



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 592	
date	1992-08-12	total pages
item nr.		supersedes document

**Secretariat:** Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)  
Kalffjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059  
2600 GB Delft  
Netherlands  
telephone: + 31 15 680390  
telefax: + 31-15 680190  
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 : Relationship between ISPs and the OSI taxonomy  
Source : USA  
Status : US contribution to SGFS  
Note :

The U.S. has determined during its discussions on its ballot of TR10000-1.2 that there is a very basic underlying difference of understanding on the relationship between ISPs and the OSI taxonomy (see note on page 8, lines 18-20 and U.S. ballot comment #5, attached). The U.S. believes that multiple ISPs can and will be written, and approved for many points in the OSI taxonomy. This is inevitable because requirements vary depending upon use; therefore, selected options may vary. To require a single profile would require it to satisfy all of these varying requirements, resulting in allowing all permitted options. This is not useful. The purpose of ISPs is to identify specific options to enhance interoperability.

There are additional concerns reflected in the ISP approval process. If only one ISP is permitted per taxonomy point then the ballot process would require an analysis and judgement as to whether that particular ISP is the "best" one for that taxonomy point. Otherwise, we would be faced with a simple "horse race", where the first (most hurried and probably, as a consequence, the poorest) ISP would be selected. If such a judgement aspect were introduced into the balloting process, the balloting process itself must be modified. In addition, additional delay in accepting any ISP for a taxonomy point could be significant, awaiting "a better solution". The U.S. does not believe that any of these unavoidable consequences are acceptable.

Lastly, the U.S. is currently unsure that a single AEP taxonomy is possible and/or desirable. Under these circumstances, the "one ISP per taxonomy point" criteria is meaningless.

The U.S. requests that SGFS place this item on its agenda for its June 1992 meeting. Resolution of this issue can not be accomplished by the TR10000-1.2 editing meeting. The editing meeting can only refer this issue back to SGFS, wasting considerable time. If this issue can be resolved, the editing group can be directed as to their action, without further delay.