

**ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology**

Document Type: National Body Contribution

Document Title: National Body of Japan Comments on JTC 1 N 9439, Draft JTC 1 Supplement to the ISO/IEC Directives

Document Source: National Body of Japan

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 6.

Action ID: ACT

Due Date:

No. of Pages: 13

1 Introduction

The following are the JNB comments on JTC 1 N 9439: JTC 1 Supplement to the ISO/IEC Directives.

2 Comments

2.1 Primary cross referencing from JT1 Supplement

	Page	Clause	Comments	Proposal/Action
JP1	Cover		JTC 1 N 9439 contains the merged text of the ISO/IEC Directives Part 1 and the JTC 1 specific procedures. It is not clear that how the final version of the JTC 1 supplement will be. Will it be a merged document like JTC 1 N 9439 or a separate document like ISO and IEC Supplements? This should be clarified.	Clarification
JP2			The JTC 1 N9439 (Draft JTC 1 Supplement) is using the colours of black and orange. However, colour of orange is not easy to read. So that colour of orange should be changed to red or blue for readability from the next draft.	Editorial suggestion
JP3			Since there is no statement that "this item is not applicable to the JTC 1" in the ISO/IEC Directives, all items of the ISO/IEC Directives seem to be applicable to the JTC 1. For example, item 2.10.4 of ISO/IEC Directives should not be applicable to JTC 1, there should be "not applicable to JTC 1" statement in the ISO/IEC Directives.	Clarification
JP4			There are some items colored in orange, but those are of JTC 1. For example, two paragraphs above the 2.1.7 of the current draft are now in orange, but they should be in black to show that those are of JTC 1 Directives. Also there are some items in black, but those are of ISO/IEC Directives.	Editorial suggestion
JP5			Assuming that all the black colored items in the current draft will move to the JTC 1 Supplement, it will be needed to insert the words of "see JTC 1 Supplement" into ISO/IEC Directives in addition to "see IEC supplement and see ISO supplement". For example, items of 1.8.1, 1.11.4, and so on of current draft need such wording inserted into the ISO/IEC Directives.	Clarification
JP6			Assuming that FCD will be changed to DIS in the near future, but the current draft seems not to specify the DIS stage nor the FCD stage. As the result, there seem to be lack of requirements for the DIS (FCD) stage.	Clarification
JP7			There are some portions in the current draft which specify many things in one subclause number instead of scattering them over the related subclauses of the ISO/IEC Directives. For	Clarification

			example, many are defined in the 1.11.6 and 2.10.5, is it okay to state many in the one new subclause, or is it needed to scatter them over the related subclauses of the ISO/IEC Directives?	
JP8	10	1.4 Role of the Chief Executive Officer	By comparison with 4.1.4, JTC 1 Directives, the following item is missing. • Convening meetings of JTC 1 and SCs;	Clarification
JP9	15	1.9.1	In the 3rd paragraph: "In JTC 1, the technical committee shall decide on the allocation of the Secretariat of the subcommittee in all cases.", "the technical committee" should be "JTC 1".	Editorial correction
JP10	25	1.17.2.4 Review of liaisons	Technical committees and subcommittees shall review all their liaison arrangements on a regular basis, at least every 2 years, or at every committee meeting. In JTC 1, JTC 1 and SCs shall review <i>annually</i> liaison relationships.	The difference should be mentioned in JTC 1 Supplement.
JP11	26	1.17.3.4 Review of liaisons	Technical committees and subcommittees shall review all their liaison arrangements on a regular basis, at least every 2 years, or at every committee meeting. In JTC 1, JTC 1 and SCs shall review <i>annually</i> liaison relationships.	The difference should be mentioned in JTC 1 Supplement.
JP12	27	1.17.3.5 Rights and obligations	The section on "Category C" Liaison is a counterpart of 3.3.4.3, JTC 1 Directives. In accordance with JTC 1 N 8964 (letter ballot), the 4th item should be removed.	Editorial correction
JP13	27-28	1.17.3.5	The section on "Liaison with ITU-T" is a counterpart of 3.3.4.3, JTC 1 Directives. (1) In "Note", there is no closing parenthesis"]". (2) There is no counterpart to "See 2.6.4, Annex K" of 3.3.4.3. (3) "in Annex K" should be "in the Guide for ITU-T and ISO/IEC JTC 1 Co-operation".	(1) Editorial correction (2) Editorial correction: "See the Guide for ITU-T and ISO/IEC JTC 1 Co-operation" should be added. (3) Editorial correction
JP14	30	2.1.5.4	The 3rd paragraph reads: "...This document shall be considered using the default approval process (see Annex ??, Voting)," It is presumed that the referenced section is the 6th paragraph, Annex AC (a counterpart of 9.1.6, JTC 1 Directives): " JTC 1 and its SCs shall pay special attention to negative votes by P-members and shall attempt as far as possible to resolve the underlying differences and achieve the maximum level of approval. In certain cases, consensus may be confirmed for questions which are expected to contain no controversial issues and for which agreement of the committee is foreseen in advance. Such questions will be distributed for a	Clarification

