mOSI Issues List

(30) through (112)

Reference: Issues from AOW NM N760-6/6/94
See Attachment A for disposition of comments.

Source: AOW NM SIG

Date Raised: June 6, 1994

Solution: See Attachment A

Status: OIW: Accepted 16 June 1994
EWOS:
AOW:

(113) through (137)

Reference: Issues from EWOS/EG NM/94/151
See Attachment B for disposition of comments.

Source: EWOS EG NM SIG

Date Raised: 10 June 1994

Solution: See Attachment B

Status: OIW: Accepted 16 June 1994
EWOS:
AOW:

(138) through (146)

Reference: Issues from MMS SIG
See Attachment C for disposition of comments.

Source: OIW MMS SIG

Date Raised: 14 June 1994

Solution: See Attachment C

Status: OIW: Accepted 16 June 1994
EWOS:
AOW:

(147) through (164)

Reference: Issues from Joel Berson
See Attachment D for disposition of comments.

Source: RDA SIG

Date Raised: 6 June 1994

Solution: See Attachment D

Status: OIW: Accepted 16 June 1994
EWOS:
AOW:

(17)   Reference: All

Issue: A number of comments is indicated in marked-up copy of draft version 4 of the mOSI document given to the editor. Structural comments with regard to format and style of an ISO specification are based on the corresponding ISO rules for drafting ISO text.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: The suggestions were taken into account and the changes were made in version 5.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
                EWOS:
                AOW:

(18)   Reference: Clause 2, general on API

Issue: Aspects of compliance related to APIs should be removed completely. The specification of APIs needs to be done separately and the relationship of APIs to CULR-3 needs to be specified in an OSE profile specification. It has no place in an OSI profile specification.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: References to APIs were removed from clauses 2 and 4. An API is only a special case of a mOSI user and needs no special treatment in CULR-3. Reference to APIs in informative annex on implementation considerations was kept.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
                EWOS:
                AOW:

(19)   Reference: Clause 2.1

Issue: The definition of compliance should be identical to the corresponding text of CULR-1. Otherwise, the reader would get very confused when reading different language for the same concept of compliance. Proposed text was supplied to the editor.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: The members of the joint editing meeting of EWOS/OIW on March 1 produced new text for 2.1 with the inclusion of some missing requirements (e.g. conformance to CULR-1, mappings of mOSI options, no requirement to fill in tables D.1 and D.2).

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(20)   Reference: Clause 2.2

Issue: Check text of bullet b. Remove bullet d (see issue 18). Remove bullet c: To complete separate tables for mOSI options is redundant to completing the base standards PICS Proformas (see also issue 28). Add as another conformance requirement: c) conforms to the requirements of ISO/IEC ISP 11188-1.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: Changes made to version 5.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(21)   Reference: Clause 2.3 Roles and options should be removed.

Issue: The base standard PICS Proformas have a mechanism for defining roles which should be used in annexes A, B, and C. There is no need to invent a mechanism specifically for ISP 11188-3.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: These roles and options are introduced as an easy to understand linkage of the corresponding roles of the corresponding aspects in ACSE, Presentation, and Session. Clause has been modified (now titled "Facilities, roles, and options") to be even more clear.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
             EWOS:
             AOW:

(22)   Reference: Clause 2.4.1 Authentication functional unit

Issue: EWOS/TLG asks for justification why this functional unit is optional instead of out-of-scope. The objective with mOSI is to reduce the number of options for the upper layers. This functional unit is not well defined regarding its semantics.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: NM requires this FU for CMIS/CMIP. OIW ULSIG does not understand what EWOS/TLG means by "not well defined". A defect was found but has been resolved in a recent TC (see OIW SIA March 94 Part 5, clause 4). No change.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
             EWOS:
             AOW:

(23)   Reference: Clause 2.4.1: Application Context Name Negotiation functional unit

Issue: Remove this optional requirement from mOSI. This functional unit has no stable definition. The IS status can not be expected by the time of mOSI approval. Nobody will use it.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: No change. DAM3/DAM2 on Application context negotiation during association establishment are out for DIS ballot by 1994-07-20.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(24)   Reference: Table 1

