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BGP Color-Aware Routing - Objective

• Define BGP based routing solution to establish end-to-end intent-aware paths across a multi-domain service provider network environment
  – Intent : Example – low-latency path between two PEs
Reminder – Deployed Solution

• SR-TE
  – ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy
  – Mature, widely deployed, multiple implementations
  – Defines notion of Color to represent intent
Colored Service Route Signaling from E3 to E1

- Key point: E1 learns about the “intent” (here for underlay SLA) requested by a route via its color
- The VPN route is said to be “colored” (<> color-aware)
- Color is widely supported BGP Color Extended-Community
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Automated Steering via SR-TE Color-Aware Path

- When E1 receives a Colored Service route from E3
- E1 requests its SR-PCE1 to compute the inter-domain path
- SR-PCE1 sends the SR Policy to E1 with label/SID stack
- E3, C1 is a SR-Policy Color-Aware Path in underlay that provides intent-aware path to E3
• **E3, C1 is a Color-Aware BGP route in underlay that provides intent-aware path to E3**
Multiple Intents with BGP Color-Aware Routes

RD:V/v via E3, VPN Label: 30030, Color C1
RD:W/w via E3, VPN Label: 30030, Color C2
Reference Deployment Design

- Well-known MPLS network reference deployment designs:
  - Seamless MPLS
  - Inter-AS option C
- Ultra-large-scale multi-domain network with around 300K nodes
  - Core, Metro, Aggregation, Access layers
- Multiple intents (1 best-effort and 4 intents for example)
  - Low-latency
  - Plane 1 & Plane 2
  - Avoidance (links/nodes/domains – for regulatory, security, quality, etc.)
Types of Intent bound to a Color

- Minimization of different metrics – link cost, latency
  - Minimization of different metric types, static and dynamic
- Exclusion/Inclusion of SRLG and/or Link Affinity
- In the inter-domain context, exclusion/inclusion of entire domains, and border routers
- Minimum MTU / number of hops / MSD
- Bandwidth management, to the extent possible
- Inclusion of one or several virtual network function chains
  - Localization of the virtual network function chains
Focus of Problem Statement Draft

• Crisp, technical analysis of intent use-cases and protocol requirements

• Consistency, co-existence, interworking with deployed SR-Policy based solution
  – Color to drive automated steering

• Widened problem scope
  – Intent-aware VPN service layer
  – NFV Integration
Problem Statement Draft Contd.

• Clarity on deployment requirements
  – E2E paths across domains with different technologies and encapsulations

• Clarity on Scale requirements and constraints
  – Data Plane (MPLS label space / FIB)
  – Control Plane (BGP) Filtering
Collaboration
• Collaboration & review with lead operators, vendors on analysis
  – Acknowledge many contributors in draft
• Recognize prior work
  – Seamless SR/Classful Transport
• Ongoing collaboration effort with SSR co-authors for consensus
  – Reached out through co-authors in Nov/Dec
  – Recognized prior publication on use-cases / illustrations
  – We published problem statement with analytical approach as contribution
  – SSR co-authors acknowledged feedback & split their document
  – Joint discussion progressing well for eventual partnership, new sets of documents
Next Steps

• Request review from Working Group