

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N10001

2010-02-17

Replaces:

ISO/IEC JTC 1 Information Technology

Document Type: other (defined)

Document Title: Formal Letter Ballot on ISO/IEC 29199 Project Extension Request

Document Source: JTC 1 Secretariat

Project Number:

Document Status: Document JTC 1 N9930 was circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies on 2009-12-01 for a 60 day default ballot closing 2010-02-01. Two National Bodies (France and US) submitted objections to this document (attached for reference) and therefore, in accordance with clause 9.1.6 of the JTC 1 Directives, the question contained in N9930 will now be decided by letter ballot vote.. This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for a three month letter ballot. Please submit your vote via the online balloting system.

Action ID: VOTE

Due Date: 2010-05-18

Pages: 7

**ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology**

Document Type: Other document (defined)

Document Title: ISO/IEC 29199 Project Extension Request

Document Source: SC 7 Convenor

Reference:

Document Status: This document is forwarded to JTC 1 National Bodies for a default letter ballot. If the JTC 1 Secretariat receives no objections to the SC 7 request, it will be forwarded to ITTF for processing.

Action ID: ACT

Due Date: 2010-02-01

No. of Pages: 2

Document type	Request
Title	ISO/IEC 29119 Project Extension Request
Source	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 7/WG 26 Convener
Status	Final
Reference	Resolution 1153
Action ID	FYI or ACT

Justification for the Request for the Extension of Time for ISO/IEC 29119 Parts 2 & 3.

Project 29119 was started after SC 7 Plenary meeting (Moscow, May 2007) as a result of ballot NP 3701. Of the five National Bodies that committed themselves to participating in the project in this ballot, only two have actually provided any input and currently only one remains (as the convener).

The resolution subdivided the standard into four parts and appointed four editors and an SC7 processes and JTC1 procedures advisor. Of these five WG members, three were new to ISO standards development and the two experienced WG members have since resigned their positions.

One (experienced) editor left after having made no contribution over a period of 4 meetings. Also five days' work of the WG at their 3rd meeting (the interim meeting in Seoul) was made redundant due to mistaken advice being followed from the Head of the US delegation.

Part 2, the process part of the standard was initially distributed as a working draft and over 1500 comments were received and resolved. It has subsequently been re-drafted to conform to the new requirements of ISO/IEC 24774 and to ensure it can be used for process assessment using ISO/IEC 15504 (and achieve harmonization with ISO 12207 and ISO 15288). A second working draft was distributed and a further 1000 comments were received. These comments have been resolved and this part will be distributed as a committee draft before the end of December 2009. The testing process defined in the current draft is already being used in several organizations, such as large multi-national banks.

Part 3, the documentation part of the standard, is dependent on (and needs to be consistent with) part 2 and has also been distributed as a working draft and the comments will be resolved and this part will also be distributed as a committee draft before the end of December 2009.

Part 1, on software testing concepts, is well underway and ahead of schedule, while work on part 4 is due to start in the next few months, in line with the initial plan, and is also the best-understood of the four parts.

After a slow start, due mostly to the inexperience of those working on it and changes to how ISO processes should be defined (and partly due to a lack of support from early volunteers), the work is now progressing well. The WG are now confident that the latest drafts are on the right track to completion and that a 12-month extension will allow for successful publication of the standard, with subsequent stages (enquiry, and approval) following the default timeframes as expected.

Document Title : French position on ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 9930

Topic : ISO/IEC 29199 Project Extension Request

Document Source : AFNOR

Date : 25th january 2010

Reference : AFNOR CN IQLS N1287

AFNOR Position on ISO/IEC JTC1 W9930 :

AFNOR decides to vote **NO** to ISO/IEC 29199 Project extension Request in document ISO/IEC JTC1 N 9930.

A position on this decision has been received by AFNOR by Dr Alastair Walker, South Africa, SC7/WG26 member. This position is attached below.

France agrees with this position without restriction, both on situation analyzis and on the proposal to continue the work. France just wants to point out the main reason for its position : finality of the work, spirit of standardisation, consensus among WG members, respect of the procedures , respect of the ISO/IEC copyright rules have never be respected.

Herebelow is the contribution received from Dr Alaister Walker, on 14th december 2009, totally approved by France :

a) The main reason for project non-performance is an abrasive leadership style of the Convener that has not paid due regard to the spirit and intent of seeking consensus amongst WG members.

