

**ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology**

Document Type: National Body Contribution

Document Title: National Body of the Germany Contribution on Initiation Ballot for Fast-Track and PAS Submissions

Document Source: National Body of the Germany

Reference: This is document is circulated to National Bodies for review and consideration. It will be discussed at the February 2009 JTC 1 SWG-D meeting in Delft, Netherlands under agenda item 11.

Action ID: ACT

Due Date:

No. of Pages: 7

DIN Standards Committee on Information Technology
and Applications (NIA)

DIN Contribution regarding an Initiation Ballot for Fast-Track and PAS Submissions

This proposal constitutes a discussion paper of the German NB on the idea of including an initiation ballot for fast-track and PAS proposals in the JTC 1 Directives (see JTC1 N 8933, where the idea was proposed).

At the last meeting of JTC1/SWG Directives in Osaka, JP, 2009-11, the topic was discussed and Germany volunteered to submit a text proposal in order to facilitate the discussion in the SWG.

The German national body invites all experts on the Special Working Group to join an open discussion on this proposal at the upcoming meeting in Delft.

Submitted by Cord Wischhöfer (2009-02-04)

DIN Contribution for an Initiation Ballot for Fast-Track and PAS Submissions

Germany would like to summarise the reasoning for our proposal of an 'initiation ballot' for all Fast-Track and PAS submissions as already suggested in document JTC 1 N 8893 as response to JTC 1 N 8666. This document tries to take account of the recent discussions with respect to changes of the Fast-Track and PAS processes at the Osaka SWG Directives meeting. At the end of the document we offer a concrete implementation proposal based on, and supplementing, Annex F of the ISO/IEC Directives Part 1.

Our main reasons for this suggestion are:

- to allow National Bodies to assess the need/value for a specific Fast-Track/PAS submission based on the information provided by the submitter organisation;
- currently Fast-Track and PAS submission can interfere with work underway as there is no 'prioritisation' or scheduling possibility. The immediate review of such a submission may have an impact on the project schedule of JTC 1's own work, possibly requiring an extension to complete such work. An 'initiation ballot' provides National Bodies with a 'tool' to evaluate the relative merit and market need of such a submission compared to work underway in JTC 1 SCs. While considering the proposal National Bodies can also make an assessment whether or not the resources for a thorough review of the submission are available at this point in time;
- multiple National Bodies have suggested to 'limit' submissions for Fast-Track/PAS simply based on the size of the document. Recent discussions have shown that this would be a too simplistic approach, which does not cater for other possible criteria e.g., the complexity of the proposed specification. Other items such as the maturity of the spec needs to be considered as well. One can assume that a 3rd edition of a standard widely accepted and implemented in the market does require less resources for a thorough review than a completely new specification without any implementation in the market (assuming that size and complexity of the document are the same).

An 'initiation ballot' on a proposed spec accompanied by information provided by the submitter, giving similar input as e.g. an NP submission or the current PAS Explanatory report (see the German contribution N 9146), allow National Bodies to make a judgement on the suitability of the proposal for Fast-Track/PAS procedure as well as the resources needed for review.

•

One of the main concerns against such an 'initiation ballot' raised at the Osaka SWG Directives meeting was the length of such a ballot. Germany originally proposed a 30 day ballot. At the meeting such a ballot period was considered to be too short to be practical and unacceptable for ISO and IEC.

However, there are precedents for such a 30 day ballot both in IEC (TC 100 Fast-Track) and in ISO (the PSDO agreement with IEEE, N9184). The relevant text of the IEEE PSDO agreement in clause 3.2 reads:

“....The Secretary General shall then submit a proposal to the relevant ISO committee for a 30-day ballot which shall decide, by simple majority vote, on: (a) the need for an ISO International Standard on the subject; and (b) submission of the proposal for FDIS ballot.”

