AERONAUTICAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK PANEL(ATNP)

WORKING GROUP 3 - APPLICATIONS AND UPPER LAYERS

Phuket, 4-6 March 1997 (ninth meeting)

Agenda Item 5.3 : Validation of Sub-Volume 3 - Review Defect Reports

WP/9-59 : ATSMHS Technical Defect reports (ICAO Version 1.0)

Date : 05/03/97

Prepared by ATSMHS SARPs Editor

<u>Summary</u>

This document provides the details on the technical defect reports identified in ICAO Version 1.0 and corrected in proposed ICAO Version 1.1.

It also gives a summary table of editorial defects which have been corrected and reported in the same version.

DEFECT REPORT ON SARPS

Defect Number (to be supplied by SARPs Editor):			ATSMHS027
SARPs affected (Sub-Volume and Part):	3.1	SARPs Version/Date:	informal version 2.1 (superseded by ICAO Version 1.0 without change for these sections)
Originator Name:	E. Edem (SITA)		
Originator Reference:	Message on 22/10/96, item d)		
Date Raised:	22/10/96		
Status:	CLOSED / ACCEPTED		

Location of Defect (including Section Number):

3.1.2.3.5.4.1.1-3

(3.1.2.3.5.4.4 for DR ATSMHS029)

Summary of the Defect:

The proposed solution to handle AMHS non-delivery reports received at an AFTN/AMHS Gateway (generation of a repeat AFTN Service Message) will generally result in a never ending AFTN->AMHS loop.

Proposed solution or assumptions made (if any):

NDRs shall be passed to the control position. Actions which can then be performed depend on rejection cause, will be detailed in GM and may be :
a) request message repetition,
b) correct error condition in AMHS,
c) send AFTN"text message" indicating non-delivery of subject-message,
d) any other as appropriate.

Editor's Comment:
This amendment solves simultaneously DRs ATSMHS027 and ATSMHS029 which had been registered separately.

Date of Resolution:	20th February 1997
SARPs Version/Date where defect is closed:	proposed ICAO Version 1.1

DEFECT REPORT ON SARPS

Defect Number (to be supplied by SARPs Editor):		ATSMHS031	
SARPs affected (Sub-Volume and Part):	3.1	SARPs Version/Date:	informal version 2.1 (superseded by ICAO Version 1.0 without change for these sections)
Originator Name:	E. Edem (SITA)		
Originator Reference:	E-Mail on 23/10/96		
Date Raised:	23/10/96		
Status:	CLOSED / ACCEPTED		
Location of Defect (including Section Number): Table 3.1.2-6 (Part 2/4.4)			
Summary of the Defect: The content-return-request EoS is one of the PerMessageIndicators and cannot thus be excluded (X) by the AFTN/AMHS Gateway.			
Proposed solution or assumptions made (if any): a. Replace the "X" in the "Action" column with "G." b. Replace the "-" in the "Mapping / Notes" column with "See 3.1.2.3.4.2.3.20." c. 3.1.2.3.4.2.3.20 indicates that content-return-request should take its default value.			
Editor's Comment: 			
Date of Resolution:	20th February 1997		
SARPs Version/Date where defect is closed:	proposed ICAO Version 1.1		

DEFECT REPORT ON SARPS

Defect Number (to be supplied by SARPs Editor):	ATSMHS052

Col1	Col2	Col3	Col4
SARPs affected (Sub-Volume and Part):	3.1	SARPs Version/Date:	ICAO Version 1.0
Originator Name:	J.M. Vacher (STNA, ATSMHS SARPs Editor)		
Originator Reference:	DR52		
Date Raised:	07/01/97		
Status:	CLOSED / ACCEPTED		

Location of Defect (including Section Number):

Table 3.1.2-6 (Part 1/1.1.11.1 and 1.1.11.2), 3.1.2.3.4.2.3.8 to 3.1.2.3.4.2.3.11

Summary of the Defect:

The following specification in the SARPs is as follows: upon generation of the Message Transfer Envelope carrying an IPM as the result of the conversion of an AFTN Message, three extension fields (recipient-reassignment-prohibited, dl-expansion-prohibited, and conversion-with-loss-prohibited) are generated and take their default values.Since these elements are classified as CRITICAL FOR DELIVERY, according to the base standards, the unability of a MTA to semantically understand these parameters (although they take their default value) will cause message rejection and generation of a NDR.

This is also true for X.400-88 MTAs which need to downgrade the message for onward routing towards an MTA which is X.400-84 compliant only. At the moment of downgrading, the 88-MTA will have to reject the message, as specified in the base standards. This means, in practice, that interoperability with 1984-MTAs is prohibited by the current specification.

If these elements were absent, their default values would be assumed, and the MTA behaviour with this respect would be identical, except that a X.400-88 MTA would be allowed to downgrade the message according to ISO/IEC 10021-6, Annex B.

