

Draft Minutes of the 10th ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS Meeting,
June 13th - 17th, 1994, Cannes, France.

Attendance: see attached list

1. Opening

The chairman Mr. Willem Wakker opened the meeting at 14.15 h. on Monday, June 13th, 1994. He welcomed all the participants. Also a word of welcome was given by Ms. Marie-Martine Guillabert on behalf of AFNOR which served as host for this meeting. The chairman expressed his appreciation to Ms. Isabelle Valet-Harper and her employer, Digital Equipment Corporation, for coordinating the arrangements for the meeting.

2. Roll call of the delegates

A short introduction round was held.

3. Adoption of Agenda

The proposed agenda (see Annex C, revision 3 of SGFS N1111) was adopted.

4. Appointment of Drafting Committee

The following persons were appointed for the Drafting Committee: Mr. Clyde Robichaux, Mr. Brian Wood, Ms. Isabelle Valet-Harper and Mr. Peter Bessems (secr.)

5. Approval of minutes

5.1 Approval of the Minutes of the 9th ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS Meeting, July 1993, Seoul

The minutes (SGFS N1020) were approved without changes.

5.2 Approval of the Minutes of the Amsterdam Authorized Subgroup Meeting, November-December 1993

The minutes (SGFS N1099) were approved without changes.

6. SGFS Chair and Secretary Report

The reports (SGFS N1103 and N1105) were noted.

7. Review incoming documents

The late received documents SGFS N1144 to 1160 were tabled.

7.1 Liaison statements ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG15

SGFS received a liaison statement from ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG15 (SGFS N1129) on the harmonization of POSIX National Profiles and OSE Profile ISPs.

SC22/WG15 asked SGFS to make any necessary changes to TR10000 to enable POSIX National Profiles to become ISPs, especially addressing the issue of references to national and regional standards in POSIX National Profiles.

Three issues have been identified:

- how compatibility can be maintained between the National Profiles for different countries or regions;
- whether the POSIX National Profiles should be published as ISPs, and if so how they should be processed;
- the criteria to be satisfied for publication.

SGFS discussed the issues and the SGFS view has been stated in document SGFS N1180 (liaison statement to SC22/WG15). SGFS will bring these issues to the attention of JTC1/WG-DFS on de-facto standards (see liaison statement SGFS N1188 to JTC1/WG-DFS).

7.2 Application Programming Interfaces (API)

Document JTC1 N2965 "Guidelines for JTC1 API Standardization" was circulated as SGFS N1118. The Document was submitted to JTC1 National Bodies and Liaison Organizations for letter Ballot. JTC1 proposed that such a document can become a new permanent and maintainable document (e.g. as an Annex to the Directives) within JTC1.

The general feeling of the participants was that the SGFS is not the right place to discuss the technical content of N1118. APIs could be identified as possible parts of OSE profiles but the content of N1118 is now under letter ballot and NBLOs should respond.

Also document SGFS N1116 (=JTC1 N2948, JTC1 Secretariat Letter on API) was seen as basically a question to the National Bodies and not as a matter of SGFS.

Document SGFS N1120 (=JTC1 N2890, JTC1 Plenary Meeting Report of Ad Hoc Group B on API) was reviewed by the subgroup on TR10000-1 and -3 (see Annex B to these minutes)

7.3 ITU-T Liaison Statement requesting joint development of MHS base standards PICS proforma

SGFS received a request from ITU-T/SG7 (SGFS N1124) for the joint ITU-T/SGFS development of MHS base standard PICS proforma. The request was mainly addressed to the Workshops. Recently the Workshops are now in a position to contribute directly to ITU-T/SG7. Therefore a liaison statement to the workshops was approved (SGFS N1184) to highlight this fact and to encourage them to cooperate with ITU-T on this.

