

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5985

DATE:

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
Other document (Open)

TITLE:
Establishment of a JTC 1 Special Group for Strategic Planning -
Request for Input and Nomination of National Body Representatives

SOURCE:
JTC 1 Secretariat

PROJECT:

STATUS:
As per JTC 1 Seoul resolution 27, JTC 1 has established a Special
Group for Strategic Planning. To facilitate one of the Group's tasks,
National Bodies and Subcommittees are asked to submit comments on the following prev
JTC 1 N 5771 (Swedish contribution), N 5892 (SC 22 contribution), N 5908 (Swiss cont

JTC 1 National Bodies are invited to nominate members of the Special Group. Please

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE: 2000-01-31

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES:

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11
West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932;
Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

Resolution 27 - JTC 1 Strategic Planning

JTC 1, in order to further evaluate the contributions which have been
made by National Bodies and Subcommittees in response to Resolution 32
of the JTC 1 Rio de Janeiro Plenary meeting, establishes a Special
Group for Strategic Planning working in an ad hoc mode, with the
following Terms of Reference:

The tasks of the Special Group are:

- To consider in detail the contributions received by JTC 1 in response to Rio resolution 32, as identified in agenda item 11.1 of JTC 1 N 5967, and comments thereon by National Bodies and Subcommittees, received not later than **2000-01-31**;
- To address the issues identified in JTC 1 N 5926, Proposals for the Modifications of NP, FCD, FDIS, and Fast Track DIS Ballot Formats and Related Pass Criteria;
- To develop proposals to JTC 1 to address the challenges identified in the contributions. Such proposals should also address aspects of implementation of the measures as well as migration if necessary.

Noting that some of the contributions received contain far-ranging proposals which require careful consideration, JTC 1 requests that the initial focus of the Group is put on measures with a short- to medium-term implementation range. An additional focus of the Group will be to look at longer-term measures that will require intensive consultation with the parent organisations, and to develop proposals towards this end. Such proposals will particularly address the way for JTC 1 to proceed.

JTC 1 National Bodies are invited to nominate members of the Special Group. The Group may decide to invite additional participants, as needed.

The Group will use electronic means of operation as much as possible, but is authorised to hold meetings, if necessary. JTC 1 National Bodies will have access to all working documents of the Group.

JTC 1 requests the Special Group to deliver the results of its deliberations in time for the November 2000 JTC 1 Plenary meeting. Additionally, the Group is encouraged to submit any intermediate proposals to JTC 1 at any time so that they can be balloted and implemented by JTC 1 at the earliest possible time.

JTC 1 authorises the Special Group to submit proposals to JTC 1 for a 60 days letter ballot as per clause 9.1.7 of the JTC 1 Directives. "

JTC 1 appoints Mr. Scott Jameson as Convener of the Special Group.

The Special Group will hold its Kick-off the week of 21 February, 2000 in Oslo, Norway.

Objection: Canada

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5892

DATE: 1999-09-29

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
Other document (Defined)

TITLE:
JTC 1/SC 22 Response to the Request for Input on Strategic Planning
(Rio Resolution 32)

SOURCE:
SC 22 Secretariat

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and
consideration at the November 1999 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Seoul.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 1

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11
West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932;
Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

Ms. Lisa Rajchel
Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1
American National Standards Institute
11 West 42nd Street
New York, NY 10036

SUBJECT: JTC 1 Request for Input on Strategic Planning

Dear Lisa:

Reference is made to Rio Resolution 32 in which ISO/IEC JTC 1 requests its Subcommittees to provide
contributions regarding future strategic orientation for JTC 1.

JTC 1/SC22 requests JTC 1 to allow National Body O-members of SC 22 to nominate experts to SC 22 Working Groups.

SC 22 understands that, if the current prohibition is relaxed, some of its WGs would realize increased participation, reversing a trend of declining participation that has concerned a number of SC 22 WGs. This increased participation could lead to higher quality and more timely JTC 1 standards due to the greater resources and additional technical expertise available to the WGs.

SC 22 has a diverse set of WGs developing International Standards within its scope. Some National Bodies are not able to fulfill the obligations of a P-member for most or all SC 22 activities, but can contribute to the work of one or two SC 22 WGs. SC 22 observes the JTC 1 Directives permit National Body O-members of JTC 1 to establish P-membership in a JTC 1 SC. SC 22 requests JTC 1 to extend this principle to SC 22 and its WGs and open participation in SC 22 WGs to SC 22 O-members.

Sincerely

WILLIAM C. RINEHULS
Secretariat, JTC 1/SC22

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5771

DATE: 1999-03-05

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
National Body Contribution

TITLE:
Swedish contribution to JTC 1 Rio Resolution 32 - National Body Input
on Strategic Planning

SOURCE:
National Body of Sweden

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated for review and consideration by the JTC 1
National Bodies.

ACTION ID: COM

DUE DATE: - -

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 7

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11
West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932;
Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

To JTC 1

Swedish contribution to:

Resolution 32 - National Body Input on Strategic Planning

JTC 1 requests its National Bodies and Subcommittees to provide contributions as early as possible during the next Plenary cycle regarding future strategic orientation for JTC 1.

JTC 1 AND ITS FUTURE

JTC 1 has decided to open a new discussion period. Topics may include any changes to working methods however radical or provocative.

Before JTC 1 starts a restructuring of its system, there is a need to understand if the market players will "return" to a restructured JTC 1. Or **is it too late**, independent of what JTC 1 and its interest parties do? Questions are found in section 2.

