

# MRT in SR

draft-agv-rtgwg-spring-segment-routing-mrt-01  
IETF-94

Anil Kumar S N  
Gaurav Agrawal  
Vinod Kumar S

# Agenda

- Why it makes sense
- Forwarding Mechanisms & SPRING
- Where will it fit
- IGP support needed
- Conclusion

# Why it makes sense

- draft-ietf-rtgwg-mrt-frr-architecture

Both MRT forwarding mechanisms options can be supported easily in SR

- Single SID/label for a prefix and MT-ID
  - Two SID/Label, Top label for MT and Next label for Prefix
- MRT complements TI-LFA when device has low computing power but has better forwarding capacity
- With Minimal changes MRT can be easily supported in SR compared to LDP

# Forwarding Mechanisms & SPRING

Current MRT forwarding mechanisms for LDP

Topology-scoped FEC encoded using a single label



Topology and FEC encoded using a two label stack



# IGP Support Needed

Segment routing depends on IGP for control layer information exchange.

- SR MRT Capability Exchange
- Selection/Consensus of forwarding among two methods
- For Non Default profile selecting non colliding MT-ID's for RED/Blue and Rainbow MTs
- To Advertise MRT Red, Blue and Rainbow SR segments In addition Default SR segments per MRT profile

# Conclusion

- MRT might be useful in SR network
- MRT and TI-LFA both has its own advantages and disadvantages, Can be used based on needs.
- MRT does suit few low end networks

# Suggestions and comments

# Thanks