Title: **ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS**

ISO/IEC JTC1 Special Group on Functional Standardization

Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

Title   :   U.S. Comments on TR 10000-1.3 as documented in ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N817

Source   :   ANSI

Status   :   For discussion during the SGFS Plenary Meeting, July 5-9, 1993, Seoul, Korea

Note   :

U.S. Comments on TR10000-1.3 as documented in ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N 817.

Item: *Done*   1
Rationale: *Page iv, Introduction, 2nd bullet:* The first comma in the second sentence is not needed.
Recommendation: Remove first comma from second sentence.

Item: 2
Rationale: *Done*   *Page 1, lines 16 through 30 (including figure 1):* Does not represent relationships among profile categories.
Recommendation: Delete

Item: 3
Background: *Various:* The scope of the document is identified in the Introduction (page iv) as "the generally understood, but loosely defined, concept of 'Open Systems'". Clause 1 (Scope) states that "This Technical Report is concerned with an environment within which Profiles are defined and used, known by the term 'Open System Environment' (OSE)." The Scope further identifies the OSE (via Figure 1 and accompanying text, plus the definitions in Clause 3.1) to include "Industry-specific Application Environment Profiles", "Generic Application Environment Profiles" and "Functional Profiles". However, conflicting statements about the scope are made elsewhere.

Done

a) Rationale: *Clause 1, Scope, Page 2, lines 5-9:* This text implies that the scope of the TR could vary, depending on whether "there is an ISO/IEC Technical Committee willing and able to sponsor the creation and approval of such specific Profiles as standards". This text is inappropriate. "Enterprise-specific" and "person-specific" can and should be excluded from the scope of this Technical Report. As currently defined (see Rationale), the scope <u>does</u> include "industry-specific", even though at this time no standards activity may be in progress.

a) Recommendation: Therefore, the text on lines 7-9, beginning with "however" should be replaced with "however, 'enterprise-specific' and 'person-specific' profiles do not fall within the scope of this Technical Report."

b) Rationale: *Clause 1, Scope, Page 2, lines 17-19:* This text states "OSE Profiles (identified in Figure 1 as Generic Application Environment Profiles)". In fact, Figure 1 indicates that Generic Application Environment Profiles are only a subset of OSE Profiles.

b) Recommendation: Figure 1 should be removed (Item 2) and the parenthetical expression should be deleted.

c) Rationale   *Clause 6.3.3, Specific types of Profile definition, page 13, lines 1-2:* This sentence is confusing by stating that no industry-specific profiles are "currently defined within the scope" of this Technical Report. By saying "currently defined", we are implying that such profiles are within the scope, but are not described at this time. However, "within the scope" indicates that industry-specific profiles are not currently in the scope of TR10000, which conflicts with earlier statements.

c) Recommendation: Industry-specific profiles are within the scope of this document, therefore the phrase "within the scope of" should be replaced by "in".

d) Rationale: *Page 17, lines 26 through 29:* The following extends the EWOS idea of scoping OSE profiles by reference to the interfaces they address.

d) Recommendation: Substitute the following partitioning of OSE Profiles

"P - OSE Profiles
- AP - Application Environment Profiles
- IP - Interface Profiles
    - API - Application Program Interface (API) Profiles
    - HCI - Human/Computer Interface Profiles
    - CMI - Communications Interface Profiles
    - ISI - Information Storage Interface Profiles

In the context of the scope of OSE as outlined in clause 1, this classification covers the domain of OSE Profiles. Note that further partitioning in the CMI and AP categories exists in 7.3.2 and TR10000-3 paragraph 1.3, respectively.

Note: if we accept the principle that only the most specific identifier will be attached to any given profile, there will be no change to existing profiles."

e) Rationale: *Page 17, lines 30 through 32:* If industry specific profiles are included as a result of coordination with external forums (for example, ISO TCs), these profiles will be represented in the document.

e) Recommendation: Modify existing text to read as follows: "Currently, no classification is assigned ... and are not yet subject to classification or ...".

f) Rationale: *Page 17, lines 33 through 35:* Functional profiles should be evolved to interface profiles.

f) Recommendation: Delete

Item: 4

Rationale: *Page 2, lines 28 through page 3, line 3:* Current list appears ad hoc. Interface based scope criteria provides better criteria for groupings.

Recommendation: Substitute the following text:

"The scope of OSE profiling embraces formats, functionality, and standards, which are encompassed by the following four classes of interfaces defined in the OSE reference model (see POSIX Guide to the Open System Environment):
- Application Program Interface (API) - where application software accesses the services of the underlying application platform
- Human/Computer Interface - where people interact with information technology.
- Communications Interface - where interoperability between systems is established.
- Information Interface - where data may be stored on external physical storage media"

Item: 5

Rationale: *Clause 6.1.4, Other Factors, page 9, line 30:* New functionality cannot be defined in an ISP.

