Comments on draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk-05.txt

Comment No.	Relevant section	Comment Text	Proposed Resolution
1	Section 4.7	Title for section 4.7 is meshed networks but the description focuses on linear protection	Introduce new sections for use of linear protection in meshed networks and uses of other protection schemes in meshed networks
2	Section 4.3.2	The clarification of shared protection (4.3.2) is confusing since Shared mesh is overlaps with section 4.7.6 and e-e shared is introduced (added in 05 version), but n:m is not req in RFC5654 as described just before the e-e shared paragraph. Why is this paragraph is required? There are two types of protection (path or segment by shared).	1. Rename section 4.7.6 as "Shared Protection in Meshed Networks" 2. Rings do offer shared protection and thus should be mentioned
	Section 4.7.2	Previous comment 63 resolution is notclear.	Last paragraph is ambiguous since reversion should be to the working channel rather than to working traffic, if reversion is enabled
3	Section 4.7.4	The para starts.. An **in-band,** data-plane protocol is defined in [MPLS-TP-Linear-Protection] for this purpose	Delete referencing a work in progress and in particular in the two sentences.

4	Section 4.8	What is meant by interoperability? "Ensure complete interoperability with the mechanisms defined for arbitrary topologies to allow end-to-end protection". Protection domains are either nested or concatenated but not arbitrary overlapping	We propose deletion.
5	Section 4.1.1	Rather Wooly. Operator control uses the term "recovery action"	1. Replace title with "Operator Commands" 2. Replace the following sentence "The operator can also be given control of **recovery** actions and" by " The operator has commands to invoke protection switching.."
6	Section 4.1.2	Last paragraph "This behavior ..". Management and control planes involvement are not needed	Delete
7	Section 4.1.3	"Hover, in this context we are concerned with the use of these messages to control or trigger survivability actions".	1. Amend to read "However, in this context these messages are used to control or trigger survivability actions". 2. add exchange to OAM messages to read "OAM messages exchange"
8	Section 1.4	Requires clarification: the term "levels of protection". What is "level", transport layers, QoS levels, or SD levels?	Define the term level
9	Section 2	Editorial	Edit

		"the distinction and definitions made in [RFC4427] for the following three terms": Protection, Restoration, and Recovery. The column of "Restoration" is duplicate.	
10	Section 4.7.4	Too many details about specific mechanisms which are assumed to be in a solution draft.	Clarify.
11	Section 12.2	MPLS-TP-Linear-Protection] in the reference part is draft-ietf-mpls-tp-linear-protection, but a lot of issues are raised about this draft, in that case it is not proper to take draft-ietf-mpls-tp-linear-protection as the solution draft.	Do not reference documents that are not pre-existing RFCs as in some instances they pre-judge the solutions
12	Section 4.8	Requires clarification: "Reuse existing procedures and mechanisms for recovery in ring Topologies" . What is meant by "existing": are they the current ring protection mechanisms?	
Response or disposition of previous comments (TD283/WP3)			
General comment 4	Fault Isolation	This draft refers to fault isolation in a protection switching draft. Consequently, a reference should be made to the draft that describes the mechanism for fault isolation .	

General comment 5	MTTR	MTTR is any repair time from sub-50 ms to as you mention "truck roll". It is used in determining the 5 nines of availability. So MTTR is certainly relevant	
	Section 4.3	Section 4.3 still mentions "cost", it should be deleted.	
Comment 63	Section 4.6.1.1	The text you have indicated refers to the restoration of the traffic, not to reversion. In the case of 1+1 protection, when the fault is repaired, the traffic is restored to the broken path (the old working path). It is then a choice whether there is reversion or not. No, when you restore the traffic to the broken path after repair you already revert to the original situation. In case non-reversion is provisioned the traffic is *NOT* restored to the broken path	