

AERONAUTICAL TELECOMMUNICATION NETWORK PANEL

Working Group 2

Munich, 24-28 June 1996

Report of the SARPs Editorial Review Committee Meeting

prepared and presented by Jean-Michel Crenais (STNA/France)

SUMMARY

This working paper contains the meeting report of the Editorial Review Committee which was tasked to review version 5.0 of Subvolume 5 of the CNS/ATM-1 Package draft SARPs. The meeting was organized from 3rd to 7th June 96 in Toulouse (France). The objectives of the meeting were to conduct a detailed editorial review of the last version of the SARPs. Typographic errors and inconsistencies among the various sections were corrected; editorial guidelines coming from ICAO or agreed by the ATNP Working Groups in Brussels were applied as much as possible. No technical change was introduced, but technical problems were identified and actions to correct them were taken so that these problems could be discussed and solved in Munich during WG2/9.

Version 5.1 of Subvolume 5 of the draft CNS/ATM-1 Package SARPs was produced during the meeting and delivered the week after on the *atn-internet-technical* mailing list.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND	1
2. INTRODUCTION	1
3. PARTICIPANTS	1
4. MEETING PROCEEDINGS	2
4.1. Review of Working Papers	2
4.2. Detailed Review of each Chapter	3
4.2.1. Review of the Cover Page, Foreword, and Chapter 1	4
4.2.2. Review of Chapter 2	4
4.2.3. Review of Chapter 3	4
4.2.4. Review of Chapter 4	4
4.2.5. Review of Chapter 5	5
4.2.6. Review of Chapter 6	6
4.2.7. Review of Chapter 7	6
4.2.8. Review of Chapter 8	7
4.2.9. Review of Chapter 9	7
5. CONCLUSION	7
ANNEX A: LIST OF WORKING PAPERS	9
ANNEX B: FLIMSY #1	10
ANNEX C: FLIMSY #2	12
ANNEX D: FLIMSY #3	13

1. Background

During its 8th meeting organised in Brussels in April 96, the ATNP Working Group 2 agreed to produce version 5.0 of the draft CNS/ATM-1 Internet SARPs. This version was delivered on the *atn-internet-technical*' e-mail list on 15 May 96.

In order to meet the mid-July ICAO deadline for submission of Subvolume 5 of the CNS/ATM-1 Package SARPs to the ATNP Secretariat, WG2 decided to organise a detailed editorial review of the document so that all typographic errors, redundancies, ambiguous wording, etc. be removed from the text and editorial guidelines coming from ICAO or from the ATNP Working Groups be incorporated.

An Editorial Review Committee was created among WG2 participants and it was agreed that this Committee would meet in Toulouse (France) from 3rd to 7th June 96, with the task to conduct this detailed editorial review of version 5.0 of the Internet SARPs, and to create version 5.1 of these SARPs. This version would then be presented to the Working Group at its 9th meeting organised end of June in Munich (Germany). The output of the Munich meeting will then be version 6.0 of the SARPs, which will be the version sent to ICAO for translation.

2. Introduction

This document contains the report of the WG2 Editorial Review Committee meeting which was held from 3rd to 7th June 96 in Toulouse (France) in the STNA offices.

It was agreed that the objectives of this committee was only to conduct an editorial review of Subvolume 5 of the CNS/ATM-1 SARPs, i.e. typographic errors, text redundancies, ambiguous wording, wrong formatting of text would be corrected, ICAO and ATNP/JWG editorial guidelines would be considered and applied as much as possible, but no technical changes to the SARPs would be introduced; only basic and simple technical mistakes could be corrected. In case significant technical problems were identified, they would be logged and reported to the Working Group which would resolve them during its 9th meeting scheduled in Munich from 24th to 28th June 96.

3. Participants

The following participants attended the meeting:

- Mr. A. Sharma (NATS),
- Mr. A. Whyman (Eurocontrol),
- Mr. R. Cossa (FAA/Mitre),
- Mr. K.P. Graf (ESG),
- Mrs. C. Ricci (STNA),
- Mr. J.M. Crenais (STNA).