(Note: As the PSDO agreement includes also some JTC 1 SC's it will be applicable for JTC 1.) The IEC TC100 Fast Standardisation Process has been taken from the TC 100 presentation at the Nara plenary:

“

TC 100 Fast Standardization Procedure

- Allows 1 month NP approval in AGM and successive 5 months CDV for publication
- In this case, Experts (including PL) should be from at least 4 NCs ...”

Note: The ballot is at the AGM (Advisory Group on Management) level, not at TC or SC level.

Another reason brought forward against a 30-day ballot was that the time to assess a proposal in 30 days is too short. Germany does not suggest to review the full specification in this time period but to base the decision on the information provided by the submitter. The better and more complete the provided information is the easier it will be for National Bodies to assess the merit of a submission. In the current 30-day review period National Bodies had to read the spec and to identify possible contradictions with existing standards. This task in our mind requires more work than thoroughly review and discuss the 'Explanatory Report' mentioned above.

Germany, therefore, believes that a 30-day 'initiation ballot' should be possible and the preferred solution in order not to extend the overall length of Fast-Track and PAS process.

Acceptance criteria: The ISO/IEEE PSDO proposal requires a simple majority. The German proposal below clarifies that this means a simple majority of all JTC 1 P-members voting. The normal voting rule that more than 50% of P-members need to participate in the ballot shall apply here as well as this is a general rule for all ballots.

Annex F (normative) Options for development of a project

F.1 Simplified diagram of options

Project stage	Normal procedure	Draft submitted with proposal	"Fast-track procedure" ¹⁾	Technical Specification ²⁾	Technical Report ³⁾	Publicly Available Specification ⁴⁾
Proposal stage (see 2.3)	Acceptance of proposal	Acceptance of proposal	Acceptance of proposal	Acceptance of proposal		Acceptance of proposal
Preparatory stage (see 2.4)	Preparation of working draft	<i>Study by working group</i> ⁵⁾		Preparation of draft		Approval of draft PAS
Committee stage (see 2.5)	Development and acceptance of committee draft	<i>Development and acceptance of committee draft</i> ⁵⁾		Acceptance of draft	Acceptance of draft	
Enquiry stage (see 2.6)	Development and acceptance of enquiry draft	Development and acceptance of enquiry draft	Acceptance of enquiry draft			
Approval stage (see 2.7)	<i>Approval of FDIS</i> ⁶⁾	<i>Approval of FDIS</i> ⁶⁾	<i>Approval of FDIS</i> ⁶⁾			
Publication stage (see 2.8)	Publication of International Standard	Publication of International Standard	Publication of International Standard	Publication of Technical Specification	Publication of Technical Report	Publication of PAS

Stages in *italics*, enclosed by dotted circles may be omitted.

1) See 5.5.

2) See 3.1.

3) See 3.3.

4) See 3.2.

5) According to the result of the vote on the new work item proposal, both the preparatory stage and the committee stage may be omitted.

6) May be omitted if the enquiry draft was approved without negative votes

F.1 “Fast-track procedure”

F.2.1 Proposals to apply the fast-track procedure may be made as follows.

F.2.1.1 Any P-member or category A liaison organization of a concerned technical committee may propose that an **existing standard from any source** be submitted for vote as an enquiry draft. The proposer shall obtain the agreement of the originating organization before making a proposal. The criteria for proposing an existing standard for the fast-track procedure are a matter for each proposer to decide.

F.2.1.2 An international standardizing body recognized by the ISO or IEC council board may propose that a **standard developed by that body** be submitted for vote as a final draft International Standard.

F.2.1.3 An organization having entered into a formal technical agreement with ISO or IEC may propose, in agreement with the appropriate technical committee or subcommittee, that a **draft standard developed by that organization** be submitted for vote as an enquiry draft within that technical committee or subcommittee.

