



doc. nr. ISO/IEC JTC 1/SGFS N 497	
date 1992-03-27	total pages
item nr.	supersedes document

**Secretariat:** Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut (NNI)  
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 : U.S. contribution on ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N401, ISP -  
Taxonomy Update, ISP Approval & Maintenance Process

Source : ANSI

Status : US contribution to the 1992 SGFS Plenary Meeting,  
June 15-19, 1992, Washington DC, USA.

Note :

U.S. contribution on ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N 401, ISP - Taxonomy Update, ISP Approval & Maintenance Process:

The U.S. has reviewed "REVISED TEXT - Proposed Revision of the JTC 1 Directives Annex C, ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 1609 Rev." and wishes to commend the editor for accomplishing this very difficult task while maintaining the integrity of the ISP procedures. The U.S. would like to call to the attention of SGFS several items which must now be considered:

Item 1:

Two versions of the SGFS procedures now exist. While there are only minor editorial differences, SGFS should address which version is correct when differences occur. Such differences could be the result of timing in the approvals involved, errors introduced when creating the "Directives" version or changes introduced by the SWG-P.

In the current case, the differences are a result of editorial improvements and changes requested by the SWG-P in the Directives version. SGFS should consider making the equivalent changes in SGFS N 401. Until such time as these changes are made, the Directives version should take precedence. For example,

- o JTC1 should be considered an "authorized body", as added to Clauses 3.1 and 4.1 of the Directives version;
- o Clause 5.1 of the Directives version correctly reflects the Berlin agreements in noting that it should not be necessary to perform a specific review for the PDISP when the material for the review report is submitted at the same time as the PDISP. (The word "not" is omitted in SGFS N401.)

However, it is not clear that the Directives version should always take precedence. For example, after SGFS has approved new procedures, but before new procedures have been approved by SWG-P, which is considered to take precedence?

Item 2:

In his letter to the Secretariat which accompanies SGFS N 401, the editor points out that SGFS N 401 includes changes which have been made since the Berlin meeting. These changes should be reviewed by the SGFS at its next meeting. In particular, the editor has suggested two items which need to be brought to the attention of the SGFS.

Item 3:

The Addendum to ISO/IEC JTC1 N 1609 Rev. provides the title page for the Directives Annex C. As pointed out in the letter referred to above, the editor has chosen to retain the "Important Note". The U.S. agrees with this decision. Unfortunately, confusion could occur as a result of extracting SGFS N 401 into the Directives. The note refers to the ballot resolution mechanism described in Clause 7. Clause 7 is the correct reference for SGFS N 401. However, Clause 6 is the correct reference for the Directives version.

Item 4:

When progressing the next modifications to the procedures, a minor editorial correction is needed to both the SGFS N 401 and the Directives versions. In SGFS N 401, clause 6.1 (Outline of procedure), paragraph 2, penultimate sentence, the word "to" is duplicated.