7.4 Request from SITA for Category A liaison with SGFS

In February 1994 a category B liaison was established between JTC1 and SITA (Airline Telecommunications and Information Services). Then SITA asked SGFS to extend the B liaisonship to SGFS (see SGFS N1139). Meanwhile, after the application of B liaison to SGFS, SITA did send an application for another kind of liaison with JTC1: the A liaison. The application was dedicated to specific JTC1 SC's including SGFS. Meanwhile the request to SGFS for B liaison was withdrawn by SITA. The JTC1 Secretariat asked the SCs concerned for preliminary recommendation of the A liaison before the next JTC1 meeting (see also SGFS N 1139). (Unfortunately, the request itself from SITA was not attached to the letter from the JTC1 Secretariat to SGFS). The result of all these correspondence was that all types of possible liaisons with SITA were considered. SGFS welcomed very much the collaboration with SITA. SGFS was strongly of the opinion that it must have strong working links with external organizations like SITA. The liaison statements to SITA (SGFS N1167) and to the JTC1 Secretariat (SGFS N1169) were approved.

7.5 Liaison statement from SC18 on the five-year periodic review of ISO/IEC 100021:1990 (MOTIS)

SC18 notified SGFS (SGFS N1141) that the standards ISO/IEC 10021:1990, Parts 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 will be withdrawn when the new second edition is published in 1995. SC18 raised a concern noting that several DISPs have recently been balloted or will shortly be balloted which contain normative references to these standards. Therefore it might be necessary to confirm the 1990 versions and keep them available in addition to the new second edition. SGFS considered that this issue is in fact a generic issue: base standards are being updated all time and ISPs could be out of step from base standards or reference obsolete base standards. Changes of the base standards could even make an ISP invalid. The workshops will be asked to monitor the workprogrammes of the SCs very accurately to ensure as good as possible that an ISP is uptodate in accordance with the base standards. SC18 was very kind to inform SGFS but no mechanism exists that the base standards committees automatically inform SGFS or the workshops about changes in their standards. A liaison statement to SC18 (SGFS N1170) and a liaison statement to the workshops (SGFS N1171) on these issues were approved.

8. SGFS working methods

o Publicity for SGFS work

It appeared to be almost impossible to produce a revised version of the Publicity document SGFS N1010 by a "normal" SGFS member. This means that the promised update in document SGFS N1097 was not yet available. The consideration that the document should be produced by a professional Public Relations person was unanimously supported. SGFS N1010 will be sent around by e-mail for suggestions.

o E-mail reflector

This service was warmly welcomed. It was seen as a very good addition to the regular distribution of documents. Documents for discussion among a small group can be made available very quickly to persons involved in the discussion on these documents. Again it was mentioned that an official SGFS document will be circulated by normal

mail.

9. Review and progression of SGFS procedures (SD-1)

In the first half of 1993 a new version of the SGFS procedures (SGFS N758) was submitted to the SGFS membership for review and comments. This version contained new text for inter-TC cooperation on mixed-TC profiles. The comments were reviewed during the SGFS 1993 Seoul meeting and the resulting document (SGFS N1001 = JTC1 N2690) was submitted to JTC1 for ballot. Comments were received from several NBLOs (SGFS N1109 = JTC1 N2874) and from ITU-T (SGFS N1123). These comments were discussed during this SGFS meeting in Cannes.

Meanwhile, the Seoul meeting already produced a new version of N1001, containing procedures for handling PTS, Object Identifiers and PAS. This document SGFS N1015 was sent to the SGFS membership for comments. The comments on SGFS N1015 were also discussed during this Cannes meeting. The results of the discussions on the comments on both SGFS N1001 and SGFS N1015 led to a new SGFS Standing Document SD-1 (dated 1994) on the procedures: SGFS N1179. The disposition of comments can be found in SGFS N1161.

A late contribution from EWOS was received on Regional Requirements (SGFS N1163). The issue was raised by the international Messaging ISP Group (MISG). SGFS understood, and agreed with, the desire of the Workshops to discourage the appearance of multiple regional or national standards. The participants also recognized the problems and sensitivities associated with character sets as exemplified in the EWOS contribution. After some discussions SGFS proposed a possible solution for this matter, as presented in a liaison statement to EWOS (SGFS N1168).

Finally it was decided that the SGFS Secretariat will remove the T-Table from SGFS Standing Document SD-4 (Directory of ISPs) and that he will produce a new SGFS Standing Document SD-8 "Proposed Taxonomy changes".

