Dear Ron,

I have some comments on your last message

1) although it is easy to propose correction to GM text, I think it is useless until we have a base text on which we can make change proposals. For the time being, I would consider this GM text to be non-existent. Therefore I propose that all related VRCIs are kept unchanged until some decision is taken at WG2 level.

2) I would agree with you to consider 95010006.DR, 95010008.DR, 95010032.DR and 95010051.DR as resolved in version 3.0. But I maintain that the other DRs 'still open' in my initial list should be considered open, at least until the following issues listed below are clarified.

3) 95010014.DR is not related to 95010017.DR. The modification proposed in point 1 of your paper is not applicable to that DR. Having considered it again, it appears as resolved in version 3.0.

4) You should submit your proposed changes to the CCB mailing list using the CP standard format so that everybody can comment before formal submission occurs.

5) I'm not sure that 95010052.DR is to be considered resolved. I'd like other CCB member's opinion.

Attached is the list of VRCI changes you should submit to the CCB approval:

DR from SUBMITTED TO ACCEPTED.
This is already confirmed by WG2 at Toulouse meeting and by subsequent CISEC work.

DR Status	Reference	Sub.Date	Rev.Date	Title
SUBMITTED	95010052.DR	09-03-95		*** should now be 'accepted', I guess

DR from ACCEPTED TO RESOLVED.
This is already confirmed by WG2 at Toulouse meeting in version 2.0 acceptance.

DR Status	Reference	Sub.Date	Rev.Date	Title
ACCEPTED	95010001.DR	09-01-95	07-03-95	*** resolved in version 1.0 (see CP)
	95010002.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** resolved in version 1.1 (see CP)
	95010005.DR	22-11-94	07-03-95	*** resolved in version 1.1 (see CP)
	95010007.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** resolved in version 1.1 (see CP)
	95010009.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** resolved in version 1.1 (see CP)
	95010015.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** resolved in version 1.1 (see CP)
	95010016.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** resolved in version 1.1 (see CP)

DR from ACCEPTED TO RESOLVED
These are resolved by changes made in version 3.0. They need confirmation by CCB.

DR Status	Reference	Sub.Date	Rev.Date	Title
ACCEPTED	95010006.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** seems resolved by version 3.0
	95010008.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** seems resolved by version 3.0
	95010012.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010013.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010014.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	
	95010021.DR	11-01-95	08-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010023.DR	11-01-95	08-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010030.DR	12-01-95	08-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010031.DR	12-01-95	08-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010032.DR	12-01-95	08-03-95	
	95010037.DR	12-01-95	08-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010040.DR	12-01-95	08-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010045.DR	12-01-95	08-03-95	*** resolved by version 3.0
	95010051.DR	31-01-95	08-03-95	

CP from ACCEPTED TO IMPLEMENTED
This is already confirmed by WG2 at Toulouse meeting in version 2.0 acceptance.

CP Status	Reference	DR or CR	Sub.Date	Rev.Date	Title
ACCEPTED	95010001.CP	95010002.DR	28-12-94	07-03-95	*** was implemented in version 1.1
	95010002.CP	95010005.DR	22-11-94	07-03-95	*** was implemented in version 1.1
	95010004.CP	95010007.DR	22-11-94	07-03-95	*** was implemented in version 1.1

```
|            |95010006.CP |95010009.DR | 22-11-94 | 07-03-95 |*** was implemented in version 1.1
|            |95010012.CP |95010015.DR | 22-11-94 | 07-03-95 |*** was implemented in version 1.1
|            |95010013.CP |95010016.DR | 22-11-94 | 07-03-95 |*** was implemented in version 1.1
|            |95010015.CP |95010001.DR | 31-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** was implemented in version 1.0
+-----------+------------+------------+---------+---------+--------
```

DR from ACCEPTED/PENDING to WITHDRAWN.
This is based on changes made by CISEC in version 3.0 which supersede these DRs. Since this
list is from a personal review it needs confirmation by CCB members.

```
+=========================================================================
| DR Status  | Reference  | Sub.Date | Rev.Date | Title
+============+============+==========+==========+=============================
| ACCEPTED   |95010011.DR | 28-12-94 | 07-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010024.DR | 11-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010025.DR | 11-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010034.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010035.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010041.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010042.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010043.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
|            |95010050.DR | 17-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
+-----------+------------+----------+----------+-------------------
|  PENDING   |95010033.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** superseded by version 3.0
+-----------+------------+----------+----------+-------------------
```

Still ACCEPTED/PENDING applicable to Guidance Material.
I propose that those are kept unchanged until GM work starts.

```
+=========================================================================
| DR Status  | Reference  | Sub.Date | Rev.Date | Title
+============+============+==========+==========+=============================
| ACCEPTED   |95010010.DR | 28-12-94 | 07-03-95 |*** still open, GM editor to consider
|            |95010018.DR | 22-11-94 | 08-03-95 |*** still open, GM editor to consider
|            |95010019.DR | 11-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still open, GM editor to consider
+-----------+------------+----------+----------+-------------------
|  PENDING   |95010003.DR | 09-01-95 | 07-03-95 |*** still pending, GM editor to consider
+-----------+------------+----------+----------+-------------------
```

Still ACCEPTED/PENDING applicable to SARPS.
Those are considered as still open/pending because of the reasons listed below. I think that
in most cases, progression is obvious but must be reviewed/confirmed by CCB. I have added a
few details on the reason why they are still open.

```
+=========================================================================
| DR Status  | Reference  | Sub.Date | Rev.Date | Title
+============+============+==========+==========+=========================
| ACCEPTED   |95010017.DR | 22-11-94 | 08-03-95 |*** still open
|            |95010027.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still open
|            |95010028.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still open !!!
|            |95010029.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still open
|            |95010038.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still open (see 6.2.2.4) IDRP defect?
|            |95010039.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still open (LQOSR)
|            |95010046.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** resolved by version 3.0 (items 6 and 8
???)
|            |95010047.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |?
|            |95010048.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still open
|            |95010049.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |?
+-----------+------------+----------+----------+-------------------
|  PENDING   |95010044.DR | 12-01-95 | 08-03-95 |*** still pending
+-----------+------------+----------+----------+-------------------
```

95010038.DR
Text that caused this DR has now moved to SARPs section 6.2.2.4. and looks identical to me.
The requirement explicitly contradicts IDRP (at least on my copy of ISO 10747). This should be
clarified before we close the DR.

95010039.DR
First part related to SECP is resolved. Second part on LQOSR is not. Previous decision from
CCB recommended modification of Status to 'M' for both columns. Now that we have 3 ATN columns
I suspect the values will be 'M', 'M', 'O' like e.g. EXPR entry.

95010046.DR
This DR contains 8 items. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 are resolved. Item 6 now refers to section
5.2.5.1 and 5.3.5.1, and is still not corrected. Item 8 is not resolved but looks minor. The
likely outcome of this should be a rewriting of sections 5.2.5.1 and 5.3.5.1 because of the
following:

- these sections contain a lot of useless/redundant material from ISO 8073/8602.
Complementary DR/CP may be needed.
 - 5.2.5.1 does not address network security QOS setting for the called Transport Entity point
of view.
Another DR should be drafted on that subject

95010047.DR
Can anybody provide info on the status of this problem w.r.t current SARPs text? Should we
consider it resolved, open or should we make it pending?

95010049.DR
Can anybody (Helene?) assess whether new section 7.6.4.3.6 + table covers this DR?