

CCAMP interim meeting

2020 – September – 23rd – MINUTES OF THE MEETING

1. Updated on OTN drafts and L1CSM (40 mins)

- draft-ietf-ccamp-layer1-types;
- draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-topo-yang;
- draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-tunnel-model;
- draft-ietf-ccamp-l1csm-yang;

Presenter: Italo Busi

draft-ietf-ccamp-layer1-types

Daniele: What is the pending issue with L1CSM?

Italo: Discuss when we get to that draft

draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-topo-yang

Daniele: will ask for yang doctor review

draft-ietf-ccamp-otn-tunnel-model

Daniele: Maybe do joint Yang Dr review with topo

draft-ietf-ccamp-l1csm-yang

Dieter: Did you discuss this with authors of MEF63?

Italo: No: the requirements from MEF63 are clear. The problem is how to model _with YANG.

Daniele: Summary. Next step is topo and tunnel ready for (pre-last-call) YANG Dr review. Probably start IPR poll in parallel. Then move them to WGLC. Need to try to avoid having a large cluster, but reviewing is made better by keeping documents in the same cluster.

2. YANG model for Flexi-grid topology (15 mins)

- draft-ietf-ccamp-flexigrid-yang;
- Presenter: Haomian Zheng

Daniele: Putting this in cluster with L0 drafts would be a bit late. Maybe ready for Yang Dr.

Framework for flexigrid is an RFC for 2 years, so should have been well read. So can remove unwanted material from this draft, also material (such as impairments) that doesn't belong.

Haomian: Yes, that's the plan

3. YANG model for impairment aware optical topology (20 mins)

- draft-ietf-ccamp-optical-impairment-topology-yang
Presenter: Sergio Belotti

Daniele: If we allow 3 options there is probability that different ends of link will pick different options. Can we shrink set of options?

Sergio: Long discussion about this since Singapore. Need explicit mode because of how interface model is built. Other two modes are quite close to each other (see slides), but difference is driven by what ITU-T application codes don't allow.

Dieter: While capabilities can be described in 3 ways, there is just one list of capabilities. I don't think that any 2 can be combined. Must also support application codes from G.698.

Daniele: If 3 different methods of encoding the same information then would insist on combining.

Dieter: Did discuss merging modes, but found different reasons for keeping them.

4. Update on Network Slicing design team work in TEAS (15 mins)

- draft-nsdt-teas-ns-framework
- draft-nsdt-teas-transport-slice-definition

draft-nsdt-teas-ns-framework

Presenter: Eric Gray

Lou Berger: What work might fall to CCAMP

Eric: Was proposed to bring this all to CCAMP, but not currently our thinking. TEAS can generically talk about TE stuff, but when trying to talk about a service interface (outside of TE and packet switching) that part of the work probably would be done in CCAMP.

Lou: That's the answer I hoped for. Generic in TEAS; technology specific L1/L2 might be in CCAMP.

Dhruv Dhody (in chat window): I thought it would be mainly transport slice realization directly on a LO/L1 networks that could be done in CCAMP

draft-nsdt-teas-transport-slice-definition

Presenter: Reza Rokui

Haomian: Maybe some understanding gaps (such as "transport", "TE", "generic"). TEAS does generic, CCAMP specific technology approaches. Discussion seems to say "transport" has wider scope than TE. Can't imagine a network slice can be a non-TE representation (because TE tracks performance of SLA/SLO).

Reza: When we talk about non-TE we are talking about realisation of a transport slice in the network. Implementation is dependent on the operator. As long as

SLA is met then TE or non-TE is operator's decision.

Haomian: Confirm proposal to this WG. CCAMP has not much experience on non-TE technology.

Fatai: F/w doc refers to terminology doc. Need to be consistent about slicing transport networks.

Adrian: Note that when Reza talks of resolving things "tomorrow" this refers to a Network Slicing Design Team meeting on Thursday.

Adrian: Do you think there is need to slice a transport network which uses CCAMP technology?

Eric: Yes

Eric: Not reinventing wheels. Expect to point most of the time to things that have already been done.

Eric: We are attempting to address a liaison from 3GPP routed to us via BBF.

Italo: Distinguish between TE technology in the network, and TE metrics used to describe services

Lou: Thank Reza and Eric and CCAMP for presentations. This work is ongoing in TEAS. Open Design Team call tomorrow: see announcement on TEAS list. Planning a TEAS interim roughly mid-October

Jie (in chat window): IMO TE is a generic characteristic of several technologies, such as packet, optical, etc, When talking about TE/non-TE, may need some explanation of what is a non-TE network.

BLUE SHEET

Haomian Zheng - Huawei Technologies

Adrian Farrel - Old Dog Consulting

Italo Busi - Huawei

Dhruv Dhody - Huawei

Dieter Beller - Nokia

Gabriele Galimberti - Cisco

Eric Gray - Ericsson

Oscar Gonzalez de Dios - Telefonica

Aihua Guo - Futurewei

Sergio Belotti - Nokia

Fatai Zhang - Huawei

Lou Berger - LabN

Yuji Tochio - Fujitsu

Bo Wu - Huawei

Jie Dong - Huawei

Vishnu Pavan Beeram - Juniper Networks

Luis M. Contreras - Telefonica

Yi Lin, Huawei Technologies

Julien Meuric - Orange

Reza Rokui - Nokia