

Juniper

Exam JN0-692

Service Provider Routing and Switching Support, Professional

Version: 7.0

[Total Questions: 56]

Question No : 1

Which two statements are true about the OSPF 2-Way state? (Choose two.)

- A. It is the normal state for neighbors that are the DR and BDR.
- B. It is the normal state for two neighbors that are neither the DR nor BDR.
- C. It indicates that a device cannot accept any more full adjacencies.
- D. It indicates that communication between two neighbors is bidirectional.

Answer: B,D

Question No : 2

What is the primary mechanism that prevents BGP routing loops?

- A. SPF tree
- B. routing policy
- C. the underlying IGP's loop prevention mechanism
- D. AS path

Answer: D

Question No : 3

What are two types of valid BGP messages? (Choose two.)

- A. Open
- B. Notification
- C. Hello
- D. Request

Answer: A,B

Question No : 4

Your network is configured with a full mesh of MPLS LSPs between all devices. However, when you enter the show route table inet.2 command on any device, no LSP routing

information is displayed.

Which statement explains why this is occurring?

- A. The inet.2 table does not contain LSP routing information.
- B. IGP routes have a better route preference, causing the LSPs to be hidden.
- C. Advanced super-user permissions are required to access the inet.2 table.
- D. A filter is applied that is preventing the LSPs from being installed in the inet.2 table.

Answer: A

Question No : 5

You are experiencing packet drops in your network.

Which two CoS components would be responsible? (Choose two.)

- A. policing
- B. RED
- C. classification
- D. rewriting

Answer: A,B

Question No : 6

Your Junos device has the following IS-IS configuration:

```
[edit protocols isis]
```

```
user@router# show
```

```
level 1 disable;
```

```
interface ge-0/0/0 {
```

```
level 2 disable;
```

```
}
```

Which statement is true?

- A. The interface can form only L1 adjacencies.
- B. The interface can form only L2 adjacencies.
- C. The interface can form both L1 and L2 adjacencies.
- D. The interface cannot form any adjacencies.

Answer: D

Question No : 7

In your network, you have noticed route oscillation involving an OSPF route.

What is the reason?

- A. There is a duplicate router ID in the network.
- B. There is a mismatching netmask.
- C. The external preference of OSPF is 201.
- D. There is an NSSA area.

Answer: A

Question No : 8

You notice that an EBGP peering session has terminated and no NOTIFICATION message appears in the traceoptions output.

What has happened?

- A. The peer router has crashed.
- B. The peer has restarted the hold timer.
- C. The peer update message was missing essential BGP attributes.
- D. The peer state was reset to Idle.

Answer: A

Question No : 9

R2 has an IBGP peering session with R1 but is not installing the expected external BGP routes. R1 has these same routes installed and they are active in its route table.

What are two reasons for this happening? (Choose two.)

- A. local preference value
- B. cannot reach next hop
- C. misconfigured policy
- D. AS path loop

Answer: B,C

Question No : 10

You have enabled MPLS in your network using LDP for control plane signaling. After completing the configurations, you find that both your input and output LDP databases have labels only for loopback interfaces.

Referring to the scenario, which two statements are correct? (Choose two.)

- A. You should verify the configurations first, then enable ldp traceoptions.
- B. The default egress policy for LDP in the Junos OS announces only the loopback address.
- C. An LDP egress policy must be used to create and advertise new label mappings for directly connected prefixes other than the loopback.
- D. An LDP export policy must be used to create and advertise new label mappings for directly connected prefixes other than the loopback.

Answer: B,C

Question No : 11

You have configured an MPLS LSP but it will not establish because of a failed CSPF computation. What are two reasons for this happening? (Choose two.)

- A. An indirect loose hop is specified in the ERO.
- B. BFD has been enabled for the IGP on the LSRs.
- C. Ingress and egress routers are in different OSPF areas.

