

LSP Ping for SR-MPLS Path Segment

draft-ietf-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-path-sid-02

Xiao Min	ZTE Corporation
Shaofu Peng	ZTE Corporation
Liyan Gong	China Mobile
Rakesh Gandhi	Cisco Systems, Inc.
Carlos Pignataro	North Carolina State University

Path Segment Definition

- As specified in RFC 9545, SR-MPLS Path Segment is:
 - To uniquely identify an SR path on the egress node of the path
 - To be a single label that is assigned from the SRLB of the egress node of an SR path
 - To be learned by only the egress node and the ingress node of the associated path. The intermediate nodes of this path will not learn it

Recap of this draft

- This draft defines three LSP Ping Target FEC Stack sub-TLVs for Path Segment:
 - SR Policy's PSID sub-TLV
 - SR Candidate Path's PSID sub-TLV
 - SR Segment List's PSID sub-TLV
- Three Target FEC Stack sub-TLVs are mutual exclusive and they wouldn't be present in one LSP Ping message simultaneously

What's addressed during and after WGLC?

- To draft-ietf-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-path-sid:

<https://author-tools.ietf.org/iddiff?url1=draft-ietf-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-path-sid-01&url2=draft-ietf-mpls-spring-lsp-ping-path-sid-02&difftype=--html>

- To draft-ietf-pce-sr-path-segment:

<https://author-tools.ietf.org/iddiff?url1=draft-ietf-pce-sr-path-segment-10&url2=draft-ietf-pce-sr-path-segment-12&difftype=--html>

- To draft-ietf-idr-sr-policy-path-segment:

Ketan has provided some clarifications on the mailing list.

<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/mpls/ecrh5pTYeoQYoqcTaJ6yKkSVHQ0/>

<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/mpls/OhD6PsSVpPSgY1ViYv8pyXRWh1A/>

What's still not addressed?

- To the authors:
 - It seems that all the requested clarifications on PCEP and BGP have been provided
 - It's NOT preferred to escalate the references to PCEP and BGP drafts
 - Would make all the changes (if any) proposed and agreed by the WG

Next step

- Sent to IESG?

Thank you!