ATNP/WG3/WP7-4 March 17, 2000

# <u>AERONAUTICAL TELECOMMUNICATION NETWORK PANEL</u> <u>Working Group 3</u>

Munich, June 24-28, 1996

# ATNP/WG3/SG3 Chairman's Report

(Presented by Steve Van Trees)

Summary

ATNP/WG3/SG3 presents accomplishments and prospects for approval by WG3.

#### 1. Introduction

The paper reviews progress and deliverables produced by ATNP/WG3/SG3 in the period between the Bruxelles and Munich meetings of WG3. The paper then presents activities scheduled through the ATNP/2 meeting in November 1996.

# 2. <u>Membership</u>

Mr. Steve Van Trees (USA) has chaired the group since the Banff meeting. Dr. Tony Kerr (Eurocontrol), Mr. Frederic Picard (France), Mr. Stephen Pearce (Australia), and Messrs. John Day and Jim Moulton (USA) have contributed great time and effort to the group. Mr. Jim Simpkins (USA) has recently joined the group.

# 3. Subgroup 3 Meetings

ATNP/WG3/SG3 has held one meeting since the Bruxelles WG3 meeting.

#### 3.a. Reston

The SG3 meeting on 10-13 June 1996 completed work on version 4.0p of the Upper Layers SARPs, based on a number of defect reports from SITA and the USA There was one addition to the Control Function (CF) state machine (to trap the returned abort in the NULL state). The encoding of the facility designator was simplified. The ISO DAM efficiency texts were completed and shipped from the meeting. The efficiency texts include the addition of user-data on the abort. The meeting detected no user requirement for the base-text enhancement, so it was not included in the SARPs. The group then updated the Upper Layers Defect Report register

#### 4. Deliverables

As detailed below, SG3 maintains the schedule agreed in San Die go in October 1994. No schedule problems are foreseen for ATNP/2 delivery in November 1996.

## 4.a. CNS/ATM-1 Upper Layer SARPs

The draft SARPs 4.0p are completed. They await WG3 approval. They are under configuration control.

# 4.b. CNS/ATM-1 Upper Layer Guidance Material

The draft GM is again available at this meeting. Minor work has been done to upgrade the guidance material on presentation encoding.

## 4.c. CNS/ATM-1 Upper Layer Validation

The validation plan has been revised to Upper Layer SARPs v4.0p. Multiple validation implementations are under way. The US has also provided an IP at the Munich meeting detailing the RTCA Upper Layer MOPS test cases.

# 4.d. CNS/ATM-2 Upper Layer SARPs

A CNS/ATM-2 UL paper is available at this meeting. Current active work is in Connectionless ULA, Common Management Information Protocol (CMIP) ULA, and Association Control Service Element (ACSE), edition 3..

## 5.0 External Dependencies

## 5.a. International Organization for Standardization (ISO)

SG3 is actively involved in work incorporating ATN requirements into ISO standards. The ACSE, edition 2 material is now in the publication cycle. The ISO efficiency enhancements have just last week been sent to ISO for registration as Draft Amendment (DAM) status. This substantially completes work on CNS/ATM-1 base standards. There is an ISO editing meeting in December 1996 in Toulouse to work minor comments.

CNS/ATM-2 requires further ISO work on the next edition of ACSE. These standards have just been registered for DIS ballot.

Mr. Van Trees is the ISO editor for the thirteen efficiency enhancement and base standards. Mr. Day is the ISO editor of the three ACSE standards. .

ISO, recognizing the maturity of the OSI architecture work, will disband WG8 and its OSI architecture rapporteur group this fall. Thus, the documents under ballot will complete, and further OSI work will continue under ITU-T SG7 as of their March 1997 meeting.

## 5.b. International Telecommunication Union (ITU-T)

The ATN community has also been active in support of ITU-T. The ITU-T upper layer efficiency enhancement ('fast-byte') standards were approved in April 1995. The ATN community also supports the OSIEFF technical report on efficiency

## 6. Conclusion

WG3 is invited to note the schedule and deliverables accomplished by SG3.

