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Abstract and Introduction

- FEC validation
  - Is it always possible?
- NIL FEC
  - Is current standard sufficient?
- Egress TLV
  - Extension to existing NIL FEC
  - Help to valid the path egress
Procedure

• Elaborated the example with diagram
• Minor changes while processing on receiving EGRESS TLV
Review comments

• Can draft-nainar-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-sr-generic-sid-04 and current draft merge together?
  • draft-nainar-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-sr-generic-sid-04
    • new sub-TLV is to validate the instruction associated with any SID.
  • EGRESS TLV
    • extension to NIL FEC only for path egress validation for NIL FEC.

• Conclusion
  • Both drafts are for different purpose.
  • Authors decided to keep it separate.
Review comments

- Number of labels and FEC should be same?
  - RFC 8029 doesn’t say it should always be same.
  - Section 3.2.17 defined NIL FEC
  - Section 4.4.1. explains FEC Validation when outer-most FEC is NIL FEC
  - Section 4.5.2. explains NIL FEC when Transition between Tunnels

- Conclusion
  - The draft is for addition of EGRESS TLV as extension to NIL FEC for path egress validation.
  - NIL FEC processing will be same as defined in RFC 8029.
Review comments

• How EGRESS TLV prefix derived?
• EGRESS TLV prefix
  • derived from path egress/destination
  • not based on SIDs
Next Steps

- Request review and comments
- Request WG adoption
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