

Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)  
Request for Comments: 8279  
Category: Experimental  
ISSN: 2070-1721

IJ. Wijnands, Ed.  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
E. Rosen, Ed.  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
A. Dolganow  
Nokia  
T. Przygienda  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
S. Aldrin  
Google, Inc.  
November 2017

## Multicast Using Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER)

### Abstract

This document specifies a new architecture for the forwarding of multicast data packets. It provides optimal forwarding of multicast packets through a "multicast domain". However, it does not require a protocol for explicitly building multicast distribution trees, nor does it require intermediate nodes to maintain any per-flow state. This architecture is known as "Bit Index Explicit Replication" (BIER). When a multicast data packet enters the domain, the ingress router determines the set of egress routers to which the packet needs to be sent. The ingress router then encapsulates the packet in a BIER header. The BIER header contains a bit string in which each bit represents exactly one egress router in the domain; to forward the packet to a given set of egress routers, the bits corresponding to those routers are set in the BIER header. The procedures for forwarding a packet based on its BIER header are specified in this document. Elimination of the per-flow state and the explicit tree-building protocols results in a considerable simplification.

## Status of This Memo

This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is published for examination, experimental implementation, and evaluation.

This document defines an Experimental Protocol for the Internet community. This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Not all documents approved by the IESG are a candidate for any level of Internet Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 7841.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8279>.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	4
2. The BFR Identifier and BFR-Prefix .....	7
3. Encoding BFR Identifiers in BitStrings .....	8
4. Layering .....	11
4.1. The Routing Underlay .....	11
4.2. The BIER Layer .....	12
4.3. The Multicast Flow Overlay .....	13
5. Advertising BFR-ids and BFR-Prefixes .....	13
6. BIER Intra-Domain Forwarding Procedures .....	15
6.1. Overview .....	15
6.2. BFR Neighbors .....	17
6.3. The Bit Index Routing Table .....	18
6.4. The Bit Index Forwarding Table .....	19
6.5. The BIER Forwarding Procedure .....	20
6.6. Examples of BIER Forwarding .....	23
6.6.1. Example 1 .....	23
6.6.2. Example 2 .....	24
6.7. Equal-Cost Multipath Forwarding .....	26
6.7.1. Non-deterministic ECMP .....	27
6.7.2. Deterministic ECMP .....	28
6.8. Prevention of Loops and Duplicates .....	29
6.9. When Some Nodes Do Not Support BIER .....	30
6.10. Use of Different BitStringLengths within a Domain .....	33
6.10.1. BitStringLength Compatibility Check .....	34
6.10.2. Handling BitStringLength Mismatches .....	36
6.10.3. Transitioning from One BitStringLength to Another .....	36
7. Operational Considerations .....	37
7.1. Configuration .....	37
8. IANA Considerations .....	37
9. Security Considerations .....	38
10. References .....	39
10.1. Normative References .....	39
10.2. Informative References .....	39
Acknowledgements .....	40
Contributors .....	41
Authors' Addresses .....	43

## 1. Introduction

This document specifies a new architecture for the forwarding of multicast data packets. The architecture provides optimal forwarding of multicast data packets through a "multicast domain". However, it does not require the use of a protocol for explicitly building multicast distribution trees, and it does not require intermediate nodes to maintain any per-flow state. This architecture is known as "Bit Index Explicit Replication" (BIER).

A router that supports BIER is known as a "Bit-Forwarding Router" (BFR). The BIER control-plane protocols (see Section 4.2) run within a "BIER domain", allowing the BFRs within that domain to exchange the information needed for them to forward packets to each other using BIER.

A multicast data packet enters a BIER domain at a "Bit-Forwarding Ingress Router" (BFIR), and leaves the BIER domain at one or more "Bit-Forwarding Egress Routers" (BFERs). A BFR that receives a multicast data packet from another BFR in the same BIER domain, and forwards the packet to another BFR in the same BIER domain, will be known as a "transit BFR" for that packet. A single BFR may be a BFIR for some multicast traffic while also being a BFER for some multicast traffic and a transit BFR for some multicast traffic. In fact, for a given packet, a BFR may be a BFIR and/or a transit BFR and/or (one of) the BFER(s) for that packet.

A BIER domain may contain one or more sub-domains. Each BIER domain MUST contain at least one sub-domain, the "default sub-domain" (also denoted "sub-domain 0"). If a BIER domain contains more than one sub-domain, each BFR in the domain MUST be provisioned to know the set of sub-domains to which it belongs. Each sub-domain is identified by a sub-domain-id in the range [0,255].

For each sub-domain to which a given BFR belongs, if the BFR is capable of acting as a BFIR or a BFER, it MUST be provisioned with a "BFR-id" that is unique within the sub-domain. A BFR-id is a small unstructured positive integer. For instance, if a particular BIER sub-domain contains 1,374 BFRs, each one could be given a BFR-id in the range [1,1374].

If a given BFR belongs to more than one sub-domain, it may (though it need not) have a different BFR-id for each sub-domain.

When a multicast packet arrives from outside the domain at a BFIR, the BFIR determines the set of BFERs to which the packet will be sent. The BFIR also determines the sub-domain in which the packet will be sent. Determining the sub-domain in which a given packet

will be sent is known as "assigning the packet to a sub-domain". Procedures for choosing the sub-domain to which a particular packet is assigned are outside the scope of this document. However, once a particular packet has been assigned to a particular sub-domain, it remains assigned to that sub-domain until it leaves the BIER domain. That is, the sub-domain to which a packet is assigned **MUST NOT** be changed while the packet is in flight through the BIER domain.

Once the BFIR determines the sub-domain and the set of BFERs for a given packet, the BFIR encapsulates the packet in a "BIER header". The BIER header contains a bit string in which each bit represents a single BFR-id. To indicate that a particular BFER is to receive a given packet, the BFIR sets the bit corresponding to that BFER's BFR-id in the sub-domain to which the packet has been assigned. We will use the term "BitString" to refer to the bit string field in the BIER header. We will use the term "payload" to refer to the packet that has been encapsulated. Thus, a "BIER-encapsulated" packet consists of a "BIER header" followed by a "payload".

The number of BFERs to which a given packet can be forwarded is limited only by the length of the BitString in the BIER header. Different deployments can use different BitString lengths. We will use the term "BitStringLength" to refer to the number of bits in the BitString. It is possible that some deployments will have more BFERs in a given sub-domain than there are bits in the BitString. To accommodate this case, the BIER encapsulation includes both the BitString and a "Set Identifier" (SI). It is the BitString and the SI together that determine the set of BFERs to which a given packet will be delivered:

- o By convention, the least significant (rightmost) bit in the BitString is "bit 1", and the most significant (leftmost) bit is "bit BitStringLength".
- o If a BIER-encapsulated packet has an SI of  $n$  and a BitString with bit  $k$  set, then the packet must be delivered to the BFER whose BFR-id (in the sub-domain to which the packet has been assigned) is  $n * \text{BitStringLength} + k$ .

For example, suppose the BIER encapsulation uses a BitStringLength of 256 bits. By convention, the least significant (rightmost) bit is bit 1, and the most significant (leftmost) bit is bit 256. Suppose that a given packet has been assigned to sub-domain 0 and needs to be delivered to three BFERs, where those BFERs have BFR-ids in sub-domain 0 of 13, 126, and 235, respectively. The BFIR would create a BIER encapsulation with the SI set to zero and with bits 13, 126, and 235 of the BitString set. (All other bits of the BitString would be clear.) If the packet also needs to be sent to a BFER whose

BFR-id is 257, the BFIR would have to create a second copy of the packet, and the BIER encapsulation would specify an SI of 1, and a BitString with bit 1 set and all the other bits clear.

It is generally advantageous to assign the BFR-ids of a given sub-domain so that as many BFERs as possible can be represented in a single bit string.

Suppose a BFR (call it "BFR-A") receives a packet whose BIER encapsulation specifies an SI of 0 and a BitString with bits 13, 26, and 235 set. Suppose BFR-A has two BFR neighbors, BFR-B and BFR-C, such that the best path to BFERs 13 and 26 is via BFR-B, but the best path to BFER 235 is via BFR-C. BFR-A will then replicate the packet, sending one copy to BFR-B and one copy to BFR-C. However, BFR-A will clear bit 235 in the BitString of the packet copy it sends to BFR-B and will clear bits 13 and 26 in the BitString of the packet copy it sends to BFR-C. As a result, BFR-B will forward the packet only towards BFERs 13 and 26, and BFR-C will forward the packet only towards BFER 235. This ensures that each BFER receives only one copy of the packet.

Detailed procedures for forwarding a BIER-encapsulated packet through a BIER domain can be found in Section 6.

With this forwarding procedure, a multicast data packet can follow an optimal path from its BFIR to each of its BFERs. Further, since the set of BFERs for a given packet is explicitly encoded into the BIER header, the packet is not sent to any BFER that does not need to receive it. This allows for optimal forwarding of multicast traffic. This optimal forwarding is achieved without any need for transit BFRs to maintain per-flow state or to run a multicast tree-building protocol.