This document asks a number of important questions, which must be answered before any wider actions should be taken. The document has also an analyses of the changing environments, including outside and inhouse the formal standardisation system.

1 JTC 1 STANDARDISATION OF TODAY

The participation in JTC1 is declining. This statement is not valid for all SC, but a more general observation. For a more in depth analyses, see section 3 and 4.

2 QUESTIONS

Statement: **The ICT-industry and its customers is fast loosing its trust in the formal standardisation system.** True or not?

If the formal standardisation bodies change completely or partly their working methods, adoption processes and availability of documents:

- Will the ICT-industry come back and use the system and its results?
- Will the ICT-governmental agencies come back and use the system and its results?
- Will the ICT-procurer (private and governmental) come back and use the system and its results?
- Will the ICT-end users use the results?
- Will the involved parties be willing to finance the system?

Which changes are needed to ensure YES on the five questions above:

- All deliverables, including ISes, shall be available free of charge over the Internet, even if this means that the NBs need extra funding.
- All drafts, including DISes, shall be available free of charge over the Internet, even if this means that the NBs need extra funding.
- A vote should not take place unless at least two independent applications show conformance and interoperability.
- The voting system shall be devoted to the interested parties who have participated in the development and taken their economic responsibility for the system.
- A voting system should be in place during the working processes within the SCs and WGs.
- Voting rights shall only be given to "committed" resources.
- Weighted voting shall be introduced. The system should give more power to the contributors to the system. Ranging from 1 to 5 related to contributions or 1 per company expert and 1 for editorship and
- The start up phase should be given more attention, to ensure the "committed" resources.
- The standardisation system should concentrate the standardisation work on different modules used by the ICT industry, and not on product standardisation.
- The system should be more cost effective for the interested parties who finance and participate in it, as the use of more electronic document development.
- The NB should concentrate on information dissemination.
- Direct participation shall be used at all levels of JTC 1, its SCs and its WGs.
- All secretariats of JTC 1 and its SCs shall be financed directly by the interested parties. This should include all parties, as user and industry associations.
- ???
- ??
- ?

3 THE OUTSIDE ENVIRONMENT

A number of drastic changes have been seen in the technical and the market development, they have influenced and will continue to influence the standardisation world.

3.1 The technical development

The technical development gives more intelligence in smaller and lighter-weighted products. As the power of the computers and memories increases the number of applications and what they can do to improve market opportunities, product planning, product development, maintenance and so on will increase.

3.2 The market development

During the seventies and eighties, the market had many more companies involved in IT business, than today. The prices of all products have gone down considerably, due to competition from new companies, and the technical development. The IT evolution and its use within companies, organisations and governments was in its infant period. Today we still have only got a basic understanding of the opportunities and challenges the new information technology techniques can give us.

The globalisation of the market is a fact in the ICT field. (ICT = Information and Communications Technologies)

3.3 The governments

Even if the governments have common intentions to use formal standards for their "public procurement", they very seldom follow their own recommendations. We can see that they do not follow global political agreements such as:

D.1 ECE Governments should in legislation whenever possible use reference to national standards, to regional standards or preferably to international standards when they exist, and should promote the wider application of the method of "reference to standards" by drawing the attention of their competent authorities to the advantages of the method and to the alternative techniques of using it. (Text from UN/ECE/STAND 17/Rev 3)

This recommendation is adopted by the UN/ECE Governments (some 60 of the countries in developed world).

3.4 Efficient use of resources

Private and official organisations have, during the last 5 - 10 years, restructured their management systems and working methods. They evaluate in more detail, which resources they shall use in standardisation. They demand added value out of the participation.

Forums and consortia have recently gained better recognition than the formal standardisation system. These bodies attract the market players for reasons of: better visibility, concentration in a narrower technical field, focus on interested parties in that specific field.

4 THE INHOUSE STANDARDISATION ENVIRONMENT

It is noted that the real and great advantage with the formal standardisation system is its openness, consensus methods and transparency.

4.1 Working methods

The computerised society has influenced the working methods within JTC 1, its SCs and WGs. The paper distribution system has largely disappeared, as has the diskette distribution.

Close to hundred percent of the work is done by electronic means There are some changes still to be completed, such as electronic voting and electronic draft distribution from ITTF.

The new working methods make it more easy to have more direct information distribution to interested parties.

4.2 Free electronic distribution of drafts and adopted standards

There are a large number of interested parties, who are requesting that the drafts and adopted standards shall be available free of charge when distributed by electronic means.

For your information: ETSI has decided to go this way. This approach was fully implemented by 1998-11-01.

4.3 Work items

A large number of work items have been deleted from the JTC 1/SC work programmes. A large number of standards are entering 5 year maintenance phases.

The number of new work items are very low. It should be noted that standards which are going to be up dated do not create new work items. This fact is a problem for the planning of resources needed within JTC 1 and its SCs.

4.4 Participation

The number of participating experts have decreased substantially in some SCs. However, other SCs are still attracting experts, and even increasing in size. The total sum of involved experts has decreased by at least some 30 (?) %.

4.5 Funding

The work in JTC 1 and its SCs are funded at a variety of levels.

To ensure that the current systems can run, bodies such as:

ISO

IEC

JTC 1 secretariat

JTC 1/SC secretariats

National Bodies

need to be funded by the interested parties. The founders have started to ask the question: Do we invest in a system that gives us a corresponding added value?

We, including ITS, are funded by a limited number of the industry, governmental bodies, regulators, and so on. Some national bodies have a substantial part of their income from sales of the documents, while others have a neglectable part of the income coming from refund of the sales.

