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Problem statement:
- Not all BMP message types support TLVs

Ideas in the draft:
- Support TLVs in Route Monitoring
- Support TLVs in Peer Down
- Bump version for backwards compatibility
Since IETF115 / draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-10

- Added wire format example (thanks Luuk!)
- Processed feedback
- Constellation of minor fixes
Status / open issues draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv

• Move the BGP PDU into a TLV

• Stateless parsing TLVs:
  o Remove, ADD-PATH becomes a bit in Peers Flag

• Bump version to 4 or use a new Message Type:
  o Authors prefer to keep bumping version
  o WG Chairs? Any opinion?
Support for Enterprise-specific TLVs in the BGP Monitoring Protocol
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Problem statement

“Vendors need the ability to define proprietary Information Elements, because, for example, they are delivering a pre-standards product, or the Information Element is in some way commercially sensitive”
Since IETF115 / draft-ietf-grow-bmp-tlv-ebit-01

• Processed feedback
65531-65534 are for experimental use for Information TLVs
  - E-bit should be used for experimental use instead

Should E-bit be applicable to other pieces too? I.e. Stats Types?
  - Authors believe so. Feedback?