

**ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology**

Document Type: Procedural Documentation

Document Title: Letter Ballot on the JTC 1 Standing Document on PAS

Document Source: JTC 1 Secretary

Reference: This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for a three-month approval ballot. JTC 1 National Bodies are instructed to submit their vote via the online balloting system by the due date indicated.

Action ID: VOTE

Due Date: 2010-02-02

No. of Pages: 12

Standing Document
Guide to the Transposition of
Publicly Available Specifications into International Standards

1.0 Purpose and Scope of this Guide

The international world of IT standardisation is changing: ISO/IEC JTC 1 has defined and implemented a policy that encourages and assists the transposition of technical specifications from sources outside of JTC 1 into international standards. The purpose of this document is to make this policy known to a larger audience world-wide. In particular, its purpose is to explain the transposition process, its benefits, and the obligations to potential owners of such specifications. The Guide intentionally uses a narrative language, hence no in-depth knowledge of the formalities of international standardisation is required. The prime audience for this document are managers of organisations that have developed candidate specifications for submission to international standardisation. After having read the Guide, you should appreciate the value to all parties involved of having your specification adopted as an International Standard, and you will understand the process you will need to follow.

The scope of this Guide is limited to the transposition of Publicly Available Specifications (PAS) into international standards. Such a standard may be either an IS (International Standard) or an ISP (International Standardized Profile).

The objective of the Guide is to inform potential submitters of PASs for transposition. It does not replace the JTC 1 Directives or parts thereof. In cases of conflict, the JTC 1 Directives prevail.

Having read this Guide, a PAS originator should be able to judge the benefits for their own organisation to submit a specification for adoption as an international standard. A PAS originator requiring explanation on the material in this guide or wishing to consider the possibility of a PAS submission further should contact any of the organisations identified in Annex A.

2.0 Benefits of the international standardisation process

International Standards (IS) issued by JTC 1 are considered the most authoritative standards on IT. International Standardized Profiles (ISPs) constitute a special form of international standards that bring together elements of other Standards.

Both ISs and ISPs are recognised throughout the world, and in many countries constitute the technical regulatory basis for public procurement of IT goods and services. The transposition of a specification into an IS or ISP makes it eligible for such procurement, and hence widens the market recognition of such a specification.

3.0 The JTC 1 Policy regarding Publicly Available Specifications

JTC 1 has decided that

"... it (JTC 1) will provide the capability of accepting standard solutions to IT problems that have been developed outside JTC 1. ..."

This JTC 1 landmark decision recognises the value of the work of other organisations and the contribution they may make to International IT standardisation. It aims at complementing existing or forthcoming JTC 1 programs by other leading edge activity with the objective of providing the best standards worldwide.

Though the manner of transposing an acceptable specification from another organisation into an international standard mainly follows existing JTC 1 processes, the new process is significantly expedited by the concept of a recognised PAS Submitter. This will help to achieve a nominal eleven months period as a target for the transposition, and thus greatly reduce the time needed to establish international standards in areas of rapidly developing technology. As a result of this process, a specification will emerge with the enhanced status of an international standard. This is to the benefit of both the owner of the specification and JTC 1.

4.0 JTC 1's strategic orientation and its standards establishment processes

JTC 1 is committed to successfully providing users and industry with information technology standards that meet the marketplace in a timely manner.

PAS originators are invited to explicitly reference their Common Strategic Characteristics when submitting their application or any PAS for transposition.

The normal JTC 1 process to establish an International Standard is through work in one of its technical bodies, which, once it has led to technical consensus, will be concluded by a ballot among JTC 1 National Bodies, to promote a specification to an IS. The duration of the consensus-building phase is dependent on the complexity of the subject, and the amount of resources available from JTC 1 members.

The PAS Transposition Process has been established in JTC 1 to allow a standard from any source to be submitted by a National Body or an A-liaison organisation directly into a final JTC 1 ballot, to become an IS. The duration of the ballot is five months. As a result, the proposed specification may become an IS, possibly with minor modifications.

5.0 The PAS transposition process

5.1 Concepts

The PAS transposition process is based on the following key concepts:

- Publicly Available Specification (PAS)

A technical specification is called a Publicly Available Specification (PAS) if it meets certain criteria, making it suitable for possible processing as an international standard. These criteria (see clause 6 below) have been established in order to ensure a high level of consensus, quality and proper treatment of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) related matters.

