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Update from last version

• Presented in IETF#106 and #108 and comments on the mailing list are appreciated from:
  • Stephane Litkowski / Dhruv Dhody / Tarek Saad / Zhenbin Li / Jeff Tantsura

• Change for LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV
  • LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV has been moved into draft-ietf-pce-lsp-extended-flags-00.
  • This document uses a flag from LSP extended flags field in LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV.

• Clarification for the MSD and ERLD limitation and the requirements in PCE scenario
  • As described in RFC8662, the ingress node may not find the minimum ERLD along the path and does not support the computation of the minimum ERLD.
  • Especially in case of inter-domain scenario, PCE would be useful for computing the minimum ERLD and the position of entropy labels as well as SR paths.

• Clarification for ingress capability
  • As defined in RFC8662, multiple <ELI, EL> pairs MAY be inserted in the SR-MPLS label stack.
  • The ingress MAY be required to support the capability of inserting multiple ELI/ELs and it need to be advertised in OPEN message from PCC to PCE.
  • The E (ELP) bit is used to indicate the capability of inserting multiple ELI/EL pairs at PCC and support the SR path with ELP from PCE.

• Clarification for the ELI/ELs positions calculated for a SR-Path
  • The ELI/ELs positions is calculated at PCE for a SR-Path and the values is calculated at PCC for a specific traffic flow.
Overview

- RFC8662 proposes to apply the entropy labels to SR-MPLS networks and provides following criteria to determine the best ELI/ELs placement:
  - a limited number of <ELI, EL> pairs SHOULD be inserted in the SR-MPLS label stack;
  - the inserted positions SHOULD be within the Entropy Readable Label Depth (ERLD) of a maximize number of transit LSRs;
  - a minimum number of <ELI, EL> pairs SHOULD be inserted while satisfying the above criteria.

- As described in RFC8662, the ingress may not find the minimum ERLD along the path and does not support the computation of the minimum ERLD.

- The controller (e.g. PCE) MAY perform the end-to-end path computation as well as Entropy Label Position (ELP) including the number and the place of the ELI/ELs based on the minimum ERLD of each segment along the path especially in inter-domain scenarios.
PCEP Extensions

• **SR-PCE-CAPABILITY** sub-TLV in Open Object
  
  • E bit is set to 1.
  
  • indicates that it supports the SR path computation with ELP configuration.
  
  • indicates that it supports the capability of inserting multiple ELI/EL pairs at PCC.

• **LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG** TLV in LSP Object
  
  • E bit is set to 1.
  
  • indicates that the PCC requests PCE to compute the SR path with ELP information.

---

**Figure 2:** E-flag in SR-PCE-CAPABILITY sub-TLV

---

**Figure 3:** E-flag in LSP-EXTENDED-FLAG TLV
PCEP Extensions

- **PATH-MINIMUM-ERLD TLV in LSP Object**
  - Path Minimum ERLD: indicates the minimum ERLD value of the nodes along the path.

- **SR-ERO Subobject**
  - E bit is set to 1.
  - indicates that the position after this SR-ERO subobject is the position to insert `<ELI, EL>`, otherwise it cannot insert `<ELI, EL>` after this segment.

![Figure 4: The PATH-MINIMUM-ERLD TLV](image1)

![Figure 5: E-flag in SR-ERO subobject](image2)
Next Step

• This document has been discussed many times in details at the meetings and on the mailing list.

• Thanks for all your comments and suggestions!

• Ready for adoption!
Thank you!