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What are the major upcoming changes?

We’re working through the two recent rounds of review from AD.

1. Some of the ASCII diagrams aren’t parallel with their SVG counterpart.
   • There aren’t requirements for things to be exact, but they do need to be reasonably reflective of each other.
   • Things like textual references matching labels in the diagram.

2. Some of the diagrams require clarifying changes.
   • e.g. are TIEs flooding north on the whole fabric or just a specific link?
   • Some of this was related to XML2RFC’s PDF rendering (which we’re handling).
What do I mean by “not parallel”?

- **The images are quite different.**
  - SVG requirements are more should than SHOULD.
  - Obviously, images do not have to be mirror copies (otherwise why not just use ASCII).
  - Though they should be *reasonably* close.
What do I mean by “not parallel”?

• **Inconsistent labels:** “PoD top Nodes” rather than “Top-of-PoD Node”.
  • The latter properly aligns with the draft’s text as well.

• **Lack of labels:** “Leaf Node”.
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What are the major upcoming changes?

We’re working through the two recent rounds of review from AD.

3. Request for early IANA allocation for multicast addresses / UDP ports.
   • When -16 is submitted, we will request this from the chairs.

4. Various editorial suggestions for readability and clarity.
   • For example, adding additional pointers for important security sections in the Reader’s Digest.

5. Reference adjustments (normative vs. informative).

6. A couple of areas warrant some discussion with AD.
What are the major upcoming changes?

We’re making a few other adjustments not directly related to AD review.

1. I’ll be added as the 6th co-author.
   - Discussed with AD, this requires a minor update to the shepherd write-up.

2. Minor update for Key/Value schema to reflect what’s always been there per KV draft.

3. Minor SVG improvements (scaling, text size, etc.)
   - No actual functional changes.

4. SVG / XML optimization to get around the 3M draft upload limit.
   - Avoids problematic PDF rendering when using `xml2rfc --v3 draft-ietf-rift-rift-16.xml --pdf`.
     - NOT the “pdfized” version that is now auto-rendered by Datatracker (which is essentially ASCII).
   - Will work the tools folks to get this limit adjusted.
   - Might also need to bug AD as necessary ;)
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