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Document History and Status

• Originally written for connecting “segment routing enabled data center sites”
• This revision generalizes the concept to interconnect and SR domains
• The work is stable and referenced by draft-farrel-spring-sr-domain-interconnect
  – This document provides protocol features
  – That document combines those features and other protocol components to describe a full solution
Reference Model

- Two SR domains
- Want to steer end-to-end traffic
- Backbone networks might or might not be SR capable
Gateway Discovery

- All GWs advertise themselves as having routes to all prefixes in the domain
- Each GW is configured with an identifier for the SR domain
  - Common across all GWs to the domain
  - Unique across all SR domains that are connected
- A route target [RFC4360] is attached to each GW's auto-discovery route and has its value set to the SR domain identifier
- Each GW constructs an import filtering rule to import any route that carries a route target with the same SR domain identifier that it uses
  - Only GWs to the domain will import those routes
  - All GWs to the same SR domain will import each other's routes and will learn (auto-discover) the current set of active GWs for the SR domain
Tunnel Usage

• When a GW advertizes it includes a Tunnel Encapsulation attribute [draft-ietf-idr-tunnel-encaps]
  – Contains an SR Tunnel TLV (a new TLV)
    • One per tunnel to the gateway
    • Includes a Remote Endpoint sub-TLV
    • Can contain a Prefix SID sub-TLV or an MPLS label stack sub-TLV to help build an end-to-end SID stack or to swap out a binding SID

• Tunnel head ends (i.e., remote GWs) can assign binding SIDs to identify the tunnels
  – But that is out of scope for this document
And the magic is...

- When a GW to a domain discovers other GWs to the same domain
  - It also adds those SR Tunnel TLVs to its advertizement
- This means that even when a GW is accessed through multiple ASBRs the full choice of access points is known
  - Combined with BGP-LS and EPE this gives full end-to-end traffic engineering
What Next

• Document still needs
  – Management and security sections
• Planning FCFS codepoint request as implementation progresses
• Would like more reviews
  – Especially in the context of draft-farrel-spring-sr-domain-interconnect
• It’s a simple draft, could we consider adopting it?