WG Document Status

draft-ietf-ccamp-flexi-grid-fwk-02, IETF 91

- **Open issues**
  - The list of requirements is not yet agreed to be complete, and some proposed requirements do not fit in the current framework
    - Consensus of the set of requirements
    - Remove editorial notes & requirements that do not apply before Last Call

  - The current framework text does not cover a network media channel over multiple (contiguous or not) frequency slots.
    - Covered → *the control plane architecture should allow multiple media channels to be co-routed and logically associated*
    - Align with label draft, regarding end-to-end connections as a composite of more than one flexi-grid slot
    - Elaborate and clarify

  - The current framework draft only covers aspects regarding the *media layer*, the *signal layer* is not discussed.
    - *Signal-to-media relationship, adaptation, mapping, not in scope, focus on the media layer, separate draft if/when needed.*

draft-ietf-ccamp-flexi-grid-fwk-02 Next steps

- Add text if needed to better reflect
  - Values of n & m with resolution 0.5
  - Feedback received from ITU-T liaison (mostly already covered)

- Complete the GMPLS applicability section, elaborate more of the set of requirements for routing, signaling, etc.

- Add text on the association of LSPs representing media channels, high level text on the need to associate LSPs and manage composite labels.

- Timeline
  - Update according to these slides by January, 31st , 2015.
  - Final review by authors for consistency with other I-Ds by February 15th 2015
  - Ready for WG last call – end of February, 2015 – Pre-IETF92

draft-ietf-ccamp-flexible-grid-rsvp-te-ext-00

- Content: define signaling procedure

  - Define signaling protocol extensions and procedures for flexi-grid

  - New objects/parameters (e.g., Traffic Parameters, Label) introduced

- Status:

  - WG adoption in June, 2014

  - Basically stable

- Next Steps:

  - Follow the progress with framework and label draft

  - Label set management

  - Switching type/capability

  - Update according to comments

  - Prepare for Last Call

draft-ietf-ccamp-flexible-grid-ospf-ext-00

- Content: provide routing procedure
  - New type (=Flexi-Grid-LSC) introduced in ISCD
  - Advertisement of available frequency ranges
- Status:
  - WG adoption in June 2014
  - Basically stable
- Next Steps:
  - Do we need multiple or only one solution to represent the available frequency ranges?
    - Inclusive/Exclusive Label Range
    - Inclusive/Exclusive Label Lists
    - Bitmap (Preferred)
  - Max width will be extended to 16 bits to cover the whole C-band (to be revised in next update)
  - Update other comments and prepare for last call

draft-ietf-ccamp-flexigrid-lambda-label

- **Process status**
  - Adopted by WG 13 June 2014
  - Updated 26 June 2014
- **Contentious issues?**
  - Composite/compound labels was added and seemed to have consensus
- **Pending changes**
  - There is a version with a one word fix pending submission
- **Implementation Status**
  - Document shows one RFC 6982 implementation status
  - Two further implementations are known, but implementers are shy
- **Related work**
  - Framework I-D needs to talk about these concepts at high level
  - Signaling and routing I-Ds use this document
- **Work plan**
  - Document is ready but…
    - Should probably be gated by Signaling draft
    - Might be best to be in synch with Framework
    - (Does not need to wait for Routing draft)

draft-ietf-ccamp-grid-property-lmp-00

- draft-ietf-ccamp-grid-property-lmp-00.txt Link Management Protocol Extensions for Grid Property Negotiation.

- Adopted as working group draft in July 2014.

- According to the comments received from IETF89, will add texts about grid property distribution after LMP link discovery and negotiation.

- Follow the framework document update.

- Further comments/reviews are most welcome.

draft-ietf-ccamp-lsp-attribute-ro-05

– Changes since 04

- Addressed the comments (thanks to Lou)
- Added a compatibility section with RFC5420
- RFC 2119 language fixed
- IANA section aligned with RFC5226   guidelines
- Security Considerations done properly
- Editorial changes (Avoid re-definitions)

– Next Steps

- Draft is mature and stable
- Authors believe it's ready for Last Call

draft-ietf-ccamp-lsp-diversity-04

- Dedicated slot for presentation

draft-ietf-ccamp-mpls-tp-rsvpte-ext-associated-lsp-11

Update since IETF-90:

- Addressed review comments received from the WG chairs

- Completed early allocation of IANA code-points

- Draft updated with allocated code-points

- IPR poll completed

- Completed working group last call

Open issues:

- None

Next steps:

- Waiting for a write-up from the document shepherd

Network Assigned Upstream Label
draft-ietf-ccamp-network-assigned-upstream-label-00

Status

- Just got adopted.
- No open issues.

Next Steps

- Submit a small set of changes:
  - Section 6.2 – change MUST->SHOULD
    - "In such a scenario, if the ingress client receives a changed label via the LABEL object in a RESV modify, it **SHOULD** retune the laser at the ingress to the new wavelength. Similarly if the egress client receives a changed label via UPSTREAM_LABEL/ LABEL_SET in a PATH modify, it **SHOULD** retune the laser at the egress to the new wavelength."
  - Add Zafar Ali to the list of contributors

draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-bandwidth-availability

- Open issue:
  - There was comment on extending the mechanism to optical area in IETF90.