4. Meeting Proceedings

In addition to version 5.0 of the draft Internet SARPs for CNS/ATM-1 Package, 13 working papers were presented and considered in order to help the group to conduct the detailed editorial review.

Annex A to this report lists these Working Papers.

4.1. Review of Working Papers

The group started the meeting with a review of all Working Papers which contained possible editorial guidelines to take into account in the detailed review of Subvolume 5.

- WP1 (ICAO Editorial Guidelines for production of SARPs material) did not contain any direct impact for the editorial review of Subvolume 5,
- WP2 (report of a discussion between M. Paydar and S. Van Trees about CNS/ATM-1 SARPs) resulted in the following agreed changes in Subvolume 5:
 1. The term *CNS/ATM-1 Package* will be replaced by *ATN* throughout all of Subvolume 5,
 2. References to other Subvolumes will be made when necessary,
 3. Requirements for future enhancements to the ATN (CNS/ATM-2) will be made into notes,
 4. Figures should be converted in CorelDraw¹.
- WP3 (e-mail from M. Paydar) contained no additional impact for the editorial review of Subvolume 5,
- WP4 (e-mails from S. Pearce, T. Kraft and R. Jones) resulted in the decision to replace all occurrences of *air/ground applications* and *ground/ground applications* with *ATN Data Link Applications*,
- WP5 (e-mail from R. Jones) contained no additional impact for the editorial review of Subvolume 5,
- WP6 (e-mails from S. Pearce and R. Jones) resulted in the following editorial change to Subvolume 5:
 1. The main title of each subvolume will be replaced by *ATN SARPs* (instead of *CNS/ATM-1 Package SARPs and Guidance Material*).
- WP7 (e-mails from M. Paydar and R. Jones) contained no additional impact for the editorial review of Subvolume 5,
- WP8 (e-mail from J.M. Crenais) resulted in the following editorial changes to SV-5:
 1. In general each sentence containing a requirement (word *shall*) will be in a separate paragraph. An exception to this rule may apply when a sentence is built as a logical expression which contains several chained requirements (e.g. *if ... then ... shall, else ... shall ...*),
 2. All paragraphs containing a requirement will be numbered,
 3. Requirements upon ICAO will be removed,
 4. Negative requirements (i.e. *...shall not ...*) will stay as they are,
- WP9 (e-mail from R. Jones) contained no additional impact for the editorial review of Subvolume 5,

¹This could not be performed during the meeting, since no CorelDraw licence was available.

- WP10 (e-mails from A. Sharma and R. Jones) concerned the conversion of SARPs into WordPerfect 6.1. No resolution on this issue was reached since no conversion tool was available in the meeting and not enough time was available during the week to conduct simultaneously the required editorial review and the conversion to WordPerfect 6.1,
- WP11 was specifically related to Chapter 7 of Subvolume 5 and was therefore considered only during the detailed review of this chapter,
- WP12 (WG2/8-WP277: *Matters of style - flimsy* from Brussels) was reviewed and the following decisions were taken for each of the 11 issues raised in this paper:
 1. Subvolumes & Parts numbering: → *Done*,
 2. Chapters & paragraphs numbering: → *Done*,
 3. Figures & Tables references: → *Done*,
 4. Multi-level Lists: → *Done in general*,
 - 4bis. References to ISO standards: → *Done*,
 5. Terminology, glossary, acronyms: → *Done except d) which has been superseded by ICAO requirement to not refer to CNS/ATM-1 Package*,
 6. APRLS formatting: → *Done*,
 7. Character font: → *Done*,
 8. Formatting of recommendations: → *Done*,
 9. Formatting of notes: → *Done*,
 10. Formatting of Introductions: → *Done for the main Introduction of Subvolume 5 (i.e. Chapter 1), but not for all chapter Introduction sections which are still formatted as notes*,
 11. Complete spelling of 1st occurrence of acronyms: → *Done in general*.
- WP13 was specifically related to Chapters 2, 3 and 8 of Subvolume 5 and was therefore considered only during the detailed review of these chapters.

