

The IESG thanks ITU-T SG15 for its liaison statement COM15-LS293-E on draft-tsb-mpls-tp-ach-ptn.

This document and the liaison were introduced to the IETF in the Routing Area Open Meeting at the 80th IETF meeting in Prague.

During the discussions of the liaison and document in the working group meeting we observed that some people believe that the MPLS-TP requirements that were jointly developed and agreed by the IETF and ITU-T as expressed in RFCs 5654 [1], RFC 5860 [2], and RFC 5951 [3] are not complete or not at the right level. It is important for the ongoing discussions for the contributed requirements to be accurate. We encourage anyone with a concern like this to document the missing or more detailed requirements in an Internet-Draft (I-D) so that they can be reviewed by the IETF community according to the normal process.

We also observed that some people believe that the solutions being developed by the IETF do not address all of the requirements currently documented. We strongly encourage anyone who notices a deficiency in the current solutions compared to the documented requirements to raise the issue on the MPLS working group mailing list so that it can be discussed according to normal process. It would be useful if anyone with concerns about the current solution set provided a detailed gap analysis as an I-D for wider discussion.

With regard to processing draft-tsb-mpls-tp-ach-pt, we will handle the document according to the relevant IETF process, as we are required to do.

The most relevant process documents are RFC 5226 [4] and RFC 4929 [5]. We recommend that you read these documents carefully before progressing further. You will need to pay particular attention to two points:

- RFC 4929 requires you to produce a "requirements statement" I-D. You need to ensure that this document sets out the technical requirements that must be addressed. It must be more than a statement of desire for a particular solution. It is usual to attempt to express the requirements as functional requirements with no reference to solutions.

In the context of RFC 4929, the responsible Area Director in this case is Adrian Farrel, and the requirements evaluation working group (REWG) will be the MPLS working group.

- The registry from which you are requesting an assignment is covered by the assignment policy known as "IETF Review". This assignment policy is defined in RFC 5226 and means that there must be an I-D that is presented for IETF review and that achieves consensus for publication. RFC 4929 additionally calls for working group consensus to be reached. Such consensus usually requires a period of sustained technical discussion and review, and we urge the authors of your I-D to make themselves available on the IETF mailing lists as described in RFC 4929.

You will find a useful discussion of IETF working group consensus at <https://www.ietf.org/tao.html#getting.things.done>

We understand from your liaison that you plan to revise draft-tsb-mpls-tp-ach-ptn in the near future. We urge you to note the processes referenced above and target your work so that it fits within the processes. In particular, in addition to following the advice and guidance to authors of I-Ds available at <https://www.ietf.org/id-info/guidelines.html>, you should also run the "idnits" tool that can be found at <http://www.ietf.org/tools/idnits/>

Please also note that all authors of an I-D need to be contactable individuals. Email lists or exploders cannot be used as author contact details.

We will wait to see your revised I-D and hear from you about how you wish to start the process described in RFC 4929. Please do not hesitate to contact us for more information about the process.

References:

- [1] Niven-Jenkins, B., Brungard, D., Betts, M., Sprecher, N., and S. Ueno, "Requirements of an MPLS Transport Profile", RFC 5654, September 2009.
- [2] Vigoureux, M., Ward, D., and M. Betts, "Requirements for Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) in MPLS Transport Networks", RFC 5860, May 2010.
- [3] Lam, K., Mansfield, S., and E. Gray, "Network Management Requirements for MPLS-based Transport Networks", RFC 5951, September 2010.
- [4] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 5226, May 2008.
- [5] Andersson, L. and A. Farrel, "Change Process for Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) and Generalized MPLS (GMPLS) Protocols and Procedures", BCP 129, RFC 4929, June 2007.