



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N	522
date	1992-04-06	total pages
item nr.		supersedes document

**Secretariat:** Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)  
Kalfjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059  
2800 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 : JTC1 N 1841: Summary of Voting on Document JTC1 N 1671  
(= SGFS N 384), DTR 10000-2.2 - Information Technology -  
Framework and Taxonomy of International Standardized  
Profiles, Part 2: Taxonomy

Source : ISO/IEC JTC1 Secretariat

Status : Organization of Ballot Resolution meeting under  
Consideration

Note :



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

- TITLE:** Summary of Voting on Document JTC 1 N 1671, DTR 10000-2.2 - Information Technology - Framework and Taxonomy of International Standardized Profiles - Part 2: Taxonomy
- SOURCE:** Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1
- PROJECT:** JTC 1/SGFS
- STATUS:** This DTR has been approved for publication as a Technical Report Type 3.
- REQUESTED ACTION:** Prior to submission of the text for publication, the SGFS Secretariat is requested to ensure proper review and consideration of the comments received on this letter ballot.
- DISTRIBUTION:** P and L Members  
SGFS Secretariat

Voting Summary of JTC 1 N 1671

'P' Members	Approve	Approve with Cmrs	Disapprove	Abstain	Comments
Australia	X				
Austria	X				
Belgium		X			Attachment 1.1
Brazil					
Canada	X				
China					
Cuba					
Denmark	X				
Egypt					
Finland					
France	X				
Germany	X				
Hungary	X				
India					
Ireland	X				
Italy	X				
Japan		X			Attachment 1.2
Korea, Republic of	X				
Netherlands					
Norway					
Russian Federation					
Sweden	X				
Switzerland	X				
United Kingdom		X			Attachment 2
USA		X			Attachment 3

Belgian Comments

1. clause 5.2.4  
Since TR10172 has been published (1991-09-15), this text is no longer valid. Change to "(to be studied)".
2. various clauses  
Currently, the denomination of a technical report is of the form ISO/IEC TR nnnn (or ISO TR nnnn), not ISO/IEC/TR nnnn. Delete solidus where applicable.
3. clauses 3.1, 4.4.1.2 and 5.1.2  
The abbreviations currently in use in SC6 standards for the network and transport services are CLNS, CLTS, CONS, COTS. Delete hyphen where applicable.
4. clauses 3.1, 4.4.1.5  
The standard abbreviation for "Quality of Service" is QOS, not qos (see e.g. CD 7498-1). Correct where applicable.

Attachment 1.2

Japanese Comments

ITEM NUMBER: 1  
QUALIFIER: Editorial  
SUBJECT: Addition of a sentence

PROPOSED CHANGE:

Add, directly after each of the Group names TA, TB, TC, TD, TE, UA and UB on pages 10 and 11, the following sentence:

"For the detailed subnetwork Taxonomy within this group see 5.1.1."

RATIONALE:

It was agreed to delete the second half of the sentence beginning with "with the exception of ..." and clarifying the subnetwork Taxonomy of each Transport Profile Group. But the first half of the sentence should remain for the clarification of each group.



UK comments on DTR 10000-2.2

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 1841  
Attachment 2

MHS Taxonomy - (clause 5.3.2)

The UK considers that there are numerous defects in the MHS taxonomy in DTR 10000-2.2; some examples are given below. It is noted that MISG are working on solutions to many of these problems, and their solutions should probably be adopted in due course. In the interim, the material in DTR 10000-2.2 should be deleted, or at least marked as unstable.

- 1) The approach is inconsistent with that adopted by Directory. Directory recognizes the asymmetry of its protocols and has different ISPs for each "side" of a protocol (e.g ADI11 is for DUA support of the Directory Access Protocol, while ADI12 is for DSA support). They also have separate ISPs for the internal operations of DUAs and DSAs (ADI3n), and F-Profiles for attribute definitions.

On the other hand, the MHS profiles do not recognize asymmetry in the protocols at this level and it will hence appear only in the classification tables within the ISP. Distributed Operations also have to be in the same ISP as the protocol and attribute definitions.

The UK considers that the Directory approach is more suitable for MHS than the current text. ISP support should not have to be qualified, but with the MHS taxonomy, that is inevitable. For example, a product might claim support for AMH12 (MS role only). While having two columns alongside each other might make for easier committee review, standards committees are not the end users of ISPs.