The idea of encoding the set of egress nodes into the header of a multicast packet is not new. For example, [Boivie\_Feldman] proposes to encode the set of egress nodes as a set of IP addresses, and proposes mechanisms and procedures that are in some ways similar to those described in the current document. However, since BIER encodes each BFR-id as a single bit in a bit string, it can represent up to 128 BFERs in the same number of bits that it would take to carry the IPv6 address of a single BFER. Thus, BIER scales to a much larger number of egress nodes per packet.

BIER does not require that each transit BFR look up the best path to each BFER that is identified in the BIER header; the number of lookups required in the forwarding path for a single packet can be

limited to the number of neighboring BFRs; this can be much smaller than the number of BFERs. See Section 6 (especially Section 6.5) for details.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## 2. The BFR Identifier and BFR-Prefix

Each BFR **MUST** be assigned a single "BFR-prefix" for each sub-domain to which it belongs. A BFR's BFR-prefix **MUST** be an IP address (either IPv4 or IPv6) of the BFR. It is **RECOMMENDED** that the BFR-prefix be a loopback address of the BFR.

If a BFR belongs to more than one sub-domain, it may (though it need not) have a different BFR-prefix in each sub-domain.

All BFR-prefixes used within a given sub-domain **MUST** belong to the same address family (either IPv4 or IPv6).

The BFR-prefix of a given BFR in a given sub-domain **MUST** be routable in that sub-domain. Whether a particular BFR-prefix is routable in a given sub-domain depends on the "routing underlay" associated with that sub-domain. The notion of "routing underlay" is described in Section 4.1.

A "BFR Identifier" (BFR-id) is a number in the range [1,65535]. Within a given sub-domain, every BFR that may need to function as a BFIR or BFER **MUST** have a single BFR-id, which identifies it uniquely within that sub-domain. A BFR that does not need to function as a BFIR or BFER in a given sub-domain does not need to have a BFR-id in that sub-domain.

The value 0 is not a legal BFR-id.

The procedure for assigning a particular BFR-id to a particular BFR is outside the scope of this document. However, it is **RECOMMENDED** that the BFR-ids for each sub-domain be assigned "densely" from the numbering space, as this will result in a more efficient encoding (see Section 3). That is, if there are 256 or fewer BFERs, it is **RECOMMENDED** to assign all the BFR-ids from the range [1,256]. If there are more than 256 BFERs but less than 512, it is **RECOMMENDED** to assign all the BFR-ids from the range [1,512], with as few "holes" as

possible in the earlier range. However, in some deployments, it may be advantageous to depart from this recommendation; this is discussed further in Section 3.

In some deployments, it may not be possible to support (in a given sub-domain) the full range of 65,535 BFR-ids. For example, if the BFRs in a given sub-domain only support 16 SIs and if they only support BitStringLengths of 256 or less, then only  $16 \times 256 = 4,096$  BFR-ids can be supported in that sub-domain.

### 3. Encoding BFR Identifiers in BitStrings

To encode a BFR-id in a BIER data packet, one must convert the BFR-id to an SI and a BitString. This conversion depends upon the parameter we are calling "BitStringLength". The conversion is done as follows. If the BFR-id is  $N$ , then

- o SI is the integer part of the quotient  $(N-1)/\text{BitStringLength}$ .
- o The BitString has one bit position set. If the low-order bit is bit 1 and the high-order bit is bit BitStringLength, the bit position that represents BFR-id  $N$  is  $((N-1) \bmod \text{BitStringLength}) + 1$ .

If several different BFR-ids all resolve to the same SI, then all of those BFR-ids can be represented in a single BitString. The BitStrings for all of those BFR-ids are combined using a bitwise logical OR operation.

Within a given BIER domain (or even within a given BIER sub-domain), different values of BitStringLength may be used. Each BFR MUST be provisioned to know the following:

- o The BitStringLength ("Imposition BitStringLength") and sub-domain ("Imposition sub-domain") to use when it imposes (as a BFIR) a BIER encapsulation on a particular set of packets, and
- o The BitStringLengths ("Disposition BitStringLengths") that it will process when (as a BFR or BFER) it receives packets from a particular sub-domain.

It is not required that a BFIR use the same Imposition BitStringLength or the same Imposition sub-domain for all packets on which it imposes the BIER encapsulation. However, if a particular BFIR is provisioned to use a particular Imposition BitStringLength and a particular Imposition sub-domain when imposing the encapsulation on a given set of packets, all other BFRs with BFR-ids in that sub-domain SHOULD be provisioned to process received BIER



packets with that BitStringLength (i.e., all other BFRs with BFR-ids in that sub-domain SHOULD be provisioned with that BitStringLength as a Disposition BitStringLength for that sub-domain). Exceptions to this rule MAY be made under certain conditions; this is discussed in Section 6.10.

When a BIER encapsulation is specified, the specification MUST define a default BitStringLength for the encapsulation. Every BFIR supporting that encapsulation MUST be capable of being provisioned with that default BitStringLength as its Imposition BitStringLength. Every BFR and BFER supporting that encapsulation MUST be capable of being provisioned with that default BitStringLength as a Disposition BitStringLength.

The specification of a BIER encapsulation MAY also allow the use of other BitStringLengths.

If a BFR is capable of being provisioned with a given value of BitStringLength as an Imposition BitStringLength, it MUST also be capable of being provisioned with that same value as one of its Disposition BitStringLengths. It SHOULD be capable of being provisioned with each legal smaller value of BitStringLength as (a) its Imposition BitStringLength, and (b) one of its Disposition BitStringLengths.

In order to support transition from one BitStringLength to another, every BFR MUST be capable of being provisioned to simultaneously use two different Disposition BitStringLengths.

A BFR MUST support SI values in the range [0,15] and MAY support SI values in the range [0,255]. ("Supporting the values in a given range" means, in this context, that any value in the given range is legal and will be properly interpreted.) Note that for a given BitStringLength, the total number of BFR-ids that can be represented is the product of the BitStringLength and the number of supported SIs. For example, if a deployment uses (in a given sub-domain) a BitStringLength of 64 and supports 256 SIs, that deployment can only support 16384 BFR-ids in that sub-domain. Even a deployment that supports 256 SIs will not be able to support 65,535 BFR-ids unless it uses a BitStringLength of at least 256.

When a BFIR determines that a multicast data packet, assigned to a given sub-domain, needs to be forwarded to a particular set of destination BFERs, the BFIR partitions that set of BFERs into subsets, where each subset contains the target BFERs whose BFR-ids in the given sub-domain all resolve to the same SI. Call these the "SI-subsets" for the packet. Each SI-subset can be represented by a single BitString. The BFIR creates a copy of the packet for each

SI-subset. The BIER encapsulation is then applied to each packet. The encapsulation specifies a single SI for each packet and contains the BitString that represents all the BFR-ids in the corresponding SI-subset. Of course, in order to properly interpret the BitString, it must be possible to infer the sub-domain-id from the encapsulation as well.

Suppose, for example, that a BFIR determines that a given packet needs to be forwarded to three BFERs, whose BFR-ids (in the appropriate sub-domain) are 27, 235, and 497. The BFIR will have to forward two copies of the packet. One copy, associated with SI=0, will have a BitString with bits 27 and 235 set. The other copy, associated with SI=1, will have a BitString with bit 241 set.

In order to minimize the number of copies that must be made of a given multicast packet, it is RECOMMENDED that the BFR-ids used in a given sub-domain be assigned "densely" (see Section 2) from the numbering space. This will minimize the number of SIs that have to be used in that sub-domain. However, depending upon the details of a particular deployment, other assignment methods may be more advantageous. Suppose, for example, that in a certain deployment, every multicast flow is intended either for the "east coast" or for the "west coast", but not for both coasts. In such a deployment, it would be advantageous to assign BFR-ids so that all the "west coast" BFR-ids fall into the same SI-subset and so that all the "east coast" BFR-ids fall into the same SI-subset.

When a BFR receives a BIER data packet, it will infer the SI from the encapsulation. The set of BFERs to which the packet needs to be forwarded can then be inferred from the SI and the BitString.

In some of the examples given later in this document, we will use a BitStringLength of 4 and will represent a BFR-id in the form "SI:xyzw", where SI is the Set Identifier of the BFR-id (assuming a BitStringLength of 4) and xyzw is a string of 4 bits. A BitStringLength of 4 is used only in the examples; we would not expect actual deployments to have such a small BitStringLength.

It is possible that several different forms of BIER encapsulation will be developed. If so, the particular encapsulation that is used in a given deployment will depend on the type of network infrastructure that is used to realize the BIER domain. Details of the BIER encapsulation(s) will be given in companion documents. An encapsulation for use in MPLS networks is described in [MPLS\_BIER\_ENCAPS]; that document also describes a very similar encapsulation that can be used in non-MPLS networks.

## 4. Layering

It is helpful to think of the BIER architecture as consisting of three layers: the "routing underlay", the "BIER layer", and the "multicast flow overlay".