			<p>period of 60 days. If no objection is received during this period, the question is considered to be approved. If any P- member objects to the question during this period, the question will be decided by a vote, either at a meeting or by letter ballot. Questions for which this may be used are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appointment/change of a Registration Authority• Establishment or cancellation of a Liaison• Proposal for stabilization/withdrawal of a standard• PAS Submitter reaffirmation• Request for free availability of a standard• Modification of a SC's Program of Work• Others as approved by JTC 1 <p>JTC 1 and its SCs shall pay special attention "</p> <p>In stead of defining "Default Ballot", 9.1.6 above was approved at the SWG-D Ottawa meeting, 2006-07-24/26 (ref. Recommendation 9). Although the use of "Default Ballot" is rejected, is the phrase "default approval process" acceptable?</p>													
JP15	32	2.1.6 Target dates	<p>The following Note has not been completed: "Note: the above timeframes should be transferred into a table.(see slides ANSI uses for training)"</p>	The Note should be completed.												
JP16		2.1.6 2.1.9 (2.1.5.4)	<p>2.1.6 is a counterpart of 6.3.1, and 2.1.9 is a counterpart of 6.4.1 JTC 1 Directives.</p> <p>In accordance with TMB resolution 30/2003 (ISO Change Notifications Issue#2 (2005-08-26) CN01/2005), the new timescales was introduced into JTC 1 Directives (ref. J1N 7302). In conjunction with ITTF, JTC 1 Secretariat made necessary changes to the JTC 1 Directives, but left the following differences.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>ISO</td><td>JTC 1</td></tr><tr><td>Target date</td><td>DIS (stage 40.00) FDIS</td><td>registration of the first CD FDIS</td></tr><tr><td>Auto-cancellation</td><td>Yes</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>approval</td><td>TMB</td><td>JTC 1</td></tr></table> <p>However, ITTF's instructions are based on the ISO Procedures and they have not followed JTC 1 Directives, in particular Progress control (Target date), Cancellation rules and their corresponding actions. In order to avoid any confusion, JTC 1 should consult with ITTF and make modifications to 2.1.6 and 2.1.9.</p>		ISO	JTC 1	Target date	DIS (stage 40.00) FDIS	registration of the first CD FDIS	Auto-cancellation	Yes	No	approval	TMB	JTC 1	Clarification
	ISO	JTC 1														
Target date	DIS (stage 40.00) FDIS	registration of the first CD FDIS														
Auto-cancellation	Yes	No														
approval	TMB	JTC 1														

