



Segment Routing Drafts Update

sprevidi@cisco.com

IETF95 Buenos Aires, April 2016

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 RHO deprecation?
 - IPv6 instantiation of SR is explained in draft-ietf-6man-segment-routing-header where the deprecation of RHO 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