SGFS also approved

- the two possible interpretations of the concept of "ballot resolution meeting" in SD-1, clause 7.2 ("face-to-face" and "by correspondence"),
- Annex A to the Cooperative Agreement with ISO/TC46/SC4 (SGFS N1183)
- and the proposed liaison statement to BSI on the role of the National Bodies during the development and approval process of ISPs (SGFS N1176).

For more detailed information about the discussions on the SGFS procedures see Annex A of these minutes.

10. Publicly Available Specifications (PAS)

During its plenary meeting in Washington D.C., February 1994, JTC1 has established a "Working Group on De Facto Standards" (JTC1/WG-DFS). This working group should tackle the issue of PAS. During the JTC1 plenary an Ad Hoc meeting on this subject took place. For the report of this Ad Hoc meeting see SGFS N1119. The SGFS chair participated in that meeting. His personal view on the subject is presented in document SGFS N1146. SGFS discussed the PAS issue. The results of the discussions have been stated in a liaison statement to JTC1/WG-DFS (SGFS N1188).

11. TR 10000 parts 1 and 3, and OSE

The discussions on the 4th WDTR 10000-1.3 (SGFS N1022) and on the 3rd WDTR 10000-3 (SGFS N1024) were very fruitful. All contributions have been reviewed during the meeting by a subgroup. The result was a new version of both documents: a proposed DTR 10000-1.3 (SGFS N1178) and a proposed DTR 10000-3 (SGFS N1181). Both PDTRs will be sent out for SGFS Ballot before July 15th, 1994. After approval by SGFS the documents will be submitted to JTC1 for DTR ballot.

SGFS approved the timetable for progression of these documents as contained in SGFS N1177.

For more detailed information about the discussions on both documents see Annex B of these minutes.

12. Progression of DTR 10000-2.4

Document DTR 10000-2.4 (SGFS N1085 = JTC1 N2916) had been under JTC1 Ballot. The voting results were received as document JTC1 N3033 = SGFS N1164. During the meeting, on Wednesday, June 15th, 1994, a Ballot resolution meeting took place to resolve the comments.

All comments have been resolved successfully. The disposition of comments and the report of the ballot resolution meeting can be found in SGFS N1173.

The final text of TR 10000-2:1994 (SGFS N1172) will be sent to ISO/IEC ITTF for publication as a Technical Report of Type 3.

The three liaison statements SGFS N1174 (ODA/CGM), N1175 (checklist) and N1182 (MMS) have been approved.

13. Items for specific PDISP needing SGFS attention

No specific items.

13.1 Submission of FTAM PTSs

On Thursday afternoon, June 16th, 1994, Ms. Cl. Mahy, Manager of the EWOS Project Team 15 on FTAM PTSs, joined the SGFS meeting. She noted and clarified document SGFS N1157 containing input from EWOS on FTAM PTSs.

It appeared that EWOS produced texts for both FTAM PTS and ATS. In fact this should follow in a submission of the ATS to SC21 and a submission of the PTS to SGFS. However, it was uncertain whether the output of the EWOS Project Team can be easily split into a ATS part and a PTS part. The alternative approach is to submit the whole stack of documents to both SC21 and SGFS.

The result of the discussion was that SC21 will be asked

- what part of the EWOS deliverable (if any) is considered suitable for base standardization in SC21,
- whether SC21 is able to take action on such base standardization and
- what the timescales are for such a standardization effort.

The workshops are asked to send SGFS harmonization statements on the FTAM PTS/ATS. In general SGFS would like to encourage AOW, EWOS and OIW to submit to SGFS test specifications that are internationally harmonized and to provide, together with the submission of a specification, the related harmonization statements or explanatory material. Finally SGFS authorized the approval of the liaison statements to SC21 and the workshops on the FTAM PTS/ATS by correspondence (SGFS N1189 and N1190).

14. Resolved and Unresolved issues

The editor of the Issues List (SGFS N1023) will update the list based on the discussions held during this meeting.

