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Content of the document (reminder)

- Policy based LFA selection (§3.2):
  - Tie-breakers for selecting the LFA are not flexible enough to accommodate for all cases.
  - Calling for a policy based LFA selection, controlled by the SP according to local constraints.
  - Based on multiple criterions with a default but customized relative order of preference.
  - Applied per protected interface or set of destinations.

- Operational aspects:
  - Providing coverage informations
  - Manual shutdown of a link
  - ISIS Overload bit management (NEW)
What’s new in V1 ?

- Added issue with ISIS OL bit management:

  - We consider traffic from PE3 to PE2
  - PE1 does NOT satisfy Equation 1: $100 < 45 + 45$
  - **BUT** PE1 should be considered as LFA because it cannot use PE3 as transit thanks to overload bit

Overload bit status of computing node **SHOULD** be taken into account while performing LFA computation

OL permanently set on PE3 to enforce routing policy
What has been changed in V1?

- We took into account all the comments, mainly:

  - Reduced set of new criterions, focus on:
    - Link coloring
    - Bandwidth
    - Neighbor preference
    - Remote and direct neighbors evaluated at the same level

- Removed LFA SPF computation throttling
Next steps

- One existing implementation, two others are in the pipe

- Next points to be discussed
  - Signalling of information: mainly link colors, bandwidth
    - Benefit of signalling?
    - Reuse existing TE extensions or define new ones?
  
  - Simulation tool needs to know the LFA selection algorithm:
    - For LFA coverage and capacity planning
    - Default implementation policy/algorithm need to be documented
    - Thanks to Martin Horneffer (DT)

- Sollicit WG adoption
thank you