



February 14, 2008

To: Mr. Adrian Farrel, IETF CCAMP Co-Chair, [adrian.farrel@aria-networks.com](mailto:adrian.farrel@aria-networks.com)  
Ms. Deborah Brungard, IETF CCAMP Co-Chair, [dbrungard@att.com](mailto:dbrungard@att.com)  
Cc: Mr. Ross Callon, IETF Routing Area Director, [rallon@juniper.net](mailto:rallon@juniper.net)  
Mr. David Ward, IETF Routing Area Director, [dward@cisco.com](mailto:dward@cisco.com)

From: Mr. Lyndon Ong, OIF TC Chair, [lyong@ciena.com](mailto:lyong@ciena.com)

Subject: **Liaison to IETF CCAMP WG**

Dear Adrian and Deborah,

OIF thanks CCAMP for its prompt and very informative response to our liaison on OIF interoperability demo findings, sent from our 4Q2007 meeting. We appreciate CCAMP's offer to use the CCAMP mailing list for questions during our demo planning and testing, although more structured liaisons are still useful in our view to reflect meeting results and issues or comments that are agreed across OIF members (as opposed to individual views).

We would also appreciate any feedback that you might have on our liaison from the 4Q2007 meeting on VCAT/LCAS requirements, especially whether these were incorporated into your work on VCAT/LCAS support.

Based on your response liaison, it is our understanding that per-LSP RESV messages should be expected for the "make-before-break" scenario of modification. However, some members have commented that it appears to be possible in the specifications to use a single RESV message for multiple LSPs because:

- a) RFC 2205 allows the RESV message to carry multiple FILTER\_SPEC objects, specifically with the Shared Explicit (SE) style that supports reservation sharing; and
- b) The FILTER\_SPEC object was extended in RFC 3209 to carry the LSP\_ID

Clarification would be appreciated as to whether we should allow for receiving a single RESV message with multiple FILTER\_SPEC objects in the "make-before-break" scenario using the SE style.

Also, in our discussions of multilayer networks and impacts on the control plane, we took note of ITU-T Recommendation G.7715.1 requirements to advertise:

- a) Local Connection Type; and
- b) Local Client Adaptations Supported.


We believe that this functionality would be very useful for applications that have been discussed in OIF (see attachment). We would appreciate further clarification as to whether both requirements have been addressed in the current CCAMP work on ASON routing support (local connection type in particular is not explicitly identified in the current draft). We would also appreciate more information on the relationship between support of adaptation in the ASON routing draft and in the multilayer/multiregion networking drafts also being developed in the CCAMP WG.

Finally, we noted the discussion on the CCAMP mailing list regarding the computation of the Length field for TLVs, especially for the Ethernet Bandwidth Profile TLV used in the Ethernet Traffic Parameters draft. As this draft is considered to be very important for support of MEF-defined Ethernet services, we request that this issue be resolved as soon as possible within CCAMP. Our preference would be to compute the Length field for all TLVs (except those in RFC 4420) based on the full TLV rather than the Value alone, as this is the method commonly used in the past for length computation in RSVP.

We look forward to continued cooperation and discussion between our groups.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,



Lyndon Ong  
OIF Technical Committee chair

Attachment: oif2008.068.00