

CCAMP Minutes For IETF 93

Wednesday, July 22, 2015 (CEST)

15:50-17:20 - Wednesday Afternoon Session II

Room: Berlin/Brussels

Presentation	Start Time	Duration	Information
--------------	------------	----------	-------------

0	15:50	10	
---	-------	----	--

Title: Administrivia - WG Status - New charter and WG scope

Presenter: Chairs

0	16:00	5	Title: Reporting on WG drafts not being presented
---	-------	---	---

-draft-ietf-ccamp-wson-iv-info:

Giovanni Martinelli: I did not do my own work, and I have to make a draft liaison to ITU-T to understand if we are right and we would like to check with them if the information like parameters and types are right. I will do that as soon as possible.

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

Xian Zhang: It is stable for a while and should be ready for LC.

Daniele Ceccarelli: will be the next after flexi grid FWK and label format.

1	16:05	10	
---	-------	----	--

Title: GMPLS OSPF-TE Extensions in support of Flexible Grid

Draft: draft-ietf-ccamp-flexible-grid-ospf-ext-02

Presenter: Haomian Zheng

Dieter Beller: I would like to have questions for clarification. Are there three possibilities to advertise available spectrum? If you define multiple approaches, it might be difficult for interoperability. Can those options be reduced ideally to one approach? Three options are a little bit too much.

Daniele Ceccarelli: good point. I was about to take this to the WG, maybe we can discuss on the list to see what is the option of the WG. I would like to poll it on the list with different options, like keep things as they are, so go for three options, or which is the preferred option. We will discuss on the list before the LC.

Giovanni Martinelli: I would like to mention that the generic encoding for WSON has the same issue.

Fatai Zhang: For WSON, why there are three options, because there are multiple cases. In some case, there is much information to be advertised, so it is good to use bit map approach to advertise the information, otherwise if there is only a little bit information, we can just use regular label set approach.

Young Lee: Are you talking about Action in generic encoding about Label Set? I think that was acceptable in WSON. Why we should argue with that? Because we have Action 1, 2, 3, bit map is the lowest one. Label set is a little more efficient way. Whatever you want, you can do it. Interoperable anyhow, it is information amount, how to optimize, so I am not sure if there is any issue.

Daniele Ceccarelli: That is why I said, we will poll to keep one or all of them.

2 16:15 10

Title: RSVP-TE Signaling Extension for Links with Variable Discrete Bandwidth

Draft: draft-ietf-ccamp-rsvp-te-bandwidth-availability-02

Presenter: Amy Ye

3 16:25 10

Title: OSPF Routing Extension for Links with Variable Discrete Bandwidth

Draft: draft-ietf-ccamp-ospf-availability-extension-02

Presenter: Amy Ye

Daniele Ceccarelli: I have comments. The first one is some sort of editorial, about PSC-1, 2,3,4, I don't remember if what was left, was PSC or PSC-1? Did you already check?

Amy Ye: Yes, I have checked RFC7074 and what is left is PSC-1.

Daniele Ceccarelli: The second thing is that, there are two drafts, when TEAS WG charted, we had long discussion on which draft should belong to TEAS, which belongs to CCAMP. This is a little ambiguous. There are mechanisms that can be considered as general, technology agnostic, there are some parts are technology specific. I am sorry that I don't have time this week to discuss with TEAS chairmen. I would like to hear from you. If you think that two draft could be split something is generic, something is technology specific, it might be that there are 90% of content is tech agnostic and you only need one page to define tech specific. We come to the conclusion, everything is technology agnostic, everything is technology specific. What is your opinion on that?

Amy Ye: My personal opinion is I am OK with this way. I would like to discuss with the rest of the coauthors if they have any comments.

Himanshu Shah: TEAS chairs are here; maybe we can make the decision right now. Either way, what we would like is that we should not restart everything from the beginning. We are almost to the LC, by changing the WG, we should not suffer restart.

Daniele Ceccarelli: absolutely, there is no issue to start with direct WG draft, so there is no need to restart everything from scratch.

Lou Berger: I agree with the chair. In terms of whether we take it go immediately LC, I suspect that the question would really be, what changes are there in order to be generic, if it is just text, that is really easy, you just re-write some text and you don't change the procedures. If it is about Object, that is a little harder. Neither one of them, it has to take long time. I agree that restart everything is not good to use time of everyone.

Daniele Ceccarelli: Your opinion, the content of the draft is 100% technology agnostic, so the draft could move the TEAS WG or split it between technology agnostic part and technology specific part, would this make sense?

Lou Berger: What I said is the authors should go through see if they can identify what part is technology specific and to separate them out without doing any version document split anything like that. Just separate them out and document them separately. When they have done that, we will know the answer. Then they have better position to answer the question than I am.

Loa Andersson: Questions to Amy. What is the content moved to the appendix? Is it technology specific?

Lou Berger: Do you have formats that technology specific right now? Do you have mechanisms that are technology specific?

Amy Ye: I think the current mechanism is generic enough. I don't think there is technology specific mechanism to indicate which technology is used.

Lou Berger: so you answered the question. There is nothing here technology specific, so that is not a problem. Do you agree with that, Loa?

Loa Andersson: I would say it does not mean that we do LC in TEAS.

Lou Berger: I said you send to TEAS and say please review these drafts to make sure they are technology agnostic. You do the LC there, this is the right thing from procedures point of view, if you are not going to do any draft revision, I would suggest do a joint LC because the work have been here, the text is here. You are going to provide new version to develop the new content. So, the first thing is take this draft as it is and send it to TEAS WG, and say this was done in CCAMP, but we believe it is generic, technology agnostic and really should be applied to all the technologies, please review it. If the feedback is great, then let's go with a joint LC.

