

# ITU-T SG15 회의 기고서

(’95. 11. 13~24, 제네바)

ITU- Telecommunication Standardization Sector

Study Group 15  
Geneva 13-24 Nov. 1995

Delayed Contribution D.

Question: WP3 Q17/15

## STUDY GROUP 15 - CONTRIBUTION-D.

**SOURCE** : Republic of Korea

**TITLE** : Addition of reception/generation of MS-REI to G.782, G. 783.

**Contact Person**:

J.I. Yoon ETRI

Transmission Systems Setion

Tel: +82 42 860 6162 Fax: +82 42 860 6104

## Introduction

In the light of past experiences of developing some SDH-related transmission equipments, we know that all the descriptions clarified in G.70X, G.782 and G. 783 had better present the procedures by which interworking between SDH-related equipments can be accomplished harmoniously.

As the application of M1(MS-REI) byte which has been provisionally specified in recent is defined in G. 70X, the specifications with relation to MS-REI(FEBE) should also be added to G. 782 and G. 783 properly.

ITU- Telecommunication Standardization Sector

Study Group 15  
Geneva 13-24 Nov. 1995  
Question: WP3-Q17/15

Delayed Contribution D.

## STUDY GROUP 15 - CONTRIBUTION-D.

**SOURCE:** Republic of Korea

**TITLE:** Addition of automatic detection/acceptance decision step to pointer interpretation process

**Contact Person:**

H. J. Lee ETRI  
Transmission Systems Section  
Tel: +82 42 860 6162  
Fax: +82 42 861 5597

## Introduction

This document is about the addition of a part to pointer processing flow chart depicted in FIGURE 2-8/G.783 for AU-n signals. Current pointer processing flow chart does not include the flow for AU-3 and AU-4 or the first AU-4 of an AU-4-Xc and the pointers of the other AU-4s to be detected automatically and to be accepted correctly into interpretation process before transmitting AU-n pointers.

This document basically relies on the concept to take each pointer word into account individually. According to NOTE 1 dedicated to the FIGURE 2-8/G.783, the decision should be made at current step 2, 'Pointer Invalid Value?(Note 1)', on whether a pointer being processed is for an AU-3 (or a pointer of the first AU-4 of an AU-4-Xc) or an AU-4(or pointers of the other AU-4s AU-4s of an AU-4-Xc), (NOTE 1: Concatenation indication(CI) should be interpreted at this point. From the rules in Recommendation G.709(G.70X) the first AU-4 of an AU-4-Xc shall be interpreted according to the flow chart; the pointers of the other AU-4s contain CI bits, and the pointer processor shall perform the same operation as performed on the first AU-4).

Figure 8-1/G.70X for AU-4 pointer offset numbering and FIGURE 8-3/G.70X for AU-n/TU-3 pointer(H1, H2, H3)coding show that the pointer processor shall interpret a pointer whose pointer value is 1001SS1111111111 (SS bits unspecified) as one concatenated and transmit the identical pointer value indicating that its AU-n is concatenated.

But current pointer processing flow chart can not meet this case in that it does not provide a flow for pointers indicating concatenation to be transmitted with the specified value. Instead of applying Note 1 in

current step 2, this document applies its meaning in newly proposed decision step “Conc\_ind?”, where Conc\_ind is defined in Annex B/G.783 as ‘NDF enabled+dd1111111111’.

ITU- Telecommunication Standardization Sector

Study Group 15

Geneva 13 Nov -24 Nov. 1995

Document Addressed to: WP5/15

Question: Q29/5

### STUDY GROUP 15 - CONTRIBUTION

**SOURCE:** Korea

**TITLE:** Proposal of additional Attributes in G.774

**STATUS:** Proposal

**CONTACT:**

Jiyoung Choe, Eun-Kyoung Jeong, Joo-bin Song, ETRI

Yusong P.O. BOX 106 TAEJON, 305-600, KOREA

Tel. +82 42 860 4888 Fax +82 42 860 6104

E-mail: choejy@orion.etri.re.kr

### Introduction

In G.774, there are two directional TPs(Termination Points)-sink TPs and source TPs. But, these TPs are using the same attribute for its naming. So, these occur a “instance conflict” error when to find a object instance in MIT and violate the unambiguity within its superior object.

According to the section 6.3/X.720 that recommends the Structure of Management Information, the AVA must have the property of unambiguously identifying a single managed object within the scope of its superior object. Different naming attributes may be used to identify the managed object instance does not satisfy this property.

So, this contribution proposes some additional naming attributes which will be used to distinguish the sink and the source TP identifier should be added to the G.774. Also, proposes some additional text for namebindings, packages, attributes and managed object class templates which are related naming attributes.

ITU- Telecommunication Standardization Sector

Study Group 15

Geneva 13 Nov - 24 Nov, 1995

Document Addressed to: WP5/15

Question: Q29/5

## STUDY GROUP 15 - CONTRIBUTION

**SOURCE:** Korea

**TITLE:** Proposal of additional specification of ASN.1 in G.774-02

**STATUS:** Proposal

**CONTACT:**

Eun-Kyoung Jeong, Joo-bin Song, ETRI

Yusong P.O. BOX 106 TAEJON, 305-600, KOREA

Tel. +82 42 860 4888 Fax +82 42 860 6104

E-mail: ekjeong@orion.etri.re.kr

## Introduction

Section 9/G.774-02 that is recommending SDH Configuration of the Payload structure for the NE View(COM15-51-E Jan. '94) defines several actions such as DefineAUGStructure, DefineVC4Structure, etc.

In Table 1/X.722, Action template is composed of ACTION-INFO, ACTION-REPLY, CONTEXT-KEYWORD and SPECIFIC-ERROR as possible context. And In X.710, it is specified that the Action in a confirmed mode expects a reply.

However, there are no WITH REPLY SYNTAXes for replying to CMIS action requests in a action definition of G.774-02. Since all the actions in the G.774-02 are specified in confirmed mode, there should be the definitions and ASN.1 specification of replying actions.

This Contribution proposes some additional text for the GDMO definition of 'WITH REPLY SYNTAX'es and ASN.1 specifications.