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• With collecting COAM Reply1, COAM Reply2, COAM Reply3 and COAM Reply4, the path of the chain: SF1->SF2->SF3->SF4 is confirmed.
Update from -01

• Comments received from last meeting
  • How SFF with multiple SFs responds to COAM Request

• Update the format of Service Function information sub-TLV
  • Add SPI field
  • Re-organized the location of other fields
Update from -01 (cont.)

• Add a new section about how to construct a SF Information Sub-TLV, consider the multiple SFs attached to one SFF.

• Multiple SFs as hops of SFP
  • Multiple SFs attached to one SFF are the several hops of the SFP, the service indexes of these SFs are different:
    • Service function types of these SFs could be different or be same.
    • All these SFs information are included in one COAM Reply message, every SF information should be listed as separate SF information sub-TLVs in COAM Reply message.
Update from -01 (cont.)

• Multiple SFs for load balance
  • Multiple SFs are attached to one SFF for load balance, that means only one SF will be transited by the particular traffic flow:
    • These SFs have the same Service Function Type, Service Index.
    • The SF identifiers of all these SFs will be listed in the SF Identifiers field in a single SF information sub-TLV of COAM Reply message.
    • The number of these SFs can be calculated according to SF ID Type and the value of Length field of the sub-TLV.
Open issues

• SF ID Type: for SF instances for load balance, are they have same SF ID type?
  • In current draft, we assume they are same.

• COAM is for SFP or RSP?
  • In current draft, we suggest add all the SFs belonging to the load balance group into the SF Identifiers list.
Next Steps

• Comments/feedback/contribution always welcome and greatly appreciated
• WG adoption?