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Recap ...

We split the **draft-ietf-idr-te-lsp-distribution** (a WG document since 2014) which covered advertisement of various types of TE Policies/LSPs via BGP-LS just before IETF116.

- **draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-sr-policy**
  - SR Policy Advertisement via BGP-LS

- **draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-te-path**
  - MPLS-TE LSPs and Local LSP Cross-connects Advertisement via BGP-LS
Summary of Updates in v01

1) Support for nodes like a PCE to advertise SR Policies reported to it via PCEP on behalf of headend nodes.
2) Clarifications of the Descriptors in the SR Policy Candidate Path TLV
3) Sharing of the Protocol Origin codepoints with PCEP (draft-ietf-pce-segment-routing-policy-cp)
4) Clarification on the use of SR Binding SID TLV for SRv6 BSID as discussed on the mailer
5) Addition of an Adjacency-sid-only constraint reporting via SR Candidate Path Constraints TLV
6) Extending existing SR Disjoint & Bidirectional Group Constraints TLVs to support conveying the PCEP association object (RFC8697)
7) Introduced a new Segment List Identifier Sub-TLV for alignment with other mechanisms for SR Policy config (e.g., PCEP)
8) Clarification that explicit/dynamic are properties of a candidate path even if reported at segment list level and rules for their consistency.
Advertising SR Policies from PCE

• In deployments where PCE is used, it can advertise SR Policies on behalf of the headend nodes that report state to it via PCEP
  • Simplification and better scaling of BGP peering for BGP-LS

• This requires minor tweaks to the spec
  • Ensure advertisements from headend are not mixed with those from the PCE
  • Node Descriptor TLV in NLRI continues to identify the headend
  • Some Descriptors are not available at the PCE; they are omitted

• Identification of PCE is done via TLVs in the BGP-LS Attribute
  • This ensures advertisements from redundant PCEs do not create duplicate state in BGP-LS
Next Steps

• Thanks for the feedback and discussion from WG members; especially implementors
  • Please continue the reviews and feedback

• IANA Code Point allocations pending for some TLVs
  • Will be requested post IETF117

• Preparing Implementation Reports
  • Will be shared on the list post IETF117 after IANA allocations are done

• It is expected that additional features may be incrementally added over a long period of time ... is it time to call “work done” for this “base” spec?