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## Bit Indexed Explicit Replication (BIER)

- Only encode the end-receivers in the packet header.
- Not the intermediate nodes.
- Assign end-receivers a Bit Position from a Bit String.
- The smallest identifier possible.
- Encode the Bit String in the packet header.
- Using some sort of encapsulation.
- Create a Bit Forwarding Table on all BIER nodes to allow multicast packet forwarding using the Bit String in the packet.
- Derived from the RIB, SPF based.


## IETF

- The BIER idea was presented in a BOF at the IETF in Hawaii.
- November 2014.
- A new BIER Working Group has been formed (bier@ietf.org)
draft-ietf-bier-problem-statement-00 draft-ietf-bier-architecture-00 draft-ietf-bier-encapsulation-mpls-00 draft-ietf-bier-use-cases-00 draft-ietf-I3vpn-mvpn-bier-00 draft-ietf-ospf-bier-extensions-00 draft-przygienda-bier-isis-ranges-01 draft-eckert-bier-te-arch-00 draft-xu-idr-bier-extensions-00
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1. Assign a unique Bit Position from a BitString to each BFER in the BIER domain.
2. Each BFER floods their Bit Position to BFR-prefix mapping using the IGP (OSPF, ISIS) $.1|1.1| 11$
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## Bit Index Forwarding Table

| BM | Nbr |
| :--- | :---: |
| 0111 | $B$ |


| BM | N.br |
| :--- | :---: |
| 0011 | $C$ |
| 0100 | $E$ |


| BM | Nbr |
| :--- | :---: |
| 0001 | D |
| 0010 | $F$ |



- D, F and E advertise their Bit positions in the IGP (flooded).
- Based on shortest path route to RID, the Bit Mask Forwarding Table is created


## Forwarding Packets
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## ECMP

Duplicate bit positions need to be resolved, ECMP logic needs to select based on Hash. In the example we selected C


## MPLS encapsulation

- We've analyzed the MPLS option, CRS and ASR9K platform.
- Both these platforms can do 256 bits.
- We consider 256 a good starting point.
- Other vendors confirmed they can do 256.

| BIER Label | ¢\| |  | VPN Label |  | Payload |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underbrace{\text { BIER header }}_{\text {MPLS Label }}$ c $\underbrace{\text { IPv4/IPv6/L2 }}_{\substack{\text { Upstream Label } \\ \text { (optional) }}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## BIER Header


http://www.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-bier-mpls-encapsulation-01.txt

## Sets and Areas

## BIER Sets

| Set | BM | Nbr |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | 0111 | I |
| 2 | 0111 | I |



Note, we create different forwarding entries for each Set

- To increase the scale we group the egress routers in Sets.


## BIER Sets

| Set | BM | Nbr |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | 0111 | I |
| 2 | 0111 | I |



Note, we create different forwarding entries for each Set

- There is no topological restriction which set an egress belongs to


## BIER Area



- A bit Mask only needs to be unique in its own area.
- ABR's translate Bit Masks between area's.
- Requires a IP lookup and state on the ABRs.
- This is very similar for 'Segmented Inter-AS MVPN'.


## Native BIER

## Native BIER

- With Native BIER there is NO PIM involved, just IGMP and BIER.
- The Source and Receiver(s) are connected to BIER router.
- There are no RP's.
- There is no equivalent of PIM modes, like sparse, ssm, bidir etc..
- We speak of 'single’ sender and 'multi' sender, which is basically the same solution.
- The overlay can be BGP or SDN based.


## Native BIER



- E and F announce their Group membership via overlay to all other routers.
- A BIER router connected to the Source can immediately start sending.
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## Native BIER



- When $B$ leans about a new source, it can immediately start sending.


## MVPN over BIER

## MVPN over BIER

- BIER replaces PIM, mLDP, RSVP-TE or IR in the core.
- BIER represents a full mesh (P2MP) connectivity between all the PE's in the network.
- There is no need to explicitly signal any MDT's (or PMSI's).
- With MVPN there are many profiles,
- This is partly due to the tradeoff between 'State' and 'Flooding'.
- Different C-multicast signaling options.
- MVPN over BIER, there is one profile.
- BGP for C-multicast signaling.
- No need for Data-MDTs.


## MVPN over BIER



- The BGP control plane defined for MVPN can be re-used.
- Big difference, there is no Tree per VPN...!!!
- The BIER packets needs to carry Source ID and upstream VPN context label


## Conclusion

## Advantages

- Packets forwarded via BIER follow the unicast path towards the receiver, inheriting unicast features like FRR and LFA.
- There is no per multicast flow state in the network.
- Multicast convergence is as fast as unicast, there is no multicast state to re-converge, signal, etc.
- Nice plugin for SDN, its only the ingress and egress that need to exchange Sender and Receiver information.
- The core network provides a many-2-many connectively between all BIER routers by default following the IGP.
- No Multicast control protocol in the network.
- Goes hand in hand with Segment Routing


## Disadvantages

- The Bit String length has an upper bound and may not cover all deployment scenarios.
- Using sets to increase the number of egress routers may cause the ingress to replicate the packet multiple times.
- Using area's requires the ABR to have state.

