INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION SECTOR

STUDY PERIOD 2009-2012

STUDY GROUP 15

TD 279 Rev.2 (GEN/15)

English only

Original: English

Question(s):	All/15	Geneva, 5-16 December 2011

TEMPORARY DOCUMENT

Source:	Director TSB
Title:	Email exchange between the Director of TSB and the IETF Chair

From: Johnson, Malcolm
Sent: 01 December 2011 10:27
To: 'Russ Housley'
Subject: RE: MPLS

Dear Russ

(1) I am pleased that we seem to have the title sorted.

(2) I attached a contribution which proposes amendments to the determined text in COM15-R22. This includes the title change and makes changes to the terminology throughout the document. What had previously been called "MPLS-TP OAM" is now never referred to as such, but simply as "OAM" or "data-plane OAM". As you can see there is a willingness to satisfy all the IETF concerns but if there is still something else in the body of the draft Recommendation that causes concern could you please specify what exactly it is so it can be addressed?

(3) I am not aware of any delay from ITU side. If there is anything that needs to be done from our side to expedite the last call so that the code point can be assigned by 10 January please let me know.

Regards
Malcolm

From: Russ Housley [mailto:housley@vigilsec.com]
Sent: 29 November 2011 23:45
To: Johnson, Malcolm
Subject: Re: MPLS

Dear Malcolm:

Thanks for the note. There are three points that need to made:

(1) The change in the title of G.8113.1 is a step in the right direction. Thanks.

(2) I do not see acknowledgement of the necessary changes to the content of G.8113.1 that address my earlier comments. The Japanese document indicates that the content to be revised to reflect that G.8113.1 is not included as part of MPLS or MPLS-TP. I anticipate technical changes, not just the

Contact:	TSB	Tel: +41 22 730 5515
		Fax: +41 22 730 5853
		Email: tsbsg15@itu.int

inclusion of a statement that G.8113.1 is not part of MPLS or MPLS-TP.

(3) As you are well aware, the timeline is quite tight, and delay from any source will prevent the IETF process from completing by the deadline of 10 January 2012. No one can predict IETF consensus, but as I have said before, clarity is vital to avoid delay.

Regards,
Russ

From: Johnson, Malcolm
Sent: 25 November 2011 12:00
To: 'Russ Housley'
Subject: RE: MPLS

Dear Russ

I am pleased to advise you that the SG15 Chairman's proposed compromise has been amended to take account of your comments and has been submitted by the government of Japan. I very much hope that this will enable IETF to assign the ACh code point which will allow a resolution of this issue and permit us to move forward with our collaboration consistent with the JWT agreement.

The relevant documents are publicly available at:

http://www.itu.int/oth/T0A0B00000C

Best regards

Malcolm

From: Johnson, Malcolm
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 12:13 PM
To: 'housley@vigilsec.com' <housley@vigilsec.com>
Subject: Re: MPLS

Dear Russ
As I said I am confident that the clarity needed on that point can be given. In any case the final text will be agreed in SG15 in December. In the SG15 Chairman's proposal if an Ach code point can then be assigned within 4 weeks we can continue with our work in accordance with the JWT agreement.
Malcolm

From: Russ Housley [mailto:housley@vigilsec.com]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 09:24 AM
To: Johnson, Malcolm
Subject: Re: MPLS

Dear Malcolm:

IETF consensus continues to be required to allocate the code point. My experience leads me to believe that careful clarity about the proposed content changes to G.8113.1, as well as specific clarity that G.8113.1 is not part of MPLS and MPLS-TP, will aid in achieving such a consensus. The current situation has engendered quite a bit of ambiguity in wording which, in my experience, will not produce IETF consensus.

Russ

On Nov 16, 2011, at 7:40 PM, Johnson, Malcolm wrote:

Russ
The proposal in TD527 is intended to change the title and content of G.8113.1 to reflect that it describes an alternative OAM mechanism for MPLS-TP networks based on Ethernet OAM and is not included as part of the MPLS or MPLS-TP protocol suite. Also it is intended to be consistent with the JWT agreement and the Newslog article. I am sure the SG15 Chairman would be willing to amend his document as necessary to reflect this. On this basis could the IETF assign an ACh code point that would be included in Recommendation ITU-T G.8113.1?
Malcolm

From: Russ Housley [mailto:housley@vigilsec.com]
Sent: 15 November 2011 11:23
To: Johnson, Malcolm
Subject: Re: MPLS

Dear Malcolm:

http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/newslog/Statement+Ahead+Of+IETF+Meeting.aspx

Thanks for getting this posted. It has already gotten a lot of visibility.

Just to make sure that we are on the same page, I'd like to repeat two things that came up while we were drafting the newslog article. These also reflect the IETF's understanding of the newslog article. I'll forward this note to the IETF participants to be sure that we're all in sync here.

First, the text of the newslog article re-affirms the JWT agreement from 2008 as captured in RFC 5317. In particular, the IETF standards process will continue to be used for all MPLS-TP architecture and protocol documents.

Second, since G.8113.1 contains a protocol that is not a product of the IETF standards process, it cannot be a part of MPLS-TP according to the conditions of the JWT agreement and the newslog article. The IETF anticipates one of the following actions will be taken to conform to this agreement. Either (1) G.8113.1 will be withdrawn, or (2) the title of G.8113.1 will be changed, and the content will be revised to reflect that it is not included as part of MPLS or MPLS-TP protocol suite..

Also, thanks for sending me the TD527/P document from the SG15 Chairman. I note that it proposes the progression of both G.8113.1 and G.8113.2 as MPLS standards. This approach is not consistent with the JWT agreement or the newslog article.

I believe this is a constructive step forward. I look forward to a resolution that fully respects the JWT agreement and moves our two organizations further toward collaborative standards development.

Russ

On Nov 12, 2011, at 5:18 AM, Johnson, Malcolm wrote:
Thanks Russ
We will publish first thing Monday.
Hope you had a good trip and wish you a successful meeting
Malcolm

_____