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History

- Presented at IETF 99
- Received some very good comments on the list
- Rev02 has addressed the major comments
Main Comments on Rev00

- UMH selection in rev00 not consistent with RFC6513 & 6514
- TTL is incremented for intra-subnet traffic
- Need clarification on some of the requirements
Remote PEs receive can reach S from both PE1 & PE2

Based on RFC6513, remote PE can choose either PE1 or PE2

What happens when remote PEs choose PE1 but multicast flow gets hashed to PE2?
UMH Selection – Cont.

- Described in section 6.3.2
- Send the multicast flow to other multi-homing PEs on that subnet (BD)
- Receiving multi-homing PEs treat this as though multicast flow is received over local AC and follow their intra/inter-subnet forwarding procedures.
TTL decrement for Intra-Subnet

- Added section 5.1 to describe "Emulated LAN Service"
  - EVPN provides an Emulated LAN service and not "exactly" Virtual LAN service (VLAN) per 802.1Q
  - EVPN IGMP/PIM proxy procedures is one example of such Emulated LAN service
  - This document extended the concept of emulated LAN service to allow for TTL to be decrement for intra-subnet multicast flow
Clarification of Requirements

- Clarified some of the requirements and added some new ones:
  - No disruption to existing multicast flows when adding new subnets to the egress PE
  - No changes to existing EVPN Interface Service mode as defined in RFC 7432 – i.e., no need for VLAN translation when VLAN-aware service interface mode is used
Next Steps

- Has been around for almost three years
- Has been implemented and deployed by one vendor and is being planned by two more
- Requesting WG call