



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N	594
date	1992-08-12	total pages
item nr.	supersedes document	

Secretariat: Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)  
Kalffjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059  
2600 GB Delft  
Netherlands  
telephone: + 31 15 690390  
telefax: + 31-15 690190  
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 JTCl/SGFS from JTCl/SC18 on  
Standardization of Profile Test Specifications  
Source : JTCl/SC18  
Status : Liaison Statement  
Note :



ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 18 N **3595**  
1992-05-28

SGFS N594

---

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 18**  
**DOCUMENT PROCESSING AND RELATED COMMUNICATION**  
**SECRETARIAT: USA (ANSI)**

**TITLE:** Liaison Statement to JTC 1/SGFS From JTC 1/SC 18 on Standardization of Profile Test Specifications

**SOURCE:** JTC 1/SC 18

**STATUS:** This document was prepared at the 1991-05-05/08 Plenary meeting of JTC 1/SC 18. In accordance with Resolution 37 of the Plenary meeting, it has been forwarded to JTC 1/SGFS.

**REQUESTED ACTION:** For SC 18's information.

**DISTRIBUTION:** P and L Members

**Address reply to:**  
**Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 18—American National Standards Institute, 11 West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036**  
**Tel: 212 642-4935; TX: 42 42 96 ANSI UI; FAX: 212 398-0023**

**TITLE: Liaison Statement to JTC 1/SGFS From JTC 1/SC 18 on Standardization of Profile Test Specifications**

JTC 1/SC 18 has considered document SGFS N 383 and makes observation on both general and specific matters:

**General Observations:**

The production of test suites is dependent on where the resources lie to produce them. It is not possible to define any hard principles. However, the SGFS has a role to play in attempting to ensure that the mechanisms used for the development of test suites are reusable by different profiles and base standards.

The SGFS role should be based on the development of procedures which encourage harmonization. The SGFS should not attempt to develop such mechanisms itself.

The experience of developing text specifications for ODA provides some useful principles which could be developed for other areas.

Developed at the same time, or shortly after, the base ODA standard were:

- the rules and a proforma for the definition of profiles
- a conformance testing methodology
- an implementation testing methodology
- a test suite notation.

The above process has encouraged the development of a set of harmonized profiles and provides the mechanisms for the efficient development and re-use of test suites.

**Specification Observations on ODA:**

It should be clearly stated whether or not the profile test specifications are restricted to Abstract Test Suites or the testing methodology for profiles. If the scope is intended to cover testing methodology then, in the case of ODA, TR 10183 should be taken into account.

References to 'PICS Proforma' should be modified if ISPs on ODA are to be taken into account. The correct terminology for ODA is GSS/RSS Proforma.

In the case of ODA (considered as a framework standard) conformance is, in general, related to ISPs. For this reason, a base standard abstract test suite is not developed. Effort is being concentrated on abstract test cases for profiles. Hence the first bullet in item 2 of SGFS N 383 is inappropriate. In the case of ODA, SC 18 understands that current development work on ISP abstract test cases is already the subject of harmonization and a workshare programme between developers intending to submit ATCs to regional workshops and PAGODA.