

## OpenBSC - Bug #3059

### System Information on SACCH missing L2 Pseudo-Length

03/11/2018 11:03 PM - laforge

<b>Status:</b> Resolved	<b>Start date:</b> 03/11/2018
<b>Priority:</b> High	<b>Due date:</b>
<b>Assignee:</b> laforge	<b>% Done:</b> 100%
<b>Category:</b>	
<b>Target version:</b>	
<b>Resolution:</b>	<b>Spec Reference:</b>
<b>Description</b>	
Something seems odd about our SI5/SI6 messages.	
The message on the downlink SACCH is structured as follows:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• two octets L1 header</li><li>• two octets "LAPDm B4" frame format: Address + Control Octet</li><li>• 23-4=19 octets of L3 payload (as specified in TS 44.018), consisting of<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ one octet L2 pseudo-length</li><li>◦ 18 octets of actual L3 message</li></ul></li></ul>	
It appears that the messages that we send from the Osmocom stack are missing the L2 pseudo-length. This maybe related to <a href="https://bugs.wireshark.org/bugzilla/show_bug.cgi?id=14105">https://bugs.wireshark.org/bugzilla/show_bug.cgi?id=14105</a>	
<b>Related issues:</b>	
Related to OsmoBTS - Bug #3057: OsmoBTS fails to schedule SACCH filling like SI5	<b>Resolved</b> <b>03/11/2018</b>
Related to Cellular Network Infrastructure - Bug #2963: Measurement Reports c...	<b>Resolved</b> <b>02/19/2018</b>

#### History

##### #1 - 03/11/2018 11:03 PM - laforge

- Related to Bug #3057: OsmoBTS fails to schedule SACCH filling like SI5 added

##### #2 - 03/11/2018 11:03 PM - laforge

- Related to Bug #2963: Measurement Reports cease to be useful some time into a voice call / after handover (not sure which project has the bug / bugs yet) added

##### #3 - 03/11/2018 11:13 PM - laforge

- Status changed from New to In Progress

- % Done changed from 0 to 10

the interesting question is: how does the format look on Abis? According to my reading of the specs:

- L3 Info TLV length given by TS 48.058 for SACCH FILLING is "22", where 1 byte is tag, and 2 bytes are length, i.e. 19 bytes left for actual payload
  - this indicates the full 19 bytes *including pseudo-length* are to be included
- The actual SI5 / SI6 definitions in TS 44.018 also include the L2 pseudo length as part of the SI message

I also found some old pcap files of a proprietary ip.access BSC, which confirms that assumption.

So it seems to me that

- OsmoBSC is lacking the L2 pseudo-length field as first byte of the L3 INFO
- the wireshark packet-rsl.c decoder is broken as it assumes no l2 plen
- we implemented our code to comply with wireshark, inheriting the bug
- the wireshark LAPDm decoder was "fixed" by me to also comply with that broken assumption

So now, wiershark RSL, wiershark GSMTAP/LAPDm and OsmoBSC are all broken. yay. :(

**#4 - 03/11/2018 11:19 PM - laforge**

This appears to be the root of all evil:

```
commit 6f0e50c8337355eb59033903ede9ab6528890835
Author: Max <msuraev@sysmocom.de>
Date: Wed Apr 12 15:30:54 2017 +0200
```

```
Prepare for extended SI2quater support
```

as it overwrites the I2\_plen just after it was written.

**#5 - 03/11/2018 11:30 PM - laforge**

- Assignee changed from laforge to neels
- % Done changed from 10 to 30

proposed (but yet untested) patch at <https://gerrit.osmocom.org/7220>

**#6 - 03/11/2018 11:33 PM - laforge**

- Project changed from Cellular Network Infrastructure to OsmoBSC

**#7 - 03/12/2018 02:05 AM - neels**

- Project changed from OsmoBSC to Cellular Network Infrastructure
- Assignee changed from neels to laforge
- % Done changed from 30 to 80

Just tested with this patch as well as <https://gerrit.osmocom.org/#/c/7218/> (it's already merged to osmo-bts master, but let me mention that it was used in the test) and: YES! Finally the measurement reports survive a handover! No matter what I do, the neighbor lists are reliably populated. Excellent! Let me add a few percent there.

**#8 - 03/12/2018 06:42 AM - fixeria**

Hi Harald,

this is probably related to:

<https://lists.osmocom.org/pipermail/openbsc/2017-December/011545.html>

my plan is to revert the:

<https://git.osmocom.org/osmocom-bb/commit/?id=1a8a80aeae4c2e5c870ae5b032d9a6ae60b67ac8>

because I was referring an outdated spec version and the way of Osmocom stack.

**#9 - 03/12/2018 10:16 AM - laforge**

- Checklist item [ ] wireshark patch for RSL added
- Checklist item [ ] wireshark patch for SACCH/LAPDm added
- Project changed from Cellular Network Infrastructure to OpenBSC
- % Done changed from 80 to 90

ok, have merged the related patch now. Let's abuse this ticket until wireshark patches are written + tested.

**#10 - 03/12/2018 10:26 AM - laforge**

- Checklist item [x] patch for legacy openbsc.git added

openbsc.git fix submitted in <https://gerrit.osmocom.org/#/c/7226/>

**#11 - 03/12/2018 01:16 PM - fixeria**

My question was lost because the 7226 was merged, but anyway, [laforge](#), what do you think about introducing a new structure with l2\_plen?

**#12 - 03/12/2018 01:50 PM - laforge**

On Mon, Mar 12, 2018 at 01:16:53PM +0000, fixeria [REDMINE] wrote:

My question was lost because the 7226 was merged, but anyway,

it wasn't lost, I read it ;)

[laforge](#), what do you think about introducing a new structure with l2\_plen?

I don't think it's worth it. Too much confusion?

**#13 - 04/07/2018 10:43 PM - laforge**

- Checklist item [x] wireshark patch for RSL set to Done

**#14 - 04/07/2018 10:43 PM - laforge**

wireshark patch for RSL now proposed as <https://code.wireshark.org/review/#/c/26797/>

**#15 - 04/07/2018 11:12 PM - laforge**

- Checklist item [x] wireshark patch for SACCH/LAPDm set to Done
- Status changed from In Progress to Stalled

LAPDm patch submitted at <https://code.wireshark.org/review/#/c/26798/1> - waiting for review.

**#16 - 04/29/2018 08:35 AM - laforge**

- *Status changed from Stalled to Resolved*

- *% Done changed from 90 to 100*

both wireshark patches merged.