



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 732	
date	1992-12-04	total pages
item nr.	supersedes document	

<b>Secretariat:</b>	<b>Nederlands Normalisatie-Instituut (NNI)</b>
	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 : Summary of Voting on Document JTC1 N2066 "DTR10000-2.3(E) - Information Technology - Framework and Taxonomy of International Standardized Profiles Part 2: Taxonomy of OSI Profiles (doc. JTC1 N2262)
- Source : ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS Secretariat
- Status : For discussion during the SGFS Ballot Resolution Meeting, during the SGFS Authorized Subgroup Meeting, 8-11 December 1992, London
- Note :



**ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 2262****Date: 1992-12-03**

**ISO/IEC JTC 1  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY  
Secretariat: USA (ANSI)**

**TITLE:** Summary of Voting on Document JTC 1 N 2066 "DTR 10000-2.3(E) - Information Technology - Framework and Taxonomy of International Standardized Profiles - Part 2: Taxonomy of OSI Profiles"

**SOURCE:** Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1

**PROJECT:** JTC 1/SGFS

**STATUS:** The results of this ballot are forwarded to the SGFS for review and resolution.

**REQUESTED ACTION:** The SGFS is instructed to prepare (1) a revised text, (2) a disposition of comments report and (3) a recommendation to JTC 1 on further progression of this document.

**DISTRIBUTION:** P and L Members  
SGFS Secretariat

## Voting Summary of JTC 1 N 2066

	Approve	Approve with Cmts	Disapprove	Abstain	Comments
Australia					
Austria *	X				
Belgium *		X			ATTACHMENT 1
Brazil *					
Canada *					
China					
Cuba					
Denmark *			X		ATTACHMENT 2
Egypt					
Finland	X				
France *		X			ATTACHMENT 3
Germany *			X		ATTACHMENT 4
Hungary	X				
India					
Ireland	X				
Italy	X				
Japan *		X			ATTACHMENT 5
Korea, Republic of *					
Netherlands *		X			ATTACHMENT 6
Norway	X				
Russian Federation					
Sweden *					
Switzerland					
United Kingdom *		X			ATTACHMENT 7
USA *			X		ATTACHMENT 8



ATTACHMENT 1  
TO JTC 1 N 2262

Comments to accompany the Belgian positive vote on ISO/IEC DTR10000-2.3 (JTC1 N2066)

## Editorial comments

Contents: move last line of page i to the top of page ii

Clause 1, par. 5, last sentence: change to: "... following procedures elaborated by SGFS".

## Clause 2:

add dates as follows: ISO/IEC 8613: 1989, ISO/IEC 9506: 1990, ISO/IEC 10021: 1990

update publication dates (publication expected in 1992):

- ISO/IEC 8073: 1988 and ISO/IEC: 1988/Add.2: 1989 to be replaced by ISO/IEC 8073: 1992

- ISO/IEC TR10000-1: 1990 to become TR10000-1: 1992; footnote to be deleted

- ISO/IEC 10028: - to become ISO/IEC 10028: 1992; footnote to be deleted

Clause 3: profile identifiers should not be considered as abbreviations. It is proposed to retitile Clause 3 "Abbreviations and Profile Identifiers",  
Clause 3.1 "Abbreviations",  
Clause 3.2 "Profile Identifiers".

Clause 4.5.3.1, par.4: change end of sentence to: "... standards prepared by JTC1"

Clause 4.5.4.1: change end of sentence to: "... defined in standards prepared by JTC1".

Reason: mentioning subcommittees does not add any useful information and would require a description of those subcommittees.

## Other comment

Serious concerns were expressed at the SGFS meeting in Washington on the proposed new taxonomy for POD profiles. At the present time, the Belgian member body considers that this new taxonomy is not suitable for inclusion in this edition of TR 10000-2. Therefore, Belgium would revert its positive vote to negative if the said new POD taxonomy would be included without a fully acceptable justification.

ATTACHMENT 2  
to JTC 1 N 2262

Danish response on DTR 10000-2.3 ballot:

The Danish ballot response on DTR 10000-2.3 is 'No' with the following comment:

Denmark considers allocation of the M-identifier (or any other identifier) for managed objects in profiles to be premature. The implications of assigning such taxonomy attributes are not sufficiently well understood at this time.

For example, allocation of the M-identifier raises questions on how this identifier interacts with other attribute identifiers that may also be needed for existing profiles, e.g. attributes for security, routing, portability, etc.

