



Question(s): 1/15

Geneva, 14-25 February 2011

LIAISON STATEMENT**Source:** ITU-T Study Group 15**Title:** Comments on Draft Recommendation G.phnt “Protocol for identifying home network topology”

LIAISON STATEMENT**For action to:** -**For comment to:** IETF IESG**For information to:** -**Approval:** Agreed to at Study Group 15 meeting (Geneva, 14-25 February 2011)**Deadline:** 20 April 2011

Contact: John A. Jay
Corning, Inc.
USA
Tel: +1-607-974-4288
Fax: +1-607-974-4354
Email: JayJA@Corning.com

Contact: Tatsuhiko Yoshida
NTT
Japan
Tel: +81-45-826-6480
Fax: +81-45-826-6055
Email: t.yoshida@ntt-at.co.jp

Q1/15 thanks IETF IESG for its Liaison Statement received as TD 470 WP 1/15.

Q1/15 understands the following four basic questions from TD 470 (WP1/15):

1. It is unclear whether the protocol specified in G.phnt is limited to discovering devices and device configuration. If not, IETF and ITU-T should manage the development of G.phnt.
2. It is unclear whether internet layer addresses would be carried in LLDP. If so, it would constitute a layering violation.
3. The security considerations in G.phnt were lacking.
4. It is unclear whether G.phnt can be extended in future to allow the protocol to act as a topology discovery mechanism across multiple links. As the current G.phnt assumes devices on a single link, it is strange that the title of G.phnt contains the keyword “network topology”.

The corresponding response to the above question is described below:

<p>Attention: Some or all of the material attached to this liaison statement may be subject to ITU copyright. In such a case this will be indicated in the individual document. Such a copyright does not prevent the use of the material for its intended purpose, but it prevents the reproduction of all or part of it in a publication without the authorization of ITU.</p>

1. The main reason why we sent our liaison to IETF is that G.phnt refers RFC 792. Moreover, G.phnt is limited to discovering devices in order to identify the home network topology, but not configuring devices. It does not modify or update LLDP in IEEE as well as UDA in UPnP. Therefore, the protocols specified in G.phnt do not impact relevant documents in IETF.
2. As G.phnt assumes the simple devices incapable of processing IP layer, LLDP in this recommendation does not carry internet layer information. It just carries device information and MAC forwarding table information.
3. We also think that the security is important in home network. The security mechanism should be established between the Access Gateway (AGW) and the Network Server (NS) in case of communication between home network/LAN and WAN. As the current G.phnt addresses only the LAN side, the security is out of scope for this Recommendation.
4. We assume that “a single link” in your liaison means the one data link layer, which constitutes one IP domain between AGW and IP Terminal. If the above understanding is correct, the current G.phnt does not identify devices on multiple links, but on a single link, as shown in Figure 8-1. However, we think that the home network with a single link is the most common case, thus G.phnt will be applied to most of the IP home networks. Even if the home network is comprised of a single link, there is a physical layer of multiple devices. Thus we think that the title of G.phnt should contain the keyword “network topology”.

Draft Rec. G.phnt was revised based on these and other comments at the February 2011 SG 15 meeting. It will be circulated by separate LS. We will ask IEFT IESG to comment on this final draft with a view to requesting consent for this Recommendation in September 2011. Q1/15 thanks IETF IESG for its continued support.