Issue: The definitions in table 1 should be fully aligned with and not be redundant with respect to the definitions in CULR-1. Further comments are in the marked-up copy of CULR-3. The possible/allowed mappings of mOSI requirements onto requirements of a referencing profile should be clearly stated in clause 2 and/or table 1.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: Agreed. All text from definitions in CULR-1 was incorporated into table 1. Additonal text was added for clarity. Text was also added to clause 2 to specify mappings. It is the OIW ULSIG's strong hope that this table be incorporated into CULR-1 as a common set of definitions of options for referencing specifications and implementations. X-entries were deleted.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(25)   Reference: Clause 7

Issue: See comment to figure 1. Furthermore, move the complete clause 7 to an informative annex. This model description of the internal structure of Basic Communications Applications is very useful information, but it should not be normative text in CULR-3. Also the concept of an API is OSE related, and is currently under discussion in ISO and among the OSE groups of the workshops. Therefore, it should not yet be mentioned in normative text of an ISP.

    Source: EWOS TLG-UL

    Date Raised: January 24, 1994

    Solution: Agreed at editor's meeting to keep clause 7 as it describes the fundamental concept of mOSI. Figure 1 was slightly revised.

    Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
                   EWOS:
                   AOW:

(26)   Reference: Annexes A, B, and C should be modified to align with the changes requested to clause 2.

    Issue: In particular, the predicate expressions should refer to the predicates specified in the base standard PICS Proformas.

    Source: EWOS TLG-UL

    Date Raised: January 24, 1994

    Solution: Changes have been made.

    Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
                   EWOS:
                   AOW:

(27)   Reference: Annex D

Issue: Annex D is a PRL Proforma (and should be called so). It should be informative and not normative. Tbale D.2 are not exceptions; this table should represent a complete list of all mOSI options and it should not have tick boxes.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: Comments accepted. But annex D remains normative, the change is that it is no longer required for compliance (see clause 2). Tables D.1 and D.2 revised to reflect their purpose as PRL Proforma.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(28)   Reference: Annex E

Issue: Annex E should either be informative or even deleted.

Source: EWOS TLG-UL

Date Raised: January 24, 1994

Solution: Similar to issue 27. Annex E remains normative, but no longer a requirement in clause 2.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(29)   Reference: Definitions of "m" and "o"

Issue: The MMS SIG believes that the new definitions of the support classifications "m" and "o" found in working draft 5 of DISP 11188-3 (CULR-3) are inconsistent with the corresponding definitions in CULR-1. Furthermore, the new definitions are inappropriate in context of MMS profiles (which are using the old definitions in CULR-1), because CULR-3 states, that an implementation shall not abort, if a non-supported optional feature is received. This contradicts the MMS protocol specification which requires a reject (and optionally an abort) in case of receiving a non-supported PDU type. The situation is different in case of receiving a non-supported optional parameter in a supported PDU. In this case the receiver must be able to parse the parameter and may ignore it.

According to the definitions of "m" in CULR-1, the MMS SIG believes that the AARQ-PDU parameters for receiving implementation shall be marked "o" and not "m" as in the ACSE PICS.

The current situation is probably due to inconsistent definitions of "m", "o", etc. and it is important to achieve a single unique definition. If such unique definitions can't be achieved it is probably better to use different letters where the definitions are different.

For the moment, the MMS SIG proposes the following:

1) although the text for the definition of "m", "o", etc. may be changed for clarification, CULR-1 and CULR-3 shall keep the meaning of the current definitions of CULR-1.

2) CULR-3 shall define a mapping of the definition in CULR-1 to the definitions in the base standard PICS.

Source: OIW MMS SIG

Date Raised: March 17, 1994

Solution: Suggestions accepted, see table 1 in version 5, revision 8.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
           EWOS:
           AOW:

(15)   Reference: All

Issue: All information in CULR-1 should be replicated in this document so that people do not have to read so many specifications.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: December 9, 1993

Solution: The problem of maintaining duplicate specifications was less appealing than the nuisance of reading two documents. References were made in table D.1 to the appropriate clauses in CULR-1 instead.

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
              EWOS:
              AOW:

(16)   Reference: Clause 6

Issue: Review the definitions in clause 6 for accuracy.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: December 9, 1993

Solution: Definitions were reviewed and revised..

Status: OIW: Accepted   17 March 1994
              EWOS:
              AOW:

(10)   Reference: New Annex

Issue: An informative bibliography should be added which would contain
            non-normative references.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: December 7, 1993

Solution: Added new annex I.

Status: OIW: Accepted December 10, 1993
              EWOS:
              AOW:

(11)   Reference: Clauses 2 and 8

Issue: All information on compliance and conformance should be
combined into clause 2.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: December 7, 1993

Solution: Combine relevant parts of clause 8 into clause 2.