			<p>In addition to the issue above, JTC 1 Supplement should specify the relationship between <i>"Request for Extension of Target Date"</i> for each project and the JTC 1's existing rule <i>"SC's modified programme of work"</i>.</p> <p>[Reference] 6.4.1.3, JTC 1 Directives (2.1.9: Progress Control, JTC 1 Supplement)</p> <p>Each SC shall review its progress against the target dates at regular intervals and amend target dates where necessary. Justification shall be provided to JTC 1 for such amendments and, where target dates have repeatedly not been met, a proposal shall be made to JTC 1 to delete or redefine the work items.</p> <p>To enable the NBs of JTC 1 to evaluate these priorities and target dates against the overall work programme of JTC 1, a written report containing the above information shall be submitted at least annually by the SC.</p> <p>6.2.2.1, JTC 1 Directives (in 2.1.5.4 JTC 1 Supplement)</p> <p>Following its plenary meeting, a subcommittee shall submit to the JTC 1 Secretariat as a single document the subcommittee's modified programme of work, including all proposed subdivisions of projects and minor enhancements of existing work, exclusive of proposals for new work. This document shall be considered using the default approval process (see Annex ??, Voting).</p>	
JP17	34	2.1.9 Progress control	<p>The section on "Reporting" is a counterpart of 6.4.2, JTC 1 Directives.</p> <p>(1) If Annex G of JTC 1 Directives is contained in a JTC 1 Standing Document, "the template in Annex G (see Form 0)." should be changed to "the template in JTC 1 Standing Document #".</p> <p>(2) The last paragraph of 6.4.2 is missing: "The JTC 1 Secretariat may notify the SC Secretariat that submission of Part 2 is unnecessary if complete, up-to date information is available and accessible via an SC web site linked to the JTC 1 web site."</p>	<p>(1) Editorial correction (2) The paragraph should be added to 2.1.9.</p>
JP18	39	2.5.6	<p>The 5th paragraph reads: "In JTC 1, in case of doubt concerning consensus, approval by a two-thirds majority of the P-members of the technical committee or subcommittee voting may be deemed to be sufficient for the committee draft to be accepted for registration as an enquiry draft; however every attempt shall be made to resolve negative votes."</p> <p>Since "approval by a two-thirds majority of the P-members" is an ISO specific rule, JTC 1 SWG-D should discuss it before adoption.</p>	New item in JTC 1 SWG-D
JP19	41	2.5.10	The last paragraph is a counterpart of 12.6.3.11, JTC 1 Directives.	Editorial correction

			<p>If a work item has not progressed to Stage 4 by the third anniversary of the first CD, the SC is required to take action as specified in 6.4.1.6.</p> <p>In conjunction with 6.4.1.5 and 6.4.1.6 of JTC 1 Directives, the rule of 12.6.3.11 applies to an item, registered as an NP before 1 January 2004. Since there are no counterparts of 6.4.1.5 and 6.4.1.6 in JTC 1 Supplement, the last paragraph of 2.5.10 should be removed.</p>	
JP20		2.6	<p>The item 2) of recommendation 4 from the SWG on Directives Osaka meeting says: "2) To eliminate constraints on the types of comments (technical; editorial) National Bodies can submit with their votes"</p> <p>However section 2.6 of the current JTC 1 supplement, actually come from ISO/IEC Directives, still can be read that the types of comment for the DIS ballot are limited either technical or editorial. In the case of either fast track or PAS DIS ballot, since NB may comments on the contents of the explanatory report, such as maintenance process, JTC 1 supplement should describe that any procedural comments other than technical or editorial comments are allowed, explicitly.</p>	JTC 1 supplement should describe that any procedural comments other than technical or editorial comments are allowed, explicitly.
JP21	44	2.7.7	<p>2.7.7 If the final draft International Standard is not approved in accordance with the conditions 2.7, the document shall be referred back to the technical committee or subcommittee concerned for reconsideration in the light of the technical reasons submitted in support of the negative votes.</p> <p>The committee may decide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resubmit a modified draft as a committee draft, enquiry draft or, in ISO, final draft International Standard; • publish a Technical Specification (see 3.1); • cancel the project. <p>In JTC 1, 12.7.2.4, JTC 1 Directives, reads: If the FDIS has not been approved, the document reverts to Stage 2 (12.5.2) and is referred back to the appropriate SC for consideration and recommendation for further processing.</p> <p>JTC 1 SWG-D should discuss it before adoption.</p>	New item in JTC 1 SWG-D
JP22	45	2.9.2 Withdrawal	<p>This is a counterpart of 15.2, JTC 1 Directives: "The procedure for withdrawal of an IS is the same as that for preparation and acceptance; that is, an initial study shall take place in JTC 1. On the recommendation of JTC 1 or of the ITTF, the proposal for withdrawal shall then be submitted to NBs for approval, giving the same voting time limits as for the approval of an IS (see 12.7.1.2)"</p> <p>The time frame indicated in 2.9.2 is "2 months" because the referenced 12.7.1.2, JTC 1 Directives, is the section on FDIS ballot. However, ITTF follows Option 3 in 2.9, ISO</p>	Clarification