Note: the internal-trace-information extension is generated also, and the content-correlator extension may optionally be generated. However these elements do not generate the same error because they are not classified as critical for transfer or critical for delivery.

Proposed solution or assumptions made (if any):

Use of the extension parameters which are "critical for delivery" is excluded when the parameter absence means default value and when use of this default value was specified in the SARPs.

Editor's Comment:

Date of Resolution:	20th February 1997
SARPs Version/Date where defect is closed:	proposed ICAO Version 1.1

List of comments and Defect reports on

DRAFT SARPS FOR ATS MESSAGE HANDLING SERVICES (ATSMHS)

updated :   **20/02/1997**   **(Correction of defects identified in ICAO Version 1.0)**

Comment Id.	SARPs ref.	Commented Version	Comment Reference	Comment Date	DR# DR	Nature (T/I/E)	Status (A/O/R)	Date closed	Comment	Rejection cause / Solution
270	3.1.2.3.5.4.1.1-3	v2.1inf 15/10/96	[16] point d	22/10/1996	27	T	A	16/01/1997	The proposed solution (generation of a repeat AFTN Service Message) will generally result in a never ending AFTN->AMHS loop.	NDRs shall be passed to the control position. Actions which can then be performed depend on rejection cause, will be detailed in GM and may be a) request message repetition, b) correct error condition in AMHS, c) send AFTN"text message" indicating non-del
272	3.1.2.3.5.4.4	v2.1inf 15/10/96	[16]point f	22/10/1996	29	T	A	16/01/1997	This should be deleted because it would result in an endless AFTN -> AMHS loop.	Clause deleted. See comment 270 for entire description of the solution.
273	3.1.3.3.2.4.21	v2.1inf 15/10/96	[16]point g	22/10/1996	30	E	A	16/01/1997	A Note should be added with the same wording as the Note under 3.1.3.3.2.4.20.	Note added
274	Table 3.1.2-6 (Part 2/4.4)	v2.1inf 15/10/96	[17]	23/10/1996	31	T	A	16/01/1997	The content-return-request EoS is one of the PerMessageIndicators and cannot thus be excluded (X) by the AFTN/AMHS Gateway.	a. Replace the "X" in the "Action" column with "G." b. Replace the "-" in the "Mapping / Notes" column with "See <clause n>." c. <clause n> indicates that content-return-request should take its default value.
287	3.1.1 Note 2	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	44	E	A	13/01/1997	typo "internationl"	change made
288	3.1.2.2.3.2	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	45	E	A	13/01/1997	typo "IA5"	changed to "IA-5"
289	3.1.2.3.3.2.1.1	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	46	E	A	13/01/1997	typo "maintained by in"	"by" deleted
290	Table 3.1.2-5	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	47	E	A	13/01/1997	missing line/element 1	reinsert element 1 in table above element 1.1
291	3.1.2.3.4.2.3.17	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	48	E	A	13/01/1997	wrong reference to "CCITT"	"CCITT" changed into "ITU-T"
292	3.1.2.3.4.3.1.5	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	49	E	A	13/01/1997	typo "take" instead of "takes"	change made
293	3.1.2.3.5.2.4.5Note	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	50	E	A	13/01/1997	text not italicised in a Note	text converted to italics
294	3.1.2.3.5.4.1.3	ICAO version1.0	[19]	06/01/1997	51	E	A	13/01/1997	ambiguous "has any other abstract-value"	text changed to read "has any abstract-value other than"

| 295 | Table 3.1.2-6 (Part 1/1.1.11.1 and 1.1.11.2), 3.1.2.3.4.2.3.8 to 3.1.2.3.4.2.3.11 | ICAO version1.0 | DR052 | 07/01/97 | 52 | T | A | 16/01/1997 | useless specification of extension message transfer envelope parameters (see full text in NOTE 5) | Use of the extension parameters which are "critical for delivery" is excluded when the parameter absence means default value and when the service is properly rendered. |
| 297 | 3.1.2.3.2.1.4, 3.1.2.3.2.1.5, 3.1.2.3.2.1.7, 3.1.2.3.2.1.12, 3.1.2.3.2.5.2, 3.1.2.3.4.1.1, Table 3.1.2-10, 3.1.2.3.5.2.2.6.2, 3.1.2.3.5.3.2.5, 3.1.2.3.5.3.2.6, Table 3.1.2-16, 3.1.3.1.8.1 | ICAO version1.0 | DR054 | 25/01/97 | 54 | E | A | 10/02/1997 | erroneous cross-references to Annex 10, Volume II | Correction of cross-references to Annex 10 Volume II changed as the result of Amendment 71 |

Sources :

[16]   E-Mail from E. Edem (22/10/96)

[17]   E-Mail from E. Edem (23/10/96)

[19]   editorial defects detected by the Editor
         during the review of ICAO version 1.0

Legend:

E   editorial

I   institutional

T   technical

A   accepted

O   open

R   rejected