

From: Peter Bessems
To: inet."sgfs@dkuug.dk"
Date: 8/26/96 9:39am
Subject: SGFS Procedures on maintenance

Dear SGFS member,

During the last months some questions reached the SGFS Secretariat about the SGFS procedures in case of maintenance of ISPs (i.e. revisions and corrigenda).

As the current SGFS procedures are not explicit in some cases because they refer to the JTC1 Directives, some procedures had to be made more explicit.

Please find below more details of the SGFS procedures on maintenance, as the result of the cross-correlation done between the SGFS procedures and the JTC1 Directives.

With kind regards,
Peter Bessems,
(SGFS Secretariat)

SGFS PROCEDURES ON MAINTENANCE

1. PROPOSED TECHNICAL CORRIGENDA (PTCs) TO ISPs

SGFS Procedures, clause 8.4 "Approval of amended ISPs":

"An amended ISP, whether for base standards defects or for ISP defects (...) will be processed in accordance with the procedures for 'Maintenance/Correction of defects in JTC1 standards', (...)."

JTC1 Directives, clause 14.4 "Correction of Defects", clause 14.4.9.4.1:

"If the response to a defect report has resulted in correction of a technical defect, it shall be processed as a technical corrigendum. The WG Convener or Secretariat shall forward the defect report, response and draft technical corrigendum to the SC Secretariat, requesting a letter ballot on the draft technical corrigendum by the SC and simultaneous distribution to JTC1 for review (...)."

CONCLUSION 1:

PTCs DO NOT NEED A REVIEW PERIOD EQUIVALENT TO A PDISP REVIEW, BUT START DIRECTLY FOR BALLOT WITHIN SGFS.

JTC1 Directives, clause 14.4.10 "Maintenance of Defect Report Index":

"The Project Editor shall be responsible for maintaining a defect report index (...)."

However, the JTC1 directives do not cover situations in which an S-liaison is responsible for the maintenance of standards. Even the concept of "Maintenance Organization" and its responsibility is only used within SGFS. There are no JTC1 requirements for publishing Defect Report Indexes in case a responsible Maintenance Organization within SGFS is keeping track of the defects in a document within its own organization.

Nevertheless, to keep the JTC1- (and SGFS-) membership informed about the list of defects and to present an overall view of the situation on the technical corrigenda, SGFS should follow the spirit of clause 14.4.10 of the JTC1 Directives. Therefore the editor should produce at least a very simple form of Index which contains:

- 1) a summary index of all defects, as headed "defect report index", and
- 2) the relevant Defect Reports, only those which are related to the proposed technical corrigenda.

This means that the defect report index is nothing more than an extract from the related defects documented within the Maintenance Organization.

CONCLUSION 2:

A PTC DOES NOT NEED AN EXPLANATORY REPORT BUT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TOGETHER WITH A DEFECT REPORT INDEX CONSISTING OF A FULL LIST OF DISCOVERED DEFECTS AND THE DEFECT REPORTS RELATED TO THE ISPs CONCERNED.

2. REVISIONS OF ISPs INITIATED BY EXTENSIONS and/or ENHANCEMENTS TO BASE STANDARDS.

SGFS Procedures,

Clause 9.2 "Extensions and enhancements to base standards":

"If it is thought that an ISP would benefit from a new version of one of its base standards, this should be done through development of a new ISP using the new version".

SGFS Procedures, clause 8.5 "Periodic review":

To reaffirm, revise or withdrawn ISPs shall be determined "in accordance with Periodic Review procedures defined in JTC1 Directives."

JTC1 Directives, clause 14.3 "Periodic Review", clause 14.3.1:

"... each IS for which JTC1 is responsible shall be reviewed by JTC1 with a view to decide (...) whether it should be

- confirmed
- revised
- withdrawn".

JTC1 Directives, clause 14.1 "Revision", clause 14.1.2:

"The steps for revision start with Stage 2." (Stage 2 = Working Draft Stage)

CONCLUSION 3:

REVISIONS OF ISPs RELATED TO REVISIONS OF BASE STANDARDS SHALL START AND INITIALLY BE PROGRESSED AS PDISP, INCLUDING EXPLANATORY REPORT, REVIEW PERIOD AND REVIEW REPORT.

NOTE: A Review Period is not always required:

SGFS Procedures, clause 6. "PDISP review process", clause 6.1:

"In case (...) PDISP, as a result of harmonization and of co-operation with JTC1/SCs, other TCs and/or ITU-T/SGs during the PDISP definition (...) it should not be necessary to perform a specific review for the PDISP". (The Review Report is to be submitted at the same time as the PDISP)

JTC1 Directives,

clause 6.2.1 "New Work Item Proposals (NP)", clause 6.2.1.5:

"... revisions should (...) be recorded in JTC1's programme of work as items at Stage 2" (Stage 2 = Working Draft Stage)

JTC1 Directives, clause 14.3 "Periodic Review", clause 14.3.1:

The decision to confirm, revise or withdraw a standard should be made "by a majority of P-members voting in a meeting or by correspondence".

Within SGFS a "New Work Item Proposal" is actually a proposal for a new entry in the taxonomy (SGFS procedures, clause 4.1) or the notification to SGFS about the planned submission of a PDISP (SGFS procedures, clause 5.1)

As revisions of ISPs in general do not need a new taxonomy change proposal, the SGFS membership is not informed on forehand that a revision is coming-up and why the revision is necessary. Therefore, at least the Explanatory Report should indicate the rationale or reason behind the need for the revision.

CONCLUSION 4:

IN CASE OF A REVISION OF AN ISP THE EXPLANATORY REPORT SHALL CONTAIN A EXPLICIT STATEMENT ABOUT THE REASON BEHIND THE NEED FOR THE REVISION (e.g, BECAUSE OF REVISION OF BASE-STANDARD).

The Explanatory Report of the revised ISP can be a simple up-date of the original Explanatory Report, including the explicit statement about the need for the revision.

960812/PB