



doc. nr. ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N 1006	
date 1993-08-18	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

Title: ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS
ISO/IEC JTC1 Special Group on
Functional Standardization

Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

Title : Liaison Statement to AOW/NMSIG, EWOS/EGNM and OIW/NMSIG: SGFS
Answers on the questions raised during the DISP 12059 - 12060 editing
meetings

Source : ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

Status : Approved by the SGFS Seoul 1993 meeting

Note :

SGFS answers on the questions raised during the DISP 12059 - 12060 editing meetings

From : SGFS plenary , Seoul, July 5-9

To : AOW NMSIG, EWOS EGNM, OIW NMSIG
cc : SGFS NBs and LOs

ISSUE 1:

DISPs 12059 and 12060 used to contain PICS proformas for 10164 Parts 1-5 base standards, and there is a strong relationship between the PICS proformas and the profiles texts. These PICS proformas have since reached DAM level and it was the understanding of the editing meeting that the ISPs texts would refer to the DAMs and not contain PICS proformas anymore. However the editing meeting was unsure about the recommended course of action when the PICS proformas DAMs are superseded by final AMs : When the DAMs become AMs, then the ISPs that refer to the DAMs become out of date since they refer to a document that is not available anymore.

- Should we append the DAMs texts to the ISPs so that they are still available in conjunction with the ISPs when they have been superseded by AMs and are therefore not available through ITTF anymore?
- Do we rather have an obligation to review the ISPs as soon as any of the base standards evolve from DIS level to IS level (or DAM to AM)?

AOW, EWOS and OIW would appreciate guidance from SGFS on this subject, since they are jointly involved in maintenance of ISPs 12059 and 12060, although formally AOW is the submitting organization

ANSWER : SGFS recognizes the problem and suggests that both measures are taken : The DAMS should be appended to the ISP, in an informative Annex, with a clear statement that they will be removed when the DAMs become AMs and when the ISP is updated accordingly. On the other hand, SGFS encourages the workshops to perform maintenance of the ISPs as soon as the AMs are available, so that we keep to a minimum the time where the ISP is not aligned with the base standard. It has been pointed out that we can use the rapid amendment procedure (ie DR procedure) for updating the ISP text.

ISSUE 2 :

ISPs 12059 and 12060 have PICS and MOCS tables where at the same time local conditions are defined and conditions coming from the base standards have to be evaluated.

In practice, DAMs 10164-1 to 5 (10164 PICS and MOCS) have several Annexes. In each annex, conditions are defined starting from c1.

As a result a condition cx evaluated in the ISP can be either defined in Annex y of 10164-z or be locally defined by the ISP itself. The situation is very confusing for the end-user and there were NBs comments asking to solve this issue.

As we believe that this is a situation that may arise in several profiles, we are asking SGFS guidance on how to reference conditions coming from various base standards:

We believe that the valid identification for a condition is :

<base standard identification><Annex Nb><cx>.

and this is the designation we would like to use for referencing a condition in one of the base standards.

However, the IPRL tables are already very bulky and it is not easy, from a purely editorial point of view, to put in the condition column something as long as : ISO10164-4.DAM1 Annex E / c3.

Therefore we have defined abbreviations of the base standard and Annex identification. In our example the reference will become 4E/c3. It will be defined at the bottom of each table where it is being used, in order to ease the understanding of the end-user.

It would be useful if SGFS was to inquire about whether such a situation has already occurred, and if a solution is adopted, to record , maybe in TR10000-1, what is the convention to be used in such a case.

ANSWER : SGFS acknowledges the solution that has been found by the editing meeting. It should be included in the next version of TR10000-1 Annex A and sent out for NBs comments and approval, so that the practice may be used more generally (or a better way be found).

ISSUE 3:

Should TR10000 be listed as a normative reference in the references section of an ISP definition ? It is the case for ISP11183 and maybe others, although a TR is in essence not normative.

ANSWER : Annex A of TR10000 Part 1 requires that TR10000 be listed in the normative references for every ISP definition.