D. The path for the LSP does not have enough bandwidth available.

Answer: C,D

Question No : 12

Click the Exhibit button.

```

May 21 22:47:07.239281 OSPF sent Hello 192.168.0.13 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.239311 version 2, length 44, ID 10.10.10.1, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.239335 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.239357 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.13, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.253659 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.14 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.253698 version 2, length 48, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.253719 checksum 0x0, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:07.253741 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.253763 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.13, BDR 192.168.0.14
May 21 22:47:07.254293 RPD_OSPF_NBRUP: OSPF neighbor 192.168.0.14 (realm ospf-v2 ge-1/1/2.103 area 0.0.0.0)
state changed from Init to ExStart due to 2wayRcvd (event reason: neighbor detected this router)
May 21 22:47:07.254498 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.14 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.254526 version 2, length 48, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.254547 checksum 0x0, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:07.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.254684 OSPF sent Hello 192.168.0.13 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.254711 version 2, length 48, ID 10.10.10.1, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.254732 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.254753 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.13, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.255326 OSPF sent Hello 192.168.0.13 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.255356 version 2, length 48, ID 10.10.10.1, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.255379 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.255401 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 192.168.0.13
May 21 22:47:07.255782 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.14 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.255820 version 2, length 48, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.255841 checksum 0x0, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:07.255864 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.255886 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.255912 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.14 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.255941 version 2, length 48, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.255962 checksum 0x0, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:07.255984 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.255906 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 192.168.0.13
May 21 22:47:07.298309 RPD_OSPF_NBRUP: OSPF neighbor 192.168.0.14 (realm ospf-v2 ge-1/1/2.103 area 0.0.0.0)
state changed from Exchange to Full due to ExchangeDone (event reason: DBD exchange of slave completed)
May 21 22:47:07.401838 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.10 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.102 IFL 326 area 0.0.0.2)
May 21 22:47:07.401880 version 2, length 44, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.2
May 21 22:47:07.401902 checksum 0x0, authtype 0

May 21 22:47:07.401924 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x18, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.401946 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.10, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.401973 OSPF packet ignored: area stubness mismatch from 192.168.0.10 on intf ge-1/1/2.102 area 0.0.0.2
May 21 22:47:08.065557 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.1 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:08.512881 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.2 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.100 IFL 324 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:08.512921 version 2, length 44, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:08.512976 checksum 0x0, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:08.513001 mask 255.255.255.0, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:08.513023 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.2, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:08.513050 OSPF packet ignored: netmask 255.255.255.0 mismatch from 192.168.0.2 on intf ge-1/1/2.100 area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:09.811973 OSPF packet ignored: area mismatch (0.0.0.1) from 192.168.0.6 on intf ge-1/1/2.101 area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:09.812053 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.6 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.101 IFL 325 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:09.812076 version 2, length 44, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.1
May 21 22:47:09.812097 checksum 0x1668, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:09.812120 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:09.812142 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.6, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:12.383482 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.9 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.2)
May 21 22:47:14.145490 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.5 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:15.582484 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.1 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:15.694211 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.13 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:16.393918 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.10 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.102 IFL 326 area 0.0.0.2)
May 21 22:47:16.394475 version 2, length 44, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.2
May 21 22:47:16.394497 checksum 0x0, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:16.394520 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x18, prio 128
May 21 22:47:16.394542 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.10, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:16.394572 OSPF packet ignored: area stubness mismatch from 192.168.0.10 on intf ge-1/1/2.102 area 0.0.0.2
May 21 22:47:16.694847 OSPF hello from 192.168.0.14 (IFL 2684276688, area 0.0.0.0) absorbed
May 21 22:47:18.235353 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.2 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.101 IFL 324 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:18.235425 version 2, length 44, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:18.235447 checksum 0x0, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:18.235501 mask 255.255.255.0, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:18.235524 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.2, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:18.235551 OSPF packet ignored: netmask 255.255.255.0 mismatch from 192.168.0.2 on intf ge-1/1/2.100 area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:18.284859 OSPF packet ignored: area mismatch (0.0.0.1) from 192.168.0.6 on intf ge-1/1/2.101 area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:19.284934 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.6 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.101 IFL 325 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:19.284958 version 2, length 44, ID 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.1
May 21 22:47:19.284978 checksum 0x1668, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:19.285001 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:19.285022 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.6, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:20.495440 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.9 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.2)

```

Referring to the exhibit, which three statements are correct? (Choose three.)

