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Source: https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/rfcll/0Gw8xG7xvOx5XXxwoK7LIE/

https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/rfcll/Sw2XbQwEoE_Ars6666G6C1QaZr43gc/

1. Use of revised Option Type (0x23) in RPL ... (Obsolete use of 0x63 RPI Option Type value).
2. Mandating the use of 6LoRH (RFC 8138), turn on
3. ROPEx
4. Support for Ext Control Options. (Allows backward compatibility for new extns... part for same mopex draft)
5. Support for Capabilities. (Enables backward compatibility, allows incremental feature support)
6) P-DAO for SDN-RPL and
7) ADDY-RPL.
RPL Observations Issues
By Pascal:

# RPLv2

Todo List

----------

* Alvero: Note that "SHOULD respond with a DAO-ACK" leaves the door open to not doing it. Unfortunately rfc6550 didn't explicitly mention what may be the reasons to not send a DAO-ACK. It is a matter of design.

* Benjamin: about draft-ietf-roll-turnon-rfc6138-17

I will say a bit more inline, but want to note upfront that my primary unease here is that we seem to be assigning some (partial) semantics to MOP value 7 here (even though we don’t do that for MOP 0).

For a MOP value of 7, [RFC8138] MUST be used on Links where LoWPAN Header Compression [RFC6282] applies and MUST NOT be used otherwise.

yet there is no “trail of breadcrumbs” for someone to follow from “I want to implement MOP 7” and end up at the sentence I quoted above. A formal Update to 6550 would provide this trail. 
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