

---

---

**Information technology — Open Systems  
Interconnection — The Directory: Protocol  
Implementation Conformance Statement  
(PICS) proforma for the Directory  
Information Shadowing Protocol**

*Technologies de l'information — Interconnexion de systèmes ouverts  
(OSI) — L'annuaire: Proformes de déclaration de conformité de mise en  
œuvre du protocole (PICS) pour le protocole d'ombrage d'information de  
l'annuaire*

IECNORM.COM : Click to view the full PDF of ISO/IEC 13248-4:1998

© ISO/IEC 1998

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and microfilm, without permission in writing from the publisher.

ISO/IEC Copyright Office • Case postale 56 • CH-1211 Genève 20 • Switzerland  
Printed in Switzerland

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>	
1	Scope .....	1
2	Normative references.....	1
2.1	Identical ITU-T Recommendations   International Standards .....	1
2.2	Paired Recommendation   International Standards equivalent in technical content .....	2
3	Definitions .....	2
3.1	Directory definitions.....	2
3.2	Conformance definitions .....	2
3.3	Basic directory conformance definitions.....	2
4	Abbreviations .....	3
5	Conventions.....	3
6	Conformance .....	3
Annex A	– Directory Information Shadowing Protocol – Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma .....	4
A.1	Identification of the ICS proforma corrigenda .....	4
A.2	Instructions .....	4
A.2.1	Purpose and structure of the proforma .....	4
A.2.2	Symbols, terms, and abbreviations .....	4
A.2.2.1	Introduction .....	4
A.2.2.2	Prerequisite notation.....	5
A.2.2.3	Item reference numbers .....	5
A.2.2.4	Status column .....	5
A.2.2.5	Support column .....	5
A.2.2.6	Definition of support .....	6
A.2.2.7	Predicate column .....	6
A.2.2.8	Predicate Name.....	6
A.2.2.9	Note column .....	6
A.2.3	Instructions for completing the PICS proforma .....	6
A.3	Identification of the implementation .....	6
A.3.1	Identification of PICS.....	6
A.3.2	Identification of the implementation and/or system .....	7
A.3.3	Identification of the system supplier .....	7
A.3.4	Identification of the testlab client .....	7
A.4	Identification of the protocol.....	8
A.5	Identification of corrigenda to the protocol.....	8
A.6	ICS Proforma tables .....	9
A.6.1	General capabilities and global statement of conformance .....	9
A.6.1.1	General Capabilities .....	9
A.6.1.2	Supported Security Levels.....	9
A.6.1.3	Supported Application Contexts .....	10
A.6.2	Capabilities and options .....	10
A.6.2.1	Supported application context .....	10
A.6.2.2	Operations (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 7.3) .....	10
A.6.2.3	Protocol Elements.....	10
A.6.2.3.1	DSAShadowBind Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 7.4) .....	11
A.6.2.3.1.1	DSA Shadow Bind Arguments (Ref. X.511   9594-3, 8.1.2) .....	11
A.6.2.3.1.2	DSA Shadow Bind Result (Ref. X.511   9594-3, 8.1.2) .....	12
A.6.2.3.1.3	DSA Shadow Bind Error (Ref. X.511   9594-3, 8.1.4) .....	13

A.6.2.3.2	DSA Shadow Unbind Elements (Ref. X.511   9594-3, 8.2) .....	13
A.6.2.3.3	Coordinate Shadow Update Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 11.1) .....	13
A.6.2.3.4	Request Shadow Update Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 11.2) ..	14
A.6.2.3.5	Update Shadow Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 11.3) .....	15
A.6.2.3.6	Total Refresh Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 11.3.1.1) .....	15
A.6.2.3.7	Incremental Refresh Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 11.3.1.2) ..	16
A.6.2.3.8	Errors and Parameters (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 12) .....	16
A.6.2.3.9	Security Parameters (Ref. X.511   9594-3, 7.10) .....	17
A.6.2.3.10	CertificationPath (Ref. X.509   9594-8, 8) .....	17
	A.6.2.3.10.1 Certificate (Ref. X.509   9594-8, 8) .....	17
	A.6.2.3.10.2 Algorithm Identifier (Ref. X.509   9594-8, 8) .....	18
	A.6.2.3.10.3 Extensions (Ref. X.509   9594-8, 8) .....	18
A.6.2.3.11	Directory String (Ref. X.520   9594-6, 5) .....	18
A.6.2.4	Shadowing Agreements .....	18
A.6.2.4.1	Shadowing Agreement Information Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 9.1) .....	18
A.6.2.4.2	Unit Of Replication Elements (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 9.2) .....	19
A.6.2.4.3	Scheduling Parameters (Ref. X.525   9594-9, 9.3.3) .....	19
A.6.2.4.4	SubtreeSpecification (Ref. X.501   9594-2, 11.3) .....	19
A.6.3	Other Information .....	20

IECNORM.COM : Click to view the full PDF of ISO/IEC 13248-4:1998

## Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) and IEC (the International Electrotechnical Commission) form the specialized system for worldwide standardization. National bodies that are members of ISO or IEC participate in the development of International Standards through technical committees established by the respective organization to deal with particular fields of technical activity. ISO and IEC technical committees collaborate in fields of mutual interest. Other international organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO and IEC, also take part in the work.

