Title   : USA comments on WDTR 10000-1.3 (SGFS N442)

Source   : ANSI

Status   : For discussion during the SGFS Plenary Meeting,
June 15-19, Washington D.C., USA

Note   :

ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS **N**

Date:

ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

SPECIAL GROUP ON FUNCTIONAL STANDARDIZATION

Secretariat: Netherlands (NNI)

TITLE: U.S. National Body Comments on TR10000-1.3
(JTC1/SGFS N442)

SOURCE: U.S.A.

STATUS: Approved National Body Contribution

The U.S. notes the unusual but necessary parallel development of TR10000-1 version 2 and version 3. While we agree with this action, we strongly desire a return to more normal procedures where version 2 is the base for development of version 3 as soon as possible. To achieve this goal, we believe that all changes made to version 2 should also be carried forward to version 3. (This includes modifications already made to version 2.) Also, as a direct result, the U.S. comments to version 2 should be taken as comments to version 3. For your convenience, a copy of the U.S. version 2 comments is attached.

Please note that these comments are based upon JTC1/SGFS N442. The line numbers cited refer to the line numbers printed at the left margin of each page (not the line number within the text being referenced).

The U.S. observes that TR10000-1.3 continues to reflect its OSI heritage. As the document nears balloting it should be carefully reexamined to determine which of that material continues to be relevant to its expanded scope, which parts should be (more) clearly marked as examples, and which might more properly belong in another Part.

JTFS/TF25

1. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: General

Rationale: We have noted during our review that the some of the changes applied in revision TR10000-1.2 are not represented in TR10000-1.3. Our comments on version 3 assume that the changes agreed in version 2 will be incorporated into version 3.

Proposed Change: In addition, reinstate the note that follows paragraph 3 of clause 6 in version 1.2, and do not add "generic" text of profile conformance, as suggested by the Editor's remark written on page 7. The reference to ISO/IEC 9646 is sufficient.

2. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: Introduction / 2 line 13, 3.1.2 / 5 line 10, 6.3.2 / 10 line 22 and 7.1 / 14 line 11

Rationale: Because of previous comments submitted on this text (for the TR 10000-2.2 ballot and the TR 10000-1.2 review), we disagree with the change made in version 1.3.

Proposed change: Insert "conforming" immediately prior to the word "subsets".

3. Item

Clause/Page: 1 / 3 line 20

Rationale: Annex C is concerned only with OSI profiles.

Proposed change: Add "OSI" before "Profiles" in the third line from the end of the second paragraph.

4. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 1 / 3 line 26

Rational: The Note following paragraph 3 is unclear. To what does "These specify" and "and those" refer?

Proposed Change: Change "These specify" to "These OSI profiles specify". Change "and those" to "and those base standards".

5. Item

Clause/Page: 1 / 3 line 49

Rationale: The use of the word "may" implies that permission is being given to extend the concept of profiles to these areas.

Proposed change: Replace "may" with "might" introducing the examples.

6. Item

Clause/Page: 3.1.3 / 5 line 18

Rationale: By deleting "informative" this note now implies that non-base standards can be referenced in an ISP. This should not be permitted.

Proposed Change: Put "informative" back and change clause reference to 6.1.3.

7. Item

Clause/Page: 3.1.5 / 5 lines 23-25, 3.1.7 / 5 lines 32-36

Rationale: The definition for Application Environment Profile is given, indicating that the AEP is, like OSI Profile, a type of Profile. However, the definition for AEP, unlike the definition for OSI Profile, unnecessarily repeats much of the definition of Profile. To achieve consistency and to avoid the potential for conflicting definitions, the definition for AEP should be modified to remove the duplicated information.

Proposed Change: Replace the definition of OSI Profile with "A profile which specifies a complete and coherent subset of the Open System Environment, which adheres to the structure defined by the Basic Reference Model for Open System Interconnection in ISO/IEC 7498."

Replace current AEP definition with "A Profile which specifies a complete and coherent subset of the Open System Environment necessary to support a class of applications."

8. Item

Clause/Page: 3.1.8 / 5 lines 37-42

Rationale: The concept of Group, as written, is specific to OSI. However, the general concept appears to be applicable to OSE.