### 4.1. The Routing Underlay

The "routing underlay" establishes "adjacencies" between pairs of BFRs and determines one or more "best paths" from a given BFR to a given set of BFRs. Each such path is a sequence of BFRs  $\langle \text{BFR}(k), \text{BFR}(k+1), \dots, \text{BFR}(k+n) \rangle$  such that  $\text{BFR}(k+j)$  is "adjacent" to  $\text{BFR}(k+j+1)$  (for  $0 \leq j < n$ ).

At a given BFR, say BFR-A, for every IP address that is the address of a BFR in the BIER domain, the routing underlay will map that IP address into a set of one or more "equal-cost" adjacencies. If a BIER data packet has to be forwarded by BFR-A to a given BFER, say BFER-B, the packet will follow the path from BFR-A to BFER-B that is determined by the routing underlay.

It is expected that in a typical deployment, the routing underlay will be the default topology that the Interior Gateway Protocol (IGP), e.g., OSPF, uses for unicast routing. In that case, the underlay adjacencies are just the OSPF adjacencies. A BIER data packet traveling from BFR-A to BFER-B will follow the path that OSPF has selected for unicast traffic from BFR-A to BFER-B.

If one wants to have multicast traffic from BFR-A to BFER-B travel a path that is different from the path used by the unicast traffic from BFR-A to BFER-B, one can use a different underlay. For example, if multi-topology OSPF is being used, one OSPF topology could be used for unicast traffic and the other for multicast traffic. (Each topology would be considered to be a different underlay.) Alternatively, one could deploy a routing underlay that creates a multicast-specific tree of some sort. BIER could then be used to forward multicast data packets along the multicast-specific tree, while unicast packets follow the "ordinary" OSPF best path. (In a case like this, many multicast flows could be traveling along a single tree, and the BitString carried by a particular packet would identify those nodes of the tree that need to receive that packet.) It is even possible to have multiple routing underlays used by BIER, as long as one can infer from a data packet's BIER encapsulation which underlay is being used for that packet.

If multiple routing underlays are used in a single BIER domain, each BIER sub-domain **MUST** be associated with a single routing underlay (though multiple sub-domains may be associated with the same routing underlay). A BFR that belongs to multiple sub-domains **MUST** be provisioned to know which routing underlay is used by each sub-domain. By default (i.e., in the absence of any provisioning to the contrary), each sub-domain uses the default topology of the unicast IGP as the routing underlay.

In scenarios where External BGP (EBGP) is used as the IGP, the underlay adjacencies, by default, are the BGP adjacencies.

Specification of the protocols and procedures of the routing underlay is outside the scope of this document.

#### 4.2. The BIER Layer

The BIER layer consists of the protocols and procedures that are used in order to transmit a multicast data packet across a BIER domain, from its BFIR to its BFERs. This includes the following components:

- o Protocols and procedures that a given BFR uses to advertise, to all other BFRs in the same BIER domain:
  - \* its BFR-prefix;
  - \* its BFR-id in each sub-domain for which it has been provisioned with a BFR-id;
  - \* the set of Disposition BitStringLengths it has been provisioned to use for each sub-domain;
  - \* optionally, information about the routing underlay associated with each sub-domain.
- o The procedures used by a BFIR to impose a BIER header on a multicast data packet.
- o The procedures for forwarding BIER-encapsulated packets and for modifying the BIER header during transit.
- o The procedures used by a BFER to decapsulate a BIER packet and properly dispatch it.

### 4.3. The Multicast Flow Overlay

The "multicast flow overlay" consists of the set of protocols and procedures that enable the following set of functions.

- o When a BFIR receives a multicast data packet from outside the BIER domain, the BFIR must determine the set of BFERs for that packet. This information is provided by the multicast flow overlay.
- o When a BFER receives a BIER-encapsulated packet from inside the BIER domain, the BFER must determine how to further forward the packet. This information is provided by the multicast flow overlay.

For example, suppose the BFIR and BFERs are Provider Edge (PE) routers providing Multicast Virtual Private Network (MVPN) service. The multicast flow overlay consists of the protocols and procedures described in [RFC6513] and [RFC6514]. The MVPN signaling described in those RFCs enables an ingress PE to determine the set of egress PEs for a given multicast flow (or set of flows); it also enables an egress PE to determine the "Virtual Routing and Forwarding Tables" (VRFs) to which multicast packets from the backbone network should be sent. MVPN signaling also has several components that depend on the type of "tunneling technology" used to carry multicast data through the network. Since BIER is, in effect, a new type of "tunneling technology", some extensions to the MVPN signaling are needed in order to properly interface the multicast flow overlay with the BIER layer. These are specified in [BIER\_MVPN].

MVPN is just one example of a multicast flow overlay. Protocols and procedures for other overlays will be provided in companion documents. It is also possible to implement the multicast flow overlay by means of a "Software-Defined Network" (SDN) controller. Specification of the protocols and procedures of the multicast flow overlay is outside the scope of this document.

### 5. Advertising BFR-ids and BFR-Prefixes

As stated in Section 2, each BFER is assigned (by provisioning) a BFR-id (for a given BIER sub-domain). Each BFER must advertise these assignments to all the other BFRs in the domain. Similarly, each BFR is assigned (by provisioning) a BFR-prefix (for a given BIER domain) and must advertise this assignment to all the other BFRs in the domain. Finally, each BFR has been provisioned to use a certain set of Disposition BitStringLengths for each sub-domain and must advertise these to all other BFRs in the domain.

If the BIER domain is also a link-state routing IGP domain (i.e., an OSPF or IS-IS domain), the advertisement of the BFR-prefix, <sub-domain-id, BFR-id>, and BitStringLength can be done using the advertisement capabilities of the IGP. For example, if a BIER domain is also an OSPF domain, these advertisements can be done using the OSPF "Opaque Link State Advertisement" (Opaque LSA) mechanism. Details of the necessary extensions to OSPF and IS-IS will be provided in companion documents. (See [OSPF\_BIER\_EXTENSIONS] and [ISIS\_BIER\_EXTENSIONS].)

If, in a particular deployment, the BIER domain is not an OSPF or IS-IS domain, procedures suitable to the deployment must be used to advertise this information. Details of the necessary procedures will be provided in companion documents. For example, if BGP is the only routing algorithm used in the BIER domain, the procedures of [BGP\_BIER\_EXTENSIONS] may be used.

These advertisements enable each BFR to associate a given <sub-domain-id, BFR-id> with a given BFR-prefix. As will be seen in subsequent sections of this document, knowledge of this association is an important part of the forwarding process.

Since each BFR needs to have a unique (in each sub-domain) BFR-id, two different BFRs will not advertise ownership of the same <sub-domain-id, BFR-id> unless there has been a provisioning error.

- o If BFR-A determines that BFR-B and BFR-C have both advertised the same BFR-id for the same sub-domain, BFR-A MUST log an error. Suppose that the duplicate BFR-id is "N". When BFR-A is functioning as a BFIR, it MUST NOT encode the BFR-id value N in the BIER encapsulation of any packet that has been assigned to the given sub-domain, even if it has determined that the packet needs to be received by BFR-B and/or BFR-C.

This will mean that BFR-B and BFR-C cannot receive multicast traffic at all in the given sub-domain until the provisioning error is fixed. However, that is preferable to having them receive each other's traffic.

- o Suppose that BFR-A has been provisioned with BFR-id N for a particular sub-domain but that it has not yet advertised its ownership of BFR-id N for that sub-domain. Suppose also that it has received an advertisement from a different BFR (say BFR-B) that is advertising ownership of BFR-id N for the same sub-domain. In such a case, BFR-A SHOULD log an error and MUST NOT advertise its own ownership of BFR-id N for that sub-domain as long as the advertisement from BFR-B is extant.

This procedure may prevent the accidental misconfiguration of a new BFR from impacting an existing BFR.

If a BFR advertises that it has a BFR-id of 0 in a particular sub-domain, other BFRs receiving the advertisement **MUST** interpret that advertisement as meaning that the advertising BFR does not have a BFR-id in that sub-domain.

## 6. BIER Intra-Domain Forwarding Procedures

This section specifies the rules for forwarding a BIER-encapsulated data packet within a BIER domain. These rules are not intended to specify an implementation strategy; to conform to this specification, an implementation need only produce the same results that these rules produce.

### 6.1. Overview

This section provides a brief overview of the BIER forwarding procedures. Subsequent subsections specify the procedures in more detail.

To forward a BIER-encapsulated packet:

1. Determine the packet's sub-domain.
2. Determine the packet's BitStringLength and BitString.
3. Determine the packet's SI.
4. From the sub-domain, the SI, and the BitString, determine the set of destination BFERs for the packet.
5. Using information provided by the routing underlay associated with the packet's sub-domain, determine the next-hop adjacency for each of the destination BFERs.
6. It is possible that the packet's BitString will have one or more bits that correspond to BFR-ids that are not in use. It is also possible that the packet's BitString will have one or more bits that correspond to BFERs that are unreachable, i.e., that have no next-hop adjacency. In the following, we will consider the "next-hop adjacency" for all such bit positions to be the "null" next hop.
7. Partition the set of destination BFERs such that all the BFERs in a single partition have the same next hop. We will say that each partition is associated with a next hop.