In the field of information technology, ISO and IEC have established a joint technical committee, ISO/IEC JTC 1. Draft International Standards adopted by the joint technical committee are circulated to national bodies for voting. Publication as an International Standard requires approval by at least 75 % of the national bodies casting a vote.

International Standard ISO/IEC 13248-4 was prepared by Joint Technical Committee ISO/IEC JTC 1, *Information technology*, Subcommittee SC 33, *Distributed application services*, in collaboration with ITU-T. The identical text is published as ITU-T Recommendation X.586.

ISO/IEC 13248 consists of the following parts, under the general title *Information technology — Open Systems Interconnection — The Directory*:

- *Part 1: Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma for the Directory Access Protocol*
- *Part 2: Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma for the Directory System Protocol*
- *Part 3: Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma for the Directory Operational Binding Management Protocol*
- *Part 4: Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma for the Directory Information Shadowing Protocol*

Annex A forms an integral part of this part of ISO/IEC 13248.

## Introduction

This Recommendation | International Standard has been produced to facilitate the interconnection of information processing systems to provide directory services. The set of all such systems, together with the directory information which they hold, can be viewed as an integrated whole, called the **Directory** collectively known as the Directory Information Base (DIB), is typically used to facilitate communication between, with or about objects such as application entities, people, terminals and distribution lists.

The Directory plays a significant role in Open Systems Interconnection, whose aim is to allow, with a minimum of technical agreement outside of the interconnection standards themselves, the interconnection of information processing systems:

- from different manufacturers;
- under different managements;
- of different levels of complexity; and
- of different ages.

To evaluate conformance of a particular implementation, it is necessary to have a statement of which capabilities and options have been implemented for a given OSI protocol. Such a statement is called a Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS).

This Recommendation | International Standard provides the Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma for the Directory Information Shadowing Protocol (DISP) specified in ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594:1995. All references to the Directory Specifications, made throughout this Recommendation | International Standard, are to the second edition of those specifications (ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594:1995).

Annex A specifies the PICS proforma for the Directory Information Shadowing Protocol as defined in ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594.

## INTERNATIONAL STANDARD

## ITU-T RECOMMENDATION

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY – OPEN SYSTEMS INTERCONNECTION –  
THE DIRECTORY: PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION CONFORMANCE  
STATEMENT (PICS) PROFORMA FOR THE DIRECTORY  
INFORMATION SHADOWING PROTOCOL**

**1 Scope**

This Recommendation | International Standard provides the PICS proforma for the Directory Information Shadowing Protocol (DISP) specified in ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594:1995. This PICS proforma is in compliance with the relevant requirements, and in accordance with the relevant guidance for PICS proforma, given in ITU-T Rec. X.296 | ISO/IEC 9646-7.

The supplier of a DISP implementation that is claimed to conform to ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594 is required to complete a copy of the PICS proforma provided in Annex A and is required to provide the information necessary to identify both the supplier and the implementation.

The scope of this Recommendation | International Standard is the specification of the conformance statements for a Directory System Agent (DSA).

**2 Normative references**

The following Recommendations and International Standards contain provisions which, through reference in this text, constitute provisions of this Recommendation | International Standard. At the time of publication, the editions indicated were valid. All Recommendations and Standards are subject to revision, and parties to agreements based on this Recommendation | International Standard are encouraged to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent edition of the Recommendations and Standards listed below. Members of IEC and ISO maintain registers of currently valid International Standards. The Telecommunication Standardization Bureau of the ITU maintains a list of currently valid ITU-T Recommendations.

**2.1 Identical ITU-T Recommendations | International Standards**

- ITU-T Recommendation X.500 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-1:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Overview of concepts, models and services.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.501 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-2:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Models.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.509 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-8:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Authentication framework.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.511 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-3:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Abstract service definition.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.518 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-4:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Procedures for distributed operation.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.519 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-5:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Protocol specifications.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.520 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-6:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Selected attribute types.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.521 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-7:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Selected object classes.*
- ITU-T Recommendation X.525 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-9:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Replication.*

## 2.2 Paired Recommendation | International Standards equivalent in technical content

- ITU-T Recommendation X.290 (1995), *OSI conformance testing methodology and framework for protocol Recommendations for ITU-T applications – General concepts*.