Note: The ITTF staff is funded by ISO and IEC. IEC funds all editing and printing for DISs and ISs coming from JTC 1/SC 25 and SC 26. The other JTC 1 DISs and ISs are funded by ISO members.

The interested parties are also funding all the experts, who contribute to the work done in the WGs, SCs and at the top level of JTC 1. This is also valid for the work done at the national level.

In some countries the interested parties are contributing the major part of all costs including their own experts, while in other countries there are other ways of finding finance support of the standardisation bodies.

4.6

National Bodies

The major number of the JTC 1 members have seen changes in the financing of them, but also a decreased number of experts in the work. However, some areas are not changing interest. There are even some which have seen increase interest.

5

EXPECTATIONS

Sweden wants to receive feed back on these questions in Section 2 in the beginning of the document.

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5908

DATE: 1999-10-01

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
National Body Contribution

TITLE:
Swiss National Body Contribution on JTC 1 Strategic Planning

SOURCE:
Swiss National Body

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 1999 JTC 1 Plenary meeting inSeoul.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 6

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11
West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932;
Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

Swiss National Body contribution on JTC 1 strategic planning

1 Introduction

Research and analysis of the reasons for the decreasing demand for international ICT standards developed by JTC 1 are virtually non-existent. Yet, knowledge about these reasons is of key importance for the determination of the strategy for the future of JTC 1, and a possible restructuring of the JTC 1 organization and working methods.

This contribution is meant as a start-up proposal (please amend) for both processes which necessarily have to take place sequentially:

1. Analysis and identification of the market need for ICT standards from JTC 1.
2. The optimal structure and working methods of JTC 1 to respond to the market need.

2 The market need

I. One important justification for the development of ICT standards is **economical**, both directly and indirectly. Direct economic effects are, for example:

- a standard means business
- re-usability, which reduces the cost of development, production, testing, etc.
- market size: standardization fosters competition, and markets with competition grow often bigger than markets without competition.

Some indirect economic effects are:

- a standard is a tool for market access
- shared and reduced risk in market development,
- the creation of tools for development, testing, etc., in case a market is large enough.
- user comfort with vendor products embodying standards

II. A second important justification is **technical**, e.g. for:

- interworking of equipment
- interchange of data via networks and media
- shared use of data by different applications
- hardware and software interfaces
- a standard provides information
- a standard demonstrates leadership in technology

III. The third justification is **public interest**, often combined with legal or regulatory arrangements. Examples are:

- security
- safety
- environmental protection
- emc

There are certainly more justifications for the creation of ICT standards. These types of justification are also often combined.

The sheer existence of far more than 100 consortia strongly confirms that there is a market need: most of these consortia have a standardization activity on board, although many are not created with standardization objectives at their very beginning. A fundamental difference between consortia and a standardization body like JTC 1 is that a consortium usually only allows participation by parties and individuals who support the objectives of the consortium, whilst JTC 1 has to allow both proponents and opponents in the room.

The relevant question is whether and where JTC 1 can offer added value in its response to the market need.

The assets of JTC 1 are:

- well-recognized deliverables, i.e. ISO/IEC standards and technical reports
- an international structure and membership
- an internal structure with units that do no overlapping work
- a process
- a legal status

However, JTC 1 has no / not enough:

- adaptable organization and process
- marketing activity, including public relations and acquisition of projects
- finances
- consultancy, e.g. to generate income
- focused commercial interest.

3 Requirements for timely developed ICT standards

What are the typical requirements to arrive at ICT standards ?

Given the short like cycle of many ICT products the **time window** for the development of standards to be implemented in ICT products is usually small. This implies that usually the time to find a time window is also short. Therefore, to exploit opportunities for ICT standardization and to turn the opportunity into a project requires good contacts in the ICT industry and a very flexible organization that can quickly start and execute a standardization project. Moreover, a group of industries must buy into having a possible standardization project done in JTC 1 instead of making it part of the activities of a new or existing consortium, and bypassing JTC 1 and ISO itself.

Another requirement is often that the risk must be minimized that a prospect specification for standardization may be considerably changed or amended. Such a requirement is in conflict with the definition of standardization. A possible consequence is that competing standards must be allowed.

It is evident from these two requirements - a small time window, and no substantial modifications allowed - that the stakeholders of a possible standardization project want to be directly represented in the project, have a flexible process and have large influence on the control of the technical contents of a standard.

4 JTC 1 as a partner for ICT consortia

To become the standardization partner of a consortium, JTC 1 must have a process that can compete with that of the consortium with respect to standardization. The additional 'sales' argument would then be that a JTC 1 standard has a well-recognized international status and is a real consensus-based standard instead of a specification.

The 'competitive' process must result in a standard that is developed in time, and with a price tag that is comparable to that of a consortium. To determine this, some insight has to be acquired about the resources used by consortia for standardization.

The aspects of competitive cost and timeliness must be added by JTC 1 to its current assets, without jeopardizing these:

- well-recognized deliverables
- global connections and infrastructure, legally based
- a due standardization process, avoiding rubber-stamping
- own identity, no mimicry of a consortium

What is needed to achieve such a situation ? Our proposal focuses on the following elements for JTC 1:

- organizational structure
- process
- participation
- finances
- subcontracting

5 A new organizational structure for JTC 1

Currently JTC 1 has four main organizational elements:

1. JTC 1 parent body
2. Technical directions
3. Sub-Committees
4. Working Groups

This should be made meaner and leaner by transforming this in two basic organizational elements:

1. Technical divisions
2. Management group

The **Technical divisions** are responsible for the total completion of technical work needed for the development of standards and technical reports - the deliverables. This total completion implies that the deliverable may not be changed anymore once it has been released by the Technical division: it has to be published as released unless it is blocked on management level for non-technical reasons (nearly always for questions on 'fairness of the process').