4.2. Detailed Review of each Chapter

The meeting then carried on with the actual detailed review of each chapter, page after page.

Some of these chapters had been reviewed in advance by some of the participants who had prepared a report of their *pre-review* in order to support the global review performed by the Committee. This was the case of Chapters 2, 3, and 8 reviewed in advance by Mr Graf, who presented WP13 as a result of his *pre-review*, and of Chapter 7 reviewed in advance by Mr Whyman who presented WP11 as a result of his *pre-review*.

This report does not list each editorial change agreed during the meeting, but only the main decisions and the actions which were decided.

The numbering of each paragraph containing a requirement resulted in the re-numbering of a lot of sections, especially subsections to sections which contained paragraphs to be numbered. In order to keep the overall consistency of the numbering through the whole document, and to produce a consistent table of contents, it was sometimes necessary to add some generic headings, such as *General*, *Overview*, etc... Some inconsistencies in the proper sequencing in the numbering of some sections were unfortunately discovered at the very end of the meeting. Corrective actions were taken by the editor after the meeting, and before the delivery of version 5.1, but it is likely that some errors still exist. Consequently, it is recommended that the appropriate checking action be taken by WG2 in Munich, especially after removal of all revision marks.

4.2.1. Review of the Cover Page, Foreword, and Chapter 1

For linguistic reasons, it was first decided to come back to the original title of Subvolume 5, i.e. *Internet Communications Service* instead of *Internet Communication Services*.

The single page stating: *Editor's note: Guidance Material is currently under development* was removed, since Guidance Material will actually be submitted to ICAO as a separate document.

The Foreword page was modified according to the various decisions reported in section 4.1².

In Chapter 1, the numbering of each paragraph was removed, as well as *Note 1* as decided in WP12, item 10.

4.2.2. Review of Chapter 2

The review of Chapter 2 was conducted based on WP13, which contained the results of the *pre-review* performed in advance by Mr Graf.

No significant modification was made to this chapter. Only some pure editorial problems were corrected:

- a section about *Default routes* (5.2.2.7) was added in the *Definitions* section,
- questions were raised about the exact nature of the *ITU requirements* which are referred to in section 5.2.7, Note 1, item c), as well as the *ITU restrictions* which are referred to in section 5.2.7, Note 6. An Action was identified to clarify the meaning of these terms - **Action 1**.

4.2.3. Review of Chapter 3

The review of Chapter 3 was conducted based on WP13, which contained the results of the *pre-review* performed in advance by Mr Graf.

The main editorial changes made in this chapter are the following:

- the text from section 5.3.8 (*Use of the Forwarding Information Base*) has been moved in section 5.3.2.2.1 (*General*), which is a new subsection to section 5.3.2.2 (*Forwarding CLNP NPDUs*), originally numbered 5.3.2.1,
- Note 7 in section 5.3.7.1.2 (originally numbered 5.3.7.1.1) has been modified to reflect the change made some months ago to the VER field in the NSAP address. An action has been identified to draft new text in Chapter 4 explaining how routes to the *Home* should be identified - **Action 2**.

4.2.4. Review of Chapter 4

No Working Paper had been prepared in advance to help the review of Chapter 4 which was simply conducted on a page by page basis.

Major concerns were raised about the contents of Chapter 4, both editorial and technical. These problems have been summarised in Flimsy #1, drafted by Mr Whyman and attached as Annex B to this report, and an action was identified to submit a Working Paper to the Munich

² This Foreword is not included in the copy of version 5.1 which was distributed on the *atn-internet-technical* list. This is an unfortunate mistake. The new version of this Foreword will be provided separately to the WG2/9 meeting in Munich.

WG2 meeting in order to propose a detailed Change Proposal which would resolve the various problems encountered with Chapter 4 - **Action 3**.