ISO/IEC 9646-1:1994, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – Conformance testing methodology and framework – Part 1: General concepts*.

- ITU-T Recommendation X.296 (1995), *OSI conformance testing methodology and framework for protocol Recommendations for ITU-T applications – Implementation conformance statements*.

ISO/IEC 9646-7:1995, *Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – Conformance testing methodology and framework – Part 7: Implementation Conformance Statements*.

## 3 Definitions

For the purposes of this Recommendation | International Standard, the following definitions apply.

### 3.1 Directory definitions

This Recommendation | International Standard uses terms defined in the ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594, specifically ITU-T X.525 (1993) | ISO/IEC 9594-9:1995.

### 3.2 Conformance definitions

The following terms are defined in ITU-T Rec. X.290 | ISO/IEC 9646-1.

- Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS);
- PICS proforma;
- conformance;
- mandatory requirement;
- optional requirement;
- conditional requirement.

### 3.3 Basic directory conformance definitions

The following terms are defined in this Recommendation | International Standard:

**3.3.1 centralized DSA:** A DSA that is not capable of holding knowledge information about other DSAs. Such a DSA is not capable of returning referrals.

**3.3.2 cooperating DSA:** A DSA that is capable of holding knowledge references. Such a DSA is capable of returning referrals, and may also be a chaining DSA.

**3.3.3 chaining DSA:** A cooperating DSA that is capable of invoking chained operations, functioning as a DSP invoker. A chaining DSA is also a cooperating DSA.

**3.3.4 security level:** Security levels shall be declared for peer entity authentication, originator authentication and results authentication, respectively:

- For originator authentication, there are five security levels which are "none", "simple without password", "simple with unprotected password", "simple with protected password" and "strong".
- For peer entity authentication, there are three security levels which are "none", "simple with distinguished name" and "strong".
- For results authentication, there are two security levels which are "none" and "strong".

## 4 Abbreviations

For the purposes of this Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement, the following abbreviations apply:

ACI	Access Control Information
CCITT	International Telegraph & Telephone Consultative Committee
DAP	Directory Access Protocol
DIB	Directory Information Base
DISP	Directory Information Shadowing Protocol
DIT	Directory Information Tree
DOP	Directory Operational Binding Management Protocol
DSA	Directory System Agent
DSE	DSA Specific Entry
DSP	Directory System Protocol
DUA	Directory User Agent
IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
ITU-T	International Telecommunication Union Telecommunication Standardization Sector
IUT	Implementation Under Test
NSSR	Non-Specific Subordinate Reference
NSAP	Network Service Access Point
PDU	Protocol Data Unit
PICS	Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement
RDN	Relative Distinguished Name
ROSE	Remote Operations Service Element
RTSE	Reliable Transfer Service Element
SDSE	Shadowed DSA Specific Entry

## 5 Conventions

This Recommendation | International Standard refers exclusively to the second edition of the Directory Specifications listed in clause 2.

## 6 Conformance

A conforming PICS proforma shall be technically equivalent to ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594 and shall preserve the numbering and ordering of the items in ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594.

A PICS which conforms to this Recommendation | International Standard shall:

- a) describe an implementation which conforms to ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594;
- b) be a conforming PICS proforma, which has been completed in accordance with the instructions for completion given in A.2;
- c) include information necessary to uniquely identify both the supplier and the implementation.

Annex A<sup>1)</sup>

**Directory Information Shadowing Protocol –  
Protocol Implementation Conformance Statement (PICS) proforma**

(This annex forms an integral part of this Recommendation | International Standard)

**A.1 Identification of the ICS proforma corrigenda**

The supplier of the PICS proforma shall identify any corrigenda (i.e. Technical Corrigenda or equivalent) to the published proforma that have been applied. Suppliers of the proforma should modify the proforma, or attach relevant additional pages in order to apply the corrigenda, and then record the application of the corrigenda in the table below.

Identification of corrigenda applied to this PICS proforma	ITU-T X.586 (1997)   ISO/IEC 13248-4:1998 Corr: Corr: Corr: Corr:
--	---

**A.2 Instructions**

**A.2.1 Purpose and structure of the proforma**

The purpose of this PICS proforma is to provide suppliers of implementations of ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594 with consistent means of stating which capabilities have been implemented.

The proforma is in the form of a questionnaire and consists of a set of items. An item is provided for each capability for which an implementation choice is allowed. Items are also provided for mandatory capabilities for which no implementation choice is allowed. Each item includes an item number, item description, a status value specifying the support requirement, and room for a support answer to be provided by the supplier.