- PAS originator

Any organisation that has developed and hence owns a PAS which it considers proposing for transposition into an international standard is called the PAS originator. There are no fundamental restrictions as to what form the organisation should have, but it should be recognised that constitutional characteristics of the organisation are supposed to reflect the openness of the organisation and the PAS development process.

- Recognized PAS Submitter

A PAS originator may apply to JTC 1 for recognition as a Submitter of PASs for transposition. Once approved, the status of a recognized PAS Submitter will remain valid for an initial period of two years, with the possibility of further extension (see also clause 6.1.1)

- Explanatory Report

The submission of the PAS must be accompanied by an Explanatory Report generated by the PAS originator. This report provides all information necessary to support the submission. In particular, it shall contain statements as to the extent that the PAS criteria are met by the specification. It should also clearly define the technical concepts used in the PAS.

- PAS Transposition ballot

The PAS together with the corresponding Explanatory Report is submitted for ballot.

6.0 PAS Criteria: Overview

JTC 1 has established criteria which serve as a basis for the judgement as to whether a particular organisation can be recognised and whether its specification can be accepted as a candidate for transposition into an international standard. Such criteria may also be used by potential submitters to determine the level of suitability of their specification for the standardisation process.

JTC 1 considers the primary benefit of these acceptance criteria to be guidance for evaluation and acceptance rather than an absolute pass/fail mechanism. There are a wide variety of PAS available for consideration as well as a wide variety of needs within the JTC 1 community.

An absolute pass/fail mechanism over such a wide variety of material is unlikely.

What is needed throughout this process is flexibility and good judgement on the part of all concerned. Rather than provide quantitative measures to evaluate acceptability of a PAS, on a pass/fail basis, the criteria set forth the key topics for consideration and measures for evaluating them in terms of the scope, depth, and thoroughness with which the criteria topics have been considered.

The PAS criteria are broadly classified into two categories and address the following topics:

- Organisation related criteria:
 - co-operative stance;
 - characteristics of the organisation;
 - intellectual property rights.
- Document related criteria:
 - quality;
 - consensus;
 - alignment.

It should, however, be noted that some of the above criteria, though primarily assigned to one category, may also be relevant for the other. Please refer to clause 7.0 for details.

6.1 The phases of the JTC 1 PAS Transposition Process

Based on these concepts, the JTC 1 PAS transposition process can be described as below. It is JTC 1's firm intention to provide full process transparency and the current status of any proposal from its website. This will contribute to an open dialogue between a PAS Submitter and JTC 1 and its National Bodies which is strongly encouraged.

6.1.1 Recognition of a PAS Submitter

A PAS originator interested in submitting an existing or forthcoming specification into the transposition process applies to the JTC 1 Secretariat for recognition as a PAS Submitter. Such application has to be accompanied by an identification of initial PAS(s) which are planned to be submitted, and by statements of the PAS Originator regarding the organisation related criteria (see below). It will be balloted among JTC 1 National Bodies. Once approved, the status of a recognised PAS Submitter gives a PAS originator the right to submit specifications into the transposition process for a period of two years with the possibility of further extension (see below). This status will lapse:

- if a National Body request for dis-qualification is sustained by JTC 1;
- or because the PAS originator failed to submit a specification to JTC 1 for transposition within the expected period (see 6.1.2 below).

The initiative to submit an application for recognition may come from a PAS originator or from an NB, an SC or a Category A liaison.

Since the DIS ballot among JTC 1 National Bodies will take five months, it is recommended that the application for recognition be submitted in time before the planned first submission of a PAS. While there are no particular requirements as to the format of the application, it is requested

- that it identify the overall scope of the application;
- that it identify the initial PASs which are planned to be submitted, together with their scope;
- that it address all mandatory elements of the organisation acceptance criteria as in 7.3.

Note: The rules for this recognition ballot are set in accordance with the JTC 1 Directives. In particular, the majority required for a recognition ballot to pass is the same as required for an A-liaison request to JTC 1. In effect, the ballot result is a straight yes/no decision; no ballot resolution process will be invoked. However, in the case of a negative result, the applicant may re-apply. In the case of a positive result, the recognised PAS Submitter must respond to all comments received on the ballot within 6 months of close of ballot and not later than the submission of the first PAS.

