

To: Liaison Organizations and National Bodies
Source: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS
Subject: Taxonomy substructure extension for FOD in TR 10000-2
Action: Request for review and clarification
Date: June 1992

During its meeting of June 15 - 19 1992 in Washington DC USA, the SGFS considered the FOD Taxonomy proposal (SGFS N449Rev) submitted by the OIW on behalf of the three workshops. In addition to this request, the SGFS also considered US comments on this proposal (SGFS N501) and correspondence (SGFS N607, dated March 24, 1992) from Jim Wing, chair OIW ODA-SIG, which provides clarification of the proposal.

In its discussion, the SGFS identified two concerns with the proposal.

One concern is the use of version number as a part of the taxonomy identifier. In the current taxonomy, identifiers are assigned which specify unique, meaningful differences in the functionality to be provided by the relevant profile. SGFS does not feel that version changes in the base standards warrant such reflection in the taxonomy itself. Appropriate re-issues of the ISPs, when the base standard(s) changes, is more appropriate.

Another area of concern is the addition of a digit to the beginning of the current taxonomy identifier. This is of particular concern because of the confusion which could occur as a result of existing, approved ISPs (FOD11, FOD26, FOD35). At its meeting, SGFS was not clear on:

1. the relationship between this initial digit and the version number (i.e., if the version number is removed from the taxonomy, does this affect the request for the initial digit?)
and
2. the clear need for this additional digit as opposed to continuing the current numbering scheme (i.e., because there are existing ISPs, would less confusion result if identifiers 4x, 5x,... were used?)

Further clarification and comment on these issues is invited from the National Bodies and Liaison Organizations.

SGFS also identified a need for clarification of the taxonomy identifier titles for the proposed FOD0.. and FOD1... FOD0 is identified as "Document Processing Applications". Should FOD1 be identified as "Image Processing Applications"?