

Doc No: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG21/**N0751**
X3J16-95-0151

Date: July 12, 1995

Project: JTC1.22.32

Ref Doc:

Reply Samuel P. Harbison

To: Tartan, Inc.

300 Oxford Drive

Pittsburgh, PA 15146

email: harbison@tartan.com

telephone: +1 (412) 856-3600 ext. 147

facsimile: +1 (412) 856-3636

Schedule Options and Recommendation

The decision by WG21 to take an extra meeting to resolve CD ballot comments will result in a schedule slip. There are still uncertainties facing us, such as whether a second CD ballot will be required. This memo describes the possible options as I see them.

1. Scenario Descriptions

0—Current schedule We resolve CD comments in one meeting (Tokyo, 11/95) and are able generate a DIS draft and start DIS balloting immediately after that meeting. WG21 has already rejected this scenario as unrealistic.

1—No second CD We take an extra meeting (Scotts Valley, 3/96) to resolve CD ballot comments, but after that meeting we have a draft acceptable as a DIS. I view this as very unlikely, since even if we satisfy most NBs, the number of changes will likely be great enough to cause SC22 to submit a second CD.

2—Second CD with fast turnaround We still use Scotts Valley (3/96) to come up with final changes to our CD, and that draft is then submitted for a second CD ballot (CD-2). When the CD-2 ballot comes back, we are able to resolve comments and generate the DIS in a single meeting (Hawaii, 11/96). I view this as somewhat problematical because most members will want to review the final DIS draft before it goes out.

3—Second CD with 2-meeting turnaround Like the previous scenario, but we use both Hawaii (11/96) and TBD (3/96) to resolve CD-2 comments and generate the DIS. Although scenario 2 seems a bit too aggressive, this seems a bit too leisurely.

Note that WG21 on Sunday left open the possibility of keeping the working draft beyond the Scotts Valley meeting (3/96) before resubmitting it to SC22. I think that would guarantee a 2nd CD ballot by SC22, in which case we might as well have started it after March.

2. Impact on Dates

Table 1 shows how the scenarios affect milestone dates. In all cases we assume the DIS ballot passes. If it does not, we must return to the CD stage, which would be unfortunate.

TABLE 1. Milestone dates for each schedule scenario

Event	Scenario 0 Current	Scenario 1 No 2nd CD	Scenario 2 2nd CD, fast	Scenario 3 2nd CD, slow
Resolve CD comments	Tokyo 11/95	Tokyo & Scotts Valley (3/96)	Tokyo & Scotts Valley (3/96)	Tokyo & Scotts Valley (3/96)
Begin CD-2 ballot	N/A	N/A	After Scotts Valley (3/96)	After Scotts Valley (3/96)
Resolve CD-2 comments	N/A	N/A	Hawaii (11/96)	Hawaii & TBD-3 (3/97)
Begin DIS ballot	After Tokyo (11/95)	After Scotts Valley (3/96)	After Hawaii (11/96)	After TBD-3 (3/97)
Final formatting and ship to ITTF	ca. Stockholm (7/96)	ca. Hawaii (11/96)	ca. UK (7/97)	ca. TBD-4 (11/97)
Net slip from current schedule	none	4 months	12 months	16 months

3. Impact on Meetings

As we enter into DIS stage and beyond, our meetings will naturally transition to considering Defect Reports and future work, rather than making changes to the standard. After DIS approval and final editing, the committees will probably wish to change the frequency or duration of meetings. Table 2 summarizes what we'll be doing at each meeting.

TABLE 2. Future meeting activities

Meeting	Scenario 0 Current	Scenario 1 No 2nd CD	Scenario 2 2nd CD, fast	Scenario 3 2nd CD, slow
Tokyo 11/95	Resolve CD; generate DIS	Resolve CD (first draft)	Resolve CD (first draft)	Resolve CD (first draft)
Scotts Valley 3/96 (or 2/96)	Mid-DIS ballot	Resolve CD; generate DIS	Resolve CD; generate CD-2	Resolve CD; generate CD-2
Stockholm 7/96	Final IS doc. approval	Mid-DIS ballot	Mid-CD-2 work	Mid-CD-2 work
Hawaii 11/96	<i>new work schedule</i>	Final IS doc. approval	Resolve CD-2; Generate DIS	Resolve CD-2; (first draft)
TBD 3/97 (or 2/97)	<i>new work schedule</i>	<i>new work schedule</i>	Mid-DIS work	Resolve CD2; Generate DIS?
UK 7/97	<i>new work schedule</i>	<i>new work schedule</i>	Final IS doc. approval	Mid-DIS work
TBD 11/97	<i>new work schedule</i>	<i>new work schedule</i>	<i>new work schedule</i>	Final IS doc. approval

4. Moving the March Meetings to February

In any of the new scenarios, it seems to me to be a good idea to move the 3/96 meeting (Scotts Valley) into February. The period following Tokyo (11/95) is only used to generate a new working draft for review, and moving up the March meeting would create a cushion that would ease the time pressure on the Project Editor producing DIS or CD-2, and per-

haps give us some more time to work on the CD-2 ballot comments (scenarios 2 & 3) before the Hawaii meeting (11/96). I have talked to Borland and they have not yet made arrangements for Scotts Valley.

If scenario 3 (2nd CD, slow turnaround) occurs, the 3/97 meeting should be moved to 2/97 for the same reason.

5. Recommendation

I think we should plan on scenario 2 (2nd CD, fast turnaround). If it later appears that we'll have to take an extra meeting to generate the DIS, we'll switch to scenario 3. If by unexpected good fortune our draft is accepted for DIS ballot after the Scotts Valley meeting (3/96), so be it.

NOTE: If everyone is more comfortable with scenario 3 (taking two meetings to generate DIS), let's go with that now rather than just being optimistic.

We should notify the members of the possibility of moving the March meeting to February, and arrange an email "ballot" about one week after the meeting to determine whether or not to do it. (This gives people to check their schedules back home.)