

Doc No: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG21/**N0750**  
X3J16/**95-0150**

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

## **WG21+X3J16 Editorial Procedures**

### **Proposed resolution on editorial procedures**

The WG21 Project Editor shall use his best efforts to incorporate all Working Group resolutions into the working paper after each meeting. If he is unable to do so, he shall notify the Convener.

WG21+X3J16 authorizes the Project Editor to make any other changes in the working paper that the Project Editor believes are needed, with the goal of producing a working paper that better reflects the consensus of the Working Group or otherwise promotes the development of the standard. The Project Editor shall note all substantive changes not covered by resolutions. The record of changes may take the form of editorial boxes in the working paper provided to WG21+X3J16 or it may be a separate document, or both.

If the Project Editor delegates any part of the editing task to assistants, he shall ensure that those assistants understand and agree to follow these procedures, and he shall include the assistants' record of substantive changes as part of his final record.

At each meeting, the WG21+X3J16 shall ratify the changes as part of the approval process for the working paper.

The following additional procedures shall apply when the Project Editor is producing a working paper to be submitted as a CD, DIS or IS, when WG21+X3J16 does not have the opportunity to approve the final draft:

Designated representatives of WG21+X3J16 shall review the Project Editor's working paper and the record of substantive changes. The Project Editor shall take into consideration all reviewer comments that are submitted in a timely fashion, and shall incorporate some or all of them into the working paper at his sole discretion. The Project Editor shall notify reviewers of the disposition of their comments, and shall add to the record of changes any substantive comments suggested by the reviewers.

The WG21 Convener shall approve the submission of the CD, DIS, or IS as long as the procedures herein described have been followed and there appears to be a consensus on the content of the working paper by the Project Editor and the designated reviewers. Otherwise, the Convener shall notify the WG21 delegations present at the previous meeting and ask for recommendations for a resolution and disposition of the working paper.

## **Background**

From San Diego minutes (March, 1994)

### **Discussion leading to Skaller Resolution**

Koenig asked for guidance on how much effort to devote to incorporating resolutions vs. making sure he got all the changes completely correct.

Plauger urged the committee to institutionalize an editorial review committee. He said it liberates the editor to be more aggressive in making changes, knowing that others will share responsibility for preserving the committee's intent. Harbison agreed.

Skaller proposed granting the editor wide latitude in making changes to the WP. The wording of his resolution appears as motion 13.

Koenig explained that he intends to use editorial boxes labeled "proposal:" to mean that, if no one objects, he will incorporate the substance of box into the normative part of the draft for the next time. There is one such box in the current WP, but it's moot because the Extensions WG proposals at this meeting include this change. The committee discussed the second part of Skaller's proposal. Plum noted that we can't forward a document to SC22 containing changes that have not been approved by the committee. Skaller suggested changing the resolution to say so.

Straw vote: Who favors this proposal granting the editor wide latitude to make editorial changes? lots yes, 6 no, 8 abstain.

No one objected to using editorial boxes in the WP as Koenig described.

Harbison proposed institutionalizing an editorial review group as suggested by Plauger. The committee did not support the proposal.

### **The Skaller Resolution**

WG21+X3J16 commends the editor for better utilizing available resources in moving the WP toward a form suitable for standardization. So that we may produce a coherent, timely document, WG21+ X3J16 grants the editor executive power to modify the WP in any way not directly contrary to our resolutions, provided the editor document and number all changes that are not clearly editorial so that we can ratify them.