-mpls-encapsulation-07.txt, June 2017.

   [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>.

   [RFC5331] Aggarwal, R., Rekhter, Y., and E. Rosen, "MPLS Upstream
            Label Assignment and Context-Specific Label Space",
            RFC 5331, DOI 10.17487/RFC5331, August 2008,
            <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5331>.

   [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>.

9.2. Informative References

   [EXPLICIT_TRACKING]
              Dolganow, A., Kotalwar, J., Rosen, E., and Z. Zhang,
              "Explicit Tracking with Wild Card Routes in Multicast
              VPN", internet-draft draft-ietf-bess-mvpn-expl-track-02,
              June 2017.

   [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>.

   [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

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

   Email: erosen@juniper.net

   Mahesh Sivakumar
   Cisco Systems, Inc.
   510 McCarthy Blvd
   Milpitas, California 95035
   United States

   Email: masivaku@cisco.com

   Sam K Aldrin
   Google, Inc.
   1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
   Mountain View, California
   United States

   Email: aldrin.ietf@gmail.com

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

Email: andrew.dolganow@nokia.com

Tony Przygienda
Juniper Networks, Inc.
1137 Innovation Way
San Jose, California 94089
United States

Email: prz@juniper.net