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Abstract

The decision to develop a Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) Transport Profile in cooperation between IETF and ITU-T does not fully define and document the process for development of the required RFCs.

This document complements the process as documented in the JWT decision with a couple of separate elements:

- An adaptation of the IETF working group process.
- Identifies the expected participation in the process by the ITU-T.
- A clarification of the decision rules regarding MPLS-TP documents.

This document does not intend to specify any ITU-T process, to the extent that is necessary it will be done according to ITU-T processes.
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1. Introduction

When IETF and ITU-T entered into the agreement to develop MPLS-TP was agreed on – the JWT agreement – it was decided that the MPLS-TP documents should be developed "according to IETF processes”. It was also assumed that a close cooperation in reviewing these IETF documents. The JWT decision is documented in RFC 5317 [RFC5317].

However, the process for this close cooperative review was mostly left to be decided as the documents evolved. The ITU-T committed to responding promptly to IETF working group last calls, this may require the development of the response via correspondence.

This document complements the process as documented in the JWT decision with a couple of separate elements:

- An adaptation of the IETF working group process, with respect to the role of the teams (MPLS Interoperability Design Team (MEAD Team), the Joint Working Team (JWT) and the ITU-T MPLS-TP ad hoc team) that has been set up to facilitate the development of MPLS-TP; see Section 2.

- Identifies the expected participation by the ITU-T in the document development process; see Section 3.

- Clarification of the decision rules regarding MPLS-TP documents; see Section 4.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

1.1. Terminology

This section includes a number of terms and abbreviations that is used on this document. The section is split into two subsection; IETF terms and ITU-T terms.

1.1.1. IETF terms and abbreviations

- JWT - Joint Working Team, a team with participants with experience from standards development in the IETF and the ITU-T.

Note: The JWT is not part of either the IETF or ITU-T, but a group that has been set up to facilitate cooperation on MPLS-TP between the two organizations.
o JWT documents - the set of documents that were envisioned in the documentation of the JWT decision

o MEAD team - MPLS Interoperability Design Team, a temporary team with participants with experience from standards development for MPLS and transport networks. The MEAD team is chartered to coordinate the development of MPLS-TP within the IETF and to coordinate the on MPLS-TP cooperation with the ITU-T.

o MPLS-TP documents - the following sets of documents are counted as MPLS-TP documents:

* Internet Drafts that are coordinated by the MEAD team.

* Individual Internet Drafts that addresses the MPLS-TP problem space.

* Working group Internet Drafts that addresses the MPLS-TP problem space.

* Internet Drafts that are considered for publication by the IESG and that addresses the MPLS-TP problem space.

* Internet Drafts that are approved for publication by the IESG and that addresses the MPLS-TP problem space.

* Published RFCs that addresses the MPLS-TP problem space.

* ITU-T Recommendations and draft Recommendations in various stages of development that addresses the MPLS-TP problem space.

Documents that originates from the IRTF RFC stream is NOT considered as MPLS-TP documents.

1.1.2. ITU-T terms and abbreviations

o Ad Hoc on MPLS-TP - A team established by SG 15 of ITU-T to coordinate the work on MPLS-TP within the ITU-T and to act as a focal point for communication with the IETF.

o Contribution - a contribution is a document that is submitted to the ITU-T to advance work on the development of a Recommendation or to propose the development of a new Recommendation.

o Recommendation - a Recommendation is the ITU-T standards document.
2. Adaptation of the IETF working group process

The IETF working group processes as defined in RFC 2026 [RFC2026] are for the purpose of the MPLS-TP updated as follows.

IETF works according the the ‘rough consensus’ model where the working group chairs determines the consensus after discussions on the mailing lists. This is applicable to the MPLS-TP work also. The mpls-tp@ietf.org is the mailing list used to find out consensus and the consensus is decided by the MEAD team chair. After a document has become a working group document the consensus is decided by the WG chairs and the MEAD team chair jointly.

A most important part of this process is the information exchange between the IETF and ITU-T. This information exchange consists of two equally important pieces:

- informal information exchange
  - this is done primarily by mails to the relevant mailing lists.

