



Question(s): 14/15

LIAISON STATEMENT

Source: ITU-T Study Group 15

Title: Liaison response to request for review of OSPFv2 extensions for ASON routing submission (ref. TD 552 (WP 3/15))

LIAISON STATEMENT

To: IETF CCAMP

Approval: Agreed to by Question 14/15 (Chicago, 13-17 June 2011)

For: Information

Deadline: None

Contact: Hing-Kam Lam
Alcatel-Lucent
USA

Tel: +1 908 582 067

Fax: +1 908 582 1124

Email: Kam.Lam@alcatel-lucent.com

Thank you for your liaison advising Q14/15 of the new CCAMP work on OSPFv2 extensions for ASON Routing. We appreciate that IETF is progressing their work on OSPF extensions for ASON.

In reviewing the draft, the changes regarding how to handle looping of information and accommodation of multiple nodes per routing instance are noted and agreed. Additionally, the simplification of the method to coordinate the advertisement of information exported from lower level area is appreciated and agreed.

There appear to be some requirements in G.7715.1 that are still not completely met and draft-ietf-ccamp-rfc5787bis-01.txt may not be the document to address them. These seem to stem mainly from a difference in the definition of layer used in ITU-T's G.800 and depended on by G.8080. This definition is more specific, treating each <Switching Type, Encoding Type, Signal Type> as a separate layer. The specific requirements defined in G.7715.1 (cf. Section 9.5.1) and not met in Section 5 of the draft are:

1. Support for per-layer attributes. While the draft allows for different signal types to be advertised in an LSA, they don't allow for different attributes (e.g. link weight, resource class) to be advertised per signal type. Adding a construct that allows for SubTLVs (e.g., link weight, resource class, SRG) to be scoped to a layer would address this issue.
2. Full support for endpoint termination/switching identification. While the draft describes in Section 5.1 how to identify links that go between "technology regions" (cf. RFC4206), it doesn't handle the identification of layers that exist within regions (e.g., VC3 vs VC4 within the TDM/SDH). Adding a construct that identifies the switching/termination capability of a link end would address this issue.

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.

3. Method for identifying client adaptations supported on a link end. Many times there are multiple adaptation methods that exist between layers (e.g., X.86 vs GFP, 802.3 vs EthernetV2) and no mechanism exists in the proposed extensions to identify the adaptation uniquely. Adding a construct that identifies the specific client adaptation method supported on a link end would address this issue.

Regarding the early allocation of code points for the constructs contained in draft-ietf-ccamp-
rfc5787bis-01.txt, Q14/15 agrees that it is mature to progress. Thank you again for this continued
work on ASON routing in OSPF.