15. Future Meeting Dates

The place of the Authorized Subgroup Meeting, December 5-9, 1994, has been changed. The meeting will be held in New Orleans, USA, and not in Berlin, Germany, as stated in the SGFS Meeting Schedule (SGFS Standing Document SD-6). The 11th SGFS Plenary Meeting, June 19-23, 1995, will be held in Berlin.

In case an Authorized Subgroup Meeting is needed in 1995, it will take place on November 27th to December 1st, 1995.

The date of the plenary in 1997 has been changed to June 23rd-27th and the tentative dates for the plenary in 1998 and 1999 have been added to the Meeting Schedule (SD-6).

16. Other Business

No other business.

17. Approval of Resolutions

All resolutions in document SGFS N1186 have been approved unanimously.

18. Closure of the meeting

The Chairman closed the meeting at 15.20 h. on Friday, June 17th, 1994, and thanked all the participants for their contributions.

Attendance List

Henry Lowe	USA
Bryan Wood	UK
Jeremy Tucker	EWOS
Werner Koch	DIN
Lutz Temme	DIN
Klaus Sondergaard	DS
Herbert Bertine	ITU-T SG 7
Joe Hungate	OIW
Fritz Schulz	USA
Clyde Robichaux	USA
Shozo Tanaka	JISC
Isabelle Valet-Harper	AFNOR
Willem Wakker	NNI
Peter Bessems	NNI
William Black	EWOS
Dave Rayner	EWOS
Marie-Martine Guillabert	AFNOR

ANNEX A
Report of the Subgroup Meeting on Procedures
During the 10th SGFS Plenary Meeting, June 13-17, 1994, Cannes, France

* SGFS Standing Document SD-1 on Procedures

In the first half of 1993 a new version of the SGFS procedures (SGFS N758) was submitted to the SGFS membership for review and comments. This version contained new text for inter-TC cooperation on mixed-TC profiles. The comments were reviewed during the SGFS 1993 Seoul meeting and the resulting document (SGFS N1001 = JTC1 N2690) was submitted to JTC1 for ballot. Comments were received from several NBLOs (SGFS N1109 = JTC1 N2874) and from ITU-T (SGFS N1123). These comments were discussed during this SGFS meeting in Cannes.

Meanwhile, the Seoul meeting already produced a new version of N1001, containing procedures for handling PTS, Object Identifiers and PAS. This document SGFS N1015 was sent to the SGFS membership for comments. The comments on SGFS N1015 were also discussed during this Cannes meeting. The results of the discussions on the comments on both SGFS N1001 and SGFS N1015 led to a new SGFS Standing Document SD-1 (dated 1994) on the procedures: SGFS N1179.

The disposition of comments can be found in SGFS N1161. It was decided to have one procedures document as output from this meeting. SGFS N1001, SGFS N1015 and the resolution of the comments on both documents are combined in SGFS N1179.

* DTR 10000-2.4

Document DTR 10000-2.4 (SGFS N1085 = JTC1 N2916) had been under JTC1 Ballot. The voting results were received as document JTC1 N3033 = SGFS N1164. All comments have been resolved successfully. The disposition of comments and the report of the ballot resolution meeting can be found in SGFS N1173. The final text of TR 10000-2:1994 (SGFS N1172) will be sent to ISO/IEC ITTF for publication as a Technical Report of Type 3. After the ballot had already started five additional taxonomy change proposals have been received:

- 1) MMS (SGFS N1108),
- 2) Character Sets (SGFS N1149),
- 3) FDI4 (TP use of Directory, SGFS N1187),
- 4) CGM (SGFS N1147) and
- 5) ODA (SGFS N1148).

On Character Sets also a pDISP has already been submitted to SGFS. The MMS pDISPs can be expected very soon. It was decided to incorporate the MMS, Character Sets and FDI4 taxonomy as informative annex in TR 10000-2:1994.

These taxonomies will be part of a "Combined Taxonomy/DISP Ballot" as referenced in the SGFS procedures, Clause 3.3.

Three liaison statements have been drafted:

- SGFS N1174 to the workshops on taxonomy change requests, specially dedicated to CGM (SGFS N1147) and ODA (SGFS N1148),
- SGFS N1175 to the workshops containing a checklist for submitting taxonomy change

- proposals, and
- SGFS N1182 to ISO/TC184 on the MMS taxonomy.