- formal information exchange
  - In addition to a mail to the relevant mailing lists, the formal information exchange is accompanied by a liaison between the two organisations. Exchange of liaisons makes it possible to follow the request/response exchange between the organisations in more detail.

2.1. Adaptation of the IETF working group process

The flow chart below describes the adaption of the working group process
2.2. The IETF MPLS-TP process

This section gives guidelines for how the flow chart above could be traversed.

2.2.1. Developing a MPLS-TP document

Individual MPLS-TP documents may take different paths through the this process, the numbers in the list below is mapped to the numbers in the flow chart above.
Although the different paths through the flow chart is given as ‘options’ it is always possible for the MEAD team to step in and take over the shepherding of a particular document. This is done in cooperation between the MEAD team chair, the relevant working group chairs and the document editors/authors.

1. They may be intended for and managed by a working group.

   This means that the author(s) of such a document has chosen to send the document to a working group instead of running through the MEAD team. Normal IETF process will kick in in such cases and working group chairs will agree to which working group(s) such a document will be taken.

2. They may be coordinated by the MEAD team.

   This means that the author(s) of such a document has chosen to send the document to the MEAD team to be coordinated with the rest of the MPLS-TP documents that is in the purview of the MEAD team.

3. They may be originated by the MEAD team based on the jwt decision.

   The documentation of the work of the JWT, there is a proposed document structure. The MEAD team used this structure to decide on a set of documents that will, when completed, constitute the MPLS-TP standard. This set of documents are slightly changing, e.g. because it becomes more appropriate to split a single document into two or more, or if new aspects of MPLS-TP needs to be specified.

4. Everytime a document is accepted by the MEAD team into the set of documents coordinated by the MEAD team a liaison is sent to the ITU-T with a pointer to the document. At the same time note is sent to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team mailing list informing that the document has become a MEAD team document.

   The ITU-T may chose to respond to the liaison but is not required to do so, see Section 3 and Section 4.

5. At any time it is possible for the ITU-T SGs and Questions to send review comments on MEAD team documents. It is also possible for the MEAD team to ask for such reviews and comments.

   Any time such an input or requests are sent between the two organizations it SHALL be accompanied by a note from the MPLS-TP ad hoc team chair(s) to the MEAD team mailing list, or from the
MEAD team chair to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team mailing list. This is done to enhance the efficiency of the information exchange.

6. A working group or the MEAD team may issue requests for general comments on MPLS-TP documents at any time, if it is deemed appropriate to extend these requests to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team this is done via a note according to entry (5) in this list.

7. If a MPLS-TP document is mature enough to become a working group document a poll is done on the mpls-tp mailing list and the appropriate wg mailing list, this request will also be sent to the ITU-T as a liaison. A note will also be sent to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team.

Which working group a document goes into is decided jointly between the MEAD team, working group chairs of the potential working groups and the document editors/authors.

If the document is accepted as a working group document the working group takes over the revision control of the document.

The ITU-T is expected to respond to the liaison within in the time indicated in the liaison, see Section 3 and Section 4.

8. Every time a MPLS-TP document is accepted as a working group document by any IETF working group a liaison is sent to the ITU-T with a pointer to the document. At the same time note is sent to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team mailing list informing that the document has become a working group document.

9. Working group documents may be reviewed in several steps, every time such a review is initiated the MPLS-TP ad hoc team is notified (10).

Note that most reviews that leads to updates of working group documents are spontaneous individual comments from participants in the MPLS-TP effort.

10. Every time a review is initiated by a working group the appropriate ITU-T SGs and Questions will be notified by a mail to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team.

Optionally the request for review may be accompanied by a liaison to formalize the request.

The MPLS-TP ad hoc is responsible for ensuring that any e-mail requests are copied/forwarded the relevant SGs and Questions.
11. When a document is deemed to mature enough a working group last call is initiated. At this time the action describe under item 12 in this list MUST be executed.

12. Procedures to be followed when a working group last call is initiated.

* A liaison containing a request for participation in the working group last call will be sent to the appropriate ITU-T SG and Questions

* A mail with a notification that the working group last call is taking place will be sent to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team.

