To: **X3S3.3 Members, Alternatives, and Observers**

From: **Scott Hiles (Navy)**

Date: **August 20, 1990**

Subject: **Minutes of July 31 - August 2, 1990 Meeting**

The 162nd meeting of Task Group X3S3.3 was held in Vancouver British Columbia and was convened by Lyman Chapin at 11:00 am on July 31, 1990. The meeting was hosted by Marilyn Martin of the University of British Columbia. The first meeting convened at 11:00 on Tuesday and ended at 5:00 pm. On Wednesday, the meeting reconvened at 9:30 am and ended at 12:45 pm. The meeting then reconvened at 9:30 am on Thursday and ended at 12:00 pm.

Lyman Chapin of Data General chaired the opening plenary. Scott Hiles of the Navy was appointed recording secretary. Membership and attendance lists were circulated. The meeting was convened in the absence of a quorum.

A quorum of 7 voting members is required for this meeting to pass any official votes. On the second day, 21 voting members were present at the time that the meeting was convened.

1.0 Working Agenda

The following Working agenda was agreed upon by the members present

1) Opening Remarks
2) X3S3 Meeting Results
3) Security
4) “I” projects
5) Add 1 10589 Comments
6) TCP/IP SD-3s
7) IDRP (cover for SC6 cont.)
8) 8072/8073 defects
9) 8073/PDAD 3.2 (PICS)
10) Final Sydney Planning
11) HSP project proposals

2.0 X3S3 Meeting Results

The following X3S3.-generated documents were voted upon for approval at the July24-25 X3S3 meeting.

X3S3 #	X3S3.3 #	Approved	Name or Comments
88	127R	Yes	"No" on 10028.3
	157R	No	This document never made it to X3S3. 10589 comments are to be sent to X3S3 in September.
71	211	Yes	SPX tutorial
66	216	Yes	IDRP needs a revised cover letter.
72	217	Yes	Comments on Security progression
70R	219R	Yes	Addressing (Amended network service definition)
	220	No	LLSIG (220, 221, 222, and 223) were never received by Lyman Chapin and the LLC contributions were not sent to X3S3.
	221	No	
	222	No	
	223	No	
91	202	No	Proposed SC6 contribution on project 753
90	236	Yes	Comment on N5847 (Rec. 4) on Editor's resolution of 9542 defect 1-6.

The document 90-251 (90-157 and a comment from Rob Hagen) will be forwarded. This paper was accidentally held due to paper shuffling.

3.0 Minutes

3.1 Tahoe 90-78

The minutes from the Lake Tahoe meeting (90-78R) by Larry Green of PEI were discussed and accepted.

4.0 Tucson 90-136

The minutes from the Tucson meeting (90-136) were discussed and the following corrections were suggested.

Amor: Page 2: KEY ISSUES, second bullet needs fixing. The proposed solution is to delete the entire bullet (starting with "Should Security be a Network Layer," and ending with "has not been raised with ISO." [page 2 bullet 2 under KEY ISSUES].

Page 3: "de" should be "of" - ("Diot de France" becomes "Diot of France")

Taylor: Page 1: Ross Callon's is the blank line making the sentence read "Ross Callon gave an overview on integrating IS-IS routing for TCP/IP and OSI environments."

Chapin: Page 1: Paragraph 1 should name Joel Snyder to read "Our thanks to Joel Snyder for the wonderful meeting arrangements."

The attendance list must be attached for approval to pass.

Di Iorio: Page 3: The last paragraph should replace PRODEON with PROTEON.

Taylor: Page 4: The document for the CCITT connectionless Data is 90-117 making the line read “Document 90-117, CCITT Connectionless Data, was accepted.”

Chapin: Page 3: The last paragraph references document A-4 which should be 90-125. It should read “PROTEON gave an overview of comments on a contribution of BRP, Document 90-125.”

Taylor: Page 4: The ninth paragraph references NWI and should reference SD-3. It should read “SD-3 Inter-Domain Routing, Document 89-187. vote ‘YES’.”

Chapin: Page 5: The fourth paragraph on page 5 should be removed. This paragraph starts with “The minutes” and ends with “Document Register.”

Approval of the Tucson meeting minutes is held pending attachment of attendance list.

4.1 Westborough 90-225

The minutes from the Westborough meeting (90-225) by Gene Geer of Belcore were discussed and various corrections were suggested. The minutes were then passed as 90-225R.

