



Question(s): 14/15

LIAISON STATEMENT

Source: ITU-T Study Group 15

Title: Response to MPLS-TP ACH TLV Structure -02 WG Last Call (ref # 020.02)

LIAISON STATEMENT

For action to: IETF MPLS TP

Approval: Agreed to by Question 14/15 and ad hoc on MPLS-TP (by correspondence)

Deadline: 26 April 2010

Contact: Hing-Kam Lam
Alcatel-Lucent
USA

Tel: +1-908-582-0672

Email: Kam.Lam@alcatel-lucent.com

Thank you for your liaison statement (ref # 020.01) soliciting last call comments by ITU-T on the MPLS-TP ACH TLV Structure draft.

The experts of Q14/15 have reviewed draft-ietf-mpls-tp-ach-tlv-02.txt by correspondence and have the following comments.

1. The purpose of the current draft is unclear. We suggest integrate the following sentences into the abstract and introduction sections to clarify the purpose of the draft.

The MPLS generic associated channel header specification [6] (GACH) describes a TLV structure that is used to provide additional context information for the ACH message. To provide the context information, TLV will need to be defined. Potentially a TLV can be applicable to multiple applications, like the case of Textual Convention (TC) in the SNMP MIB modules. It is therefore beneficial to define the TLVs in a document so that other applications can re-use them. This document defines a number of TLVs that are required by the MPLS-TP design in [7] and [8]. However, the use of each TLV (including the processes and the order of the TLV in the ACH message) in the context of the ACH message that carries it MUST be specified in the document that defines the ACH message.

2. While the use of the TLV defined in this draft must be specified in the document that defines the ACH message, some guidance as below should be provided in this draft.

While TLVs can be a flexible tool when defining protocol information, they can also limit implementations so they can only be realized in general purpose CPUs. Not defining the specific location data exists in a PDU due to having random order and a variety of length of TLVs can force this. Limiting realization to CPUs will not only affect performance and also significantly increase the complexity of interoperability testing. It can also limit use of application specific gate oriented realizations.

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. Additional TLVs may be identified and need to be defined in the future. Where will these new TLVs will be defined. Will they be defined in a future revision of this document? What are the ground rules to define the new TLVs?
4. To simplify the implementation of the identification and location of the individual TLVs, they should be aligned on the 32-bit boundary.
5. Address vs Identifier

The draft defines in Section 2.2 the IPv4 Source Address TLV and in Section 2.3 the IPv6 Source Address. However in a MPLS-TP network using co-routed bidirectional LSPs we do not need (or use) a return address. We do need the MEG identifier to check that the message is from the expected MEP, the return message should also include the MEG identifier to ensure that the message is from within the MEG. The format of the identifier may be IPv4 or IPv6 or else. This context should be made clear. That is, they are being used to identify the MEG. We also suggest change the heading of these two sections to “Identifier in IPv4 Format” and “Identifier in IPv6 Format” respectively.

The format for MIP, MEP, and MEG identifier TLVs should also defined in this draft.

6. Section 2.7 says “The authentication procedures and data format used is the same as that defined in Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 of [9]”. Since [9] introduces the procedures in Section 6, the above sentence should be “The authentication data format and procedures used is the same as that defined in Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 6 of [9]”. Also, [9] should be a normative reference. Since authentication should be common to all applications, the scope of authentication should be defined in this draft.

Because of the above comments, we feel the current draft is not mature enough for publication. We would expect our comments be addressed and appreciate the opportunity of providing further review on the revised draft.
