INTRODUCTION

According to ITU procedures, as described in ITU-T Recommendation A.5, any normative reference to documentation produced outside the ITU (other than ISO and IEC texts) needs to be evaluated by the study group or working party before a decision is made to incorporate the reference in an ITU-T Recommendation.

This TD contains the A.5 justification information for revised G.8110.1/Y.1370.1.

REVIEWED DOCUMENTS AND RESPECTIVE JUSTIFICATIONS

- IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane: MPLS Transport Profile Data Plane Architecture
  - The Internet-Draft is under IETF Last Call
  - G.8110.1 refers the MPLS-TP data plane architecture as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 1.
- IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework: A Framework for MPLS in Transport Networks
  - The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).
  - G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP Architecture as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 2.
- IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-identifiers: MPLS-TP Identifiers
  - The Internet-Draft is an MPLS WG draft
  - G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP Identifiers as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-identifiers
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 3.
- IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-oam-framework: MPLS-TP OAM Framework and Overview
- **The Internet-Draft is under IESG Processing**
- G.8110.1 refers the MPLS-TP OAM framework as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-oam-framework
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 4.
- IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk: Multiprotocol Label Switching Transport Profile Survivability Framework
- **The Internet-Draft is under IESG Processing**
- G.8110.1 refers the MPLS-TP survivability (protection and restoration) framework as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 5.
  - The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).
  - G.8110.1 refers to the PWE3 Control Word definition as specified in RFC 4385
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 6.
- IETF RFC 4448 (2006): Encapsulation Methods for Transport of Ethernet over MPLS Networks
  - The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).
  - G.8110.1 refers to Ethernet PW definition as specified in RFC 4448
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 7.
- IETF RFC 4720 (2006): Pseudowire Emulation Edge-to-Edge (PWE3) â€“ Frame Check Sequence Retention
  - The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).
  - G.8110.1 specifies PWE3 FCS retention as defined in RFC 4720
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 8.
  - The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).
  - G.8110.1 refers to the data plane aspects of p2mp LSP as defined in RFC 4875
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 9.
  - The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).
  - G.8110.1 refers the MPLS upstream label assignment and context-specific label space as specified in RFC 5331
  - Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 10.
- IETF RFC 5332 (2008): MPLS Multicast Encapsulations
- The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).
- G.8110.1 refers the MPLS multicast encapsulations as specified in RFC 5332
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 11.

IETF RFC 5462 (2009) (*): Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Stack Entry: "EXP" Field Renamed to "Traffic Class" Field
- The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.
- G.8110.1 refers to the TC field as defined in RFC 5462
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 12.

IETF RFC 5586 (2009) (*): MPLS Generic Associated Channel
- The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.
- G.8110.1 refers the GAL and G-ACh as defined in RFC 5586.
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 13.

IETF RFC 5654 (2009) (*): MPLS-TP Requirements
- The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.
- G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP Requirements as defined in RFC 5654
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 14.

IETF RFC 5718 (2010) (*) (*): An In-Band Data Communication Network For the MPLS Transport Profile
- The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.
- G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP DCN as defined in RFC 5718
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 15.

IETF RFC 5860 (2010) (*): Requirements for Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) in MPLS Transport Networks
- The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.
- G.8110.1 refers the MPLS-TP OAM Requirements as defined in RFC 5860
- Complete A.5 justification information can be found in Annex 16.
Annex 1

A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane: MPLS Transport Profile Data Plane Architecture

2 Status of approval:
The Internet-Draft is under IETF Last Call

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers the MPLS-TP data plane architecture as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced draft are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:
Normative References


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.
9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):
Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 2
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework (: A Framework for MPLS in Transport Networks

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP Architecture as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Informational" with IETF consensus.

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Informational" with IETF consensus.

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFCs are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 3
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-identifiers

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-identifiers: MPLS-TP Identifiers

2 Status of approval:
The Internet-Draft is an MPLS WG draft

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP Identifiers as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-identifiers

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Proposed Standard"

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Proposed Standard"

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced draft are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 4

A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-oam-framework

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-oam-framework: MPLS-TP OAM Framework and Overview

2 Status of approval:
The Internet-Draft is under IESG Processing

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.811.1 refers the MPLS-TP OAM framework as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-oam-framework

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Informational" with IETF consensus.

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Informational" with IETF consensus.

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced draft are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


[8] Vigoureux, M., Betts, M., Ward, D., "Requirements for OAM in MPLS Transport Networks", draft-ietf-mpls-tp-oam-requirements-06 (work in progress), March 2010
9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 5
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF Internet Draft draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk: Multiprotocol Label Switching Transport Profile Survivability Framework

2 Status of approval:
The Internet-Draft is under IESG Processing

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers the MPLS-TP survivability (protection and restoration) framework as defined in draft-ietf-mpls-tp-survive-fwk

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Informational" with IETF consensus.