Despite this overall action concerning the whole chapter, the following significant editorial changes were agreed during the meeting:

- A main section entitled *Network Layer Addressing* has been created (new section 5.4.2) in order to balance properly the whole structure of the chapter which contains now three main sections:
 - 5.4.1. *Introduction*
 - 5.4.2. *Network Layer Addressing*
 - 5.4.3. *Transport Layer Addressing*
- Former section 5.4.2 (*Administrative Provisions*) has been deleted because of the request from ICAO to not put any requirement on ICAO into SARPs,
- New text has been added to explain the semantics of the VER field in the ATN (see Flimsy #2, drafted by Mr Graf and attached to this report as Annex C).

4.2.5. Review of Chapter 5

No Working Paper had been prepared in advance to help the review of Chapter 5 which was simply conducted on a page by page basis.

Chapter 5 has been modified in order to re-organise it in a more logical structure. No major change to the text itself was introduced. The new structure is as follows:

- 5.5.1. General
 - *same as before except deletion of the References section (5.5.1.2) and the Network Service Specification section (5.5.1.4),*
- 5.5.2. Connection Mode Transport Layer Operation
 - *former section 5.5.2.3 (Transport Service Primitives) moved forward as 5.5.2.1,*
 - *new section 5.5.2.2 (ATN Specific Requirements) created with mostly text from the notes originally added to the APRL tables as well as text from previous 5.5.2.1 and the recommendation about timers, originally included in 5.5.4 (Implementation),*
 - *previous section 5.5.2.2 (Transport Quality of Service) becomes section 5.5.2.3,*
 - *section 5.5.2.4 (Encoding of Transport Protocol Data Units) created from previous 5.5.2.4.2 - same title - and encoding provisions contained in previous 5.5.4 about the encoding of the acknowledgement timer parameter,*
 - *section 5.5.2.5 (Congestion Avoidance) is the previous 5.5.2.6,*
 - *section 5.5.2.6 (Use of the ATN Network Service) is the previous 5.5.2.5,*
 - *section 5.5.2.7 contains the COTP APRLs,*
- 5.5.3. Connectionless Mode Transport Protocol Operation
 - *5.5.3.3 (Service Primitives) has been moved forward as 5.5.3.2; consequently previous 5.5.3.2 (Quality of Service) becomes 5.5.3.3,*
 - *a section 5.5.3.4 (Encoding of Transport Protocol Data Units) has been created,*
 - *section 5.5.3.5 (Use of the Network Service) stays as it was, and the APRLs are moved at the end of the chapter (section 5.5.3.6).*

The COTP APRL Tables have been simplified:

- All so-called *ATN Specific Requirements* defining ATNn predicates which were then never used in other tables were deleted because they were simply identifying features compliant to the ISO standard and did not in fact represent specific ATN features,
- Only 5 ATN Specific Requirements were identified:
 - ATN1: Support of Congestion Avoidance Procedures,
 - ATN2: Transport to Network Priority Mapping,
 - ATN3: Support of ATN Security Label,
 - ATN4: Timer Settings on a per Transport Connection basis,
 - ATN5: Enhanced encoding of the Acknowledgement Time parameter,
 - *<Author's note>: some mistakes were discovered after delivery of v5.1 in these APRLs since previous predicates (ATN6, ATN7, ATN15, and ATN17) are in fact still used. A corrective action must be taken in Munich during WG2/9.*
- All recommendations originally listed below some APRL tables were moved to the new section 5.5.2.2 (ATN Specific Requirements).

An action has been identified to check all ISO Standard references in Transport APRLs - **Action 4**.

4.2.6. Review of Chapter 6

No Working Paper had been prepared in advance to help the review of Chapter 6 which was simply conducted on a page by page basis.

The main editorial changes made in this chapter are the following:

- section 5.6.2.2.5.7 (*ATSC Route Selection - Tie Breaking*) has been removed³,
- section 5.6.3 (*Compliance Statement*) has been renamed to *ATN Specific Requirements for ISO/IEC 8473* and only specific ATN use of the ISO standard has been described in the section, i.e. all text stating a normal use of an ISO 8473 function has been deleted (e.g. 5.6.31.1. *PDU Composition Function*),
- In CLNP APRLs, references to the proper Part of the ISO/IEC 8473 standard have been checked.

