ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC6 N 7532

Project: JTC1.06.41.02
Date: 1992-07-21

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC6
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE BETWEEN SYSTEMS

Secretariat: U.S.A. (ANSI)

Title: Disposition of Comments on Defect Report ISO/IEC 9542/014

Source: Routeing Project Editor (D. Oran)

Address reply to:
Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 – American National Standards Institute, 11 West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036

Tel: 212 642-4931; TX 42 42 96 ANSI UI; FAX 212 302-1286

Disposition of Comments on Defect Report ISO/IEC 9542/014

1 Introduction

The Defect Report ballot for ISO/IEC 9542/014 (SC6 N6824) closed on 1992-04-17. The summary of voting is contained in document **SC6 N7265**. There were 9 approval votes (Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Japan, Sweden, USA), no approval with comments, 2 disapprovals (France, UK), 1 abstention (Italy), and 7 ballots not returned (Australia, Belgium, Korea, Netherlands, Romania, Russian Federation).

Ballot results and member body comments were discussed and resolved successfully at the San Diego meeting of SC6/WG2. Experts from the member bodies submitting comments were present for the discussions. All comments were successfully resolved and replacement text agreed for a Technical Corrigendum to the standard.

2 Resolution of specific member body comments

2.1 France Comments

Comment 1: The French comment expressed concern that the proposed defect resolution constituted an enhancement to the protocol and not simply a defect correction. It was agreed by the editing group that indeed the French concern was justified, but that by adopting the approach proposed by the UK in their comment 1, this concern would be eliminated. Since the editing group concurred with the essence of the UK replacement text, the comment from France was accommodated.

2.2 UK Comments

Comment 1: This comment was the basis for the UK negative vote on the defect report. The rationale behind the UK position was accepted by the editing group as the basis for rejecting the proposed defect resolution in the balloted defect report. The UK proposed alternate replacement text which was accepted, with modification, as the basis for a Technical Corrigendum to the standard. Thus, this UK comment was accommodated.

Comment 2: The UK also expressed concern that, even with the proposed replacement text to correct the problem with allowing enhancement to ISO/IEC 9542 by adding new PDU types, that the standard would still not be sufficiently “future proof”. After discussion the editing group developed a simple approach to better support future extension of the protocol while preserving complete backwards compatibility with implementations conforming to the published standard. The proposal divides the PDU type code space for ISO/IEC 9542 into two ranges. The range containing all the existing PDU types would have the behavior specified in the UK proposed replacement text; the other range could be used for future extension of the protocol to incorporate PDU types which would generate a protocol error if received by an implementation not supporting the extended protocol.

Comment 3: This comment reflected on the consequences of having made ISO/IEC 9542 a separate protocol type from ISO/IEC 8473, while incorporating a similarly “distinct” protocol for address administration as part of the ISO/IEC 9542 protocol. It cautioned that in the future it would be desirable to give more thought to whether extended functions should be incorporated into an existing protocol specification and sharing the protocol type of that protocol, or be considered a separate protocol with its won protocol type. Since this comment was philosophical in nature and did not affect the approach taken to resolving the subject defect, the point was noted to be considered in the development of future OSI protocols.

3 Replacement text for ISO/IEC 9542

Add the following text at the end of clause 7.2.5:

> “If a PDU is received with a reserved PDU type value in the range 10000 to 11111, it shall be treated as invalid and therefore as constituting a protocol error. If a PDU is received with a reserved PDU type in range 00000 to 01111, then it may either:
>
> a) be considered as valid but entirely ignored, or
>
> b) be treated as invalid, and therefore constituting a protocol error.
>
> NOTE - It is recommended that PDUs having type values in the range 00000 to 01111 should be ignored rather than treated as invalid, because this would be the most appropriate behaviour in view of the envisaged use of these type values in protocol enhancements.”