- Next steps:
  - Would like to have further discussion on the open issue if still interested. Will update the draft if needed.
  - Any other comments are welcome

draft-ietf-ccamp-ospf-availability-extension

- This document is a companion document to the previous one, draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-bandwidth-availability.

- Open issue:
  - If the mechanism was extended to optical area, the Switching capability is needed to be updated accordingly. Right now the switching capability of Availability sub-TLV is PSC-1/ PSC-2/ PSC-3/ PSC-4

- Next step:
  - Asking for review, comments are welcome.

draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-domain-subobjects

- ## Status
  - Was pending the IRO issue resolution in the sister PCE document (draft-ietf-pce-pcep-domain-sequence)
    - An update is made (-06 version) after a survey of existing IRO implementation (draft-dhody-pce-iro-survey) and an update to IRO procedure (draft-dhody-pce-iro-update)
      - *<Status from PCE WG meeting>*

- ## Open Issue
  - None

- ## Next Step
  - To be progressed in coordination with PCE WG

draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-li-lb-05(06)

- Defines RSVP-TE extensions for generic Lock Instruct (LI) and Loopback (LB) provisioning for all kinds of LSPs

- Content has been stable for a while

- Recent editorial changes based on discussion with Lou (Many thanks)

- Open issues: None

- Next step: authors believe it is ready for WG last call

draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-srlg-collect-08

- Dedicated slot for presentation

TE Metric Recording:
draft-ietf-ccamp-te-metric-recording-04.txt

- ## Open Issues:

  - No outstanding comments or issues.

  - The delay in the LC has been due to the dependency on OSPF and ISIS TE Metric Extensions drafts.

  - Latest status for the dependency is as follows:

    - draft-ietf-ospf-te-metric-extensions – **Post LC**. LC ended Oct. 4, 2014.

    - draft-ietf-isis-te-metric-extensions – **In LC**. LC ending Nov. 21, 2014.

- ## Next Steps:

  - Draft has been stable for quite some time.

  - Authors needs to make some editorial changes and make any changes induced by LC of OSPF/ ISIS TE metric recording drafts.

  - Ask WG for LC before IETF 92.

draft-ietf-ccamp-wson-iv-info-00

- Status:
  - The original individual draft updated based on feedbacks from IETF 90.
  - Abstract/Introduction narrative
  - Editorial fixes
  - WG Document Since Oct 2014 (no changes since submission as WG doc).
  - Vehicle for discussion with ITU (Any news from Q6?)
- Next steps:
  - Update according to inputs from WG and ITU SG15/Q6
  - Update the companion encoding draft (still individual submission).
  - Propose protocol specific drafts using this information model. Compatibility assessment with :
    - existing WSON draft currently in LC.
    - SSON WG drafts.

draft-ietf-ccamp-interconnected-te-info-exchange

- **Assuming adoption by WG**
  - Currently draft-farrel-ccamp-interconnected-te-info-exchange
- **Pending changes**
  - Some changes requested along the way to adoption are now queued
    - Minor edits around GMPLS UNI text from George Swallow
    - Suggested changes from Dhruv Dhody
- **Open issues**
  - Is this really Standards Track or should it move to Informational?
  - Missing sections
    - 5.4 Considerations for Dynamic Abstraction
    - 5.6 Addressing Considerations
    - 11 manageability Considerations
    - 12 Security Considerations
- **Related work**
  - Two or three applicability statements for specific use cases
    - Separate I-Ds
    - Build on material in this document
    - Show how architecture and existing protocols deliver function
    - Identify any protocol extensions needed

draft-ietf-ccamp-interconnected-te-info-exchange: Work plan

- Complete adoption as WG draft
  - Whenever the chairs tell us
  - Post revision with changed name (Day X)
- New revision for minor queued changes
  - Simple re-spin (Day X + 7)
  - Explain changes to mailing list
- New revision completing missing sections
  - Some work needed (anyone may volunteer!)
  - Post revision (Day X + 60)
- Authors to review and scrub document ready for WG last call
  - Post revision (Day X + 75)
- Ready for WG last call
  - (Day X + 76)
  - Not gated on separate applicability work

draft-ietf-ccamp-additional-signal-type-g709v3-00

- ## Open Issues:

  - Dependency on draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-signal-type-subregistry-00.txt.

  - No other outstanding comments or issues.

- ## Next Steps:

  - Looking for feedback from the WG.

  - This is a very slim document and we should be able to move to LC quickly.

draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-signal-type-subregistry-00

- ## Open Issues:

  - Need to address Adrian's comments.

  - No other outstanding comments or issues

- ## Next Steps:

  - Looking for feedback from the WG.

  - Once Adrian's comments are addressed, we can ask for WG LC (This is a very slim document).

  - In due time, the WG/ IESG to assign "Designated Expert" to review.