



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 437	
date	1991-11-22	total pages
item nr.		supersedes document

Secretariat: Nederlands Normalisatie-Instituut (NNI)
Kalfeestraat 2 P.O. box 5059
2600 GB Delft
Netherlands
telephone: + 31 15 690 390
telefax: + 31 15 690 180
telex: 38144 nni nl
telegrams: Normalisatie Delft

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS
Title: ISO/IEC JTC 1 Special Group on Functional
Standardization

Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

Title : Future work on IAP Modeling
Source : U.S. National Body contribution
Status :
Note :

Future work on IAP Modeling

The U.S. recommends:

- 1) Distribution of the TSG-1 report to all SCs for their consideration, especially regarding the use of frameworks and reference models which affect application portability.
- 2) That SGFS should review the TSG-1 report as a guide in addressing application portability considerations as TR10000 is modified to address Open System Environments.
- 3) SCs should send comments and/or recommendations to SGFS regarding reference models used or developed within their scope of work. This input should be considered in future SGFS framework and taxonomy activities.

This coordinated approach to frameworks and models, which utilizes SGFS and all SCs and WGs wishing to participate, is preferable to a narrower, more centralized approach. The coordinated approach assures that a considerable pool of resource and wide range of perspectives is represented in defining frameworks and profiles for application portability.

Additional Proposal

Introduction:

- 1) As SGFS begins its work in these new areas, JTC1 needs to recognize the management implications of this work.
- 2) A basic thrust of the TSG1 recommendations is that the many organizations (SCs, NB and S-Liaisons) doing work relating to Application Portability needs to continue to do this work.
- 3) This implies that proposed additions to a broadened taxonomy (new parts) are likely to not be aligned in an architectural sense and will draw upon such diverse technologies (both inside and outside of JTC1) that consideration of a single technical group to reconcile proposed positions is not feasible.

In recognition of this and other management concerns, the U.S. feels that JTC1 should charge SGFS to address the procedures and process for their expanded role in consideration of the following principles.

The U.S. Recommends:

- A. The basic definition of an ISP and the essential criteria that a pDISP must meet (i.e. openness, harmonization and conformance with base standards) be preserved. In particular, approved ISPs must include, exclusively, approved base standards (as base standards are currently defined).
- B. The early formal identification of profile needs, such as a taxonomy provides, is important even in cases where final agreement on the structure of the taxonomy has not been obtained.
- C. Recognizing the potential impact of the addition of new parts to the taxonomy on management and organizational matters which are the concern of JTC1, early notification of the JTC1 National Bodies as well as potentially affected TCs/SCs of proposed changes to the taxonomy structure is required.

Note: In the following, the term Standardized Profile is used to mean a balloted, formal, harmonized document that specifies a profile. Within the domain of SGFS this is an ISP.

These are the specific positions on issues considered important by the U.S. when adapting TR10000 to Open System Environments:

- 1) The U.S. recommends that SGFS transmit document SGFS N383 to SC22 and to SC24.
- 2) Conformance criteria and test methods for standardized profiles must be clearly stated and generalized to address the full technical scope of SGFS. This will be difficult and it will be necessary to evolve the approach over time.
- 3) Identification of "gaps" in base standards should be encouraged in standardized profiles. Gaps are functional requirements in the domain of the standardized profile that are not met by approved standards.

Gaps may exist in terms of the characteristics available with one standard that need to be made available from another, or missing standards, or additional functionality that is needed for a specific applications activity. All gaps found should be recorded in the standardized profile.

- 4) When gaps are identified they should not be filled by referencing specifications other than base standards.

When gaps are identified they should not be filled by specifications written into the standardized profiles themselves.

- 5) The US believes that the current restriction against subsetting should be maintained as we expand TR10000 to include consideration for OSEs. (This restriction should be made clearer in TR 10000.)

Once a standardized profile has included a base standard, it may not exclude any portion of that standard, except for parts that are named and identified as optional by the base standard itself.

- 6) The nesting of standardized profiles should be specifically allowed and encouraged. That is, standardized profiles should be able to reference other standardized profiles.

7) Options should be named and identified in base standards. Doing this will make the job of standardized profile writers easier and lead to more easily harmonized standardized profiles. Some specific recommended wording:

All optional parts of base standards will be uniquely named and explicitly and completely defined within the base standard itself. It is not in the province of standardized profile writers to name or define options.

All future base standards shall contain a normative annex that lists all of the options for that standard with a unique identifier for each option. This annex should also include a summary of the implications and consequences of making a particular selection, possibly including guidance from the standards developers as to which possibilities should be preferred or avoided.

Where standardized profiles have options themselves, they would also have to comply with these requirements.

The US delegation has noted ambiguities in the interpretations of the word "option" and believes there is an issue to be resolved in this area.

It is also felt that a generalization of the concept of PICS is needed to address OSEs.

8) There is a strong need for a taxonomy (or taxonomies) that includes OSE standardized profiles. When such a taxonomy is prepared, the criteria used and the rationale behind the specific partitioning developed must be captured and documented.

9) We encourage the adoption of the TSG1 Final report terms:

Open system environment
Standards