Status: OIW: Accepted December 10, 1993
              EWOS:
              AOW:

(12)   Reference: Annexes A, B and C.

Issue: It was felt that since the definition of category 1 compliance/conformance implies that all facilities are mandatory for sending, it is not necessary to have separate column for category 1 and 2 in the tables.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: December 7, 1993

Solution: Removed category 1 column from all tables.

Status: OIW: Accepted December 10, 1993
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(13)   Reference: Annexes A and B.

Issue: In order to align with AOM1n (CMISE) and AFTnn (FTAM) profiles, the following facilities/parameters should be made optional in the tables: RLRQ and RLRE reason code, CPR and ARP provider reason, and CPR Responding Presentation selector.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: December 7, 1993

Solution: Tables have been changed.

Status: OIW: Accepted December 10, 1993
               EWOS:
               AOW:

(14)   Reference: Clause 6

Issue: There should be a new table which outlines the definitions of mandatory, optional, out-of-scope, and excluded for the cases of compliance and conformance.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: December 7, 1993

Solution: Table added to clause 6.

Status: OIW: Accepted December 10, 1993
              EWOS:
              AOW:

(4)   Reference: Introduction

Issue: Add expalnatory report and executive summary to document.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: September 13, 1993

Solution: Added Foreword, Explanatory Report, changed Introduction.

Status: OIW: Accepted   September 16, 1993
              EWOS:
              AOW:

(5)   Reference: Clause 8

Issue: Compliance clause should be in same section in both CULR-1 and this document.

Source: EWOS TLG

Date Raised: July 13, 1993

Solution: Moved 8.1 - 8.2 to new clause 2. Moved 8.3 and 8.4 to new Annex D.

Status: OIW: Accepted   September 16, 1993
              EWOS:

AOW:

(6)   Reference: Clause 5, Table 1

Issue: Issue on whether the definition of mandatory is correct.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: June 10, 1993

Solution: After joint meeting with the OIW CT SIG, added new note under table 1. Comments requested.

Status: OIW: Accepted   September 16, 1993
             EWOS:
             AOW:

(7)   Reference: 2.1
                  Annex D, Tables 2 and 3

Issue: Issue on the correctness of tables 2 and 3 (and their corresponding documentation in 2.1) when used as a proforma by a referencing standalone application specification.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: 15 September 1993

Solution: Jim Quigley has supplied new text in clause 2 and annexes D and E..

Status: OIW: Accepted December 10, 1993
             EWOS:
             AOW:

(8)   Reference: 3.7

        Issue: Add definitions for category 1 and 2.

        Source: OIW ULSIG

        Date Raised: 13 September 1993

        Solution: Done. Section number has changed to 4.7.

        Status: OIW: Accepted   September 16, 1993
                     EWOS:
                     AOW:

(9)   Reference: None.

        Issue: Issue on whether to add section on use of transport services,
               especially the Reuse of Transport Connection service.

        Source: Kedem Kaminsky

        Date Raised: 14 September 1993

        Solution: Mr. Kaminsky was specifically interested in the use of mOSI by
                     network management profiles. The AOM1n profile is the most
                     widely used network management profile. It explicitly states that
                     reuse of the transport connection is out of scope. CULR-3 also
                     states this in Annex C. The AOM1n profile makes no other
        comments on the use of the Transport service. This is not an
        issue.

        Status: OIW: Accepted December 7, 1993
                     EWOS:
                     AOW:

(1)   Reference: B.3.1 line 2
                     C.4.1.3 line 3

       Issue: Called (N)-selectors should be optional for sending in Catagory II
compliance.

       Source: OIW ULSIG

       Date Raised: June 10, 1993

       Solution: Cat II 'm' should be changed to 'o'.

       Status: OIW: Accepted   June 10, 1993
                     EWOS:
                     AOW:

(2)   Reference: D.2

       Issue: Clause D.2 is not written clearly.

       Source: OIW ULSIG

       Date Raised: June 10, 1993

       Solution: Rewritten to say the following:
                     "Transfer-syntax is the representation of the abstract-syntax during
                     data transfer. If an application doesn't make a distinction between
                     the abstract and transfer syntax, the same object identifier should
                     be used to denote both syntaxes. In the case where: a) the abstract
                     and transfer syntax are not the same; and b) the default abstract
                     syntax object identifier has been used (see D.1 above) the following
                     default transfer syntax object identifier may be used..."