Furthermore, separating protocol and, say, MS attribute definitions seems an excellent idea. This makes for a clear separation between the basic transfer mechanism and the information itself. Where a UA and MS, say, have different roles as regards P7, but compatibility is required for interworking, as regards attributes, there only needs to be an overlap in attribute support corresponding with the user's requirements, for two products to be acceptable. Having separate ISPs for these two aspects of UAs and MSs makes it much easier to express these differing requirements.

- 2) Why is AMH24 included? P2 (1984) over P1 (1984) is not part of ISO/IEC 10021 except for the limited case of downgrading rules, which we understand are being handled by Functional Groups. AMH24 appears to legitimise and encourage an obsolete non-ISO mode. There is thus good reason for deleting it.

- 3) In AMH11, what does MTA and MTS mean? How does it relate to AMH 13 (P3)? If it is just P1 then this should be stated. If it includes the procedures of operation then it has to refer to AMH13 as the MTA's procedures of operation can only be fully discussed in the context of both P1 and P3. But then how does this affect conformance claims by MTAs that do not support P3? This seems to be another case where the directory approach is superior and avoids qualified support of ISPs.
- 4) AMH21 (P2 over P1) seems to yet another item leftover from 1984. First of all, the title: an AT/SYS conforming to this profile may well be connected to an S/SYS which has not a single line of code devoted to P2. This is of course not a problem. The scope of the ISP suggested by the title is wrong and is yet another example of the fundamental asymmetry of MHS protocols not being reflected in the classification scheme (ditto AMH31).
- 5) AMH22 (P2 over P7): what is the scope of this ISP? Is it IPM-MS attributes? Is it IPM specific autoactions? What about submit; are the UA procedures and IPM/IPN format discussed again or by reference to AHM21? Here too, there is the whole problem of asymmetry.

TNN/JMP  
92-02-10

U.S. Comments

The U.S. votes **APPROVE WITH COMMENTS**, on the publication of DTR 10000-2.2 as a Technical Report Type 3. The U.S. requests that the following comments be incorporated prior to publication of the DTR.

---

**NUMBER:** 1  
**CLAUSE:** STATUS, Title Page  
**RATIONALE:** Reference is made to resolution 14 of the Berlin meeting.  
Resolution 14 refers to the handling of TR 10000-1.2. (See SGFS N 411.)  
Resolution 15 refers to the handling of DTR 10000-2.2.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Replace "resolution 14" with "resolution 15", if the title page is to be part of the publication.

---

**NUMBER:** 2  
**CLAUSE:** Introduction, Page III  
**RATIONALE:** The second bullet item under the first paragraph refers to "subsets". In the Brussels Authorized Subgroup meeting, this term was identified in the Issues List (SGFS N 439, Issue 4) as causing confusion as to whether subsets of base standards are allowed in ISPs. The Subgroup left the issue of subsetting of profiles as an open issue. However, it was pointed out that subsets of base standards should be identified by the "owner" of the base standard. The U.S. believes that clarification of the SGFS intent would be useful at this time.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Replace "subsets" with "conforming subsets".

---

**NO:** 3  
**CLAUSE:** Scope, Page 1  
**RATIONALE:** The first sentence strongly implies that there will be only one universal taxonomy (and document, i.e., part 2). However, paragraphs 3 and 5 note the limitations to the scope of this part. Based on this, and discussions within SGFS, the implication should be removed from the sentence.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Delete the word "full" in the first sentence.

---

**NO:** 4  
**CLAUSE:** Scope, Page 1  
**RATIONALE:** The second sentence of the third paragraph reads "as a lower priority". SGFS certainly has no intent to discount the importance of non-OSI standards. The point has already been made in the first sentence that OSI is being given priority. Re-emphasizing the priority is unnecessary.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Replace "In addition, as a lower priority," with "Nevertheless,".

---

**NO:** 5  
**CLAUSE:** Scope, Page 1  
**RATIONALE:** The fifth paragraph notes the possibility of new functional areas being addressed in TR 10000. In order to confirm that the SGFS may choose to address these new areas (or other changes) by the addition of new parts to TR10000, this should be stated in this discussion on updates.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Fifth paragraph, fourth line, change "updated" to "updated or have new parts added".

---

**NUMBER:** 6  
**CLAUSE:** 5.3.7 Remote Database Access, Page 13  
**RATIONALE:** The first line under the title is underlined. This is inconsistent with the rest of sections 5.3 and 5.4.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Remove underline.

