



doc. nr. ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 92	
date 1989-05-23	total pages 4
Item nr.	supersedes document

Secretariat: Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)
 Kalffjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059
 2600 GB Delft
 Netherlands

telephone: + 31 15 690390
 telefax: + 31 15 690190
 telex: 38144 nni nl
 telegrams: Normalisatie Delft

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS
 Title: ISO/IEC JTC 1 Special Group on Functional
 Standardization

Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

REPORT OF THE FSTG AND SGFS MEETINGS IN COPENHAGEN
1989-01-30 - 1989-02-03

受付
 1.6.05
 標準化委員会
 規程調査

FSTG

Monday, January 30

The FSTG meeting was opened by its convenor, mr. J. Tucker. Mr. H.J. Reuss, on behalf of the Danish host (Dansk Standardiseringsraad) welcomed the delegates. Documents SGFS N 68-83, 85-88, 94-96 were distributed. It was decided to have PDTR 1000 Part 2 on Procedures discussed in parallel to other FSTG topics and not to wait with resolving of comments until the start of the SGFS meeting.

The various members presented the main points of their comments on parts 1-4. SGFS N 82 gives a summary of the voting results on part 3 (Taxonomy of profiles). The editor (mr. Hartmann) had already prepared a first disposition of these comments. Two fundamental questions remained:

- 1) which amount of improvement is necessary.
- 2) which level of ballot is required for the first issue and for the subsequent (updating) versions?

The editor considered it quite feasible to accomodate the comments received in a satisfactory way. Concerning the balloting, it was decided that changes in part 3 should be "batched" and then go for JTC 1 ballot, at least if any major updating was considered necessary. The "batching" should always take place at SGFS/FSTG meetings with about 9-12 months intervals.

The ISO/IEC Central Secretariat has no objections to yearly datings.

The main questions on PDTR part 4 were: what type of document is best suited to this type of content and what level of approval is necessary for that document? It was decided that after the amendments proposed by DK and UK part 4 was but a simple directory of ISP's and profiles contained therein. Therefore, it will be published as an SGFS secretariat document. Balloting of such material is not needed and, in fact, impractical. This document will be numbered SGFS N 100 (revision 1, revision 2 etc). The SGFS secretariat is responsible for updating and distribution. Mr. Hartmann, the editor of part 4, remains responsible for the first version. Accomodation of the comments received (doc. SGFS N 83) was done after the decision that the material should no longer be a part of TR 10000.

Mr. Gibbon, (editor) presented his views (documents SGFS N 63, 68, 69, 70) on the way to advance part 2 (Procedures). It was agreed that this material, too, should no longer remain a part of TR 10000 but in stead should be submitted as a separate document for JTC 1 ballot, together with the remaining two TR 10000 parts. In editing the procedures document on the basis of the comments received, mr. Gibbon proposed that the paper was to be revised as one document, but identifying three types of material contained in it: guidance to ISP originators, rules for the division of work and responsibilities between SGFS and FSTG, and material that will be incorporated into the JTC 1 on Procedures. This proposal was accepted.

Tuesday, January 3 and Wednesday, February 1

One FSTG subgroup considered conformance and ISPCS issues. The SC 21 liaison officer on the subject, mr. D. Rayner, explained the SC 21 position, which is still under study. However, there are ISP proposals forthcoming and we cannot afford to let them wait. It was decided to come back to the matter in the part 1 editing group. Also the subject of multipart ISP's was considered. It was agreed as a principle that a part should never contain more than one profile. If more profiles are allowed, each one should go into a separate part (of one page, or even one line) that only needs to describe the difference with the "main" profile.

In the course of the work in subgroups for Part 1, and Parts 3 and 4, the following new documents were considered (see document list SGFS N 128): SGFS N 97-99 and 101-107; the results of the discussions have been documented in SGFS N 109-114, 116-123.

SGFS

On Thursday February 2, mr. Van den Beld opened the SGFS meeting and welcomed the delegates. A drafting committee consisting of Mrs. Cerny, Mr. Hathway and Mrs. Valet was appointed. A proposal by the secretary was accepted, to the effect that the activities and results of all FSTG and SGFS meetings would be documented in the form of a short informal report. After approval by both the chairman of the SGFS and the convenor of the FSTG the report will be distributed to all SGFS and FSTG parties for information, in addition to the formal resolutions and other outcomes of the meetings. If any member wishes to have a discussion, point of view or result of the meeting explicitly reported, the secretary will see to it that it is included in the report. E.g., the voting of national body members in a meeting shall always be clearly documented.

The agenda of the SGFS meeting was then adopted with the following changes:

5. Report of the Part 3 & 4 FSTG subgroup, with recommendations on the progressing of these texts;
6. Report of the (former) Part 2 FSTG subgroup, with recommendations on the progressing of this text;
7. Report of the Part 1 FSTG subgroup, with recommendations on the progressing of the text.

