IETF-102 ccamp agenda

Session 2018-07-17 1550-1820: Saint-Paul/Sainte-Cath. - ccamp chatroom

Agenda

CCAMP Agenda For IETF 102

Session I

Tuesday, July 17, 2018 (EDT)

15:50-18:20 Tuesday Afternoon session II

Room: Saint-Paul/Sainte-Catherine

Presentation		Start			
Time	Duration	Information			
0	15:50	5	Title:	Administrivia - WG	

Status - Reporting on WG drafts not being presented

Draft:

Presenter: Chairs

| 1 | 15:55 | 10 | Title: | Transport Northbound |

Interface Applicability Statement

https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ccamp-transport-nbi-app-statement-02

Presenter: Italo Busi

Gert Grammel:How do you define vendor's domain?

Daniele Ceccarelli: this is only different domains, not necessarily to be different vendors.

Gert Grammel: Are they assumed to different control domain?

Italo Busi: Transponder is in the network, not in the CE.

Gert Grammel: Boundary is technology domain, but this is not necessarily true for all cases. Define more clearly on domain boundary.

Italo Busi: Can be anything, any technology, ETH, STM, ODU.

Gert Grammel: boundary is link basis here, but it can be a node??

Italo Busi: Current assumption is that all links are ODU capable of switching at the ODU layer. Another individual draft is to solve the problem.

Young Lee: what does it mean by 'boundary as a node'?

Gert Grammel: It can be a single box, for both the client and transport. In this case the boundary is in the 'middle' of the box.

Daniele Ceccarelli: One node is controlled by the same PNC control.

Gert Grammel: There could be two clients to collect telemetry from one node. In such case, it is not necessarily true that one node is controlled by one controller.

Fatai Zhang: Different SDOs may define different terminologies about domain, but we should use IETF language here. The IETF definition of the term "domain" should be used, the draft should reference to the related RFCs.

Gabriele Galimberti: for the next step, is there plan for develop the case including L3?

Italo Busi: not for now.

Gabriele Galimberti: how about DWDM?

Italo Busi: not yet. We can work if needed.

2   16:05   15   Title: A YANG Data Model for
OTN Topology and Tunnel

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-tunnel-model-
03

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-topo-yang-03

Presenter: Haomian Zheng

Mahesh Jethanandani: Since you will do the YANG doctor review soon or later,
you could send the question to YANG doctor list, to ask an early review

Gert Grammel: Where to put OTU: in the ODU or in the WDM? I think OTU should
pair with ODU. The draft should have clear statement about where to put OTU.

Haomian Zheng: OTU is not needed as it is a data plane modeling, but we can
discuss this point in the list.

Haomian Zheng: I do not think OTU has to be configured.

Mahesh Jethanandani: Meet all the guidelines from RFC6087-bis before sending
to YANG doctor's review.

Daniele Ceccarelli: [TE Tunnel] draft did not finish for WG LC, while [TE-
Topology] model is now stable. OTN topology will start the YANG doctor
review first, and then OTN tunnel. Need to follow the guideline before
that.

3   16:20   10   Title: A Yang Data Model for
L1 Connectivity Service Model (L1CSM)

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ccamp-l1csm-yang-05

Presenter: Young Lee

Mahesh Jethanandani: I work in IETF and MEF, MEF service YANG model,
particularly service-type, MEF58.

Dieter Beller: Support alignment with MEF models. Is a liaison necessary?

Daniele Ceccarelli: Any feedback from MEF?

Young Lee: Currently there is no data model in MEF, only info model. This
work is welcome in MEF as long as alignment.

Fatai Zhang: If the draft only cover L1, how about L0?

Young Lee: We cover only L1. Also MEF does not have plan for L0 services.
Missing standard references from ITU-T.

Gert Grammel: Is there any place define L0?

4   16:30   10   Title: Information Encoding
for WSON with Impairments Validation

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ccamp-wson-iv-encode-01

Presenter: Young Lee

Young Lee: Where to define GMPLS encoding? In this document or another document? I propose to add specific protocol enhancements (e.g., OPSF-TE and RSVP-TE) in this document rather than creating separate documents.

