doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N 988
date 1993-08-18	total pages
item nr.	supersedes document

Secretariat: Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)
Kalfjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059
2600 GB Delft
Netherlands
telephone: + 31 15 690390
telefax: + 31 15 690190
telex: 38144 nni nl
telegrams: Normalisatie Delft

Title: ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

ISO/IEC JTC1 Special Group on Functional Standardization

Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

Title : Issues raised during the DISP 12059 - 12060 Editing meeting, Tokyo, June 30 - July 2, 1993

Source : DISP 12059 - 12060 Editing meeting, Tokyo, June 30 - July 2, 1993

Status : Discussed during the SGFS Seoul 1993 meeting

Note : The results of the discussion in SGFS are presented in SGFS N 1006

From : DISP 12059 - 12060 Editing meeting, Tokyo, June 30-July 2, 93

To : SGFS plenary , Seoul, July 5-9

ISSUE 1:

DISPs 12059 and 12060 used to contain PICS proformas for 10164 Parts 1-5 base standards, and there is a strong relationship between the PICS proformas and the profiles texts. These PICS proformas have since reached DAM level and it was the understanding of the editing meeting that the ISPs texts would refer to the DAMs and not contain PICS proformas anymore. However the editing meeting was unsure about the recommended course of action when the PICS proformas DAMs are superseded by final AMs : When the DAMs become AMs, then the ISPs that refer to the DAMs become out of date since they refer to a document that is not available anymore.

- Σ Should we append the DAMs texts to the ISPs so that they are still available in conjunction with the ISPs when they have been superseded by AMs and are therefore not available through ITTF anymore?
- Σ Do we rather have an obligation to review the ISPs as soon as any of the base standards evolve from DIS level to IS level ?

AOW, EWOS and OIW would appreciate guidance from SGFS on this subject, since they are jointly involved in maintenance of ISPs 12059 and 12060, although formally AOW is the submitting organization

ISSUE 2 :

ISPs 12059 and 12060 have PICS and MOCS tables where at the same time local conditions are defined and conditions coming from the base standards have to be evaluated.
In practice, DAMs 10164-1 to 5 (10164 PICS and MOCS) have several Annexes. In each annex, conditions are defined starting from c1.
As a result a condition cx evaluated in the ISP can be either defined in Annex y of 10164-z or be locally defined by the ISP itself. The situation is very confusing for the end-user and there were NBs comments asking to solve this issue.
As we believe that this is a situation that may arise in several profiles, we are asking SGFS guidance on how to reference conditions coming from various base standards:
We believe that the valid identification for a condition is <base standard identification><Annex Nb><cx>.
and this is the designation we would like to use for referencing a condition in one of the base standards. However, the IPRL tables are already very bulky and it is not easy, from a purely editorial point of view, to put in the condition column something as long as : ISO10164-4.DAM1 Annex E / c3. Therefore we have defined abbreviations of the base standard and Annex identification. In our example the reference will becom 4E/c3. It will be defined at the bottom of each table where it is being used, in order to ease the understanding of the end-user.

It would be useful if SGFS was to inquire about whether such a situation has already occurred, and if a solution is adopted, to record , maybe in TR10000-1, what is the convention to be used in such a case.

ISSUE 3:
Should TR10000 be listed as a normative reference in the references section of an ISP definition ? It is the case for ISP11183 and maybe others, although a TR is in esssence not normative.