For more details information of the discussions and the disposition of comments see document SGFS N1173.

* Cooperative Agreements

In consultation with the JTC1 Secretariat it was decided to change the name "Memorandum of Agreement" (see SD-1) into "Cooperative Agreement" because the concept of Memorandum of Agreement is used within JTC1 for other kinds of agreements as it is used within SGFS.

The first Cooperative Agreement on mixed-TC profiles was an agreement between the JTC1 chair and the ISO/TC46 chair on the Library and Documentation profiles (SGFS N1158). They will sign the agreement soon.

The details on the cooperation between JTC1/SGFS and ISO/TC46/SC4 (Annex to the Cooperative Agreement N1158) was discussed by TC46 and now by SGFS. The result was approved as SGFS N1183. This annex will be signed by the SGFS chair and the TC46/SC4 chair.

* National Body Processing of DISP Ballots

Document SGFS N1162 was received from BSI on the role of the National Bodies during the development and approval process of ISPs. It was mentioned that the first opportunity for National Body comment is at the DISP ballot.

The UK contribution was welcomed and it was considered to be important that the key role played by NBs during the processing of profiles be made clear. There are differences indeed between the approval process within SGFS and the approval of standards within TCs of ISO and IEC. When a profile is submitted to JTC1, the role of JTC1 is not the same as its role in the processing of standards. The concept of S-Liaisons, the possibility of harmonized inputs from Regional Workshops and the direct participation of technical experts began as an exception within ISO and IEC. Specially dedicated to ISPs this approach is called after the place of the first meeting of SGFS "the spirit of Eindhoven".

A liaison statement to BSI was drafted (SGFS N1176) as response on this issue.

* Regional requirements in ISPs

A late contribution from EWOS was received on Regional Requirements (SGFS N1163). The issue was raised by the international Messaging ISP Group (MISG). The subgroup understood, and agreed with, the desire of the Workshops to discourage the appearance of multiple regional or national standards. The participants also recognized the problems and sensitivities associated with character sets as exemplified in the EWOS contribution.

After some considerations a possible solution was drafted for this matter, as presented in a liaison statement to EWOS (SGFS N1168).

* Liaison with SITA

The subgroup welcomed very much the collaboration with SITA and was strongly of the opinion that SGFS must have strong working links with external organizations like SITA.
History:

In February 1994 a category B liaison was established between JTC1 and SITA (Airline Telecommunications and Information Services). Then SITA asked SGFS to extend the B liaisonship to SGFS (see SGFS N1139).

Meanwhile, after the application of B liaison to SGFS, SITA did send an application for another kind of liaison with JTC1: the A liaison. The application was dedicated to specific JTC1 SC's including SGFS. Meanwhile the request to SGFS for B liaison was withdrawn by SITA. The JTC1 Secretariat asked the SCs concerned for preliminary recommendation of the A liaison before the next JTC1 meeting (see also SGFS N 1139). (Unfortunately, the request itself from SITA was not attached to the letter from the JTC1 Secretariat to SGFS). The result of all these correspondence was that all types of possible liaisons with SITA were considered.

A liaison statement to SITA (SGFS N1167) and a liaison statement to the JTC1 Secretariat (SGFS N1169) were drafted.

* Maintenance ISPs related to maintenance Base Standards (SC18 issue)

SC18 raised a concern noting that several MHS DISPs have recently been balloted or will shortly be balloted which contain normative references to base standards which will be revised in 1995.

The subgroup considered that this issue is in fact a generic issue: base standards are being updated all time and ISPs could be out of step from base standards or reference obsolete base standards. Changes of the base standards even could make an ISP invalid.

The workshops will be asked to monitor the workprogrammes of the SCs very accurately to ensure as good as possible that an ISP is uptodate in accordance with the base standards. SC18 was very kind to inform SGFS but no mechanism exists that the base standards committees automatically inform SGFS or the workshops about changes in their standards. A liaison statement to SC18 (SGFS N1170) and a liaison statement to the workshops (SGFS N1171) were drafted.

