



doc.nr.	ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N486	
date	1992-03-13	total pages 4
item nr.	supersedes document	

Secretariat:	Nederlands Normalisatie-Instituut (NNI) Kalfjeslaan 2 P.O box 5059 2600 GB Delft Netherlands
telephone:	+ 31 15 690 390
telefax:	+ 31 15 690 190
telex:	38144 nni nl
telegrams:	Normalisatie Delft

ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS	
Title:	ISO/IEC JTC1 Special Group on Functional Standardization
Secretariat:	NNI (Netherlands)

**Title:** Disposition of Comments on ISO/IEC/WDTR 10000-1.2 (N430)

**Source:** Editor, TR 10000-1

**Date:** March 1992

**Status:**

**Action:** National Bodies and Liaison Organizations are requested to take note of this document in responding to the ballot of DTR 10000-1.2 (SGFS N485) and, if possible, to present positions on specific points for consideration at the SGFS meeting in June 1992.

In response to Berlin resolution 14 of SGFS in June 1991 (see N411), WDTR 10000-1.2 was circulated as N430 to SGFS Members for three months' review, terminating on 1991-02-22. Four sets of comments were received, in documents N463-N466. The Editor has reviewed these with the Chairman of SGFS, and it has been determined that there is no requirement to call an Authorised Subgroup of SGFS to process these. As a result, N430 has been revised to create ISO/IEC/DTR 10000-1.2 which is being circulated to SGFS as N485, and sent to JTC1 for 4-month ballot, in accordance with the terms of SGFS Berlin resolution 14.

The ballot period will terminate after the Washington meeting of SGFS in June 1992; however, SGFS members are requested to anticipate as far as possible their ballot responses and present issues for resolution at SGFS in June, in order, if possible, to permit a rapid and simple progression to TR. This in turn will enable SGFS to progress TR 10000-1.3 from an agreed baseline of TR 10000-1.2.

This document indicates the action taken by the Editor in response to the submitted comments. It also identifies one further change made, anticipated in the TR 10000-1 Issues List, N432. Additional simple editorial changes are not specifically identified.

**N463: France**

1. §8.3 No change made.

Reference to Profile Test Specs should await the stabilising of the work of SC21/1. At present, TR 10000 avoids all reference to Testing, but does not, of course, exclude it. The status of the reference to the Abstract Test Suite for FOD profiles in clause 8.3.2 is only that of a preliminary indication, awaiting further development in SC18.

2. §8.3.2 No change made.

The text does say that it "corresponds in general to Table 1" - this is probably as far as TR 10000 can go, unless SGFS can negotiate anything else with SC18 and CCITT.

**N464 Germany**

1. §1 No change made.

Until the scope extension of TR 10000-1.3 is agreed, it would probably be inappropriate to guess what sort of OSE reference to add. The ODP reference should also be kept - WDTR 10000-1.3 still includes the ODP reference, and SGFS could discuss the relevance of that when reviewing N442.

2. §3.2 A clause for 8613-1 references has been added, with Document Application Profile listed. However, SGFS should note the comments in N432 Item 9 about the weakness of the definition of this term.

**N465 UK**

No change is requested - the contribution supports the inclusion of the existing paragraph on Registration in §6.2

