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Summary of changes from v18 (WG LC)

• Addressed WG LC comments received from Chaode, Dhruv and Tom Petch
  • Clarified it augments RPC defined in draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-32
  • Resolved WG LC comments on SVEC OFs
  • Aligned JSON examples with those in draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-32
• Aligned with draft-ietf-teas-rfc8776-update-06 and draft-ietf-teas-yang-te-33
  • Renamed te-types:tunnel-actions-type with te-types:tunnel-action-type to align with the changes in tsaad-dev/te#198
  • Removed co-routed leaf from secondary-path in alignment with the changes in tsaad-dev/te@008cd7b
  • Added preference for the secondary-reverse-path: fix #112
  • Associated forward and reverse co-routed secondary paths: fix #117
• Addressed post-WG LC comment
  • Added compute-priority leaf: fix tsaad-dev/te#226
  • Additional security considerations
• Editorial clean-up
  • Updated authors' list: fix #121
  • Updated the reference to RFC8776-bis: fix #123
  • Folded YANG tree diagram: fix #119
Added compute-priority leaf

- Path computation can be different depending on the order of the request
  - e.g. because of remaining bandwidth for which one order can be feasible for one request and not feasible changing the order.

- Orange (Esther Lerouzic) asked for the introduction of an “index” in the unordered list of request

- You could avoid to add an index ordering by user but that would dictate order by user all the time

- Following the PCEP proposal it was decided:
  - to add a “priority” leaf (see Section 7.4.1 of RFC5440: Path Computation Element (PCE) Communication Protocol (PCEP))
  - To add a “feature” “compute-priority” indicating the server supports path computation request’s priority

```
augment /te:tunnels-path-compute/te:input/te:path-compute-info:
  +-- path-request* [request-id]
  |   +-- request-id uint32
  |   +-- compute-priority? uint8
  |   |   {compute-priority}?
```
Additional Security consideration

• We got a comment from one of the contributors (C. Perocchio (Ericsson)) related to section 10.7.2 of RFC5440
  • The usage of “priority” attribute does not protect against DoS since the attacker could set all the request to the same highest priority.
  • A shaping-policing mechanism should be considered in the implementation

• We added text in the security section:
  “The RPC defined in this document can also be used for Denial-of-service (DoS) attacks. The security considerations defined in section 10.7.2 of [RFC5440] also applies to the use of this RPC.

  The definition of the input shaping/policing mechanisms and of their configuration is outside the scope of this document.”
Next steps

• All WG LC comments have been addressed
• No pending open issues are left
• We think the draft is now ready for a 2nd WG LC
  • Suggested to be joint with te-tunnel and te-types to keep alignment