doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 501
date 1992-03-27	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 : US Comments on Change Request for FOD Taxonomy in TR10000-2 (SGFS N449)

Source : ANSI

Status : US contribution to the 1992 SGFS Plenary Meeting, June 15-19, 1992, Washington DC, USA

Note :

U.S. Comments on *Change Request for FOD Taxonomy in TR10000-2* (SGFS N449)

1) The level of support within the U.S. National Body for this proposal is unclear at this time. The concerns expressed primarily relate to the introduction of version number into the taxonomy structure. If the concern being addressed by the proposal is the need for a unique identifier, the ISP number is a more appropriate solution. SGFS should investigate the need for this version number as a subclass numerical identifier. Some of the difficulties introduced by the proposal are:
   - o The use of version number introduces the possibility that more than a single digit may be needed in some positions within the taxonomy subclass numerical identifier. The use of multiple digits for a single position will clearly introduce ambiguities.
   - o The change (rather than addition) to the existing taxonomy has implications for naming of existing documents.

   The problems introduced are not unique to this particular proposal and, hence, SGFS should develop policies regarding the difficulties noted.

2) The following text changes are needed to correct inconsistencies in the document. Changes have been marked (by hand) in the rationale provided in Clause 2, but have not been carried through to the proposed new taxonomy text. (This oversight has been verified with the chair of the OIW ODA SIG.)

   The following corrections are needed in the proposed changes to Clause 5.4.1 (page 3 of the proposal):

   * description of "0" should be "Document Processing Applications"

   * description of "1" should be "Image Applications"