SECRETARIAT OF ISO/IEC JTC 1/SG-FS / ISO/IEC JTC 1/FSTG
Title: ISO/IEC JTC 1/Special Group on Functional Standardization
ISO/IEC JTC 1/Functional Standardization, Taxonomy Group

direct line +31 15 690129

your reference | your date | our reference | our date

JTC 1/SG-FS N59 | 1988-10-20

To the member of
SG-FS

Dear members,

In reply to our letter ref. IV/88/190 of 22 August 1988 concerning the processing of the parts 1,3 and 4 of (PD)TR 10000, a number of responses were received. A summary of these is attached to the present letter.

It was agreed in Tokyo that a DTR ballot would be allowed only if none of the national members objected to it. The results of the consultation clearly do not leave us a choice in this matter - a second PDTR ballot is required.

Therefore, enclosed please find three separate PDTR ballot forms for
PDTR 10000
Part 1 - Taxonomy Framework (SG-FS N 51)
Part 3 - Taxonomy of Profiles (SG-FS N 52)
Part 4 - Directory of Profiles and ISP's (SG-FS N 54).
as well as the documents SG-FS N 51, N 53, N 54, N 55 rev. 1 (Editer's notes regarding Part 1), N 56 rev. 1 (Editor's notes regarding Part 3 and 4).

In this connection, let me remind you that
Part 2 - Taxonomy Update, ISP Approval and Maintenance Procedures
has already been submitted to you for a first (3 months) PDTR ballot with my letter ref. IV/88/191 of 22 August 1988.

Since the contents of the parts 1,3 and 4 (documents SG-FS N 51, N 53, N 54) remain unchanged and are already in the possession of all P-members and most S-members, I hope you'll forgive the few weeks delay in submitting the letter ballots for these parts (they should have been distributed on or before October 1). Only those parties that were not included in the consultation procedure now receive these documents for the first time.

secretariat: Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)

Postal address
P.O. box 5059
2600 GB Delft, Netherlands

Office address
Kalfjeslaan 2
Delft

Telephone + 31 15 690390
Telefax + 31 15 690190

Telex 38144 nni nl
Telegrams Normalisatie Delft

Please complete the three enclosed ballot forms and return them to the SG-FS secretariat not later than January 20, 1989.

Thanking you for your cooperation,

Sincerely yours,

H. Oosthoek
Secr. SG-FS

Attachment 1 to letter ref. ISO/IEC JTC 1/SG-FS N 59

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATION PROCEDURE CONCERNING THE BALLOT OF DRAFT TR 10000 PART 1, 3 AND 4.

The following responses were received:

ANSI (signed Frances E. Schrotter):

While the U. S. remains strongly committed to the JTC1 Functional Standards efforts and is anxious to see the documents finalized as soon as possible, we cannot agree that the current documents are ready for DTR ballot at this time.

While the majority of the text of the three parts is generally acceptable, we feel that the material currently reflected in Part 4 is inappropriate to include in a Technical Report. This material would better be handled as a Secretariat status report and we feel should not require National Body approval.

Further, in certain portions of Part 1 (e.g., Sections 6.1 and 6.2), we have major comments to submit.

We regret that our position will delay the progression of the document, but it is not intended to delay the submission of pdISPs. We feel this should proceed on schedule.

AFNOR (signed Françoise Bousquet):

For both technical and consistency reasons, the four parts of the document should be submitted for PDTR ballot.

However, schedule reasons must be considered. In addition, the ISP procedure - Part 2 - contains non-technical, but organisational matters, and it seems difficult to progress it to its final TR stage without trying to apply it on some test cases before.

Therefore, it is suggested that, as soon as the four parts (together) of the document have reached the DTR status (Early 89 if the ballot succeeds), it be applied for starting tentative registration of the first pdISPs available, if any. This could allow both to meet the schedule requested by Feeders, and to test the ISPs-making process itself. DTR ballot could hopefully take into account the results of such a tentative registration. (Progression of pdISPs to dISPs, and ballot delays, is allowed to take place while the document 10000 is still at DTR stage. Final ISP approvals must only take place when the document has reached the TR stage).

BSI (signed Francesca M. Gilbert-Chappell):

The UK supports the division of TR 10 000 into multiple parts as agreed in the May 1988 Tokyo meeting of JTC1 SGFS.

However even though on preliminary analysis the post-Tokyo drafts appear to incorporate the agreements reached in Tokyo, the degree of both technical and editorial change which has occured in parts 1, 3 and 4 is such that the UK would prefer a 2nd PDTR ballot to be undertaken in time for the ballot results to be discussed at the January 1989 Copenhagen meeting.

The UK therefore recommends that:

N51 rev	go for a 2nd DPTR ballot
N53	go for a 2nd DPTR ballot
N54	go for a 2nd DPTR ballot

It is the UK's desire that outstanding issues on TR 10 000 be resolved during the Copenhagen meeting, enabling a straight forward DTR ballot to be undertaken which will not hinder the processing of any DPISPS received during the first half of 1989.

CS (Canada, signed Mike Harrop):
i have no objections to these docs going to dtr ballot.

DIN (signed K.-P. Schulz):
DIN is of the opinion, that these three documents are not yet sufficiently stable for DTR-voting. We would recommend to have one more consideration as PDTR because of the extensive changes made at the last meeting in Tokyo.

DS (Denmark, signed Hans Jørn Reuss):
Annex B of Part 1 contains examples of multi part ISP structure. The conclusions drawn in the examples given in B3, seem to coincide with the current ECMA and SPAG policies. The Danish NB considers that the lack of objectivity reflected in these conclusions, seriously reduces the usefulness of this document and endangers the future of the whole Taxonomy work. Denmark would suggest therefore, the removal of Annex B from (P)DTR 10000 before publication for ballot.

As is commonly known, Remote Operations only permit a very simple usage of Session and Presentation. ROS is therefore of no use if there is a need for an extended functionality in the Presention and/or Session layers.
Advocacy of the use of Remote Operations in this way, greatly reduces the potential level of functionality which can be offered by the application.
There is in principle, no restriction in either FTAM or VT, or potentially in any other ASE, in the use of the same underlying protocol stack.

ITSCJ (Japan, signed Tadao Saitoh):
Japan propose that those three documents should be circulated for the ballot as JTC1 DTR level.

POSI (Japanese S-member, signed Shozo Tanaka):
POSI propose that those three documents should be circulated for the ballot as JTC1 DTR level.

- - - x - - -