



doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 727	
date	1992-12-04	total pages
Item nr.	supersedes document	

<b>Secretariat:</b>	<b>Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)</b>
	Kalfjeslaan 2 P.O. box 5059
	2600 GB Delft
	Netherlands
telephone:	+ 31 15 690390
telefax:	+ 31 15 690190
telex:	38144 nni nl
telegrams:	Normalisatie Delft

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS
Title: ISO/IEC JTC 1 Special Group on Functional Standardization
Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

Title : Comments on SGFS SD-2 (Guidelines for editors)

Source : UK

Status : For consideration at the SGFS meeting (8-11 Dec. 1992, Tier 1)

Note :

**Title:** Comments on SGFS SD-2 (Guidelines for editors)  
**Source:** UK  
**Status:** For consideration at the SGFS meeting (8-11 Dec 1992, Tier 1)  
**Dated:** 30-Nov-92

### The Issue

The guidelines for preparation of ISP that has been issued by ITTF and distributed as SGFS Standing Document-2 (SGFS SD-2) is not fully aligned with the ISP approval and maintenance procedures contained in SGFS SD-1. In some areas SD-2 is unclear and in others it places additional requirements on the submitter of the pDISP text.

### PDISP Submission

The guidelines imply that a supporting letter from all the regional workshops is a requirement, whereas the procedures only require that the explanatory report contains a statement of the extent to which international harmonization has been sought and achieved. Supporting letters are a useful demonstration of the statements in the explanatory report, but they are not a prerequisite for submission. The guidelines should make this clear, both in the text and in the figure.

### PDISP Processing

The review of the PDISP by the SGFS and the generation of the review report by the review group take place during the same 1-2 month period. The guidelines are unclear on this issue, and could be read as implying that these periods are consecutive, thus extending the PDISP stage to a maximum of 4 months.

### DISP Text

If this guidance is to be of use, it must be clear on the options that the submitter has. In the case of moving from pDISP to DISP, the guidance only describes one option! The submitter is not required to revise the pDISP text before the DISP ballot commences. The introduction of a requirement to do so could introduce unnecessary delays in the approval process. Indeed, since the review report is distributed with the DISP, it may be advantageous to retain the reviewed text for ballot so that the review comments can be understood. In addition, the submitter can withdraw the document at any time in the process.

For accuracy, the figure should indicate that the Explanatory report is also distributed with the DISP text.

### Conclusion

These documents should be aligned, and at the very least the guidance document should be easier to understand than the procedures specification. If it is not there is little need for such a document.