* Ballot resolution by correspondence

In accordance with the SGFS procedures (clause 7.2) a ballot resolution meeting has to be organized in case one or more negative votes have been received after a DISP Ballot. The last year it occurred several times that, based on the ballot results and before a Ballot Resolution Meeting was called, the editor of the ISP proposed a solution for the comments which resulted in a change of the negative votes into positive votes. The question arose whether a Ballot Resolution Meeting is necessary in those cases.

The subgroup proposed to give two different interpretations to the concept of "meeting": both a "face-to-face" meeting and a meeting by "correspondence". This means that in the future the ballot comments can be resolved by correspondence. The Editor should inform the SGFS secretariat with a statement that the negative votes have been changed into positive votes without objections of other countries.

* New SGFS Standing Document SD-8

The subgroup agreed with the proposal submitted by AFNOR to remove the T-Table from SGFS SD-4 (Directory of ISPs) and to establish a new SGFS Standing Document SD-8 containing proposed taxonomy changes. (see AFNOR contribution SGFS N1109, Att.1, item 5)

ANNEX B

Source: Subgroup on TR 10000 Parts 1 and 3, SGFS meeting, 13-17 June 1994, Cannes, France.

The meeting began at 9.00 on 14 June 1994

1. Attendees

Willie Black	EWOS	Chair
Joe Hungate	OIW	
Henry Lowe	ANSI	
Fritz Schultz	ANSI	Editor,
Shozo Tanaka	Japan	
Lutz Temme	DIN	
Jeremy Tucker	EWOS	
Willem Wakker	NNI	Editor,
Bryan Wood	UK	
Dave Rayner	EWOS	

2. Documents

SGFS N1022

Working Draft 4 of ISO/IEC/TR 10000-1.3, Framework and Taxonomy of International Standardized Profiles - Part 1: General Principles and Framework.

- N1024 Working Draft 4 of ISO/IEC/TR 10000-1.3, Framework and Taxonomy of International Standardized Profiles - Part 3: Principles and Taxonomy for Open System Environment Profiles.
- N1075 Liaison from EWOS on the need to allow more than one profile to be specified in an ISP part.
- N1082 Contribution from SC21/WG7 - A discussion of the relationship between ODP and OSE Profiling.
- N1089 White paper on OSE profiling concepts. SGFS
- N1114 UK position on the progression of TR 10000 to cover ISPs for OSE profiles.
- N1115 Liaison Statement on ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N1022 (TR 10000 part 1) and ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N1024 (TR 10000 part 3). OIW
- N1117 EWOS comments on Regional Workshop proposal on TR 10000 (SGFS N1115)
- N1120 JTC1 Plenary Meeting Report of Ad Hoc Group B on Application Program

Interfaces (= JTC1 N2890).

- N1128 Liaison Statement from WFMTUG on PAS
- N1130 ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG15 Liaison Statement to JTC1/SGFS on APIs.
- N1131 ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG15 Liaison Statement to JTC1/SGFS in Response to SGFS N1081
- N1132 ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG15 Liaison Statement to JTC1/SC21 and JTC1/SGFS on harmonising Conformance Testing Methodology.
- N1133 German position on the Progression of TR 10000 and OSE profiles.
- N1135 US comments on White Paper on OSE Profiling concepts (as documented in SGFS N1089), WDTR 10000-1.3 (as documented in ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N1022) and WDTR 10000-3 (as documented in ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N1024).
- N1136 US comments on SGFS N1114
- N1137 US comments on SGFS N1117
- N1138 US Submission of Expert Paper
- N1140 NNI contribution to SGFS on progression of TR 10000.
- N1143 AFNOR comments on ISO/IEC JTC/SGFS document N1117 – EWOS comments on regional workshop proposals on TR 10000.
- N1159 UK position on SGFS N1115, Liaison statement on ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N1022 (TR 10000 part 1) and ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N1024 (TR 10000 part 3).

3. Discussion

3.1 Preliminary review

3.1.1 The input documents were briefly reviewed in order to establish the main issues raised. The main issues from this review were:

- N1114 had been directed at the Joint Workshop Meeting that resulted in N1115. It was superseded by N1159.
- N1115 contained detailed proposals for the progression of N1022 and N1024 generated from a joint meeting of the Regional Workshops hosted by OIW.
- N1117 supported the proposals in N1115 but had additional proposals in relation to the discussion of the types of interface, the relation with ODP, the taxonomy and conformance.