This subclause provides general information and instructions for completion of the proforma.

Subclause A.3 is for the identification of the implementation.

Subclause A.4 is for identifying the protocol within ITU-T Rec. X.500-Series | ISO/IEC 9594.

Subclause A.5 is for the identification of the Technical Corrigenda to the protocol.

Subclause A.6 contains tables in which the supplier specifies details of the implementation options chosen.

**A.2.2 Symbols, terms, and abbreviations**

**A.2.2.1 Introduction**

Notations have been introduced in order to reduce the size of the tables in the PICS proforma. These have allowed the use of multi-column layout where the columns are headed 'Status' and 'Support'. Definitions of each are given below. Additionally, the following definitions apply.

**A.2.2.1.1 (PICS) item:** A row in the PICS proforma table.

**A.2.2.1.2 (PICS) question:** The question to be answered in the intersection of a PICS item and either a support column (i.e. "Is this item supported in the context applying to this table and column?") or supported value column (i.e. "What values are supported for this item in the context applying to this table and column?") in a PICS proforma table.

<sup>1)</sup> **Copyright release for ICS proformas**

Users of this Recommendation | International Standard may freely reproduce this ICS proforma so that it can be used for its intended purpose and may further publish the completed ICS.

**A.2.2.1.3 status (value):** An allowed entry in the status column for an item in a PICS proforma table.

**A.2.2.1.4 (support) answer:** An allowed entry in the support or supported values columns for an item in a PICS, in answer to a PICS question.

#### A.2.2.2 Prerequisite notation

If a predicate applies to a whole table, a prerequisite line may be specified in front of the table to which it applies. A prerequisite line takes the form:

Prerequisite: <Predicate>

The meaning of such a line is that if <predicate> is True, then the table applies, else it is not applicable.

#### A.2.2.3 Item reference numbers

Each line within the PICS proforma is numbered at the left-hand edge of the line. This numbering is included as a means of uniquely identifying all possible implementation details within the PICS proforma. This referencing is used both inside the PICS proforma, and for references from other test specification documents.

The means of referencing individual responses is done by the following sequence:

- a reference to the smallest enclosing the relevant item;
- a solidus character, '/';
- the reference number of the row in which the response appears;
- if, and only if, more than one response occurs in the row identified by the reference number, then each possible entry is implicitly labeled a, b, c, etc., from left to right, and this letter is appended to the sequence.

An example of the use of this notation would be A.6.2.3.1.1/1, which refers to the support for credentials in a DirectoryBind protocol data unit.

#### A.2.2.4 Status column

This column indicates the level of support required for conformance to this Recommendation | International Standard.

The values are as follows:

- m The capability is required to be implemented in conformance with the related specification
- o The capability may be implemented and if it is implemented it is required to conform to the related specification
- c The requirement on the capability depends on the selection of other optional or conditional items
- i The capability is outside the scope of this PICS and hence irrelevant and not subject to conformance testing
- In the given context it is impossible to use this capability

Nested conditionals are denoted by nested numbering (e.g. 1, 1.1, 1.1.1, etc.) of the item descriptions in the tables. A table may have zero, one or more levels of nesting. The status of a leading item is specified by its status entry, as defined above. The status of a subordinate (that is nested) item is specified as follows: If the superior item is supported, the status of the subordinate item is determined by its status column entry and applicable predicate, if any. If the superior item is not supported, the subordinate item is not applicable, independent of its status column entry.

#### A.2.2.5 Support column

This column shall be completed by the supplier or implementor, to indicate the level of implementation of each item. An item is not considered implemented simply because a default value has been defined by the standard. In order for an Implementation Under Test (IUT) to claim a protocol element is implemented, it must have the ability, where appropriate, to generate, receive, and perform the appropriate action.

The proforma is designed such that support values are:

- Y Yes, the item has been implemented
- N No, the item has not been implemented
- The item is not applicable

**A.2.2.6 Definition of support**

A capability is said to be supported if the Implementation Under Test (IUT) is able:

- to generate the corresponding operation parameters (either automatically or because the invoke explicitly requires that capability);
- to interpret, handle and, when required, make available to the invoker the corresponding error or result.

A protocol element is said to be supported for a sending implementation if the IUT is able to generate it under some circumstances (either automatically or because the invoker requires relevant services explicitly).

A protocol element is said to be supported for a receiving implementation if it is correctly interpreted and handled and, when appropriate, made available to the invoker.

An attribute type is said to be supported by a DSA implementation if the DSA supports the specified syntax, and hence data types, to which every value in such attributes shall conform.