A Technical division is responsible - within the confines of its area of work - for the creation, execution, management, planning, resources, style and quality control, and necessary liaisons needed for its projects.

The **Management group** is responsible for the creation (including their scope and initial programme of work) and disbandment of Technical divisions, resolution of disputes over competing or possibly overlapping areas of work, changes in scopes of existing Technical divisions, ratification of deliverables coming from Technical divisions, subcontracting to bodies outside JTC 1, marketing of the values of standards, non-technical liaisons, acquisition of new work areas, representation of JTC 1, public relations, finances.

6 The JTC 1 process

The current 5-stage process is too formal and too much controlled by distinctive procedures for each of the stages. Therefore, a much simpler process is proposed:

- Within Technical divisions a new project is started when there is substantial support and a number of members, e.g. five, is prepared to work on the project.
- A project only works on drafts of the deliverable aimed at, there is no need for distinctive stages (WD, CD, DIS) unless perhaps for administrative purposes only. Decisions that cannot be made otherwise are decided by voting within the project. There is one final approval vote on a deliverable within a Technical division. Projects that have not progressed during six months are automatically stopped within a possibility for appeal.

The Management group has to ratify, without making any technical assessment, the deliverables coming from Technical divisions or subcontractors.

The Management group takes decisions by voting at the meeting. Subjects to be voted upon are announced no less than six weeks before a meeting. Postal ballots can be used for urgent subjects.

7 Participation

On Technical division level the participation is direct for all parties concerned: industries, user groups, administrations, research and other not-for-profit institutions (e.g. national standardization bodies). Each party has only one vote. If several individuals from the same party participate in a project, then they have only one vote between them. If a consortium participates as consortium then it has only one vote.

On Management group level the following types of participants are distinguished:

- National Bodies
- Technical division representatives
- Subcontractors
- Others

The first three types have voting rights: 60% of these rights are assigned to National Bodies.

8 Finances

The current system of national funding has to be replaced by one international system. The national funding system can be retained for national activities. The international funding is needed to:

- cover the operational costs of the Technical divisions and the Management group, including meeting costs, document distribution, etc.
- personnel costs
- publication relations / representation
- acquisition of new work

A treasurer has to be appointed to run the financial operations of JTC 1.

The income consists of:

- membership contributions from participating parties, preferably on an annual basis. Notifications of withdrawal have to be given at least half a year in advance. The minimum contribution period is two years. Categories of members and corresponding contribution levels have to be defined.
- Donations, e.g. subsidies by Administrations other than membership contributions.
- Other, e.g. income from reserves.

The height of membership contributions has to be fixed every year based on an annual budget. The contributions are highly determined by the level of expenses in the budget. Changes in the membership contributions should not fluctuate randomly. Build-up of a reserve / buffer fund is needed to limit fluctuations in the membership contributions and to guarantee a smooth financial operation.

9 Subcontracting

JTC 1 need not to develop all its deliverables from scratch in its own Technical divisions, whilst still maintaining the possibility to ratify deliverables coming from elsewhere.

Current JTC 1 mechanisms to achieve this are the fast-track and PAS procedures. These are broad procedures allowing for deliverables on any subject that falls within the remit of JTC 1.

Also on more focused areas of work (a project or set of projects) subcontracting should be considered by JTC 1 to create a synergetic effort that broadens the support for JTC 1 by appreciating the recognition of the JTC 1 deliverables.

10 Conclusion

This contribution contains several proposals for substantial changes of JTC 1, in particular to turn JTC 1 into an adaptable organization and to strengthen its financial structure, without violating the JTC 1 assets and its parent environment ISO/IEC.

Implementation of these proposals requires entrepreneurship-like actions.

Therefore, it is highly recommended to put a relatively small but influential group in place to prepare an overall implementation plan and to work out change proposals in detail. Also considerable consultation of potential member parties will be needed before restructuring JTC 1.

The test of the muscles and flexibility of JTC 1 lies in the near future.

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5909

DATE: 1999-10-01

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
National Body Contribution

TITLE:
US National Body Contribution on JTC 1 Strategic Planning

SOURCE:
US National Body

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 1999 JTC 1 meeting in Seoul.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 7

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11 West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932; Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

US National Body Contribution on JTC 1 Strategic Planning

The US offers this contribution in response to JTC 1 N 5757, "Request for National Body Input on Strategic Planning", from the JTC 1 Rio Resolution 32. The US National Body notes with concern:

- While JTC 1's standards have long been valued by both the private and public sectors, in recent years, the JTC 1 program of work has become less relevant to our industry's market objectives.
- JTC 1 is perceived as being too slow and bureaucratic. As a result, more and more IT standards are being developed in consortia and other de facto bodies.
- The market demand for more timely and less costly distribution of standards is affecting the revenue opportunities from the sale of those standards. This revenue impact, together with the increased cost of operating a Secretariat, has limited the number of National Bodies that can actively support the management of technical work.

This contribution is intended to address three objectives:

1. Better position JTC 1 to be the preeminent leader in information technology standardization by continuing and improving JTC 1's market relevance in information technology standardization.
2. Ensure that the structure of JTC 1 is simple, efficient and easy to administer, yet retains the value of JTC 1 standards.
3. Offer a faster and more efficient way to function while maintaining financial viability into the next millennium.

To meet these objectives the US offers two strategies.

