



doc.nr.	ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS <b>N630</b>	
date	1992-08-20	total pages 3
item nr.	supersedes document	

<b>Secretariat:</b>	Nederlands Normalisatie-Instituut (NNI) Kaljeslaan 2	P.O box 5059 2600 GB Delft Netherlands
telephone:		+ 31 15 690 390
telex:		+ 31 15 690 190
telegrams:		38144 nni nl Normalisatie Delft

<b>ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS</b>	
<b>Title:</b>	ISO/IEC JTC1 Special Group on Functional Standardization
<b>Secretariat:</b>	NNI (Netherlands)

**Title:** Disposition of Comments on DTR 10000-1.2 (SGFS N430)

**Source:** Editor, TR 10000-1

**Date:** August 1992

**Status:** To accompany submission of final text of TR 10000-1.2 (N631) for publication.

**Action:** For information.

## 2. §6.2 No change made.

In June 1991, the intent of SGFS was to make this extension on the subject of using ISPs as registration agents, subject to agreement of other bodies as identified in N396. Apart from the procedural concerns expressed by the USA, the other responses were N465 from the UK, N540 from EWOS and N586 from SC21 which were positive towards the proposal, particularly to support the processing of ISPs for VT control object definitions.

No negative positions were taken by the JTC1 Plenary on this issue. SGFS has left procedural issues open (N624, Issue 13) and the JTC1 SWG-RA meets in September at which it is possible that such issues may be reviewed. SGFS N612, addressed to SC21 and S-liaison organisations, indicates that further refinement of procedural issues will be considered for inclusion in future revisions of TR 10000.

The conclusion of the Editor, based on the above, is that the text proposed in N485 should be published in TR 10000-1:1992, and that further consideration of procedural aspects of registration should be made in the context of SGFS SD-1, and the ongoing work on the JTC1 Directives in the SWG-P.

## 3. §6.5 No change made.

SGFS has consistently avoided including in TR 10000-1 text concerning what and how testing of Profiles may be done (see Note to §6.4.1), leaving this subject to the development of ISO/IEC 9646-6 by JTC1 SC21 WG1. The conclusion of the SGFS meeting in June 1992 was that all changes with regard to the imminent ISO/IEC 9646-6 should be avoided (see SGFS N611).

Changes have been made to "Notes" in the following clauses of TR 10000-1, regarding future alignment with ISO/IEC 9646:

6.4.1 8.4 8.4.2 8.4.3 C.1 C.5

In addition, corresponding references to the forthcoming ISO/IEC 9646-6 and 9646-7 have been inserted into Clause 2.

## 4. §8.2 Change accepted.

It is clear from 8.2(c) that there should be a single document (ISP or ISP-part) for each Profile, and the proposed change makes this unambiguous.

In addition, in support of the same objective of unambiguity, the Editor has also amended A.4.2(b) to remove the optional plurals: "The element shall include the identifier and title of the Profile defined within the ISP or ISP-part".

## 5. §7.1 No change made.

The question as to whether a Taxonomy should permit the existence of more than one Profile with the same identifier was the subject of discussion at SGFS in June 1992, but no agreement was reached on any change to the concept represented by the current text of TR 10000.

In N624, Issue 19 leaves open for progression within TR 10000-1.3 and TR 10000-3 a number of questions regarding the concept and purpose of a Taxonomy of Profiles for OSE. The Editor suggests that a further attempt be made by SGFS to understand and, if possible, to meet the USA concerns, when reviewing this issue in future meetings.

