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SRv6 protocol extensions: Mature for deployment

All SRv6 basic features have been stable and ready for commercial deployment.
Current Situation: WGLC Comments to be addressed

• The WGLC ended in March.
• We have addressed the editorial comments received from Quan Xiong, Chongfeng Xie, Adrian Farrel, Ketan Talaulikar and others. Many thanks for your comments!
Comments to be addressed: is X bit needed?

Last Update:
• Add Chen Ran as a new contributor, thank you!
• Addressed Adrian’s comments
  • Record Route Object -> Reported Route Object
• Addressed Yingzhen’s IESG review comments
• Addressed Ketan’s editorial comments
• References update and removal.
X-Flag: is needed or not? Implementation status?

• X bit: A PCC sets this bit to 1 to indicate that it does not impose any limit on MSD (irrespective of the MSD-Type).

• Why X flag is needed?
  • X-flag is used to indicate that it does not impose any limit on MSD

• Why X flag is not needed?
  • A PCC can simply advertise the value of 255 if it is capable instead of the X bit. Another alternative is for PCE implementations to provide a knob to overrule whatever MSD is signaled by the PCC (not sure if this is even a good idea). Do any of the current PCC implementations set this X flag and if so, why? (From Ketan)

• If we do not need it, how to handle this? Ask for implementation of this before making a decision?
Next Step

• Address functional comments from 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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