5.0 Security

Dale Walters presented a summary of the progress of the security documents.

The SPX tutorial and requirements which were submitted to X3S3. Changes were suggested and the document was approved.

Dale Walters came up with a SD-3 for transport security and it is numbered 90-245.

Dale talked with someone at the UK and they seem to be accepting security at levels 3 and 4.

The Canadian comments on security were distributed and numbered 90-246 (nationally: 60-80). These indicate support for SPX and also some support for Transport Security.

The following questions were posed and will be addressed in the Sydney meeting:

1) We never responded to the question of how security related to network internal architecture. This will be handled by Dale through e-mail responses.

2) We do not have the integrity for the SPX and if we do not have it by September, our only alternative is to just say that “it is coming.”

3) We need a discussion on the network security through e-mail as responses to the UK comments.

4) Dale will come up with justification for the different addressing modes.

The responses to these questions will be addressed during the month of August and will be placed in a document by Dale numbered 90-252. To facilitate this an AD-HOC meeting has been approved for September 7 in Gaithersburg hosted by Dale. The latest date for confirmation will be August 17.

The project proposal number 773D (Network layer security) was approved by SPARC. This was approved July 7 and the press release is August 15.

The subject of Security in the LLC was brought up. Basically, this package sent from IEEE 802.10 was sent back. X3S3.3 proposed that 802.10 consult X3T5, but they did not. 802.10 forwarded their proposal to the chair of X3S3 but X3S3 could not send it forward because it was

copyrighted and there were no directions for the goals of the proposals. The documents will not be forwarded by X3S3.

Lyman suggested that X3S3.3 draft a letter of our concerns about 802.10 over the reference model, security additions to the reference model, and the lower layer security model and forward this letter to X3S3. Colin Amor volunteered to write the letter and Lyman will provide him with the details.

By the end of the meeting, Colin had composed document number 90-244 which contains comments on 802.10 proposed contributions to SC6 in Sydney.

5.1 Transport Security

No comments were made on the document 90-245 and so this document will be forwarded to X3S3.

No comments were made on 90-252 this document will be forwarded as a task group record of security issues.

6.0 "I" projects

Explanation: An "I" project is a project which results in a document that ANSI automatically tracks when it is forwarded to ISO. ANSI automatically starts the public review for the documents when they are forwarded. The specification of I means international, D means developmental, and M means maintenance.

When a project gets an "I" designation, X3S3.3 is still responsible for handling the comments. The "I" projects will help the X3S3.3 close projects by allowing public review. Joint designations as standards by ISO and ANSI allow for joint acceptance.

A question was raised as to if the designation of an "I" project would be likely to impede the progress that the X3S3.3 committee can make due to the possibility of negative comments preventing draft progression. Lyman's answer was that the public review cycle was not a ballot. Effectively, ANSI must respond to all comments if only to acknowledge the comment and indicate its result. The big point here is that we want all comments regardless of what it takes to handle the comment. If we get irrelevant comments, we can just send a response which indicates that we will not perform any action as a result of the comment. After January 1, all ISO-NWI projects will be designated as "I" projects automatically without having to go through the recommendations process.

Lyman agreed to draft a document number 90-247 to list the proposed "I" projects, with the promise that project 756 can be included only if DP 10589 is issued for second DP ballot at Sydney. This document will be passed to X3S3 and will contain the following information

671 - Network Level Managed Objects

672 - Transport Level Managed Objects

756 - IS-IS DP 10589

773 - Network Layer Security

TLS - Transport Layer Security

TER - IDRP

DAA - Dynamic NSAP Address Assignment (This is possibly 2 documents)

IPF - 8473 Estelle

We also need a list of documents which we want to close out and then send the list to X3S3. This document should show that the ISO document exists and needs X3S3 work. The projects will then go from a "D" to a "M" designation. This list of documents will be prepared by Lyman and numbered 90-248, but tentatively follows.

365 - 8473

462 - 8602

549 - 8348/Add 2.

550 - 8348

551 - 8648

643 - 9575 - TR

644 - 9542 - ES-IS

332,493, 674 - 8072 and addendum & 8073 and addendum

Note: 8073/Add 1 should be ANSI/ISO

By the end of the meeting, Lyman presented the contents of 90-247 and 90-248 which were then approved for forwarding.

7.0 TCP/IP SD-3s

Lyman presented two likely scenarios for the future of the SD3s.

a) Don't forward the documents and the result would be that nothing happens.

b) forward the SD3s that are on the table and two things could happen:

   1) X3 gets interested in the "meta-question" of coordination.