Six months prior to the expiration of an organisation's status as an approved JTC 1 PAS Submitter, the JTC 1 Secretariat will invite the submitter to review its future intentions as a PAS Submitter and consider the following options with regard to its initial application for recognition as a JTC 1 PAS Submitter:

- revise (significant changes to the initial application, e.g. changes in scope, procedures),
- withdraw (lapse), or
- reaffirm (extend current status with no significant changes).

If the PAS Submitter opts to revise, it must submit a document to the JTC 1 Secretariat stating the changes to the answers to the questions in clause 7.3 from its previous application. If the PAS Submitter opts to reaffirm, it should identify subsequent PAS(s) intended for submission. In order to allow JTC 1 a timely reaction to the revision or reaffirmation, the necessary documentation should be submitted not later than three months and one week prior to the expiration of its status as a PAS Submitter. JTC 1 Secretariat will issue a three-month letter ballot on the request for either a revision or reaffirmation. Failure to respond to the Secretariat's invitation for review of PAS Submitter status will automatically result in lapse of a PAS Submitter's status at the conclusion of its term.

6.1.2 Submission

Once a PAS originator has been recognised, a PAS submission to the JTC 1 Secretariat may occur within the scope as identified on application (see 6.1.1 above). This submission has to be accompanied by an Explanatory Report produced by the Submitter, and a statement that the conditions for recognition have not changed or an indication of the nature of changes that have occurred. The Explanatory Report particularly shall contain statements regarding the document-related criteria (see below). It should also explicitly mention how the JTC 1 Common Strategic Characteristics (see 4.0 above) are addressed.

JTC 1 requests that all submissions including the Explanatory Report occur in electronic form.

JTC 1 requests that the first submission will occur not later than six months after the initial recognition.

On request by the PAS Submitter not later than six weeks before the end of this 6 months period, the period may be extended for another six months, subject to approval by the JTC 1 chair and secretary. Failure by the PAS Submitter to submit a specification within the expected period will result in its recognition status to lapse.

The format of the specification submitted is not regulated by JTC 1. However, PAS Submitters are encouraged to apply, if flexibility still exists, a documentation style close to ISO/IEC's style (as shown in the ISO/IEC Directives Part 2), as this will ease later alignment at the time of the first review after five years. Advice on JTC 1's documentation style can be obtained from JTC 1 National Bodies.

The JTC 1 Secretariat, after checking the recognition status of the submitter, will forward the specification together with the Explanatory Report to the ISO/IEC Information Technology Task Force (ITTF) to initiate the appropriate ballot process among the JTC 1 National Bodies.

In view of the importance of the Explanatory Report for a successful transposition, JTC 1 offers its National Bodies, its Subcommittees (SCs) or A-liaison organisations for counsel and advice to PAS Submitters during the generation of this Report and throughout the whole transposition process. JTC 1 encourages PAS Submitters to make use of this counsel. This counselling process could include a review of the submissions.

In the case of interest in receiving this support, PAS Submitters are encouraged to approach any of the organisations whose addresses are given in Section 8 below.

6.1.3 Ballot

The ballot on the transposition of a PAS into an international standard follows normal JTC 1 rules.

The PAS Submitter will receive a copy of the ballot document.

Reflecting the importance of the PAS process, the JTC 1 secretariat will inform JTC 1 National Bodies and Liaison Organisations, and those organisations authorised to be PAS Submitters, of the initiation of any PAS ballot, the result of the ballot, and the identity of the JTC 1 committee which will be responsible for any future work.

For both the DIS and FDIS ballots, JTC 1 National Bodies will receive both the PAS to be transposed and the accompanying Explanatory Report. During the ballot JTC 1 members may propose changes to the PAS. These can be resolved with the PAS Submitter after completion of the ballot.

In the case of a failure of the ballot, JTC 1 will make known to the Submitter the reasons which have led to the negative result. Based on this information, the Submitter may choose to re-submit the specification after modification.

The duration of the DIS ballot is five months, and 2 months for the FDIS ballot. There may be additional time needed to consolidate the ballot results, and the JTC 1 Supplement to the ISO/IEC Directives Part 1 provides for a "Ballot Resolution Meeting" to discuss comments raised with the DIS voting; the results of this meeting are typically used to modify the DIS vote document into a more acceptable document for FDIS voting. The PAS Submitter will be able to attend and participate in these BRM discussions.

