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Brief Introduction

- This document introduces a mechanism to mark PCEP objects as optional in stateful PCEP messages.
  - Something that is allowed for PCReq and PCRep but was ignored for stateful messages.
  - This document introduces this relaxation to stateful PCE and updates RFC 8231.
- This document clarifies how the existing P (Processing-rule) and I (Ignore) flag in PCEP common object header are used in
  - PCRpt
  - PCUpd
  - PCInitiate

- The extension includes
  - A new R-flag (Relax) in the Stateful PCE capability TLV
  - Updated handling of P flag
    - PCRpt
    - PCUpd/PCInitiate
  - Updated handling of I flag
    - PCUpd
    - PCRpt
  - Unknown Object handling
Current Status of the I-D

- The draft was in WGLC that ended recently
- Thanks for all the comments received
- This is a quick update for all changes done during WGLC
- Also an opportunity to discuss comments that did not lead to any text change
Changes

- Moved the delegation section inside the section dealing with Handling of P flag in the PCRpt message
  - Changed MUST to SHOULD to make it consistent with delegation!
Changes

- Removed disjoint association example as it already has a mechanism to relax disjoint constraint
- Changed to SHOULD for the configuration of this capability
- Default Behavior updated

(Reception of an invalid object) and Error-value=1 (reception of an object with P flag not set). By default, the PCE SHOULD set the P flag, unless a local configuration or local policy indicates that some constraints (corresponding PCEP objects) can be marked as optional and could be ignored by the PCC.

(Reception of an invalid object) and Error-value=1 (reception of an object with P flag not set). On a PCEP session on which R bit was set by both peers, the PCE SHOULD set the P flag by default, unless a local configuration/policy indicates that some constraints (corresponding PCEP objects) can be marked as optional and could be ignored by the PCE or the object itself conveys informational parameters that can be safely ignored.
Changes & Next Step

- Some editorial changes and text suggestions were incorporated
  - Used “specify” instead of “clarify”
- PSF also suggested to add duplicate text for clarity but the authors believe that is not needed and in alignment to RFC 5440
- Do we need a backward compatibility text? Or is this enough -

Draft is ready for the next step and shipping to the IESG...

Thanks!