INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

**TELECOMMUNICATION
STANDARDIZATION SECTOR**

STUDY PERIOD 2009-2012

COM 15 – LS 311 – E

English only

Original: English

Question(s):	12/15	

<div align="center">

Ref. : TD 563 (WP 3/15)

</div>

Source:	ITU-T Study Group 15	
Title:	Comments on draft-ietf-mpls-tp-identifiers-05 [Ref#046.04]	

<div align="center">

LIAISON STATEMENT

</div>

For action to:	**IETF MPLS WG**
For comment to:	-
For information to:	-
Approval:	**Agreed to by Question 12/15 (by correspondence)**
Deadline:	**1 August 2011**

Contact:	Malcolm Betts ZTE P. R. China	Tel: +1 678 534-2542 Email: malcolm.betts@zte.com.cn

Thank you for your liaison statement indicating that the MPLS WG has initiated a one week WG last call to verify that all comments on the previous version have been correctly addressed. A number of sector members have indicated that several of the comments contained in the liaison statement on the -04 version have not been addressed to their satisfaction. A list of these comments is provided below. As you are aware one of the major issues, raised by a number of sector members, is not allowing the Global ID and ICC ID to be mixed. We understand that the WG has reached rough consensus on this point and intend to approve the draft without this capability.

As a result SG 15 does not have consensus that this draft, in its current form, meets the needs of the transport network.

Following some investigation triggered by comments on the MPLS email list, we have now been advised that the ICC identifier should have the Country Code (CC) as a prefix to ensure that it is globally unique, we will provide further input on the CC later. We request that this is noted in the current draft with an indication that further details will be provided later.

List of comments on the -04 draft that have not been addressed to the satisfaction of a number of sector members (the numbers below refer to the numbers on the comments embedded in the marked up copy of the -04 draft sent with the liaison on 16 March 2011). The resolution proposed for these comments in the v5 draft was not discussed with the originator:

M1) The scope is still not clear, this version of the draft only provides the identifiers for the current scope of MPLS-TP i.e. bidirectional (co-routed and associated) point-to-point MPLS-TP LSPs, including SPMEs, PWs and Sections, please add the text from the previous comment.

M12) SPMEs are constructs defined by IETF in the context of MPLS-TP and an identification scheme for SPME needs to be provided. The proposed text in M12 was to clarify that SPMEs are identified exactly as LSPs are identified. This clarification is needed otherwise there will be no clear and unambiguous definition of how SPMEs can be identified. Please insert the following text at the end of section 4. "Sub-Path Maintenance Elements (SPMEs) as defined in RFC 5921 are a particular instance of MPLS-TP LSPs. Therefore, the attachment point of an SPME at any sub-layer also requires a unique IF_ID."

M15) Comment resolution does not match the text in the draft. The confusing text "LSP_ID within the context of that tunnel" is still present in the draft. The removal of the confusing text (as for comment resolution) will resolve the comment.

M16) Comment resolution does not match the text in the draft. The comment resolution also needs an amendment: it should be "and an MPLS-TP LSP_ID to uniquely identify an LSP"

M21) The comment resolution indicates that text was added to section 7.1.2.1 however this new text does not address resolve the original comment "Use of independent LSP IDs conflicts with the naming of MEGs defined in section 7.1.2.1 Use of independent LSP IDs conflicts with the naming of MEGs defined in section 7.1.2.1"

M23) Neither the new draft nor the comment resolution explains the difference between GMPLS and RSVP-TE as requested by the comment

M24) Text has been removed from the first paragraph of section 5.3, the restriction (in this -04 text) is correct and valid for any implementation based on the current standard, please restore the deleted text and insert "This limits the scope of the control plane to a single network operator". The RFC defining any standard extensions to overcome the current limitations can explicitly state that these extensions eliminate this restriction.

M30) The comment is not resolved as draft does not distinguish between data plane and control plane identifiers for PWs (as done in section 5.3 for LSPs). Note that one of the requirements for MPLS-TP is independence between the data plane, control plane and management plane. This requires the use of independent identifiers.

M31) We do not understand the proposed resolution of this comment. Resolving comment M30 may help to resolve this comment.

M32) We am not satisfied with the comment resolution: while section 7.1 indicates the need to identify MEG_IDs for sections, Section 7.1.1 does not allow using the ICC-based MEG_ID format for MPLS-TP section.

M33) We are not satisfied with the resolution of this comment.

The difference between the OAM capabilities on LSP and PW is not aligned with the ITU-T view: When this was discussed the applicability of PW to MPLS-TP the agreement was to include PW within the MPLS-TP architecture because PW and LSP can be operated in the same manner.

However, OAM capabilities have no implications with MEG Identification. The only reason to have a different Type is that operators will manage three different MEG-ID spaces for LSP, PW and section (e.g., they can have a PW and an LSP using the same MEG-ID name).

M38) We are not satisfied with comment resolution: The identifiers draft introduces an identification scheme for components that are not defined in the OAM architecture/framework.

Which messages can S-PE originate that an intermediate LSR cannot originate on an LSP? Why is the node identification is not sufficient?

M41) Comment is not related with the discussion of mixing Global ID and ICC based identifiers. PE1, PE2, PE3 and PE4 can use the ICC for node identification: this option is not considered in the current text.

_____