



## ISO/IEC JTC 1 N9806

2009-09-27

**Replaces:**

### ISO/IEC JTC 1 Information Technology

**Document Type:** National Body contribution

**Document Title:** French Contribution on N9718, REVISED JTC 1 Supplement to the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1 and JTC 1 Standing Documents

**Document Source:** National Body of France

**Project Number:**

**Document Status:** This document is forwarded to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the October 2009 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Tel Aviv.

**Action ID:** ACT

**Due Date:**

**No. of Pages:** 4

## France National Body contribution on document N 9718, REVISED JTC 1 Supplement to the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1 and JTC 1 Standing Documents

The FNB analyzed the content of all documents included in the zip file and would like to share the following comments/recommendations for improvement of the overall package (JTC 1 Supplement, merged directives and Standing Documents).

### General comments:

1. The FNB would like clarification on the question of Fast Track of Amendments. The ISO/IEC Directives as well as the JTC 1 Supplement do not exclude this possibility. At least two SDs make reference to this possibility.
2. Each standing document should include explicit reference(s) to the relevant parts of the JTC 1 supplement (including the annexes when appropriate). Generally speaking references in the documents should refer to a document of higher level (e.g. reference in a SD to the JTC 1 supplement and reference in the JTC 1 document to the ISO/IEC Directives).
3. In order to avoid potential inconsistencies, it would be better if voting durations were to appear only in the Voting annex. In other documents references to the relevant parts of the Voting annex could be added as appropriate, without explicitly mentioning voting durations.
4. The Guide for ITU-T and ISO/IEC JTC 1 cooperation is not included in N 9718. It is essential that the document is included in the package that will be sent for formal voting (after the Plenary and the SWG-D meetings), in synchronization with the ITU-T approval process. Also, Annex L in JTC 1 Supplement and the SD on ITU-T in N 9718 are very similar, with the SD containing an improved version of the text in Annex L.

### JTC 1 supplement:

1. The numbering 1.18.4.3.1.4 is incorrect and should be 1.18.4.1.4
2. The numbering of clauses in JTC 1 supplement and merged directives should be fully consistent. For example, clauses 1.18.2.5, 1.18.3 and 1.18.3.1 differ from one document to the other.

### Annex F:

1. Modify second sentence of PAS Originator under clause F.3.1 as follows (text in bold appears to be missing from a previous version) : "There are no fundamental restrictions **as to what form the organization should have, but** constitutional characteristics of the organizational are supposed to reflect the openness of the organization and of the PAS development process".
2. On page 3, the third sentence states that the submission of an application for PAS recognition "may come from a PAS originator or from a NB, a subcommittee or a Category C liaison". The French NB is wondering whether such a broad statement is intended, as it may be understood as allowing one body (e.g., an NB or SC) to make an application on behalf of another one (e.g., a consortium).
3. As the SD on Normative Referencing is adopted, Annex F/PAS process needs to be updated to reflect the new requirements on PAS Submitter for Normative Referencing.

### SD on EDPDA:

1. (Reference to general comment #1)
2. In clause 12.1, table in line 216:
  - 2.1. Four rows refer to Fast Track. Suggest using same terminology (Fast Track document or Fast Track/PAS document) in the four rows.
  - 2.2. FCD no longer exists; replace FCD by DIS (one row). Similarly, FPDAM no longer exists, replace FPDAM by DAM (one row).

SD on liaisons:

1. The French NB does not see what the difference is between a "liaison" and a "technical liaison". A liaison is defined (lines 38/39) as a technical working relationship. What would be the definition of a non technical liaison?  
The FNB recommends referring only to "liaisons" and replacing "technical liaison" with "liaison" in the whole document.  
In line 18; remove " (mandatory for technical liaison)."
2. Liaison organizations are not members (only member bodies are). So, in line 23 replace "liaison members" by "liaison organizations" and in line 24 replace "membership" by "liaison"
3. Speaking about "NB participation in the liaison organization activities." is totally inappropriate.  
Text in lines 24/26 mostly duplicates the text from JTC 1 Supplement clause 1.18.3. It is recommended to remove last part of the sentence and limit the sentence to: "JTC 1, or the appropriate subsidiary body, should review the liaison activity".
4. In line 64 replace "their own subcommittee" with "the subcommittee they represent".
5. In lines 70/71, the meaning of "Arrangements for adequate liaison between JTC 1 and technical committees or subcommittees of ISO and IEC are essential." is unclear. The whole sentence should be deleted.
6. Lines 73/75 state that "As far as the study of new subjects is concerned, the ITTF seeks the agreement of all interested parties in ISO and IEC so that the work will go forward without overlap or duplication of effort."  
Is this the role of ITTF? If not, delete the sentence.
7. In line 121, replace "X.1" by "clause 1"
8. No need for lines 131/133 (already very well covered in the JTC 1 Supplement); delete them.
9. Clause 6.1 does not provide with clear guidance. A liaison should be at JTC 1 level for JTC 1 Rapporteur Groups, at SC level for SC Rapporteur groups, or at WG level for WG Rapporteur groups.  
Delete clause 6.1
10. Clause 6.2: is the restriction to "invitation only" really intended and in line with the open spirit of JTC 1. This limitation does not appear in current JTC 1 Directives, so it is recommended to delete clause 6.2. If confirmed, its title should be "JTC 1 Study Groups (SGs) and Special Working Groups (SWGs)".
11. Clause 6.3: is the restriction to "invitation only" really intended and in line with the open spirit of JTC 1. This limitation does not appear in current JTC 1 Directives, so it is recommended to delete clause 6.3. If confirmed, line 150 should read "Liaisons to the subcommittee may participate at subcommittee Advisory Group meetings by invitation only."

SD on Maintenance:

1. The term “reprint” should nowadays be understood as publication of a new reprint or of a new electronic version. The French NB suggests replacing “reprint” with “publication” in the whole document.
2. In line 171, the voting duration should be deleted. The sentence should read: “Upon completion of the ballot period, the SC secretariat should distribute...”

SD on Normative Referencing:

1. In line 95 (editorial) remove “it” (in the sentence “JTC 1 supports this approach and it has to maintain the quality..”)
2. In line 113: is FDIS the intended stage, noting that FDIS ballot is at ISO and IEC level, not at JTC 1? Also noting that FDIS may be omitted if there is no negative vote at DIS level? Perhaps CD (for subcommittee work) and DIS (for Fast Track), as used in clause 5.3, would be better. In order to make it simple, we suggest using “CD, DIS or FDIS” (instead of FDIS).
3. In line 117 (editorial) remove “i”
4. In line 244 should be “CD, DIS or FDIS ballot”.

SD on Operations:

1. The document only talks about development of standards - nothing about Amendments, TR, TS. It would be useful to add a note like: “PDAMs, PDTs and PDTRs are processed like a CD”.

SD on Registration Authorities:

1. The French NB recommends adding a sentence at the beginning of the document making the following references: “In addition to the requirements of ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, 2.12 and annex H, the following applies for JTC 1 Registration Authorities.”