



Bundle Protocol Specification Issues

3 November 2015

Scott Burleigh
Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology

3 November 2015

This research was carried out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. © 2015 California Institute of Technology. Government sponsorship acknowledged.



Open Technical Issues (1 of 2)

- Should the BP spec be divided into two documents? One to talk about conops and context and one that focuses specifically on the protocol?
- Should a node that is able to process a given extension block be permitted to clear the block's "Block was forwarded without being processed" flag?
- ECOS features: omit some or all of these? Is "critical" the right name for the "critical" flag?
- Should "DTN times" in status reports be retained but made optional? Or simply retained as mandatory?
- Who controls the time at which a bundle is forwarded to the next node, the BPA or the convergence-layer adapters?



Open Technical Issues (2 of 2)

- Is the “inventory” mechanism in the spec good enough?
Revise it, remove it?
- Should we prohibit multiple occurrences of any single block type, requiring that any necessary multiplicity be built into the block-type specific data structure?
- If BP were used for information-centric networking, would cache points “transmit” cached data to clients or would they just “forward” previously transmitted bundles of which they have retained copies?
- Which specific CRC options should we support?