

July 2004 CalConnect Interoperability Test Rules and Test Scenarios

Published Administrative

Warning for drafts

This document is not a CalConnect Standard. It is distributed for review and comment, and is subject to change without notice and may not be referred to as a Standard. Recipients of this draft are invited to submit, with their comments, notification of any relevant patent rights of which they are aware and to provide supporting documentation.

Recipients of this draft are invited to submit, with their comments, notification of any relevant patent rights of which they are aware and to provide supporting documentation.

© 2004 The Calendaring and Scheduling Consortium, Inc.

All rights reserved. Unless otherwise specified, no part of this publication may be reproduced or utilized otherwise in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or posting on the internet or an intranet, without prior written permission. Permission can be requested from the address below.

The Calendaring and Scheduling Consortium, Inc.

4390 Chaffin Lane
McKinleyville
California 95519
United States of America

copyright@calconnect.org
www.calconnect.org

Contents

Foreword.....	iv
Introduction.....	v
1. Conditions and Their Meanings.....	1
1.1. MUST.....	1
1.2. MUST NOT.....	1
1.3. SHOULD.....	1
1.4. SHOULD NOT.....	1
1.5. MAY.....	1
2. Number of Conditions per RFC.....	1
Bibliography.....	2

Foreword

This document incorporates by reference the CalConnect Intellectual Property Rights, Appropriate Usage, Trademarks and Disclaimer of Warranty for External (Public) Documents as located at

<http://www.calconnect.org/documents/disclaimerpublic.pdf>.

Introduction

The purpose of this testing is to move the iCalendar, iMIP and iTIP proposed standards to the next level, Draft Standard. The following text describes what must occur.

A specification from which at least two independent and interoperable implementations from different code bases have been developed, and for which sufficient successful operational experience has been obtained, may be elevated to the "Draft Standard" level. For the purposes of this section, "interoperable" means to be functionally equivalent or interchangeable components of the system or process in which they are used. If patented or otherwise controlled technology is required for implementation, the separate implementations must also have resulted from separate exercise of the licensing process. Elevation to Draft Standard is a major advance in status, indicating a strong belief that the specification is mature and will be useful.

The requirement for at least two independent and interoperable implementations applies to all of the options and features of the specification. In cases in which one or more options or features have not been demonstrated in at least two interoperable implementations, the specification may advance to the Draft Standard level only if those options or features are removed.

The Working Group chair is responsible for documenting the specific implementations which qualify the specification for Draft or Internet Standard status along with documentation about testing of the interoperation of these implementations. The documentation must include information about the support of each of the individual options and features. This documentation should be submitted to the Area Director with the protocol action request. (see Section 6)

A Draft Standard must be well-understood and known to be quite stable, both in its semantics and as a basis for developing an implementation. A Draft Standard may still require additional or more widespread field experience, since it is possible for implementations based on Draft Standard specifications to demonstrate unforeseen behavior when subjected to large-scale use in production environments. A Draft Standard is normally considered to be a final specification, and changes are likely to be made only to solve specific problems encountered. In most circumstances, it is reasonable for vendors to deploy implementations of Draft Standards into a disruption sensitive environment.

— IETF, [IETF RFC 2026, Section 4.1.2](#)

July 2004 CalConnect Interoperability Test Rules and Test Scenarios

1. Conditions and Their Meanings

1.1. MUST

This word, or the terms "REQUIRED" or "SHALL", mean that the definition is an absolute requirement of the specification.

1.2. MUST NOT

This phrase, or the phrase "SHALL NOT", mean that the definition is an absolute prohibition of the specification.

1.3. SHOULD

This word, or the adjective "RECOMMENDED", mean that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances to ignore a particular item, but the full implications must be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.

1.4. SHOULD NOT

This phrase, or the phrase "NOT RECOMMENDED" mean that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances when the particular behavior is acceptable or even useful, but the full implications should be understood and the case carefully weighed before implementing any behavior described with this label.

1.5. MAY

This word, or the adjective "OPTIONAL", mean that an item is truly optional. One vendor may choose to include the item because a particular marketplace requires it or because the vendor feels that it enhances the product while another vendor may omit the same item. An implementation which does not include a particular option **MUST** be prepared to interoperate with another implementation which does include the option, though perhaps with reduced functionality. In the same vein an implementation which does include a particular option **MUST** be prepared to interoperate with another implementation which does not include the option (except, of course, for the feature the option provides.)

2. Number of Conditions per RFC

Conditions	iCalendar (IETF RFC 2445)	iMIP (IETF RFC 2446)	iTIP (IETF RFC 2447)
MUST	159	195	16
REQUIRED	17	67	2
MUST NOT	55	60	0
SHALL	14	0	0
SHALL NOT	1	0	0
SHOULD	39	36	7
SHOULD NOT	6	2	0
MAY	79	217	7
MAY NOT	2	5	0

Bibliography

- [1] IETF RFC 2445, DAWSON, F., D. STENERSON and Internet Engineering Task Force. *Internet Calendaring and Scheduling Core Object Specification (iCalendar)*. 1998. RFC Publisher. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2445>.
- [2] IETF RFC 2446, SILVERBERG, S., S. MANSOUR, F. DAWSON, R. HOPSON and Internet Engineering Task Force. *iCalendar Transport-Independent Interoperability Protocol (iTIP) Scheduling Events, BusyTime, To-dos and Journal Entries*. 1998. RFC Publisher. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2446>.
- [3] IETF RFC 2447, DAWSON, F., S. MANSOUR, S. SILVERBERG and Internet Engineering Task Force. *iCalendar Message-Based Interoperability Protocol (iMIP)*. 1998. RFC Publisher. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2447>.
- [4] IETF RFC 2026, BRADNER, S. and Internet Engineering Task Force. *The Internet Standards Process — Revision 3*. 1996. RFC Publisher. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2026>.