A period of seven to eleven months is therefore to be expected for this phase.

6.1.4 Publication

Once the specification has been approved by JTC 1 as an ISO/IEC International Standard, it will be published following ISO and IEC standing copyright policy, i.e.:

- Copyright for publication of the specification as an International Standard (IS) or an International Standardized Profile (ISP) is granted to ISO/IEC and any National Body which transposes such IS or ISP into a national standard.
- The originator of the specification retains copyright for its own publication.

The expected duration of this final phase is two months.

6.1.5 Maintenance

For the maintenance of an International Standard of whatever origin normal JTC 1 rules apply. Such rules distinguish between correction of defects and revisions of or amendments to existing Standards.

Note: The JTC 1 rules for maintenance are found in the Standing Document on Maintenance of International Standards.

For the correction of defects, JTC 1 provides for the installation of an editing group. Active participation of the PAS Submitter in such an editing group is expected and strongly encouraged. Depending on the degree of openness of the PAS Submitter, JTC 1 will determine its specific approach.

As for revisions and amendments, it is JTC 1's intention to avoid any divergence between the JTC 1 revision of a transposed PAS Submission and a version published by the originator. Therefore, JTC 1 invites the submitter to work closely with JTC 1 in revising or amending a transposed PAS Submission.

The PAS Submitter is requested to state its willingness for co-operation with JTC 1 for both on-going maintenance and revisions in its application (see 7.3.1). It is particularly important to note that the PAS Submitter's expected plans for maintenance are clearly spelled out in the Explanatory Report, and National Bodies will consider this information in their voting.

It is at the discretion of the PAS Submitter to withdraw the specification from the transposition process at any point prior to publication. It is also the right of the Submitter to request that the specification remain unchanged throughout the transposition process (therefore not accepting any changes proposed by National Bodies during the DIS voting, for example). Such a request should be clearly stated in the Explanatory Report, and may be an issue in the ballot process. Changes to the specification during the ballot process are, however, not acceptable as they will lead to confusion.

228 7.0 Detailed PAS Criteria

229 7.1 Introduction

230 There are three key sets of parties involved in the transposition process where a Publicly Available
231 Specification (PAS) from a source external to JTC 1 is considered as a candidate to become an
232 international standard. First, there is the body of technical experts responsible for generating the PAS.
233 Second, there is usually an organisation under whose auspices the technical experts generate, review,
234 and ultimately approve a PAS document.

235 Third, there are one, or more, organisational entities within the JTC 1 infrastructure that review and
236 process a candidate PAS for consideration as an international standard. While there may be more than
237 three parties involved in some instances, these three are considered common to all transposition
238 processes.

239 It is believed that this set of criteria can be used by all affected organisations and experts throughout the
240 entire process. That is, some PAS organisational entities may use these criteria to judge for themselves
241 whether a completed document is appropriate to be considered for the transposition process. Other PAS
242 organisational entities might consider these criteria prior to the generation and approval of a specification
243 that subsequently is to be reviewed by JTC 1 as a PAS candidate. JTC 1 Subcommittees (SCs) might
244 use these criteria to facilitate a smooth transposition process as they work with potential PAS
245 organisations either prior to or after the generation of a PAS. Finally, JTC 1 National Bodies might use
246 these criteria to judge about a PAS to become an international standard.

247 7.2 Expectations in the Use of These Acceptance Criteria

248 7.2.1 Basic Perspective

249 These PAS Criteria are a checklist of subjects and measures considered useful in both preparing and
250 reviewing a PAS Submission. The list is rather extensive in order to address the wide range of potential
251 Submissions expected to be generated and considered for transposition. It is not anticipated that all
252 criteria will be relevant to every Submission. Instead a somewhat unique set of criteria are likely to be
253 important for each different Submission.

