

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2
Coded Character Sets
 Secretariat: [Japan \(JISC\)](#)

DOC. TYPE	Request for comments	
TITLE	Request for reconsideration of Documents JTC 1 N 6267 and N 6271 Dealing with tabilized/Obsolescent Standards [JTC 1 N 6455]	
SOURCE	JTC 1 Secretariat	
PROJECT		
STATUS	For comment by 2001-09-15.	
ACTION ID	ACT	
DUE DATE	2001-09-15	
DISTRIBUTION	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF	
ACCESS LEVEL	Def	
ISSUE NO.	117	
FILE	NAME	02n3534.pdf
	SIZE (KB)	
	PAGES	6

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 - IPSJ/ITSCJ *(Information Processing Society of Japan/Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan) Room 308-3, Kikai-Shinko-Kaikan Bldg., 3-5-8, Shiba-Koen, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0011 Japan *Standard Organization Accredited by JISC
 Telephone: +81-3-3431-2808; Facsimile: +81-3-3431-6493; E-mail: kimura@itsci.ipsj.or.jp

Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N6455

Date: 2001-06-13

Replaces:

Document Type: Request for comments

Document Title: Request for reconsideration of Documents JTC 1 N 6267 and N 6271 Dealing with stabilized/Obsolescent Standards

Document Source: JTC 1 Secretariat

Project Number:

Document Status: As per Tromso resolution 26, JTC 1 National Bodies and SCs are requested to reconsider documents JTC 1 N 6267 and N 6271 and to provide input by 2001-09-15.

Action ID: COM

Due Date: 2001-09-15

No. of Pages: 2

Resolution 26 - Stabilized/Obsolescent Standards

The Strategic planning Ad hoc group supports the contributions of the US and UK (J1N6267 and J1N6271 respectively) in respect of a new classification of standard to be titled 'Stabilized' or 'Obsolescent' (or some other appropriate word) standards. This category would apply to standards toward the end of their life cycle where JTC 1 National Bodies no longer have access to the appropriate resources to review them but the standards may still be in productive use. The Strategic Planning Ad Hoc requests that JTC 1 re-circulates the two national body documents indicating its support for the strategy proposed and request further input from National Bodies and Sub Committees for further consideration by JTC 1.

Unanimous

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 6267

DATE: 2000-10-02

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:

National Body Contribution

TITLE:

US National Body Contribution in Response to Document JTC 1 N 6210, Request for Input on Maintenance Teams

SOURCE:

National Body of the United States

PROJECT:

STATUS:

This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 2000 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Tromsø.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE: - -

DISTRIBUTION: P and L Members

MEDIUM:

DISKETTE NO.:

NO. OF PAGES: 2

US National Body Contribution in Response to JTC 1 N 6210 – Request for Input on Maintenance Teams

The United States supports the concepts related to Maintenance Teams as recommended by the National Body of Ireland in its contributions JTC 1 N 5911 and N 6182 to the JTC 1 Special Group on Strategic Planning, while noting that the focus of the contribution is not only on Maintenance Teams, but in general on a more flexible way to approach the maintenance and updating of standards. The United States offers the following additional points to the recommendations from Ireland:

1. The need for a more flexible approach to the maintenance of standards should provide not only for standards which require more frequent review and updating, but for those standards which do not actually require maintenance at all, yet which remain valid and should not be withdrawn. These standards may not require any maintenance, although a periodic opportunity for review is still valuable. In particular, the United States notes that the need for regular “maintenance” and review of such standards can become a burden upon the owning Technical Groups, and can even result in committees voting to withdraw such “obsolete” standards simply to avoid spending scarce resources on them.

The IEC approach of establishing the “cycle” or term between reviews for a standard during its development could provide for this by allowing the establishment of a maintenance period of 10 to 15 years for such standards, assuming that the developers could anticipate how the standard would mature. If this approach is adopted, the US recommends that the term between review of a standard can be changed during a maintenance review.

Regardless of whether the term for periodic reviews becomes flexible, the United States recommends the adoption of a new category for standards which are deemed mature and not changing, where the periodic review would be handled administratively by the JTC 1 Secretariat. Such an approach has been adopted within the US. The goal is to free Technical Group resources to work on new and changing standards while retaining necessary controls and opportunities for maintenance, updating or withdrawing those standards. The major elements of the process are:

- create a new way of managing a specific class of standard – the “stabilized” standard
 - undergo at least one review without revision before a standard can be categorized as “stabilized”
 - reaffirmation of “stabilized” standards is an administrative process managed by the Secretariat without involvement of the responsible Technical Group
 - removal of a standard from the list of stabilized standards can be done by the responsible Technical Group at any time
2. With respect to Maintenance Teams themselves, the United States understands that the goal of IEC was to establish a subset of the original developers of the standard or group of standards who would be responsible for ongoing maintenance “in perpetuity” so long as a need for updating the standard continued. We believe that such Maintenance Team subsets could allow resources to be more appropriately distributed within a committee, rather than having the entire committee deal with all maintenance as a default. Instead, those members of the committee having particular expertise or interest in a standard or group of standards could be established as the Maintenance Team. A particular area of concern might be fast-tracked standards where an overall level of competence in the committee could be lower than for more traditionally developed standards.