4.2.7. Review of Chapter 7

The review of Chapter 7 was conducted based on WP11, which contained the results of the *pre-review* performed in advance by Mr Whyman.

The review of this chapter was made difficult because of the overstanding issue related to the Mobile SND CF, as regards its adaptation to the VDL requirements. The group decided to focus only on pure editorial errors, despite the temptation to correct some technical problems related to the unresolved SND CF issue. An action was identified and assigned to Mr Whyman to prepare for the Munich WG2/9 meeting a Working Paper proposing a possible re-structuring of the first part of the chapter and a solution as regards the use of the Fast Select option - **Action 5**.

The main editorial changes made in this chapter are the following:

³<Author's note>: are we sure that the text explaining how to route NPDU's based on ATSC Class selection still exist somewhere ?

- section 5.7.2 (*Mobile Subnetwork routing initiation and termination*) has been deleted,
- a new figure 5.7.1 has been added to describe the various SND CF services possible in the CNS/ATM-1 Package,
- section 5.7.3 (*Subnetwork Service Primitives*) has been renamed *Service provided by the SND CF*,
- section 5.7.4 (*Subnetwork Dependant Convergence Function*) has been deleted, since it contained no new material compared to what was already in the introductory part of the chapter.

4.2.8. Review of Chapter 8

The review of Chapter 8 was conducted based on WP13, which contained the results of the *pre-review* performed in advance by Mr Graf.

The main editorial changes made in this chapter are the following:

- the title of Chapter 8 has been modified from *Routing Information Exchange Protocol Specification* to *Routing Information Exchange Specification*,
- The *Htv* and *Ctv* items of the ISO 9542 APRLs (end of Table 5.8-1) have been modified so that they are compliant with the ISO standard. A note explaining the use of these timers in the ATN context was added to the APRLs (see Flimsy #3 drafted by Mr Crenais and attached to this report as Annex D),
- Table 5.8-5 (*ATN Routers and Route Aggregation*) has been deleted and more detailed information about the various types of route aggregation functions supported by the various types of ATN BISs has been added in the first IDR P APRL table in 5.8.3.4.2.

4.2.9. Review of Chapter 9

The review of Chapter 9 resulted in minor editorial modifications.

5. Conclusion

After the detailed review of version 5.0 of the draft CNS/ATM-1 Internet SARP s, it was decided to deliver version 5.1 based on the decisions agreed in the meeting.

As already agreed by WG2 in Munich, version 5.1 contains revision marks to version 5.0.

Due to the large amount of editorial modifications made during this meeting, it is likely that formatting errors are still contained in the document. Consequently, it is desirable that WG2 members cross-check the overall consistency of the structure of version 5.1 before it is changed into version 6.0 and delivered to ICAO.

During the meeting, the following list of actions was agreed:

Action number	What ?	Who ?	When ?
Action 1	Clarify the nature of ITU requirements and ITU restrictions mentioned in 5.2.7	All	WG2/9
Action 2	Propose new text in chapter 4 explaining how routes to the <i>Home</i> should be identified	Mr Whyman	WG2/9
Action 3	Prepare a Working Paper for Munich proposing a Change Proposal to the various problems identified in Chapter 4	Mr Whyman	WG2/9
Action 4	Check all references to ISO standards in the APRLs in Chapter 5 ⁴	All	WG2/9
Action 5	Prepare a Working Paper for Munich proposing a change in the structure of the 1st part of Chapter 7, and a solution to the Fast Select issue.	Mr Whyman	WG2/9

⁴ <Author's note>: the same action should apply to all APRLs in Subvolume 5

Annex A: list of Working Papers

The following Working Papers were considered during the meeting:

