# Impact Analysis Report / RFC-Proposal

**Section 1: Meta-data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFC ID** | **RFC\_DDCOM\_0025** (RTC-53670) |
| **Related Incident ID** | - |
| **RFC Initiator / Organization** | NA-FI & DG TAXUD/B3 |
| **CI** | DDCOM-20.3.0-v1.00 |
| **Type of Change** | **Standard** **Emergency** |
| **Nature of Change** | Justification for Evolutive   |  | | --- | |  | |
| **RFC Source** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Legal & Policy Change**  **Organisational Changes** | **Business Change**  **IT Change** | |
| **Review by Business User recommended?** | **Yes No** |

***Change Summary***

|  |
| --- |
| **DDCOM 20.3.0-v1.00 – Clarification regarding the usage of MsgType element of the CSIMQMD structure** |
| It’s requested by NAs to clarify, update and simplify the allowed values for the **MsgType** element. It is proposed to restrict to **CSIMQMT\_DATAGRAM** and **CSIMQMT\_REPORT**. It will simplify the configuration at the side of the National applications and reduce the number of the service requests raised on the subject. |

**Section 2: Problem statement**

|  |
| --- |
| The **Table 57** of section “***VIII.2.1 The message descriptor***” defines the use of the values of the CSIMQMD structure members.  This table includes   * CSIMQMT\_DATAGRAM, * CSIMQMT\_REPORT, * CSIMQMT\_REQUEST.   In NCTS-P4, ECS-P2 an ICS-P1 operations, it seems that the MsgType used is only **CSIMQMT\_DATAGRAM** and **CSIMQMT\_REPORT**.  To avoid that in the context of AES & NCTS-P5 the value CSIMQMT\_REQUEST is incorrectly used, it should be clarified in DDCOM that only two values are possible:   * CSIMQMT\_DATAGRAM, * CSIMQMT\_REPORT. |

