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Update/Relevant Drafts

draft-spring-sr-replication-segment-07 (adopted)
draft-ietf-pim-sr-p2mp-policy-04 (adopted)
draft-hb-spring-sr-p2mp-policy-yang-02 (need to revive it)
draft-ietf-bess-mvpn-evpn-sr-p2mp-04 (adopted)
draft-ietf-pce-sr-p2mp-policy-00 (adopted)
draft-hb-idr-sr-p2mp-policy-04 (Good support should be adopted)
draft-ietf-pim-p2mp-policy-ping-001 (adopted)
Example 1
Single Candidate Path

1. The primary path (candidate path 1) is A to C to LEAF D and LEAF E with C being a BUD node
2. B does not support Replication Segment
Details

• To test every Candidate Path (active or backup) and its corresponding Path Instance.

• Only for MPLS SR
  • For SRv6 there will be a separate draft based on draft-ietf-6man-spring-srv6

• Reuses RFC4379 for packet construction

• Reuses RFC6425 P2MP MPLS – Extensions to LSP Ping for most common concepts

• Detecting faults in the SR Unicast domain (SID-LIST) is beyond the scope of this draft. Procedures are only valid between Replication Segments.

• Introduces 1 new sub-TLVs for Target FEC Stack TLV, the following is proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Value Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>P2MP Policy MPLS CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed P2MP Policy CP FEC Stack Sub-TLVs

- Do we need one Sub-TLV with AF or two Sub-TLV, one for IPv4 Root-Address and another for IPv6 Root-Address
- Started an conversation with MPLS WG
Next Steps

• Asking for adoption of this draft

Thank you!