Reference	Title	Author
WP1	Presentation of SARPs material - Guidelines to ANC Panels for the development of SARPs Material	M. Paydar
WP2	Report of a discussion between Mr Paydar and Mr Van Trees about the formatting of ATN SARPs	S. Van Trees
WP3	e-mail about SARPs formatting	M. Paydar
WP4	e-mails about terminology to be used for ATN Applications	R. Jones & S. Pearce
WP5	e-mail about SARPs formatting	R. Jones
WP6	e-mails about the title of the SARPs	R. Jones & S. Pearce
WP7	e-mail about the use of the 'CNS/ATM-1 Package' term	M. Paydar & R. Jones
WP8	e-mail about conventions for editing ICAO SARPs	J.M. Crenais
WP9	e-mail about the numbering of SARPs Subvolumes & Parts	R. Jones
WP10	e-mails about conversion of SARPs into WordPerfect 6.1	A. Sharma & R. Jones
WP11	Defects found in Chapter 7 of the draft ATN Internet SARPs	A. Whyman
WP12	Matters of style (flimsy from Brussels meeting)	WG3
WP13	Proposed Editorial Amendments to Chapters 2, 3 and 8 of Subvolume V of the CNS/ATM-1 SARPs	K.P. Graf

Annex B: Flimsy #1Flimsy #1
04 June 1996

ATN Addressing Issues

1. Introduction

The ATNP/WG2 Editorial Committee has reviewed Chapter 4 (Addressing) of the draft ATN Internet SARPs and found a number of editorial and technical problems with the specification. This flimsy has been produced in order to record the problems found, and to suggest how a solution may be found.

2. Problem Statement

The following problems have been found:

1. 5.4.1.10 misleadingly re-defines Administrative Domains as addressing domains. This hides a greater problem, that is that the notion of a Network Addressing Domain (as defined in ISO 8348) is not properly introduced and related to the ATN Addressing Plan. In particular, it is necessary to introduce the idea that there is an ATN Network Addressing Domain that is a subset of the Global NSAP Addressing Domain, and this is sub-divided into a number of nested Addressing Domain, each administered by a different authority i.e. that the administration of NSAP Addressing is iteratively devolved, to states and organisations and possible to subordinate organisations.
2. The ICAO secretariat has already objected to ICAO being responsible for administering NSAP Addresses. In many places, ICAO is required to be responsible for address administration that is fully defined in the draft SARPs. This is clearly unnecessary. Furthermore, even when administration of addresses is devolved to (e.g.) Administrations, ICAO is still specified as the administrative authority.
3. AINSC organisations are only recommended as to how the ADM field is assigned. However, for unambiguous address assignment, it is necessary for either the draft SARPs, or a separate IATA specification, to definitively specify how this field is administered. A recommendation does not appear to be appropriate here.
4. The encoding of the AFI and IDI fields is specified without reference to ISO 8348 and the preferred binary encoding. Instead, it is specified as “BCD” without a clear statement of whether a big or little endian approach is required. Furthermore, this is not consistent with the modified encoding specified in ISO 10589 and used by ISO 10747 for the encoding of NSAP Address Prefixes that end within the IDP.
5. Alphanumeric and “Identifier” encodings for addressing fields are defined. However, neither is referenced by Table 5-4.1, which defines which encodings are used. The Alphanumeric encoding does appear to be used for the ADM field. However, no use is made of the identifier encoding.
6. The ADM field does not provides values for International Organisations (e.g. Eurocontrol) and ignores the need for efficient NSAP Address Allocation to the members of an ATN Island.

3. Resolution

There appear to be three major changes required to this chapter:

1. The first is to clearly define the nested addressing domains associated with the ATN NSAP Addressing Plan and which organisation, or type of organisation, is responsible for each such addressing domain.
2. The second is to separate out the encoding of the AFI and IDI (which should follow the International standards) from the encoding of the DSP fields and to make clear when alphanumeric encoding is used.
3. The third is to introduce additional addressing domains (i.e. further ADM field allocations) for International Organisations and regions (c.f. ATN Islands). This may require the establishment of international addressing authorities.

This needs to be discussed by WG2.

Annex C: Flimsy #2

Flimsy #2
9 June 1996
Version 1.1

Replacement Text for Version Identifier Field

5.4.5.3 Version Identifier

Note.--- Beside the version number of the ATN NSAP addressing plan which is applicable to the ATN NSAP address, the Version Identifier (VER) field identifies the type of the addressed object in terms of whether it belongs to a fixed or mobile system, and whether it belongs to an ATSC or AINSC addressing domain.

