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# Liaison statementFuture Port Allocation Requests

* [Statement](https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/1743/)
* [History](https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/1743/history/)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State** | Posted |
| **Submitted Date** | 2021-05-24 |
| **From Group** | TSV |
| **From Contact** | Martin Duke |
| **To Group** | 3GPP-TSGCT-CT4 |
| **To Contacts** | Lionel MorandSusanna Kooistra |
| **Cc** | Zaheduzzaman SarkerThe IETF ChairMartin Duke |
| **Response Contact** | Lars Eggert |
| **Purpose** | In response |
| **Attachments** | (None) |
| **Liaisons referred by this one** | [Reply LS on port allocation for the W1 interface](https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/1726/) |
| **Body**Thank you for your correspondence about port allocation. In your latest messageyou write:“However, besides the assignment of transport protocol port(s) that could berequested by 3GPP for the deployment of specific service discoverymechanism(s), it is also the 3GPP understanding that this statement cannotprohibit 3GPP to request in the future a port assignment for a new serviceapplication for which none of the port assignment alternatives would beapplicable.”Your understanding is correct. Our previous statements on this subject areintended to reduce port requests with a low chance of approval, but no party isever prohibited from requesting a port assignment. An application justified bya particular use case, especially if that use case is deployed over the open Internet, should be registered with IANA and will be evaluated in accordance with IETF and IANA policy, just like any other request. |