Telecommunications Standardization Sector
(TSS)

Study Period 1993-1996

Question:2/15

AVC-772
Date: May 4, 1995
Original: English

STUDY GROUP 15/WP1 CONTRIBUTION

SOURCE: AT&T

CONTACT: Dale L. Skran, +1 908-957-5988(W), +1 908-957-5627(F)

Title: Comments on H.310, H,321, H.245, and H.322

---

1. H.310 Comments

AT&T has the following comments on the February 6-17 Version of H.32X:

1. The current draft does not specify the capacity of the H.32X terminal to handle either AAL 1 or AAL 5 at given transfer rates. Thus, one manufacturer might build a terminal that mainly uses AAL 1, and can support 4 Mbps of AAL 1, but only 9600 bps of AAL 5. Another manufacturer might build a terminal that uses only AAL 5, and supports over 4 Mbps of AAL 5. Although both terminals support AAL 5, the capacity of one terminal to do so is very low, resulting in a lack of interoperability. This issue should be managed either by signaling capacity for AALs, or by changing the requirements on the H.310 terminal.
2. In section 4.2.5 "Other Data Capabilities" T.120 should be mentioned as the preferred method for use by conversational terminals.
3. In section 7.2, "Intercommunication with N-ISDN Terminal Types" various required transfer rates are mentioned. H.261 CIF mode should also be required of H.32X terminals to meet customer quality expectations.
4. A section should be added on multipoint. Multipoint capabilities should be mandatory for the H.32X terminal as for the H.320 terminal.

2. H.32Y[Now H.321]

AT&T has the following comment on the February 6-17 Version of H.32Y:

1. The structured data pointer in AAL 1 should be required for all H.32Y terminals to ease interoperability issues.

3. H.245

AT&T has the following comments on the April 7 Version of H.245:

1. In SG15/WP1 an issue concerning the code points for data applications in H.32P has arisen. At this time, the working party has not reached a conclusion as to whether T.84/T.434/T.120 are appropriate for H.32P terminals. Without regard to how this issue is resolved, T.84/T.434 are not appropriate for use in the high-function H.32X terminal, or in other areas (such as H.32Z.2) where H.245 may be used. This issue is of significance now that H.24X/H.24P have been merged into a single document. It is suggested that a method be devised to ensure that even if codepoints are allocated to T.84/T.434 in H.32P, they are not allocated for H.32X(H.310) terminals. The general principle being put forward is that data codepoints should be limited to T.120 as the only standard set of procedures and formats, and transparent data that can be used for any purpose in a point-to-point mode only. This will maximize interoperability.

4. H.32z.1(H.322)

AT&T has the following comments on the January 27 Version of H.322:

1. We suggest the following text relating to the need for a gateway be added just after "... not on the same LAN." **Note that in some cases the LAN has a star topology, and for some of these cases the central hub is connected to the WAN as a normal feature of the LAN. For such LANs(e.g. IEEE 802.9a), the H.32Z.1 gateway is the central hub. For other types of LANs, the H.32Z.1 gateway may be an additional device connecting the LAN to the WAN.**
2. In the past some questions have been raised about clocking issues for H.32Z.1 terminals. This statement might be added, perhaps as a footnote: **Note that IEEE 802.9a LANs assume that each endpoint has access to the network clock.**
3. The issue of where ATM LANs are handled (H.322, H.321, or H.323) should be clarified. The use of LAN emulation over ATM makes the situation more complex, since users may install H.323 software to make use of the emulated LAN, but this endpoint would then need a gateway to communicate with an H.321 terminal on the same ATM hub. This may be satisfactory, but the issue requires clarification.