8. For each partition:
  - a. Make a copy of the packet.
  - b. Clear any bit in the packet's BitString that identifies a BFER that is not in the partition.
  - c. Transmit the packet to the associated next hop. (If the next hop is the null next hop, the packet is discarded.)

If a BFR receives a BIER-encapsulated packet whose <sub-domain, SI, BitString> triple identifies that BFR itself, then the BFR is also a BFER for that packet. As a BFER, it must pass the payload to the multicast flow overlay. If the BitString has bits set for other BFRs, the packet also needs to be forwarded further within the BIER domain. If the BF(E)R also forwards one or more copies of the packet within the BIER domain, the bit representing the BFR's own BFR-id MUST be clear in all the copies.

When BIER on a BFER is to pass a packet to the multicast flow overlay, it of course decapsulates the packet by removing the BIER header. However, it may be necessary to provide the multicast flow overlay with contextual information obtained from the BIER encapsulation. The information that needs to pass between the BIER layer and the multicast flow overlay is specific to the multicast flow overlay. Specification of the interaction between the BIER layer and the multicast flow overlay is outside the scope of this specification.

If the BIER encapsulation contains a "Time to Live" (TTL) value, this value is not, by default, inherited by the payload. If a particular multicast flow overlay needs to know the TTL value, this needs to be specified in whatever specification defines the interaction between BIER and that multicast flow overlay.

If the BIER encapsulation contains a Traffic Class field, a Type of Service field, a Differentiated Services field, or any field of that sort, the value of that field is not, by default, passed to the multicast flow overlay. If a particular multicast flow overlay needs to know the values of such fields, this fact needs to be specified in whatever specification defines the interaction between BIER and that multicast flow overlay.

When BIER on a BFER passes a packet to the multicast flow overlay, the overlay will determine how to further dispatch the packet. If the packet needs to be forwarded into another BIER domain, then the BFR will act as a BFER in one BIER domain and as a BFIR in another.



A BIER-encapsulated packet cannot pass directly from one BIER domain to another; at the boundary between BIER domains, the packet must be decapsulated and passed to the multicast flow overlay.

Note that when a BFR transmits multiple copies of a packet within a BIER domain, only one copy will be destined to any given BFER. Therefore, it is not possible for any BIER-encapsulated packet to be delivered more than once to any BFER.

## 6.2. BFR Neighbors

The "BFR Neighbors" (BFR-NBRs) of a given BFR, say BFR-A, are those BFRs that, according to the routing underlay, are adjacencies of BFR-A. Each BFR-NBR will have a BFR-prefix.

Suppose a BIER-encapsulated packet arrives at BFR-A. From the packet's encapsulation, BFR-A learns (a) the sub-domain of the packet and (b) the BFR-ids (in that sub-domain) of the BFERs to which the packet is destined. Then, using the information advertised per Section 5, BFR-A can find the BFR-prefix of each destination BFER. Given the BFR-prefix of a particular destination BFER, say BFER-D, BFR-A learns from the routing underlay (associated with the packet's sub-domain) an IP address of the BFR that is the next hop on the path from BFR-A to BFER-D. Let's call this next hop "BFR-B". BFR-A must then determine the BFR-prefix of BFR-B. (This determination can be made from the information advertised per Section 5.) This BFR-prefix is the BFR-NBR of BFR-A on the path from BFR-A to BFER-D.

Note that if the routing underlay provides multiple equal-cost paths from BFR-A to BFER-D, BFR-A may have multiple BFR-NBRs for BFER-D.

Under certain circumstances, a BFR may have adjacencies (in a particular routing underlay) that are not BFRs. Please see Section 6.9 for a discussion of how to handle those circumstances.

6.3. The Bit Index Routing Table

The "Bit Index Routing Table" (BIRT) is a table that maps from the BFR-id (in a particular sub-domain) of a BFER to the BFR-prefix of that BFER, and to the BFR-NBR on the path to that BFER. As an example, consider the topology shown in Figure 1. In this diagram, we represent the BFR-id of each BFR in the SI:xyzw form discussed in Section 3.




Figure 1: BIER Topology 1

This topology will result in the BIRT of Figure 2 at BFR-B. The first column shows the BFR-id as a number and also (in parentheses) in the SI:BitString format that corresponds to a BitStringLength of 4. (The actual minimum BitStringLength is 64, but we use 4 in the examples.)

Note that a BIRT is specific to a particular BIER sub-domain.

BFR-id (SI:BitString)	BFR-Prefix of Dest BFER	BFR-NBR
4 (0:1000)	A	A
1 (0:0001)	D	C
3 (0:0100)	E	E
2 (0:0010)	F	C

Figure 2: Bit Index Routing Table at BFR-B

#### 6.4. The Bit Index Forwarding Table

The "Bit Index Forwarding Table" (BIFT) is derived from the BIRT as follows. (Note that a BIFT is specific to a particular sub-domain.)

Suppose that several rows in the BIRT have the same SI and the same BFR-NBR. By taking the logical OR of the BitStrings of those rows, we obtain a bit mask that corresponds to that combination of SI and BFR-NBR. We will refer to this bit mask as the "Forwarding Bit Mask" (F-BM) for that <SI, BFR-NBR> combination.

For example, in Figure 2, we see that two of the rows have the same SI (0) and same BFR-NBR (C). The bit mask that corresponds to <SI=0, BFR-NBR-C> is 0011 ("0001" OR'd with "0010").

The BIFT is used to map from the BFR-id of a BFER to the corresponding F-BM and BFR-NBR. For example, Figure 3 shows the BIFT that is derived from the BIRT of Figure 2. Note that BFR-ids 1 and 2 have the same SI and the same BFR-NBR; hence, they have the same F-BM.

BFR-id (SI:BitString)	F-BM	BFR-NBR
1 (0:0001)	0011	C
2 (0:0010)	0011	C
3 (0:0100)	0100	E
4 (0:1000)	1000	A

Figure 3: Bit Index Forwarding Table

This BIFT is programmed into the data plane and used to forward packets, applying the rules specified below in Section 6.5.

## 6.5. The BIER Forwarding Procedure

Below is the procedure that a BFR uses for forwarding a BIER-encapsulated packet.

1. Determine the packet's SI, BitStringLength, and sub-domain.
2. If the BitString consists entirely of zeroes, discard the packet; the forwarding process has been completed. Otherwise, proceed to step 3.
3. Find the position (call it "k") of the least significant (i.e., of the rightmost) bit that is set in the packet's BitString. (Remember, bits are numbered from 1, starting with the least significant bit.)
4. If bit k identifies the BFR itself, copy the packet, and send the copy to the multicast flow overlay. Then clear bit k in the original packet, and go to step 2. Otherwise, proceed to step 5.
5. Use the value k, together with the SI, sub-domain, and BitStringLength, as the "index" into the BIFT.
6. Extract from the BIFT the F-BM and the BFR-NBR.
7. Copy the packet. Update the copy's BitString by AND'ing it with the F-BM (i.e., `PacketCopy->BitString &= F-BM`). Then forward the copy to the BFR-NBR. (If the BFR-NBR is null, the copy is just discarded.) Note that when a packet is forwarded to a particular BFR-NBR, its BitString identifies only those BFRs that are to be reached via that BFR-NBR.
8. Now update the original packet's BitString by AND'ing it with the INVERSE of the F-BM (i.e., `Packet->BitString &= ~F-BM`). (This clears the bits that identify the BFRs to which a copy of the packet has just been forwarded.) Go to step 2.

This procedure causes the packet to be forwarded to a particular BFR-NBR only once. The number of lookups in the BIFT is the same as the number of BFR-NBRs to which the packet must be forwarded; it is not necessary to do a separate lookup for each destination BFER.

When a packet is sent to a particular BFR-NBR, the BitString is not the only part of the BIER header that needs to be modified. If there is a TTL field in the BIER header, it will need to be decremented. In addition, when either of the encapsulations of [MPLS\_BIER\_ENCAPS] is used, the BIFT-id field is likely to require modification, based on signaling from the BFR-NBR to which the packet is being sent. The

BIFT-id field of an incoming BIER packet implicitly identifies an SI, a sub-domain, and a BitStringLength. If the packet is sent to a particular BFR-NBR, the BIFT-id field must be changed to whatever value that BFR-NBR has advertised for the same SI, sub-domain, and BitStringLength. (If the encapsulation of Section 2.1 of [MPLS\_BIER\_ENCAPS] is used, this is essentially an MPLS label swap operation.)

Suppose it has been decided (by the above rules) to send a packet to a particular BFR-NBR. If that BFR-NBR is connected via multiple parallel interfaces, it may be desirable to apply some form of load balancing. Load-balancing algorithms are outside the scope of this document. However, if the packet's encapsulation contains an entropy field, the entropy field **SHOULD** be respected; two packets with the same value of the entropy field **SHOULD** be sent on the same interface (if possible).

In some cases, the routing underlay may provide multiple equal-cost paths (through different BFR-NBRs) to a given BFER. This is known as "Equal-Cost Multipath" (ECMP). The procedures described in this section must be augmented in order to support load balancing over ECMP. The necessary augmentations can be found in Section 6.7.

