

N029
10 APR 89

An opinion

E.G. Keizer

Introduction

This statement contains my opinion on the responsibilities WG14 has at this moment.

Procedure

The British delegates to WG14 have complained that X3J11 did not follow the proper procedure in two instances.

The first concerns the reactions to the comments sent to X3J11 by Alen Mycroft. His initial reaction, X3J11/87-103, was considered at the Paris meeting of X3J11. X3J11 has not sent a reply to him. For which they apologized, although they had no obligation to send an reply. His second reaction, X3J11/88-041, was a part of the second public review. X3J11 considered it and sent him a reply. He again sent in a reaction, X3J11/88-111, for the third public review. X3J11 considered his reaction, and sent him an reply. Alan Mycroft may not be satisfied with the content of the replies, but he should not complain about the procedure.

During its last meeting in London in June 1988, WG14 took a decision that in all probability would result in sending the result of the september X3J11 for voting as a Draft Proposed Standard. In the opinion of BSI this implies that X3J11 was not allowed to send its latest draft to X3 for final confirmation. During the London WG14 meeting the US representatives stated clearly that X3J11 would not be likely to make any substantive changes and would in all propability fixate the Draft at the september X3J11 meeting and send it on to X3J11. At that time nobody from WG14 proposed to ask X3J11 to delay this action. The proposed synchronization as mentioned in SC22/N555 did not exist at that time. In my opinion X3J11 had the right to send its latest draft to X3.

I regret that it has taken WG14 several months to send out the december 7 version of the X3J11 C standard as a DP. A more timely procedure would have resulted in a 3 month balloting period that would have finished before the Seattle meeting.