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SRv6 protocol extensions: Mature for deployment

All the SRv6 basic features have been stable and ready for wide deployment.
Current Situation: WGLC is closed, comments should be addressed

- The WGLC was started in February 13, 2023, and ended now.
- We have addressed the editorial comments received from Quan Xiong, Chongfeng Xie, Adrian Farrel, Ketan Talaulikar and others. Many thanks for your comments!
Thanks for the editorial comments.

- Delete redundant text.
- Reorganize the text in introduction.
- Delete ‘early allocation’ text
Add IANA allocation for SID verification error

- Move IANA allocation from draft-chen-pce-sr-mpls-sid-verification to this draft to avoid independence.

---

* V: The "SID verification" bit usage is as per Section 5.1 of [RFC9256]. If a PCC "Verification fails" for a SID, it MUST report this error by including the LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV with LSP error-value "SID Verification fails" in the LSP object in the PCRpt message to the PCE.

9.3. LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV

This document defines a new value in the sub-registry "LSP-ERROR-CODE TLV Error Code Field" in the "Path Computation Element Protocol (PCEP) Numbers" registry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD2</td>
<td>SID Verification fails</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Step

• Address functional comments from Adrian and Ketan. Would like to hear wider discussion of these functional comments, since we are in WGLC stage.

• Move the draft to the next stage, accelerate for publication.
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