In the event that unicast traffic to the BFR-NBR is being sent via a "bypass tunnel" of some sort, the BIER-encapsulated multicast traffic sent to the BFR-NBR **SHOULD** also be sent via that tunnel. This allows any existing "fast reroute" schemes to be applied to multicast traffic as well as to unicast traffic.

Some examples of these forwarding procedures can be found in Section 6.6.

The rules given in this section can be represented by the following pseudocode:

```
void ForwardBitMaskPacket (Packet)
{
    SI=GetPacketSI(Packet);
    Offset=SI*BitStringLength;
    for (Index = GetFirstBitPosition(Packet->BitString); Index ;
        Index = GetNextBitPosition(Packet->BitString, Index)) {
        F-BM = BIFT[Index+Offset]->F-BM;
        if (!F-BM) continue;
        BFR-NBR = BIFT[Index+Offset]->BFR-NBR;
        PacketCopy = Copy(Packet);
        PacketCopy->BitString &= F-BM;
        PacketSend(PacketCopy, BFR-NBR);
        Packet->BitString &= ~F-BM;
    }
}
```

Figure 4: Pseudocode

This pseudocode assumes that, at a given BFER, the BFR-NBR entry corresponding to the BFER's own BFR-id will be the BFER's own BFR-prefix. It also assumes that the corresponding F-BM has only one bit set, the bit representing the BFER itself. In this case, the "PacketSend" function sends the packet to the multicast flow overlay.

This pseudocode also assumes that the F-BM for the null next hop contains a 1 in a given bit position if and only if that bit position corresponds to either an unused BFR-id or an unreachable BFER. When the BFR-NBR is null, the "PacketSend" function discards the packet.

## 6.6. Examples of BIER Forwarding

In this section, we give two examples of BIER forwarding, based on the topology in Figure 1. In these examples, all packets have been assigned to the default sub-domain, all packets have SI=0, and the BitStringLength is 4. Figure 5 shows the BIFT entries for SI=0 only. For compactness, we show the first column of the BIFT, the BFR-id, only as an integer.

BFR-A BIFT				BFR-B BIFT				BFR-C BIFT			
Id	F-BM	NBR		Id	F-BM	NBR		Id	F-BM	NBR	
1	0111	B		1	0011	C		1	0001	D	
2	0111	B		2	0011	C		2	0010	F	
3	0111	B		3	0100	E		3	1100	B	
4	1000	A		4	1000	A		4	1100	B	

Figure 5: BIFTs Used in the Forwarding Examples

### 6.6.1. Example 1

BFR-D, BFR-E, and BFR-F are BFERs. BFR-A is the BFIR. Suppose that BFIR-A has learned from the multicast flow overlay that BFER-D is interested in a given multicast flow. If BFIR-A receives a packet of that flow from outside the BIER domain, BFIR-A applies the BIER encapsulation to the packet. The encapsulation must be such that the SI is zero. The encapsulation also includes a BitString, with just bit 1 set and with all other bits clear (i.e., 0001). This indicates that BFER-D is the only BFER that needs to receive the packet. BFIR-A then follows the procedures of Section 6.5, as follows:

- o Since the packet's BitString is 0001, BFIR-A finds that the first bit in the string is bit 1. Looking at entry 1 in its BIFT, BFR-A determines that the bit mask F-BM is 0111 and the BFR-NBR is BFR-B.
- o BFR-A then makes a copy of the packet and applies the F-BM to the copy: Copy->BitString &= 0111. The copy's BitString is now 0001 (0001 & 0111).
- o The copy is now sent to BFR-B.

- o BFR-A then updates the packet's BitString by applying the inverse of the F-BM:  $\text{Packet} \rightarrow \text{BitString} \ \&= \ \sim \text{F-BM}$ . As a result, the packet's BitString is now 0000 (0001 & 1000).
- o As the packet's BitString is now zero, the forwarding procedure is complete.

When BFR-B receives the multicast packet from BFR-A, it follows the same procedure. The result is that a copy of the packet, with a BitString of 0001, is sent to BFR-C. BFR-C applies the same procedures and, as a result, sends a copy of the packet, with a BitString of 0001, to BFR-D.

At BFR-D, the BIFT entry (not pictured) for BFR-id 1 will specify an F-BM of 0001 and a BFR-NBR of BFR-D itself. This will cause a copy of the packet to be delivered to the multicast flow overlay at BFR-D. The packet's BitString will be set to 0000, and the packet will not be forwarded any further.

#### 6.6.2. Example 2

This example is similar to example 1, except that BFIR-A has learned from the multicast flow overlay that both BFER-D and BFER-E are interested in a given multicast flow. If BFIR-A receives a packet of that flow from outside the BIER domain, BFIR-A applies the BIER encapsulation to the packet. The encapsulation must be such that the SI is zero. The encapsulation also includes a BitString with two bits set: bit 1 is set (as in example 1) to indicate that BFR-D is a BFER for this packet, and bit 3 is set to indicate that BFR-E is a BFER for this packet. That is, the BitString (assuming again a BitStringLength of 4) is 0101. To forward the packet, BFIR-A follows the procedures of Section 6.5, as follows:

- o Since the packet's BitString is 0101, BFIR-A finds that the first bit in the string is bit 1. Looking at entry 1 in its BIFT, BFR-A determines that the bit mask F-BM is 0111 and the BFR-NBR is BFR-B.
- o BFR-A then makes a copy of the packet and applies the F-BM to the copy:  $\text{Copy} \rightarrow \text{BitString} \ \&= \ 0111$ . The copy's BitString is now 0101 (0101 & 0111).
- o The copy is now sent to BFR-B.



- o BFR-A then updates the packet's BitString by applying the inverse of the F-BM:  $\text{Packet} \rightarrow \text{BitString} \oplus \sim \text{F-BM}$ . As a result, the packet's BitString is now 0000 (0101 & 1000).
- o As the packet's BitString is now zero, the forwarding procedure is complete.

When BFR-B receives the multicast packet from BFR-A, it follows the procedure of Section 6.5, as follows:

- o Since the packet's BitString is 0101, BFR-B finds that the first bit in the string is bit 1. Looking at entry 1 in its BIFT, BFR-B determines that the bit mask F-BM is 0011 and the BFR-NBR is BFR-C.
- o BFR-B then makes a copy of the packet and applies the F-BM to the copy:  $\text{Copy} \rightarrow \text{BitString} \oplus 0011$ . The copy's BitString is now 0001 (0101 & 0011).
- o The copy is now sent to BFR-C.
- o BFR-B then updates the packet's BitString by applying the inverse of the F-BM:  $\text{Packet} \rightarrow \text{BitString} \oplus \sim \text{F-BM}$ . As a result, the packet's BitString is now 0100 (0101 & 1100).
- o Now BFR-B finds the next bit in the packet's (modified) BitString. This is bit 3. Looking at entry 3 in its BIFT, BFR-B determines that the F-BM is 0100 and the BFR-NBR is BFR-E.
- o BFR-B then makes a copy of the packet and applies the F-BM to the copy:  $\text{Copy} \rightarrow \text{BitString} \oplus 0100$ . The copy's BitString is now 0100 (0100 & 0100).
- o The copy is now sent to BFR-E.
- o BFR-B then updates the packet's BitString by applying the inverse of the F-BM:  $\text{Packet} \rightarrow \text{BitString} \oplus \sim \text{F-BM}$ . As a result, the packet's BitString is now 0000 (0100 & 1011).
- o As the packet's BitString is now zero, the forwarding procedure is complete.

Thus, BFR-B forwards two copies of the packet. One copy of the packet, with BitString 0001, has now been sent from BFR-B to BFR-C. Following the same procedures, BFR-C will forward the packet to BFER-D.

At BFER-D, the BIFT entry (not pictured) for BFR-id 1 will specify an F-BM of 0001 and a BFR-NBR of BFR-D itself. This will cause a copy of the packet to be delivered to the multicast flow overlay at BFR-D. The packet's BitString will be set to 0000, and the packet will not be forwarded any further.

The other copy of the packet has been sent from BFR-B to BFER-E, with BitString 0100.

At BFER-E, the BIFT entry (not pictured) for BFR-id 3 will specify an F-BM of 0100 and a BFR-NBR of BFR-E itself. This will cause a copy of the packet to be delivered to the multicast flow overlay at BFR-E. The packet's BitString will be set to 0000, and the packet will not be forwarded any further.

## 6.7. Equal-Cost Multipath Forwarding

In many networks, the routing underlay will provide multiple equal-cost paths from a given BFR to a given BFER. When forwarding multicast packets through the network, it can be beneficial to take advantage of this by load-balancing among those paths. This feature is known as "Equal-Cost Multipath (ECMP) forwarding".

BIER supports ECMP forwarding, but the procedures of Section 6.5 must be modified slightly. Two ECMP procedures are defined. In the first (described in Section 6.7.1), the choice among equal-cost paths taken by a given packet from a given BFR to a given BFER depends on (a) routing, (b) the packet's entropy, and (c) the other BFERs to which that packet is destined. In the second (described in Section 6.7.2), the choice depends only upon the packet's entropy.

