

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 9015
ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

2008-04-01

Document Type: Summary of Voting/Table of Replies

Document Title: Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N 8918 – SC 31 Request for Category C Liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal

Document Source: JTC 1 Secretariat

Reference:

Document Status: As per the results of this ballot, the request has passed and will be forwarded to ITTF for processing.

Action ID: Information

Due Date:

No. of Pages: 8

Result of voting

Ballot Information:

Ballot reference:	JTC001-N-8918
Ballot type:	CIB
Ballot title:	SC 31 Request for Category C Liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal
Opening date:	2008-01-30
Closing date:	2008-03-30
Note:	This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for a 60 day letter ballot. This document previously failed a 60 day default ballot as JTC001-N 8856. The objection to the JTC001-N-8856 default ballot has been annexed with this document. Please submit your vote via the online balloting system by the due date indicated.

Member responses:

Votes cast (26)	Australia (SA) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Nigeria (SON) Norway (SN) Singapore (SPRING SG) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) Turkey (TSE)
------------------------	--

	United Kingdom (BSI) Uruguay (UNIT)
Comments submitted (1)	Sweden (SIS)
Votes not cast (14)	Algeria (IANOR) Belgium (NBN) Côte-d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Ecuador (INEN) Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Kenya (KEBS) Malaysia (DSM) Pakistan (PSQCA) Philippines (BPS) Saudi Arabia (SASO) Slovenia (SIST) USA (ANSI) Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

Questions:

Q.1	"Does your National Body approve the SC 31 Request for Category C Liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal?"
------------	---

Answers to Q.1: "Does your National Body approve the SC 31 Request for Category C Liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal?"

14 x	Yes	Czech Republic (CNI) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Nigeria (SON) Norway (SN) Singapore (SPRING SG) Turkey (TSE) Uruguay (UNIT)
8 x	Abstain	Australia (SA) Denmark (DS) India (BIS) Jamaica (BSJ) Malta (MSA) New Zealand (SNZ) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV)
4 x	No	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) South Africa (SABS)

United Kingdom (BSI)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Canada (SCC)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-03-04 14:17:56
CommentFiles/Canada(SCC).doc		
China (SAC)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-03-18 08:41:12
CommentFiles/China(SAC).doc		
South Africa (SABS)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-03-28 16:25:08
CommentFiles/SouthAfrica(SABS).doc		
United Kingdom (BSI)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-03-25 14:34:32
CommentFiles/UnitedKingdom(BSI).doc		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Sweden (SIS)	<i>Comment</i>	2008-03-28 09:42:39
<p>Sweden do not approve SC 31 Request for Category C Liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal. EPCglobal is a business unit of GS1 and as such the liaison should be between SC 31 and GS1 which is already covered by a separate ARO application.</p>		

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2008-03-04	Document: N8918
------------------	------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CA				<p>CAC SC31 committee recommends that SCC not to support the request for a Category C liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal. The liaison process demands that information is shared freely, and that the information can be peer reviewed by both parties to the liaison. The statements made by the EPCglobal representative at the November 2007 meeting of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 31/WG 4/SG 3 in Aix made it clear that the constitution of EPCglobal does not permit EPCglobal to share information with ISO during the drafting stages.</p> <p>A more recent letter from EPCglobal does not appear to indicate any significant change in position</p> <p>We believe these statements make any liaison between SC31 and EPCglobal ineffective, especially in the task of keeping ISO and</p> <p>EPCG standards in alignment as additional functionality is required by their respective constituencies. The CAC SC31 committee would support the liaison proposal if written clarification is received from EPCglobal that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISO peer group review is welcome in order to remove ambiguities, correct errors, and generally improve clarity. • SC31 has the right to add features to the basic EPCglobal specification in order to meet the needs of the ISO community, and that EPCglobal will preserve the integrity of these in future revisions to its specifications 		

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CA for Canada; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:	Document:
-------	-----------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
Chi na			ge	China would support the C liaison proposal if written clarification is received from EPCglobal that information is shared freely		

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

**Comments by the South African national body (SABS) on JTC001-N-8918 SC 31
Request for Category C Liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal**

2008-03-28

Having reviewed the benefit statement included in JTC001-N-8918, the national body of South Africa (SABS) does **not approve** the request for a Category C liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal. Clause 3.3.4.2 of the JTC 1 Directives regarding liaisons states, in part, that:

"Each request for liaison status forwarded to JTC 1 from an appropriate JTC 1 subsidiary body must contain a statement of expected benefits and responsibilities accepted by both the JTC 1 organisation and the organisation requesting liaison status."

It is our opinion that the benefit statement has not addressed various substantive issues.

This request must be considered together with JTC001-N-8933, wherein GS1 has requested approval of the GS1 (Global Office) to be recognized as an Approved RS Originator Organization (ARO). EPCglobal is a joint venture between GS1 (formerly known as EAN International) and GS1 US™ (formerly the Uniform Code Council, Inc.). It is an organization set up to achieve world-wide adoption and standardization of Electronic Product Code (EPC) technology.

In part, their motivation states that *"GS1 expects however that the submitted specifications will be adopted with substantially the same content as submitted"*. We consider it essential that SC 31 has the right to modify or to add features to any of the basic EPCglobal specifications or any contributions submitted to SC 31 in order to meet the needs of the international users of the ISO/IEC standards.

The objectives of EPCglobal and GS1 are laudable and the technical ability of their members is not questioned. Their involvement in SC 31 has benefited the international standards development process. However, we consider it essential that the responsibility for the international standards development process remains within SC 31. The community served by SC 31 is considerably larger than that addressed by the EPCglobal/GS1 membership, and the needs also span a wider spectrum of users.

Since the constitution of EPCglobal does not permit them to share information with ISO during the drafting stages and since the issue of patents belonging to EPCglobal or its members being freely available has not been clarified, we believe these statements make the category C liaison between SC31 and EPCglobal ineffectual.

The liaison process demands that information is shared freely during the development stages between the various committees, and that the draft under development be peer reviewed by both parties to the liaison. There were statements made by the EPCglobal representative at the November 2007 meeting of SC 31/WG 4/SG 3 in Aix that seemed to indicate that this could not occur. No satisfactory clarification of this issue has been received.

UK COMMENTS ON ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 8918

“BSI does not approve the request for a Category C liaison between SC 31 and EPCglobal. The liaison process demands that information is shared freely, and that the information can be peer reviewed by both parties to the liaison. The statements made by the EPCglobal representative at the November 2007 meeting of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 31/WG 4/SG 3 in Aix made it clear that the constitution of EPCglobal does not permit EPCglobal to share information with ISO during the drafting stages. A more recent letter from EPCglobal does not appear to indicate any significant change in position

We believe these statements make any liaison between SC31 and EPCglobal ineffective, especially in the task of keeping ISO and EPCG standards in alignment as additional functionality is required by their respective constituencies.

The UK would support the liaison proposal if written clarification is received from EPCglobal that:

- ISO peer group review is welcome in order to remove ambiguities, correct errors, and generally improve clarity.
- SC31 has the right to add features to the basic EPCglobal specification in order to meet the needs of the ISO community, and that EPCglobal will preserve the integrity of these in future revisions to its specifications”