Recommendation: Delete "or in another ISP" from line 30.

Item: 6

Rationale: *Clause 6.1.4, Other Factors, page 10, lines 3 & 4:* The phrase "in order to make good the omission" is unclear in what is intended.

Recommendation: Delete the text on lines 3 and 4 following "implement".

May 14, 1993

Rationale: *Clause 6.2, The Relationship to Registration Authorities*: Because the definition of objects defined in base standards may contain optional elements or objects may be combined with other objects defined in separate base standards to form composite objects, there is a need for ISPs to be able to define option-selected or composite objects or both, and possibly to serve as a Registration Authority for these newly defined objects.

Recommendation: Insert the following text on page 10, between lines 37 and 38:

"ISPs may, when deemed necessary, define new objects that are composed of objects defined in base standards or other ISPs, selecting specific optional elements, or new objects composed of objects from multiple base standards or ISPs, or both.

Note: All elements of these defined objects must be defined in base standards. Only the particular selection makes the object new.

- proliferation of different objects is strongly discouraged because it creates 'islands of isolation', i.e., objects that vary in only the slightest manner are perceived as being totally different. Every attempt should be made to develop composite objects with the broadest possible field of use to promote interoperability.

- as with other objects, an ISP (either the one defining the object or others) may act as a registrar for the object defined."

Item: 8

Rationale: *Clause 7.1, Nature and Purpose of the Taxonomy, page 15 lines 27-29 and lines 37-39*: The new text (lines 27-29) is only marginally better than the previously approved text (lines 37-39). Unfortunately, the new text has introduced two problems:

a) line 27 indicates that the taxonomy identifies "required" Profiles. It is unlikely that TR10000 will "require" that Profiles exist.

b) line 28 introduces the term "unique identifiers". It was agreed in the London discussion of SGFSN751 that this term raised implications which had not been agreed. As a result, SGFSN751 was modified to read "unambiguous identifiers".

Recommendation: One potential solution is to return to the original text as shown in lines 37-39. Otherwise,

a) The term "required" should be removed.

b) The term "unique" should be replaced by "unambiguous".

Item: 9

Rationale: *Clause 7.2.2, Profile Elements, page 16 line 43*: The phrase "creating new profiles in the taxonomy" is somewhat confusing.

Recommendation: Replace with "creating new profile identifiers in the taxonomy".

Item: 10

Rationale: *Clause 7.2.2, Profile Elements, page 16 line 43*: The functions provided by the base standards may also decrease or change significantly.

Recommendation: Replace "increase" with "change".

Item: 11
Rationale: *Clause 8.2, Multi-part ISPs, page 18 lines 32-35 and page 19 lines 1-16:* The editor has taken broad license to make a significant change in the guidelines given to profile writers. This text, which was unclear in the initial version of TR10000-1, was clarified in TR10000-1.2. The original text stated that a single part ISP shall not contain the definition of more than one Profile. The situation for a part of a multi-part ISP was unclear. The change included in the approved version of TR10000-1.2 extended the original intent to include each part of a multi-part ISP.

Further, the editor's justifications for making this change are weak.
- One justification is on page 18 line 33, noting that there have been cases where this rule has not been observed. This is not a justification for changing the rules. SGFS has options of "grand-fathering" those created when the rules were unclear, of granting exceptions, or of asking editors to change to meet the rules.
- Another justification on page 18 line 35 and page 19 line 1 is that "there is a view which says that" a combination should be permitted when the differences are small. There is also the view, stated on page 16, lines 34-36, that "Too many nearly-similar Profiles within a sub-class of the Taxonomy will increase the likelihood that users will be unable to agree on a single Profile choice to interwork successfully, or port applications or use easily". This could be used to conclude that, if the profiles are as close as the editor suggests, there should only be one profile with options.

Recommendation: Remove the change made by the editor and return to the text of TR10000-1.2. If other, more compelling, arguments are forthcoming, these should be made in contributions to SGFS.

Item: 12
Rationale: *Clause A.3.4, Introductions (Rules 2.2.4), page 24 line 25:* Explanatory Reports are provided expressly for the PDISP and thus are provided for "review". "Approval" occurs on the DISP. While the Explanatory Report is included with the ballot, it remains unchanged from that submitted with the PDISP.

Recommendation: Remove "and approval" from line 25.

Item: 13
Rationale: *Clause A.3.4, Introduction (Rules 2.2.4), page 24, lines 25-26:* TR10000 gives guidance and requirements on the ISP document itself, not on implementations of the ISP. Therefore a compliance statement is not appropriate.

Recommendation: Replace the sentence beginning with "It shall include . . ." with "Any deviation from the requirements in TR10000 shall be identified and justified in the Introduction".

Item: 14
Rationale: *Clause A.4.3, Normative References (Rules 2.3.3), page 26, lines 10-12:* See Rationale in Item 13.

Recommendation: Delete lines 10-12.

May 14, 1993