Denmark believes that technical work on managed objects for existing profiles (e.g. TA51) can proceed without allocating further taxonomy identifiers.

Denmark will revert its vote to 'Yes' if the managed object attribute identifier is removed from DTR 10000-2.3.

Attachment 3  
to JTC 1 N 2262

### AFNOR COMMENTS ON DTR 10000-2.3

#### COMMENT 1

Qualifier: Major  
Section : 4.5.x (see also DDC SGFS/N 620)  
Rationale :

- 1- These are not principles, but simply an introduction of the issues around profiling
- 2- These introductory texts are useful, but by no means mandatory
- 3- AFNOR cannot vote on texts that are not available together with the document under ballot. Placeholder for these texts should be removed for the time being. The full texts will be welcome in a further edition of TR 10000-2.

PROPOSAL : - Rename all sections entitled "principles..." to read "Introduction to..."

- Remove all sections that are "to be supplied", ie 4.5.1.6.x, 4.5.3.4.1, 4.5.3.4.3, 4.5.3.4.4, 4.5.3.4.5, 4.5.3.4.7, 4.5.3.4.9, 4.5.4.3.2, 4.5.4.3.3.

#### COMMENT 2

Qualifier : Major  
Section : 4.2 (see also SGFS/ N 615)  
Rationale:

#### PROPOSAL :

- The question is much larger than the problem of managed objects profiling, but a decision is needed urgently in order to "adopt" MO profiles corresponding to lower layers profiles.
- AFNOR does not believe that managed object category for managed object profiles is necessary. Possible solutions could include AOM Profiles, POM profiles or extensions to existing profiles.

Attachment 4  
to JTC 1 N 2262

Comments accompanying the German "no"-vote  
on ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 2066, DTR 10 000-2.3  
=====

Ess. 1): Delete the entry for Managed-Object Profiles in subclause 4.2.

MO should be treated purely as extensions to already existing and future profiles.

No extra taxonomy is therefore required.

Ess. 2): The text for a number of subclauses is still marked as "to be supplied".

We will only accept the addition of this text if SGFS has positively recognized that the text is consistent with the taxonomy as given in clause 5.

Ess. 3): The ALD taxonomy structure as outlined in SGFS N 573 seems to introduce new concepts (group of profiles - ALD12, relay function - ALD19, combination function - ALD3) into A-profiles which need to be reviewed and clarified to ensure consistency with the concept of A-Profiles.

Ed. 1): The title of the letter ballot should read "Taxonomy of OSI Profiles".

Ed. 2): On page 18, Annex A should quote SGFS Standing Document 4 (instead of "2").



Attachment 5  
to JTC 1 N 2262

Japanese Comment on DTR 10000-2.3

The Japanese National Body votes YES with the following comment on DTR 10000-2.3.

.....

ITEM NUMBER       1  
QUALIFIER         Technical  
SUBJECT            FOD Taxonomy

PROPOSED CHANGE :

The Japanese National Body requests that the taxonomy of FOD profiles is to be changed to have an additional digit which represents application area as follows:

- 0 Document processing applications
- 1 Image applications

**N** Nederlands  
Normalisatie-instituut

Attachment 6  
to JTC 1 N 2262

Kalfjeelaan 2  
Postbus 5069, 2600 GB Delft  
Telefoon (015) 690 390  
Telefax (015) 690 190  
Telex 38 144 nni nl

---

Comments from the Netherlands concerning the ballot of DTR 10000-2.3  
(ISO/IEC JTC1 N2066)

The Netherlands approves the progression of the proposal to TR but has the following comment.

The Netherlands considers the level of detail of the taxonomy structure for "Library and Documentation" (clause 5.3.9) too high and recommends to specify only one level in the substructure.

rationale:

the specification of the detailed structure (SGFS N573) needs a more detailed discussion on the way various concepts are used, e.g.:

- Is ALD12 a profile or a profile group?
- The precise nature of profile ALD19;
- Are the profiles ALD3.. (each being a combination of other profiles) needed.

Attachment 7  
to JTC 1 N 2262



UK COMMENTS ON DTR 10000-2.3 - Information technology - Framework & Taxonomy  
of International Standardised Profiles - Part 2: Taxonomy of Profiles.

---

FOD Taxonomy

The UK believes that the regional workshops (AOW, EWOS and OIW) and CCITT have jointly proposed a revised harmonized FOD taxonomy which addresses the SGFS comments in SGFS N 619. The UK proposes that this proposed revised taxonomy is included in TR 10000-2.3.

