



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N 927	
date	1993-05-27	total pages
item nr.		supersedes document

Secretariat:	Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)
	Kalfjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059
	2600 GB Delft
	Netherlands
telephone:	+ 31 15 690390
telefax:	+ 31 15 690190
telex:	38144 nni nl
telegrams:	Normalisatie Delft

Title:	ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS
	ISO/IEC JTC1 Special Group on Functional Standardization
Secretariat:	NNI (Netherlands)

Title : Liaison to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC21/WG4 (for Editing Meetings of DIS 10165-6 and PDAMs to 10164-1 to -7), and to JTC1/SGFS (for Editing Meeting for DISPs 12059 & 12060) on the Need to Expand All ASN.1 Parameters in MAPDUs

Source : EWOS

Status : For discussion during the SGFS Plenary Meeting, July 5-9, 1993, Seoul, Korea

Note :



Mail Address : Rue de Stassart, 36

B-1050 Brussels - Belgium

Tel : (+ 32 2) 511 74 55 - Fax : (+ 32 2) 511 87 23

- Title: Liaison to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC21/WG4 (for Editing Meetings of DIS 10165-6 and PDAMS to 10164-1 to -7), and to JTC1/SGFS (for Editing Meetings for DISPs 12059 & 12060) on the Need to Expand All ASN.1 Parameters in MAPDUs
- Source: Regional Workshop Network Management Coordinating Committee Meeting (OIW NMSIG, AOW NMSIG, EWOS EG/NM), San Francisco, April 1993
- Status: Approved by RWNMCC. Awaiting EWOS TA approval 18th/19th May 1993.

1 Introduction

The joint workshops have detected a problem with the current PDAMs for ICS to ISO/IEC 10164-1 to -7 which is documented in section 2 of this paper. The workshops request that SC21 forward this liaison statement to the forthcoming editing meeting for those PDAMS so as to allow the editing meeting to decide if a correction is required. Additionally, the workshops request that SC21 forward this liaison to the forthcoming editing meeting for DIS 10165-6 so as to allow that editing meeting to determine if additional generic advice is required on the structure of ICS proformas.

The joint workshops also request SGFS to forward this liaison statement to the editing meeting for DISPs 12059-0 to -6 and 12060-1 to -5 so that that editing meeting can decide if further changes are required to DISPs in order to resolve a related problem (described in section 3 of this paper).

2 The Problem

In order to avoid ambiguity, there is a need to further specify the MAPDU tables for the ICS Proformas beyond what is in the current PDAMs for ICS proformas. It is necessary, as a general rule, to indicate the parameter names for each MAPDU, both sending and receiving, down to the lowest possible ASN.1 level

The particular problem is illustrated initially by reference to the pDAM for ICS for the Security Alarm Reporting Function, ISO/IEC 10164-7. On page 9, Table B.6 - Integrity violation MAPDU (agent sending), B.6.1.3, the parameter securityAlarmDetector, is not currently specified down to the lowest ASN.1 level. But the definition of securityAlarmDetector, from DMI, states:

SecurityAlarmDetector ::=

CHOICE {mechanism [0] OBJECT IDENTIFIER, object [1] ObjectInstance,
application [2] AE-title}

and ObjectInstance is further defined in CMIP as follows:

```
ObjectInstance ::=
    CHOICE {distinguishedName [2] IMPLICIT DistinguishedName,
            nonSpecificForm [3] IMPLICIT OCTET STRING,
            localDistinguishedName [4] IMPLICIT RDNSequence}
```

In defining the profile, the workshops may wish to make specific decisions concerning these choices. The current granularity in the pDAM causes a problem since the MAPDU tables in the profile must reflect the PICS Proformas; it is difficult to indicate in the profiles that the distinguished name form must be implemented. It would be more convenient to change the PICS Proformas to specify parameter names down to the lowest possible ASN.1 level. In the above example, the MAPDU table for Integrity violation - Table B.6 - would be:

```
.
.
B.6.1.3 securityAlarmDetector
B.6.1.3.1 mechanism
B.6.1.3.2 object
B.6.1.3.2.1 distinguishedName
B.6.1.3.2.2 nonSpecificForm
B.6.1.3.2.3 localDistinguishedName
B.6.1.3.3 application
.
```

3 A Related Problem

Additionally, the workshops have considered the case of parameters which might have system wide applicability. It was considered that these should be documented only once in a new table which is then referenced by all relevant PDU tables. This would avoid inconsistency and possible confusion.

An example of such a parameter is managed object name syntax. Although it might be desirable for a single form of managed object name to be used within a system, our interpretation of the base standards was, however, that they did not prohibit use of different forms in different PDUs. Thus, in such cases, the workshops considered that if they wished to make a profiling decision that only one form was to be used, this should be done once (in the profiles) in separate table and that all other tables that used such parameter(s) should refer to the separate table.

It is desirable that the DISPs for the AOM2xx profiles adopt this approach.