Proposed change: This paragraph should be recast in broader terms.

9. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 3.2 / 5 lines 50 & 53

Rationale: Terms c) and f) should be singular, as that is how they are
                     defined in 9646-1.

Proposed Change: Change requirements to requirement in c) and f).

10. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 5 / 6 lines 24-26

Rationale: The first bulleted item in paragraph 1 should be aligned with the
                     definition of AEP. It is currently based on the definition of Profile.

Proposed Change: Add "or to support a class of applications" to the end of bulleted
                     item 1 and delete "for the purposes of interoperability"

11. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 5 / 7 line 6

Rationale: ISPs do not serve as the basis for establishing test laboratories.

Proposed Change: Delete "and test laboratories", line 3 of new last paragraph.

12. Item

Clause/Page: 5 / 7 lines 8-9

Rationale: There may be further increases in the scope of TR10000. This
                     phrasing appears to limit it to OSI plus AEP.

Proposed change: Modify along the lines of "but to promote the goals of the class of
                     standards being profiled".

3

13. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 6.1.1 / 8 lines 1-2

Rationale: The text in paragraph 3 contradicts the text in Clause 6.3.la. Paragraph 3 states that a profile "shall" make specific choices where the base standard allows options. Clause 6.3.la, however, states that the profile may leave some things optional.

Proposed Change: As suggested by the Editor's note, replace this paragraph by the following: "Clause 6.3.1 states the requirements for deriving the functionality of a profile from the functionality of a base standard."

14. Item

Clause/Page: 6.1.2 / 8 lines 13-16

Rationale (1):   Normative references to technical reports should not be permitted--they are, by definition, non-consensus documents (and with the special exception of TR10000, do not themselves contain normative text).

Rationale (2):   Technical Reports, especially Type 1, do not reflect functionality which has achieved agreement by JTC1. This status, which has been recognized by the removal of Technical Reports from the definition of Base Standard, suggests that SGFS should not document, even in exceptional circumstances, that normative reference be made to Technical Reports.

Proposed Change: Delete the paragraph beginning with "In exceptional circumstances,..." through "...on a case-by-case basis."

4

15. Item

Clause/Page: 6.2 / 9 line 13-20

Rationale: The Editor has brought this text forward from the draft
                            TR10000-1.2. However, as the U.S. has noted in its comments
                            on TR10000-1.2, SGFS N432 Item 13 reminds us that this issue
                            remains open. Inclusion of the current text in TR10000-1 implies
                            that ISPs can in fact be used as registration agents. This issue
                            cannot be closed, and hence the text cannot be included, until
                            (at least) responses to SGFS N396 have been received and
                            considered.

Proposed Change: Remove the second paragraph, which begins: "When a type of
                            information object requires a registration agent". In addition, the
                            JTC1 Special Working Group on Registration Authorities should
                            be consulted on the use of ISPs as registration agents before
                            proceeding with this text.

16. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 6.3.1 / 9 line 31

Rationale: It is not correct to state that relationships between base
                            standards are always implicit in those base standards. An
                            example of a base standard which specifies explicit relationships
                            is Transaction Processing, which places explicit requirements on
                            Session, Presentation and CCR.

Proposed Change: Change "which are" to "which may be", line 2 of paragraph 1.

17. Item

Clause/Page: 6.3.2 / 10 line 19

Rationale: Item d is too vague. "any other relevant source documents"
                            needs to identify specific document types.

Proposed Change: Identify documents, e.g. national and regional standards.

                            Within the context of "Main Elements of a Profile Definition" the
                            above change will provide the propoer reference. However, to
                            clarify that it is possible to have other informative references,
                            add the following text to Clause 6.1.3, page 8 after line 54: "c)
                            background materials helpful in understanding the profile,
                            suitable for citation in the Bibliography (as provided for in the
                            JTC1 Directives addressing formats for standards)."

5

18. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 6.3.2 / 10 lines 21-22

Rationale: The items listed in bullet e) are no longer recommendations by the time a profile has been created for a set of base standards: they are (typically) requirements (although some can remain optional).

Proposed Change: Change "covering recommendations on the" to "stating the" in line 21, and change "and on the selection" to "and the selection" in line 22.

