

# Proposed Roadmap for the First IS 29500 Technical Corrigenda and Amendment Sets

**MURATA, Makoto (Convener)**  
**Jesper Lund Stocholm (Denmark)**  
**Rex Jaeschke (Ecma)**

**2009-03-05**

## Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Technical Corrigenda .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Amendments .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Project Editors .....	3
2.2 Granularity.....	3
2.3 Authorizing Work on, and Approving, an Amendment.....	3
2.4 Amendment Generation and Processing .....	3
2.4.1 Steps.....	3
2.4.2 Timelines .....	4
2.4.2.1 Slowest Schedule .....	4
2.4.2.2 Non-Accelerated Schedule .....	4
2.4.2.3 Accelerated Schedule .....	4

# Introduction

This paper contains a proposal for the generation and processing of the first set of Technical Corrigenda and Amendments for IS 29500. (Hopefully, that proposal can also serve as a model for subsequent sets.)

In recent email and in discussions at the Okinawa meeting, it became clear that some of the DRs already submitted likely would be classified by WG4 as additions or changes rather than as corrections. As such, those submissions must be considered as proposals for amendment (PAs) rather than as defects. The result is that some WG4 members have started discussing the idea of working on one or more amendments in parallel with the defect processing. This is permitted and can be a useful thing to do.

At the BRM, substantive changes were agreed, and some member bodies changed their votes as a consequence. They did so on the understanding that those changes would be incorporated into the final text of ISO/IEC 29500. As such, member bodies are requested to review ISO/IEC 29500 to check if the BRM resolutions relating to their comments were, in fact, incorporated correctly and completely. For any that were not, WG4 should consider giving priority to rectifying that situation. Such corrections would be handled best as Defects, whose resolutions are incorporated into COR1.

§1 covers the defect correction work, while §2 covers the amendment work.

This paper assumes familiarity with the terms defined in document SC34-WG4/2009/N 0028, “Managing Defects and Proposed Amendments”.

# 1. Technical Corrigenda

The schedule below assumes that all goals are reached in a timely fashion; specifically,

- On-time delivery by members of the text they promise.
- No substantive objections result from the final review of the COR1 set.
- All the votes on the SC 34 letter ballots have no, or only trivial, comments.

**If we miss one or more of these goals we'll see a short (i.e., 1 or more weeks) or medium (i.e., 1 or more months) delay, or cancellation of COR adoption.**

The proposed schedule for producing the COR1 set is as follows:

1. 2009-06-24: (End of the Copenhagen meeting) WG4 identifies the DRs to go into the COR1 set (with some members taking action items to provide final text to the editor for decisions made in Copenhagen).
2. 2009-07-03: WG4 members deliver to the editor all the text promised at the Copenhagen meeting.
3. 2009-07-12: Editor distributes the final text of the COR1 set to WG4 for review.
4. 2009-07-22: WG4 has a 2-hour phone meeting to report corrections and, hopefully, to approve the final text of the COR1 set. (If there are non-trivial objections, we'll need another edit/review cycle. If 2 hours is insufficient, we'll need to schedule more than one call [2 weeks in advance].)
5. 2009-07-29: A 3-month SC 34 letter ballot on each member of the COR1 set begins.
6. 2009-10-29: The 3-month SC 34 letter ballots on the COR1 set ends, with the results being issued within 24 hours.
7. 2009-10-31: For each COR in the COR1 set, if there are no NO votes and no comments, COR1 goes to ITTF for publication. If the general results of the ballot were positive, but some comments were received, the editor considers those comments making changes as appropriate, and COR1 goes to ITTF for publication. If the results of the ballot were not positive, the Secretariat instructs the WG4 Convener or Secretariat to distribute the results to WG4 for its consideration and the preparation of a recommendation on further action to be taken.
8. 2010-02-01: ITTF publishes all COR1 set members that were approved by letter ballot. (ITTF might well take significantly less than 3 months to publish.)

Work on a second COR set can begin while the first COR set is being processed.

## 2. Amendments

### 2.1 Project Editors

Each amendment has its own editor, although the same person can be the editor of multiple amendments. The editor of an amendment is responsible for the maintenance of that amendment until it is absorbed by a future revision of the base standard. (DRs can be logged against an amendment, which means that an AMD can have one or more CORs pertaining to it.)

