

A Realization of Network Slices for 5G Networks Using Current IP/MPLS Technologies

draft-ietf-teas-5g-ns-ip-mpls-08

IETF#120, Vancouver
July 2024

K. Szarkowicz (Juniper), R. Roberts (Juniper), J. Lucek (Juniper),
M. Boucadair (Orange), L. M. Contreras (Telefonica)

History Log Since IETF#119

- -04 (03/24): WGLC
- -05 (04/24)
 - Changes to address the comments raised during the WGLC period, mainly from Jie and Xuesong, e.g.,
 - Ensure **better alignment** with the application I-D
 - Use **consistent** terminology
 - Clarify customer of end-to-end slice customer vs. customer (realization)
 - **Removed NRP** from the list of transport plane candidate because NRP is not part of "*current IP/MPLS technologies commonly used in operators' networks*«
 - Suggestion to remove the addressing example to a separate document
 - Authors explained that this is **not about making recommendation**, but **exemplifying** a local design that can be used by operators using existing tools
 - **No follow-up since then**

History Log Since IETF#119

- -06 (05/24) to -08 (06/24)
 - Received a thorough review from Adrian
 - *Document structure and new content*
 - Many changes to enhance the overall document structure.
 - Most of Adrian’s suggestions were taken into account (add scalability discussion, etc.)
 - *Keep or remove the 3GPP Appendix*
 - An LS was sent to 3GPP for review
 - *Map/Unmap*: Clarified in the draft that binding back a packet received from the TN is not within the scope and classification is the business of the non-TN domain
 - *Transport plane vs NRP vs Filtered Topology slice*
 - Went with “Inter-PE Transfer Plane” as we need a term to refer to the realization of that part
 - Added new text to explain the link with the concept of “underly-transport” defined in other RFCs
 - Clarified that (multiple) *NRPs can be used but that’s out of scope*. This is consistent with the changes made in -05
 - Revealed some confusion about the use of “and” in some RFC 9543 definitions. That discussion can happen as part of the erratum discussion, not this draft
 - **No follow-up from Adrian since 31/05**

History Log Since IETF#119

- -07 (05/24)
 - Comments from Deborah about addressing
 - Deborah ACKed that the revised version is "*clearer on the addressing being local*" but questioned that this might not belong to "existing technologies"
 - Authors clarified that configuring explicit addresses is definitely an *existing practice*
 - **No follow-up since 05/24. We consider that point closed**
- -08 (06/24)
 - Questions for clarification from Greg about OAM
 - Whether there are gaps in RFC7276 or how to assess isolation objectives
 - Clarified that there are missing tools (e.g., SFC) but the scope is to leverage existing tools
 - No change was needed
 - **ACKed** by Greg (06/24)

Next Steps

- The authors actively engaged with all reviewers to address their comments, make changes, and provide rationale for not making changes, etc.
- The authors believe -08 is ready to be sent to the IESG for publication