Maintain Current Product

JTC 1 should maintain its current product -- formal, consensus-based International Standards -- but should encourage changes to the process to make their introduction more efficient and effective. The US considers the creation of formal standards and technical reports essential to our industry and believes these products should continue to be the basis of our ongoing work, rather than expanding the JTC 1 product line to include lower-consensus documents.

Establish Simplified Two Level Structure

JTC 1 should be organized in just two levels. All technical work should be done at a single Technical Group level to encourage greater responsibility and productivity. This structure would encourage Technical Groups to investigate and explore opportunities to progress their work and help ensure that projects will have greater market relevance. The responsibilities of a Technical Group should include:

- Management of the program of work
- Creation and approval of project proposals within its scope
- Approval of all technical documents through FCD level
- Establishment of liaisons with other JTC 1 Technical Groups
- Submission of an annual report

The JTC 1 Technical Groups would report to the JTC 1 Executive Group, whose responsibilities include:

Management of the overall JTC 1 program of work
Creation and approval of new Technical Groups and their associated scopes

Approval of FDIS and all managerial and policy decisions
Evaluation of the progress of the Technical Groups

Establishment of liaisons with ISO and IEC groups outside of JTC 1

Much of the process of JTC 1 would remain unchanged under this proposal. The US proposes, however, major changes in the areas of membership, voting, project management and fees.

Membership

The US believes that the National Body process should be preserved at the management level. Membership in the JTC 1 Executive Group would therefore be limited to National Bodies, with provision for information (current Category B) liaisons. The US notes that long and fruitful relationships between JTC 1 and its current Category A liaisons, and suggests that mechanisms be investigated in the spirit of this proposal to maintain the effective working relationships.

Membership in the Technical Groups should be open to all materially affected entities such as National

Bodies, companies, user groups, consortia, trade associations and government agencies. The US believes that opening the technical process to the widest possible input would make JTC 1 more attractive to those directly affected, and would produce more market-relevant standards. While JTC 1 has initiated a number of mechanisms to broaden the base of JTC 1 technical input, none have proven effective. This proposal seeks to provide a simpler and more responsive mechanism to open JTC 1 to the large body of work currently in process throughout the industry. It does so by granting a "seat at the technical table" for those with demonstrated interests. It also recognizes, through the continued inclusion of National Bodies in the technical process, the importance of representation for materially affected interests who do not choose to participate directly at the international level. As with the JTC 1 Executive Group, information liaisons would be allowed.

By providing direct participation rights to all materially affected parties, the US believes that the need for other classes of external liaison has been eliminated. Additionally, there would no longer be a need for the PAS process since prospective PAS submitters could join any Technical Group and directly submit new project proposals.

Voting

The voting mechanisms for the above structure would also be done at two levels. All Technical Group level votes through FCD would be cast by Technical Group members only. JTC 1 Executive Group votes, which would be cast by National Bodies, would be for final approval of standards (FDIS) and policy matters. FDIS balloting would be accompanied by the ballot comments from the Technical Group. The principle of "one member, one vote" would be preserved for both the JTC 1 Executive Group and Technical Group levels.

Project Management

To expedite the introduction of new work, Technical Groups would be empowered to introduce new projects that are within their approved scopes. Once approved, the Technical Group would notify the JTC 1 Executive Group to ensure that all National Bodies and other interested parties have the opportunity to participate. This notification would include an estimated project time line. Work would go forward in the Technical Group unless contested by a National Body at the JTC 1 Executive Group. Work that is outside the scope of existing Technical Groups would require approval by the JTC 1 Executive Group and may necessitate the establishment of a new Technical Group.

Technical Groups would be required to provide annual reports which describe the progress and any deviations in the time line as stated in the approved project.

Fee Structure

Secretariat support and National Body infrastructure costs are increasing while the revenue from the sale of standards is decreasing. Because of this, many national bodies find it difficult to assume leadership roles in JTC 1. It is therefore necessary to find a more equitable way of funding JTC 1 and of distributing Secretariat responsibilities. With the expanded membership in Technical Groups, JTC 1 has the opportunity to establish a better funding philosophy.

The US recommends that each Technical Group be financially supported by its members. While a National Body Secretariat retains the responsibility for the financial operation of the Technical Group, materially interested parties would be assessed a fee for their membership. Since the fee would be a fixed amount for all members and across all Technical Groups, the resources required by a Secretariat will vary. National Bodies would be exempt from paying fees.

The US also recommends that payment of fees should be structured so that members could pay fees in one of two methods. Members could either pay a fee for each Technical Group in which they participate, or pay a single universal fee to cover membership in an unlimited number of Technical Groups. The collection and disbursement of the membership fees would be as follows:

Single Technical Group Membership fees would be paid to the Secretariat for that Technical Group. That Secretariat, in turn, would remit a percentage (e.g. 10%) of that fee to the Secretariat for the JTC 1 Executive Group.

Universal membership fees would be paid to the Secretariat for the JTC1 Executive Group. That Secretariat, in turn, would distribute a percentage (e.g. 90%) of that fee in equal increments to each of the Technical Group Secretariats.

The US believes that the universal membership fee should be less than the sum of the single membership fees for all Technical Groups.

Conclusion

The US National Body believes the issues facing JTC 1 are significant and require immediate action. As this proposal is substantial, it is imperative that initial steps be taken now and completed by the JTC1 Plenary in Norway. We expect the breakout session in Seoul to result in firm decisions to be incorporated in the Directives for the approval of ISO and IEC.

The US National Body remains firmly committed to maintaining a strong JTC 1. We believe the swift implementation of our proposals will ensure the preeminent leadership of JTC 1 in information technology standardization and request the support of all National Bodies.