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The intended status of the referred draft, is "Informational" with IETF consensus.

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced draft are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.
10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 6

A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 4385 (2006) (*) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 4385 (2006) (*) (*): Pseudowire Emulation Edge-to-Edge (PWE3) Control Word for Use over an MPLS PSN

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to the PWE3 Control Word definition as specified in RFC 4385

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFCs are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:
Normative References

[RFC2119] IETF RFC 2119 (1997), Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels

Informative References

[BCP] IETF RFC work in progress (2005), Avoiding Equal Cost Multipath Treatment in MPLS Networks
[FRAG] IETF RFC work in progress (November 2005), PWE3 Fragmentation and Reassembly
[IANA] IETF RFC work in progress (November 2005), IANA Allocations for Pseudowire Edge to Edge Emulation (PWE3)
[RFC2434] IETF RFC 2434 (1998), Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs
[RFC3985] IETF RFC 3985 (2005), Pseudo Wire Emulation Edge-to-Edge (PWE3) Architecture
[VCCV] IETF RFC work in progress (2005), Pseudowire Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV)

9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 7
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 4448 (2006) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 4448 (2006) (*): Encapsulation Methods for Transport of Ethernet over MPLS Networks

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to Ethernet PW definition as specified in RFC 4448

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:

9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:

9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):
Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 8
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 4720 (2006) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 4720 (2006) (*): Pseudowire Emulation Edge-to-Edge (PWE3) â€“ Frame Check Sequence Retention

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 specifies PWE3 FCS retention as defined in RFC 4720

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referred RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 9
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 4875 (2007) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to the data plane aspects of p2mp LSP as defined in RFC 4875

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 10

A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 5331 (2008) (*)(*).

1 Clear description of the referenced document:

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers the MPLS upstream label assignment and context-specific label space as specified in RFC 5331.

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:

9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:
9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.
9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.
10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 11
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 5332 (2008) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 5332 (2008) (*): MPLS Multicast Encapsulations

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group).

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers the MPLS multicast encapsulations as specified in RFC 5332

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:

9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:
9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.
9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 12
A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 5462 (2009) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 5462 (2009) (*): Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Label Stack Entry: "EXP" Field Renamed to "Traffic Class" Field

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to the TC field as defined in RFC 5462

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 13

A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 5586 (2009) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 5586 (2009) (*): MPLS Generic Associated Channel

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers the GAL and G-ACh as defined in RFC 5586.

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
Annex 14

A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 5654 (2009) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 5654 (2009) (*): MPLS-TP Requirements

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP Requirements as defined in RFC 5654

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:


9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
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A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 5718 (2010) (*) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 5718 (2010) (*) (*): An In-Band Data Communication Network For the MPLS Transport Profile

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers to the MPLS-TP DCN as defined in RFC 5718

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
RFC 5718 is based on definitions in RFC 5586 and references RFC 5586

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:

9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:
9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.
9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):
Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.
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A.5 justification information for the reference to IETF RFC 5860 (2010) (*)

1 Clear description of the referenced document:
IETF RFC 5860 (2010) (*): Requirements for Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) in MPLS Transport Networks

2 Status of approval:
The referred RFC was approved by IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) with ITU-T support.

3 Justification for the specific reference:
G.8110.1 refers the MPLS-TP OAM Requirements as defined in RFC 5860

4 Current information, if any, about IPR issues:
IETF IPR archives at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.html

5 Other useful information describing the "Quality" of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

6 The degree of stability or maturity of the document:
The status of the referred RFC, is "Proposed Standard".

7 Relationship with other existing or emerging documents:
References within the referenced RFC are listed under item (8).

8 Any explicit references within that referenced document should also be listed:
9 Qualification of ISOC/IETF:


9.7 The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is responsible for ongoing maintenance of the RFCs when the need arises. Comments on RFCs and corresponding changes are accommodated through the existing standardization process.

9.8 Each revision of a given RFC has a different RFC number, so no confusion is possible. All RFCs always remain available on-line. An index of RFCs and their status may be found in the IETF archives at http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html.

10 Other (for any supplementary information):

Reference should always be made by RFC number (and not by other designations such as STD, BCP, etc.). References should not be made to documents referred to as "Internet Drafts" or to IETF RFCs categorized as Historic or Experimental. Normative references must only be made to IETF RFCs that are Standards Track or to Informational RFCs that have IETF consensus.