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## Discussion Topics

1. Lou’s comment during CCAMP presentation

It was not clear whether the concern is about the assumption to use the TE Tunnel model at the MPI (based on ACTN applicability draft) or on the use of the TE Tunnel model to setup a tunnel segment (between access links), instead of just tunnels between PEs.

We will add an explicit statement about the assumptions based on ACTN applicability draft as well as the assumption that the TE Tunnel model can be also used to setup a tunnel segment between access links.

Action - talk with Lou to check and write down his concern and a possible resolution

Action - send a mail to TEAS WG to validate Igor's assumption that the TE Tunnel model can be used also to setup a tunnel segment between access links

2. Gert’s comment during CCAMP presentation

His concern is about the fact that in ITU-T each ODU type (ODU0, ODU1, ODU2, …) is a layer while we are using the term layer to indicate any ODU.

It was pointed out the following text in section 4 of [RFC 7062](https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7062):

While [G872-2001] considered the ODU to be a set of layers in the

same way as SDH has been modeled, recent ITU-T OTN architecture

progress [G872-2012] includes an agreement to model the ODU as a

single-layer network with the bit rate as a parameter of links and

connections.

We will reference this text within the drafts to justify the use of term layer.

3. Next steps - priority

We have identified the following priority for future work:

* EPL service for Use Case 1 (UC#1)
* Other OTN client services for UC#1
* Protection scenarios for UC#1

Note - Since UC#1 is a single-layer scenario, protection applies only at the ODU layer

* UC#3 (single-layer, multi-domain)

4. Open Issues

We discussed the current open issue about how to get information regarding the ingress and egress point of the transit tunnel (router-id and interface-id), assuming that the TE Tunnel model can be used to setup a tunnel segment (between access links).

The current assumption is that the router-id would be the te-node-id in the teas-topology and the interface-id can be the te-tp-id in the teas-topology.

Action - write a mail to TEAS to validate the current assumption

5. AOB

Next call is planned on April 12, 2017 at 3:00-5:00 PM CET

Please take care that CET has switched to daylight saving time on March 26 so if you have not switched to daylight saving time (e.g., in China) the call will start 1h earlier than usual on your time zone.