There are trade-offs between the two forwarding procedures described here. In the procedure of Section 6.7.1, the number of packet replications is minimized. The procedure in Section 6.7.1 also uses less memory in the BFR. In the procedure of Section 6.7.2, the path traveled by a given packet from a given BFR to a given BFER is independent of the other BFERs to which the packet is destined. While the procedures of Section 6.7.2 may cause more replications, they provide a more predictable behavior.

The two procedures described here operate on identical packet formats and will interoperate correctly. However, if deterministic behavior is desired, then all BFRs would need to use the procedure from Section 6.7.2.

## 6.7.1. Non-deterministic ECMP

Figure 6 shows the operation of non-deterministic ECMP in BIER.




Figure 6: Example of Non-deterministic ECMP

In this example, BFR-B has two equal-cost paths to reach BFER-F: one via BFR-C and one via BFR-E. Since the BFR-id of BFER-F is 2, this is reflected in entry 2 of BFR-B's BIFT. Entry 2 shows that BFR-B has a choice of two BFR-NBRs for BFER-B and that a different F-BM is associated with each choice. When BFR-B looks up entry 2 in the BIFT, it can choose either BFR-NBR. However, when following the procedures of Section 6.5, it MUST use the F-BM corresponding to the BFR-NBR that it chooses.

How the choice is made is an implementation matter. However, the usual rules for ECMP apply: packets of a given flow SHOULD NOT be split among two paths, and any entropy field in the packet's encapsulation SHOULD be respected.

Note, however, that by the rules of Section 6.5, any packet destined for both BFER-D and BFER-F will be sent via BFR-C.

### 6.7.2. Deterministic ECMP

With the procedures of Section 6.7.1, where ECMP paths exist, the path a packet takes to reach any particular BFER depends not only on routing and on the packet's entropy but also on the set of other BFERs to which the packet is destined.

For example, consider the following scenario in the network of Figure 6.

- o There is a sequence of packets being transmitted by BFR-A, some of which are destined for both D and F and some of which are destined only for F.
- o All the packets in this sequence have the same entropy value (call it "Q").
- o At BFR-B, when a packet with entropy value Q is forwarded via entry 2 in the BIFT, the packet is sent to E.

Using the forwarding procedure of Section 6.7.1, packets of this sequence that are destined for both D and F are forwarded according to entry 1 in the BIFT and thus will reach F via the path A-B-C-F. However, packets of this sequence that are destined only for F are forwarded according to entry 2 in the BIFT and thus will reach F via the path A-B-E-F.

That procedure minimizes the number of packets transmitted by BFR-B. However, consider the following scenario:

- o Beginning at time  $t_0$ , the multicast flow in question needs to be received ONLY by BFER-F.
- o Beginning at a later time,  $t_1$ , the flow needs to be received by both BFER-D and BFER-F.
- o Beginning at a later time,  $t_2$ , the flow no longer needs to be received by D, but still needs to be received by F.

Then, from  $t_0$  until  $t_1$ , the flow will travel to F via the path A-B-E-F. From  $t_1$  until  $t_2$ , the flow will travel to F via the path A-B-C-F. And from  $t_2$ , the flow will again travel to F via the path A-B-E-F.

The problem is that if D repeatedly joins and leaves the flow, the flow's path from B to F will keep switching. This could cause F to receive packets out of order. It also makes troubleshooting difficult. For example, if there is some problem on the E-F link,

receivers at F will get good service when the flow is also going to D (avoiding the E-F link) but bad service when the flow is not going to D. Since it is hard to know which path is being used at any given time, this may be hard to troubleshoot. Also, it is very difficult to perform a traceroute that is known to follow the path taken by the flow at any given time.

The source of this difficulty is that, in the procedures of Section 6.7.1, the path taken by a particular flow to a particular BFER depends upon whether there are lower-numbered BFERs that are also receiving the flow. Thus, the choice among the ECMP paths is fundamentally non-deterministic.

Deterministic forwarding can be achieved by using multiple BIFTs, such that each row in a BIFT has only one path to each destination but the multiple ECMP paths to any particular destination are spread across the multiple tables. When a BIER-encapsulated packet arrives to be forwarded, the BFR uses a hash of the BIER entropy field to determine which BIFT to use, and then the normal BIER forwarding algorithm (as described in Sections 6.5 and 6.6) is used with the selected BIFT.

As an example, suppose there are two paths to destination X (call them "X1" and "X2") and four paths to destination Y (call them "Y1", "Y2", "Y3", and "Y4"). If there are, say, four BIFTs, one BIFT would have paths X1 and Y1, one would have X1 and Y2, one would have X2 and Y3, and one would have X2 and Y4. If traffic to X is split evenly among these four BIFTs, the traffic will be split evenly between the two paths to X; if traffic to Y is split evenly among these four BIFTs, the traffic will be split evenly between the four paths to Y.

Note that if there are three paths to one destination and four paths to another, 12 BIFTs would be required in order to get even splitting of the load to each of those two destinations. Of course, each BIFT uses some memory, and one might be willing to have less optimal splitting in order to have fewer BIFTs. How that trade-off is made is an implementation or deployment decision.

## 6.8. Prevention of Loops and Duplicates

The BitString in a BIER-encapsulated packet specifies the set of BFERs to which that packet is to be forwarded. When a BIER-encapsulated packet is replicated, no two copies of the packet will ever have a BFER in common. If one of the packet's BFERs forwards the packet further, that BFER will first clear the bit that identifies itself. As a result, duplicate delivery of packets is not possible with BIER.

As long as the routing underlay provides a loop-free path between each pair of BFRs, BIER-encapsulated packets will not loop. Since the BIER layer does not create any paths of its own, there is no need for any BIER-specific loop-prevention techniques beyond the forwarding procedures specified in Section 6.5.

If, at some time, the routing underlay is not providing a loop-free path between BFIR-A and BFER-B, then BIER-encapsulated packets may loop while traveling from BFIR-A to BFER-B. However, such loops will never result in delivery of duplicate packets to BFER-B.

These properties of BIER eliminate the need for the "Reverse Path Forwarding" (RPF) check that is used in conventional IP multicast forwarding.

### 6.9. When Some Nodes Do Not Support BIER

The procedures of Section 6.2 presuppose that, within a given BIER domain, all the nodes adjacent to a given BFR in a given routing underlay are also BFRs. However, it is possible to use BIER even when this is not the case, as long as the ingress and egress nodes are BFRs. In this section, we describe procedures that can be used if the routing underlay is an SPF-based IGP that computes a shortest-path tree from each node to all other nodes in the domain.

At a given BFR, say "BFR-B", start with a copy of the IGP-computed shortest-path tree from BFR-B to each router in the domain. (This tree is computed by the SPF algorithm of the IGP.) Let's call this copy the "BIER-SPF tree rooted at BFR-B". BFR-B then modifies this BIER-SPF tree as follows.

1. BFR-B looks in turn at each of its child nodes on the BIER-SPF tree.
2. If one of the child nodes does not support BIER, BFR-B removes that node from the tree. The child nodes of the node that has just been removed are then re-parented on the tree, so that BFR-B now becomes their parent.
3. BFR-B then continues to look at each of its child nodes, including any nodes that have been re-parented to BFR-B as a result of the previous step.

When all of the child nodes (the original child nodes plus any new ones) have been examined, BFR-B's children on the BIER-SPF tree will all be BFRs.

When the BIFT is constructed, BFR-B's child nodes on the BIER-SPF tree are considered to be the BFR-NBRs. The F-BMs must be computed appropriately, based on the BFR-NBRs.

BFR-B may now have BFR-NBRs that are not "directly connected" to BFR-B via Layer 2. To send a packet to one of these BFR-NBRs, BFR-B will have to send the packet through a unicast tunnel. In an MPLS network, this may be as simple as finding the IGP unicast next hop to the child node and pushing on (above the BIER encapsulation header) an MPLS label that the IGP next hop has bound to an address of the child node. (This assumes that the packet is using an MPLS-based BIER encapsulation, such as the one specified in Section 2.1 of [MPLS\_BIER\_ENCAPS].) Of course, the BIFT-id in the BIER encapsulation header must be the BIFT-id advertised by the child node for the packet's SI, sub-domain, and BitStringLength.

If for some reason the unicast tunnel cannot be an MPLS tunnel, any other kind of tunnel can be used, as long as the encapsulation for that tunnel type has a way of indicating that the payload is a BIER-encapsulated packet.

Note that if a BIER-encapsulated packet is not using an MPLS-based BIER encapsulation, it will not be possible to send it through an MPLS tunnel unless it is known that the tunnel only carries BIER packets; this is because MPLS has no "next protocol type" field. This is not a problem if an MPLS-based BIER encapsulation is used, because in that case the BIER encapsulation begins with an MPLS label that identifies the packet as a BIER-encapsulated packet.

Of course, the above is not meant as an implementation technique, just as a functional description.

While the above description assumes that the routing underlay provides an SPF tree, it may also be applicable to other types of routing underlays.