19. Item

Clause/Page: 6.4.1 / 10 line 52

Rationale: The most complete testing possible of a Profile may not be practical.

Proposed Change: Replace "possible" with "practical".

20. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 6.4.1 / 11 lines 8-9

Rationale: Notes are not allowed to place requirements. The note following paragraph 3, by use of the word "shall", is placing a requirement.

Proposed Change: Replace the word "shall" with "should".

21. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 6.4.1/11 line 16

Rationale: Text is not a proper sentence.

Proposed Change: Delete "But" at beginning of paragraph 5.

22. Item

Clause/Page: 6.3.2 / 11 line 20

Rationale: Section incorrectly numbered.

Proposed Change: Paragraph labeled "6.3.2 OSI Profiles" should be "6.4.2 OSI Profiles.

23. Item

Source: USA

Cause/Page: 6.7 / 13 line 30 & 37

Rationale: This section on dynamic conformance only addresses OSI.

Proposed Change: Add "for OSI" to the end of the section title. Add "OSI" before "Profile" in the first line of the second paragraph.

24. Item

Source: USA

Cause/Page: 7.1 / 14 lines 31-32

Rationale: The last paragraph introduces the concept of a "structured identifier system", but provides no explanation of what this is. If it is true that each taxonomy Part (2 through n) will contain information about structured identifiers, then the following change needs to be made. If, however, Part 2 will contain all of this information no change is necessary.

Proposed Change: Replace last sentence of last paragraph by "Subsequent parts of this Technical Report provide the detail of this system; only the main principles and primary classifications are used in this clause for illustrative purposes.".

25. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 7.2.1 / 14 line 58-59

Rationale: The text in paragraph 2 regarding the current OSI-orientation of the taxonomy is no longer relevant.

Proposed Change: Delete the phrase beginning "particularly when the Taxonomy...".

7

26. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 8.2 / 16 line 54 through 17 line 2

Rationale: The sentence at the end of paragraph 2 is unclear. It seems to imply that the IPRL for a profile will be split up, and that parts of that IPRL will appear in different sections of the profile. However, the ISP structure shown in Table 1 places the IPRL in an Annex of the profile, while the requirements are all placed into clause 5.

Proposed Change: Reword the last sentence of paragraph 2 to make the intent more clear and its relationship to the ISP structure shown in Table 1.

27. Item

Clause/Page: 8.2 / 17 lines 12-13

Rationale: Item b) in the rules for multi-part ISPs is unclear. What is a "section"? Depending on the definition, these items may be inconsistent. Are "main elements" (section 6.3.2, page 10) sections?

Proposed Change: Clarify text or define "section".

28. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 8.2 / 17 line 44

Rationale: Note 2 applies to all implementers not just OSI.

Proposed Change: Replace "OSI" with "OSE" in the first line of the note.

29. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 8.2 / 17 lines 51-52

Rationale: The text of Note 3 (preceding clause 8.3) states useful information, and should therefore be made normative.

Proposed Change: Move the sentence of Note 3 into Clause 8.1, as a new principle "e)".

30. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 8.4.3 / 20 lines 4, 6-8

Rationale: The last 2 sentences of paragraph 8 state that the PICS Proforma can be integrated, along with the IPRL, into the ISPICS. This should be discouraged: in the case of OSI profiles, this approach is recognized as causing difficulties in proper selection of test cases. (The problem occurs when the IPRL is written is such a way as to include a "Support" column to be answered by the implementer; existence of such a column is implied by the current text.)

Proposed Change: Change "Alternatively, especially if no" to "If no" at the beginning of the penultimate sentence. Replace the last sentence with "This should be kept separate from the Profile requirements as specified by the IPRL.".

31. Item

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 8.4.3 / 20 lines 18-20

Rationale: Profile-specific conformance requirements, as discussed in this last paragraph of this clause, will require additions or changes to the set of test cases which have been written for the base standards. This consideration should be noted.

Proposed Change: (i) Add the following to precede the last sentence of this paragraph: "In addition, additions or changes reflecting the IPRL may be needed to the set of test cases which have been defined for the base standards.".

                           (ii) Change "Care" to "Therefore, care" at the beginning of the last sentence.