       Status: OIW: Accepted   June 10, 1993
                     EWOS:
                     AOW:

(3)   Reference: Annex E

Issue: There is no text for Annex E. It should be removed.

Source: OIW ULSIG

Date Raised: June 10, 1993

Solution: Removed.

Status: OIW: Accepted   June 10, 1993
               EWOS:
               AOW:

**Attachment A
OIW/ULSIG disposition to
AOW comments on CULR-3
(AOW NM N760–6/6/94)**

Issue	No	Subclause	Description / Rationale	Disposition / comments
30	1	3.1	Incorrect tittle of ACSE protocol	Accepted
31	2	3.1	Incorrect title of session protocol	Accepted
32	3	3.1	Incorrect title of presentation protocol	Accepted
33	4	3.1	Incorrect number 8822-1	Accepted
34	5	3.2	Incorrect title of BRM-N&A	Accepted
35	6	3.3	Incorrect title of session PICS	Accepted
36	7	3.3	Incorrect title of presentation PICS	Accepted
37	8	3.5	Incorrect title of TR 10000-2	Accepted
38	9	4.3	Incorrect number 8823	Accepted
39	10	4.4	Incorrect number 8327	Accepted
40	11	6.1	Incorrect table # and word	Accepted
41	12	6.1	Definition of "m" – state that this is not a dynamic requirement; Add notes 1 and 2	Text for "m" definition: Accepted Note 1: Disagree–not added Such a note implies that an application cannot require the use an optional feature for the operation of its protocol. The application context defines the rules for the occasion of communication. These rules (e.g., defined by an ISP) may include mandating optional parameters. Do you mean this as a footnote to "o"? Also, remember, footnotes shall not contain normative text. Note 2: Agree in principle. Note made part of main text. These changes have been aligned with CULR-1.
42	13	6.1	"o" / implementor – extraneous ")"	Accepted
43	14	A.4	Remove ACN FU	Not removed; plan to add as a revision of minor importance to 8650-2 at Southampton (see note 3)
44	15	A.5	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
45	16	A.5	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)

46	17	A.5	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
47	18	A.5	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
48	19	A.6.1 & [3]	Remove ACN FU	Not removed; plan to add as revision of minor importance to 8650-2 at Southampton (see note 3)
49	20	A.6.1	Support level change	Accepted (see note 1)
50	21	A.6.1	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
51	22	A.6.1	Support level change	Accepted (see note 1)
52	23	A.6.1	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
53	24	A.6.1	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
54	25	A.6.1	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
55	26	A.6.1	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
56	27	A.6.2	Remove ACN FU	Not removed; plan to add as revision of minor importance to 8650-2 at Southampton (see note 3)
57	28	A.6.2	Support level change	Accepted (see note 1)
58	29	A.6.2	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
59	30	A.6.2	Support level change	Accepted (see note 1)
60	31	A.6.2	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2) *Notice here–support for receiving the Authentication-mechanism Name parameter on the AARE APDU is mandatory–even if the sending implementation does not support/propose the Authentication FU. The OIW believes that mandatory in this (and most other cases) means "ignore". Actually, in this situation, receiving the Authentication-mechanism Name parameter on the AARE APDU when the Authentication FU was not proposed is a protocol error. Calling this support for the Authentication-mechanism Name parameter on the AARE APDU is going too far!*
61	32	A.6.2	Support level change	Accepted (see note 1)
62	33	A.6.2	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
63	34	A.6.2	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
64	35	A.6.5	Typo Diagnostic parameter is "m" (sending and receiving) if authentication is supported	Typo accepted: [1] -> c[1] Disagree. For the receiver–this is the m/o/i issue. This parameter was "forgotten" in the 1998

