Network Working Group Request for Comments: 40 E. Harslem J. Heafner RAND March 1970

More Comments on the Forthcoming Protocol

We have recently discussed NWG/RFC Nos. 36 and 39 with Steve Crocker, UCLA. Steve has asked that we elaborate on the errors, queries, and HOST status that were mentioned in NWG/RFC #39.

Please voice your opinions soon in order to affect the forthcoming protocol specifications.

ERROR MESSAGES

<ERR> <Code> <Command length> <Command in error>

<Code> is an eight-bit field that specifies the error type. The assigned codes are shown below. <Command length> is a 16-bit integer that indicates the length of the <Command in error> in bits. The <Command in error> is the spurious command.

The ranges of <Code> are shown below in hexidecimal.

00 Unspecified error types 10-0F Resource errors 10-1F Status errors 20-2F Content errors 30-3F Unused

Specific values of <Code> are shown below with their meaning.

<Code> value Semantics

00	Unspecified errors.
01	Request for an invalid resource.
02	Request for an exhausted resource, try later.
03-0F	Unused.
10	Invalid <rsm>, i.e., link connected but unblocked.</rsm>
11	Invalid <spd>.</spd>
12	Invalid <asg>, i.e., connected but no <rdy></rdy></asg>
	received.

<Code> value Semantics

13 14-1F	Message received on blocked link. Unused.
2.0	Unknown command code.
2.1	
21	Message received on unconnected link.
22	Invalid <rfc>.</rfc>
23	Invalid <cls>.</cls>
24	Invalid <rsm>, i.e., link not connected.</rsm>
25	Invalid <fnd>.</fnd>
26	Invalid <end>.</end>
27	Invalid <rdy>.</rdy>
28	Invalid <asg>, i.e., not connected.</asg>
29-2F	Unused.
30-FF	Unused.

QUERIES

<QRY> <My Socket> or <RPY> <Your Socket> <Text>

The <QRY> is the query indicated in NWG/RFC #39 and <RPY> is the reply. The format of <Text> is shown below; also refer to NWG/RFC #36, p. 3.

<Text>::= <16 bit count of relevant connection table entries> <relevant connection table entries>

<reconnection control state>

[Page 2]

<NOP>

An NCP may be up, down, pending, etc. When an NCP changes its state to UP it should send a <NOP> to each remote NCP which indicates the NCP is available. The sending NCP can then construct a vector of HOST status from the RFNMs it receives. An NCP receiving a <NOP> can update the availability of the sending NCP in its HOST status vector.

> [This RFC was put into machine readable form for entry] [into the online RFC archives by Richard Ames 6/97]

> > [Page 3]