**A.2.2.7 Predicate column**

The item number contained in the predicate column, if any, means that the status in the "Status" column applies only when the PICS states that one or more features identified by the item is supported.

**A.2.2.8 Predicate Name**

The predicate name indicates that name upon which the predicate is based. A predicate name flagged with an asterisk preceding the predicate name indicates the condition by which the predicate is being set. A predicate name not flagged with an asterisk indicates the predicate on which the conditional support is based.

**A.2.2.9 Note column**

This column indicates the following:

- notexx Refers to Note xx
- d(xx) A default value xx within ( ) is defined in the standard. When absent in the PDU, both sender and receiver shall interpret it as having the default value specified in the standard.
- See xx Refers to Table xx

**A.2.3 Instructions for completing the PICS proforma**

The supplier shall complete all entries in the column marked 'Support'. In certain clauses of the PICS proforma further guidance for completion may be necessary. Such guidance shall supplement the guidance given in this clause and shall have a scope restricted to the clause in which it appears. In addition, other specifically identified information shall be provided by the implementor where requested. No changes shall be made to the proforma except the completion as required. Recognizing that the level of detail required may, in some instances, exceed the space available for responses, a number of responses specifically allow for the addition of appendices to the PICS.

All entries within the PICS proforma shall be made in ink. Alterations to such entries shall be made by crossing out, not erasing or making the original entry illegible, and writing the new entry alongside the alteration. All such alterations to records shall be initialized by the staff making them.

**A.3 Identification of the implementation**

**A.3.1 Identification of PICS**

Item No.	Question	Response
1	Date of Statement (DD/MM/YY)	
2	PICS Serial Number	
3	System Conformance Statement Cross Reference	

**A.3.2 Identification of the implementation and/or system**

Item No.	Question	Response
1	Implementation Name	
2	Version Number	
3	Machine Name	
4	Machine Version Number	
5	Operating System Name	
6	Operating System Version No.	
7	Special Configuration	Note
8	Other information	
NOTE – Please enter one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Shadow Supplier DSA;</li> <li>– Shadow Consumer DSA.</li> </ul>		

**A.3.3 Identification of the system supplier**

Item No.	Question	Response
1	Organization Name	
2	Contact Name(s)	
3	Address	
4	Telephone Number	
5	Telex Number	
6	Fax Number	
7	E-Mail Address	
8	Other information	

**A.3.4 Identification of the testlab client**

Item No.	Question	Response
1	Organization Name	
2	Contact Name(s)	
3	Address	
4	Telephone Number	
5	Telex Number	
6	Fax Number	
7	E-Mail Address	
8	Other information	

**A.4 Identification of the protocol**

Item No.	Identification of protocol specification	Support
1	ITU-T Rec. X.500 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-1:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Overview of concepts, models and services	
2	ITU-T Rec. X.501 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-2:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Models	
3	ITU-T Rec. X.511 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-3:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Abstract service definition	
4	ITU-T Rec. X.518 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-4:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Procedures for distributed operations	
5	ITU-T Rec. X.519 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-5:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Protocol specifications	
6	ITU-T Rec. X.520 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-6:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Selected attribute types	
7	ITU-T Rec. X.521 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-7:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Selected object classes	
8	ITU-T Rec. X.509 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-8:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Authentication framework	
9	ITU-T Rec. X.525 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-9:1995, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – The Directory: Replication	

**A.5 Identification of corrigenda to the protocol**

Item No.	Specification	Technical Corrigenda	Support
1	ITU-T Rec. X.501 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-2:1995	Cor.1: 1995	
2	ITU-T Rec. X.501 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-2:1995	Cor.2: 1995	
3	ITU-T Rec. X.509 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-8:1995	Cor.1: 1995	
4	ITU-T Rec. X.509 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-8:1995	Cor.2: 1995	
5	ITU-T Rec. X.509 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-8:1995	Cor.3: 1995	
6	ITU-T Rec. X.511 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-3:1995	Cor.1: 1995	
7	ITU-T Rec. X.511 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-3:1995	Cor.2: 1995	
8	ITU-T Rec. X.518 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-4:1995	Cor.1: 1995	
9	ITU-T Rec. X.518 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-4:1995	Cor.2: 1995	
10	ITU-T Rec. X.519 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-5:1995	Cor.1: 1995	
11	ITU-T Rec. X.520 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-6:1995	Cor.1: 1995	
12	ITU-T Rec. X.525 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-9:1995	Cor.1: 1995	
13	ITU-T Rec. X.525 (1993)   ISO/IEC 9594-9:1995	Cor.2: 1995	

## A.6 ICS Proforma tables

### A.6.1 General capabilities and global statement of conformance

Answering "No" to A.6.1.1/1 indicates non-conformance to the protocol specification. Non-supported mandatory capabilities are to be identified in the PICS, with an explanation of why the implementation is non-conformant. Such information shall be provided in A.6.3 "Other information".