				version! It was added for the Authentication FU amendment. However, in the amended 8650-1, 9.1, ASN.1 for the abort-diagnostic datatype states "… not be present if only the Kernel is used." It is an OPTIONAL datatype. For sending, its use is not mandated by selecting the Authentication FU. The CASE group reckoned that a diagnostic could help a hacker break a security mechanism–so, including it is an implementor's choice. The OIW believes the condition should be: [1] If Authentication or Application Context Negotiation is selected then "o" else "-". The OIW suggests possibly revisiting this issue in the DISP NB ballot.
65	36	A.7.2	Typos Support level change	Typo accepted Accepted (see note 1)
66	37	A.7.2	Typos Receiving should be "m"	Typos accepted m/o/i issue (see note 2) but CULR-3 condition is not correct (see note 1) and has been corrected
67	38	B.3.1.2	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
68	39	B.3.1.2	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
69	40	B.3.1.2	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
70	41	B.3.1.2	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
71	42	B.3.1.2	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
72	43	B.3.1.2	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
73	44	B.4.1	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
74	45	B.4.1	Protocol version should be "*"	protocol version issue (see note 4)
75	46	B.4.1	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
76	47	B.4.2	Protocol version should be "*"	protocol version issue (see note 4)
77	48	B.4.2	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
78	49	B.4.2	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
79	50	B.4.3	Protocol version should be "*"	protocol version issue (see note 4)
80	51	B.4.4	Presentation Context Identifier List should be changed to "*" for sender	Agree in principle–the situation is that this parameter shall be present when the User Data parameter is present in the ARU

				and when either the Context Management FU has been selected or the Presentation Context Definition List parameter was preset in the CP PPDU. If either are present, then "m" else "-". The ARU PPDU User Data parameter always contains an ABRT APDU, so this parameter must be m. Was inadvertently changed in version 6 of CULR-3. CULR-3: changed to "m" / "m" for sending / receiving.
81	52	B.4.4	Presentation Context Identifier List should be changed to "m" for receiver	Agree in principle. (see disposition of 51)
82	53	B.4.5	Event identifier for sender should be "*"	Agree for sender CULR-3: changed to "*" for sender However, it is not clear why an applications such as NM would care whether the stack supporting it sent this PPDU parameter. The semantic sent is not available at the A-P-ABORT indication service boundary–A-P-ABORT indication has a Provider Reason parameter but not "event identifier" parameter.
83	54	B.4.5	Receiving should be "m"	CULR-3: changed to "*" for receiving. Part of m/o/i issue (see note 2 and disposition of 53, above)
84	55	C.3.1.2	Support level change	Agree in principle (see note 1)
85	56	C.3.1.2	AA SPDU support should be changed from "m" to "*"	Disagree; A.7.1.2 in 8327-2 has an "m" for receiving an AA SPDU. Suppose your NM system with its UL stack inadvertently receives an AARQ from a non-NM system with an application context name of (say) bank-funds-query. Your system does an abort (ABRT), how do you know that the "alien" system won't send you back an AA SPDU? If your system doesn't support receiving an AA, what are you going to do blow up? Abort again? **11183-1 issue:** recommend changing to "m"
86	57	C.4.1.1	Receiving Calling SS-user Reference should be "m(n)" = Ignore	Not necessary–"i" for receiving in table 2 handles this case and you don't need to do negative testing

				to prove your stack can ignore it. really part of m/o/i issue. The semantics of these parameter are not defined at the A-ASSOCIATE request/indication boundary.
87	58	C.4.1.1	Receiving Common reference should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
88	59	C.4.1.1	Receiving Additional reference information should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
89	60	C.4.1.2.1	Change TSDU maximum size from "o" to "*"	Agree in principle CULR-3: sending changed to "I" for sending
90	61	C.4.1.2.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
91	62	C.4.1.2.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
92	63	C.4.1.3	Receiving should be "m"	m/o/i issue (see note 2)
93	64	C.4.2.1	Calling should be Called	Accepted
94	65	C.4.2.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
95	66	C.4.2.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
96	67	C.4.2.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
97	68	C.4.2.2.1	Change TSDU maximum size from "o" to "*"	Agree in principle CULR-3: sending changed to "i"
98	69	C.4.2.2.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
99	70	C.4.2.2.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
100	71	C.4.2.3	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
101	72	C.4.2.3	Calling Session Selector for AC SPDU for receiving should be changed from "o" to "*" because 11183-1 is "m"	Agree in principle. If a value was sent and one is receive back, then the sender must check that it is the same value or abort the connection. If no value is sent or a null value is sent, then the sender must check that no value is returned or a null value is returned. CULR-3: receiving changed to "m". Deleted last sentence in Constraint / value column.
102	73	C.4.3.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
103	74	C.4.3.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" =	(see disposition of 57)

