



TC-MTS #29

Anthony Wiles

11 October, 1999

MTS 29 TD14

EUROPEAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS STANDARDS INSTITUTE

**TC-MTS #29
19 - 21 October 1999
Sophia Antipolis**

**Subject: Proposed liaison statement to TB SPAN on
TTCN.mp/TTCN.gr precedence**

Source ETSI PEX

Date: 11 October 1999

Document for: Discussion

1. Background

ISO/IEC 9646-3 Version 2 has the following note in clause 6 (Compliance):

NOTE: If there is a standardized ATS specified in TTCN.GR and an apparently equivalent TTCN.MP representation, but there is a conflict in interpretation of the operational semantics of the two, then the operational semantics of the TTCN.GR takes precedence, because it is the TTCN.GR version that is the standardized ATS.

Unfortunately this note is repeated in the ETSI drafting rules (Annex I) and is required to be included in all ETSI TTCN test suites. However, this statement serves no longer serves a useful purpose, for the following reasons:

- 1) the note is fuzzy, to say the least, interpretation of operational semantics applies to the executable test suite rather than the graphical or .mp format;
- 2) modern tools, where the .mp is generated from the .gr (and vice-versa) means that in practice there are no discrepancies between the graphical and machine-processable format in standardised ETSI test suites;
- 3) in the unlikely case that there is a discrepancy then it is of no help saying one format shall have blind precedence over the other (i.e., if it's broke fix it!).

For a number of years the PEX have been recommending that this statement be either removed from the ETSI drafting rules or replaced with more suitable text. However, some committees, while they agree with this in principle, quite rightly wish to see a formal statement to this effect coming from MTS.

2. Action for MTS

The PEX request that TB MTS decide whether or not this precedence clause is valid, and if not to take the following actions:

- a) make a statement that ETSI does not follow this note (it is just a note, after all, and thus is not considered to be a normative part of the TTCN standard);
- b) instruct the ETSI Secretariat to either remove the note from the ETSI drafting rules or to change the note to something more suitable, for example

"Where an ETSI Abstract Test Suite is published in both .gr and .mp format these two forms shall be considered equivalent. In the event that there appears to be syntactical or semantic differences between the two then the problem shall be resolved and the erroneous format (whichever it is) shall be corrected"

- c) send a liaison statement to SPAN informing them of this decision.