The technique above can also be used to provide "node protection" (i.e., to provide fast reroute around nodes that are believed to have failed). If BFR-B has a failed BFR-NBR, BFR-B can remove the failed BFR-NBR from the BIER-SPF tree and can then re-parent the child BFR-NBRs of the failed BFR-NBR so that they appear to be BFR-B's own child nodes on the tree (i.e., so that they appear to be BFR-B's BFR-NBRs). The usual BIER forwarding procedures then apply. However, getting the packet from BFR-B to the child nodes of the failed BFR-NBR is a bit more complicated, as it may require using a unicast bypass tunnel to get around the failed node.

A simpler variant of step 2 above would be the following:

If one of the child nodes does not support BIER, BFR-B removes that node from the tree. All BFERs that are reached through that child node are then re-parented on the tree, so that BFR-B now becomes their parent.

This variant is simpler because the set of BFERs that are reached through a particular child node of BFR-B can be determined from the F-BM in the BIFT. However, if this variant is used, the results are less optimal, because packets will be unicast directly from BFR-B to the BFERs that are reachable through the non-BIER child node.

When using a unicast MPLS tunnel to get a packet to a BFR-NBR:

- o The TTL of the MPLS label entry representing the tunnel SHOULD be set to a large value, rather than being copied from the TTL value from the BIER encapsulation header, and
- o When the tunnel labels are popped off, the TTL from the tunnel labels SHOULD NOT be copied to the BIER encapsulation header.

In other words, the TTL processing for the tunnel SHOULD be as specified in [RFC3443] for "Pipe Model" and "Short Pipe Model" Label Switched Paths (LSPs). The same principle applies if the tunnels are not MPLS tunnels; the BIER packet SHOULD NOT inherit the TTL from the tunnel encapsulation. That way, the TTL of the BIER encapsulation header constrains only the number of BFRs that the packet may traverse, not the total number of hops.

If two BIER packets have the same value in the entropy field of their respective BIER headers and if both are transmitted through a given tunnel, it is desirable for the tunnel encapsulation to preserve the fact that the two packets have the same entropy.

The material in this section presupposes that if a given router is a BFR, then it supports BIER on all its interfaces. It is, however, possible that a router will have some line cards that support BIER and some that do not. In such a case, one can think of the router as a "partial BFR" that supports BIER only on some of its interfaces. If it is desired to deploy such partial BFRs, one can use the multi-topology features of the IGP to set up a BIER-specific topology. This topology would exclude all the non-BIER-capable interfaces that attach to BFRs. BIER would then have to be run in a sub-domain that is bound to this topology. If unicast tunnels are used to bypass non-BFRs, either (a) the tunnels have to be restricted to this topology or (b) the tunnel endpoints have to be BFRs that do not have any non-BIER-capable interfaces.



## 6.10. Use of Different BitStringLengths within a Domain

The procedures of this section apply only when the same encapsulation is used throughout the BIER domain. Consideration of the scenario where both multiple encapsulations and multiple BitStringLengths are used in a given BIER domain is outside the scope of this document.

It is possible for different BFRs within a BIER domain to be using different Imposition and/or Disposition BitStringLengths. As stated in Section 3:

"if a particular BFIR is provisioned to use a particular Imposition BitStringLength and a particular Imposition sub-domain when imposing the encapsulation on a given set of packets, all other BFRs with BFR-ids in that sub-domain SHOULD be provisioned to process received BIER packets with that BitStringLength (i.e., all other BFRs with BFR-ids in that sub-domain SHOULD be provisioned with that BitStringLength as a Disposition BitStringLength for that sub-domain)."

Note that mis-provisioning can result in "black holes". If a BFIR creates a BIER packet with a particular BitStringLength and if that packet needs to travel through a BFR that cannot process received BIER packets with that BitStringLength, then it may be impossible to forward the packet to all of the BFRs identified in its BIER header. Section 6.10.1 defines a procedure, the "BitStringLength Compatibility Check", that can be used to detect the possibility of such black holes.

However, failure of the BitStringLength Compatibility Check does not necessarily result in the creation of black holes; Section 6.10.2 specifies OPTIONAL procedures that allow BIER forwarding to proceed without black holes, even if the BitStringLength Compatibility Check fails.

If the procedures of Section 6.10.2 are not deployed but the BitStringLength Compatibility Check fails at some BFIR, the BFIR has two choices:

- o Create BIER packets with the provisioned Imposition BitStringLength, even though the packets may not be able to reach all the BFRs identified in their BitStrings.
- o Use an Imposition BitStringLength that passes the Compatibility Check (assuming that there is one), even if this is not the provisioned Imposition BitStringLength.

Section 6.10.1 discusses the implications of making one or the other of these choices.

There will be times when an operator wishes to change the BitStringLengths used in a particular BIER domain. Section 6.10.3 specifies a simple procedure that can be used to transition a BIER domain from one BitStringLength to another.

#### 6.10.1. BitStringLength Compatibility Check

When a BFIR needs to encapsulate a packet, the BFIR first assigns the packet to a sub-domain. The BFIR then chooses an Imposition BitStringLength L for the packet. The choice of Imposition BitStringLength is determined by provisioning. However, the BFIR should also perform the BitStringLength Compatibility Check defined below.

The combination of sub-domain S and Imposition BitStringLength L passes the BitStringLength Compatibility Check if and only if the following condition holds:

Every BFR that has advertised its membership in sub-domain S has also advertised that it is using Disposition BitStringLength L (and possibly other BitStringLengths as well) in that sub-domain. (If MPLS encapsulation (Section 2.1 of [MPLS\_BIER\_ENCAPS]) is being used, this means that every BFR that is advertising a label for sub-domain S is advertising a label for the combination of sub-domain S and Disposition BitStringLength L.)

If a BFIR has been provisioned to use a particular Imposition BitStringLength and a particular sub-domain for some set of packets, and if that combination of Imposition BitStringLength and sub-domain does not pass the BitStringLength Compatibility Check, the BFIR SHOULD log this fact as an error. It then has the following two choices about what to do with the packets:

1. The BFIR MAY use the provisioned Imposition BitStringLength anyway. If the procedure of either option 2 or option 3 of Section 6.10.2 is deployed, this will not cause black holes and may actually be the optimal result. It should be understood, though, that the BFIR cannot determine by signaling whether those procedures have been deployed.
2. If the BFIR is capable of using an Imposition BitStringLength that does pass the BitStringLength Compatibility Check for the particular sub-domain, the BFIR MAY use that Imposition BitStringLength instead.

Which of these two choices to make is itself determined by provisioning.

Note that discarding the packets is not one of the allowable choices. Suppose, for example, that all the BFIRs are provisioned to use Imposition BitStringLength L for a particular sub-domain S but one BFR has not been provisioned to use Disposition BitStringLength L for sub-domain S. This will cause the BitStringLength Compatibility Check to fail. If the BFIR sends packets with BitStringLength L and sub-domain S, the mis-provisioned BFR will not be able to forward those packets, and thus the packets may only be able to reach a subset of the BFERs to which they are destined. However, this is still better than having the BFIRs drop the packets; if the BFIRs discard the packets, the packets won't reach any of the BFERs to which they are destined at all.

If the procedures of Section 6.10.2 have not been deployed, choice 2 above might seem like a better option. However, there might not be any Imposition BitStringLength that a given BFIR can use that also passes the BitStringLength Compatibility Check. If it is desired to use choice 2 in a particular deployment, then there should be a "Fallback Disposition BitStringLength" (call it "F") such that:

- o Every BFR advertises that it uses BitStringLength F as a Disposition BitStringLength for every sub-domain, and
- o If a BFIR is provisioned to use Imposition BitStringLength X and Imposition sub-domain S for a certain class of packets but the BitStringLength Compatibility Check fails for the combination of BitStringLength X and sub-domain S, then the BFIR will fall back to using BitStringLength F as the Imposition BitStringLength whenever the Imposition sub-domain is S.

It is RECOMMENDED that the value of F be the default BitStringLength for the encapsulation being used.

### 6.10.2. Handling BitStringLength Mismatches

Suppose that a packet has been BIER-encapsulated with a BitStringLength value of X and that the packet has arrived at BFR-A. Now suppose that according to the routing underlay the next hop is BFR-B, but BFR-B is not using X as one of its Disposition BitStringLengths. What should BFR-A do with the packet? BFR-A has three options. It MUST do one of the three, but the choice of which procedure to follow is a local matter. The three options are:

1. BFR-A MAY discard the packet.
2. BFR-A MAY re-encapsulate the packet, using a BIER header whose BitStringLength value is supported by BFR-B.

Note that if BFR-B only uses Disposition BitStringLength values that are smaller than the BitStringLength value of the packet, this may require creating additional copies of the packet. Whether additional copies actually have to be created depends upon the bits that are actually set in the original packet's BitString.

3. BFR-A MAY treat BFR-B as if BFR-B did not support BIER at all, in which case BFR-A applies the rules of Section 6.9.

Note that there is no signaling that enables a BFR to advertise which of the three options it will use.

Option 2 can be useful if there is a region of the BIER domain where the BFRs are capable of using a long BitStringLength as well as a region where the BFRs are only capable of using a shorter BitStringLength.