			Ignore	
104	75	C.4.3.1	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
105	76	C.4.3.2	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
106	77	C.4.3.2	Session User Requirements for sending should be changed from "o" to "m" because 11183-1 is conditional	Agree in principle. CULR-3 changed to "m/m". Please, note that the condition is dynamic–the static requirement is m, so should be no problem with the 11183-1 condition.
107	78	C.4.3.2	Session User Requirements for receiving should be changed from "o" to "m" because 11183-1 is conditional	Agree in principle. CULR-3 changed to "m/m". Please, note that the condition is dynamic–the static requirement is m, so should be no problem with the 11183-1 condition.
108	79	C.4.3.2	Version parameter for sending should be changed from "o" to "*" because 11183-1 is "m".	Agree in principle; CULR-3: changed to "m"/"m".
109	80	C.4.3.2	Version parameter for receiving should be changed from "o" to "m"	Agree in principle; CULR-3: changed to m/m.
110	81	C.4.4	Receiving should be "m(n)" = Ignore	(see disposition of 57)
111	82	C.4.6	Reflect Parameter Values for sending should be changed from "m" to "*"	Disagree; 11183-1 condition mentioned is dynamic; static status is "m". **11183-1 issue:** recommend changing to "m"
112	83	C.4.8	Given should be Give – typo	Accepted

Attachment B

**OIW/ULSIG comments on EWOS/EG NM/94/151–
EGNM comparison between
CULR-3.6 and ISO/IEC ISP 11183-1**

Issue	Subclause	EGNM comment / rationale	OIW ULSIG proposed changes / comments
113	General 1	Generally speaking, part 1 of the 11183-1 profiles could be considered as compliant.	It is intended that the 11183-1 be fully compliant to the mOSI profile – as specific by the 11183-1 completion of tables D.1 and D.2. We suggest that these tables be completed ASAP.
114	General 2	Difference noticed between m/o/i/- in CULR-1 and CULR-3	The definitions should be identical. Several NB ballot comments to CULR-1 have been made that should bring both into alignment.
115	General 3	"o" features must remain so in a referencing specification	The CULR-3 status of "o" has been assigned to features that do not directly affect the operation of an application. The features are endogenous, that is, they are internal to the operation of the ULs. The CULR-3 status of "*" has been assigned to features whose status is the option of the referencing specification. They are exogenous, that is, they are determined external to the operation of the ULs.
116	General 4	Allowing open "*" status values diminishes the benefit of common ULs.	The original intent of the mOSI profile was to have zero options. However, we found this was not practical. Too many compromises of included or omitted feature would be necessary – the various roles (initiator/ responder); naming parameters (AE titles, invocation-identifiers, selectors); etc. CULR-3 is used to define UL requirements rather than to define a particular implementation.
117	General 5	Meanings of "m" and "o" are not always consistent with the PICS proformas.	This is correct–but for the receiving of parameters, only. The meanings used in the base PICS proformas and the profiles (including CULR-3) are different because their use and purpose are different. This is discussed in the US contribution to SC 21 on this subject. The definitions in CULR-3 (which will also be in CULR-1 – after processing NB comment) are more precise and are based on 9649-7.
118	A.4	ACN negotiation	The WG 8 CASE group will propose this addition to the ACSE PICS proforma as a revision of minor importance in Southampton for the 1994 edition of ACSE.
119	A.5	RLRQ and RLRE	No inconsistency exists between CULR-3 and 11183-1 because *Establishment-initiator* and