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5911

DATE: 1999-10-01

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
National Body Contribution

TITLE:
Irish National Body Contribution on JTC 1 Strategic Planning

SOURCE:
Irish National Body

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 1999 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Seoul.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 2

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11
West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932;
Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

re: JTC 1 N 5757 Request for input on Strategic Planning

As per JTC 1 Rio Resolution 32, JTC 1 requests its National Bodies and Subcommittees to provide contributions as early as possible during the next Plenary cycle regarding future strategic orientation for JTC 1. Topics may include any changes to working methods, however radical or provocative.

The Irish National Body welcomes the opportunity to provide its input on future JTC 1 work methods, procedures and structure.

1. Responsibility of Maintenance Teams

A five year interval between review cycles is not adequate for most JTC 1 standards. JTC 1 should investigate adoption of the approach introduced by IEC. Maintenance teams, which are working groups of experts designated by the Participating members of their committee, have replaced the old IEC system of systematic review for standards. They are designed to ensure that standards are kept up-to-date according to market requirements, and not revised simply according to an arbitrary time schedule. This approach is more flexible and would add an additional set of inputs to any new NP process.

2. New deliverables: Living Standards

The fit of JTC 1 deliverables with the fast moving requirements and changes which occur in ICT industries has been raised several times. One particular contribution worthy of detailed reconsideration is the concept of a "Living Standard". The proposal envisaged the introduction of a new standards deliverable which is issued electronically and is updated as required, possibly to a predetermined frequency. At the same time this new 'document' will contain or provide pointers to work in progress. The intent is to somehow link existing standards and work in progress for the reader and user community. The challenges represented by this proposed approach are substantial and would need careful study. Elements of the approach are evident in the way some Consortia deliverables are presented today.

3. Leveraging Technical Directions

There is a need to better understand and establish a process to meet user requirements for the systems integration aspects of groups of standards and specifications working together in given technical areas. The synergies established between experts within the JTC 1 Technical Directions should be increased and the opportunity taken to leverage this talent to help meet user requirements for standards integration.

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5919

DATE: 1999-10-04

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
National Body Contribution

TITLE:
French National Body Contribution to JTC 1 on Strategic Planning

SOURCE:
National Body of France

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 1999 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Seoul.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 3

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11
West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932;
Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

DATE : 1999-09-30

Source : AFNOR-

Subject : French National body Contribution to JTC 1 on Strategic Planning

The position of the French National Body regarding JTC 1 N 5757 is the following :

1-. Making International standards with an high level of consensus is an essential requirement shared by user's, vendor's and manufacturers, administrations and other organisations.

2- ISO and IEC have just finished to clean up their procedures introducing a maximum of flexibility at each stage of the standardisation process for covering expressed needs. On the other hand, the JTC 1 procedures have been rewritten last year including new features, like Web based documents distribution, resulting from JTC 1 experience to speed up the process. A cross analysis of these two sets of new procedures by JTC 1 and by ISO EIC would be of utmost benefit to all.

3- There is a general need to ensure all interested parties including users' representation at each level including JTC 1 plenary meetings. The new recently voted ISO CEI procedures introduce a new kind of liaison called Category D liaison which could be suitable for any international organisations (i.e. UNESCO). It is then proposed to adapt JTC 1 procedures by introducing such Category D liaison.

4- The new ISO CEI procedures framework have given a possibility to achieve different kinds of consensus through the establishment of new types of documents i.e. ITA. The current TMB known standpoint was that official International standards require a national based consensus making process.

The new kinds of documents (e.g. ITA) defined by these new procedures would not bring added value to JTC1 community with regard to the deliverables offered by consortia.

5- P-members of JTC 1 and/or JTC 1 SCs must assume the responsibility to participate effectively in the Work once they have chosen to do so. The application of this principle should be analysed with regards to the Rules of participation as P-members.

6- For efficiency reasons and to avoid a waste of expertise and resources in the middle of a project, It should be made clear that experts designated by national bodies for participating in a Working Group are entitled to keep they responsibility until their parent national body or liaison decide otherwise and notify the SC secretariat accordingly.

7- The members of JTC 1 could sometimes benefit from more direct inputs from experts performing the standardisation work in WGs. Considering that many decisions often address specific technical aspects, direct presentation of normative texts and informational input by the concerned experts at SC and JTC 1 level should be favoured, without giving them voting rights and without authorising their direct participation in the voting discussion.

8- Technical works in Working Groups needs in most cases support and feed back from a large community including users, lobbies, implementers, etc, which is normally much wider than the circle of experts directly involved. Accordingly, Working Groups should be given the opportunity to experiment the use of open email exploders.

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5959

DATE: 1999-10-18

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
National Body Contribution

TITLE:
German Contribution to ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5757, Request for National Body
Input on JTC 1 Strategic Planning

SOURCE:
National Body of Germany

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and
consideration at the November 1999 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Seoul.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 5

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11
West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932;
Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

DIN Contribution to ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5757

Request for National Body Input on Strategic Planning

In response to the JTC 1 request as of resolution 32 of the Rio de Janeiro Plenary meeting, DIN wishes to contribute the following thoughts:

1. Basic observations

The following fundamental trends in JTC 1 and the environment in which it operates, can be observed (note: no significance is attached to the order below):

1. A significant reduction in number of experts contributing to the work in the SCs, though this may vary from SC to SC.
2. A lack of ground breaking new projects in JTC 1.
3. An increasing number of consortia being established outside of JTC 1, to do highly innovative work which can be considered as within the remit of JTC 1.
4. A reluctance of industry to submit innovative work to JTC 1 (see Java, and also the experiences of the JTC 1 Business Team on Electronic Commerce).