   2) Nothing "bad" happens because this task group owns the documents.

The net results could be that 1) the ANSI standard is equivalent to the IAB standard and 2) the ANSI standard is different and becomes irrelevant. In this light, it would do no harm to send the documents forward.

James Moulton proposed that a letter be written which says that we do not object to the forwarding or an individual forwarding the documents.

Based on this discussion, a decision was made to allow the TCP/IP sub-committee continue to work and come up with service proposals. There was a lack of agreement to approve sending the SD-3s forward, and Lyman withdrew his suggestion.

Larry Green proposed that a TCP Ad-HOC group appoint a leader who would put together the "strawman" set of procedures for processing the documents. Nelluri Reddy of Control Data volunteered to chair the Ad-HOC group.

8.0 IDRP (cover for SC6 cont.)

The initial IDRP contribution has been completed and no further work is necessary; however, a PICS boiler plate (document 90-243) for the IDRP was discussed. James Moulton suggested approving the PICS and submit it as a US contribution at Sydney.

Charlie Kunzinger of IBM has been approved as editor of IDRP. Lyman will arrange for a US sponsored presentation of this work to WG2. This is to show details of the contribution to WG2. The goal is to insure that people will have been motivated to take a close look at the US proposal.

Yakov Rekhter of IBM will present the information. This is to propose replacing the current base text with the new US based text.

An Ad-HOC meeting on August 22 and 23 will be held to complete the IDRP Boiler plate PICS proforma. This meeting will be chaired by Charlie Kunzinger and hosted by Steve Willis of Wellfleet in Bedford MA.

Paul Tsuchiya proposed a simple modification which will be a proposed US comment for modification of 90-216. The comment is to modify page 16 of 90-216 to add a "Metric Handling type" to the Source Specific QOS. These types could be "additive", "min", or "max". The metric handling type of "O" would associate the QOS with internal tables (or locally known) and "1" == additive, "2" == min, "3" == max. This would go to Sydney as comments and will be referenced as 90-251

9.0 8473 Addressing

Paul Tsuchiya also made a comment on addressing in 8473. Basically the comment is that 8473 has no certainty to allow NSAP addresses to scale. Existing protocols have their own addressing space at the NSAP. 8473 backbones have no address space and needs an OSI routing address space which is officially recognized internationally. The two suggested approaches are to come up with a concrete proposal for a new work item or to write an amendment to the addressing addendum to add a new AFI to the OSI space.

Doug Montgomery suggested drafting an expert paper which suggested a New Work Item. The draft would state that "8473 backbones need a coordinated numbering plan".

Lyman suggested that X3S3.3 draft a contribution to SC6 WG2 which lets them know that we are thinking about this problem. X3S3.3 should also come up with an expert paper and a US contribution stating the problem and the need for a new work item by September 10. The US contribution would be numbered 90-253 which would request work to define an 8473 backbone based on an OSI NSAP addressing scheme. Paul Tsuchiya volunteered to write up the draft letter and a default ballot will be scheduled to close by September 5. Any comments should be addressed to Paul or Lyman. During this time, if any significant questions come up which cannot be resolved, the US contribution will be killed and a US expert paper will be brought to Sydney.

The US expert paper will be numbered 90-254 and will provide a scheme for numbering 8473 backbones.

10.0 8072/8073 defects

Lyman will generate a document which summarizes the positive votes on the defect reports. The negative comments will be addressed separately.

Document N6047 -

James Moulton commented that this defect correction cannot hurt because the existing text is poor. This document is approved and forwarded with a "YES" response.

Document N6048 -

James Moulton suggested that on Page 2, Line 2 the words "will not normally detect" be changed to "may not detect."

This document received no other comments and a "YES" ballot response was made.

Document N6049 -

James Moulton commented that this does not match currently existing paragraphs

in 8073 and should not be approved with the stipulation that it be corrected to contain the correct references. A “NO” ballot response should be forwarded.

Document N6051 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6052 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6053 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6054 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6055 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6056 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6057 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6058 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

Document N6059 -

James Moulton commented that you cannot have a length indicator of 0 and that this should generate a protocol error. A vote of “NO” was made because this makes a substantial change for a reason which does not seem to be of any benefit.

Document N6060 - No comments were made and this document received a “YES” ballot response.