In JTC 1 any P-member of JTC 1 or organisation in Category A liaison with JTC 1 (the proposer) may propose that

- a) an existing standard from any source be submitted without modification directly for vote as a DIS; ~~or~~
- ~~b) an existing amendment to a standard, with the approval of the responsible SC, be submitted without modification directly for vote as a DAM.~~

The criteria for proposing an existing standard for the fast-track procedure is a matter for each proposer to decide.

F.2.2 The proposal shall be received by the Chief Executive Officer, who shall take the following actions:

a) settle the copyright and/or trademark situation with the organization having originated the proposed document, so that it can be freely copied and distributed to national bodies without restriction;

b) for cases **F.2.1.1** and **F.2.1.3**, assess in consultation with the relevant secretariats which technical committee/subcommittee is competent for the subject covered by the proposed document; where no technical committee exists competent to deal with the subject of the document in question, the Chief Executive Officer shall refer the proposal to the technical management board, which may request the Chief Executive Officer to submit the document to the enquiry stage and to establish an ad hoc group to deal with matters subsequently arising;

c) ascertain that there is no evident contradiction with other International Standards;

d) distribute the proposed document as an enquiry draft (**F.2.1.1** and **F.2.1.3**) in accordance with 2.6.1, or as a final draft International Standard (case **F.2.1.2**) in accordance with 2.7.1, indicating (in cases **F.2.1.1** and **F.2.1.3**) the technical committee/subcommittee to the domain of which the proposed document belongs.


In JTC 1 the proposal for the fast-track procedure shall be received by the ITTF which shall take the following actions:

- Settle the copyright or trademark situation, or both, with the proposer, so that the proposed text can be freely copied and distributed within ISO/IEC without restriction;

- Assess in consultation with the JTC 1 Secretariat that JTC 1 is the competent committee for the subject covered in the proposed standard and ascertain that there is no evident contradiction with other ISO/IEC standards;

- Check that the proposer has submitted an Explanatory Report (see Annex ????) and responded to all the questions;

- Distribute the text of the proposed standard together with the 'Explanatory Report' to all JTC 1 National Bodies for a 30 day initiation ballot. In case of particularly bulky documents the ITTF may demand the necessary number of copies from the proposer. Each National Body shall review the Explanatory Report and decide if it accepts the proposal as a Fast-Track submission considering inter alia its capability to perform a thorough review of the proposed standard and the impact on the work program of the concerned sub committee. As part of the response a National Body may indicate their preference to process the proposed standard in the normal development process.

- If more than 50% of the JTC 1 P-members accept the proposal as a Fast-Track submission ITTF will distribute the text of the proposed standard ~~(or amendment)~~ as a DIS ~~(or DAM)~~, indicating that the text of the standard belongs in the domain of JTC 1 (see **Form G12**)  in case of particularly bulky documents the ITTF may demand the necessary number of copies from the proposer.

F.2.3 The period for voting and the conditions for approval shall be as specified in 2.6 for an enquiry draft and 2.7 for a final draft International Standard. In the case where no technical committee is involved, the condition for approval of a final draft International Standard is that not more than one-quarter of the total number of votes cast are negative.

F.2.4 If, for an enquiry draft, the conditions of approval are met, the draft standard shall progress to the approval stage (2.7). If not, the proposal has failed and any further action shall be decided upon by the technical committee/subcommittee to which the document was attributed in accordance with **F.2.2 b)**.

If, for a final draft International Standard, the conditions of approval are met, the document shall progress to the publication stage (**F.2.2b**). If not, the proposal has failed and any further action shall be decided upon by the technical committee/subcommittee to which the FDIS was attributed in accordance with **F.2.2 b)**, or by discussion between the originating organization and the office of the CEO if no technical committee was involved.

If the standard is published, its maintenance shall be handled by the technical committee/subcommittee to which the document was attributed in accordance with **F.2.2 b)**, or, if no technical committee was involved, the approval procedure set out above shall be repeated if the originating organization decides that changes to the standard are required.