2. Interpretation

Many reasons for the above trends can possibly be given. Of these, the most commonly heard is the perception that international standardization is slow, bureaucratic and does not meet market demands, and, hence, industry uses other mechanisms, such as consortia, to establish the necessary consensus on a particular specification. We recognize that, to some extent, this argument may be valid; but in our view, it does not meet the true point which DIN believes is the following: to what extent does the market need International Standards (IS) from JTC 1 at all and where can the requirements of the market also – or even better – be met by other types of specifications which originate from other consensus building environments?

We attempt to offer some answers to this question, but recognize that they are controversial and certainly not exhaustive. JTC 1 has a number of SCs which we consider fairly successful in establishing International Standards with a broad acceptance in the market. Among those are SC 17, SC 27, SC 29 and SC 31. An analysis of the characteristics of such SCs, both in terms of technical domains and constituency, leads to the following conclusions: International Standards are most appropriate relative to consortia specifications where:

- the technical domain is mainly of an infrastructural nature and competing technologies would confuse rather than further the market (see the well known VHS/Beta example), (SC 17, SC 27, SC 29); and/or
- the constituency of market actors is very broad, both in terms of geographic coverage as well as in number and size of players; in other words: where many companies and not only the big, but also small and medium size ones, are interested and affected by the standard, and where

not a single company or country/ region dominates the relevant technology (SC 29, SC 31); and/or

- public interest, represented by, e.g., governmental agencies or consumers, is affected (SC27).

International standards play in many countries a prominent role in the domain of public procurement. The WTO TBT Agreement requires that international standards are used as a basis for technical regulation and encourages signatories to participate in the preparation of such standards. Further, International Standards are most appropriate where cultural and linguistic aspects are considered or, generally, a broad community of end users is affected.

Conversely, consortia are the preferred instrument for consensus building where:

- the choice among competing technologies can readily be left to the market; and/or
- a group of industry actors does not want to share a particular technology with the public, but only with a limited number of other companies; and/or
- there are economic reasons for the technology owner(s) not to abide by the strict IPR rules of International Standardization, but, rather, to aim at full commercial exploitation of the technology; and/or
- only a limited number of companies is affected by a given technology.

Note: Such reasons are given without any further judgement.

3. Proposed orientations for the future strategy of JTC 1

The overall conclusion from the above is that there are good reasons for International Standardization and there are good reasons for consortia. It is important that JTC 1 recognizes this and builds its future strategy on it, rather than attempting to compete with consortia. In other words: JTC 1 should:

- Recognize the existence of consortia and the valuable contribution they can make to the promotion of the information society;
- Recognize its own strengths
 - in infrastructural domains;
 - where a very heterogeneous constituency exists;
 - where the public interest is affected, i.e. where actors other than industry should be directly involved, such as governmental agencies, consumers;
 - where cultural differences have to be taken into account,and concentrate its activities in such domains.
- Further improve the co-operation with consortia where a need exists, by establishing a policy of open invitations to consortia.

Hence, the following orientations of JTC 1 are proposed:

1. JTC 1 acknowledges that the implementation of the Global Information Society requires standards and specifications of different qualities and different level of consensus. Therefore, the future infrastructure for standardization will be a network of cooperating standards bodies, consortia/fora and other specification developing organizations.

2. The main product of JTC 1 are International Standards with their specific qualities and with a level of consensus based on a public inquiry. JTC 1 has to investigate carefully the fields and scopes where International Standards are essential. For these fields, JTC 1 has to provide the requested International Standards with further improved efficiency. Fast Track and PAS Transposition are proven processes for co-operation with consortia and other specification developers.

3. Reducing effort and time is a permanent challenge in a competitive environment.

JTC 1 has to continue its measures to increase efficiency and to streamline procedures. The measures have to maintain the quality and the level of consensus of JTC 1's main product – the International Standard. This is the real challenge and task for JTC 1: to develop procedures and methods of working which use all advantages of the Global Information Infrastructure and new media for development and distribution of its main product, but at the same time to maintain the quality and the level of consensus of International Standards.

The implementation of 1. to 3. above should have the highest priority for JTC 1. JTC 1 has to settle its field of activities and to prove that it can provide International Standards in this field efficiently and within the requested time frame.

DIN is concerned that any attempt of JTC 1 to compete as a developer of specifications with flexible consortia by giving up or reducing the quality or level of consensus of International Standards, will ultimately will not be successful and, instead, will negatively affect JTC 1's credibility.

4. Considerations for JTC 1's operation

Based on the above strategic orientation of JTC 1, the aspects below need further consideration.

- **Products of JTC 1**

JTC 1 should investigate whether or not it is useful and helpful for JTC 1 to offer also specifications with a reduced level of consensus, e.g. a specification for which consensus is established at SC level.

- **Membership of / participation in JTC 1**

While the membership of and participation in JTC 1 should, in principle, be as open as possible, practical considerations need also to be taken into account. It has to be assured that the standards development and ratification process is as smooth and fast as possible, without any unnecessary surprises and set-backs at any stage. If the membership constituents at technical and at ratification level differ significantly, this can certainly not be assured and, hence, the overall efficiency of the JTC 1 process is at risk. Therefore, DIN does, at this time, not support a model of direct participation at technical level; instead, we suggest that the instrument of external liaison is used appropriately to allow other parties to contribute to and influence the ongoing work.