**Section 3: Description of proposed solution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| On the next release of DDCOM the following changes will be performed (addition of **text highlighted in yellow** – removal of ~~text with strikethrough~~ ):   1. **Table 57** of section " **VIII.2.1 The message descriptor**" will be corrected as follows:  | **Typedef struct tag** | | **Value on SEND** | **Value for CCN Report** | **Notes** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | CSIMQMD { | | | | | | CSICHAR4 | StrucId; | CSIMQMD\_STRUC\_ID | CSIMQMD\_STRUC\_ID |  | | CSILONG | Version; | CSIMQMD\_VERSION\_1 | CSIMQMD\_VERSION\_1 |  | | CSILONG | Report; | 0L | 0L |  | | CSILONG | MsgType; | ~~CSIMQMT\_REQUEST or~~  CSIMQMT\_DATAGRAM | CSIMQMT\_REPORT |  | | CSILONG | Expiry; | 3 456 000L | (DNC) |  | | CSILONG | Feedback; | CSIMQFB\_NONE |  |  |  1. Business processes (e.g. the reply to a request message) are not (and shall not be) managed by the National Applications based on the MsgType. Therefore, the **Point 5** will be removed from the list of notes in section "**VIII.2.1 The message descriptor**". 2. Column “Value on SEND” exhibits the value that an application has to set in each structure member. 3. Column “Value for CCN report” defines the value set in the CCN reports. 4. The indication “(DNC)” means: “Do not consider”. 5. Values in uppercase are CCN/CSI constants defined in the header files. 6. ~~The value CSIMQMT\_REQUEST has the effect of requesting a reply. The name of the queue to which the reply is to be sent is contained in ReplyToQ field of CSIQOS structure. See paragraph VIII.2.5.~~ 7. In section **VIII.2.14 *Putting a message into a queue: HL\_mq\_put1()***, the reference to CSIMQMT\_REQUEST will be removed.   (…)  This means in practical terms that, within a set of messages read with a uniform “Priority” (see argument “QoS”), the messages will be read in their order of appearance.  They have then to be handled separately in line with the value of the “MsgDesc.MsgType” (either ~~CSIMQMT\_REQUEST,~~ CSIMQMT\_DATAGRAM or CSIMQMT\_REPORT, as stated in Table 57). Any message with its MsgType equal to CSIMQMT\_REPORT must be matched to its own originator by the rule:  [report\_message.CorrelId] is equal to [original\_message.MsgId]  To be able to correlate a report with the related Information Exchange, it is recommended that the software controlling the sending CSI stack maintains a dynamic table that cross-references the state of a CSI message and its message identification. Message identification consists of:   * Value of field CSIMQMD.MsgId in the message sent by the sending NTA; * Value of field CSIMQMD.CorrelId in a report message given by the sending NTA (exception, COA, expiration, COD).   The “GetMsgOpts” argument is a structure that controls the behaviour of the HL\_mq\_get() verb. The structure is shown in Table 63:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **typedef struct tag** | | **Initial value** | | CSIMQGMO{ | | | | CSICHAR4 | StrucId; | CSIMQGMO\_STRUC\_ID | | CSILONG | Version; | CSIMQGMO\_VERSION\_1 | | CSILONG | Options; |  | | CSILONG | WaitInterval; |  | | CSILONG | Signal1; | (DNC) | | CSILONG | Signal2; | (DNC) | | CSICHAR48 | DynamicQName; | (DNC) | | } CSIMGMO; | | |   Table : CSIMQGMO Object Descriptor  **Notes:**   1. It is a design issue related to the NCA architecture, to choose between an applicative polling of a queue or a triggering mechanism initiated by CCN/CSI software, to be awakened upon a new message forthcoming in the queue. Regarding polling of a queue two processing mechanisms can be used:    * Constant CSIMQGMO\_NO\_WAIT is related to first choice;    * While CSIMQGMO\_ WAIT and value of WaitInterval set relate to second choice.   Whichever the choice taken, two precautions must be taken:   * + “WaitInterval” cannot be set to CSIMQWI\_UNLIMITED when “Options” has value CSIMQGMO\_WAIT;   + When applicative polling is used (“Options” has value CSIMQGMO\_NO\_WAIT), then there must be a grace period foreseen in the application between two successive readings in the queue.   Value of argument “DataOut” represents the location of the data, when the value of the “MsgDesc.MsgType” is ~~CSIMQMT\_REQUEST or~~ CSIMQMT\_DATAGRAM. Otherwise (in the case of a CSIMQMT\_REPORT) the CSIDD “DataOut” is left undefined (check this with the value of argument “MsgLen”, that must be 0L).  When a value for “DataOut” is defined, the attribute “Flags” of this CSIDD structure defines the way the information in CSIDD is to be represented.  (…)  **Impacted CIs**:   * DDCOM 20.3.0-v1.00: **Yes;** * UCC IA/DA Annex B: No; * Functional Specifications (FSS/BPM)-v5.30: No; * DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Appendix Q2, Q2\_R\_C): No; * DDNXA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Appendix Q2, Q2\_R\_C): No; * CSE-v51.6.0: No; * DMP Package-5.6.0 SfA-v1.00: No (incl. update of file Rules and Conditions\_v0.43): No; * CTS-5.6.1-v1.00: No; * ACS-v5.5.0 & ACS-Annex-NCTS: 5.5.0: No; * NCTS\_CTP-5.7.0-v1.00: No; * NCTS\_TRP-5.7.5: No; * ieCA 1.0.2.0: No; * CRP-5.5.0-v1.00: No; * CS/MIS2-v2.0.0: No; * CS/MIS2\_DATA: No; * CS/RD2\_DATA: No; * AES-P1 and NCTS-P5 Long-Lived “Legacy” (L3) Movements Study v1.40: No   **IMPACT ASSESSMENT**  **No impact on External Domain.**  This RFC-Proposal is considered as **purely documentary correction, if the NECA (AES) and NTTA (NCTS-P5) are implemented like the Legacy applications**.  It is considered that the change proposed has no impact on business continuity and – IF AN IMPACT EXISTS IN SOME NAs - it can therefore be deployed in a **flexible way**.  **Proposed** date of applicability in Operations (T-Ops): If needed, as soon as possible, at the latest 01.12.2023 (**flexible**)  **Proposed** date of applicability in CT (T-CT): N/A  **Expected** date of approval by ECCG (T-CAB): January 2022  **Impact on transition Legacy/To-Be**: None  **Consequence of not approving the RFC-Proposal**: Minor inconsistencies remain, causing possible minimum confusion.  **Risk of not implementing the change**: None. |

**Impact on CI artefacts**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DDCOM 20.3.0-v1.00 | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | Updates as described in section 3. | |

**Estimated impact on National Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cosmetic?  Low?  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | * **NAs are very likely already aligned. If confirmed, then no impact on NAs.** * **Else, it should be only a change of configuration.**   **🡪 To be assessed by each NA.** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document History** | | | |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | ***Comment*** |
| v0.10 | Draft by CUSTDEV | 13/12/2021 |  |
| v0.11 | SfR to NPMs | 14/12/2021 |  |
| v1.00 | SfA to NPMs | 03/02/2022 | *No comment received* |