The text from N9930 indicates *“The resolution subdivided the standard into four parts and appointed four editors and an SC7 processes and JTC1 procedures advisor. Of these five WG members, three were new to ISO standards development and the two experienced WG members have since resigned their positions. One (experienced) editor left after having made no contribution over a period of 4 meetings.”*

The primary reason for the claimed non-performances of WG membership can be attributed to a leadership style of the Convener that has been abrasive and divisive, and not in the spirit and intent of the JTC1 and SC7 procedures and practices.

The said “more experienced” WG members have left the team in order to better spend their time elsewhere.

The Convener has not been effective in separating the roles associated with WG governance activities from technical responsibilities associated with the document editorial responsibilities of Part 2.

b) Consistently missed deadlines for project deliverables

A review of the minutes of work group meetings indicate that the release of project deliverables has been consistently delayed.

c) JTC1 SC7 documentation standards have not been followed.

With the exception of project document WG26-N049-29119-Part2-12207-Conformant-Exemplar, no project documents have used the mandated ISO document template.

d) JTC1 SC7 comment review and disposition arrangements and procedures have not been followed.

JTC1 N9930 claims that “*Part 2, the process part of the standard was initially distributed as a working draft and over 1500 comments were received and resolved*”.

There is no record in the WG26-N series that identifies this disposition of comments.

JTC1 N9930 further claims that “*A second working draft was distributed and a further 1000 comments were received. These comments have been resolved, To-date there is no record in the WG26 N series of such a resolution of comments*”.

Consequently, we have no confidence in the ability of this working group to effectively manage the consensus process.

e) The very large number of comments received on Part 2 in working draft indicates that this document is technically highly unstable.

It is anticipated that this product will continue to attract large numbers of technical comments. It is expected that the document will not meet the expected time frame for completion as several CD ballot review cycles are anticipated - leading to further requests for project extension.

f) Working group minutes do not agree with assertions made in JTC1 N9930.

JTC1 N9930 states *“Also five days work of the WG at their 3rd meeting (the interim meeting in Seoul) was made redundant due to mistaken advice being followed from the Head of the US delegation”*.

There is no record in the WG minutes for that meeting (SC7 N4179-WG26-N046-Minutes-Seoul-Nov08) of any comments made by the US Head of Delegation, or any reference to any advice being offered or recorded.

Consequently, we have lost confidence in the ability of the Convener to manage the affairs of SC7 WG26 with integrity.

The way forward

We do believe the proposed 29119 standard series is very important.

We therefore propose the following way forward after project cancellation:

The way forward might be:

- a) The present project is abandoned (i.e. deleted)a study period is initiated in May in Japan 2010 to review the project requirements, its achievements, and to make a proposal for progressing the work,
- b) The new project (under a new NWIP) is launched at the Paris meeting in 2011. (Under new convener and new project editors). Existing editors that have performed to expectations will obviously be considered as lead candidates.
- c) A new convener must appointed who is impartial, and experienced in JTC1 and SC7 procedural matters.
- d) The appointed convener will not have any document editor responsibilities.

From: ISOT

Sent: Friday, January 29, 2010 12:44 PM

To: Lisa Rajchel

Cc: Jennifer Garner

Subject: USNB Response to JTC 1 N 9930 - JTC 1 Default Ballot on ISO/IEC 29119 Project Extension Request - Closes February 1, 2010

Dear Lisa,

Please accept the following USNB response to JTC 1 N 9930 – JTC 1 Default Ballot on ISO/IEC 29119 Project Extension Request, due on February 1, 2010.

The US National Body registers an objection in response to JTC 1 N 9930 - JTC 1 Default Ballot on ISO/IEC 29119 Project Extension Request, with the following comments:

The US National Body notes that the Working Group has not performed well vs. its plans and schedules, and reflecting on that performance the USNB does not believe that an extension of the project is warranted. The US National Body believes the proposed ISO/IEC 29119 standard series is very important and recommends the following way forward after the cancellation of this project:

- a) The present project is cancelled (i.e. removed from the SC 7 programme of work).
- b) A study period is initiated in May in Japan 2010 to review the project requirements, its achievements, and to make a proposal for progressing the work.
- c) The new project (under a new NWIP) is launched at the Paris meeting in 2011.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

Joyce Hsu

Program Administrator

American National Standards Institute