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Updates

• One update since Maastricht:

• This version is a primarily a result of various comments and suggestions provided by the following (thanks!)
  – Otmar Lendl (see email from 7/21)
  – Peter Koch (see email from 8/3)
  – Sohel Khan (comments were shared offline; included in email from Alex M on 11/2)

• This slide deck presents some of the key comments that may be worth discussing
PI to SED Record – Yay or Nay?

- **Comment:** Disallow the direct association of a Public Identifier with a SED record

- **Consensus at the interim meeting:** Retain it as-is to support user-specific SED
Selective Peering - at what Level?

- Use case interconnect #4 is about per-peer policies; e.g., peer-dependent ingress points for the same public identifier.

- Q: What is the level of granularity for this selectiveness?

- A: Based on the current data model, the answer is “Destination Group”
Number Portability

- There was a comment that the use case (UC MISC #1) for number portability (or the way it is documented) was a bad idea
  - This use case allows for the association of a group of TNs with an RN, in cases where number portability is supported

- Comments?
Registrar and Registrant

• Version -03 of the I-D introduced the following terms:
  – **Registrar**, an entity that provisions and manages data into the registry.
  – **Registrant**, the authoritative source for provisioned SED and related information.

• Comment: since these are not used in the use cases, can we remove them?

• Current resolution: The term **Registrant** was removed, although **Registrar** was retained to indicate that separation and delegation aspects

• Further Recommendation: Add an explicit use case to illustrate the support for delegation
Inconsistency between the use cases and the protocol document, since the former uses ‘SED Record’ and the latter uses ‘Route Record’

Is there a difference or does this need to be corrected?

Recommendation: Add clarification in the protocol document for this to be ‘SED Record’, consistent with RFC5486
Status & Next Steps

• This I-D is currently in **WGLC**; see email from Alex M. on 11/2

• Is this document really done?
  – Have we captured all the primary use cases and requirements?

• WGLC comments due by: **Nov 22, 2010**