			-responder can be assigned the status value of "m" in 11183-1. We however, noticed a session PICS proforma discrepancy with the ACSE PICS proforma. **8327-2 issue:** remove the requirement in A.7.1.1.2 for at least one of the release roles. In ACSE, both roles are optional. The OIW and EWOS had ballot comments to make ACSE so. Not making the comparable change for 8327-2 was an oversight.
120	A.6.1&2	AC List: Implementation information	(see A.4) m/o/i issue; Actually (inconsistently) marked as "o" in the ACSE PICS proforma. Changed to "i" to avoid testing.
121	A.6.3&4	Sending RLRQ parameters Receiving RLRQ parameters	No inconsistency exists between CULR-3 and 11183-1 because *Release-requestor* can be assigned the status value of "o" in 11183-1. m/o/i issue. Also, see above for *Release-requestor*.
122	A.6.5	Abort Diagnostic	**8650-2 issue:** condition is true for all functional units except Kernel; must be updated for future amendments; include with addition of revision of minor importance. **CULR-3:** condition should be same as c[1] in tables A.6.1&2. No conflict should exist with 11183-1; notice: status value should be $\underline{c}$[1]
123	B.4.1 CP	Receiving: Called P-selector Sending: Protocol Version Receiving: User Session Requirements [CPC Type – new row in PICS]	m/o/i issue. NOTE–If the receiving system does not support P-selectors, the field is properly ignored. **11183-1:** Should be "o" – this is an implementor's decision. Only version 1 is defined and is the default. The semantic of 1 is sent whether or not the parameter is physically included in the PDU. Changing 11183-1 to "o" will not affect existing implementations. Should be "i"**.** Parameter is only present if presentation adds the session Typed Data FU to support its Context Management FU. This is out side the scope of mOSI. Also, part of m/o/i issue. **CULR-3:** note added to explain why "i", **CULR-3:** add CPC Type row–assigning it "*" / "m" and add comment. **11183-1:** add CPC Type
124	B.4.2 CPA	Protocol version Receiving: P-requirements Receiving User S-requirements	(see as B.4.1) A mOSI conformant initiator shall not include any presentation FUs on the CP. None should return on the CPA. To avoid negative testing, the status was set as "i". (see B.4.1)
125	B.4.3	Sending: Protocol Version	(see B.4.1)

126	B.4.5	Event identifier	**CULR-3:** Change to (*, *), adding to table D.2 **11183-1:** Remove note (1) – it states dynamic requirements
127	B.5.1	Object Identifier	not an issue - is open in mOSI
128	B.5.2	Object Identifier	not an issue - is open in mOSI
129	C.2.2	Use of transport expedited data Max size of User data	A mOSI variable (*Transport-expedited*) was added not that is referenced in this row. This should remove this difference. The features for this table have been changed in 8327-2. CULR-3 has been changed to reflect the new options: max size of user data on S-CONN > 512 m, max size of user data on S-CONN > 10240 i, max size of user data is S-ABORT > 9 m
130	C.3.1.2 (since there is no distinction between initiator and responder, there will be only one table)	Abort Accept Prepare	mOSI is "i" (not "m") for sending. **11183-1:** change receiving to "m". If received, the AA should be processed, i.e. a T-DISC should be sent. Therefore is "m" for receipt Should translate to "i" for 11183-1; not an issue
131	C.4.1.2	Sending: TSDU maximum size Receiving: Initial Serial Number Receiving: Token setting item	**CULR-3:** change to "i"; (however, "o" but only allowing a value of 0 is equivalent). If refused, connection shall not be established. m/o/i issue m/o/i issue
132	C.4.1.3	Receiving: Called S-selector	m/o/i/ issue
133	C.4.2.2	Sending: TSDU maximum size Receiving: Initial Serial Number Receiving: Token setting item	**CULR-3:** change to "i"; ("o" but only 0 is equivalent). If refused, connection shall not be established. m/o/i issue m/o/i issue
134	C.4.2.3	Receiving: Token Item Receiving: S-selector	m/o/i issue m/o/i issue
135	C.4.3.2	Receiving: Transport Disconnect Session User Requirements Version Number	m/o/i issue; set to "i" to avoid testing **11183-1:** Change to "m" / "m" – note (1) is a dynamic requirement; your static requirement is "m" *(Currently status is "?" in session PICS!)* **CULR-3:** Change to "m" / "m" **CULR-3:** Change to "m" / "m"

| 136 | C.4.4 | Receiving Transport Disconnect | m/o/i issue; set to "i" to avoid testing |
| 137 | C.4.6 | Sending Reflect Parameter Values | **11183-1:** Change sending to "m". note (1) is a dynamic requirement; your static requirement is "m" |

Attachment C

**OIW/ULSIG disposition of comments supplied
by the MMS SIG on CULR-3 (version 6)**

Issue	Subclause	MMS comment / rationale	OIW ULSIG disposition / comments
138	6.2	Clarify scope of the Transport-expedited variable	Agree: mentions that it does **not** include the S-EXPEDITED-DATA service
139	Table 1	"o" for receiving not same as "I" for receiving. In particular, "I" should not include conformance test.	Disagree: Text "I" under "implementor" states "… shall follow the guidelines outlined for optional above with the exception that this feature **shall not be the subject of an ISP conformance test**."
140	Table 1	Cell i/implementor has extraneous ")"	Removed
141	Table 1	x / implementor – last sentence is run-on and confusing	Agree: changed to 2 sentences
142	Table 1	o / implementor – last sentence not true for MMS. OK to remove	Removed
143	Table 1	* / implementor – not applicable; an implementor should never see a *.	Disagree: an implementor of a mOSI stack–one who references CULR-3–will see an "*". Not changed.
144	Table 1	Version 5 note [10] – not true for MMS.	Not added back
145	Table 1	Version 5 note [11] – not relevant for MMS; OK to add back	Added back to table 1
146	7.1 Model	Text implies that encoding / decoding is not considered as part of the P-layer. Implies that a P-P-ABORT will not be sent upon a decoding error.	Agree: Clarifying text added

