Title: Liaison statement to the Workshops on CGM F-profile identifiers

Source: SGFS Plenary Meeting, Berlin, 19-23 June 1995

In response to a UK request, SGFS reconsidered the proposals for CGM F-profile identifiers that were made in a taxonomy request submitted to its December 1995 meeting, namely for

FCG BST to replace FCG 11
FCG ASTto replace FCG 23
FCG BSV to replace FCG 32
FCG APVto replace FCG 33.

For the reasons set out below, SGFS has decided to retain the numeric identifiers for the profiles but, in order to accommodate the concerns behind the request at least partially, will include the proposed profile names BST etc. as additional comment in TR 10000-2 and would see no objection to the use of the names "BST profile"(or something similar) in informal contexts. Also it is noted that since there is no substructure proposed for the CGM profiles, there is no need to use the 2 digit numeric string, and a single digit (FCG1, FCG2, FCG3 and FCG4) could be used equally well.

However at this point in time, the formal profile identifiers remain FCG 11, FCG 23, FCG 32 and FCG 33. The rationale for this position is as follows.

1   For consistency, SGFS does not wish to allow a form for OSI F-profile that is inconsistent with TR 10000-3.

2   SGFS had previously considered whether to allow alphanumeric strings in this position, and decided not to in order to avoid the need to define rules for delimiting the root mnemonic and the alphanumeric string.

3   SGFS considers that using a numeric string to *identify* a profile, as opposed to an alpha string to *name* it, supports hierarchic structuring of the taxonomy and is more flexible in supporting extensions.

4   Further, in order to simplify presentation and understanding of the taxonomy, SGFS wishes to keep a simple and consistent structure.