5.4.5.3.1 Format

The VER field shall contain the two-digit hexadecimal version number of the ATN NSAP addressing plan applicable to the ATN NSAP address which represents

- a) the network addressing domain type (ATSC or AINSC), and
- b) whether the addressed object is contained in a mobile or fixed ATN system.

5.4.5.3.2 Administration

Note.--- The VER field value for an ATN NSAP address is defined by this specification and is administered, if required, through future versions of this specification.

5.4.5.3.3 Range

The VER field value for Version 1 of an AINSC ATN NSAP Address in fixed systems, expressed as a two-digit hexadecimal number, shall be **[01]**.

The VER field value for Version 1 of an AINSC ATN NSAP Address in mobile systems, expressed as a two-digit hexadecimal number, shall be **[41]**.

The VER field value for Version 1 of an ATSC ATN NSAP Address in fixed systems, expressed as a two-digit hexadecimal number, shall be **[81]**.

The VER field value for Version 1 of an ATSC ATN NSAP Address in mobile systems, expressed as a two-digit hexadecimal number, shall be **[c1]**.

The VER field values **[00]**, **[02 - 40]**, **[42 - 80]**, **[82 - c0]** and **[c2 - ff]** shall be reserved.

Note.--- VER field values in the range **[02 - 3f]** may be allocated to fixed AINSC systems and VER field values in the range **[42 - 7f]** to mobile AINSC systems in future versions of this specification. VER field values in the range **[82 - bf]** may be allocated to fixed ATSC systems and VER field values in the range **[c2 - ff]** to mobile ATSC systems in future versions of this specification.

5.4.5.3.4 Encoding

The VER field shall be encoded using binary rules, as defined in 5.4.4.5.

Annex D: Flimsy #3Flimsy #3
7 June 1996

ES-IS Timers Setting

1. Introduction

The ATNP/WG2 Editorial Committee has reviewed Chapter 8 (Routing) of the draft ATN Internet SARPs and found an inconsistency in the ES-IS APRLs as regards the entries related to the Configuration and Holding timers (entries Htv and Ctv in Table 5.8-1). The APRLs have been corrected so that they are now compliant with the ISO/IEC 9542 standard, but a note needs to be added to clarify the setting of these two timers. This flimsy proposes such a note.

2. Problem Statement

The following problem has been raised:

1. No values were proposed in the ES-IS APRLs for the Htv and Ctv entries (Holding and Configuration Timers)
2. For both timers, a minimal value equal to '0' was added and a maximum value equal to '65534 s.' was added.
3. Section 5.3.5.2.9 recommends that, when IDRPs are used on the air/ground link, the Holding Timer be set to 65534 seconds, in order to suppress the regular generation of ISHs PDUs. No statement is made as regards the setting of the Configuration Timer in this case. Do we need any statement?
4. In the case when IDRPs are not used on the air/ground link, ISHs PDUs must be sent on a regular basis, but the current SARPs do not require, or even recommend any specific value. Such values must be set appropriately based on operational experiment.

The purpose of the following note is to clarify these facts. It must be added as a footnote in section 5.8.2.2, Table 5.8-1.

3. Proposed new note

Note 1.— In case where IDRPs are used over the air/ground link, The Holding Time field of transmitted ISH PDUs is preferably set to 65534 seconds as recommended in 5.3.5.2.9. The purpose of this recommendation is to effectively suppress the regular generation of ISH PDUs on the air/ground link.

Note 2.— In case where IDRPs are used over the air/ground link, the Configuration Timer may therefore be set to a large value so that the regular generation of ISH PDUs is inhibited.

Note 3.— In the case where the procedures for the optional non-use of IDRPs are used on the air/ground link, the Holding Time field of the transmitted ISH PDUs and the Configuration Timer are set appropriately based on operational experience so that the exchange of ISH PDUs ensures a regular update of the respective FIBs in both the air/ground and airborne routers, without overloading the air/ground link.