



| | | |
|----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| doc. nr. | ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N | 609 |
| 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 : Liaison Statement to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC24 in Response to
SGFS N453

Source : ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

Status : Approved liaison statement

Note :

Title: Liaison to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC24 in Response to SGFS N453

Source: ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

Status: Approved liaison statement

The SGFS considered, during its June 1992 Washington meeting, the liaison statement from SC24 contained in SGFS N453. SGFS offers the following in response to various questions posed in SGFS N453 on the intent of TR 10000 and the procedures of the SGFS.

SGFS N453 makes some very valid points about the problems that may arise due to proliferation of similar profiles. These problems have been recognized by SGFS as well. (Refer to ISO/IEC TR 10000-2, Clause 7.2, last paragraph, which discusses this in terms of the granularity that is appropriate in TR 10000-2.)

The need for early liaison between an organization which will submit an ISP and the SCs responsible for the base standards used in the ISP is best approached by the submitter entering into a dialogue with the SC, with a view to establishing S-Liaison status in areas of mutual interest. In addition, early information on the intent to develop and submit an ISP from within the regional workshops is to be found in the report from the Regional Workshop Coordinating Committee (RWS-CC). This document is distributed periodically by the SGFS, and all subcommittees which have an interest in functional standards should distribute this document to their committees. Information on ISPs already approved or under ballot is contained in the standing SGFS document 2, known as the Directory (and previously referred to as N100), which is also published by SGFS on a periodic basis.

The SGFS submits the following answers to the questions raised in SGFS N453. References to the SGFS procedures are references to the version to be found in the latest issue of the JTC1 Directives (JTC1 N1838), Annex C.

Question 1, paragraph 1: The intent of The Taxonomy (TR 10000-2) is to maintain a record of the taxonomy of profiles that may be or have been submitted into the ISP process. The relationship between ISPs and Registration Authorities is currently under study. (Refer to TR 10000-1.2, Clause 6.2.)

SGFS N100 ("The Directory of ISPs and Profiles Contained Therein") now lists profiles, ISPs, and taxonomy changes in 3 classifications:

A: Profile has been approved and published as an ISP

S: Profile has been submitted into the ISP process

T: Taxonomy changes submitted or under ballot

Thus Table 1 of SGFS N100, which is for the "A" status, lists all approved ISPs. This document is revised periodically, and published annually.

Question 1, paragraph 2: As stated above, the question of registration is not yet decided, but SGFS N100 records information about profiles and ISPs. The term "Directory" for N100 was carefully chosen to avoid confusion with any register or registration process.

In the title of SGFS N100, "... and Profiles" refers to the profile(s) that are contained in each ISP, hence the name "The Directory of ISPs and Profiles Contained Therein". (A single ISP may contain the specification of multiple related profiles, when the multi-part ISP structure is used. Refer to TR 10000-1, Clause 8.2.)

Question 2: All submitted PDISPs are processed if they meet the criteria for submission, as outlined in JTC1 N1838, C5. However, this does not mean that all PDISPs are processed; see sections C5.4 d) and C5.3, second a), of the SGFS procedures.

Question 3: The Explanatory Report is distributed to SGFS National Bodies and Liaison Organizations; see C5.1, first sentence, and C5.3, last paragraph, in the SGFS procedures.

Question 4: The intent of Clause C4.2, section b), of JTC1 N1838 is not to imply that non-compliance with base standards is permitted. "... should be addressed" means that the Explanatory Report should document any instances of non-compliant specifications. Any such instances then require change in order to align with the base standards: TR 10000 is quite clear about the requirement for alignment.

In addition to the reference given in SGFS N453 to TR 10000-1, Clause 6.1 (paragraph 3), see also Clause 6.3.1 b) which states

"It follows ... that a profile shall not specify any requirements that would contradict or cause non-conformance to the base standards to which it refers."

and also Clause 8.1 a), which states

"... conformance to Profiles shall imply conformance to base standards."

Question 5: Liaison between all ISO/IEC SCs and/or CCITT SGs responsible for the base standards cannot be mandated: it can only be carried out on a best-effort basis. Any party may initiate the liaison and if it is in existence, then submitted comments will be addressed.

Question 6: There are several opportunities in the ISP process for detecting overlap. If overlap does occur, the ballot process

for the DISP should resolve the issue. PDISP submission requires harmonization: existence of overlap is a sign that this harmonization may not have occurred.

- Question 7: There is no automatic transition of a PDISP following a review. SGFS procedures C5.3, last part, indicate that modification and resubmission may take place, and C5.4 d) states that the submitter may withdraw a PDISP at any time.
- Question 8: The ballot resolution meeting should produce an agreement for text which is collectively approved by all parties involved. The harmonization process referred to in the procedures is that which takes place prior to PDISP submission, but Liaison Organizations are permitted to attend the ballot resolution meeting.
- Question 9: See the first sentence of this clause (7.3), which states that the National Bodies are those of JTC1.
- Question 10: JTC1 N1838, Clause C7.3, paragraphs 2 and 3 discuss this problem. If a defect is identified, and there is agreement that this is a defect, then either the defect is in a base standard or in the ISP. If the defect is in the ISP, but the MO refuses to change the ISP, then paragraph 3 of Clause C7.3 applies: the SGFS may reassign responsibility for maintenance, or the ISP may be withdrawn. The latter would be appropriate in the situation where agreement between NBLOs on the correct solution to the defect cannot be reached: the ISP no longer represents an internationally harmonized specification, and thus is not appropriate as an ISP.
- Question 11: The flow chart referred to does not exist in the latest version of the SGFS procedures.
- Question 12: The intent of this suggestion is unclear.