



Question(s): 12/15

LIAISON STATEMENT

Source: ITU-T Study Group 15

Title: Comments on the MPLS-TP process document available (ref #05.002)

LIAISON STATEMENT

For comment to: IETF MPLS liaison representative: MPLS Working Group

Approval: Agreed to at SG 15 meeting (Geneva, 28 September-9 October 2009)

Deadline: November 2009

Contact: Malcolm Betts
Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd.
PRC
Tel: +1 678 534-2542
Email: malcolm.betts@huawei.com

Thank you for bringing draft-ietf-mpls-tp-process to our attention. We have reviewed this document and propose the revisions:

Section 1.2: To align it with the scope of the document i.e. the adaptation of the IETF process used in a working group replacing the following text from section 1.2:

“The objective of cooperation between the IETF and ITU-T is to ensure full participation of interested parties to make sure that all opinions are heard with the intention of producing sound and stable MPLS-TP documentation. It is understood that the neither the IETF nor the ITU-T should be in a position to block the work of the other body within its areas of authority. In the context of this document, this means that the ITU-T must not block IETF work on MPLS-TP against the IETF consensus view.”

With:

“The objective of cooperation between the IETF and ITU-T is to ensure full participation of interested parties to make sure that all opinions are heard with the intention of producing sound and stable MPLS-TP documentation. It is understood that the neither the IETF nor the ITU-T can block the work of the other body within its areas of authority. In the context of this document, this means that the ITU-T cannot block IETF work on MPLS-TP in the IETF against the consensus view of the IETF.”

Section 2.3.1 step 14: To ensure that the ITU-T has visibility of changes and the opportunity to provide formal confirmation that changes made as a result of ITU-T last call comments change the following text at the end of the description of step 14:

<p>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.</p>

“The working group and document editors MUST fully address any comments received from the ITU-T via liaison under this step either making the requested changes, or discussing the changes with the ITU-T to reach a consensus position on the MPLS-TP mailing list.”

With:

“The working group and document editors MUST fully address any comments received from the ITU-T via liaison under this step either making the requested changes, or discuss the changes with the ITU-T to reach a consensus position on the MPLS-TP mailing list. The Rapporteur of the question that generated the liaison statement is responsible for ensuring that the ITU participants have visibility and input to the IETF WG comment resolution process. If the changes are not as requested by the ITU liaison the Rapporteur who was responsible for the generation of the original liaison should generate another liaison statement indicating if the resolution of the comments is acceptable to the ITU-T.”

Section 2.3.1 step 16: To further clarify the scope of this document i.e. the adaptation of the IETF process used in a working group replacing the following text from step 16:

“Once this request for publication is sent there is no further scope for the ITU-T to influence the development of the document. After this point, the document will be handled as any other IETF document with individual comments made during IETF last call, and with IESG review following.”

With:

"Once this request for publication is sent the document will be handled as any other IETF document with individual comments made during IETF last call, and with IESG review following. Therefore, after this point there is no further scope for ITU-T experts to influence the development of the document other than as individual contributors.”

In addition we would like to bring to your attention some discussion that occurred late in the current SG15 meeting. During this discussion it became evident that we should treat communication in the early stages of development of drafts differently from the final stages where support for approval is requested. We request that you send liaisons “for comment” in the early stages and “for action” in the final stages. We request that these differences are reflected in the update to the draft-ietf-mpls-tp-process.