Ad 5) The convenor of the (former) Part 3 & 4 subgroup, mr. Aschenbrenner, made the following recommendations on behalf of this subgroup:

- the former Part 3 goes for DTR ballot in conformity with resolution 4 of SGFS N 124;
- several liaison statements have been drafted, as well as a disposition of comments (SGFS N 116) and instructions to the editor (SGFS N 117) of the former Part 3;

- the question how ISP-proposals (partly) outside the JTC 1 field are to be handled in the taxonomy, remains a difficult one - SGFS N 123 proposes two possibilities (see SGFS N 124 resolution no. 19);
- the former Part 4 is progressed according to resolutions no. 8, 9 and 10 of SGFS N 124;
- a disposition of comments (SGFS N 118) and instructions to the editor of the former Part 4 (SGFS N 119) have been drafted;
- messrs. Hartmann and Van den Beld are requested to write an "awareness" paper on the handling of ISP's and have that distributed among SGFS members for comment;
- the first version of the former Part 4 remain under the responsibility of the present editor (mr. Hartmann); future revisions will be handled by the SGFS secretariat and not be subjected to balloting.

All drafts and recommendations of this subgroup were approved by the SGFS.

Ad 6) Mr. Gibbon, editor of the former Part 2 and convenor of the Part 2 subgroup, on behalf of this group made the following recommendations:

- an interim editor's report has been prepared (temporary document no. K 26), to be read in conjunction with SGFS N 68 and to be followed by a final editor's report SGFS N 89. K 26 gives a number of recommendations that are expected to solve many issues documented in SGFS N 68. However, three questions remained and were now for the SGFS to decide:
 1. Options for PDISP review cycle length (temporary document K 28): should this period be extended to 3 or 4 months or remain as described in SGFS N 70 clause 6.2?
 2. The description of national body balloting criteria: should this be retained (or reformulated) or be deleted?
 3. How closely involved should the JTC 1 SC's be in the review process and should the review groups be composed of experts only or a mixture of experts and representatives (e.g. of national bodies)?
- a preliminary revised version of the procedures text (temporary doc. no. K 27) has been prepared by the editor and the subgroup;
- recommendations concerning the editing and progressing of the text are documented in SGFS N 124 resolutions nos. 2, 3 and 20.

These recommendations were approved by the SGFS, which voted as follows on the three remaining issues:

A - extension of review cycle length (to 3 or 4 months)?

Yes : France

Abstain: —

No : Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany F.R., Japan, Korea, Netherlands, UK, US.

The French arguments were that

1. the quality of the review may well suffer if the review period is kept as short as 1-2 months, and
2. in the case of ISP proposals there is no equivalent to the work item ballot usual with the normal TC or SC work. However, the majority of the members were of the opinion documented in SGFS N 93.

B - delete national body balloting criteria?

Yes : Canada, Denmark, Germany F.R., Netherlands, UK, US

Abstain: Belgium, Korea

No : France, Japan

C - experts only in review group?

Yes : Belgium, Denmark, Germany F.R., Japan, Korea, Netherlands, UK
 Abstain: Canada, US
 No : France

Ad 7) Mr. Lloyd, editor of TR 10000 part 1 (Taxonomy Framework), reported on behalf of the Part 1 subgroup:

- a disposition of comments (SGFS N 113) and a draft revision of the text (SGFS N 109 & 110) have been prepared, as well as several liaison statements (SGFS N 111, 112, 114);
- on the progressing of Part 1 several resolutions have been drafted. (SGFS N 124 resolutions 12, 13).

All drafts and recommendations of this subgroup also were approved by the SGFS.

Remainder of SGFS meeting

Firstly, the resolutions documented in SGFS N 124 were approved, with amendments and corrections.

Next came the constitution of the review teams for the four draft ISP's expected in 1989. Proposals have been received already from AFNOR, BSI, JTC 1 SC 6 and SC 21, COS and OSITOP. It was decided to work with one review convenor for the whole review process, one review group leader (to be nominated by the group itself) per group and one contact point per organization involved (SC 21 - mr. Aschenbrenner, CCITT - mr. Bertine, COS - mrs. Haropulos). As for the review convenor, mr. Van den Beld was considered the natural choice for the present stage of the work. Mr. Van den Beld accepted the responsibility to make practical arrangements for the four ISP review groups needed in 1989. Meanwhile, two actions were considered necessary:

- It should be made clear to the member bodies what is expected from review group members and how the review process works. Mrs. Haropulos on behalf of COS offered to produce a draft informative paper on this subject in the course of March 1989, which would be presented to messrs. Van den Beld and Tucker for confirmation and then be distributed among the members and other interested organizations.
- Also all members should try and come up with suitable candidates for the position of review convenor and for review group members.

Thirdly, responses to liaison statements and other documents received from various parties were considered and approved (a.o. SGFS N 120 in reply to SC 21 N 3380) as well as the final text of the 25 resolutions in document SGFS N 124.

Fourthly, the request received from Eusidic for a membership of the SGFS was considered. More information on the exact nature of Eusidic's activities is needed in order to decide on this matter; mr. Smith (Central Secretariat) promised to obtain further information on Eusidic's work.

Finally, concerning the next SGFS/FSTG meetings the following preliminary decisions were reached:

In 1989: the week starting November 27, at a location in the US (San Diego?) and with COS as our host.

In 1990: the week following the SC 21 meeting in June 1990 in Seoul, Korea; this is the week of 11 to 15 June, 1990.

An offer was also received from DIN (mr. Sessler) to meet in Berlin.

All items of the SGFS agenda having been dealt with, the chairman, after having thanked the delegates for their very fruitful work and the Danish hosts for their efficiency and hospitality, closed the meeting.