### 6.10.3. Transitioning from One BitStringLength to Another

Suppose one wants to migrate the BitStringLength used in a particular BIER domain from one value (X) to another value (Y). The following migration procedure can be used. This procedure allows the BFRs to be reprovisioned one at a time and does not require a "flag day".

1. Upgrade all the BFRs in the domain so that they use both value X and value Y as their Disposition BitStringLengths.
2. Reprovision the BFRs so that they use BitStringLength value Y as the Imposition BitStringLength.
3. One may then optionally reprovision all the BFRs so that they no longer use Disposition BitStringLength X.

## 7. Operational Considerations

BIER offers a radical simplification over current IP multicast operations: no tree-building control plane, no per-flow forwarding state, no Reverse Path Forwarding (RPF), no Rendezvous Point (RP), etc. BIER packet forwarding/replication is along the unicast paths to each bit position set in the packet, ensuring that the encapsulated multicast packets follow the same path as unicast to each set bit in the header. The BIER FIB can be derived from the SPF-calculated unicast FIB or from any other forwarding-path calculation in or out of band. Each bit will follow this unicast path from the entry point of the BIER domain to the edge device with that assigned bit.

Due to these differences, operational expectations from traditional multicast solutions do not apply to a BIER domain. There is no granular per-flow state at each node defining a tree. Monitoring flows at the forwarding-plane level ((S,G) entries) is not provided in a BIER node. BIER FIB packet counters may be maintained for BFR-ids or next-hop neighbors. Any flow-based metrics will require deeper packet inspection; this topic is outside the scope of this document. In this way, BIER is again more like unicast.

It is this reduction in state that allows for one of the key operational benefits of BIER: deterministic convergence. The BIER FIB can converge immediately after the unicast FIB regardless of how many multicast flows are transiting the links. Careful monitoring of (S,G) utilization is not required within a BIER domain.

### 7.1. Configuration

A BIER domain requires that each edge node (BFER) be given a unique bit position in the BIER mask (BFR-id). The BFR-id must be configured on each BFER and associated with a unique IP address of that BFER. Any existing manual or automated configuration tools must provide access to BIER-specific configuration. The association of the BFR-id with a unique address of the BFER to which it is assigned must also be advertised into the IGP of the BIER domain. This may be implied from the BIER configuration or require IGP-specific configuration. This document does not dictate any specific configuration methodology.

## 8. IANA Considerations

This document does not require any IANA actions.

## 9. Security Considerations

When BIER is paired with a particular multicast flow overlay, it inherits the security considerations of that layer. Similarly, when BIER is paired with a particular routing underlay, it inherits the security considerations of that layer.

If the BIER encapsulation of a particular packet specifies an SI or a BitString other than the one intended by the BFIR, the packet is likely to be misdelivered. If the BIER encapsulation of a packet is modified (through error or malfeasance) in a way other than that specified in this document, the packet may be misdelivered. Some modifications of the BIER encapsulation, e.g., setting every bit in the BitString, may result in (intentional or unintentional) denial-of-service (DoS) attacks.

If a BFIR is compromised, it may impose a BIER encapsulation with all the bits in the BitString set; this would also result in a DoS attack.

Every BFR MUST be provisioned to know which of its interfaces lead to a BIER domain and which do not. BIER-encapsulated packets MUST NOT be accepted from outside the BIER domain. (Reception of BIER-encapsulated packets from outside the BIER domain would create an attack vector for DoS attacks, as an attacker might set all the bits in the BitString.)

If two interfaces lead to different BIER domains, the BFR MUST be provisioned to know that those two interfaces lead to different BIER domains. If the provisioning is not correct, BIER-encapsulated packets from one BIER domain may "leak" into another; this is likely to result in misdelivery of packets.

DoS attacks may also result from incorrect provisioning (through error or malfeasance) of the BFRs.

If the procedures used for advertising BFR-ids and BFR-prefixes are not secure, an attack on those procedures may result in incorrect delivery of BIER-encapsulated packets.

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3443] Agarwal, P. and B. Akyol, "Time To Live (TTL) Processing in Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Networks", RFC 3443, DOI 10.17487/RFC3443, January 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3443>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

### 10.2. Informative References

- [BGP\_BIER\_EXTENSIONS]  
Xu, X., Ed., Chen, M., Patel, K., Wijnands, IJ., and A. Przygienda, "BGP Extensions for BIER", Work in Progress, draft-ietf-bier-idr-extensions-03, August 2017.
- [BIER\_MVPN]  
Rosen, E., Ed., Sivakumar, M., Aldrin, S., Dolganow, A., and T. Przygienda, "Multicast VPN Using BIER", Work in Progress, draft-ietf-bier-mvpn-09, November 2017.
- [Boivie\_Feldman]  
Boivie, R. and N. Feldman, "Small Group Multicast", Work in Progress, draft-boivie-sgm-02, February 2001.
- [ISIS\_BIER\_EXTENSIONS]  
Ginsberg, L., Ed., Przygienda, A., Aldrin, S., and J. Zhang, "BIER Support via ISIS", Work in Progress, draft-ietf-bier-isis-extensions-06, October 2017.
- [MPLS\_BIER\_ENCAPS]  
Wijnands, IJ., Ed., Rosen, E., Ed., Dolganow, A., Tantsura, J., Aldrin, S., and I. Meilik, "Encapsulation for Bit Index Explicit Replication in MPLS and non-MPLS Networks", Work in Progress, draft-ietf-bier-mpls-encapsulation-12, October 2017.

**[OSPF\_BIER\_EXTENSIONS]**

Psenak, P., Ed., Kumar, N., Wijnands, IJ., Dolganow, A., Przygienda, T., Zhang, J., and S. Aldrin, "OSPF Extensions for BIER", Work in Progress, draft-ietf-bier-ospf-bier-extensions-09, October 2017.

**[RFC6513]** Rosen, E., Ed., and R. Aggarwal, Ed., "Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP VPNs", RFC 6513, DOI 10.17487/RFC6513, February 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6513>>.

**[RFC6514]** Aggarwal, R., Rosen, E., Morin, T., and Y. Rekhter, "BGP Encodings and Procedures for Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP VPNs", RFC 6514, DOI 10.17487/RFC6514, February 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6514>>.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to thank Rajiv Asati, Alia Atlas, John Bettink, Ross Callon (who contributed much of the text on deterministic ECMP), Nagendra Kumar, Christian Martin, Neale Ranns, Albert Tian, Ramji Vaithianathan, Xiaohu Xu, and Jeffrey Zhang for their ideas and contributions to this work.

The authors also wish to thank Sue Hares, Victor Kuarsingh, and Dan Romascanu for their reviews of this document.



## Contributors

The following people contributed significantly to the content of this document and should be considered co-authors:

Gregory Cauchie  
Bouygues Telecom  
Email: gcauchie@bouyguestelecom.fr

Mach(Guoyi) Chen  
Huawei  
Email: mach.chen@huawei.com

Arkadiy Gulko  
Thomson Reuters  
195 Broadway  
New York, NY 10007  
United States of America  
Email: arkadiy.gulko@thomsonreuters.com

Wim Henderickx  
Nokia  
Copernicuslaan 50  
Antwerp 2018  
Belgium  
Email: wim.henderickx@nokia.com

Martin Horneffer  
Deutsche Telekom  
Hammer Str. 216-226  
Muenster 48153  
Germany  
Email: Martin.Horneffer@telekom.de

Luay Jalil  
Verizon  
1201 East Arapaho Rd.  
Richardson, TX 75081  
United States of America  
Email: luay.jalil@verizon.com

Uwe Joorde  
Deutsche Telekom  
Hammer Str. 216-226  
Muenster D-48153  
Germany  
Email: Uwe.Joorde@telekom.de

Greg Shepherd  
Cisco Systems  
170 West Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134  
United States of America  
Email: [shep@cisco.com](mailto:shep@cisco.com)

Jeff Tantsura  
Email: [jefftant.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:jefftant.ietf@gmail.com)

**Authors' Addresses**

IJsbrand Wijnands (editor)  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
De Kleetlaan 6a  
Diegem 1831  
Belgium

Email: [ice@cisco.com](mailto:ice@cisco.com)

Eric C. Rosen (editor)  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
10 Technology Park Drive  
Westford, Massachusetts 01886  
United States of America

Email: [erosen@juniper.net](mailto:erosen@juniper.net)

Andrew Dolganow  
Nokia  
438B Alexandra Rd #08-07/10  
Alexandra Technopark  
Singapore 119968  
Singapore

Email: [andrew.dolganow@nokia.com](mailto:andrew.dolganow@nokia.com)

Tony Przygienda  
Juniper Networks, Inc.  
1194 N. Mathilda Ave.  
Sunnyvale, California 94089  
United States of America

Email: [prz@juniper.net](mailto:prz@juniper.net)

Sam K. Aldrin  
Google, Inc.  
1600 Amphitheatre Parkway  
Mountain View, California 94043  
United States of America

Email: [aldrin.ietf@gmail.com](mailto:aldrin.ietf@gmail.com)