

# ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 N 0381

Date: 1999-11-30

REPLACES: --

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Data Management and Interchange</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Secretariat: United States of America (ANSI)</b> <b>Administered by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory on behalf of ANSI</b></p>
---

<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	Other document (Open)
<b>TITLE</b>	UK Position on the timing of SC32 meetings
<b>SOURCE</b>	UK
<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	
<b>STATUS</b>	For discussion at the SC32 Plenary, Santa Fe, 1999
<b>REFERENCES</b>	
<b>ACTION ID.</b>	COM
<b>REQUESTED ACTION</b>	NBs are requested to review for their positions
<b>DUE DATE</b>	
<b>Number of Pages</b>	2
<b>LANGUAGE USED</b>	English
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>	P & L Members SC Chair WG Conveners and Secretaries

Douglas Mann, Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory \*, 901 D Street, SW., Suite 900, Washington, DC, 20024-2115,  
United States of America

Telephone: +1 703 575 2114; Facsimile; +1 703 681 9180; E-mail: [MannD@battelle.org](mailto:MannD@battelle.org)

\*Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNL) administers the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32 Secretariat on behalf of ANSI



Title: UK Position on the timing of SC32 meetings  
Status: UK Position  
Date: 26 November 1999  
Requested Action: For discussion at the SC32 Plenary, Santa Fe, 1999

---

Reference: [1] ISO/IEC JTC1 SC32 N0310, SC 32 Proposed Future Meeting Dates

The UK notes the SC32 Calendar of Meetings in [1] reproduced below:

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Location</u>
2000-01-24	2000-01-28	SC32 Plenary meeting	Santa Fe, USA
2000-10	2000-10	SC32 Plenary meeting	Helsinki, Finland
2001-9	2001-9	SC32 Plenary meeting	Canada
2002-5	2002-5	SC32 Plenary meeting	Korea

The UK is concerned that the SC32 meeting cycle is not geared towards timely progression of work because the frequency of meetings does not best take into account ISO ballot cycles.

FCD ballots are four month ballots. With secretariat and other processing before and after, it is not possible to hold a Ballot Resolution Meeting (Editing Meeting) sooner than five months after the text is available from the Editor for balloting.

It has been the pattern that Working Groups meet concurrently with SC32. These concurrent meetings are important because they encourage liaison and synergy. It has also become the pattern that Ballot Resolution Meetings are held concurrently with Working Group meetings because this makes efficient use of delegate's time.

The effect of having SC32 meetings less than twelve months apart is to make it very difficult to schedule interim Working Group meetings so that the output of one Working Group meeting can be edited, reviewed and balloted, in time for the ballot comments to be resolved at the next Working Group meeting.

Noting that the time between the Matsue (1999-05) and Santa Fe (1999-01) meetings is less than eight months, and between the Santa Fe and Helsinki meeting less than nine months the UK requests that the schedule of future meetings be set such as to facilitate a (nominally) six month cycle of Working Group meetings. This could be achieved by establishing a twelve month cycle of SC32 meetings.