The document 90-249 will be forwarded with a “YES” vote on all but N6049 and N6059.

11.0 8073/PDAD 3.2 (PICS)

A short discussion of the 8073 PICS and Lyman encouraged the document to be read before the Sydney meeting. After the Sydney meeting, the PICS will go out for DAD ballot.

12.0 Final Sydney Planning

Keith Sklower’s US contribution (90-116 “Summary information of Level I IS-IS”) needs someone to present it in Sydney as a US expert paper. With consensus of X3S3.3, instructions will be given to the US delegates to support this document.

James Moulton suggested that this paper be converted to a US contribution rather than being presented as an expert paper; however, there were some objections and it was decided that 90-116 would remain as a US expert paper.

12.1 Delegates

The list of the delegates for the Sydney meeting which were approved in Westborough are as follows.

Charlie Kunzinger of IBM

Nick Di Iorio of AT&T

Lyman Chapin of Data General

Brad Kemp of Locus

Ed Taylor of IBM

Dale Walters of NIST

Dale Gustafson of NCR

Paul Tsuchiya was added to the list during the Vancouver meeting.

13.0 HSP project proposals

The X3T5.5 committee is discussing the HSP proposals and they see both Latency control for QOS and Layer management to handle error information as the only reason to look at these documents. They see no reason to send it forward, but if the X3S3.3 committee decides to send it forward, we will need a cover letter to explain our intentions. The general feeling was that T5.5 does not care either way.

Revised text for the 6 project proposals have been distributed. 90-202 has also been distributed and has been sent to X3T5. X3S3.3 expects information back from T5.

90-203 is the final report which recommends the new project proposals. It is up to T5 to allow this document to proceed or not to proceed to SC6. The task group report to be written by Lyman is to say that X3S3 should forward the document (90-202) if no major concerns are raised by T5.

Document 90-45 (Requirements for HSP) was revised and is now an appendix to document 90-201 (Draft final report) and is also a separate document 90-233.

There was some discussion that the members of the X3S3.3 group have not had time to present the information in 90-202 to their companies. This discussion resulted in recommendations to 1) Renumber the pages, 2) Remove the word “draft”, and 3) Identify the two sections of this report.

It was pointed out that the purpose for 90-202 was to get SC6 to look at the new work. Later X3S3.3 can send the supporting information. It was also pointed out that if X3S3.3 sends too much information, it will overwhelm SC6 who are already overloaded and they will just table it.

Lyman suggested that we recommend the closure of project 753 (HSP) by sending the final report 90-201 to SPARC. The SD-3s would be sent with the final report of the study project.

It was decided that X3S3.3 will continue with its work and ask for contributions to the SD-3s as if the documents had proceeded. Also, it should be pointed out that some members of the task group object to the progression of the 6 SD-3s until they have had a chance to make a formal action on the project proposals.

The decision point for continuing this effort will be the December meeting where either the SD-3s will be progressed or rejected. Modifications are possible, but a vote will be made for documents 201 through 208.

14.0 Next years meeting dates

2/5-7: Santa Monica (Retix)
[3/19-20 X3S3] [3/11-14 IETF St. Louis]

4/2-4 Raleigh (IBM)
[5/7-8 X3S3]

6/11-13 Boston/Westborough (Data General)
[6/25 X3S3] [6/8-19 SC6 and WG's Berlin]

9/17-19 Boulder (NIST) -- **(Could change)**
[9/24-25 X3S3]

12/3-5 San Jose -- **(Could change)**

15.0 Output Documents

90-243R IDRP PICS (Taylor)

90-244 Letter to X3S3 containing comments on 802.10 proposal contribution to SC6 (Amor)

90-245 Transport security SD-3 (Walters)

90-247 Letter to X3S3 listing "I" projects (D->I) (Chapin)

90-248 Letter to X3S3 listing "M" projects (D->M) (Chapin)

90-249 Responses to 8072/8073 defect report Ballots - noting that Di Iorio abstains from the decisions on the defect reports.

90-250 Additional 10589 comments (Taylor)

90-251 Additional IDRP comments (Tsuchiya)

90-252 Security issues list (Walters)

16.0 Approved Ad-HOC meetings

Security Ad-HOC meeting hosted by Dale Walters on September 7 at NIST.

IDRP PICS Ad-HOC meeting hosted by Kunzinger and Rekhter on August 22 through 23 at Wellfleet in Bedford MA.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Hiles

Recording Secretary