



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 453	
date	1992-01-17	total pages
item nr.	supersedes document	

Secretariat:	Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)
	Kalfjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059
	2600 GB Delft
	Netherlands
telephone:	+ 31 15 690 390
telefax:	+ 31-15 690 190
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 from JTCl/SC24 to JTCl/SGFS: Request for clarification on TR10000 Intent and Procedures

Source : ISO/IEC JTCl/SC24

Status :

Note :



ISO SGFS Secretariat (P. Besser)

**American National
Standards Institute** 11 WEST 42ND STREET, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036

TEL. 212.642.4900

FAX. 212.398.0023

Cable: Standards, New York

International Telex: 42 42 96 ANSI UI

D-U-N-S 07-329-4837

- 8 NOV. 1991

October 25, 1991

Mrs. W. Wilke
Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 24
DIN - Deutsches Institut für
Normung e.V
Burggrafenstrasse 6
Postfach 1107
D-1000 Berlin 30
Germany.

Dear Mrs. Wilke:

Enclosed please find a U.S. National Body contribution entitled "Liaison statement to SIO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS re: Request for Clarification on TR 10000 Intent and Procedures." The U.S. requests that this proposed liaison statement be forwarded to JTC 1 SGFS for consideration.

Sincerely,

Beth Somerville

Beth Somerville
for the U.S. P-Member to SC 24

Enclosure

Title: Liaison statement to ISO/IEC JTC1 SGFS re: Request for Clarification on TR10000 Intent and Procedures

TO: JTC1/SC24

Source: USA

Date: October 18, 1991

Requested Action: Forward to JTC1 SGFS for consideration

The experts in ^{the} U.S.A. have reviewed the procedures for submission, review, and approval of an International Standardized Profile (ISP) contained in ISO/IEC/TR10000 and ISO/IEC Directives. We request the attached concerns be forwarded to JTC1 SGFS for clarification.

Title: Liaison Statement to JTC1 SGFS from Experts
re: Request for Clarification of ISP Procedures.

A major goal of Graphics Standards is to facilitate and promote interoperability between machines, sites, and applications. Profiles are a means of achieving this goal. However, the uncontrolled proliferation of profiles as well as incorrect specifications thwarts successful interoperability. The development of a large number of profiles, especially if similar in functionality, could negatively affect the acceptance and usage of the ISP and standards as well as rendering conformance testing impractical. It has been our experience that rather than the marketplace sorting out the 'best' profiles, implementors and users will avoid using the profiles and standards, and choose other alternatives.

We wish to express concern regarding the procedures for submission review and approval of an International Standardized Profile (ISP). It is important to ensure that a proposed ISP is technically correct and does not contradict the base standard(s). We suggest that liaison between the proposing organization and the JTC1 SCs responsible for the base standards be established as early as possible in the ISP development process. Moreover, we request clarification on the following procedures and framework as defined by JTC1 in its Directives and TR10000 and modified by ISO/IEC JTC1 N1608 and ISO/IEC JTC1 N1609, both dated 1991-09-23.

1. Is the intent of the ISP framework and procedure to register profiles? Consequently, will the SGFS act as a registration authority? Will a list of approved ISPs be maintained and published on a regular basis?

Is the Directory of ISPs and Profiles the register? What profiles does the '.. and Profiles' refer to?

2. Are all submitted PDISPs accepted and processed?
3. The explanatory report for a PDISP provides useful general information about the profile and its development process. We suggest this report be distributed to all national bodies and liaison organizations (NBLO). This would inform NBLO of ensuing ISP activities which may be related to their own ISP and standards activities.
4. An ISP should not contradict or be in non-compliance with base standards.

Clause 5.2, section b) of N1608 states: "3) Any aspect of actual or potential non-compliance with base standards should

be specifically addressed." This statement implies that an ISP may contradict the base standards. Additionally, this statement contradicts TR10000, clause 6.1, "Profiles shall not contradict base standards...."

5. In the PDISP development process, the submitting organization shall include "...identification of liaisons". Must there be active liaison with all ISO/IEC SCs and/or CCITT SGs responsible for the referenced base standards? Who initiates this liaison and when? Will comments submitted by these liaison organizations be addressed and resolved?
6. What action is taken if as part of the PDISP assessment, the review group finds another or planned ISP similar to the PDISP? Is the PDISP submitter requested to examine the existing ISP and if similar in functionality, withdraw their PDISP? Will the PDISP and planned ISP submitters be asked to liaise and possibly consolidate their efforts.
7. Section 6.4 states, "Once the review process for a given PDISP terminates,.... the PDISP then becomes a DISP". This implies that PDISPs with unresolved deficiencies also become DISPs. Is this transition automatic? A PDISP with unresolved deficiencies and/or non-conformance should not be progressed.
8. Section 7.3 states that representatives from NBLO, submitting organization and other S-liaisons who have taken part in the harmonization process will be invited to participate in the ballot resolution meeting. Which harmonization process does this refer to - harmonization prior to PDISP submission or harmonization that took place during PDISP review?
9. Section 7.3, c), first sentence. Change or clarify the reference to 'national body' in "if the national body comments sufficient level of national body approval ..." .
10. What action is taken in the event that the maintenance organization (MO) does not accept a submitted defect to an ISP?
11. We suggest the flow chart in Annex C of JTC1 Directives depicting the ISP process from PDISP submission to ISP approval be expanded to include the participation and interaction among the organizations involved in this process (e.g., submitting organization, SGFS members, SGFS review group, JTC 1 National bodies, and any liaison groups).
12. The roles and responsibilities of the organizations involved in the ISP process should be clearly defined. We suggest a separate section entitled Roles and Responsibilities be included in TR10000.