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SPRING WG drafts

• draft-ietf-spring-problem-statement
• Use cases drafts
• Other drafts to be considered for WG adoption
SPRING WG drafts

• draft-ietf-spring-problem-statement
  – Version 07
  – IESG review in progress
  – Authors (hopefully) addressed the various comments and discuss’s
draft-ietf-spring-problem-statement

- Comments/Discuss addressed:
  - Added Security Section
  - Added Manageability Section
  - Clarified text explaining applicability of SR on MPLS networks (i.e.: avoid comparison between RSVP and SR)
  - Clarified SR applicability to v6 dataplane (pointer to draft-ietf-6man-segment-routing-header)
  - Clarification on intra/inter-domain applicability
  - Identified requirements: MUST vs. SHOULD
  - Added clarification text related to label stack depth and source routing
draft-ietf-spring-problem-statement

• Other comments received during IESG review
  – Please add introductory text for FRR and Microloop avoidance
    • Text need to be added to draft-ietf-spring-resiliency-use-cases draft.
  – Segment Routing means SPRING and the terminology should be defined as introduction to the problem-statement draft
    • As requested at the time WG was formed, SR is the solution while SPRING is the term to be used in use-case and problem-statement draft.
  – TE use-case is simplified and would probably require more details
    • Co-authors did submit a segment-routing-use-cases draft with more details on how SR can be used for TE but, at that time, it has been required to focus only on the use-case description (o solution). Draft has expired. Should we re-activate it?
  – Missing details on IPv6 requirements
    • These are explained in draft-ietf-spring-ipv6-use-cases
  – SR-IPv6 use case: why not mention RH0 deprecation?
    • IPv6 instantiation of SR is explained in draft-ietf-6man-segment-routing-header where the deprecation of RH0 is mentioned
  – Missing SR-IPv6 security details
    • Again, these are addressed in draft-ietf-6man-segment-routing-header
SPRING WG drafts

• A question has been raised on whether the problem-statement and use cases drafts should be moved forward or abandoned
• However:
  – Use cases drafts describe the protocol extensions defined in separate documents (BGP, BGPLS, ISIS, OSPF, OSPv3, IPv6, MPLS, PCE, …)
  – Use cases drafts have been requested at the begin of spring wg activity
  – Co-authors believe that substantial amount of effort has been put on these documents which deserve publication
SPRING WG drafts

• Use cases drafts
  – draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-msdc
  – draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-central-epe
  – draft-ietf-spring-6man-use-cases

• Ready to go after problem-statement
Architecture Drafts

• draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing
  – Version 07
  – Added SR Domain definition
    • taken from draft-ietf-6man-segment-routing
  – To do list:
    • Security and Manageability sections

• draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-mpls
  – Version 04
  – Fixed typo’s
  – In progress:
    • Add clarification text on the SR/LDP example
    • Basically: LDP terminology (targeted vs. directed vs extended)

• draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-ldp-interop
  – Version 00
  – Still work in progress... sorry
  – Received comments from Sasha Vainshtein that will be integrated in next revision (work in progress)
SPRING WG drafts

• To be evaluated for WG adoption
  – draft-filsfils-spring-sr-recursive-info
  – draft-filsfils-spring-large-scale-interconnect