254 7.2.2 Mandatory Elements

255 Of all the criteria, the following Clauses are essential for consideration of a PAS Submitter and a PAS
256 Submission for transposition (see also 7.2.5 below):

- 257 • Organisation related criteria:
 - 258 • Co-operative stance (7.3.1);
 - 259 • Characteristics of the Organisation (7.3.2); and
 - 260 • Intellectual Property Rights (7.3.3).
- 261 • Document related criteria
 - 262 • Completeness (7.4.1.1);
 - 263 • Testability (7.4.1.3);
 - 264 • Stability (7.4.1.4);
 - 265 • Availability (7.4.1.5);
 - 266 • Consensus (7.4.2),

267 The wording throughout the Clauses identified above is in terms of "shall respond". Hence, failure to
268 respond to any of these Clauses will result in rejection of the application for recognition of the PAS
269 Submitter or of the PAS Submission. All remaining criteria Clauses are optional. A response is desired
270 but not absolutely necessary. The mandatory response Clauses have been identified by "(M)" after the
271 clause heading.

7.2.3 Supplementary Elements

The questions asked under each Criteria Category (e.g. "7.4.1.2 Clarity", items a, b, and c) are examples of ways in which the basic criteria sub-category might be evaluated. There may well be other responses to unasked questions that best describe how well a given PAS meets, for example, an acceptable level of "Clarity". In general, the more complete the PAS Explanatory Report the more the process in JTC 1 National Bodies to judge about a PAS transposition will be eased.

7.2.4 Rationale for Extensive Criteria List

This rather extensive list of criteria is intended to produce positive benefits for all concerned. Essential aspects of this rationale are as follows:

- A single comprehensive list to apply to as wide a range of PAS Submissions as possible should open up a variety of submissions under an extensive set of conditions. The net result should be the transposition of not just a few but a variety of useful technologies into the JTC 1 arena.
- A comprehensive criteria checklist will hopefully address all reasonable means of evaluating appropriateness on a "single pass" through the evaluation process.
- The criteria are intended to help ensure that the international standards resulting from the PAS transposition process in turn facilitate the development and use of successful products in the market place which result from quality standards of a stable and widely accepted nature.
- The consistent application of the criteria will help ensure that the transposition process is not misused.
- The criteria focus the valuable time of PAS producing organisations on those factors and characteristics considered most important to a successful transposition process.

7.2.5 Application of the criteria

When applying for recognition as a PAS Submitter, a PAS Originator shall respond to the following:

- the overall scope of the application
- the initial PAS Submissions which are planned to be submitted, together with their scope
- the criteria of subclause 7.3

When submitting a PAS, the Recognized PAS Submitter shall respond, in the Explanatory Report, to the criteria of subclause 7.4. The Explanatory Report shall include both the approved overall scope and the scope of the PAS to be submitted side by side.

7.3 Organisation Acceptance Criteria

7.3.1 Co-operative Stance (M)

There should be evidence of a co-operative attitude toward open dialogue, and a stated objective of pursuing standardisation in the JTC 1 arena. The JTC 1 community will reciprocate in similar ways, and in addition, will recognise the organisation's contribution to international standards.

It is JTC 1's intention to avoid any divergence between the JTC 1 revision of a transposed PAS and a version published by the originator. Therefore, JTC 1 invites the submitter to work closely with JTC 1 in revising or amending a transposed PAS.

There should be acceptable proposals covering the following categories and topics.

7.3.1.1 Commitment to Working Agreement(s)

- a) What working agreements have been provided, how comprehensive are they?
- b) How manageable are the proposed working agreements (e.g. understandable, simple, direct, devoid of legalistic language except where necessary)?
- c) What is the attitude toward creating and using working agreements?

315 **7.3.1.2 Ongoing Maintenance**

- 316 a) What is the willingness and resource availability to conduct ongoing maintenance, interpretation, and
317 5 year revision cycles following JTC 1 approval (see also 6.1.5)?
- 318 b) What level of willingness and resources are available to facilitate specification progression during the
319 transposition process (e.g. technical clarification and normal document editing)?

320 **7.3.1.3 Changes during transposition**

- 321 a) What are the expectations of the proposer toward technical and editorial changes to the specification
322 during the transposition process?
- 323 b) How flexible is the proposing organisation toward using only portions of the proposed specification or
324 adding supplemental material to it?

325 **7.3.1.4 Future Plans**

- 326 a) What are the intentions of the proposing organisation toward future additions, extensions, deletions or
327 modifications to the specification? Under what conditions? When? Rationale?
- 328 b) What willingness exists to work with JTC 1 on future versions in order to avoid divergence?
329 Note that the answer to this question is particularly relevant in cases where doubts may exist about
330 the openness of the submitter organisation.
- 331 c) What is the scope of the organisation activities relative to specifications similar to but beyond that
332 being proposed?

