

Title : Liaison Statement to the MED groups of the Regional Workshops

Source : ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS Plenary Meeting, June 1995, Berlin, Germany

SGFS at its Berlin meeting has reviewed taxonomy change proposals and has the following comments and questions on the MED taxonomy:

- 1) SGFS, in response to the liaison sent by EWOS EG MED to the previous SGFS meeting in New Orleans (SGFS N1236), had incorporated the FMI taxonomy in TR 10000-2 with two notes. Note 25 "This section of the taxonomy may need further harmonization" has been removed at the Berlin meeting following statements of harmonization provided by the Regional Workshops. Note 26 "It is recognized that some of the FMI taxonomy entries may be more appropriately positioned within existing branches of the TR 10000 taxonomy" raised the point of ODA profiles in particular, which would seem to more appropriately go to the ODA taxonomy. No comment was received on this Note 26 which therefore stands in the final text of TR 10000. The Regional Workshops may want to comment further on this point.
- 2) SGFS at the New Orleans meeting did not incorporate the AMI taxonomy into TR 10000-2 and sent back SGFS N1246, liaison statement to the Regional Workshops on this taxonomy change. Having received no comment at the Berlin meeting, SGFS reiterates its questions from SGFS N1246 and hopes these questions are answered when application taxonomy gets submitted:
 - a) It was felt that the constraints placed on the choice of T profile were not sufficient to ensure interoperability.
 - b) In order to take account of future needs it is suggested that the A profiles be classified as OSE CSI profiles for medical purposes rather than A -profiles.
- 3) SGFS, in SGFS N1246, was asking the Regional Workshops to consider
 - what action is requested to ensure harmonization with sources of the standards?
 - are there experts who can be nominated to review any PDISP that were proposed?SGFS will welcome contributions from the Regional Workshops on these two points. As for the identification of reviewers, it is suggested that the Regional Workshops provide SGFS with a list of bodies that may be in a position to provide reviewers for the process. SGFS would appreciate that the Regional Workshop make preliminary contacts with these bodies in order to increase the probability of mutual understanding and successful review process. SGFS reminds the Regional Workshops that the role of reviewers is primarily to ensure alignment with base standards, and that this role would usefully be made clear when contacting the bodies that may perform the review.