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Follow the principle of completeness, where all changes related to the issue or problem within a deliverable are simultaneously proposed to be made E.g. A change impacting 5 tables should not only include a proposal to change only 3 tables. Includes any changes to references, definitions, and acronyms in the same deliverable.

Follow the drafting rules.

All pictures must be editable.

Check spelling and grammar to the extent practicable.

Use Change bars for modifications.

The change should include the current and surrounding clauses to clearly show where a change is located and to provide technical context of the proposed change. Additions of complete clauses need not show surrounding clauses as long as the proposed clause number clearly shows where the new clause is proposed to be located.

Multiple changes in a single CR shall be clearly separated by horizontal lines with embedded text such as, start of change 1, end of change 1, start of new clause, end of new clause.

When subsequent changes are made to content of a CR, then the accepted version should not show changes over changes. The accepted version of the CR should only show changes relative to the baseline approved text.

## Introduction

The CR proposes changes in <mgmtCmd> UPDATE (NORMAL) procedure.

**Change 1:**

In TS-0004, **clause 7.3.3.4**, it is mentioned that

|  |
| --- |
| **NP attribute for update request**  If the attribute is present in the resource representation in the UPDATE request, the Hosting CSE shall reject the request with a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "BAD\_REQUEST" error. |

In TS-0004, clause 7.4.16.2.3.1 for <mgmtCmd> update, it is mentioned that

|  |
| --- |
| If the Originator attempts to update attributes ***resourceType***, ***resourceID*** or ***cmdType***, the Receiver shall generate a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "BAD\_REQUEST" error. |

The CR proposes to delete this line from <mgmtCmd> update as it doesn’t mention all the NP attributes and same can be handled by the common description given in clause 7.3.3.4 as highlighted above.

**Change 2:**

In TS-0004, clause 7.3.3.3 and 7.3.3.4, it is mentioned that:

|  |
| --- |
| If the provided value is not accepted, the Hosting CSE shall reject the request with a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "BAD\_REQUEST" error. |

But in <mgmtCmd> update procedure, it is mentioned that for this case “CONTENTS\_UNACCEPTABLE” error is given, along with one other case.

|  |
| --- |
| 7.4.16.2.3.1 Update (Normal)  If the Update primitive does not address the ***execEnable*** attribute of the <mgmtCmd>, it results in update of all or part of the information of an existing <mgmtCmd> resource with the new attribute values. The procedure uses the common Update operations detailed in clause 7.3, without primitive specific actions.  The Originator shall use the steps Orig-U-1.0, Orig-U-2.0, and Orig-U-3.0 as described in clause 7.3. The Receiver shall use the steps Rcv-U-1.0 to Rcv-U-11.0 as described in clause 7.3.  If the Originator attempts to update attributes ***resourceType***, ***resourceID*** or ***cmdType***, the Receiver shall generate a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "BAD\_REQUEST" error.  If the Originator attempts to update attributes ***execTarget***, ***execMode***, but the <mgmtCmd> has child resource <execInstance> already created, the Receiver shall generate a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "CONTENTS\_UNACCEPTABLE" error.  If the Originator attempts to update attributes any attribute with a value which is not allowed, the Receiver shall generate a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "CONTENTS\_UNACCEPTABLE" error.  If the Update primitive for <mgmtCmd> does address the ***execEnable*** attribute of the <mgmtCmd>, it effectively triggers an Execute <mgmtCmd> procedure, see clause 7.3.15.2.3.2. |

The CR proposes to delete this line from <mgmtCmd> update as error same can be handled by the common description given in clause 7.3.3.4 as highlighted above.

In revision, CR proposes to change the status to “OPERATION\_NOT\_ALLOWED” when update is not possible.

### -----------------------Start of change 1-------------------------------------------

##### Update

7.4.16.2.3.1 Update (Normal)

If the Update primitive does not address the ***execEnable*** attribute of the <mgmtCmd>, it results in update of all or part of the information of an existing <mgmtCmd> resource with the new attribute values. The procedure uses the common Update operations detailed in clause 7.3, without primitive specific actions.

The Originator shall use the steps Orig-U-1.0, Orig-U-2.0, and Orig-U-3.0 as described in clause 7.3. The Receiver shall use the steps Rcv-U-1.0 to Rcv-U-11.0 as described in clause 7.3.

If the Originator attempts to update attributes ***execTarget***, ***execMode***, but the <mgmtCmd> has child resource <execInstance> already created, the Receiver shall generate a ***Response Status Code*** indicating "OPERATION\_NOT\_ALLOWED" error.

If the Update primitive for <mgmtCmd> does address the ***execEnable*** attribute of the <mgmtCmd>, it effectively triggers an Execute <mgmtCmd> procedure, see clause 7.4.16.2.3.2.

### -----------------------End of change 1---------------------------------------------
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