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RFC 4875 Design

• Assumes the root already has a priori knowledge about the leaves before computing the P2MP tree
  – Often addressed by static configuration
  – May use BGP Auto-Discovery mechanism in some environments

• Loses the dynamics of receiver-initiated multicast distribution trees

• Does not cover MP2MP tree computation
  – *E.g.*, for large scale, QoS-demanding interactive e-learning services
Best of Breed

• Dynamics of IP multicast
  – Receiver-driven scheme allows for finer tree design, computation and maintenance
    • Key for bandwidth optimization in the access

• Robustness of MPLS TE
  – RSVP-based paradigm yields hard guarantees
    • Down to the first IP node
  – Protection toolkit (PLR design for both link and node protection purposes)

• Agility of multicast-inferred AAA
  – Dynamic policy (QoS, security) enforcement scheme
MP2MP Scenario

- Each leaf needs to learn about the others first, e.g.:
  - BGP Auto-Discovery may be used by PE4 and PE5 leaves to notify PE2 (root) and then trigger tree computation
- A P2MP tree is then computed by each leaf
  - Hence raising scalability issues
Requirements

• Requirements of RFC 4461 still apply
• Receiver-Driven MPLS tree structures introduce additional requirements
  – Tree computation relies upon a collection of label states
    • Upstream label states should be merged with downstream states for MP2MP trees
  – Covers MP2MP tree computation
  – Support of dynamic leaf Graft/Prune operation
  – State maintenance operation for P routers should be independent of the number of receivers and source/receivers (MP2MP)
  – Intermediate routers need to compute a route towards the root or use explicit object for next hop resolution
In-Band Signaling

• mRSVP TE object should be used by leaf routers to signal multicast stream information
  – mRSVP TE object is parsed by root to compute the tree and forward traffic to receivers accordingly
  – P routers do not need to parse mRSVP TE object

• Aggregation of several multicast flows bound to a given RD tree structure is encouraged
  – To facilitate LSP design and operation
Overview

- Receiver triggers RSVP_PATH towards the source
  - By means of IGMP/MLD messages processed by access routers (R3/R4)
- RSVP_RESV messages are sent back from the root
  - R1 connected to the source
- Label allocation is done prior to sending PATH messages
- RSVP is used as per procedure defined in RFC 4875
  - But RSVP machinery is triggered by leaf routers instead of ingress router
Comments?