

# JN0-694<sup>Q&As</sup>

Enterprise Routing and Switching Support, Professional (JNCSP-ENT)

## Pass Juniper JN0-694 Exam with 100% Guarantee

Free Download Real Questions & Answers **PDF** and **VCE** file from:

<https://www.pass2lead.com/jn0-694.html>

100% Passing Guarantee  
100% Money Back Assurance

Following Questions and Answers are all new published by Juniper  
Official Exam Center

- ⚙️ **Instant Download** After Purchase
- ⚙️ **100% Money Back** Guarantee
- ⚙️ **365 Days** Free Update
- ⚙️ **800,000+** Satisfied Customers



### QUESTION 1

You are having problems redistributing RIP routes into OSPF. Your Junos device has the following configuration:

```
[edit protocols ospf]
user@router# show

import my-policy;

area 0.0.0.0 {
interface ge-0/0/0.0;

interface ge-0/0/ ;

interface ge-0/0/ {

passive;

}

}
```

What would resolve the problem?

- A. Apply my-policy as an export policy under the [edit protocols rip] hierarchy.
- B. Apply my-policy as an import policy under the [edit protocols rip] hierarchy.
- C. Apply my-policy as an export policy under the [edit protocols ospf] hierarchy.
- D. Use the area-range parameter instead of a routing policy.

Correct Answer: D

---

### QUESTION 2

You are implementing Q-in-Q tunneling on an EX Series switch. You want the tunnel to support all C-VLANs; however, only some VLANs are able to send traffic across the tunnel. Switch-1 has the following configuration:

```
[edit vlans]
user@Switch-1# show

v100 {

vlan-id 100;
```

```
interface {  
ge-0/0/0.10;  
ge-0/0/1.20;  
}  
dot1q-tunneling {  
customer-vlans [ ];  
}  
}
```

What would solve this problem?

- A. Add family ethernet-switching to the tunnel-side interface on Switch-1.
- B. Implement RSTP.
- C. Q-in-Q tunneling will not work in this scenario; use a Layer 2 VPN instead.
- D. Remove the customer-vlans statement.

Correct Answer: C

---

### QUESTION 3

Two neighboring routers are able to form an OSPF adjacency, but are not able to establish an IBGP neighborhood.

What are two reasons for the IBGP neighborhood problem? (Choose two.)

- A. One of the devices has a misconfigured BGP peer address.
- B. One or both of the connected interfaces are missing the family iso statement.
- C. OSPF has a lower route preference than BGP.
- D. A firewall filter on one of the interfaces is blocking TCP traffic.

Correct Answer: BC

---

### QUESTION 4

The exhibit shows part of the configuration for a router. You receive a complaint that the router is not correctly reclassifying all traffic to the best-effort forwarding class when the amount of IPv4 traffic exceeds 10 Mbps.

```
interfaces {
  ge-0/0/0 {
    unit 0 {
      family inet {
        filter {
          input filter1;
        }
        policer {
          input policer1;
        }
        address 10.210.33.131/26;
      }
    }
  }
}
class-of-service {
  classifiers {
    inet-precedence ip_classifier_1 {
      forwarding-class best-effort {
        loss-priority low code-points [ 000 010 011 100 ];
      }
      forwarding-class assured-forwarding {
        loss-priority low code-points 001;
      }
      forwarding-class expedited-forwarding {
        loss-priority low code-points 101;
      }
      forwarding-class network-control {
        loss-priority low code-points 110;
        loss-priority high code-points 111;
      }
    }
  }
  interfaces {
    ge-0/0/0 {
      unit 0 {
        classifiers {
          inet-precedence ip_classifier_1;
        }
      }
    }
  }
}
firewall {
  policer policer1 {
    if-exceeding {
      bandwidth-limit 10m;
      burst-size-limit 2k;
    }
    then forwarding-class best-effort;
  }
  filter filter1 {
    term 1 {
      from {
        precedence b101;
      }
      then {
        count term1;
        forwarding-class expedited-forwarding;
      }
    }
    term 2 {
      from {
        forwarding-class-except best-effort;
      }
      then {
        policer policer1;
        count term2;
      }
    }
    term 3 {
      from {
        forwarding-class best-effort;
      }
      then count term3;
    }
  }
}
```

You have isolated the problem to traffic with the IP precedence bits set to the binary value 101. Which configuration is causing this behavior?

- A. the filter firewall filter's term 1
- B. the filter firewall filter's term 2
- C. the ip\_classifier\_1 classifier
- D. the policer1 policer

Correct Answer: A

**QUESTION 5**

-- Exhibit -user@router# show class-of-service

```
classifiers {
  inet-precedence ipp-test {
  import default;
  forwarding-class best-effort {
  loss-priority low code-points be;
```

```
}  
  
forwarding-class expedited-forwarding {  
  
loss-priority low code-points af21;  
  
}  
  
forwarding-class assured-forwarding {  
  
loss-priority low code-points af11;  
  
}  
}  
forwarding-class network-control { loss-priority low code-points nc1; } }  
  
user@router# show firewall filter MF { term 1 { from { precedence 0; } then forwarding-class best-effort; } term 2 { from {  
precedence 5; } then forwarding-class expedited-forwarding; } term 3 { from { precedence 2; } then forwarding-class  
assured-forwarding; } term 4 { from { precedence 6; } then forwarding-class network-control; } term 5 { then accept; } }  
user@router> show class-of-service ... Code point type: inet-precedence Alias Bit pattern af11 001 af21 010 af31 011  
af41 100 be 000 cs6 110 cs7 111 ef 101 nc1 110 nc2 111 -- Exhibit -
```

Click the Exhibit button.

Traffic with the IPP value af21 should be assigned to the expedited forwarding queue; however, this traffic is not being assigned to that queue.

Referring to the exhibit, what is causing this behavior?

- A. The af21 traffic is assigned to the assured forwarding queue because of the BA classifier.
- B. The af21 traffic is assigned to the assured forwarding queue because of the MF classifier.
- C. The af21 traffic is assigned to the best effort queue because of the MF classifier.
- D. The af21 traffic is assigned to the best effort queue because of the BA classifier.

Correct Answer: B