Daniele Ceccarelli: There are no strict rules. It's up to the authors' decision. If added to this WG document, the text to be added should be agreed by the WG.

5   16:40   10   Title: A YANG Data Model for Microwave Topology
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-ye-ccamp-mw-topo-yang-01.txt
Presenter: Amy Ye

Igor Bryskin: you said the topology can be divided into overlay/underlay, however they are not independent with each other. A tunnel in the underlying topology supports a link in the overlay domain. Therefore a MW tunnel supports an overlay ETH link, not a MW link.

Igor Bryskin: it's server-client relationship, MW need to have a tunnel in network that carries the ETH.

Amy Ye: Yes, the ETH link is supported by the mw tunnel, the mw tunnel is supported by the mw link. It's just one hop tunnel.

Lou Berger: How much of this is MW technology-specific or generic?

Amy Ye: Nominal and current b/w are microwave specific.

Lou Berger: I think you are just talking a variable bit-rate media channel. I suggest to change microwave model to variable bit-rate model. Just change the name to make it generic.

Rick Taylor: Change the name to radio.

Amy Ye: I think radio is a good name.

6   16:50   10   Title: Interworking of GMPLS Control and Centralized Controller System
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-zheng-ccamp-gmpls-controller-inter-work-02.txt
Presenter: Sergio Belotti

Daniele Ceccarelli: For interface 3, it could also be a routing protocol (IGP or BGP)

Young Lee: BGP for optical?

Gabriele Galimberti: There should not be BGP-LS for optical.

Daniele Ceccarelli: OK, but IGP is an option.

Daniele Ceccarelli: What is the value to have IGP resource updated (IF#2) if everything is centralized?

Lou Berger: interesting work but my concern is that it is duplicated with RFC8283 saying the same thing with different words.

Lou Berger: Why in CCAMP and not in TEAS? There is nothing which is technology-specific

Young Lee: I do not think that PCECC (RFC8283) and this one have overlapping content.

Lou Berger: It is not complete overlapping, so there is room for this work. Ok to have a poll about interest: Chairs and AD can figure out which WG should take responsibility.

Daniele Ceccarelli: How many people has read the draft? A lot

How many think it is an interesting work for the Routing Area? A lot, almost the same number as who read.

7   17:00   10   Title: A YANG Data Model for Transport Network Client Signals
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-zheng-ccamp-client-signal-yang-00.txt
Presenter: Haomian Zheng

Igor Bryskin: What we need is a generic framework, should not dependent on special technologies. Besides using the tunnels to carry the client signal, how to select the tunnel is also needed.

Haomian Zheng: done in the Transport-NBI applicability statement draft.

Igor Bryskin: network operator want to backup tunnel, to tell this connection should be protected by this backup tunnel. L3, TE tunnel, to describe the network service, then another. Should be a draft in TEAS.

Haomian Zheng: It's a valuable point, but this work based on giving the tunnel beforehand and just put the client signal into the given tunnel.

Dieter Beller: Some of the data node are not well-know, miss reference. The work should be done in ITU-T and IEEE.

Haomian Zheng: for transparent signals, it's clear, for non-transparent (carrier-Ethernet), we will align with other SDO, and add reference.

Italo Busi: The mapping to the Tunnel is generic (reference Tunnel's name) but the client definitions is technology-specific. We have tried to generalize but the client technologies are different.

8   17:10   10   Title: Signaling extensions for Media Channel sub-carriers configuration in SSON in LSC Optical Line Systems.
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ggalimbe-ccamp-flexigrid-carrier-label-04
Presenter: Gabriele Galimberti

Daniele Ceccarelli: How many think we should work on this topic?

How many think this is a good candidate for WG adoption?

How many read the draft? Almost

Daniele Ceccarelli: Julien is in favor of the draft.

Gabriele Galimberti: Maybe it could be a different document with the same content but it is time to start working on a solution.

Daniele Ceccarelli: need to increase the interest.

