Compressed SRv6 Segment List Encoding

draft-ietf-spring-srv6-srh-compression

Weiqiang Cheng, Clarence Filsfils, Zhenbin Li, Bruno Decraene, Francois Clad

IETF 118, Prague, November 2023

Issue Tracking

- Closed on August 24 following WG poll
 - Issue #2 Conformance to existing RFCs
 - Issue #3 Updated definition for SegmentsLeft Field needed
 - Issue #4 Implications on SRH based filtering policies
 - Issue #5 ICMPv6 troubleshooting in presence of C-SIDs
- Open
 - Issue #1 Clarity on one or multiple data plane solutions
 - All outstanding technical comments have been replied to

Reviews

- Linda Dunbar
 - Addressed in revision -09 and replied
- Andrew Alston
 - Addressed in revision -09 and replied
- Adrian Farrel
 - Partially addressed in revision -09 (78/85 92%)
- Boris Hassanov
 - Partially addressed in revision -09 (48/60 80%)

Thanks a lot to all reviewers!

Changes since revision -05

- Many editorial clarifications and fixes
- Section 1
 - Removed the reference to draft-ietf-spring-compression-requirement (expired)
 - Replaced with a short summary of the rationale for SRv6 compression
- Section 3
 - Added a reference to draft-ietf-6man-sids

Changes since revision -05 (continued)

- Section 4
 - Clarified that SIDs with that NEXT-C-SID flavor and REPLACE-C-SID flavor SIDs can co-exist in the same SR segment endpoint node, in the same segment list, and even (with some restrictions) in the same C-SID container
 - Added a high-level description of the NEXT-C-SID and REPLACE-C-SID flavors
 - Clarified how the pseudocodes in section 4 combine with those in RFC8986 (full combined pseudocode in appendix)

Changes since revision -05 (continued)

- Section 5
 - Clarified the definition of global and local C-SID
- Section 6
 - Expanded the description of the compression algorithm
- Section 9
 - Merged subsections 9.1 and 9.2 (pinging a SID with or without a segment list)

Next Steps

- Addressing the remaining comments and getting ready for WGLC
- Soliciting feedback on the latest changes