

# Update on SRv6 standardization activities

Written by the authors of the key SRv6 documents ([SRH](#) and [Net-PGM](#))



## 1 STATUS

**SRv6 standardization is well on its way and can be considered as nearly complete.**

- Segment Routing architecture is RFC 8402. It defines 2 data-plane instantiations of SR: SR over MPLS (SR-MPLS) and SR over IPv6 (SRv6). SRv6 uses a new type of routing header called the SR Header (SRH)
- SPRING working group's charter and milestones are about completing SR-MPLS and SRv6 standardization
- Segment Routing Header (SRH) has been approved as Proposed Standard RFC in October 2019
- SRv6 Network Programming draft is on track with an on-going SPRING last-call request

This clearly exemplifies SRv6 maturity and its ability to meet all expressed requirements.

Surprisingly, Juniper has lately proposed an alternate solution, a.k.a "SRv6+", invoking superior benefits over existing SRv6.

**The IETF Area Director has clearly indicated that SPRING working group should focus on completing the standardization of SRv6. It has also been requested that "SRv6+" be renamed as this has no relationship with the work in SPRING and 6MAN related to SRv6.**

Here are a few concerns that many operators and vendors have expressed on the IETF mailing-list:

- No benefit
  - SRv6 native compression is mathematically better
- Hardware tax is significant
  - new extension headers must be supported without any leverage of the SRH eco-system
  - multiple extension headers need to be parsed instead of a single SRH
  - more lookups are required
- Scale tax is significant
  - Loss of the stateless property
  - Reinvention of label mapping resulting in well-known scale and operational problems
  - Definition of a brand-new control plane
- Open-source tax
  - Linux, FD.io, networking plugin's would need extensive work without any SRH ecosystem leverage

So far, no conclusive answers have been provided on all these open items.

This new proposal seems to be a weak re-engineering of SR MPLS for IPv6 without any added benefits but increased complexity.

Even more concerning, Juniper has not publicly demonstrated any line-rate hardware support of "SRv6+" not to mention interoperability across vendors.

As a reminder, SRv6 is already rolled out in live networks, with commercial traffic, with multiple interoperable linerate multi-Tbps hardware, with a rich open-source eco-system and with a standardization process expected to complete in the next few months.

### IETF leadership

- Martin Vigoureux (Nokia) – as Area Director for SPRING – closing the discussions on SRv6+ <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/nQ-8cslcGSmT8BDUWAMjyQm1IRg>

### SRv6+ name change

- 1<sup>st</sup> request by Mach Chen (Huawei) during the SPRING working group session at IETF 105 <http://youtu.be/WuoJWecyATQ?t=4265>
- 2<sup>nd</sup> request by Cheng Li (Huawei) on the SPRING mailing list <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/26855I76rVmxtfe3b-04WFewIK4>

### Operators

- Robert Raszuk (Bloomberg) on the many extensions required by CRH (IGP, BGP, OAM) <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/V8dsQOeRTuK2r7Lfi77bgICqhE>
- Robert Raszuk (Bloomberg) and Dirk Steinberg (Deutsche Telekom) on CRH being a poor re-engineering of SR-MPLS over IP/UDP  
Robert: [https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/6bdX\\_gb47uFYnd6ytwFLPYxXCYo](https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/6bdX_gb47uFYnd6ytwFLPYxXCYo)  
Dirk: <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/6Bm4nN5ah8rFb7VutexK30kRUPM>
- Dan Voyer (Bell CA) reminding that SRv6 is a mature technology (deployments, long IETF work), as opposed to CRH <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/OB1I41EhhUu8x8XEnKaBTdczDj4>

### Vendors

- Zhibo Hu (Huawei) on the many advantages of SRv6 <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/D7IFJakb5Ew2iMXUfvf1wub7arQ>
- Cheng Li (Huawei) expressing concerns on the dataplane performance of CRH [https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/XK0F40oEuZv-3ule-X5685d\\_6Mc](https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/XK0F40oEuZv-3ule-X5685d_6Mc)
- Zafar summarizing the main issues of CRH [https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/wFDK\\_Be7IEt4s191m61WdUOEzL4](https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/wFDK_Be7IEt4s191m61WdUOEzL4)
- Wim Henderickx (Nokia) <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/nX5-1rdXKOw6ks73VYfvwn7ial8>
- Darren Dukes (Cisco) <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/spring/v8UAgBGQ0yp0VBwGkZ3RwzH1MME>