			Supplement, and uses the time frame "3 months".	
JP23	45	2.9.3	<p>This is a counterpart of 15.3, JTC 1 Directives.</p> <p>Since 2007, JTC 1 Periodic Review is handled at the ISO/CS level through the Systematic Review (SR) balloting system. In addition to 2.9.3, ITTF adopts the procedures of ISO Supplement partially. Those complemented procedures should be added to 2.9.3.</p> <p>e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JTC 1 Supplement uses the term "Periodic Review", while ITTF does "Systematic Review". - SR-ballots are basically launched on quarterly basis. - Ballot period is 5 months. 	Clarification
JP24	47, 48	2.10.5.2	<p>The following items are redundantly specified by the ISO/IEC Directives text and also by the JTC 1 supplement text.</p> <p>Page 47, 2nd Paragraph The Chief Executive Officer shall decide, in consultation with the secretariat of the technical committee or subcommittee, and bearing in mind both the financial consequences to the organization and the interests of users of the publication, whether to publish a technical corrigendum or a corrected or updated reprint of the existing edition of the publication (see also 2.10.4).</p> <p>Page 48 First paragraph 2.10.5.2 General A published IS may subsequently be modified by the publication of a technical corrigendum (or corrected reprint of the current edition). Technical corrigenda are normally published as separate documents, the edition of the IS affected remaining in print. However, the ITTF shall decide, in consultation with the Secretariat of JTC 1 or SC, and bearing in mind both the financial consequences to the organisation and the interests of users of the IS, whether to publish a technical corrigendum or a corrected reprint of the existing edition of the IS.</p>	The redundant JTC 1 supplement text should be removed.
JP25	51	2.10.6	<p>The following items are redundantly specified by the ISO/IEC Directives text and also by the JTC 1 supplement text.</p> <p>Page 47, 4th Paragraph At the approval stage (2.7), the Chief Executive Officer shall decide, in consultation with the secretariat of the technical committee or subcommittee, and bearing in mind both the financial consequences to the organization and the interests of users of the International Standard, whether to publish an amendment or a new edition of the International Standard, incorporating the amendment. (See also 2.10.4.)</p> <p>Page 51 2nd paragraph At the publication stage (see 12.8), the ITTF shall decide, in consultation with the Secretariat of JTC 1 or SC, and bearing in mind both the financial consequences to the organisation and the interests of users of the IS, whether to publish an amendment or a new edition of the IS, incorporating the amendment. [Note: Where it is foreseen that there will be frequent additions to the provisions of an IS, the possibility should be borne in mind at the outset of developing these additions as a series of parts (see ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2)]</p>	The redundant JTC 1 supplement text should be removed.

JP26	53	3.2	<p>An annex for the JTC 1 should be provided since the following text exists in the section 3.2. "In JTC 1, Publicly Available Specification process is a process that leads to an International Standard. The Process is described in Annex ?"</p> <p>The procedure of the PAS should become consistent with the fast track process of JTC 1 as much as possible.</p>	Annex should be added.
JP27	54	3.3.2	<p>The 6th paragraph is a counterpart of 16.3.6, JTC 1 Directives. However, the 6th paragraph reads:</p> <p>"When publication of a TR has been agreed by a 2/3 majority of those P-members voting, the text shall be submitted by the JTC 1 Secretariat to the ITTF, normally within two months."</p> <p>In 9.10.1, JTC 1 Directives, the criteria for approval of DTR is approval by "a majority of JTC 1 P-members".</p> <p>JTC 1 SWG-D should discuss it before adoption.</p>	New item in JTC 1 SWG-D
JP28	54	3.3.2	<p>The final line of 3.3.2 should be replaced by an appropriate Table.</p> <p>Editors' note: should add here comparison table</p>	Editorial correction
JP29	54	3.3.3	<p>The 2nd paragraph: "In JTC 1, TRs shall be subject to review every five years in the same manner as ISs."</p> <p>should read:</p> <p>"In JTC 1, TR shall be subject to review every five years in the same manner as IS."</p> <p>Rationale: only one kind of TRs, i.e. type 3, is left in JTC 1.</p>	Editorial correction
JP30	55	4.1.2	<p>In the 3rd paragraph, the example of meeting interval is "at six- or twelve-month intervals", while, in 7.2.2, JTC 1 Directives, it is "at twelve- or eighteen-month intervals".</p>	Editorial Recommendation: "at six- to eighteen-month intervals"
JP31	56	4.2.1.3	<p>Only those committee drafts for which the compilation of comments will be available at least 6 weeks before the meeting shall be included on the agenda and be eligible for discussion at the meeting.</p> <p>The rule doesn't apply to JTC 1 SCs and WGs.</p>	The difference should be mentioned in JTC 1 Supplement.
JP32	59	Languages	<p>The following items are redundantly specified by the ISO/IEC Directives text and also by the JTC 1 supplement text.</p> <p>Page 56, 4.3</p>	The redundant JTC 1 supplement text should be removed.

