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LIR explicit-tracking for Segmented BIER

- Besides, the SPMSI(S,G) routes are ‘flooded’ to routers that even don’t want.
**LIR-pF** explicit-tracking for Segmented BIER

- Accordingly, the unwanted SPMSI(S,G) routes are eliminated.
- The same benefit as Un-Segmented BIER MVPN.
Control Plane Process on ABR

Process 1: per-vpn info: FEC=(RD,PE1), upstream (X, PE1), downstream(Y, ABR)
Process 2: per-flow info: FEC=(RD,PE1,S1,G1), upstream(X,PE1), downstream(Y,ABR,PE2)
Per-flow state building

Process 2: Build the control-plane state for per-flow on ABR

- ABR receive Leaf-AD, and form the **downstream state**: \(<RD, S1, G1, PE1> <Leaf=PE2> (Attrs=BFR-id)\)
- ABR send Leaf-AD to PE1, and form the **upstream state**: \(<RD, S1, G1, PE1> (umh=PE1)\)
- It is very similar to the PIM Join, or mLDP Mapping, which build a state driven by downstream join.
- Control-plane always need keeping a Per-flow state \(<RD, S1, G1, PE1>\), including **upstream** and **downstream(s)** parts.
- The \(<RD, S1, G1, PE1>\) is an **Per-flow FEC** (I’d like to call it a BIER-FEC like RFC7524).
- The \(<RD, PE1>\) is an implicit VRF identifier for an ABR (call **Per-vpn FEC**).
Per-flow state for forwarding

Process 2: Build the forwarding state for per-flow on ABR

- **upstream state**: <RD, S1, G1, PE1> (umh=PE1)
- **downstream state**: <RD, S1, G1, PE1> <Leaf=PE2> (Attrs=BFR-id)
- Do a mapping of <RD,PE1> to <virtual VRF identifier> **locally on ABR**, then
  - Disposition Process : (BIER Label<of sdX>, BFIR-id<PE1>, VpnLabelX, virtual-VRF-identifier)
  - Re-Imposition Process : (virtual-VRF-identifier, S1, G1, sdY, VpnLabelY, BitString=PE2)
  - The Re-imposition process need an IP lookup ---- actually an MFIB lookup.
Think a little more

- Case 1 (the above diagram):
  - Ingress Area using P2MP ---- ‘less specific replication’, for example, SPMSI(*,*) for rep.
  - Egress Area using BIER ---- ‘most specific replication’, or say, ‘per-flow specific replication’.
    - The LIR-pF explicit-tracking is still available ---- so do the LIR explicit-tracking.

- Case 2 (the opposite to the above diagram):
  - Ingress Area using BIER ---- ‘per-flow specific replication’ generally.
  - Egress Area using P2MP ----’less specific replication’, for example, SPMSI(*,*) for rep.
    - Trade-off difficulty ----not only for LIR-pF, but also for LIR.
    - If Ingress Area(BIER) uses ‘less specific replication’ BIER ----not optimized replication.
    - If Egress Area(P2MP) uses ‘most specific replication’ Per-flow SPMSI ----possibly overloaded.
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