Attachment D

**OIW/ULSIG disposition to
Joel Berson's comments based on
draft RDA profile differences**

Issue	Subclause	Comment description	Disposition
147	Table 1/5(I)	Feature shall remain "i" – this does not allow any leeway	No change proposed. It should be possible for a referencing specification to claim "almost" mOSI compliance but with an itemized set of exceptions.
148	2.1/e	Too vague re CULR-1 requirements	CULR-3: Changed footnote: "See clause 2 and annex B in ISO/IEC 11188-1.
	[8650-2: A.4.1]	Don't understand required answer	8650-2 issue: clarify support answer required
	[8650-2: A.4.2]	No version 2 planned	8650-2 issue: remove "version2" twice
149	B.4.1/1	Calling presentation selector needs explanation	CULR-3: Added comment: "Implementation option; only needed if presentation selector is part of the presentation address for the implementation"
150	B.4.2/1	Responding presentation selector needs explanation	CULR-3: Added comment: "Implementation option; only needed if presentation selector is part of the presentation address for the implementation"
151	B.4.5	Provider Reason "o" in 8823 -> "m" in PICS	8823-2 issue: change to "o" / "o". See editor's note (issue) in CULR-3
152	B.4.5/2	Event identifier is i/i in CULR-3; o/m in RDA	CULR-1: changed to "*"/"*"
153	B.4.7	PICS clause reference wrong 11 S-UERreq/ind is na/na for RDA; is m/m for CULR-3	CULR-3: Changed to A.8 in table CULR-3: Changed to "i"/"i"
	[8823-2: A.4.1]	Don't understand answer required in PICS	8823-2: Clarify required answer; why is row "-"?
	[8327-2: A.4.1]	Don't understand answer required in PICS	8327-2: Clarify required answer; why is row "-"?
	[8327-2: A.4.]	Version supported should be part of CULR-3 specification	CULR-3: Added PICS table A.4 to annex C
154	C.2.1/10 new	Missing Data Separation functional unit	CULR-3: added column to table (row 10) as "i"
155	C.4.1.3/2	Calling session selector needs explanation	CULR-3: Added comment: "Implementation option; only needed if session selector is part of the presentation address for the implementation"

156	C.4.1.2.1/1	Sending: "—" in CULR-3; "i" in RDA if *Establishment-initiator* is "i"	RDA issue: recommend changing to "—"
157	C.4.2.3/5	Responding presentation selector needs explanation	CULR-3: Added comment: "Implementation option; only needed if session selector is part of the presentation address for the implementation"
158	C.4.2.2.1/2	Sending: "o" in CULR-3; "i" in RDA	CULR-3: changed to "i" with a comment
159	C.4.2.3/1	"i"/"i" in CULR-3; "o" / "m" in RDA	RDA: For sending: recommend changing to "i"–no tokens selected for BCA; receiving: m/o/i issue.
160	C.4.2.3/4	"o" / "o" in CULR-3; "m" / "m" in RDA Something about table E.3 and note	ULSIG believes that it should be "o" for sending–this is simply a sobriety test. In 8327-1 it is an OPTIONAL parameter. **8327-2 issue:** sending should be "o". RDA: recommend changing to "o" if 8327-2 does
161	C.4.2.3/5	"o" / "m" in CULR-3; "m" / "m" in RDA	CULR-3: Added comment: "Implementation option; only needed if session selector is part of the presentation address for the implementation"
162	C.4.3.2/1	"i" / "i" in CULR-3; "o" / "m" in RDA	Should be an "I" because reuse of transport connection is "I". RDA: recommend changing to "I" / "i"
163	C.4.3.2/2	"o" / "o" in CULR-3; "m" / "m" in RDA	Agree CULR-3: changed
164	C.4.3.2/3	"o" / "o" in CULR-3; "m" / "m" in RDA	Agree CULR-3: changed