ISO **IEC**

Title   : Summary of Voting on Document JTC1 N1830, DTR 10000-
1.2 - Information Technology - Framework and Taxonomy of
International Standardized Profiles - Part 1: Framework

Source   : ISO/IEC JTC1 Secretariat

Status   : This DTR has been approved for publication as a
Technical Report Type 3

Note   :

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

TITLE: Summary of Voting on Document JTC 1 N 1830, DTR 10000-1.2 - Information Technology - Framework and Taxonomy of International Standardized Profiles - Part 1: Framework

SOURCE: ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat

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 1830

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

* ISO/IEC JTC 1/SG FS 'P' MEMBERS

ATTACHMENT 1

The U. S. National Body submits the following comments on TR 10000-1.2 (as documented in SGFS N485) accompanying a NO vote. Satisfactory resolution of our Major comments (numbered 1, 2, 4, and 5) is required before this vote can be changed to Yes.

1. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 3.1.5 / 2

   Type: Major

   Rationale: At the Brussels meeting of the SGFS Authorized Subgroup, agreement was reached that, due to the non-normative nature of Technical Reports, these should be removed from the definition of Base Standard in Version 3 of TR10000-1. The U.S. agrees with this conclusion and further believes that the change should be incorporated in Version 2 of TR10000-1, because (i) this is a change unrelated to the expansion to OSE, which is the scope of the Version 3 changes, and (ii) in order that the Brussels agreement is reflected in the "approved" version of TR 10000 as soon as possible.

   Proposed Change: Delete "Technical Report" from Clause 3.1.5.

2. Item

   Source: USA

   Clause/Page: 6.2 / 4

   Type: Major

   Rationale: The editor has correctly added this paragraph as directed by Resolution 14 and by SGFS N 390. However, the U.S. notes that SGFS N 432 Item 13 reminds us that this issue remains open. Inclusion of the current text in TR10000-1.2 implies that ISPs can in fact be used as registration agents. While we do not necessarily disagree with this concept, this issue cannot be closed, and hence the text cannot be included, until (at least) responses to SGFS N 396 have been received and considered.

   We believe that allowing ISPs to be used as Registration Authorities will require changes to the ISP approval process. For example, the ISO Central Secretariat has specific procedures for Registration and Registration Authorities. Also, reviewers familiar with the requirements for registration will need to be involved during the review. We do not support adding the text in clause 6.2 until the impact on the ISP Approval Procedures has been carefully thought out and documented.

   Proposed Change: Remove the second paragraph, which begins: "When a type of 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.

3. **Item**

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 6.5 / 6

Type: Minor

Rationale: SC21 N6191, "Liaison to SGFS on Profile Conformance", states that when an optional capability is excluded by a profile, tests shall be run to verify that the implementation does not initiate such capabilities. (See Clause 3, paragraph 3, of SC21 N6191.) This is useful information that should be included with the warning about using exclusion.

While it is true that the current text of DIS 9646-6 contains similar information, it must be recognized that those protocol experts who participate in definition of profiles are more likely to read the text of TR 10000 to search for guidance on profile definition than they are to read the 9646 series to search for information on how those profiles will (eventually) be tested. Therefore, the U.S. National Body feels that it is important to highlight this consequence of excluding optional capabilities. (Our suggested text addition is intended to cause the reader to ponder whether "Excluded" is really the status they mean to use, as opposed to "Out of scope", for example.)

Proposed Change: Add to the end of the note following item c), bullet for "Excluded": "Tests will be written for excluded features to verify that the excluded behaviour does not occur."

4. **Item**

Source: USA

Clause/Page: 8.2 / 9

Type: Major

Rationale: The text gives inconsistent statements about whether an ISP can or cannot contain multiple profiles. While the U.S. National Body recognizes that much of the pertinent text has remain unchanged over several years, we do not find the "age" of confusing text to be particularly relevant to whether it should be clarified: groups defining ISPs carefully scrutinize TR 10000 to determine what is, and what is not, allowed in an ISP. TR 10000 must be clear and consistent on this matter.

Paragraph 4 of Clause 8.2 clearly states that a single-part ISP does not contain more than one profile. However, Clause A.4.2 item b states "...title(s) of the Profile(s) defined within the ISP". These phrases do not prohibit a single part of a multi-part ISP from defining multiple profiles: this must be corrected.

Proposed Change: In Clause 8.2, paragraph 4, replace "A single-part ISP" with "A single-part ISP, or a single part of a multi-part ISP,".

2

5. **Item**

    Source: USA

    Clause/Page: 7.1, paragraph 3 / 7

    Type: Major

    Rationale: User requirements vary in detail, resulting in multiple profiles distinguished only by selections for a few options among many. Since no useful taxonomy can represent all of the available options for any arbitrary set of base standards, multiple profiles per taxonomy point must be allowed in order to provide the flexibility to meet user requirements.

    Proposed Change: Add the following to the end of paragraph 3: "Note that multiple profiles may exist for a given taxonomy point.".