333 **7.3.2 Characteristics of the Organisation (M)**

334 The PAS should have originated in a stable body that uses reasonable processes for achieving broad
335 consensus among many parties. The PAS owner should demonstrate the openness and non-
336 discrimination of the process which is used to establish consensus, and it should declare any ongoing
337 commercial interest in the specification either as an organisation in its own right or by supporting
338 organisations such as revenue from sales or royalties.

339 **7.3.2.1 Process and Consensus:**

- 340 a) What processes and procedures are used to achieve consensus, by small groups and by the
341 organisation in its entirety?
- 342 b) How easy or difficult is it for interested parties, e.g. business entities, individuals, or government
343 representatives to participate?
- 344 c) What criteria are used to determine "voting" rights in the process of achieving consensus?

345 **7.3.2.2 Credibility and Longevity:**

- 346 a) What is the extent of and support from (technical commitment) active members of the organisation?
- 347 b) How well is the organisation recognised by the interested/affected industry?
- 348 c) How long has the organisation been functional (beyond the initial establishment period) and what are
349 the future expectations for continued existence?
- 350 d) What sort of legal business entity is the organisation operating under?

351 **7.3.3 Intellectual Property Rights: (M)**

352 The organisation is requested to make known its position on the items listed below. In particular, there
353 shall be a written statement of willingness of the organisation and its members, if applicable, to comply
354 with the ISO/IEC patent policy in reference to the PAS under consideration.

355 **7.3.3.1 Patents:**

- 356 a) How willing are the organisation and its members to meet the ISO/IEC policy on these matters?
- 357 b) What patent rights, covering any item of the proposal, is the PAS owner aware of?

358 **7.3.3.2 Copyrights:**

- 359 a) What copyrights have been granted relevant to the subject specification(s)?

360 b) What copyrights, including those on implementable code in the specification, is the PAS originator
361 willing to grant?

362 c) What conditions, if any, apply (e.g. copyright statements, electronic labels, logos)?

363 **7.3.3.3 Distribution Rights:**

364 a) What distribution rights exist and what are the terms of use?

365 b) What degree of flexibility exists relative to modifying distribution rights; before the transposition
366 process is complete, after transposition completion?

367 c) Is dual/multiple publication and/or distribution envisaged, and if so, by whom?

368 **7.3.3.4 Trademark Rights:**

369 a) What trademarks apply to the subject specification?

370 b) What are the conditions for use and are they to be transferred to ISO/IEC in part or in their entirety?

371 **7.3.3.5 Original Contributions:**

372 a) What original contributions (outside the above IPR categories) (e.g. documents, plans, research
373 papers, tests, proposals) need consideration in terms of ownership and recognition?

374 b) What financial considerations are there?

375 c) What legal considerations are there?

376 **7.4 Document Related Criteria**

377 **7.4.1 Quality**

378 Within its scope the specification shall completely describe the functionality (in terms of interfaces,
379 protocols, formats, etc) necessary for an implementation of the PAS. If it is based on a product, it shall
380 include all the functionality necessary to achieve the stated level of compatibility or interoperability in a
381 product independent manner.

382 **7.4.1.1 Completeness (M):**

383 a) How well are all interfaces specified?

384 b) How easily can implementation take place without need of additional descriptions?

385 c) What proof exists for successful implementations (e.g. availability of test results for media
386 standards)?

387 **7.4.1.2 Clarity:**

388 a) What means are used to provide definitive descriptions beyond straight text?

389 b) What tables, figures, and reference materials are used to remove ambiguity?

390 c) What contextual material is provided to educate the reader?

391 **7.4.1.3 Testability (M)**

392 The extent, use and availability of conformance/interoperability tests or means of implementation
393 verification (e.g. availability of reference material for magnetic media) shall be described, as well as the
394 provisions the specification has for testability.

395 The specification shall have had sufficient review over an extended time period to characterise it as being
396 stable.

397 **7.4.1.4 Stability (M):**

398 a) How long has the specification existed, unchanged, since some form of verification (e.g. prototype
399 testing, paper analysis, full interoperability tests) has been achieved?

400 b) To what extent and for how long have products been implemented using the specification?

401 c) What mechanisms are in place to track versions, fixes, and addenda?

402 **7.4.1.5 Availability (M):**

403 a) Where is the specification available (e.g. one source, multinational locations, what types of
404 distributors)?

