mOSI Issues List

(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: