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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 -03

- Mainly focus on the consideration of Load Balance with multiple SFs
- Change “SF Information TLV” to “SFF Information Record TLV”
  - SFF MUST include the Information of SFs into the SF Information Record TLV in the COAM Reply message.

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFF Record TLV Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Path Identifier(SPI)</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Information Sub-TLV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

- Re-organize the SF Information TLV

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF sub-TLV Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Index</td>
<td>SF Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF Identifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Note: SF ID Type and SF Identifier may be a list
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Update from -03 (Cont’)

- Two examples provided, and it is confirmed that
  - Multiple SFs as hops of SFP: Information about each SF MUST be listed as separate SF Information Sub-TLVs in the COAM Reply message, *if these SFs are the hops of the SFP.*

```
COAM Req .......> SF1 .......> SF2 .......> SF3
(SPI=x)          .           .           .
<.............  <.............  <.............
  COAM Reply1(SF1, SF2)  COAM Reply2(SF3)  COAM Reply3(SF3)
```

- Multiple SFs for load balance: SF identifiers and SF ID Type of all these SFs MUST be listed in the SF Identifiers field and SF ID Type in a single SF information sub-TLV, *if these SFs are for load balance.*

```
COAM Req .......> SF1 .......> SF2
(SPI=x)          .           .
<.............  <.............
  COAM Reply1(SF1a, SF1b)  COAM Reply2(SF2a, SF2b)
```
Request WG adoption?

• We have presented the draft 4 times in previous meetings.
• We have updated it according to the comments from the meeting and the mail list.
• We think it is ready for WG adoption.
• Any comments, questions are always welcome and greatly appreciated.