- 405 b) How long has the specification been available?
- 406 c) Has the distribution been widespread or restricted? (describe situation)
- 407 d) What are the costs associated with specification availability?
- 408 **7.4.2 Consensus (M)**
- 409 The accompanying report shall describe the extent of (inter)national consensus that the document has
- 410 already achieved.
- 411 **7.4.2.1 Development Consensus:**
- 412 a) Describe the process by which the specification was developed.
- 413 b) Describe the process by which the specification was approved.
- 414 c) What "levels" of approval have been obtained?
- 415 **7.4.2.2 Response to User Requirements:**
- 416 a) How and when were user requirements considered and utilised?
- 417 b) To what extent have users demonstrated satisfaction?
- 418 **7.4.2.3 Market Acceptance:**
- 419 a) How widespread is the market acceptance today? Anticipated?
- 420 b) What evidence is there of market acceptance in the literature?
- 421 **7.4.2.4 Credibility:**
- 422 a) What is the extent and use of conformance tests or means of implementation verification?
- 423 b) What provisions does the specification have for testability?
- 424 **7.4.3 Alignment**
- 425 The specification should be aligned with existing JTC 1 standards or ongoing work and thus complement
- 426 existing standards, architectures and style guides. Any conflicts with existing standards, architectures
- 427 and style guides should be made clear and justified.
- 428 **7.4.3.1 Relationship to Existing Standards:**
- 429 a) What international standards are closely related to the specification and how?
- 430 b) To what international standards is the proposed specification a natural extension?
- 431 c) How is the specification related to emerging and ongoing JTC 1 projects?
- 432 **7.4.3.2 Adaptability and Migration:**
- 433 a) What adaptations (migrations) of either the specification or international standards would improve the
- 434 relationship between the specification and international standards?
- 435 b) How much flexibility do the proponents of the specification have?
- 436 c) What are the longer-range plans for new/evolving specifications?
- 437 **7.4.3.3 Substitution and Replacement:**
- 438 a) What needs exist, if any, to replace an existing international standard? Rationale?
- 439 b) What is the need and feasibility of using only a portion of the specification as an international
- 440 standard?
- 441 c) What portions, if any, of the specification do not belong in an international standard (e.g. too
- 442 implementation-specific)?
- 443 **7.4.3.4 Document Format and Style**
- 444 a) What plans, if any, exist to conform to JTC 1 document styles?

445 **8.0 PAS Submitter Points of Contact**

446 **8.1 JTC 1 Secretariat**

447 The JTC 1 Secretariat is the central contact point in JTC 1. Approaching it is recommended when contact
448 is sought with a JTC 1 Subcommittee, or in cases where no other appropriate contact point (see below) is
449 readily available.

450 The JTC 1 Secretariat is reached at:

451 American National Standards Institute
452 25 West 43rd Street, 4th Floor
453 New York, NY 10036
454 USA

455 Tel: +1 212 642-4932

456 Fax: +1 212 398-0023

457 e-mail: lraichel@ANSI.org

458 <http://www.JTC 1.org>

459 **8.2 ITTF**

460 The Information Technology Task Force (ITTF) of ISO and IEC is the central contact point for JTC 1
461 matters in ISO and IEC. Approaching it is recommended in cases where no other appropriate contact
462 point is readily available.

463 ITTF is reached at:

464 ITTF: ISO Central Secretariat
465 1, rue de Varembe
466 CH-1211 Geneva 20
467 Switzerland

468 TP: +41 22 7490 111

469 TF: +41 22 733 34 30

470 e-mail: brannon@isocs.iso.ch

471 **8.3 The National Standardisation Organisations**

472 The national standardisation organisations are the members of JTC 1 and as such, contact points on JTC
473 1 matters in the individual countries. A potential PAS originator may choose to approach the national
474 standardisation organisation in the country of its residence.

475 A list of the JTC 1 National Bodies is found at: <http://www.JTC 1.org>

476 **8.4 The Organisations in A-liaison with JTC 1**

477 An organisation in A-liaison with JTC 1 is entitled, among others, to submit a standard for ballot in JTC 1
478 under the Fast Track process. A list of organisations in A-liaison with JTC 1 is found at: <http://www.JTC 1.org>
479 [1.org](http://www.JTC 1.org)

480