

Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

| | |
|--|---|
| Document Number: | N14185 |
| Date: | 2010-01-14 |
| Replaces: | |
| Document Type: | National Body Contribution |
| Document Title: | NB of UK's contribution on the ISO/IEC 16512-3 RMCP-3 (X.603.2) project |
| Document Source: | National Body of UK |
| Project Number: | |
| Document Status: | For consideration at SC 6/WG 7 Barcelona meeting. |
| Action ID: | FYI |
| Due Date: | |
| No. of Pages: | 4 |
| ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 Secretariat Ms. Jooran Lee, KSA (on behalf of KATS) Korea Technology Center #701-7 Yeoksam-dong, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, 135-513, Republic of Korea ; Telephone: +82 2 6009 4808 ; Facsimile: +82 2 6009 4819 ; Email : jooran@kisi.or.kr | |

UK POSITION ON THE RMCP-3 (X.603.2 | 16512-3) PROJECT

1. Although authorization for a joint meeting of SC 6/WG 7 and ITU-T WP 3/11 was approved by the SC 6 plenary meeting in Tokyo, June 2009 (see N 14026), no meeting announcement was issued by the SC 6 Secretariat. Because of the lack of notice, we consider that the Mar del Plata meeting cannot be recognized as a formal meeting of the Collaborative Team for ITU-T X.603.2 | ISO/IEC 16512-3.
2. UK participation in the RMCP-3 project at the WP 3/11 meeting in Mar del Plata was limited to resolution of the ballot comments on FCD 16512-3 by email. The attachment to this document contains comments on the proposed disposition of UK comments (private copy) from the Mar del Plata meeting.
3. The Guide for ITU-T and ISO/IEC JTC 1 Cooperation states that a JTC 1 SC Final Committee Draft will be circulated for a 4-month ballot at the SC level. At the same time the document will be submitted to the SG Secretariat and circulated as an SG document for review and comment. ITU-T member comments should be provided within the same period so that all responses are considered together.
4. The Editor's proposed text in SC 6 N 14163 issued on 23 December 2009 contains original text, markup and final text. We note that the 'original' text in this document is not the FCD ballot text and we assume it represents proposed input by the editor to the Mar del Plata meeting. We further note that these changes were not supported by comments submitted during the FCD ballot period. The proposed changes make significant technical modifications to the ballot text and, as such, will require a further ballot in ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 if this is to be published as a joint ITU-T Recommendation | International Standard.
5. The UK NB does not have sufficient resources to participate in a further round of balloting and announces its intention to withdraw its participation in this project as from the end of the SC 6 meeting in Barcelona, 22-26 January 2010. This will be confirmed at the meeting.
6. The UK NB suggests that the SC 6 meeting should consider the possibility of proposing to ITU-T SG 11 that this document should be progressed as an ITU-T only Recommendation.

Attachment 1. UK comments on the proposed disposition of UK comments on FCD 16512-3

| | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| GB 1 | 1 | <u>Scope</u> The RMCP-3 topology has undergone significant development since the publication of ISO/IEC 16512-1. | Delete the following sentence: 'The RPCP topology and service scenario described in this specification follows the definition of the RPCP framework without any modification'. | Agreed. Sentence is deleted. |
|-------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------|

1. We note that the sentence in the fourth column above has been deleted.
2. Additional sentences have been added to the Scope in the revised text, two of which appear to have essentially the same content. We suggest the following:

This Recommendation | International Standard describes the RMCP-3 as an application-level protocol that realizes and supports relayed multicast data transport capability for N-plex group applications. ~~This Recommendation | International Standard specifies the protocol over overlay multicast, which describes the protocol operation and message types.~~

This Recommendation | International Standard specifies the followings:

- ~~Overview of protocol which~~ describes the entities, control and data delivery models, ~~and messages used in RMCP-3;~~
- ~~defines the~~ protocol operation of RMCP-3 for many-to-many data delivery; ~~and~~
- ~~Definition of~~ specifies the messages and the parameters ~~used in the RMCP-3 protocol.~~

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| GB 2 | 3.1 | <u>Definitions. Terms defined elsewhere</u> Many of the definitions in 3.1 have been taken from X.603 16512-1 but in places the wording has been modified. This could lead to duplications and contradictions and should be avoided. The ISO Directives state: 'If the concept is used in several documents, it should be defined in the most general of those documents, or in an independent terminology standard. The other documents should then refer to this standard, without repeating the definition of the concept. When the repetition of a definition is necessary, an informative reference shall be made to the document from which it is reproduced.' We consider that the definitions in 3.1 are sufficiently close to those in ITU-T Rec. X.603 ISO/IEC 16512-1 or ITU-T Rec. X.603.1 ISO/IEC 16512-2 to be used in this standard and that these definitions should be referenced from this standard. | Proposed replacement text, together with minor corrections to the terms defined in 16512-3, is indicated below. <i>Note that both a CoreMA and an Edge MA are individual MAs and not groups of MAs. Also that a CoreMA by definition is not part of the edge domain.</i> | Agreed Made revision as proposed. |
|-------------|-----|--|---|--------------------------------------|

1. Our proposals have not been accepted. The sentence from the ISO Directives 'When the repetition of a definition is necessary; an informative reference shall be made to the document from which it is reproduced' means that the definition should be made by reference to the definition in the quoted standard, not by means of an (inaccurate) copy of the definition from the original standard. If it is thought necessary to include the definitions in this standard, they should be copied without any change. Most of the definitions from 16512-1 and 16512-2 are not identical with the original; in some cases the differences are minor but others are significantly different.
2. **simplex** is not used in the standard except in the title of 16512-2 in the references. Delete this definition.
3. **sender multicast agent** is not used in the standard; **sending MA** is used but in the sense of the sender of a specific message – this is not the meaning as used in 16512-1 and 16512-2; the abbreviation **SMA** is used once in an informative annex – its use in this context should be reviewed with a view to replacing it with a less ambiguous term. Delete the **sender multicast agent** definition.
4. **receiver multicast agent** is not used in the standard. Delete this definition.

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------|---|--|---|
| GB 11 | 8.4.1 | <u>Ordering of sub-controls</u> We suggest that the sub-controls in 8.4.1 be listed in order of the sub-control codes. Rationale: Consistency with listing in tables. | Order 8.4.1.2 to 8.4.1.16 so that the sub-controls are listed in code order. | Agreed: No action required. Sub-controls are already in order. Controls are not code order and this can be considered in a future review. |
|--------------|-------|---|--|---|

Comment: Agreed that sub-controls in N 14163 are in order. They were not in order in the FCD ballot text. No change is necessary.

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--|-------|----------------------------------|
| GB 15 | 8.4.2 9.5 | <u>Format of data profile</u> ----- | ----- | For further discussion. ----- |
|--------------|--------------|--|-------|----------------------------------|

1. We note that further general discussion is indicated.
2. Specific comments relating to 8.4.2.1 and Table 18 have been taken into account in N 14163 and no change is necessary in relation to these specific comments.

Additional comment

The following UK comment in SC 6 N 14053 has not been taken into account:

In cases where there is only one possible code value, the code value should be included in the text of the specification rather than by direct reference to the code table in clause 9 (but the addition of 'see Table XX' is still useful).

Example:

Control type – This field denotes the NEIGHBORLIST control type. Its value shall be set to 0x04 (see Table 21).

We would like to see this applied to all message and control specifications in the standard. It would save having to look up the tables. The tables are necessary as they give lists of allocated code values which help to ensure that duplicate codes are not issued.