* ITU-T is REQUIRED to respond to the liaison within the time indicated. The MPLS-TP ad hoc team is expected to verify that all the SGs and Questions with the ITU-T that needs to respond to the working group last call are aware that it has been issued.

Note that a request to participate in an IETF are in some ways different from any other of the information exchanges according to the process adaptations described in this document between the IETF and the ITU-T.

+ This is the last point in this process where IETF processes are adapted for the purpose of facilitating the development of the MPLS-TP standard.

+ A response is REQUIRED, at all other points in the process lack of comments will be interpreted as "no issues".

13. When all last call are addressed and responded to a request for publication will be sent to the IESG. The document after this point in time handled as any other IETF document.

Note: WG last call may be re-iterated, for the entire document or limited to only verify the updates made because of an earlier working group last call.
3. Expectations on ITU-T participation in the process

The IETF and ITU-T processes for the development of the MPLS-TP standards interconnect at the following point in the flow chart above (4), (5), (7a), (8), (10) and (12). This section describes in short what is expected to happen on the ITU-T side at the interaction points.

3.1. Becoming a MEAD team document

(4) is a point where the MEAD team communicates to the ITU-T that a document is considered to be accepted to be coordinated by the MEAD team.

The ITU-T is expected to respond to the communication with a simple ACK or NAK, however a non-response is counted as an ACK.

An ACK means that ITU-T accepts that the documents has become a MEAD team document, a NAK means that ITU-T has issues that needs to be resolved before the document is allowed to progress.

3.2. Comments on MEAD team documents by participants in the ITU-T

(5) and (10) offers possibilities for ITU-T or people active in the ITU-T to send un-triggered comments on MEAD team or working group documents. Such comments shall be sent to the mpls-tp list and for working group documents also to the appropriate working group mailing list. Comments received in this way will be treated as the same way any as other individual comments received on the IETF documents.

3.3. Poll for working group documents

(7a) is the point where an IETF working group informs the ITU-T that a poll to progress a document to an IETF working group document has been started.

It is not necessary or required for the ITU-T to respond to this message. If the ITU-T has serious concerns these should be provided via a liaison statement. If the ITU-T has no serious concerns it is allowed and encouraged that individual participants provide comments. Such responses shall be sent to the appropriate working group and mpls-tp mailing lists and represent the view of the person sending the mail.

An Internet Draft is ready to become a working group draft if it meets at least the three criteria below.
it is within the charter of the working group

- it addresses a problem that needs to be solved

- it is a good enough start to solve this problem

Responses to polls for checking if a document is ready to become a working group document should be limited to answer if the document meets those three criteria.

3.4. Responding to an IETF Working Group Last Call

(12) is the point in the process where ITU-T is made aware of that an IETF working group last call has been started. The working group last call is issued when a working group document is getting close to be ready for publication. The intention is to make sure that there are no important pieces missing and that technical details are correct.

According to the JWT decision ITU-T is required to respond to a working group last call within the time set for the working group last.

The chair of an IETF working group that starts a working group last call will send a liaison to the ITU-T announcing the working group last call. A message will also be sent to the MPLS-TP ad hoc team. The IETF will make a best effort to target the SGs and Questions that should be involved in responding to the working group last call. However, the ITU-T has to make sure that the appropriate entities within the ITU-T participate in responding to the working group last call. The ITU-T MPLS-TP ad hoc team coordinates the development of the ITU-T response to the working group last call.
4. Specific guidelines that apply to work on MPLS-TP in the ITU-T

These guidelines apply to progressing work on MPLS-TP in the ITU-T.

Any member of the ITU-T may send a MPLS-TP contribution to a ITU-T Study Group or Question.

Before the ITU-T initiates any new work (i.e. items not previously identified by the JWT) based on such contributions the ITU-T shall send a liaison to the IETF. The message will go to the MEAD team, the team is responsible for creating a consolidated IETF response.

The IETF is expected to respond to the information that a new MPLS-TP work item has been proposed with an ACK or NAK.

If the response is a NAK that work item is held until the issues is resolved.
5. IANA considerations

There are no requests for IANA allocation of code points in this document.
6. Security considerations

This document defines a process adaptation for the cooperation between IETF and ITU-T and thus does not introduce any new security considerations.
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