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Motivation

• Allow a single network to carry both
  • L2/IP/VPN connection-less services
  • Connection-oriented p2p transport services (aka private lines)

• Address the following requirements
  • Persistent traffic engineered paths
  • Strict bandwidth commitment
  • End2end path protection (incl. <50msec) and restoration
  • Path OAM
Circuit-style SR Policy Characteristics

• Bandwidth requested and reserved
• Bi-directional, co-routed paths by associating the SR policy from A to Z and Z to A
• Segment lists have strict hops of unprotected adj-SIDs
• No path reoptimization unless manually requested
• Multiple candidate paths for path protection and restoration
• STAMP loopback mode liveness and performance measurement
Circuit-style SR Policy Creation

• Network Topology
  • Unprotected adj-SIDs allocated persistently
    • IGP and BGP-LS extensions for topology info distribution
  • Bandwidth available for CS-SR per link
  • PHB guaranteeing the provisioned bandwidth is available

• PCC delegates SR policy candidate path computation to PCE
  • BANDWIDTH object (operational & requested bandwidth)
  • LSPA object (enforce no local protection via L=0 E=1)
  • Bidirectional association (co-routing via C=1) ¹)
  • SR policy association in case of multiple candidate paths ²)
  • Disjointness association for 1:1 protection ³)
  • Request strict hops and no-reoptimization ⁴)

1) draft-ietf-pce-sr-bidir-path
2) draft-pce-segment-routing-policy-cp
3) RFC8800
4) draft-sidor-pce-circuit-style-pcep-extensions
Updates and Progress

• First draft presentation @ IETF113 in PCE WG
  • Lots of feedback and input from several people
  • Received detailed review comments

• Document improvements
  • Clarified the role of stateful PCE
  • Added section on maximum segment depth
  • Reshuffled sections to improve the document structure

• Renamed the draft to redirect from PCE to SPRING WG
Next Steps

• Further comments are welcome
• Suggesting WG adoption of the draft