The United States also observes that while the goal of the maintenance team is laudable, issues such as the ongoing membership of a team, and what to do with standards when the entire team or the owning committee vanishes will still be an issue for JTC 1.

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 6271
DATE: 2000-10-02

REPLACES

DOC TYPE:

National Body Contribution

TITLE:

Contribution from the National Body of the United Kingdom in Response to Document JTC 1 N 6210, Request for Input on Maintenance Teams

SOURCE:

National Body of the United Kingdom

PROJECT:

STATUS:

This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 2000 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Tromsø.

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



UK Contribution to ISO/IEC JTC 1 Tromsø Plenary meeting in response to J1N6210 Request for Input on Maintenance Teams (Agenda item 8.2.7)

The UK notes the call for input on Maintenance teams as used by the IEC. The UK would like to propose to JTC 1 that a new classification for JTC 1 standards of 'Obsolescent'¹ be introduced. This would cover the circumstances where a Standard will no longer be updated but will be retained to provide for the servicing of existing systems/equipment that are expected to have a long working life. The UK proposes that this classification would be a further option at the in the periodic review process for standards where the present options are limited to 'Confirm, Revise, or Withdraw'.

Discussion

The de facto process for standards development in JTC 1 emphasises the delivery of published standards. The focus is to produce standards as quickly as possible and with the widest possible consensus. Many words have been spoken and written in JTC 1 on how to achieve this!

However, once a standard is delivered and published, and any corrigenda or amendments dealt with, the emphasis of those involved in IT Standardization switches to new work, frequently in arenas other than JTC 1. This often leaves the published standard with no technical experts to support it or insufficient to represent consensus.

This phenomena has resulted in standards becoming 'Widowed' and not the responsibility of any specific sub committees. For example, those of SC1 (Vocabulary) and SC21 in the area of Open Systems Interconnection Systems Management and some International Standardized Profiles. The JTC 1 secretariat has become de facto the owner of these standards and has no direct or indirect resource to do anything more than keep the records of the standards.

¹ Oxford English Dictionary: "Becoming Obsolete, going out of use or date"

JTC 1 has attempted in the past to quantify the effectiveness of its standards. The exercise started in April 1998 prompted by a request from the IEC (J1N5292) obtained much information about the numbers of published standards in JTC 1 member national bodies (see J1N5759). The follow-on exercise set up at the Rio de Janeiro plenary (J1N5755 - February 1999) collected together further qualitative data about the use of JTC 1 standards that was reported at the Seoul Plenary (J1N5902, J1N5913, J1N5932, J1N5936, J1N5955, J1N5956 - November 1999). The Seoul plenary also set up a further call to measure sub committee activity (J1N5984) and responses were consolidated in document J1N6130.

However, the UK believes that despite all these endeavours, the true position on the actual use of JTC 1 standards has not been exposed. The UK believes that finding this information would be very costly, requiring market research to be commissioned. This would need resources that neither JTC 1 nor its member bodies have at their disposal. Indeed, given the commercial sensitivity of information within companies about how they have designed and implemented their products, it might never be possible to obtain a true view of the use of JTC 1 standards.

Consequently, the UK considers it is impossible to assess the extent to which the standard has been implemented as required by the JTC 1 Directives when JTC 1 no longer has contact with the appropriate technical experts who might know about the standard's usage. Thus the UK has found that it is impossible to properly answer the questions; 'Confirm', 'Review' or 'Withdraw' as posed when JTC 1 standards are reviewed.

Thus, the UK believes that there is scope for a further category of standard within the Standard Life Cycle process. This is 'Obsolescent'. Such a category exists within the UK national procedure and is defined as follows within the national review process:

"Declaration of Obsolescence

The Standard will no longer be updated but will be retained to provide for the servicing of existing equipment that is expected to have a long working life" (BS0:1997)

If standards are so classified, then purchasers of the standard would be informed of this status by a disclaimer.

By this means, the work previously done by JTC 1 and its sub committees would not be lost and the standards would continue to be available to users products and systems incorporating them.