- N466**      **USA**
1.      Intro      *Change accepted - assuming that it is also accepted for TR 10000-2.2.*
  2.      §2      *Change accepted.*  
*Note also the addition of X.660 to ISO/IEC 9834-1, and the addition of ISO/IEC 9545, now proposed for reference in §6.3.2.*
  3.      §3.1.5      *No change made.*  
*If the proposed change were to be made, then the other, and more extensive, consequential change proposed in WDTR 10000-1.3 to §6.1 would also have to be made, in particular, in order to retain the possibility of making exceptional normative reference to a TR. (NB: N455, PDISP 10608-4, currently contains such a reference).*  
*Given that it was only the Authorised Subgroup of SGFS that agreed this change for WDTR 10000-1.3, it seems incorrect to include this as an editorial action. SGFS Members are invited to make specific comments on this proposal in the June meeting, and if agreed then, the change could be made in the process of resolving ballot comments.*
  4.      §6.2      *No change made.*  
*The intent of SGFS was to make this extension, subject to agreement of other bodies as identified in N396. So far, the only response has been N465 from the UK, which is positive. The conclusion, therefore, is that it should remain in the DTR for ballot. Any comment from other NBS or SCs in response to N396 should be provided in time for the June SGFS meeting, and hence before the end of the DTR ballot. Any fine tuning of the text, or more radical change can then be handled in the ballot resolution process or during the SGFS meeting.*  
*The SGFS chair will raise the issue with the JTC1 SWG on Registration Authorities.*
  5.      §6.5      *Change accepted.*
  6.      §6.5      *No change made.*  
*The comment is in line with the current draft text of ISO/IEC 9646-6. However, SGFS has avoided including in TR 10000-1 text concerning what and how testing of Profiles may be done (see Note to §6.4.1) and therefore this proposed change is not accepted.*
  7.      §8.2/A.4      *A complicated comment, which is difficult to answer simply and constructively.*  
*First - note that, except for the change made in N442 at the bottom of page 9/top of page 10, the text of this clause has been unchanged through the DTR 10000-1 ballot and its resolution and TR publication, and also at the last SGFS meeting (i.e. since SGFS N109 in February 1989). It is therefore difficult to see that there is any great concern among SGFS members that it is inaccurate or incorrect or too permissive. However, SGFS members who have concerns about the intelligibility or imprecision of this clause should make contributions to the June meeting in order that any remaining concerns can be resolved.*  
*Second - the proposed change (ii) seems to imply a new dimension to the relationships between the Taxonomy, the Profile Identifiers, and the ISPs. By definition, there cannot be "multiple profiles for a position in the taxonomy" - each terminal identifier in the taxonomy is a single profile. If this comment means that "a unique ISP number (or ISP-part*

number) is required for each profile" - OK, but that has been said already. If it means that there could be more than one definition of a profile recorded in separate ISPs, then the processes of SGFS, including the use of the explanatory report and the review group, are designed to prevent more than one definition of a profile from being created as ISPs (apart from the normal processes of amendment and revision, leading to the publication of a new version of an ISP with the same number).

So, §8.2 text has not been changed.

Point (iii) about A.4.1(b), has been adopted, but with wording to make it clear that the note also applies to the case of an ISP which defines no profiles (e.g. 11188 for Common Upper Layer Requirement being proposed by the workshops).

Point (iv) reiterates the definitive point made in §8.2 about relating Profiles and ISP parts, and is inappropriate and repetitive in this Annex.

8. §8.3.1 Change accepted.

9. Figs 2&3 This proposes a change which was not discussed at Berlin, and which comes under the general heading of alignment with ISO 9646 when the proposed changes for Protocol Profiles are stable. A note reiterating this has been added to §8.4.3.

It is true that these figures, which were based on those in an early draft of ISO 9646-2, could now be based on those in Annex A of its published text, which are different, and which would largely take care of the pseudo-3-dimensional problem. Any major revision should await the anticipated alignment with stable ISO/IEC 9646 text; however, a minor modification has been proposed in N485 to alleviate the US concerns, and commentary on this is specifically requested during the ballot process.

10. §A.5.3 Change accepted.

11. §A.5.5 Change accepted.

**N432 Issues List**

8 §6.3.2 Application Contexts.

The Editor drew attention here to text drafted by SGFS in Tokyo in 1990, which was intended as a liaison statement to SC21 in SGFS N233. This originated from a comment by Canada in SGFS N181 (December 1989). No comments have been received on this point, either in response to N233, or during the review of N430. The editor has therefore included in §6.3.2 a revised version of this text, including a direct reference to ISO/IEC 9545.

The Editor is aware that ISO/IEC 9545 is undergoing revision, with DAM-1 ballot terminating in April 1992. In SC21 N6302, there is now an Annex C which addresses the relationship between Application Contexts and Application Profiles, and SGFS should consider at its June meeting the status of this material, and whether further alignment of TR 10000-1 is required.

Clause §6.3.2 specifically relates to OSI Profiles; however the other proposed addition to §5 would not be in an OSI-specific context, and has therefore been omitted.