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I-D History and Brief Overview

• draft-fedyk-ccamp-l1vpn-extnd-overlay-01 became draft-fedyk-ccamp-uni-extensions-00 as per Vancouver meeting suggestion to broaden the applicability scope from GMPLS UNI for L1VPNs to the GMPLS UNI in general:
  – Title/I-D file name changed
  – Content aligned with new scope
  – Still applicable to the GMPLS UNI for a L1VPN following the overlay extension service model (L1VPN is a special case of the general UNI case)

• draft-fedyk-ccamp-uni-extensions-00 is still addressing:
  – UNI extensions for achieving diversity in the provider network
  – UNI extensions to deal with latency/latency variation (delay/delay variation) constraints
Updates from 00 to 01 version

• Diversity part:
  – Error handling procedures added

• Latency part:
  – “Latency Signaling Extensions” section revised (new text added)

• Reference added and references updated
Relationship with other CCAMP work

• draft-fedyk-ccamp-uni-extensions-01 complements:
  – draft-ietf-ccamp-lsp-diversity-01.txt
  – draft-ali-ccamp-extended-srlg-00.txt
  ➔ these drafts address signaling extensions to support LSP diversity and SRLG for multi-provider domain networks

• draft-fedyk-ccamp-uni-extensions-01 differs from:
  – draft-beeram-ccamp-melg-00.txt
  ➔ draft describes routing actions on a virtual topology that has been provided to the CEs
Next Steps

• Solicit feedback/comments from the group

• Further refinement of dual-homing solution including more detailed signaling extensions

• Further refinement of latency section

• Collaboration with authors working on: draft-farrel-interconnected-te-info-exchange-00.txt
Thank You!
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Problem Statement: ensure that LSP1 and LSP2 are mutually disjoint
Option 1: Exchange of SRLG List

Exchange of SRLG ID list for disjoint LSPs via source CE node
Option 2: Exchange of Path Affinity Set

- Exchange of PAS + LSP ID via source CE node
- Dissemination of (PAS, LSP ID, SRLG IDs) among PEs for each L1VPN