

## TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION SECTOR

**STUDY PERIOD 2009-2012** 

**English only** 

**Original: English** 

Question(s): 9/15

LIAISON STATEMENT

**Source:** ITU-T SG 15

**Title:** MPLS-TP Survivability Framework (ref # 28.06)

LIAISON STATEMENT

For action to: IETF IESG

For comment to:

For information to: IETF MPLS WG

**Approval:** ITU-T SG 15 (by correspondence)

**Deadline:** 31/8/2010

**Contact:** Ghani Abbas Tel: +44 7710 370 367

Ericsson, UK Email: Ghani.Abbas@ericsson.com

Thank you for your liaison response (ref #028.05) of 16 July 2010 (<a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/923/">https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/923/</a>) to our liaison of 30 June 2010 (<a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/920/">https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/920/</a>), which had provided Q9/15 input regarding v05 comment disposition and the corresponding new text in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk-06.

Within our 30 June 2010 liaison, Q9/15 had indicated the intention of conducting full review of draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk-06 and to send a complete set of comments prior to IETF 78. However, since draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk-06 was approved by the IESG for publication as an Informational RFC and placed in the RFC editor's queue on July 13<sup>th</sup>, plans for this further review have been cancelled as it appears that there was no opportunity for the IETF to consider any further input from the ITU.

Regarding your comments on our June 30<sup>th</sup> liaison, we observe the proposed dispositions for draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk-06, which is still dated June 20<sup>th</sup>, are provided under the IESG write-up tab at <a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk/">https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk/</a>.

Without undertaking a review of the final text we are unable to provide feedback on your disposition of our comments. However, we can provide feedback to your comment re interpretation of A.5 by referring to the report of WP3/15 (TD321/PLEN):

"During the review it was noted that in many places, draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework-12 includes the text "as specified in X" or "defined in X" which implies a normative reference to X. However, X is listed in section 7.2 as an Informative Reference. A representative from ISOC stated that this is normal practice for an informational track RFC. The meeting agreed that since G.8110.1 will make

**Attention:** Some or all of the material attached to this liaison statement may be subject to ITU copyright. In such a case this will be indicated in the individual document.

Such a copyright does not prevent the use of the material for its intended purpose, but it prevents the reproduction of all or part of it in a publication without the authorization of ITU.

a normative reference, to draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework-12 these references will be listed as normative secondary references in the A.5 justification."

The same interpretation is relevant to draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk-06, where there is text stating, for example:

"The MPLS-TP protocol to coordinate protection state, which is specified in [MPLS-TP-Linear-Protection]". Thus, [MPLS-TP-Linear-Protection] must be listed as a normative secondary reference in the A.5 justification.