- A. There is an area type mismatch on interface ge-1/1/2.102.
- B. There is an area number mismatch on interface ge-1/1/2.102.

- C. There is an area number mismatch on interface ge-1/1/2.101.
- D. There is an area type mismatch on interface ge-1/1/2.101.
- E. There is a subnet mismatch on interface ge-1/1/2.100.

Answer: A,C,E

Question No : 13

Click the Exhibit button.

```

May 21 22:47:07.253659 OSPF rcvd Hello 192.168.0.14 -> 224.0.0.5 (ge-1/1/2.103 IFL 323 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:07.253698 version 2, length 48, id 10.10.10.2, area 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:07.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:07.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:12.383482 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.9 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.2)
May 21 22:47:12.145490 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.5 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:12.582484 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.1 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:13.692411 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.13 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:13 version 2, length 44, id 10.0.9.7, area 0.0.0.1
May 21 22:47:13 checksum 0xd611, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:13 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x2, prio 128
May 21 22:47:13 dead_ivl 40, DR 10.0.8.10, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:13.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:13.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:14.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:14.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:14 OSPF packet ignored: authentication type mismatch (0) from 10.0.2.10
May 21 22:47:14.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:14.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:14.383482 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.9 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.2)
May 21 22:47:14.145490 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.5 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:15.582484 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.1 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:15.692411 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.13 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:15.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:15.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:15.383482 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.9 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.2)
May 21 22:47:15.145490 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.5 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:16.582484 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.1 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:16.692411 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.13 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:16 version 2, length 44, id 10.0.9.7, area 0.0.0.1
May 21 22:47:16 checksum 0xd611, authtype 0
May 21 22:47:16 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x2, prio 128
May 21 22:47:16 dead_ivl 40, DR 10.0.8.10, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:16.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:17.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:17.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:17.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:17 OSPF packet ignored: authentication type mismatch (0) from 10.0.2.10
May 21 22:47:17.254569 mask 255.255.255.252, hello_ivl 10, opts 0x12, prio 128
May 21 22:47:17.254590 dead_ivl 40, DR 192.168.0.14, BDR 0.0.0.0
May 21 22:47:17.383482 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.9 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.2)
May 21 22:47:18.145490 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.5 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:18.582484 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.1 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
May 21 22:47:18.692411 OSPF periodic xmit from 192.168.0.13 to 224.0.0.5 (IFL 2684276180 area 0.0.0.0)
  
```

You have been asked to troubleshoot why an OSPF session will not establish.

Referring to the exhibit, what is the problem?

- A. The OSPF hold-time configuration is set too low.
- B. The OSPF authentication type is incorrectly configured.
- C. The OSPF authentication key is incorrectly configured.
- D. The OSPF dead-interval configuration is set too low.

Answer: B

Question No : 14

Click the Exhibit button.

-- Exhibit --

ISIS Trace options :

May 21 20:58:25.3 ERROR: interface ae1.12 MTU 1200 is too small

Interface configuration :

```
user@router# show interfaces ae1.12
```

```
vlan-id 12;
```

```
family inet {
```

```
address 10.1.1.1/24;
```

```
}
```

```
family iso {
```

```
mtu 1200;
```

```
}
```

-- Exhibit --

An IS-IS adjacency does not come up between two directly connected routers.

Referring to the exhibit, what would cause this problem?

- A. The neighboring router has a larger MTU configured.
- B. The MTU configured on the interface is less than the IS-IS minimum MTU requirement.
- C. MTU has been configured for family iso instead of family inet.
- D. The MTU configured on the interface is higher than the maximum MTU supported by IS-IS.

Answer: B

Question No : 15

Click the Exhibit button.