TNN/JMP

Attachment 8  
to JTC 1 N 2262

Clarification

In its review of DTR 10000-2.3, the U.S. also reviewed SGFS N598, Editors Report on Progression of TR 10000-2. SGFS N598 contains a summary of the contributions which have been made on the progression of the OSI Taxonomy in TR 10000-2, including the Action taken on each. In the attachment summary form, page 1, reference is made to SGFSN501 for a comment on the FOD taxonomy. The "Subject" clause states "OIW reservation on identification of Base Standard Version in Taxonomy". SGFSN501 actually states U.S. reservations about this proposal.



The U.S. National Body submits the following comments on DTR 10000-2.3 (as documented in JTC1 N2066) accompanying a **DISAPPROVE** ballot response. Satisfactory resolution of our Major comment (Comment 1) is required before this response can be changed to **APPROVE**.

---

**NUMBER:** 1  
**TYPE:** Major  
**CLAUSE/PAGE:** 4.2/3  
**RATIONALE:** As stated in footnote 3, the concept of Managed-object profiles is subject for further discussion. Based on requirements presented thus far, the U.S. believes that managed-object information should be an integral part of relevant profiles.

In addition, other requirements (such as routing, security, internationalization and naming) present similar needs and should result in similar solutions. Thus, provision of a separate class for each new attribute would lead to a proliferation of classes. Each new attribute would result in exponential growth in the taxonomy.

**PROPOSED CHANGE:**

Delete the class "M" and the associated footnote.

---

**NUMBER:** 2  
**TYPE:** Editorial  
**CLAUSE/PAGE:** Introduction/iv and 1(Scope)/1  
**RATIONALE:** The "Directory of ISPs and Profiles contained therein" has received a Standing Document designation by SGFS. For clarification of reference, the new designation should be used.

**PROPOSED CHANGES:**

- o Page iv, penultimate line: following "Directory of ISPs and Profiles contained therein", insert the parenthetical reference: (SGFS Standing Document 4).
- o Page 1, column 2, line 1: at the end of this line, add: (SD-4).

---

**NUMBER:** 3  
**TYPE:** Editorial  
**CLAUSE/PAGE:** Introduction/iv  
**RATIONALE:** The June SGFS meeting resulted in changes to the content of the directory of profiles (SD-4). This change needs to be reflected in the introduction to avoid conflict.

**PROPOSED CHANGE:**

Page iv, last line, delete the text ", scenario, and model".

---

**NUMBER:** 4  
**TYPE:** Editorial  
**CLAUSE/PAGE:** 1(Scope)/1  
**RATIONALE/PROPOSED CHANGE:**  
Page 1, column 2, line 1 should refer to "an SGFS" not "a SGFS".

---

NUMBER: 5  
TYPE: Minor  
CLAUSE/PAGE: New clause/2  
RATIONALE: To be consistent with document guidelines and to locate definitions in the relevant document, a clause of Definitions is needed for TR10000-2. In addition, the Group concept has been recognized and defined as being relevant in the OSI case. Clause 4.4 of DTR 10000-2.3 already includes a modified version of the definition of Group. To make TR10000-2 complete, and in preparation for the removal of this definition from TR10000-1, the definition of Group should be included in the new clause.

**PROPOSED CHANGES:**

- o Add new Clause 3 DEFINITIONS
- o Renumber subsequent clauses and relevant references.
- o Definition of Group found in WDTR 10000-1.3 (SGFSN442) should be copied to new DEFINITIONS Clause.

---

NUMBER: 6  
TYPE: Editorial  
CLAUSE/PAGE: 4.5.1.2/6  
RATIONALE: Current taxonomies identified in Clause 5.1.1 define Subnetwork numerical identifiers abcde. Clause 4.5.1.2 must be updated to reflect these designations.

**PROPOSED CHANGE:**

Clause 4.5.1.2, line 2 and line 10: "abcd" should be changed to "abcde".

---

NUMBER: 7  
TYPE: Editorial  
CLAUSE/PAGE: 4.5.4.3/10  
RATIONALE/PROPOSED CHANGE: To be consistent with the other references in Clause 4.5.4, Clause 4.5.4.3 should be titled "Principles for the Taxonomy of Interchange Format and Representation Profiles".

---

NUMBER: 8  
TYPE: Editorial  
CLAUSE/PAGE: Annex A/18  
RATIONALE/PROPOSED CHANGE: The proper designation of the "Directory of ISPs and Profiles contained therein" is Standing Document 4, not Standing Document 2.