-- --

IEEE P1003.0 Draft 14 – November 1991

that the required changes may be made through established methods such as defect reporting, amendment procedures, or the introduction of new work.

A.5 Other Issues

A significant number of issues remain to be addressed concerning the management of POSIX SP development. Some of the issues and the concerns are summarized here.

Coherence

The insurance of coherence among the many base standards referenced by a profile has been found by profile writers to be an onerous task. The profile writer's burden could be eased significantly if base standards writers address coherence at the outset. Specifically, all the P1003.x base standards should be developed to maximize their coherence. This is seen as a management issue for TCOS-SEC, the sponsoring body of the P1003.x standards.

Conformance

The development of conformance statements and test methods for profiles is a significant challenge for profile writers. The challenge is most acute in the area of conformance of standards that are being developed outside of P1003. A premise for the profile writing rules associated with conformance must be that the profile writers are not really experts in the referenced standards. Profile writers (especially at this early period in their development) must not be overburdened with untested conformance writing rules. A possible solution is to create a new project under the auspices of P1003.3 to actually generate new test methods and actually write the necessary assertions for the first profile. (This approach was used also for the initial POSIX base standard.)

Base Standards Working Groups

Because profile writers are in some sense the customers of base standards, it is important for base standards writers to address with priority and urgency the gaps identified in the development of POSIX SPs.

Scope and Number of POSIX SPs

How many different POSIX SPs are appropriate and how broadly ranging should be their scope? Should POSIX SPs be rather narrowly focused, spanning just a few base standards, or should they address a large number of base standards?

Issues Pertaining to Referencing Base Standards

Many practical writing issues pertain to referencing, for instance, parts of base standards. This includes not only referencing options, but even the concept of subsetting, or reducing the functionality of a base standard. Also an issue is how to reference multiple versions of the same standard (e.g., two different COBOL standards.)

POSIX SP Procedures and Rules

What does it mean to be a POSIX SP? Rule making for use of the word ‘POSIX’’ must address criteria for such use. Also, many issues remain to be resolved in the area of ballot procedures. Should IEEE delegate to others the ability to develop POSIX SPs? If so, should IEEE maintain a registry of such efforts?

A.6 Conformance to a POSIX SP

A POSIX SP must address test methods for itself. In the simplest case, testing the base standards referenced is sufficient. In more complex cases, additional test methods will be necessary. In the worst case (if a base standard is subsetted, for example), the test methods for the base standards may have to be rewritten or expanded within the POSIX SP.

At the same time, P1003.3 will have to consider revisions to the *Test Methods for Measuring Conformance to POSIX* to address test methods for POSIX SPs (e.g., additional assertion types, minimum requirements for testing POSIX SPs, . . .)

A.7 Structure of Documentation for POSIX SPs

This clause gives specific format and content requirements to profile writers who are developing POSIX SPs.

A.7.1 Principles

The requirements for content and format of POSIX SPs are based on the following principles:

(1) Profiles shall be directly related to base standards and conformance to profiles shall imply conformance to base standards.

(2) POSIX SPs shall follow the rules for drafting and presentation of POSIX SPs detailed here.

(3) POSIX SPs are intended to be concise documents that do not repeat the text of the base standards.