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Status

► Gone through IETF and IESG review
  ▪ Comments received from transport area and gen area directorates

► Two DISCUSSes filed

► New version produced addressing all the comments available at

One paragraph added as agreed in Chicago and as specified in draft-trammell-sctp-change-01:

…an Exporting Process sending Template Withdrawal Messages should ensure to the extent possible that the Template Withdrawal Messages and subsequent Template Sets reusing the withdrawn Template IDs are received and processed at the Collecting Process in proper order.
Transport directorate review: the use of UDP is NOT RECOMMENDED

► SOLUTION:

► Added text in the UDP section to discourage the use of UDP unless limited to very special cases
Gen-art review: use of RFC2119 language

►► Filed as DISCUSS n. 1:
  ▪ The use of RFC2119 language in guidelines documents
    is considered dangerous

►► SOLUTION
  ▪ Inserted text stating that:
    „This document is Informational. It does not specify a
    protocol and does not use RFC 2119 keywords
    [RFC2119] such as "MUST" and "SHOULD", except in
    quotations and restatements from the IPFIX standards
    documents. The normative specification of the protocol
    is given in the IPFIX Protocol and Information Model
    documents.“
  ▪ All MAYs, MUSTSs and SHOULDs in the document are
    restatement of the protocol (with reference)
IESG Chat ➔ DISCUSS n. 2

- Problems with a paragraph on SCTP „maturity“ considerations
- SOLUTION
- Paragraph removed
  - Not applicable anymore
  - Confusing rather than useful
Other changes

► Section 1.1 „History of IPFIX“ removed
► Editorial changes
► Nits
► ...

...