



INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ISO/IEC 10021-4:1997
TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1

Published 1998-09-01

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION • МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ПО СТАНДАРТИЗАЦИИ • ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION
INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION • МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ЭЛЕКТРОТЕХНИЧЕСКАЯ КОМИССИЯ • COMMISSION ÉLECTROTECHNIQUE INTERNATIONALE

Information technology — Message Handling Systems (MHS): Message transfer system: Abstract service definition and procedures

TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1

Technologies de l'information — Systèmes de messagerie (MHS): Système de transfert de messages: Définition et procédures du service abstrait

RECTIFICATIF TECHNIQUE 1

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW
(standards.iteh.ai)

[ISO/IEC 10021-4:1997/Cor.1:1998](http://standards.iteh.ai/Standard/ISO/IEC/10021-4:1997/Cor.1:1998)

Technical Corrigendum 1 to International Standard ISO/IEC 10021-4:1997 was prepared by Joint Technical Committee ISO/IEC JTC 1, Information technology, Subcommittee SC 33, Distributed application services.

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW
(standards.iteh.ai)

[ISO/IEC 10021-4:1997/Cor 1:1998](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-411fee1fa1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-411fee1fa1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998>

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD

ITU-T RECOMMENDATION

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY – MESSAGE HANDLING SYSTEMS (MHS):
MESSAGE TRANSFER SYSTEM: ABSTRACT SERVICE DEFINITION
AND PROCEDURES**

TECHNICAL CORRIGENDUM 1

1) Subclause 5.3

Add the following to the end of this subclause:

Although the abstract syntax in this Service Definition contains extension markers, it has not been verified that these are present in all instances that would be required before Packed Encoding Rules could safely be used.

2) New subclause 5.4

Insert a new subclause 5.4:

[ISO/IEC 10021-4:1997/Cor 1:1998](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-411fb1f1c1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998)

[https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-411fb1f1c1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998)

[411fb1f1c1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-411fb1f1c1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998)

5.4 Interpretation of UTC time values

Dates and times in the MHS protocols are represented using the ASN.1 *UTCTime* type which uses only two decimal digits to represent the year, leaving the century unspecified. Since MHS systems must deal with dates both in the past (e.g. submission times of old messages which may be held in local storage or forwarded) and in the future (expiry time, deferred delivery time), it is important to observe a standard convention to avoid inaccurate display or malfunction of the MHS when dates from different centuries are compared.

The two decimal digits give 100 different years that can be expressed; an implementation has to associate each of these values with a particular century. The chosen convention is that dates up to ten years prior to the current time and up to forty years ahead of the current time should be associated with the corresponding century, with the interpretation of the remaining 49 values being implementation dependent. For example, for a system operating in 1996 the values "86" to "99" are interpreted as 1986 to 1999 and the values "00" to "36" are interpreted as 2000 to 2036, and the values "37" to "85" are implementation dependent.

NOTE – This convention permits two possible implementation strategies. An implementation can choose a fixed interpretation of all the year values, such that the convention is satisfied throughout the expected life of the product, or it can interpret the dates dynamically, based on the current date, such that the implementation remains valid indefinitely. For example, an implementation could choose the fixed range 1970 to 2069 for the available values, meaning that the implementation would require revision if it is still in use by the year 2029.

3) Subclause 9.1

Number the current Note as NOTE 1.

Add a new last paragraph:

Each extension type shall occur at most once in a set of ExtensionField. The same extension type may occur in different places in the protocol. This applies to both standardized extensions and private extensions.

Add a new Note at the end of the subclause:

NOTE 2 – Per-message and per-recipient extensions are merged on delivery. This should be considered when defining a private extension.

4) Subclause 9.2

In Figure 2, Part 5, amend the ASN.1 comments for "MessageSubmissionResultExtensions" and "ProbeResultExtensions" with the following:

, at most one instance of each extension type

In Figure 2, Part 11, amend the ASN.1 comments for "PerMessageSubmissionExtensions" and "PerRecipientMessageSubmissionExtensions" with the following:

, at most one instance of each extension type

In Figure 2, Part 12, amend the ASN.1 comments for "PerProbeSubmissionExtensions" and "PerRecipientProbeSubmissionExtensions" with the following:

, at most one instance of each extension type

In Figure 2, Part 13, amend the ASN.1 comments for "MessageDeliveryExtensions", "ReportDeliveryExtensions" and "PerRecipientReportDeliveryExtensions" with the following:

, at most one instance of each extension type

5) Clause 13

iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW
(standards.iteh.ai)

[ISO/IEC 10021-4:1997/Cor 1:1998](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-411ffe1fa1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/38dc5674-e3e7-49fb-b26e-411ffe1fa1c/iso-iec-10021-4-1997-cor-1-1998>

In Figure 4, Part 3, amend the ASN.1 comment for "MessageTransferExtensions" and "PerRecipientMessageTransferExtensions" with the following:

, at most one instance of each extension type

In Figure 4, Part 4, amend the ASN.1 comments for "ProbeTransferExtensions" "PerRecipientProbeTransferExtensions"