#### A.6.1.1 General Capabilities

Item No.	Question	Status	Support	Predicate
1	Are all mandatory general capabilities for the DSA implemented?	m		
2	Are minimum knowledge requirements (ITU-T Rec. X.501   ISO/IEC 9594-2) implemented?	m		
3	Is the RTSE supported?	c1		
4	Can the DSA act as a secondary shadow supplier?	o		
5	Does the DSA support shadowing of overlapping units of replication?	o		
6	Is filtering on ObjectClass supported for UnitOfReplication?	o		*RepFilter
7	Does the DSA provide support for modifyTimeStamp operational attribute?	m		
8	Does the DSA provide support for the createTimeStamp operational attribute?	m		
9	Does the DSA provide services of the copyShallDo service control?	c2		
c1: If the DSA supports the reliableShadowSupplierInitiatedAC or the reliableShadowConsumerInitiatedAC then support of this feature is m else o. c2: If [RepFilter] then support of this feature is m else -.				

#### A.6.1.2 Supported Security Levels

Item No.	Supported Security Levels	Status	Support	Predicate
1	none	o.1		
2	simple	o.1		*Simple-DSA
3	strong	o.1		*Strong-DSA
4	external	i		
o.1: At least one security level shall be supported.				

**A.6.1.3 Supported Application Contexts**

Item No.	Supported Application Contexts	Status	Support	Predicate
1	shadowSupplierInitiatedAC	o.2		*Supplier
2	shadowConsumerInitiatedAC	o.2		*Consumer
3	shadowSupplierInitiatedAsynchronousAC	o.2		*Supplier
4	shadowConsumerInitiatedAsynchronousAC	o.2		*Consumer
5	reliableShadowSupplierInitiatedAC	c3		
6	reliableShadowConsumerInitiatedAC	c4		

c3: If [Supplier] then support for this feature is o else –.  
c4: If [Consumer] then support for this feature is o else –.  
o.2: At least one AC shall be supported as specified in 7.2.3.1, 7.2.3.2, and 9.3.1a of ITU-T Rec. X.519 | ISO/IEC 9594-5.

**A.6.2 Capabilities and options**

This part of the PICS proforma identifies the supported application context, the PDUs and operations. Finally, the operation arguments and PDU parameters are identified.

**A.6.2.1 Supported application context**

The application contexts supported by this PICS proforma are the Shadow Supplier Initiated and the Shadow Consumer Initiated application contexts. This PICS also supports the Reliable Shadow Supplier Initiated and the Reliable Shadow Consumer Initiated application contexts.

**A.6.2.2 Operations (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 7.3)**

Item No.	Protocol Element	Status	Support	Predicate Name	Note
1	dSAShadowBind	m			
2	dSAShadowUnbind	m			
3	coordinateShadowUpdate	c5		*Coordinate	
4	requestShadowUpdate	c6		*Request	
5	updateShadow	m			

c5: If [Supplier] then support of this feature is m else o.  
c6: If [Consumer] then support of this feature is m else o.

**A.6.2.3 Protocol Elements**

Some protocol elements may be digitally signed. In those cases where an operation can be signed, the PICS table is divided into signed/unsigned columns. Suppliers of implementations claiming conformance to signed protocol elements, for a given operation, should supply responses to the appropriate status/support columns under the signed column. Suppliers of implementations not claiming conformance to signed protocol elements should supply responses to the status/support columns under the unsigned column. Note that update operations return NULL results and that errors are often single integers. They therefore are not digitally signed. To do so could compromise the private key of the digital signature.

