Title   : US comments on WDTR 10000-1.2

Source   : USA

Status   :

Note   :

The U. S. National Body submits the following comments on TR 10000-1.2 (as documented in SGFS N430).

1. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: Introduction / v

   Rationale: Align this text with the change recommended by the US for the corresponding text of TR 10000-2.2, which has previously been balloted.

   Proposed Change: Change "subsets" to "conforming subsets" in the second bulleted item of paragraph 1.

2. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 2 / 1 and 2

   Rationale: Corresponding CCITT Recommendation numbers given for ISO/IEC 9646 are incorrect. 9646-1 is Recommendation X.290 (not X.290 Part 1). 9646-2 is Recommendation X.291 (not X.290 Part 2). In addition, there is a typographical error in the reference for 9646-1: "IISO" should be "ISO".

   Proposed Change: (i) Replace "X.290 Part 1" with "X.290", in 9646-1 reference. (ii) Replace "X.290 Part 2" with "X.291", in 9646-2 reference. (iii) Replace "IISO/IEC" with "ISO/IEC", in 9646-1 reference.

3. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 3.1.5 / 2

   Rationale: At the Brussels meeting of the SGFS Authorized Subgroup, agreement was reached that, due to the non-normative nature of Technical Reports, these should be removed from the definition of Base Standard in Version 3 of TR10000-1. The U.S. agrees with this conclusion and further believes that the change should be incorporated in Version 2 of TR10000-1.

   Proposed Change: Delete "Technical Report" from Clause 3.1.5.

4. **Item**

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 6.2 / 4

   Rationale: The editor has correctly added the second paragraph as directed by Resolution 14 and by SGFS N 390. However, the U.S. notes that SGFS N 432 Item 13 reminds us that this issue remains open. Inclusion of the current text in TR10000-1.2 implies that ISPs can in fact be used as registration agents. This issue cannot be closed, and hence the text cannot be included, until (at least) responses to SGFS N 396 have been received and considered.

   Proposed Change: Remove the second paragraph, which begins: "When a type of object requires a registration agent". In addition, the JTC1 Special Working Group on Registration Authorities should be consulted on the use of ISPs as registration agents before proceeding with this text.

5. **Item**

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 6.5 / 6

   Rationale: Grammatical error.

   Proposed Change: Change "may be remain" to "may remain" in item c), bullet for "Optional".

6. **Item**

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 6.5 / 6

   Rationale: SC21 N6191, "Liaison to SGFS on Profile Conformance", states that when an optional capability is excluded by a profile, tests shall be run to verify that the implementation does not initiate such capabilities. (See Clause 3, paragraph 3, of SC21 N6191.) This is useful information that should be included with the warning about using exclusion.

   Proposed Change: Add to the end of the note following item c), bullet for "Excluded": "Tests will be written for excluded features to verify that the excluded behaviour does not occur."

7. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 8.2 / 9

   Rationale: The text gives inconsistent statements about whether an ISP can or cannot contain multiple profiles. It must be made clear and consistent.

   Paragraph 4 of Clause 8.2 clearly states that a single-part ISP does not contain more than one profile. How-ever, Clause A.4.1 item b and Clause A.4.2 item b state "If an ISP defines more than one Profile..." and "...title(s) of the Profile(s) defined within the ISP", respectively. Both of these phrases indicate that a single ISP may contain multiple profiles.

   The U.S. believes it is necessary to have a unique iden-tifier for each profile.

   Proposed Change: (i) In Clause 8.2, paragraph 4, re-place "A single-part ISP" with "A single part of an ISP". (ii) Add the following to Clause 8.2, following paragraph 5: "Note that a unique identifier is required for each complete profile. This is required because there may be multiple profiles for a given taxonomy po-sition." (iii) Restore the text of the note in Clause A.4.1, item b, to include "a multi-part". (iv) In Clause A.4.2, add the following to the end of item b: "(Note that an ISP contains more than one Profile only if it is a multi-part ISP.)"

8. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 8.3.1 (Table 1) / 10

   Rationale: To align with the change made to the text of 8.3.1, the name of Table 1 should have "for OSI" ap-pended. (Refer to first sentence of 8.3.1, which states that this table shows the format of an ISP for OSI.)

   Proposed Change: Change name of Table 1 to "Outline structure of an ISP for OSI".

9. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 8.4.3 (Figures 2 and 3) / 12

   Rationale: The "overlay" style of these 2 figures leads
   to confusion. Each figure shows 2 contexts (send and
   receive) overlaying each other, while having a single
   left-hand side that apparently applies to both contexts.
   Since it is not possible to generate a document in the 3
   dimensions that are suggested, it would be of great help
   to readers of this document to use figures that repre-
   sent real examples. (For example, the reader cannot de-
   termine whether the two contexts are supposed to appear
   side-by-side, or follow each other sequentially, or be
   somehow intermingled..)

   Proposed Change: Remove the overlay structures from
   these two figures, and replace with figures showing how
   the two contexts are expected to be shown in an actual
   document. (If users are allowed to choose their own
   style, then this can be so stated following a new exam-
   ple.)

10. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: A.5.3 / 15

   Rationale: The text of Clause A.5.3 states requirements
   that are not aligned with Clause 8.3.2. Paragraph 2 of
   Clause 8.3.2 states that an ISP for ODA does not contain
   an IPRL. Paragraph 2, final sentence, of Clause A.5.3
   does not make this distinction for IPRLs.

   Proposed Change: Change "...in the ISPICS Requirements
   List..." to "...in the ISPICS Requirements List (when
   used)...".

11. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: A.5.5 / 15

   Rationale: The text of Clause A.5.5 states requirements
   that contradict Clause 8.3.2. Paragraph 2 of Clause
   8.3.2 states that an ISP for ODA does not contain an
   IPRL. Paragraph 2 of Clause A.5.5 states that an IPRL
   is required.

   Proposed Change: Change "The first normative annex..."
   to "The first normative annex for an OSI profile...", to
   align with Clauses 8.3.1 and 8.3.2.