Question(s):	10/15	16 November 2010

LIAISON STATEMENT

Source:	ITU-T Study Group 15
Title:	MPLS-TP OAM Analysis draft review (ref # 041.02)

LIAISON STATEMENT

For action to:	IETF MPLS WG
For comment to:	
For information to:	
Approval:	Agreed to by Q10/15 (by correspondence)
Deadline:	-
Contact:	Huub van Helvoort Huawei Technologies Ltd. PR China	Tel: +31 649248936 Email: hhelvoort@huawei.com

Please don't change the structure of this table, just insert the necessary information.

Thank you for your liaison statement (ref # 041.01) soliciting Last Call review comments by ITU-T of the MPLS-TP OAM Analysis draft.
The experts of Q10/15 have reviewed draft-ietf-mpls-tp-oam-analysis-02.txt by correspondence.

The following comments were received:

General comments:
1.   This draft has not previously been sent to the ITU for early review.

2.   This draft has not reached a level of maturity normally expected for a draft in last call.

3.   The purpose of the draft is not clear:
a.   The initial version adopted as a working group draft was intended to provide an analysis of the ITU-T requirements and a mapping to the OAM tools based on BFD, LSP-Ping and Y.1731.
b.   The current version only provides an overview of some of the tools that have been selected.
c.   There is no record on the email list of a discussion and agreement on this change of scope.
d.   If this draft is intended to be an overview of the tools that have been selected the WG last call is premature since several tools are still at an early stage of development.

Specific comments:

A.   The current scope states:

"One of the mandates of the joint (IETF and ITU-T) MPLS-TP work-item is the objective of developing a Transport Profile is to base the toolset on existing MPLS technologies".

This is not correct; the JWT report states on page 12:

"This presentation is a collection of assumptions, discussion points and decisions that the combined group has had during the months of March and April, 2008.
This represents the agreed upon starting point for the technical analysis of the T-MPLS requirements from the ITU-T and the MPLS architecture to meet those requirements"

B.   The current scope also states:

"The purpose of this document is to outline the recommendations of the MPLS-TP design team and confirmed by the working group for the toolset that should be defined to fulfill the OAM functionality requirements as documented in [MPLS-TP OAM Reqs] and [MPLS-TP OAM Frwk]".

However, there is no record of this agreement being confirmed on an IETF email list before the MEAD team was disbanded.

Also there is no record of an official communication from the IETF indicating that this decision had been taken.

We (i.e. Q.10) do not have consensus regarding the technical direction being taken for the MPLS-TP OAM Analysis as outlined in this draft. We should have had the opportunity to debate the direction, to confirm that all of the requirements are fully met, before being asked to provide comments on this draft.

_____