9   17:20   10   Title: IP - WDM interface extensions drafts

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-dharini-ccamp-dwdm-if-param-yang-05.txt

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-galimbe-ccamp-iv-yang-06.txt

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-dharinigert-ccamp-dwdm-if-lmp-07.txt

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-ggalimbe-ccamp-flex-if-lmp-05.txt

Presenter: Gert Grammel

Daniele Ceccarelli: We can consider adoption only when ITU finish the revision of the DWDM framework document. Same comment to the dwdm-if-param-yang.

Haomian Zheng: Some misalignment between this work (iv-yang) and existing WG draft (IV-encode, iv-info). This work focus on ROADM only, while WG drafts are between the Ss and Rs. You have different scope.

Gert Grammel: The parameters (e.g. power) need to be get from the ROADM, so they must fit together.

Haomian Zheng: But only some of them (ROADM parameters) are needed instead of ALL of them, for impairment validation.

Gert Grammel: Let's wait for the ITU document.

10   17:30   10   Title: ISIS Extensions for Flex Ethernet Link Advertisement

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-zhu-ccamp-flexe-link-advertisement-00.txt

Presenter: Mach Chen

Daniele Ceccarelli: Expecting framework (FlexE framework). The FlexE framework draft doesn't have much discussion on the list.

Dave Sinicrope: My understanding is that FlexE is defined by OIF and the only client is Ethernet. Why the routing is interested to know about FlexE?

Mach: An example is to use the protocol to trigger the configuration of the sub-interface.

Dave Sinicrope: Using the routing to exchange the FlexE characteristic, which is contradict to OIF.

Dave Sinicrope: My understanding of the OIF spec is that the FlexE is not visible to the upper layer: they only see an Ethernet interface.

Daniele Ceccarelli: These are actually the concerns with the framework document. If we have progress in framework, this draft could be considered.

11   17:40   10   Title: GMPLS Signaling Extensions for Shared Mesh Protection
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-he-ccamp-gmpls-signaling-smp-00.txt
Presenter: Jia He

Yuji: Is APS channel set up by the signaling?
Fatai Zhang: APS channel is already there and is based on data plane, the draft is defining the signaling to prepare the LSP, and then the APS will be used once there is a failure.
Dieter Beller: SMP is the most complicated scheme. In the past we have developed framework documents to describe how the protection mechanisms work, this is required for this mechanism. A separated draft to describe the motivation would be useful before providing protocol extensions.
Vishnu Pavan Beeram: It only requests a simple extension of the protocol.
Italo Busi: Understand Dieter Beller's concerns, but prefer to do within the same draft.
Jia He: This draft deals with the generic SMP, not ODU SMP.

12   17:50   20   Title: DLEP extensions
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-manet-dlep-credit-flow-control-02
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-manet-dlep-da-credit-extension-05
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-manet-dlep-latency-extension-03
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-manet-dlep-multi-hop-extension-05
Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-manet-dlep-pause-extension-04
Presenter: Lou Berger

Rick Taylor: Prefer split into separate documents.
Lou Berger: the technical part keeps unchanged even split into different documents.
Lou Berger: Who think it should be split? 75%
Igor Bryskin: why we are discussing here?
Lou Berger: AD thinks this DLEP work belongs to CCAMP

Stan Ratliff: We got make better discussion first.
Lou Berger: Ask AD's opinion
Rick Taylor: Manet is split into CCAMP and PIM and have a conflict today
Lou Berger: Need to add PIM as WG not to conflict to…

Deborah: Not formally decided yet. The result will be in one month. If it comes to CCAMP, it's related with LMP, ask people to review and help.

Rick Taylor: Real development on DELP.

13   18:10   10   Title: Finite state machine YANG model augmentation for Transponder Reconfiguration

Draft: https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-sambo-ccamp-yang-fsm-transponder-reconf-01.txt

Presenter: Daniele Ceccarelli

Gert Grammel: Given that it is transponder, should wait ITU?

Young Lee: Talk to Nicola, next IETF we can have some draft to model the transponder from the network perspective.

Fatai Zhang: Is it possible to combine with WSON models?

Young Lee: Maybe in the WSON impairment model.

Adjourn.