## A.6.2.3.1 DSAShadowBind Elements (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 7.4)

## A.6.2.3.1.1 DSA Shadow Bind Arguments (Ref. X.511 | 9594-3, 8.1.2)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Status	Support	Predicate	Note
1	credentials	c7			
1.1	simple	c:c8			
1.1.1	name	c:m			
1.1.2	validity	c:o			
1.1.2.1	time1	c:o			
1.1.2.2	time2	c:o			
1.1.2.3	random1	c:o			
1.1.2.4	random2	c:o			
1.1.3	password	c:o			
1.1.3.1	unprotected	c:o.3			
1.1.3.2	protected	c:o.3			
1.1.3.2.1	algorithmIdentifier	c:m		*Algor-ID	See A.6.2.3.10.2
1.1.3.2.2	encrypted	c:m			
1.2	strong	c:c9			
1.2.1	certification-path	c:o		*Cert-Path	See A.6.2.3.10
1.2.2	bind-token	c:m			
1.2.2.1	toBeSigned	c:m			
1.2.2.1.1	algorithm	c:m			
1.2.2.1.2	name	c:m			
1.2.2.1.3	time	c:m			
1.2.2.1.4	random	c:m			
1.2.2.2	algorithmIdentifier	c:m		*Algor-ID	See A.6.2.3.10.2
1.2.2.3	encrypted	c:m			
1.2.3	name	c:o			
1.3	externalProcedure	i			
2	versions	m			d(v1)
<p>c7: If [Simple-DSA or Strong-DSA] then support of this feature is m else o.</p> <p>c8: If [Simple-DSA] then support of this feature is m else o.</p> <p>c9: If [Strong-DSA] then support of this feature is m else o.</p> <p>o.3: The password, for the DSA, may be unprotected and/or protected as described in clause 6 of ITU-T Rec. X.509   ISO/IEC 9594-8.</p>					

A.6.2.3.1.2 DSA Shadow Bind Result (Ref. X.511 | 9594-3, 8.1.2)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Status	Support	Predicate	Note
1	credentials	c7			
1.1	simple	c:c8			
1.1.1	name	c:m			
1.1.2	validity	c:o			
1.1.2.1	time1	c:o			
1.1.2.2	time2	c:o			
1.1.2.3	random1	c:o			
1.1.2.4	random2	c:o			
1.1.3	password	c:o			
1.1.3.1	unprotected	c:o.3			
1.1.3.2	protected	c:o.3			
1.1.3.2.1	algorithmIdentifier	c:m		*Algor-ID	See A.6.2.3.10.2
1.1.3.2.2	encrypted	c:m			
1.2	strong	c:c9			
1.2.1	certification-path	c:o		*Cert-Path	See A.6.2.3.10
1.2.2	bind-token	c:m			
1.2.2.1	toBeSigned	c:m			
1.2.2.1.1	algorithm	c:m			
1.2.2.1.2	name	c:m			
1.2.2.1.3	time	c:m			
1.2.2.1.4	random	c:m			
1.2.2.2	algorithmIdentifier	c:m		*Algor-ID	See A.6.2.3.10.2
1.2.2.3	encrypted	c:m			
1.2.3	name	c:o			
1.3	externalProcedure	i			
2	versions	m			d(v1)
<p>c7: If [Simple-DSA or Strong-DSA] then support of this feature is m else o.                      c8: If [Simple-DSA] then support of this feature is m else o.                      c9: If [Strong-DSA] then support of this feature is m else o.                      o.3: The password, for the DSA, may be unprotected and/or protected as described in clause 6 of ITU-T Rec. X.509   ISO/IEC 9594-8.</p>					

**A.6.2.3.1.3 DSA Shadow Bind Error** (Ref. X.511 | 9594-3, 8.1.4)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Status	Support	Predicate	Note
1	versions	m			d(v1)
2	error	m			
2.1	ServiceError	m			
2.2	SecurityError	m			

**A.6.2.3.2 DSA Shadow Unbind Elements** (Ref. X.511 | 9594-3, 8.2)

DSAShadowUnbind has no arguments (see 8.2 of ITU-T Rec. X.511 | ISO/IEC 9594-3).

**A.6.2.3.3 Coordinate Shadow Update Elements** (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 11.1)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Unsigned		Signed		Predicate	Note
		Status	Support	Status	Support		
1	coordinateShadowUpdateArgument	m		m			
1.1	ToBeSigned	–		m			
1.2	agreementID	m		m			
1.2.1	identifier	m		m			
1.2.2	version	m		m			
1.3	lastUpdate	o		o			Note 1
1.4	updateStrategy	m		m			
1.4.1	standard	m		m			
1.4.1.1	noChanges	m		m			
1.4.1.2	incremental	m		m			
1.4.1.3	total	m		m			
1.4.2	other	i		i			
1.5	securityParameters	o		m		*Sec-Param	See A.6.2.3.9
1.6	algorithmIdentifier	–		m		*Algor-ID	See A.6.2.3.10.2
1.7	encrypted	–		m			
2	coordinateShadowUpdateResults	m		m			NULL
3	Errors	m		m			Note 2, See A.6.2.3.8

NOTE 1 – lastUpdate argument may only be omitted in the first instance of a coordinateShadowUpdate for a particular shadowing agreement.

NOTE 2 – Shadow Errors are returned by the Consumer in response to a supplier initiated Coordinate Shadow Update.

