# Transport NBI DT Meeting - 26 April 2017

## Participants

* Italo Busi
* Sergio Belotti
* Carlo Perrocchio
* Gianmarco Bruno
* Luis Miguel
* Yuji Tochio

## Agenda

1. Tool for analysis description (JSON editor)
2. Analysis of use case 1
3. *Current status of inter-SDO discussions*
4. *Plan for the next steps*
5. *AOB*

### 1) Tool for analysis description (JSON editor)

Proposed tool to write example using JSON on-line editor:

<http://www.jsoneditoronline.org/>

Thanks to Ricard for the suggestion

There was general support among call participants to the proposal to use this tool for developing analysis/examples.

**Action (Italo) - Check with the DT mailing list that there is support among all DT members**

Carlo/Gianmarco put question about the possibility to uese XML (what is used in Restconf) instead of Json as proposed in the tool.

Need to verify the compliance of the JSON code with the Yang tree idefinition. We may need to look for another toool for validator.

**Action (Carlo/Gianmarco) - Check if there are tools for validation of the JSON code**

Question about whether the examples should be completed or just providing a snapshot of whole code.

We can develop a complete JSON example with the editor but may insert only a snapshot in the Internet-Draft.

The important point is to have an example that is self-explining the part of use case we want to show . So, the example could be "partial" prodided that is exhaustive in the context of use cases.

In any case, it would be worthwhile proceeding in parallel steps, not waiting for a complete example to be ready before starting to work on other examples.

**Action (Italo) - Check with Ricard the possible use of the whole JSON code**

### 2) Analysis of use case 1

Updated contribution available on Github:

<https://github.com/danielkinguk/transport-nbi/blob/master/Meetings/2017-04-26/tnbi-analysis-uc%231-190417.pptx>

Slide 7:

For some people, the Tunnel model can be used to request Connectivity Services (at the CMI).

Question received offline about how to know if a Tunnel end-point is available or not available.

Normally in the context of service management, there is some information about whether the service point is available or not available.

Italo: not clear when and why a service point is considered "not available". One or few examples may be useful.

Carlo: if it is related with physical issues/constraints, they should be represented in an abstract manner at the MPI.   
Otherwise they should be dealt with not at the MPI but above.

The question is more related to the CMI rather than the MPI since we have to provide proper information to the customer.

The question is whether the MDSC needs, or not, information from the PNC to provide proper information at the CMI.

**Action (Sergio) - provide more detailed information about this question. For example, when the service point is not considered available?**

Slide 7:

From offline discussions, it seems that the assumption described in this slide on how to setup Tunnel segment is still under discussion among the authors of the TE Tunnel model.

Slide 14:

From offline discussion, TE Tunnel and TE Topology models authors confirm our understanding that:

* The router id can be the te-node-id in the teas-topology
* The interface-id can be the te-tp-id in the teas-topology

Some clarification text will be added in the description of these attributes in the next version of the models.

**Open Issue can be considered closed.**

The slide has been updated based on the current working assumptions.

The slide has been updated with the attributes needed to qualify the ODU2 Tunnel as bidirectional co-routed.

**Action (Italo) - Prepare a mail for the TEAS WG requesting feedbacks for our assumption on how bidirectional co-routed Tunnels are configured.**

It is not clear how the state of named-explicit-paths and the lsp-record-route-subobjects are used to report the path of the ODU2 Tunnel.

**Action (Italo) - Prepare a mail for the TEAS WG requestion further clarification about the use of the state of named-explicit-paths and the lsp-record-route-subobjects.**

Slide 15:

There is no need to disinguish incoming-ero and outgoing-ero elements from route-include-ero elements. This slide has been removed.

Slide 17:

The best solution to resolve the current open issue is to raise a question to the TEAS WG to check how the labels on the access/inter-domain links are configured and/or if it is possible to have suggested labels between controllers.

**Action (Sergio) - Prepare an initial proposed text for the mail to TEAS WG and circulated on the DT mailing list for review**

Carlo: this may have impact also on path computation in case the labels available on the inter-domain links depend on the path within the network (e.g., WSON domain).

This would be true for both stateful and stateless path computation methods.

We can inquiry TEAS WG mailing list after the previous point has been discussed.

**Action (Carlo) - Prepare an initial proposed text for the mail to TEAS WG and circulated on the DT mailing list for review**

### 3) Current status of inter-SDO discussions

Postponed to the next calls

### 4) Plan for the next steps

During the face-to-face meeting in Chicago (IETF 98) 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)

Planning postponed to the next call

### 5) AOB

## Note takers (feel free to add your name here):

* Italo Busi
* Sergio Belotti
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