# ATNP/WG3/SG3 Upper Layer Architecture 10-13 June 1996 Reston

## Attendance

Norman Goodacre (USA)

Tony Kerr (Eurocontrol)

Gigi Louden (USA)

James Moulton (USA)

Jim Simpkins (USA) Steve Van Trees (USA)

#### 1. Introduction

Steve Van Trees welcomed the group to Reston, Virginia, USA. In accordance with WG3 instructions and schedule, the meeting determined to produce CNS/ATM-1 Upper Layers SARPs, v4.0p proposed, CNS/ATM-1 guidance material, CNS/ATM-1 Upper Layers validation material, CNS/ATM-2 SARPs introduction, and SG3 SARPs descriptor for the WG3 meeting in Munich.

## 2. CNS/ATM-1 Upper Layers SARPs, v4.0 proposed

The group reviewed defect reports. Fif Edem sent in a list of comments on Chapter 3. The relevant comments were raised as defect reports. Frederic Picard proposed comments against the extensibilty syntax (this was also an ISO defect, which was fixed in Kansas City), and encoding of the authentication-mechanism. The group decided to exclude the security feature from CNS/ATM-1 in order to obviate the encoding problem. Jim Moulton offered a simpler method of facility designator encoding, which allows encoding on a per-octet basis. This was accepted...

## 4. CNS/ATM-1 guidance material

The group updated the GM. Tony Kerr's discussion of presentation encoding was included. The defect reports on efficiency enhancements were deleted, having been closed in the Paris ISO efficiency enhancements

## 5. CNS/ATM-1 Upper Layers validation material

Tony Kerr demonstrated the Eurocontrol Validation database. The group was impressed with the ease of use and comprehensive nature of the database.

Jim Simpkins presented his paper on Upper Layer test cases. The group made detailed comments on the service description and CF conformance statements, which were incorporated. SG3 noted that Jim Simpkins had incorporated recent upper layer enhancements in the test case material. The paper is the basis of the RTCA SC-162 test cases and is also a Munich IP.

#### 6. CNS/ATM-2 SARPs

Tony Kerr provided CULR-4, for connectionless upper layers. This will be referenced in the CL ULA material. The group did not work on the Common Management Information Protocol (CMIP) profile. Steve Van Trees has the action.

#### 7. Review of ICC SARPs

The group briefly reviewed the AIDC SARPs. The group queried whether the dialogue service was actually used. The group also noted that orderly release was provided only in the application, with P-ABORT used to close the connection. The group also noted that the AIDC SARPs reference ULA SARPs, v1.0.

#### 8. Review of Annex 10 / Sub-Volume 1 SARPs/GM

SG3 review indicated that there were missing bits from Sub-Volume 1. Examples include the APRL key, the ATSC class, priority, and residual error rate (RER). SG3 corresponded with Tom Kraft, who indicated that an RER requirement of 10<sup>-8</sup> would appear in Sub-Volume 1.

## 8. ATNP/2 Overview Paper

Steve Van Trees has the action.

## 8. Other Organizations

# a. ATNP/WG3/SG2

SG3 was in daily telephone contact with SG2 in Vancouver.

## b. ISO/SC21/WG8

The group spent a day completing and shipping the ISO efficiency DAM texts. ISO efficiency documents available on ftp.stel.com ~/pub/atnsarps/Svolume4/P2.

## 8. Munich WG3 Meeting

Steve Van Trees has the action to draft the SG3 chairman's report for Munich.

- 9. Action Items
- a. Authentication mechanism-name (Van Trees)
- b. SG2 use of Peer ID in D-START (Van Trees)
- c. Fletcher's always on for air-ground applications. (Kraft)

•

- 10. Meeting Input Papers
- a. Jim Simpkins, Upper Layers Functional Validation Scenarios
- b. Fif Edem, Defect Report
- c. Frederic Picard, Defect Report
- d. ISO/SC21 N 10452 "Nature of Current Upper Layer Efficiency Enhancements"
- e. DAF Study, User Guide for a Requirements Databases to support the Validation of SARPs
- f. DAF Study, Design and Schema for a Requirements Databases to support the Validation of SARPs
- g. COTP Timers Settings for the ATN CNS/ATM-1 Package
- 11. <u>Meeting Output Papers</u>
- a. ULA SARPs, 4.0p
- b. ISO Efficiency DAM texts
- c. Upper-Layer Test Cases
- 12. Next Meeting

The group did not agree a next meeting, pending the outcome of the Munich WG3 meeting.