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Agenda

1. Status update after IETF 98 Meeting

2. Plan for the next steps

3. AOB

Discussion Topics

1. Status update after IETF 98 Meeting

Meeting notes for the face-to-face discussion in Chicago:

<https://github.com/danielkinguk/transport-nbi/blob/master/Meetings/2017-03-26%20-%20IETF%2098/Transport%20NBI%20Meeting%20Minutes%2030-Mar-17.docx>

**Lou’s comment during CCAMP presentation**

Some offline discussion has been done in Chicago to better understand Lou's comment.  
  
Lou clarified that since the ACTN applicability draft is not yet a TEAS WG document, we cannot assume the applicability of the TE Tunnel model at the ACTN MPI represents TEAS WG consensus.  
  
It is ok to explicitly describe the assumptions we are making in the analysis.  
  
An e-mail has been sent to the TEAS WG to check our current understanding/assumption on how to use the TE Tunnel to setup transit tunnel segments.

Gert’s comment during CCAMP presentation

An additional concern from Gert is that an ODU E2E Tunnel can be terminated to support a dynamic ODU Link (e..g, an HO-ODU supporting multiplexing of multiple LO-ODUs)  
  
This case is not considered to be part of use case 1. We need to discuss later if this is part of use case 2 (multi-layer) or another use case.  
  
**Action - Add some text to the next version of the Internet-Draft to clarify that use case 1 does not include cases where mutiplexing of LO-ODUs into an HO-ODU is controlled at the MPI.**  
Under this assumption there is no need for the PNC to provide topology information for the ODU types which are not going to be used by any access link. For example, if access links supports only ODU2, there is no need to provide topology information for ODU3 and ODU4.  
  
**Action - Add some text to the Internet-Draft (topology abstraction section)**

2. Plan for the next steps

Postponed to the next call

3. AOB

We have discussed the current open issue related with the mapping between the router-id and interface-id attributes in the explicit-route-objects list of the TE Tunnel and the information provided by the TE Topology (e.g., te-node-id and te-tp-id).  
  
An e-mail has been sent to the TEAS WG to check our current understanding/assumption on how to map the router-id and interface-id attributes in the TE Tunnel with the information provided by the TE Topology (e.g., te-node-id and te-tp-id).

Next DT call

Next DT call will be on April 26, 2017 at 3pm CEST  
  
Please provide your contributions for the discussion in the call before April 23 midnight