



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N	593
date	1992-08-12	total pages
item nr.	supersedes document	

**Secretariat:** Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)  
Kalffjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059  
2600 GB Delft  
Netherlands

telephone: + 31 15 690390  
telefax: + 31-15 690190  
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 : The U.S. comments to the questions raised by SC24 in  
paper SGFS N453

Source : USA

Status : US contribution to SGFS

Note :

The U.S. submits the following proposed answers to the questions raised by SC24 in paper SGFS N453.

SGFS N453 makes some very valid points about the problems that may arise due to proliferation of similar profiles. These problems have been recognized by SGFS as well. (Refer to ISO/IEC TR 10000-2, Clause 7.2, last paragraph, which discusses this in terms of the granularity that is appropriate in TR 10000-2.)

In addition, the need for early liaison between an organization which will submit an ISP and the SCs responsible for the base standards used in the ISP is highlighted in SGFS N453. One mechanism that is currently in place to enable early notification is SGFS N100, "The Directory of ISPs and Profiles Contained Therein". This document allows profile content to be recorded as soon as the need for the profile has been recognized. SCs may find it useful to consult this document periodically, to find profiles in their areas of expertise for which they might not yet have received official notification.

The U. S. submits the following responses to the specific questions raised in SGFS N453.

Question 1, paragraph 1: The intent of The Taxonomy (TR 10000-2) is to maintain a record of the taxonomy of profiles that may be or have been submitted into the ISP process. The relationship between ISPs and Registration Authorities is currently under study. (Refer to TR 10000-1.2, Clause 6.2.)

SGFS N100 ("The Directory of ISPs and Profiles Contained Therein") lists profiles (and ISPs, as applicable) in 4 classifications:

A: Profile has been approved and published as an ISP

S: Profile has been submitted into the ISP process

C: Profile is intended as future ISP contribution

R: Need for profile has been recognized

Thus Table 1 of SGFS N100, which is for the "A" status, lists all approved ISPs. This document is revised periodically, and published annually.

Question 1, paragraph 2: As stated above, the question of registration is not yet decided, but SGFS N100 records information about profiles and ISPs.

In the title of SGFS N100, "... and Profiles" refers to the profile(s) that are contained in each ISP, hence the name "The Directory of ISPs and Profiles Contained Therein". (A single ISP may contain the specification of multiple related profiles, when the multi-part ISP structure is used. Refer to TR 10000-1, Clause 8.2.)

Question 2: All submitted pDISPs are processed if they meet the criteria for submission, as outlined in SGFS N401, Clause 5.

Question 4: The intent of Clause 5.2, section b), of JTC1 N1608 is not to imply that non-compliance with base standards is permitted. "... should be addressed" means that the Explanatory Report should document any instances of non-compliant specifications. Any such instances then require change in order to align with the base standards: TR 10000 is quite clear about the requirement for alignment.

In addition to the reference you cite in TR 10000-1, Clause 6.1 (paragraph 3), see also Clause 6.3.1 b) which states

"It follows ... that a profile shall not specify any requirements that would contradict or cause non-conformance to the base standards to which it refers."

and also Clause 8.1 a), which states

"... conformance to Profiles shall imply conformance to base standards."

Question 6: There are several opportunities in the ISP process for detecting overlap. If overlap does occur, the ballot process for the dISP should resolve the issue. pDISP submission requires harmonization: existence of overlap is a sign that this harmonization may not have occurred.

Question 9: See the first sentence of this clause (7.3), which states that the National Bodies are those of JTC1.

Question 10: SGFS N401, Clause 8.3, Paragraph. 2 and 3 discuss this problem. If a defect is identified, and there is agreement that this is a defect, then either the defect is in a base standard or in the ISP. If the defect is in the ISP, but the MO refuses to change the ISP, then paragraph 3 of Clause 8.3 applies: the SGFS may reassign responsibility for maintenance, or the ISP may be withdrawn. The latter would be appropriate in the situation where agreement between NBLOs on the correct solution to the defect cannot be reached: the ISP no longer represents an internationally harmonized specification, and thus is not appropriate as an ISP.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

5300 S. DICKINSON DRIVE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

TEL: 773-936-3700

FAX: 773-936-3700

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU

WWW: WWW.PHYSICS.UCHICAGO.EDU