

2021-04-06 TAPI Meeting Notes

Date

06 Apr 2021

Attendees

- [Andrea Mazzini](#)
- [Ronald Zabaleta](#)
- [Ramon Casellas](#)
- [Xiang YUN](#)
- [Nigel Davis](#)
- [Hing-Kam Lam](#)
- [Xiaobing NIU](#)
- [Leo Nederlof](#)
- [Karthik Sethuraman](#)

Goals

- Admin
 - Agenda for next TAPI *virtual meeting*, first draft [2021Q2 TAPI Virtual Meeting Agenda and Notes Apr. 12/13/15](#)
 - European H2020 PASSION Project - [presentation moved to virtual meeting, P3 of 13 April](#)
- Review the updated [TR-547-TAPI Reference Implementation Agreement_v1.1.docx](#)
 - *New use cases: **0d, 1g, 1h, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3d, 3e, 3f, 5d, 11a, 11b, 13b, 13c, 16a, 16b.***
 - Optical Impairments and Topology
 - Link model, agree a general rule
 - OTS and OMS model
- Clean up of "Experimental" stereotypes

Agreed Items & Priority

- Below the list of the agreed items and related priority.
- An item is blocking when its resolution is necessary precondition for the delivery.

TAPI 2.1.3 and RIA 1.1

1. OTU(+ODUCn) CEP/CSEP as single point for OTU/OTSiA ConnectivityService provisioning ([solved](#))
2. ENNI/INNI Asymmetric service provisioning for multi-domain scenarios, agree UCs ([solved](#))
3. Alarm / TCA notification ([blocking, 1](#))
 - a. Subscription
 - b. Notification contents
 - Probable Causes / Elementary alarms (e.g. ITU-T cZZZ fault causes), including TCA PM Parameters
4. OTS and OMS model ([blocking, 2](#))
5. Path Computation Use Cases ([blocking, 3](#))

TAPI 2.3 and RIA 1.2

1. MEP/MIP model vs. direct inclusion of OAM parameters in the CEP ([blocking, 1](#))
 - a. ODU OAM
 - b. Photonic OAM
 - c. TCA provisioning
2. Physical impairments ([not blocking](#))
 - OFC is augmenting TAPI Link, others the AbstractStrand.
 - Type of amplifier, fibre attenuation, etc.
3. Photonic model capability ([not blocking](#))
4. Lifecycle management of ConnectivityService at every layer, necessary to identify UCs ([not blocking](#))
 - Lifecycle management of single ConnectivityService, necessary to identify UCs
5. 3R ([not blocking](#))
6. UNI Client interfaces modelling. DSR/ODU multiplexing over ODU ([not blocking](#))
7. RESTCONF Response codes for use cases ([not blocking](#))
8. TAPI OAS, action points to be assigned ([not blocking](#))
9. Routing Constraints ([not blocking](#))
10. Physical Route ([not blocking](#))

Discussion items

1 0 m ins	A d m in is tr at ive	<p>Next TAPI virtual meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12, 13, 15 April - PDT 4am - 9am • 2021Q2 TAPI Virtual Meeting Agenda and Notes Apr. 12/13/15 • Hing-Kam Lam cannot attend due to overlap with ITU-T SG15 meetings <p>• Call dedicated to review alarm probable causes (TR-547-TAPI RIA V1.1 Alarms.xlsx): Thu 8, 5:00-6:00 pm CEsT.</p> <p>Nigel Davis will set up an <i>additional</i> separate call for clarification regarding TR-548 scope, involving Jack Pugaczewski (MEF and TMF).</p> <p>20 Apr 2021 TAPI Call: 2 hours</p> <p>27 Apr 2021 TAPI Call: canceled - week of Q2 MEF Meeting</p>
1 0 m ins	O th e r A d m in	<p>Agreed to update the TAPI Roadmap 2022-2023 with RIA plan (TR-547, TR-548).</p> <p>Updated the 2021Q2 TAPI Virtual Meeting Agenda and Notes Apr. 12/13/15 with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mention of GNP_y, • additional column with applicable TAPI release. <p>Brief discussion on GNP_y:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which are the input needed by GNP_y? • Which input shall extend TAPI? • Noted also that GNP_y has some limitations, for further analysis. • ODTN is evaluating GNP_y input and definining the list of amplifier types.

Andrea Mazzini provides an overview of [draft-ietf-ccamp-optical-impairment-topology-yang-06](#) and [RFC 8795](#).

- The Optical Impairment Topology is defined as a profile of three unidirectional path types: Express Path, Add Path, Drop Path. Each Node/NE instance has
- [Karthik Sethuraman](#) reminds that in past discussions the IETF folks considered the TAPI ConnectivityService as mostly similar to the TE-Tunnel, i.e. a path similar to a TAPI Link - i.e. the result of a planned/provisioned Trail.
- After some discussion, agreed that:
 - Device object has been introduced mainly to model the (simplified) Control Domain concept.
 - There is no need to introduce Device recursion, because the AccessPort has a relationship with supporting Equipment.
 - The AccessPort is represented when useful / relevant to describe the topology internal to the Device, e.g. in case of cabling and/or monitoring capabilities.
 - An AccessPort instance may be supported by more Equipment instances, e.g. to abstract a cascade of unidirectional mux/demux.
 - The "physical route" Use Case can be fulfilled by the list of involved AccessPorts.
 - The AccessPort instances supported by a given Equipment instance(s) are considered as all potentially interconnectable - in analogy with the NEPs

