



November 5, 2004

Mr. Adrian Farrel, adrian@olddog.co.uk, IETF, CCAMP Working Group Chair
Mr. Kireeti Kompella, kireeti@juniper.net, IETF, CCAMP Working Group Chair

Re: IETF Response to Results from OIF World Interoperability Demo

Dear Adrian and Kireeti,

Thank you for your responses to our liaison regarding our Supercomm Interoperability Demo. We appreciate the time and effort that was spent reviewing our liaison and your detailed reply, and hope for continued cooperation between our groups.

In response to your questions, we have the following information:

-- Regarding compliance with ASON: there are no compliance "tests" for ASON, however OIF has established a close liaison relationship with ITU-T over the past few years and has aligned its specifications closely with the ITU-T ASON specifications, especially G.8080, G.7713 and G.7713.1/2/3. We worked with ITU-T leading up to the Demo to make sure that our activities were considered supportive of ASON and welcomed by ITU-T.

-- Regarding the use of the term "domain": we have been following ITU-T G.8080 in the use of the term "domain". We are aware that an amendment to G.8080 is in progress in ITU-T. We are following work on refinements to the definition of "domain" in G.8080 and expect that this work will also be liaised to IETF when complete.

-- Regarding the issue of loss of RSVP signaling adjacency: we thank IETF for the suggestion to utilize the procedures in draft-ietf-ccamp-ospf-gmpls-extensions for this case, which would result in the associated link being made unavailable for new connection requests. However, we note that the trigger identified in that draft is the restart of an OSPF instance, which is an independent event from loss of RSVP signaling adjacency due to DCN failure. Consequently we request that IETF consider the addition of loss of RSVP signaling adjacency as a trigger for the procedures identified in draft-ietf-ccamp-ospf-gmpls-extensions.

-- Regarding reachability advertisement: we also thank IETF for the suggestion to use the reachability advertisement document referenced in the liaison response, and would request also that each address entry be supplemented to include a mask length, as the reachable endpoints addresses may be summarizable. Including a mask would also allow for address packing as shown for the Extended IP Reachability TLV in RFC 3784.

-- Regarding the scope of OIF work, the existing Implementation Agreements for the UNI and E-NNI are SONET/SDH oriented, however planned UNI 2.0 features include support of additional services including G.709, sub-STS-1 signal types and Ethernet interfaces (using the same solutions from existing CCAMP documents). We understand that the ASON architecture itself is applicable to any layer network, existing and future, and are phasing our work based on input from our carrier members on capabilities that are of greatest importance to them.

-- As a clarification, all Implementation Agreements represent fully ratified documents, and are published on the OIF website after being voted on and approved by the OIF membership. Current Implementation Agreements include the UNI 1.0R2 and the Intra-Carrier E-NNI Signaling 1.0 specifications, available for open public access at <http://oiforum.com/public/impagreements.html>.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "James D. Jones".

Jim Jones
OIF Technical Committee Chair

cc: statements@ietf.org