doc. nr.	ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS N 1012
date 1993-08-18	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

Title: ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

ISO/IEC JTC1 Special Group on Functional Standardization

Secretariat: NNI (Netherlands)

Title : SGFS answer to SC21 liaison (SC21 N8120) on proposed revised Procedures for informal ISP quality service

Source : ISO/IEC JTC1/SGFS

Status : Approved by the SGFS Seoul 1993 meeting

Note :

SGFS N1012

SGFS answer to SC21 liaison (SC21N8120) on proposed revised Procedures for informal ISP quality service (SC21N8120 will be appended)

1- Review experts list

SGFS welcomes the organizational measures that SC21 is taking in order to facilitate the informal quality service process. The list of reviewers is kept by SGFS in SD-3.

2- Review process (SGFS calls this " Informal quality service")

The description of the initiating process (first paragraph) is generally agreed but SGFS suggest to amend it slightly as follows:

When a RW wishes to submit a preliminary pDISP for an informal quality service it may submit a request to the ISP coordinator in the relevant SC or TC committee, asking that an informal quality service take place at one of the SC meetings, and it shall directly mail the preliminary pDISP to all of the review experts identified in the relevant areas.

The main change being that the preliminary pDISP must be distributed to all experts (and not only to the ones that will attend the meeting).

As for the informal quality service summary, (last but one paragraph) SGFS suggests the following description of the process:

A summary of the informal quality service should be produced by the experts involved in the review or by the ISP coordinator. It should contain the list of experts that have contributed to the informal quality service, and the comments that have been made during the informal quality service. It would help if those comments were flagged that especially relate to possible non conformance of the preliminary pDISP to base standards.
In the explanatory report, the submitter will identify the informal quality service(s) actions that have taken place, if any. With regard to the informal quality service summary, the submitter should provide a disposition of comments at least for those comments that relate to possible non-conformance of the preliminary pDISP to base standards.