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Main Changes
Received new comments
Next steps
Main changes

All comments worked out (including PCN WG ones) according to decisions taken on mailing list and IETF 84 meeting in Vancouver:

- changed status of draft from proposed standard to experimental
- modified description of Extended Virtual Destination Port, specifies that its length is different for IPv4 and IPv6 addresses
Editorial comments:

- Improve introduction section, organization and clarity of draft including a background section, better goal description and document structure description

- Eliminate given terminology that is not used in the draft

- Eliminate duplicated definitions of terminology

- Refer to a section of a particular RFC (i.e., RFC 4860), instead of referring only to that particular RFC
New comments raised by Lixia and Ken (2)

- Elaborate rationale of why it is considered that the decision point is collocated with the PCN-ingress-node
  - Signaling solution focuses only on on-path signaling to support feedback loop from egress to ingress.
  - Off-path signaling support required between edges and centralized entity is out of scope

- Recommendation to re-visit SHOULDs
  - On further review, some SHOULDs to MUSTs
  - Other SHOULDs inherited from RFC 4860, RFC 6661, RFC 6662
  - Changes will be posted on the list
Next steps

- Update draft based on received comments
- Working Group Last Call after received comments are worked out?