



doc. nr. ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 582	
date 1992-05-29	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

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS  
Title: ISO/IEC JTC 1 Special Group on Functional  
Standardization  
  
Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

Title : AFNOR position on ISO/IEC SGFS N439, SGFS Subgroup  
Issues List  
  
Source : AFNOR  
  
Status : for discussion during the SGFS Plenary Meeting,  
June 15 - 19, 1992, Washington DC, USA  
  
Note :

association  
française  
de normalisation

Tour Europe - Cedex 7  
92049 Paris La Défense

Tél. : (1) 42 91 55 55  
Télex : AFNOR 611 974 F  
Télécopie : (1) 42 91 56 56

Liaison directe.

TITLE : AFNOR POSITION ON ISO/IEC SGFS N 439, SGFS Subgroup Issues List  
SOURCE : AFNOR

Issue 1:

OSE represents the whole of Open Systems Environment. AEP seems more specific and refers to Application profiles. OSE should be used as generic term in TR10000-1.3

Issue 2:

A profile should NOT be allowed to define new functionality. If a profile, identified in the taxonomy, has got "holes" that are not defined elsewhere, it should not exist until the holes are filled (either by base standards or by Public domain specifications, see Issue 3). If a subset of the profile, without the missing part, makes sense, it should get a new entry in the taxonomy and be developed separately.

Issue 3:

Doc ISO/IEC SGFS N439 Issue 3 (gaps):

When there is a "gap" in the definition of a profile, for which there is no base standard available, but where public domain specification (PDS) exists that could fill this gap, it is permitted to refer to the public domain specification with the following provisions:

- 1- The proposed PDS shall be in the public domain.

Note : AFNOR has not come with a complete definition of what "public domain" means for a specification. Clearly one condition is that the specification must be publicly available and free of charge. Other conditions have to be defined. A document circulated by OIW (Ref xxxxxx) would be a good starting point for completing this clause.

- 2- Measures should be taken to ensure that the adoption of the PDS in a profile will not jeopardize the future development of Base standards on the subject. To this effect, the following steps should be taken:

. Reference to a PDS should not be made when the base standard that will fill the gap is under development (unless it is a very early stage and it is foreseen that its completion will take a long time).

. If base standard is not under development, a liaison should be sent by SGFS to the relevant standards body (SC, TC) if identified, stating the need for base standard in the area and encouraging the standards body to start work on the subject. A copy of the PDS should be appended to the liaison. The relevant standards body should then inform SGFS of the progress of standardization in the area, and of its completion.

. ISPs that contain profiles which reference PDS should be revised as soon as a base standard emerges (ie reached DIS stage) in the area covered by the PDS, and the reference to base standard, if adequate, must replace the previous reference to the PDS in the same ISP. SGFS should initiate the revision.

Issue 4:

This seems to be more a problem of conformance. When conformance clause is not clearly stated for a standard, the profiling of this standard becomes more difficult and the subsetting of base standards has no guiding principle. See Issue 7

Issue 5:

OK



Issue 6:

We do not believe that the definition of base standard should be changed. In particular the definition of base standard should not be made recursive and a profile is NOT a base standard. On the other hand, the definition of profile should be recursive in order to allow a profile of profiles. It should be changed accordingly.

Issue 7:

We believe this is an issue on Conformance, and not on conformance testing.

A clear conformance clause is of great help in profiling a standard, since it provides the definition of minimal content of a profile. (ie what is mandatory in the base standard), as well as an inventory of what is optional.

In any case, the profiling of a base standard is an exercise in defining what subsets are meaningful and best suited for resulting in successful products. It is a difficult exercise that must be done in close liaison with the USERS.

Issue 8:

It may well happen that in some cases, subsetting the base standard will result in having a small (or maybe even non-existent) "mandatory" core set of features. This should not be a problem in itself, as long as the profiles make sense from the point of view of user needs.

Issue 9:

In the case described in this issue (profile of profiles referencing the same standard), the requirements placed by two profiles on the same base standard will add (in the sense of a logical AND), the maximum result being the base standard itself. There is no problem here, EXCEPT if any of the profiles excludes features that are made either optional or mandatory by the other profile. This seems a very good reason for NOT USING the exclusion of protocol features when defining a profile.

Issue 10:

Closed

Issue 11:

Closed

Issue 12:

AFNOR contribution SGFS N5xx makes a different proposal on the structure of TR10000 taxonomy. We do not believe that this issue is closed and we would like to reconsider it.

Issue 13:

AFNOR could not recall the meaning of the issue