			<p>4.3 Languages at meetings The languages at meetings are English, French and Russian, and meetings are conducted in any one or more of these. The national body for the Russian Federation provides all interpretation and translation into or from the Russian language. The chairman and secretariat are responsible for dealing with the question of language at a meeting in a manner acceptable to the participants following the general rules of ISO or IEC, as appropriate. (See also Annex E.)</p> <p>Page 59 Languages The languages of JTC 1 are English, French and Russian. In general, the work of JTC 1 and its subsidiary bodies may be in any one or more of the above-mentioned languages. However, meetings are conducted in any one of these. The Chairman or Convener is entitled to authorise participants to speak in a language other than that in which the meeting is conducted. The NB for the Russian Federation provides all interpretation and translation into or from the Russian language into or from another official language. When at a meeting of JTC 1 or one of its subsidiary bodies a participant wishes, in view of exceptional circumstances, to speak in any other language, the Chairman or Convener of the session shall be entitled to authorise this, for the session only, provided that a means of interpretation has been secured.</p>	
JP33	89	Annex F	The Table doesn't apply to JTC 1, in particular TR and PAS.	The difference should be mentioned in JTC 1 Supplement.
JP34	90	F.2.1.2 F.2.1.3	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The rule doesn't apply to JTC 1.</p>	The difference should be mentioned in JTC 1 Supplement.
JP35	94-96	Annex H RA	<p>In JTC 1 Directives, rule for JTC 1 Registration Authority is composed of 2.7.2, 6.2.19, 18, and Annex E. However, Annex H doesn't include 6.2.19 and Annex E.</p> <p>In addition, although Annex E of JTC 1 Directives is cited in Annex H, there is no section of Annex E in JTC 1 Supplement.</p>	Clarification: Annex E of JTC 1 Directives will be contained in a Standing Document or the texts should be inserted in this Annex.
JP36	109	Annex AA	<p>In accordance with Resolution 4 adopted at the SWG-D Osaka meeting, the text of N 9309 (UK comment) should be included in JTC 1 Supplement.</p> <p>(e.g. payment for meeting rooms, photocopying facilities, etc.)</p> <p>→ "photocopying facilities, etc." should be "photocopying facilities, document distributing facilities etc."</p>	To-Do item by JTC 1 SWG-D