A.6.2.3.4 Request Shadow Update Elements (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 11.2)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Unsigned		Signed		Predicate	Note
		Status	Support	Status	Support		
1	requestShadowUpdateArgument	m		m			
1.1	ToBeSigned	-		m			
1.2	agreementID	m		m			
1.2.1	identifier	m		m			
1.2.2	version	m		m			
1.3	lastUpdate	o		o			Note 1
1.4	requestedStrategy	m		m			
1.4.1	standard	m		m			
1.4.1.1	incremental	m		m			
1.4.1.2	total	m		m			
1.4.2	other	i		i			
1.5	securityParameters	o		m		*Sec-Param	See A.6.2.3.9
1.6	algorithmIdentifier	-		m		*Algor-ID	See A.6.2.3.10.2
1.7	encrypted	-		m			
2	requestShadowUpdateResult	m		m			NULL
3	Errors	m		m			Note 2, See A.6.2.3.8
<p>NOTE 1 – lastUpdate argument may only be omitted in the first instance of a requestShadowUpdate for a particular shadowing agreement.</p> <p>NOTE 2 – Shadow Errors are returned by the Supplier in response to a Consumer initiated Request Shadow Update.</p>							

IECNORM.COM : Click to view the full PDF of ISO/IEC 13248-4:1998

## A.6.2.3.5 Update Shadow Elements (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 11.3)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Unsigned		Signed		Predicate	Note
		Status	Support	Status	Support		
1	updateShadowArgument	m		m			
1.1	ToBeSigned	–		cm			
1.2	agreementID	m		m			
1.2.1	identifier	m		m			
1.2.2	version	m		m			
1.3	updateTime	m		m			
1.4	updateWindow	o		o			
1.4.1	start	c:m		c: m			
1.4.2	stop	c:m		c: m			
1.5	updatedInfo	m		m			
1.5.1	noRefresh	m		m			
1.5.2	total	m		m			
1.5.3	incremental	m		m			
1.5.4	otherStrategy	i		i			
1.6	securityParameters	o		m		*Sec-Param	See A.6.2.3.9
1.7	algorithmIdentifier	–		m		*Algor-ID	See A.6.2.3.10.2
1.8	encrypted	–		m			
2	UpdateShadowResult	m		m			NULL
3	Errors	m		m			See A.6.2.3.8

## A.6.2.3.6 Total Refresh Elements (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 11.3.1.1)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Status	Support	Predicate	Note
1	TotalRefresh	m			
1.1	sDSE	o			
1.1.1	sDSEType	c:m			
1.1.2	subComplete	c:m			d(FALSE)
1.1.3	attComplete	c:o			
1.1.4	attributes	c:m			
1.2	subtree	o			
1.2.1	rdn	c:m			
1.2.2	TotalRefresh	c:m			

**A.6.2.3.7 Incremental Refresh Elements** (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 11.3.1.2)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Status	Support	Predicate	Note
1	IncrementalRefresh	m			
1.1	sDSEChanges	c:o			
1.1.1	add	c:m			
1.1.2	remove	c:m			
1.1.3	modify	c:m			
1.1.3.1	rename	c:o			
1.1.3.1.1	newRDN	c:m			
1.1.3.1.2	newDN	c:m			
1.1.3.2	attributeChanges	c:o			
1.1.3.2.1	replace	c:m			
1.1.3.2.2	changes	c:m			
1.1.3.2.2.1	addAttribute	c:m			
1.1.3.2.2.2	removeAttribute	c:m			
1.1.3.2.2.3	addValues	c:m			
1.1.3.2.2.4	removeValues	c:m			
1.1.3.3	sDSEType	c:m			
1.1.3.4	subComplete	c:m			d(false)
1.1.3.5	attComplete	c:o			
1.2	subordinateUpdates	o			
1.2.1	subordinates	c:m			
1.2.2	changes	c:m			

**A.6.2.3.8 Errors and Parameters** (Ref. X.525 | 9594-9, 12)

Item No.	Protocol Element	Supplier		Consumer		Predicate	Note
		Status	Support	Status	Support		
1	shadowError	m		m			
1.1	problem	m		m			
1.1.1	invalidAgreementID	m		m			
1.1.2	inactiveAgreement	m		m			
1.1.3	invalidInformationReceived	-		m			
1.1.4	unsupportedStrategy	m		m			
1.1.5	missedPrevious	-		m			
1.1.6	fullUpdateRequired	m		m			
1.1.7	unwillingToPerform	m		m			
1.1.8	unsuitableTiming	m		m			
1.1.9	updateAlreadyReceived	-		m			
1.1.10	invalidSequencing	m		m			
1.1.11	insufficientResources	m		m			
1.2	lastUpdate	-		o			
1.3	updateWindow	o		o			