

**ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology**

Document Type: National Body Contribution

Document Title: National Body of France Contribution on the JTC 1 N 8666, Alignment of the JTC 1 Processes

Document Source: National Body of France

Reference: At the request of the National Body of France, this document has been renumbered to avoid confusion. This is document is circulated to National Bodies for review and consideration.

Action ID: ACT

Due Date:

No. of Pages: 4

French replies on document JTC 1 N 8666

List of Issues and Questions Regarding the Alignment of JTC 1 Processes

1.) Inconsistencies within the Directives in dealing with these procedures.

Should the inconsistencies be maintained (intentional vs. accidental inconsistencies)?

These processes are different, sometimes with a good rationale for the difference, sometimes not. Thus, all differences should not be seen as inconsistencies. On the other hand it is worthwhile considering whether aligning some areas would make sense and benefit all of the JTC 1 activities. Such analysis should be limited to relevant elements and not to every single difference.

- a. **What information should be provided to National Bodies with any proposal (NP, Fast Track, PAS)? Is the information needed by National Bodies the same for all? Does each process have separate requirements? Where separate requirements exist, please list them. Should the explanatory report be used in both the PAS and Fast Track processes and should it be aligned with information requested on the NP form?**

Fast Track and PAS processes correspond to situations that differ from the NP process. The information requested in relation to a New Work Item proposal should enable NBs to decide whether the proposed standardization work is well defined, worthwhile and whether they will commit resources to its development or not, while in a Fast Track or a PAS process, the submitter is already approved as a qualified entity to submit well processed specifications for final review and approval as international standard. The context and objective being different, the information submitted is also different. Nevertheless an in-depth analysis could be done to identify useful additional information. Concerning the alignment of Fast Track and PAS processes, FNB recommends the inclusion of an Explanatory Report with the submittal package in both cases.

- b. **Should the possibility of document withdrawal be aligned between PAS and Fast Track processes?**

FNB supports the possibility to withdraw a submitted document at any point prior to publication both for the PAS and the Fast Track process (alignment of Fast Track with PAS process).

- c. **How should the 30 Day Review Period be addressed?**

The 30 Day review Period currently does not provide added value to the process already performed by the ITTF prior to submitting the documentation. Then, FNB recommends deleting this statement and coming back to the previous version of JTC 1 Directives, which were better in line with the ISO Directives.

- d. **How should the discrepancies in the acceptance criteria (voting process) (clause 9 and clause 14.4.3.3) be addressed?**

The criteria in clause 9.6 for approval of a DIS are identical to the criteria in clause 14.4.3.3 for approval of PAS transposition. FNB sees no need to change those

requirements.

- e. **Should maintenance requirements be aligned between the PAS and Fast Track processes? Should these requirements be strengthened?**

It should be possible to assign the responsibility of the maintenance of an International Standard to:

- (i) - the relevant SC,
- (ii)- a joint maintenance team of the SC and the submitter
- (iii)- the submitting entity ("subcontracted").

Although FNB would, in general, prefer (i) to (ii) and (ii) to (iii), the choice should be left to the relevant SC.

FNB recommends aligning corresponding requirements for both processes (Fast Track and PAS).

2.) Should the commenting in the enquiry stage (if applicable) and approval stages of all three processes be aligned?

The enquiry stage is specific to the NP process. No change is foreseen/needed for this stage, which the FNB believe is well adapted to a stage where commitment of resources needs to be considered. Concerning the approval stage, FNB considers the current situation as adequate.

What type of comments should be allowed in each stage of the processes?

Any comments are allowed during the stages NP, WD, CD/FCD or DIS. At the FDIS stage no technical or editorial comments are allowed in principle. In exceptional cases comments of minor editorial nature may sometimes be considered by the responsible secretariat. Any negative vote shall be accompanied by a rationale.

Are the voting forms (G10 and G18) and electronic balloting system consistent with the voting processes?

Form G 10 is consistent with the electronic balloting system.

Form G 18 is neither consistent with 9.8 (or itself) nor with the electronic balloting system. Form G 18 states (above the title) that "If a national body votes affirmatively, it shall not submit comments." while comments may be submitted with an approval.

3.) Is the information required for PAS Submitter Recognition adequate? For example, please see items 1 and 4 contained in JTC 1 N 8632, French Contribution on the Potential Alignment of PAS and Fast Track Processes.

The comments submitted by FNB in document N 8632 are still valid.

4.) Should we align the a.)JTC 1 Fast Track Process and b.) JTC 1 PAS Process with the ISO and IEC Fast Track Process? For example, if the BRM following the DIS ballot results in the modification of the document, should the document be balloted as an FDIS? If so, how do we align the processes?

For example, please see JTC 1 N 8634, which proposes the alignment of the JTC 1 Fast Track and PAS processes.

FNB considers that only some relevant elements of these two processes (JTC 1 Fast Track and

PAS Processes) should be aligned (e.g. inclusion of an Explanatory Report with the submittal package, deletion of the 30 Day review Period, implementation of an FDIS ballot when significant modifications of the document have been agreed during the BRM meeting).

PAS process in ISO/IEC procedures is different from the JTC 1 PAS process, no alignment should be sought.

FNB considers that for both JTC 1 PAS and JTC 1 Fast Track processes an FDIS ballot should be added when significant modifications of the document have been agreed during the BRM meeting.

5.) Should we harmonize the initiation of all three JTC 1 processes? For example, NPs require National Body votes for approval. Please see the third chapter of JTC 1 N 8625.

The Fast Track and PAS have been designed to ensure a fast approval of a specification already processed and approved by a qualified entity. No initiation ballot is needed for these processes. For the NP stage, a key question is the commitment of resources for the development of a well defined and worthwhile standard; here a ballot is an adequate process.