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Comments and Resolution I

- Comments from Acee Lindem, Rakesh Ghandi, and Tom Petch
- Issues identified and still outstanding:
  - Scope:
    - Current base specification is RFC 8029, the original specification at the time of the start of this work was RFC 4379. Missing or need review FECs:
      - Nil FEC
      - LDP
      - FEC 128 Pseudowire IPv4 (Current)
      - FEC 128 Pseudowire IPv6 (Current)
      - FEC 129 Pseudowire IPv4
      - FEC 129 Pseudowire IPv6
    - Also, additional extensions to LSP Ping were published in the meantime that may be considered to be added to the scope of the MPLS LSP Ping YANG data model:
      - RFC 6425 LSP Ping over p2mp MPLS LSP
      - RFC 8287 LSP Ping over Segment Routing in MPLS Data Plane
  - Handling of the test results:
    - In case of repeating the named test;
    - In case of removing the named configuration;
    - Add RPC to clear the test results of the named LSP ping test.
  - References to RFC 8029 are absent
Comments and Resolution II

- Identified issues being already addressed:
  - Replace "scheduling-parameters" rather than "schedule-parameters"
  - Remove source-address-type as ip-address type implicitly defines the address family
  - Unclear attribution of sum-of-squares. Clarified:
    description "The sum of the squares of RTT, calculated as the sum of the squared differences between each RTT and the overall mean RTT, for all replies received."
  - Use tunnel name for tunnel_interface, remove optional reference by the tunnel index (uint32)
  - Clarified measurement units (usec) for min-rtt, max-rtt, average-rtt
  - Indents
  - Typos
  - Grammar (to some extent)
Priorities

• References to RFC 8029 in the existing target-fec (IPv4/IPv6, BGP, RSVP, VPN, L2 VPN Endpoint)
• Add FEC Types to match the model with RFC 8029
• Add the suggested RPC to clear the named test measurement results
• Expand the scope beyond RFC 8029
Next steps

• Agree on the plan
• Execute the plan