

Title: Liaison statement to JTC1 SWG-CA in response to JTC1 N3561

Source: SGFS Plenary Meeting, Berlin, 19-23 June 1995

As requested by JTC1 SWG-CA, SGFS has reviewed the Request for Information from SCs and SGFS on implementation of JTC1 policies on Conformity Assessment and Interoperability (JTC1 N3561) and the Revised Draft JTC1 Policy on Interoperability (JTC1 N 3560) to which it relates.

1.Request for information on key interfaces for interoperability

SGFS suggests that the request for information in clause 3 of N3561 should be made more specific, and relate to standards for behaviour at identified interfaces rather than the interfaces themselves. SC21's work on OSI, for example, relates almost entirely to CSI interfaces, and indeed to a whole family of CSI interfaces for various communications technologies. Hence SGFS suggests that the first paragraph of clause 3 would be better rephrased as:

SCs and SGFS are requested to provide JTC1 with information on the key interfaces and standards for behaviour at those interfaces which are needed to meet (continues as in N 3561)

and that questions (a) and (b) could be replaced by the following 3 questions:

(a)what are the key interfaces within the scope of the SC/SGFS and in which category(ies) of interface (API, CSI, HCI, ISI etc.) do they fall?

(b)what are the key standards for behaviour at those interfaces within the scope of the SC/SGFS?

(c)do all key standards for interoperability exist for these interfaces?

2.Comments on the usage of the term Interoperability in JTC1 N 3560

During its review of JTC1 N 3561, SGFS noted that in the opening paragraph of JTC1 N 3560 (which is referenced in JTC1 N 3561) the description of what is meant by the term '*interoperability*' might cause confusion, given the usage of the terms interoperability and portability in the POSIX Reference Model DTR 14252 and TR 10000. SGFS has invited its NBLOs to comment to SWG-CA on this issue.