



IETF 117– San Francisco
Jul 2023
IDR Working Group

draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-sr-policy-01

Stefano Previdi (Huawei)

Ketan Talaulikar (Cisco)

Jie Dong(Huawei)

Hannes Gredler (RtBrick)

Jeff Tantsura (Microsoft)

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?