			<p>Facilities fee: covers expenses associated with renting meeting rooms, duplicating documents, translation services, renting audio-visual equipment, providing light refreshments during the meeting, etc.</p> <p>→ "duplicating documents" should be "duplicating and distributing documents".</p>	
JP37	112	Annex AB	In the 1st paragraph, although "clauses 12-17, Annex B (JTC 1 standard development stages)" are cited, they are missing from JTC 1 Supplement.	Clarification
JP38	113	Annex AB	<p>In the following Note in the section of "Rules for Numbering of JTC 1 Working Documents", "FCD" should be "DIS".</p> <p>[Note: Working documents might or might not also be CD/FCD or FDIS texts and, therefore, can have both a CD number and a document number.]</p>	Editorial correction
JP39	116	Annex AC	<p>The following counterpart of 9.1.7, JTC 1 Directives, appears in two places:</p> <p>JTC 1 and its SCs shall pay special attention to negative votes by P members and shall attempt as far as possible to resolve the underlying differences and achieve the maximum level of approval.</p>	Editorial correction
JP40	118	Annex AC	<p>In the section of "Combined Voting Procedure", there is a copy & paste error for the counterpart of 9.5, JTC 1 Directives.</p> <p>Combined Voting Procedure The voting procedure which uses simultaneous voting (one vote per country) by the Pmembers fo JTC 1 and by all ISO member bodies and IEC national committees on a letter ballot is called the combined voting procedure. This procedure shall be used on FDISs, DISs, FDAMs, DAMs and FDISPs.e The submission of FDISs, DISs, FDAMs, DAMs and FDISPs for simultaneous voting (one vote per country) by the P members of JTC 1 and by all ISO member bodies and IEC national committees is called the combined voting procedure. It should be used whenever possible.</p> <p>while, 9.5, JTC 1 Directives, reads: The voting procedure which uses simultaneous voting (one vote per country) by the P-members of JTC 1 and by all ISO member bodies and IEC national committees on a letter ballot is called the Combined Voting procedure. This procedure shall be used on FDISs, DISs, FDAMs, DAMs and FDISPs.</p>	Editorial correction
JP41	121-138	Annex AA	Multiple duplication of Annex AA	Editorial correction (5 Annex AA should be

				removed.)
JP42		Annex	<p>Japan would suggest creating an annex in JTC 1 supplement for BRM process. The annex should contain a diagram, such as Attachment, about process flow around BRM and the following processes. Japan further think that new process for BRM need to be invented, since the objectives of BRM has been changed through the migration from JTC 1's DIS process to ISO/IEC DIS and FDIS process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The responsible officer who determines whether BRM is needed or not Note. Either the submitter of the DIS or secretariat of assigned SC might have the responsibility. • Decision and/or Voting process in the BRM Note. Since the objectives of BRM have no longer been maximization of support of IS and provision of the final text for the IS, but only for provision of better FDIS text to be balloted, disposition of each comments could be delegated to the project editor without having official vote in the BRM. Straw vote might be good enough for project editor to understand general opinion of BRM participants against proposed dispositions provided by the project editor. 	Annex for the BRM process including diagram should be added.

2.2 Secondary cross referencing from JTC 1 Directives

JP43

2.2.1 Foreword, Clauses 1 to 18

JNB understands that based on JTC 1 N 8111 and JTC 1 N 8981, supplemental texts should be added to JTC 1 Supplement. However, many action items in JTC 1 N 8111 and JTC 1 N 8981 have not been implemented. JNB is concerned that some key sections of JTC 1 Directives are missing from JTC 1 Supplement. JNB suggests that the JTC 1 Secretariat re-visit JTC 1 N 8111 and JTC 1 N 8981.

Example:

Clause	Comments
1.1, 1.2 Introduction	<p>There is no subclause in JTC 1 Supplement, while JTC 1 N 8111 indicates: ISO/IEC doesn't have specific wording on the scope of JTC 1 Directives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROPOSAL – Supplemental text <p>Agree with proposal for supplemental text</p>
2.1, 2.2 Organization	<p>There is no subclause (other than 2.1.4) in JTC 1 Supplement, while JTC 1 N 8111 indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO/IEC Directives does not define JTC 1. • PROPOSAL – Supplemental text. <p>Agree with proposal for supplemental text</p>

4.6 Responsibility for the Archiving of Documents	There is no subclause in JTC 1 Supplement, while JTC 1 N 8111 indicates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO/IEC does not detail the responsibility for keeping records. • PROPOSAL –Supplemental text. Accept as supplemental text
--	---

JP44

2.2.2 Annexes A to O

Several important Annexes, for example Annex N, are not incorporated in JTC 1 Supplement. Since there is no JTC 1 N document which clearly mentions the handling of most of the Annexes, JNB requests SWG-D to clarify which Annex will be contained in JTC 1 Supplement or in a JTC 1 Standing Document.

Attachment