- N1131 was concerned with POSIX profiling and was not directly related to the progression of N1022 and N1024.
- N1133 was supportive of N1115 and N1117 except for a concern on one aspect of the taxonomy, but it stressed the urgent need for progress.
- N1135 contained detailed proposals for the progression on N1022 and N1024 that supplemented the comments in N1115.
- N1137 supplemented N1135 with support for N1115 and comments on N1117.
- N1138 addressed conformance issues in N1022 from the perspective of JTC1/SC22/WG15 (POSIX)
- N1140 supported the proposals in N1115 and N1117
- N1143 raised concerns about the status of contributions from the Regional Workshops and about the fact that, in AFNOR's view, the direction of development did not appear to build on previous SGFS work. It urged a pragmatic approach and raised specific concerns on the taxonomy proposals in N1115.
- N1159 supported N1115 but expressed specific concerns on the discussion of the types of interface and the relation to ODP. It supported N1117 on these issues

3.1.2 It was agreed to start by working through the detailed comments in N1115 and N1135. Comments for which editing instructions could not be agreed immediately were deferred for detailed discussion together with any related contributions. The following issues list was generated:

1. Conformance

N1115: Part 1 - items 11 and 21; Part 3 - item 20
 N1117
 N1128
 N1135: Part 3 - items 27-29; Part 3 - item 23
 N1138

2. Proposals for Part 3, clause 6.1 (Discussion of types of interface and ODP relationship)

N1115: Part 3 - item 19
 N1117
 N1120
 N1130
 N1133
 N1135: Part 3 - item 22
 N1137
 N1140
 N1159

3. Definitions of OSE profile and OSI profile N1115: Part 1 - item 9

N1117
N1137

4. Taxonomy N1115: Part 3 - items 21 and 22
N1117
N1133
N1135: Part 3 - item 24
N1137
N1143
N1159

5. Registration N1115: Part 1 - item 18
N1135: Part 1 - items 23-24

6. Review of definitions
N1135: Part 1 - items 8-17; Part 3 - items 2, 8-13.

3.2 Issue 1 - Conformance

3.2.1 Initial discussion established guidelines for the revision of the conformance text in N1022.

3.2.2 It was agreed that the text should be revised to remove OSI oriented terminology and to avoid the need to introduce special terms. Only the term "implementation conformance statement" should be retained and the definition should have a note which interpreted the term in the POSIX and OSI contexts.

3.2.3 Proposals for Part 2 were prepared as Cannes 9. After review and agreement of these proposals there was discussion of N1024 revisions. It was agreed that only a single short clause "Conformance to an OSE profile" was now required in Part 3. This should refer back to the Part 1 discussion, identify the application of ISO/IEC DIS 13210 for APIs and of ISO/IEC 9646 for CSIs, proposes relevant use of concepts and terminology from these documents for HCIs and ISIs and the need for further study on a unified approach. Text was prepared and agreed as Cannes 9 revised.

3.3 Issue 2: Proposals for N1024, clause 6.1 (Discussion of types of interface and ODP relationship)

3.3.1 The base text for discussion of changes was taken as that proposed in N1115: Part 3 - item 19. In relation to this text the positions in the other contributions were:

- N1117:

- a) there is a need to clarify what is meant by "the scope of the interfaces is generalised to be architecturally neutral";
- b) the four interface types can be shown to correspond to the ODP reference points by reference to relevant definitions.
Two alternatives to resolving these issues are proposed. The second offers a set of definitions to be identified as interpretations of the definitions from PDTR 14252 referenced in N1115.

- N1120: makes statements on the nature of APIs and the text should be consistent with this.
- N1130: stated a requirement to generalise the interpretation of the API definition.
- N1140: supported N1117 with a preference for the second alternative.
- N1136: supported the text in N1115 and opposed the proposals in N1117.
- N1159: strongly supported the second alternative in N1117.

