



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 591	
date	1992-08-12	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 : The U.S. comments on SGFS N439 (Issues List)
Source : USA
Status : US contribution to SGFS
Note :

The U. S. National Body submits the following comments on SGFS N 439 (Issues List).

- Issue 2: We believe that when new functionality is needed, it should be added to the base standard(s). This issue should be closed.
- Issue 3: One purpose of identifying gaps in profiles is to define areas of needed standards activities. Gaps should be identified by describing the missing functionality, not by identifying a non-standard solution which may include more or less functionality than is necessary and/or may describe an arbitrary or overly restrictive solution. Examples of any documents that address the missing functionality may be identified to assist in the development of these new standards.
- Issue 4: All ISPs must satisfy all relevant conformance requirements of all standards referenced normatively (see TR 10000). If the referenced standards do not contain appropriate conformance statements, or contain conflicting requirements, this is a defect in the standards and should be corrected.
- Issue 5: The U.S. feels that the adoption of any taxonomy for OSE profiles is (very) premature at this time. Many questions must be answered before a final taxonomy is selected.

Primary among the issues to be addressed is a clear statement of the purpose to be served by a taxonomy of profiles for OSE. Definition of the problem addressed by the taxonomy, and discussion of available alternatives, should precede any selection. It is a distinct possibility that more than one alternative taxonomy may be needed. It is also not clear that the taxonomy needs to be normative in any sense. Its most useful role may be in providing guidance, or as a labelling device giving a rough indication of the content or scope of a profile.

Premature adoption of a taxonomy could result in substantial and unnecessary constraint on efforts to create profiles addressing user requirements.

The U.S. suggests that adoption of a single concept for a taxonomy at this time could discourage (or prematurely terminate) a necessary and appropriate period of experimentation required to more fully understand profiles and the profiling process.

- Issue 6: As noted in our comments on WDTR 10000-1.3, we disagree with allowing normative reference to TRs, even in exceptional cases.
- Issue 7: SGFS has requested a comparison between ISO/IEC 9646 and IEEE 1003.3. The U.S. notes that many years of work and study have gone into the creation of these documents, and that both ISO and IEEE are extending their work into profile testing (reference DIS 9646-6 and IEEE "Rules and Definitions Regarding the Development of POSIX Standardized Profiles").

We have received input from U.S. technical experts on these subjects. We feel the comparison requires careful review, and we do not believe the deadline for contributions on this question has allowed sufficient time. We intend to study the question further, and will submit a final position at a later time.

- Issue 8: We do not believe this is an issue for ISPs, but is instead an issue at the base standards level. This issue should be closed.
- Issue 9: We believe this is a defect in the ISP. The issue should be closed.
- Issue 13: We note that this issue has been resolved by new text in TR 10000-1.3. Our comments on the resolution, if any, will be directed to the discussion of TR 10000-1.3.

