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Update States

- draft-xie-mpls-mldp-bier-extension -01 rev update
  - Address comments about MBB from ietf101
- draft-xie-mpls-rsvp-bier-extension -01 rev update
  - Address comments about MBB from ietf101
- Slides update on IETF103
  - Address comments on MPLS WG @ietf101: MBB support
  - Address comments on BIER WG @ietf102: New FEC lead to overlay change
  - Seeking for feedback/inputs on this draft, and the solution.
Problem 1: Make Before Break

- **MBB:** A strong requirement for multicast.
  - Adding some link/router in a network, and the multicast flow is broken.
  - What is your feeling about that?

- **The Key to gain the MBB in multicast.**
  - One-shot/atomic change on forwarding state (RFC 6388).
  - Double flows from two link temporarily, work on old, and *change atomically* to use the new.
  - **PIM** change the incoming-interface, flag from interface 1/0/1 to interface 1/0/2.
  - **MLDP** change the incoming-label, flag from label 101 to 102.
    - MLDP allocate different Labels for the same P2MP FEC<root> for different upstream interfaces!

- **While for IGP-based BIER, can MBB be still available?**
  - BIER don’t use RPF/Upstream-check mechanism.
  - One BFR is responsible for staring at many downstream BFERs.
  - Different Line cards may be responsible for different downstream BFERs.
  - It is difficult to do a one-shot/atomic change on two different line cards.
MBB for P2MP-LSP based BIER

• The Mechanism defined in RFC6388 (MLDP) is still useful for building P2MP LSP with BIER-TLV.

• A router allocate different labels for different upstream interfaces to the same P2MP FEC<root>.

• This has updated to the -01 rev.

• One possible impact is that, a change of F-BM need to be known through the path to the root. So the convergence may be slower than normal P2MP LSP.
Problem 2: **New FEC or existing FEC?**

- P2MP_BIER_FEC = P2MP_FEC + BIER_Set_Id<0 to 255>

One BIG comment from BIER WG is that, a new FEC means a new PTA type, and thus a overlay multicast service (MVPN service) signaling change.

- Above picture, D has a BFR-id<1>, F has a BFR-id<257>, E has a BFR-id<513>, they are belonging to different sets for a 256bit bit-string-length.

- Can the original P2MP FEC (RFC6388) be used for multiple BIER sets?
How about using existing P2MP_FEC?

BGP x-PMSI A-D route(RD,S,G,PTA<type=mLDP, ID=P2MP_FEC>)

- D--C: Label Mapping(FEC<Root=A, ID=10>, Label=400, BIER_TLV<Label=401, Set=0, FBM=0001>)
- F--C: Label Mapping(FEC<Root=A, ID=10>, Label=600, BIER_TLV<Label=601, Set=1, FBM=0001>)
- E--B: Label Mapping(FEC<Root=A, ID=10>, Label=500, BIER_TLV<Label=501, Set=2, FBM=0001>)
- C--B: Label Mapping(FEC<Root=A, ID=10>, Label=300, BIER_TLV<Label=301, Set=0, FBM=0001> <Label=305, Set=1, FBM=0001>)
- B--A: Label Mapping(FEC<Root=A, ID=10>, Label=200, BIER_TLV<Label=201, Set=0, FBM=0001> <Label=205, Set=1, FBM=0001> <Label=208, Set=2, FBM=0001>)
P2MP LSP based BIER fwd overview

- P2MP LSP for simple forwarding.
- BIER for selective/optimization/bypassing.
- Whether to change the BitString can be done locally/differently for different purpose.

Diagram:

- (A) (Root) to (B) (C) (D) (E) (F)
- Eth 0x8847 Label 200 BIER Header 0101 Payload (S,G)
- P2MP/BIER-Label Changes hop-by-hop
- BitString inside Unchanges hop-by-hop
Summary

• The authors believe that, it is a simple way to introduce BIER in the current P2MP deployment, for at least the following reasons:

  • MBB: IGP BIER may be hard to support.

  • Multi-AS BIER deployment: OSPF/ISIS/BGP are all need to change for BIER. While mLDP is protocol-independent, and the Recursive FEC can easily reach the rootIP acorssing any Area/AS/ASes.

  • Bypassing: So many effort has been through in the bypassing of some BIER-incapable routers, and turns out to be very complex and side-effect.
Next Steps

• Update the `<mpls-mldp-bier-extension>` using the original P2MP FEC instead of a new FEC type.

• Update the BIER-TLV in LDP mapping message to carry multiple `<Label + Set ID +FBM>` tuples for building of multiple p2mp LSPs using one FEC.

• BIER-TLV used with Recursive FEC (RFC5512) for building inter-AS P2MP LSP with BIER.
Open discussions/feedback

• Do you think it right to build multiple P2MP LSPs for multiple BIER sets using only One P2MP FEC?

• Do you think it useful?
Thank you !