



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 734	
date	1992-12-14	total pages
Item nr.		supersedes document

<b>Secretariat:</b>	<b>Nederlands Normalisatie-Instituut (NNI)</b>
	Kalfjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059
	2600 GB Delft
	Netherlands
telephone:	+ 31 15 890390
telefax:	+ 31-15 890190
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 : AFNOR comments on SD-1

Source : AFNOR

Status : Discussed during the SGFS Authorized Subgroup Meeting,  
December 1992, London

Note :

**TITLE : Comments on SD-1 (Taxonomy Update, ISP Approval & Maintenance Process)**

Source : AFNOR

Reference : ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N 601

**Comment 1**

Reference : p 1, clause 1 (Scope), Abbreviations

Qualifier : editorial

Proposed change : delete the second occurrence of ITTF abbreviation

**Comment 2**

Reference : p 5, clause 4.2 (Explanatory report), second subclause, item b) (Base Standards referenced), item 1)

Qualifier : technical minor

Rationale :

Resolution 3 of the SGFS Washington meeting reaffirms that, when ISPs specify CCITT Recommendations and/or ISO/IEC International Standards which contain aligned or identical text, both the CCITT Recommendation and its counterpart ISO/IEC International Standard shall be referenced in the ISP.

Proposed change :

Add a note below item 1) :

Note : When an ISO/IEC International Standard and a CCITT Recommendation contain aligned or identical text, both shall be referenced in the ISP.

**Comment 3**

Reference : p 5, clause 4.2 (Explanatory report), second subclause, item b) (Base Standards referenced), item 4)

Qualifier : technical minor

Rationale : As far as published Amendments and Technical Corrigenda are concerned, the Explanatory Report should be as exhaustive as possible : a clear indication should be made of which Amendments, Technical Corrigenda are thought to be applicable and those thought to be not applicable.

This rationale is in line with SGFS N 603.

Proposed change :

replace item 4) by :

An identification of any approved amendments, technical corrigenda (errata) to base standards referenced in the profile which in the view of the submitting organization, are thought to be applicable or not applicable.

**Comment 4**

Reference : p 6, clause 4.2 (Explanatory report), second subclause, item f), item 2)

Qualifier : editorial

Proposed change : replace If F(1) is not positive by If f(1) is not positive

### **Comment 5**

Reference : p 9, clauses 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3

Qualifier : editorial

Rationale : The MO abbreviation (for Maintenance Organization) is introduced in clause 7.3, third subclause, last line. It would be usefull to introduce it as soon as possible in clause 7.

Proposed changes :

In clause 7.1, add a second sentence :

This organization is known as the maintenance organization (MO).

In clause 7.2, second subclause, first sentence, second sentence, NOTE replace "organization responsible for maintenance of the ISP" by "MO".

In clause 7.3, third subclause delete the last sentence : "This organization is known as the maintenance organization (MO)."

In addition, replace in clause 7.1, first sentence "organization/ " by "organization ".

### **Comment 6**

Reference : p 9, clause 7.2 (Modifications to base standards)

Qualifier : technical minor

Rationale : As far as published Amendments to Base Standards referenced in an ISP are concerned, the amended ISP should be as exhaustive as possible : a clear indication should be made of  
. which Amendments to the Base Standards are thought to be applicable  
. and those thought to be not applicable.

This rationale is in line with SGFS N 603.

Proposed change :

replace the last sentence of the second paragraph by :

In any amendment to an ISP, a clear indication shall be made of which published base standard amendments are thought to be applicable and those thought to be not applicable.

### **Comment 7**

Reference : p 10, clause 7.4 (Approval of amended ISPs), first sentence

Qualifier : TECHNICAL MAJOR

Rationale : The criteria that the MO applies for making the choice between  
. the JTC1 rapid amendment procedures for base standards  
. the JTC1 ISP approval procedures  
are not indicated at all.

Is it possible to process an amended ISP (amended for ISP defects and not for Base Standards defects) by the JTC1 rapid amendment procedures ?

Are the JTC1 rapid amendment procedures reserved to the amendment of an ISP for Base Standards defects only ?

### **Comment 8**

Reference : p 10, clause 7.4 (Approval of amended ISPs), last sentence

Qualifier : technical minor

Rationale : As far as published Amendments to Base Standards are concerned, the amended ISP should be as exhaustive as possible : a clear indication should be made of  
. which Amendments to the Base Standards are thought to be applicable



. and those thought to be not applicable.  
This rationale is in line with SGFS N 603.

Proposed change :

replace the last sentence by :

Any amended ISP shall include an explicit list of published amendments to the base standards it references and indicate which published base standard amendments are thought to be applicable and those thought to be not applicable.

**Comment 9**

Reference : p 10, clause 7.4 (Approval of amended ISPs) and clause 8.1 (Extensions and enhancements to ISPs)

Qualifier : technical minor

Rationale : For each amended ISP or new (extended or enhanced) ISP, the MO should produce an informative text stating the differences with the previous edition or version of the ISP. This text may be useful to implementors, testers and purchasers.

Proposed changes :

. In clause 7.4 (Approval of amended ISPs)

Add at the end of this clause :

Any amended ISP shall include an explicit list of the differences with the previous edition of the ISP.

. In clause 8.1 (Extensions and enhancements to ISPs)

Add at the end of this clause :

The submitter should prepare an explicit list of the differences with the previous version of the ISP.