



---

**Question(s):** 3, 9, 10, 12, 14/15

**LIAISON STATEMENT**

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

**Title:** p2mp framework for MPLS-TP

---

**LIAISON STATEMENT**

**For action to:** IETF MPLS WG

**For comment to:** -

**For information to:** -

**Approval:** Agreed to by Question 3, 9, 10, 12, 14/15 joint meeting (Hiroshima, 28 January – 1 February 2013)

**Deadline:** 1 June 2013

---

**Contact:** Malcolm Betts (Q12)  
ZTE  
PRC

Tel: +1 678 534-2542

Email: [malcolm.betts@zte.com.cn](mailto:malcolm.betts@zte.com.cn)

---

Thank you for your liaison statement “iLS: Full response to "Progressing work on the p2mp framework in MPLS-TP"”. We note that this work is progressing and we will develop extensions to the appropriate MPLS-TP Recommendation when the work is completed.

We note that you indicated that several of the issues we raised are not within the scope of a protocol specification so we plan to cover these points in the appropriate Recommendations (e.g. G.8121 and G.8151).

For the issues related to mismatches, we note your response and we expect that participants interested in these issues and the three new issues identified below will help to progress this work via the normal IETF process (email discussion or individual drafts).

During discussion 3 additional issues were raised, we request that you consider these issues as the draft is progressed.

- 1) The application of the requirement in section 2.2.3 of RFC5860

*The MPLS-TP OAM toolset MUST provide a function to enable an End Point to determine whether or not it is connected to specific End Point(s) by means of the expected PW, LSP, or Section.*

Needs some clarification since a source MEP cannot determine if it is connected to a specific end point. We suggest the following:

<p><b>Attention:</b> 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.</p>
---

The MPLS-TP OAM toolset MUST provide a function to enable a sink End Point to determine whether or not it is connected to a specific source End Point by means of the expected PW or LSP.

- 2) Similarly the application of the requirement in section 5.1 of RFC6371.

Proactive Continuity Check functions, as required in Section 2.2.2 of RFC 5860 [11], are used to detect a loss of continuity (LOC) defect between two MEPs in an MEG.

Proactive Connectivity Verification functions, as required in Section 2.2.3 of RFC 5860 [11], are used to detect an unexpected connectivity defect between two MEGs (e.g., mismerging or misconnection), as well as unexpected connectivity within the MEG with an unexpected MEP.

Needs some clarification since a source MEP cannot determine if it is connected to a specific end point. We suggest the following:

Proactive Continuity Check functions, as required in Section 2.2.2 of RFC5860, are used to detect a loss of continuity (LOC) defect from the source MEP to sink MEP(s).

Proactive Connectivity Verification functions, as required in Section 2.2.3 of RFC5860, are used to detect an unexpected connectivity defect from the source MEP to sink MEP(s) (e.g., mismerging or misconnection), as well as unexpected connectivity within MEG with an unexpected source MEP.

- 3) In a P2MP transport path, it is highly desirable that in order to reduce OAM bandwidth consumption, CV, when used, should be linked with CC into CC-V OAM packets.
-