Title: Proposed Responses to Editor′s Notes in IDRP

Source: IBM

Reference: X3S3.3/90-261 (SC6 N6387)

In document SC6 N6387, there are several ″Editor′s Notes″ to which member bodies were asked to respond. As part of the USA comments, IBM proposes the following responses to the notes contained in the indicated clauses:

1. Clause 7.3, page 20:

   The protocol needs this information to operate correctly, but correct operation does not depend critically on the manner in which it is obtained. This information is used simply to list all the systems located in a given routeing domain, but not whether each system is ″up″ or ″down″. Since it conveys system identity, not operational status, it is not expected to change at a very rapid rate.

   Therefore, the current text in SC6 N6387 is sufficient, and there is no need to expand upon it within SC6 N6387. However, the USA notes that further work on the viability of acquiring this information dynamically can be addressed in a type 2 TR which will provide guidance on interworking between inter- and intra-domain routeing. (See X3S3.3 /91-003.)

2. Clause 7.9, page 27:

   It is appropriate to expand upon the material in Annex B and make appropriate updates in the body of the text to define BISPDU encodings and appropriate usage rules. Annex B should then be deleted, and the revised material should be included in the normative sections of SC6 N6387.

3. Clause 7.11.9, page 31:

   Since CO/CL interworking function units are not within the scope of the OSI Reference Model, and are only described in a TR, the USA recommends that this attribute be dropped from SC6 N6387.

4. Clause 7.11.10, page 31:

   A single value of TRANSIT DELAY per routeing domain is sufficient. The benefits from introducing ″path specific delay″ for each possible path between each pair of BISs in a routeing domain would be minimal, and would be far outweighed by the complexity that would be added.

5. Clause 7.11.11, page 32:

   A single RDLRE value per routeing domain is sufficient. The benefits from introducing ″path specific error rate″ for every possible path across a routeing domain would be minimal, and would be far outweighed by the complexity that would be added.

6. Clause 7.11.12, page 32:

   A single EXPENSE value per routeing domain is sufficient. The benefits from introducing ″path specific expense″ for every possible path across a routeing domain would be minimal, and would be far outweighed by the complexity that would be added.

7. Clause 7.11.15, page 33:

The USA believes that with proper normative procedures, the HIERARCHICAL RECORDING attribute can be useful. The USA expects to provide a description of its role and of the associated usage rules for discussion in Berlin. (This will be based on the work begun in X3S3.3/91-005.)

8. Clause 7.16, page 42:

   Although it would be technically possible for SC6 N6387 to route CR packets (under the assumption that the problem of transient looping is soled in some other protocol), the USA has found no justification for this function in the first place. The USA recommends that "Forwarding for CONS" be deleted from SC6 N6387. (See X3S3.3/002 for details.)

9. Annex C, page 54:

   Same answer as for note in clause 7.9

10. Annex D, page 58:

    This material should be addressed in a Technical Report, type 2. (See X3S3.3/91-003.)