- **Operation at technical level**

The role of the technical bodies (SCs and WGs) in JTC 1 needs to be strengthened in the sense that, once a project has been approved by JTC 1, its execution is fully left to the SC's responsibility, but that the SC at the same time is held accountable for its operations and that projects having passed their scheduled target dates, can easily be cancelled.

JTC 1 SCs are asked to ensure that their standards projects and deliverables are meeting the requirements of the market. Business Plans and the process to establish New Projects should in this context be seen as measures to support the SCs rather than as bureaucratic requirements. SCs are expected to operate in close contact with all market actors, i.e. industry and end users, understand/anticipate the technical evolution in their technical direction and cooperate, using the appropriate instruments, with other related standards organizations and relevant consortia/fora.

The decision of the 13th JTC 1 Plenary Meeting to spend more time and attention to the reports of Technical Directions and SCs during the Plenary Meeting is an appropriate action to support efficient operation at technical level. As a further step, we propose that JTC 1 should establish a group of independent experts, whose task is to evaluate the reports of the TDs /SCs (with particular consideration of the technical state of the art and the perceived market requirements in the given domain) and to give a co-report during the Plenary.

Further, the formation of inter-SC working entities should be encouraged where appropriate to allow for taking account of the multi-disciplinary nature of many work items.

The Fast Track and PAS processes are considered helpful to adopt proven technologies quickly as International Standards and therefore these processes should remain in place.

- **Project Management**

It is obvious that full project management has to be introduced in the SCs and their Working Groups. While it is often argued that international standardization lives from voluntary contributions and, hence, no strict project management can be executed, we are convinced that at the beginning of a project, firm and reliable commitments of all those interested to participate can and must be available. JTC 1 has to make clear to its participants that contributing to standardization is not a donation but an obligation. It is important to stress that the relevance of a standardization project can be directly measured by the amount of contributions received for this project.

In order to help project managers and secretariats to consistently apply project management, JTC 1 should select an appropriate software tool and make it broadly available.

- **Financial considerations**

Currently, financing of JTC 1's work is done at several levels:

- All participants bear their own costs,
- The costs of an international secretariat are borne by the national body which holds this secretariat; this financial burden is accompanied by the right of the secretariat to propose a chairperson for the technical unit. We understand that currently such burden is not equally distributed among the JTC 1 membership and that reasons may exist for a change. We offer the following considerations for this problem:
 - The possibility exists that several NBs share the costs of an international secretariat. This, however, should be organized among such NBs, and JTC 1 should not be actively involved in such process, but should only be kept informed about the fact of such cost sharing. As regards the right to propose a chairperson, it is a matter of the group of NBs to resolve this aspect among themselves.
 - We are not sympathetic about JTC 1 collecting fees for funding an international secretariat, as this puts an administrative burden on JTC 1 itself and, hence, detracts from its core tasks.
- The costs of an international meeting are borne by the host of such meeting, with the possibility to collect - under certain conditions - attendance fees. DIN does not see the need for a change of this approach.

- **Electronic working methods**

JTC 1 has already made significant progress in applying electronic working methods, and we highly welcome such achievements. We are, however, convinced, that further progress can be made in this domain. In particular, with the broad global availability of inexpensive tools, it should, in future, be requested from all participants at all working levels that access to such tools exists. This will help to significantly reduce meeting and travelling costs, both for participants and for international secretariats, and it will speed up the development process.

Development of electronic working methods should not be seen as a simple replacement of manual/mechanic methods by electronic methods. JTC 1 should develop new working methods, making full use of the new possibilities of information technology, information infrastructure and WWW with all their revolutionary applications - with the only restriction that the specific characteristics and qualities of the consensus-based standardization process and of (formal) standards have to be maintained.

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 5960

DATE: 1999-10-18

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:
National Body Contribution

TITLE:
Japan's comments on National Body contributions on JTC 1 Strategic Planning

SOURCE:
National Body of Japan

PROJECT:

STATUS:
This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 1999 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Seoul.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 3

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 11 West 42nd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932; Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

Title: Japan's comments on NB contributions on JTC 1 Strategic Plan

Source: The National Body of Japan (JNB)

Comments:

Japan reviewed NB contributions of Switzerland (N5908), the USA (N5909), Ireland (N5911) and France (N5919) on JTC 1 Strategic Planning. Among them N5908 and 5909 both propose a reform of JTC 1 based on the same drastic conception. Their proposition in short is to simplify the structure, streamline the standard development cycle, and open up the organization to any parties concerned including industry consortia, user groups, and companies that pay membership fees.

Japan basically welcomes such grand re-design of JTC 1 with an expectation that it will revitalize the organization. To be successful in its efforts for self-reform, however, Japan believes that JTC 1 should also examine the fundamental issues on the standardization activities in JTC 1 as discussed in the Japanese contributions N5924 through N5929 which are designed to address some of such immediate problems. They include the following items to secure JTC 1's reason for existence by winning a high reputation as an SDO that timely delivers market-relevant high quality international standards.

- Transparency, reliability and visibility of projects of JTC 1
- Ways to build up consensus versus speed in development of standards
- Methods to capture user needs and evaluate market relevance of standards under development and published
- Policy and practice to resolve IPR problems
- Ways to stimulate morale of experts participating in JTC 1 technical work.

Apart from the Japan's contribution referred to above, we would like to remind that JTC 1, in its work to reform itself, should not overlook the treatment of existing collaborative arrangement with ITU and liaison with various organizations including ECMA.

We hope Japanese contributions together with those from the other national bodies will help activate constructive discussions for JTC 1 to formulate a viable plan to restore its attraction to industry.