Juniper JN0-692 : Practice Test

```

Interface          State Area          DR ID          BDR ID          Nbrs
ge-5/3/0.0         DR    0.0.0.0        1.1.1.1        0.0.0.0         0
  Type: NBMA, Address: 10.1.2.1, Mask: 255.255.255.252, MTU: 1500, Cost: 1
  DR addr: 10.1.2.1, Priority: 128
  Adj count: 0
  Hello: 30, Poll: 90, Dead: 120, RExmit: 5, Not stub
  ...

```

```

lo0.0              PtToPt 0.0.0.0        0.0.0.0        0.0.0.0         0
  Type: P2P, Address: 1.1.1.1, Mask: 255.255.255.255, MTU: 65535, Cost: 0
  Adj count: 0, Passive
  Hello: 10, Dead: 40, RExmit: 5, Not stub
  ...

```

```

user@r1# show protocols ospf | display inheritance no-comments
traffic-engineering;
area 0.0.0.0 {
  interface all {
    interface-type p2p;
  }
  interface ge-5/3/0.0 {
    interface-type nbma;
  }
}

```

```
user@r1# run show ospf neighbor
```

```

user@r2# run show ospf interface detail
Interface          State Area          DR ID          BDR ID          Nbrs
ge-5/3/1.0         DR    0.0.0.0        2.2.2.2        0.0.0.0         0
  Type: LAN, Address: 10.1.2.2, Mask: 255.255.255.252, MTU: 1500, Cost: 1
  DR addr: 10.1.2.2, Priority: 128
  Adj count: 0
  Hello: 10, Dead: 40, RExmit: 5, Not stub
  ...

```

```

lo0.0              DR    0.0.0.0        2.2.2.2        0.0.0.0         0
  Type: LAN, Address: 2.2.2.2, Mask: 255.255.255.255, MTU: 1500, Cost: 0
  DR addr: 2.2.2.2, Priority: 128
  Adj count: 0
  Hello: 100, Dead: 400, RExmit: 5, Not stub
  ...

```

```

user@r2# show protocols ospf | display inheritance no-comments
traffic-engineering;
area 0.0.0.0 {
  interface all {
    interface-type p2p;
  }
  interface ge-5/3/1.0;
  interface lo0.0 {
    hello-interval 100;
    mtu 1500;
  }
}

```

```
user@r2# run show ospf neighbor
```

Referring to the exhibit, routers r1 and r2 are connected to each other by interfaces ge-5/3/0 and ge-5/3/1, respectively. They do not become OSPF neighbors.

What would you do to make them neighbors without changing their interface types?

- A.** Modify the hello interval and MTU of the loopback interfaces in either r1 or r2 so that they match.
- B.** Set the OSPF hello interval for interface ge-5/3/1.0 to 30.
- C.** Set the OSPF hello interval for interface ge-5/3/0.0 to 30.
- D.** Modify the OSPF interface type of router r2's loopback to p2p.

Answer: B

Question No : 16

Click the Exhibit button.

```
user@router> show route 100.1.1.0
```

```
inet.0: 17 destinations, 19 routes (16 active, 0 holddown, 0 hidden)
```

```
+ = Active Route, - = Last Active, * = Both
```

```
100.1.1.0/24 *[BGP/170] 00:08:51, localpref 100
```

```
AS path: 65000 I
```

```
to 17.3.1.4 via xe-5/2/0.0
```

```
> to 17.1.1.1 via xe-5/2/1.0
```

```
[BGP/170] 00:08:51, localpref 100
```

```
AS path: 65000 I
```

```
> to 17.3.1.4 via xe-5/2/0.0
```

Referring to the exhibit, which configuration was used to load-balance traffic across xe-5/2/0 and xe-5/2/1 interfaces?

- A. set protocols bgp group CUST multipath
- B. set protocols bgp group CUST advertise-inactive
- C. set protocols bgp group CUST metric-out igp
- D. set protocols bgp group CUST multihop

Answer: A

Question No : 17

Click the Exhibit button.