3.3.2 Initial discussion clarified the National Body and Workshop positions. In summary, the differences related to two fundamental issues:

- * The meaning of the term architecturally neutral. One position was that this related to the fact that the interpretations of the definitions of the types of interface should be implementation independent. The other position was that the interpretations should be reference model independent.
- * The purpose of the Part 3 One position was that the purpose was to facilitate the development of POSIX OSE profiles. The other position was that it should facilitate the development of profiles related to some subset of the interface types defined - including POSIX profiles.

3.3.3 Further discussion led to a revision to 6.1 on which agreement was reached. This agreement had two main elements:

- * Interpretations of the definitions of types of interface in PDTR 14252 would be provided as in line text in 6.1, based on N1117, alternative 2, and N1130.
- * The text on ODP reference points would be modified to say that the interfaces "can be interpreted as corresponding to" the ODP reference points.

As part of the agreement, a definition of "system" was provided for Part 1.

The agreed text was provided in Cannes 27

3.4 Issue 3: Definitions of OSE profile and OSI profile

3.4.1 N1117 proposed definitions for OSE profile and OSI profile for incorporation in TR 10000-3. N1137 took the position that

- * there was not a need for an OSE profile definition;
- * the OSI profile definition did not state the purpose of such profiles and that any definition should be in Part 2.

3.4.2 It was agreed that:

- * A revised version of the OSE profile definition that satisfied the US concerns in N1137 should be incorporated in Part 3.

- * The proposed text for OSI profile should be placed temporarily in Part 3 with Note that it was intended that it should be moved to Part 2. Comments should be invited from National Bodies and SC21 to provide a fuller definition.

3.4.3 A statement on the definition of OSI profile was drafted for circulation to National Bodies and Liaison Organizations (Cannes 16).

3.5 Issue 4: Taxonomy

3.5.1 N1117 provided some editorial changes and clarifications to the text proposed on taxonomy in N 1115. After some further editorial modifications the text from N1117 was agreed for incorporation in Part 1. The text was provided in Cannes 27.

3.5.2 The DIN comment in N1133 (on the identifiers for profiles that incorporated other profiles) was satisfied by allowing such incorporation to be indicated as part of the taxonomy entry, but not as part of the profile identifier.

3.5.3 In the case of the AFNOR comment in N1143, the meeting recognised the concerns expressed and, in particular, that it was likely that a catalogue document would be required. Nevertheless, it felt that a classification scheme was necessary for the current document, that the proposed scheme would be helpful, and that, in the absence of alternatives, it should be incorporated.

3.6 Issue 5: Registration

3.6.1 After review of the current text on registration in Part 1, 6.2, it was agreed that

- * there was, at this time, no general statements on registration to be made in Part 1;
- * the existing text was OSI specific and should be moved to Part 2;
- * until action can be taken to move the text to Part 2, it should be retained in Part 1 with a Note indicating the intention that it shall be moved.

3.6.2 The existing Editor's Notes should be retained for the PDTR review - with the indication that the text will be retained (and, hence the Editor's Notes deleted) in the absence of NB comment.

3.7 Issue 6: Review of definitions

The definitions were reviewed in the light of changes agreed and of US comments on definitions that were outstanding. The outstanding concerns from N1135 had been resolved. The following additional changes were made:

- * In Part 3 there should be reference to PDTR 14252 for all terms used that are defined in that document (OSE, API, HCI, ISI, CSI, interoperability, application platform etc.). At present, the definitions should be included in the Part 3 text with a Note that they will be removed when the PDTR is approved. Because of

the issue of interpretation, the definitions for the four types of interface should be given with a reference forward to clause 6.1.

- * In Part 3 there should be reference to the definitions of the ODP reference points in DIS 10746-2

3.8 Other issues

3.8.1 N1135: Part 1 - item 33 and 34 on the use of object identifiers for profiles was agreed.

3.8.2 An outstanding DIN comment (in SGFS N1069), on the deletion of "Homogeneous or heterogeneous" in Part 3, 5.1.2 and 5.1.4 was agreed.

3.9 Progression

The Editors were requested to prepare draft text for the closing Plenary.

The meeting was closed at 6.00 on 16 June 1994