|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TM/AOSVC Demux & Reception**  | **Creator = CSTSWG** | **Editor = Wolfgang** | **Reviewer = ??** |
| **Status: 191024** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue Short Title** | **Issue Description/Discussion** | **Source** | **Status** | **O/C** |
| **Break into 2 FRs** | **needs to be broken out into 2 separate FRs: Return VC Demux and Return VC Reception****190812 WH – I realize that the FR TN applies this split, but I fail to see the advantage of doing that. Therefore for now I left the FR scope as it was originally. We should discuss which benefits this split would bring.****191024 JP – We agreed to keep the two functions combined into the single FR, and to add a configuration parameter to identify whether one of the MCs carries an MC CLCW (and if so, which MC)** | **FR Tech Note** | **CLLOSED - 191024** | **C** |
| **do they have resource status?** | **190812 WH – Yes, I think that we have agreed at some point that any FR type shall have a resource status and consequently it then also should have the associated resource status change event. I have now added both to the FR, although I have difficulties what the semantic of this parameter might be in this particular case.** | **correspondence between WH and JP** | **agreed/editor** | **C** |
| **parameters are configured** | **The listed parameters must be configured****190812 WH – Agreed and therefore I have also added the directive to the FR that permits setting of those parameters.** | **JP** |  | **C** |
| **support for Unified SLP?** | **Can the resulting FRs support USLP (possibly with some tweak, or do we need a separate Unified versions of the FRs? Note that theoretically USLP can be variable-length frames in either direction, which could seriously complicate including it in this FR.****190812 WH – John’s latest FR type list not only has dedicated USLP FR types but even suggests to have separate FR types for TLM and AOS. Given that for the end of the year delivery we want to have the option to stay silent about USLP, I agree to have a dedicated USLP FR type for fixed length return frame. However, when looking at TLM and AOS, the only difference is the range of the SCID. Therefore having separate FR types for TLM and AOS might be overdone. For now I have specified the FR type such that it can handle both TLM and AOS frames.****If one day we were to support delivery of the insert zone (as considered now for the OCF) we have one further TLM and AOS difference because TLM does not have an (optional) insert zone. But even if we were to support that it could be easily covered by a slightly more complex parameter type.****191024 JP – We agreed to have a combined TM/AOS SDLP Reception FR Set and a USLP Reception FR Set that supports both FLF and VLF USLP.** | **JP** | **CLOSED - 191024** | **C** |
| **Change FR name/classifier to TmAosVcDemuxRcpt** | **Changed name reflects decisions to combine TM and AOS and to make this FR usable outside of an ESLT** | **JP - 191024** |  | **O** |