INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

**TELECOMMUNICATION
STANDARDIZATION SECTOR**

STUDY PERIOD 2009-2012

COM 15 – LS 207 – E

English only

Original: English

Question(s):	12/15

<div align="center">

LIAISON STATEMENT

</div>

Source:	ITU-T Study Group 15
Title:	Review of draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane-03 (Ref #035.01)

<div align="center">

LIAISON STATEMENT

</div>

For action to:	**IETF IESG**
For comment to:	**IETF MPLS WG**
For information to:	
Approval:	**Agreed to at SG15 meeting (Geneva, 31 May – 11 June 2010)**
Deadline:	**30 July 2010**

Contact:	Malcolm Betts ZTE PRC	Tel: +1 678 534-2542 Email: malcolm.betts@zte.com.cn

ITU-T SG15 thanks the IETF MPLS WG for the liaison "Response to comments in LS173 - Comments on draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane-02". We accept the resolution of the first comment, however we have on additional comment and an alternative proposal for our original comment on the security section which are provided below.

We request that you address these comments and provide us a final version of the text that will be approved so that we can reach consensus to include this as a normative reference in draft revised Recommendation G.8110.1. WP3 has tentatively planned to hold an interim plenary meeting to consent G.8110.1 in November 2010.

```
MPLS                                                    D. Frost, Ed.
Internet-Draft                                         S. Bryant, Ed.
Intended status: Standards Track                        Cisco Systems
Expires: November 13, 2010                              M. Bocci, Ed.
                                                       Alcatel-Lucent
                                                         May 12, 2010


              MPLS Transport Profile Data Plane Architecture
                     draft-ietf-mpls-tp-data-plane-03


3.2.  Sections
```

This change is intended to clarify that providing a multiplexing capability for a section layer is optional.

A section MAY be required to provide a mechanism for multiplexing MPLS with other protocols MUST provide a means of identifying the type of payload it carries. If the section is a data-link, link-specific mechanisms such as a protocol type indication in the data-link header MAY be used. If the section is an LSP, this information MAY be implied by the LSP label or, if the LSP payload is MPLS-labeled, by the setting

Frost, et al.   Expires November 13, 2010   [Page 8]

6. Security Considerations

This change is intended to clarify the difference between the peer and a neighbour, it also provides a description of the application scenario.

2. Any MPLS label processed at the receiving LSR, such as an LSP or
    PW label, has a label value that the receiving LSR has previously
    distributed to the peer (in a common sub-layer) beyond that immediate
neighbour, the specific
scenario being when labels for more than one sub-layer in the
hierarchy has been allocated from a common label space AND
the sub-layer of receipt does not correspond to the sub-layer of
label distribution for the specific label value
(i.e., when it is
       known that the path from the system to which the label was
       distributed to the receiving system is via that neighbour).

Further details of MPLS and MPLS-TP security can be found in
[I-D.ietf-mpls-tp-framework] and
[I-D.ietf-mpls-mpls-and-gmpls-security-framework].

_____