Thank you for your liaison statement (Ref # 26.01) requesting a review of the MPLS-TP framework draft. The experts of Q.12/15 have reviewed draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework-11 by correspondence and your response to our comments on draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework-10 in liaison reference #015.03.

We have not been able to reach consensus to support the approval of this draft in its current form. We request that you address our comments before the IETF approves the draft. Note that a number of Q.12 experts requested that an updated version be provided for review.

A number of the comments that we provided on draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework-10 in liaison #015.02 have not been addressed in a way that allows Q.12/15 to reach consensus to support approval of the draft. These have been repeated in attached marked up draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework-11, and are identified with the phrase “Comment from 15.02”.

Some experts were disappointed to note both the volume of new material that has been added and the material that has been deleted since we reviewed draft-ietf-mpls-tp-framework-10.

The new material is marked with a comment “New material. Additional time required to complete review”. This indicates that some experts requested additional time to review this new material. However, some experts indicated that they did review this new material and had no issues with the draft. If the current schedule of four parallel final working group last calls is maintained we will probably not be able to provide additional comments before May 21st i.e. 2 weeks after the four parallel WG last calls are completed. We are striving to advance this schedule any suggestions that you could provide would be welcome.

The attached marked up version of the draft identifies a number of comments and proposed changes collected from various Q12/15 experts. The comments and proposed changes do not have consensus within Q12/15. However, addressing these issues will allow Q.12/15 to reach consensus to support the approval of this draft.
Some the questions for clarification on the previous version were not addressed to some expert’s satisfaction in your liaison reference #015.03. Some comments on your response liaison reference #15.03 are provided in annex A of this liaison.
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