Loa Andersson: It sounds generalized means it applies to everything, but I think it applies to more than one thing.

Lou Berger: Yes, that is the definition that we always use. We use this definition for more than one, not all.

Lou Berger: TEAS chairs can do that (send a mail to TEAS) if CCAMP chairs say “yes”.

CCAMP Chairs: Yes, please do that.

Lou Berger: OK, I will send it to the group. Let’s see the result. If the feedback is good, then we do a joint LC. If it needs more work, then it can be shepherded in the TEAS WG.

4 16:35 10 Title: A Yang Data Model for WSON Optical Networks

Draft: draft-lee-ccamp-wson-yang-02

Presenter: Young Lee

Young Lee: asks for flexi-grid YANG document

Oscar Gonzalez: The flexi grid has been updated and submitted as ccamp document.

<https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-vergara-ccamp-flexigrid-yang-01>. Alignment is in progress and a new version aligned with TE Model will be sent soon.

Daniele Ceccarelli: Is the draft covering WDM data plane with and without WSON control plane?

Discussion among Daniele, Young and Lou on the meaning of WSON. In Daniele’s opinion WSON means GMPLS for WDM, in Young’s definition it means reconfigurable WDM (with or without control plane). The final agreement is to get stick to the actual definition of WSON, i.e. WDM reconfigurable networks (with or without control plane). Hence this draft, which is based on WSON info models, applies to WDM networks controlled by any mean (e.g. GMPLS, NMS, SDN etc).

Lou Berger: are the chairs ok with TEAS sending to CCAMP technology specific work which is not GMPLS?

Daniele Ceccarelli: Sure

Gabriele Galimberti: I think the draft is a good start but, if we use it just for a control plane is a bit redundant, while if we want to use it also for management plane and centralized control plane, some things are missing. I’m willing to contribute to the draft or write a new one.

Daniele C. : This is an individual draft. Whether to work together or have two separate drafts is up to the authors. If you could start working together now it would be great.

Oscar G.: In the flexi grid YANG draft we speak only about the data layer (no signal layer) while in this draft you also deal with the transponders and the signal layer. There is a misalignment.

Young L: We’re willing to work with Gabriele to complement the draft.

Oscar G.: OTN YANG model is in I2RS, will it be brought to CCAMP?

Xian Zhang: Yes, L1 draft is going to be brought to CCAMP.

Lou B.: It was also agreed in the TEAS and I2RS coordination meeting.

>5 16:45 10 Title: Extensions to LMP for DWDM OLS to manage black-link

> Draft: draft-dharinigert-ccamp-g-698-2-lmp-10

> Presenter: Dieter Beller

Young L.: Is the power level used to determine the feasibility of the path or more than that? In DICONET (European project) one of the concerns is that power level is nearly stable, so if you're using the power for feasibility it's ok.

Giovanni Martinelli: Power is stable

Fatai Zhang: There are other open issues, like for example the name of the draft.

Dieter B.: Indeed I was speaking about the technical issues.

Fatai Z.: Other issues regard the scope of the draft. Are you considering making it general enough to cover also LMP for WSON?

Gert Grammel: Yes, we're looking into that.

Daniele C.: When a CCAMP relevant contribution to ITU-T is submitted could you please send an heads-up to the CCAMP list? In addition to that, specifically to all the black link drafts, what we are speaking about is more than black links. We had discussions with authors these days and good inputs from Deborah. This is not black link, we need to get a name for this (90% could be based on black links but we need to add terms and parameters. The proposal by chairs is to describe this new thing in a framework document. There are two options:

1. "short framework": just describe this "enhanced" black links and then go forward with the 3 existing draft using this framework as reference
2. "long framework": which describes the entire signal layer for flexi grid. In that document you can define 2 scenarios: transponder internal to the WDM domain and transponder external. In that case the existing drafts would reference the latter scenario.

The choice is up to the authors.

Gabriele G. : Two solutions are still on the table. Not decided yet which one to go for. My personal opinion is to go for the long framework and extend the draft to more contributors since it's a huge amount of work. Another issue is timing, we can't wait too long.

Daniele C.: The long framework would go for a fast track. In order to help you decide let's poll the WG to see how many would be interested in the long framework and how many would be willing to contribute: [Polling] a few people.

Dieter B.: The problem with the big framework is time.

Oscar G.: From the experience of the flexi-grid framework, it will take almost two years. Flexi-grid fwk went well because there were many people interested and continuous feedback and liaisons with ITU-T.

>6 16:55 5 Title: An SNMP MIB extension to RFC3591 to manage optical interface parameters of DWDM applications

>Draft: draft-galikunze-ccamp-g-698-2-snmp-mib-12

>Presenter: Gabriele Galimberti

>7 17:00 5 Title: A YANG model to manage the optical interface parameters of "G.698.2 single channel" in DWDM applications

>Draft: draft-dharini-netmod-g-698-2-yang-04

>Presenter: Dharini Hiremagalur

>Adjourn 17:05

Gabriele G.: Dharini already took the action to modify the document with the new name and the new text referring (and removing the references) to ITU-T documents. The document has been circulated to the interested people, please send feedbacks.

Gert G.: We modified the draft just to see if we captured what you meant.

Daniele C.: Please upload this version of the draft and involve the whole WG in the review. We'll start with a new -00 version when we'll have the new name and the new references to the new framework.