



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 751	
date	1992-12-14	total pages
Item nr.	supersedes document	

**Secretariat:** Nederlands Normalisatie-Instituut (NNI)  
Kalijeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059  
2800 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 : Liaison Statement to all S-Liaison organizations on the structure of  
Profile Identifiers in the Taxonomy

Source : ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

Status : Output of SGFS Authorized Subgroup Meeting, December 1992,  
London

Note :

Date: December 11, 1992

TITLE: Liaison statement to all S-Liaison organizations on the structure of Profile Identifiers in the Taxonomy

SOURCE: ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

STATUS: Output of SGFS Authorized Sub-group meeting

In response to (N738) - Request for guidance on Taxonomy Identifiers - from RWNMCC.

SGFS is of the opinion that, on this subject, there is only one significant issue of principle on which it can make a statement: all profiles shall have unambiguous identifiers.

SGFS has also stated in TR 10000-2 clause 4.1 that the identifier shall have "as many ... digits as are necessary to reflect its position within the hierarchic structure of the class". This leaves it open to the proposer of each class/subclass of the taxonomy to define the number and sequence of elements of the identifier. There are no further rules about the number of digits in each element.

SGFS would advise that separators should not be used in the "standard" format of Profile identifiers. "Dot" is already used in the structure of Relay profile identifiers; "space" can easily become lost or confused in use; retrospective changes to other identifier structures in the Taxonomy should be avoided. (However, when explaining taxonomy structures or relationships between profiles, the format with "space" can be used for clarification - as in TR 10000-2 for instance)

In the context of the example given in (L9), therefore, there shall only be one "AOM2111" profile. The proposers of extensions to the taxonomy shall take due care to construct the taxonomy such that the suggested clash between AOM2 1 11 and AOM2 11 1 cannot occur - either by not using "11" as the second element, or by using two (or more) digits for the third element - e.g. AOM2 11 01, or by opening up a further subclass AOM3xxx which has the same significance as AOM2xxx.

SGFS will propose a small change to TR 10000-1 clause 7 to record the main principle that such identifiers have to be unambiguous.