



INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

COM 15 – LS 289 – E

**TELECOMMUNICATION  
STANDARDIZATION SECTOR**

STUDY PERIOD 2009-2012

**English only**

**Original: English**

---

**Question(s):** 10/15

Geneva, 14-25 February 2011

**LIAISON STATEMENT**

**Source:** ITU-T Study Group 15

**Title:** Reply to the IETF MPLS working group last call on "MPLS Fault Management OAM (ref #047.01)" (ref #047.02)

---

**LIAISON STATEMENT**

**For action to:** IETF MPLS WG

**For comment to:** -

**For information to:** -

**Approval:** Agreed to at Study Group 15 meeting (Geneva, 14-25 February 2011)

**Deadline:** 1 April 2011

---

**Contact:** Huub van Helvoort  
Huawei Technologies Ltd.  
P. R. China

Tel: +31 649248936  
Email: [Huub.van.Helvoort@huawei.com](mailto:Huub.van.Helvoort@huawei.com)

---

Thank you for your liaison statement (Ref # 047.01) requesting a review by the ITU-T of the *MPLS Fault Management OAM* draft.

We have noticed the deadline of 28 February 2011.

Please note that in the past weeks the Q10/15 experts have been very busy preparing for the ITU-T SG15 plenary meeting and attending this meeting in Geneva 14-25 February 2011.

Considering this lack of time, the Q10/15 experts request to have the opportunity to send more comments at a later date.

---

**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.

Very few experts of Q.10/15 have had time to review draft-ietf-mpls-tp-fault-03 in order to provide comments on this draft. The few comments that were collected are included below.

---

(1) Page 5, section 2:

In the sentence ‘the intermediate node sends Fault Management messages using the LSP’s Fault associated channel back to the endpoint of the LSP.’, it is suggested to change “back to” into “downstream”.

(2) Page 5, section 2:

In the sentence ‘The messages are sent to the client MEPs by inserting them into the affected LSPs in the direction opposite to the detecting MEP’s peer server MEP(s).’, it is suggested to clarify this sentence, considering that the insertion of messages is downstream from the fault location (a picture would be helpful). A proposed rewording is:

“The messages are sent to the client MEPs by inserting them into the affected LSPs, downstream from the fault location”

(3) Page 5, Section 2.1.1:

Regarding the usage of the term “fatal”, as per “The LDI flag MUST be set if the defect has been determined to be fatal. For example during a protection switching event the LDI flag is not set’

From a discussion, it appeared that “fatal” means it is “service affecting” and “non-fatal” means it is “non service affecting”. To elaborate:

§ A failure affecting the service (fatal) => either unprotected case, or protected case where there is failure on both main and spare resources;

§ A failure not affecting the service (not fatal) => protected case where there is failure only on main resources.

If this is the case, it might be simplest to use the words “service affecting” and “non-service affecting”.