### 2.2 Granularity

There are no rules governing the size or complexity of an amendment, or the number of issues it addresses. For example, if five amendment proposals are adopted, they can be published one per AMD, all five in the same AMD, or contained in two, three or four AMDs, as SC 34 desires. However, the decision of amendment packaging must be part of the scope of each amendment when its project is created. For example, if SC 34 desires the solution to the namespace issue currently defined by DR 08-0012 to be an amendment, it can create a project for an amendment containing that solution only.

A WG can work on multiple AMDs in parallel with each having its own schedule.

### 2.3 Authorizing Work on, and Approving, an Amendment

While work on a Technical Corrigendum can be started at any time by the WG, starting work on an amendment requires the parent SC's authorization, which can only be obtained by a vote at a Plenary of that SC or by a letter ballot of that SC. (Note that this authorization can be overruled later on by JTC 1.) This involves a subdivision of the project assigned to the WG (see JTC 1 Directives, §6.2.2). **Each amendment for each Part needs its own amendment authorization.**

Approval of a PDAM/FPDAM is determined by a letter ballot of SC 34.

The final vote on an amendment is taken at the highest level, as was used for the Fast Track processing of ECMA-376 1e (see JTC 1 Directives, §9.5).

### 2.4 Amendment Generation and Processing

#### 2.4.1 Steps

The complete set of steps involved in producing a single AMD is as follows:

1. WG4 reviews proposals for the creation of an amendment.
2. WG4 takes the final proposal to SC 34 for an in-Plenary vote or letter ballot (depending on the plenary schedule).
3. SC 34 approves the proposal (with subsequent endorsement by JTC 1).
4. Editor distributes a Working Draft (WD) of the amendment to WG4 for review.

5. WG4 refines the WD, and repeats Step 4, until a final WD results.
6. SC 34 votes on the final WD (now called a PDAM) using a 3-to-6-month letter ballot.
7. The comments from the PDAM ballot are processed.
8. WG4 refines the PDAM, producing as many revisions as necessary, each of which requires a 3-to-6-month letter ballot, until a final PDAM (FPDAM) results.
9. SC 34 votes on the FPDAM using a 4-to-6-month letter ballot.
10. The comments from the FPDAM ballot are processed.
11. Consideration of successive (F)PDAMs continues until the substantial support of the P-members of SC 34 is obtained. (Multiple FPDAMs are permitted.)
12. The ISO and IEC members vote on the FDAM using a 2-month letter ballot.
13. Only editorial corrections can be submitted with approval votes on the FDAM. No technical comments are processed in case of approval. (The FDAM is a confirmation ballot and there is no Ballot Resolution Meeting).
14. If the FDAM ballot fails, processing goes back to Step 4.
15. The final text of the amendment (now called an AMD) is published by ITTF.

Steps 4–5, 6–7 and 8 are optional.

## 2.4.2 Timelines

### 2.4.2.1 Slowest Schedule

By having a number of iterations at each of the WD and PDAM Steps, the process literally could “go on and on”. There could even be multiple FPDAM submissions.

### 2.4.2.2 Non-Accelerated Schedule

For a large and/or complex amendment, a reasonable approach might be to have the following: An initial WD, a PDAM, an FPDAM, and an FDAM. Assuming the shortest allowable ballot periods, the elapsed time for such a series from the adoption of an initial WD by WG4 to a successful result from the FDAM ballot (before AMD publication) would be about 14½ months. (For each extra WD add 3 months. For each extra PDAM add 4 months.)

### 2.4.2.3 Accelerated Schedule

The most ambitious schedule would be to start with an FPDAM, followed by an FDAM. Assuming the shortest allowable ballot periods, the elapsed time for that from the adoption of an FPDAM by WG4 to a successful result from the FDAM ballot (before AMD publication) would be about 7½ months. Such a timeline assumes

- On-time delivery by members of the text they promise.
- No substantive objections result from the WG4’s final review of the FPDAM before balloting begins.
- The comments received with any NO votes from the SC 34 FPDAM letter ballot can be resolved without requiring another iteration.
- Enough votes on the FDAM letter ballots are positive and not too many are negative.

## **SC 34/WG 4 N 0031 — Proposed Roadmap for the First IS 29500 COR and AMD Sets**

Assuming the creation of AMD1 is approved at the Prague SC 34 Plenary, WG4 agrees on final text at the Copenhagen meeting, the editor produces FPDAM1 soon after, and WG4 agrees with that text, the result of the corresponding FPDAM1 ballot could be known early in December 2009, and the result of the FDAM1 ballot could be known early in March 2010, with final publication happening early in June 2010.