



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 742	
date	1992-12-14	total pages
item nr.		supersedes document

Secretariat: Nederlands Normalisatie-Instituut (NNI)
Kalffjeslaan 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 : U.S. Contribution on SGFS N623 - Standardization of Profile Test Specifications

Source : ANSI

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

Note :



**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

December 3, 1992

DEC 3 1992

Mr. Peter J.J. Bessems
NNI
P.O. Box Box 5059
2600 GB Delft
The Netherlands

Dear Mr. Bessems:

Enclosed please find the following document:

U.S. Contribution on SGFS N 623 Standardization of
Profile Test Specifications.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions regarding
this matter.

Sincerely,

Stacy M. Leistner
Program Manager

cc: C. Robichaus, JTFS

Standardization of Profile Test Specifications

SGFS N623 discusses Standardization of Profile Test Specifications. The U.S. National Body has studied this paper, as well as DIS 9646-6, which is entitled "Protocol Profile Test Specification". We offer the following comments:

1. N623 implies that SGFS will process the balloting of Profile Test Specifications. DIS 9646-6 makes no explicit statements on this, but seems to imply that the base standards group will be responsible.
 - o Refer to DIS 9646-6, Clauses 7.2 paragraph 3 and 10.2 paragraph 3. These references explicitly cover the situation where no ATS exists for the base protocol, and state that in such situations, the corresponding ATS for the profile shall be written and submitted to the base standards group.
 - o No such explicit statements were found in DIS 9646-6 regarding the situation where an ATS does exist for the base. Therefore, the expectations of the WG1 Conformance group are not clear.

The U.S. recommends that SGFS clarify the responsibilities for ballot processing in both of these two situations with the highest urgency.

2. DIS 9646-6 does not explicitly state whether an ATS covering only one of the possible profiles can in fact be standardized in conformance with 9646-2. (We note that 9646-2 expects an ATS to address the entire protocol standard, not just a subset related to one profile.)
 - a. DIS 9646-6, Clause 7.2 paragraph 3, states "... one or more ATS(s) are developed, in the context of a PROFILE, and submitted ...". This implies that the test cases for a single profile are suitable for standardization.
 - b. DIS 9646-6, Clause 10.2 paragraph 3 states "... ATS shall be developed for a SUBSET of the base specification specific to the profile."

Other clauses of DIS 9646-6 imply that an ATS covering the entire base protocol is required. Refer to Clause 7.2, paragraphs 1 and 2 ("... Abstract Test Suites SHOULD already exist ..."), and Introduction paragraph 8, "The PTS is based on the STANDARDIZED ATSS of the protocols referenced by the profile."

The U.S. suggests that SGFS request WG1 Conformance to clarify this situation. We do not feel that the SGFS Procedures can be properly modified unless the intent of

WG1 Conformance in this respect is clearly understood. SGFS should also request WG1 Conformance to clarify the referenced text discussed in points a) and b) above.

3. Pending the result of item 1), we recommend that SGFS modify N601 to address each of the following two cases:
 - a. If an ATS exists for the base standard, then we believe the existing review + ballot procedure can be used for Profile Test Specifications. However, it will depend on whether the ATS has reached IS level or not. (Practice has shown that errors are very difficult to detect until such time as the tests are actually in use.)
 - b. If the answer to item 2) above is that ATSS covering a profile-related subset of the base can in fact be standardized, then we believe the existing review + ballot procedure is NOT sufficient. We suggest that, upon submission, the PTS should be registered as a Committee Draft within the base standards group, as indicated in DIS 9646-6, Clause 7.2 paragraph 3 and Clause 10.2 paragraph 3. Standardization of the PTS related to this ATS should be delayed until the ATS has reached DIS level. At that time, use of the review + ballot procedure for the PTS within SGFS seems acceptable.

4. We recommend that SGFS raise the following objection to DIS 9646-6:

DIS 9646-6 states that Profile test standards (PTS-Summary and PSTS, specifically) are to become Parts 2 and 3 of the Profile Specification Document (in the case where a single profile is documented therein), or as Parts x, y, etc. for a specification document containing multiple profiles. SGFS would like to inform WG1 Conformance that the latter situation (an ISP documenting multiple profiles) is by far the normal occurrence, and that the parts of such an ISP are developed in an ongoing manner. We therefore believe it is most inappropriate for such an ISP to also have parts related to Profile Test Specification. We suggest that these testing documents should be separate standards. This aligns with the approach used for test specifications for base standards.

5. We recommend that SGFS add the following consideration to N601:

The PTS must be harmonized between the regional workshops before submission to SGFS.

This item is in addition to those which were previously addressed as item 3).

We also note that regional differences might exist in PTS to account for the requirements of the various GOSIPs. This possibility needs to be addressed. WG1 Conformance should be consulted to provide clarification on this point.