

Webinar 2019-11-05

Changes to the publication procedure – Handling of comments at Formal Vote

Questions & Answers

Questions asked by Attendees	Answers from the Presenter
<p>If there are secretariat observations stating that a change is going to be made - and that change was implemented incorrectly - is that then deemed as technical comment?</p>	<p>Everything can be changed before the text is launched to the Formal Vote. Any change requested after the text is approved will be assessed according to if it is an obvious editorial error or an error introduced by CCMC during the preparation of the draft for Formal Vote (e.g. a comment that CCMC implemented incorrectly)</p>
<p>How will the decision be handled for standards under Vienna agreement (i.e. ISO lead) where changes are accepted by ISO?</p>	<p>Where CEN is in parallel with an ISO deliverable, ISO is responsible for handling and assessing the comments at the publication stage.</p>
<p>What happens if the HAS Consultant requires that technical changes are made during the assessment at Formal Vote?</p>	<p>In harmonized cases, consultant assessments should be returned before the start of the vote, which means in case of negative assessments or technical changes required, the formal vote will not be launched with the exception of documents in parallel with ISO or IEC (as we are obliged to keep the same launch and publication schedule as ISO and IEC). This means that changes can be made or the deliverable can be blocked/put on hold before it is sent to the vote.</p>
<p>Please confirm that if a National Body identifies an error that could be considered to be technical then they should submit a negative vote.</p>	<p>If an error or technical point within a text is unacceptable for a member, they should submit a negative vote. However, if the NSB feels that the error does not unduly impact the implementation of the standard, they may submit a positive vote (and they should not expect that the standard is corrected).</p>

<p>We got the information that there will be an additional proofing already during Formal Vote. Is that right and how will this be done practically?</p>	<p>CCMC is currently working on a process to enable TCs to begin proofing the texts for publication before the formal TC proofing – the one at publication stage - officially starts. More details will follow when this procedure has been finalised.</p>
<p>Is there the possibility to check the corrections implemented by CCMC after return of the completed table of comments by the TC? How long can these be corrected?</p>	<p>If the TC returns the proofed files before the end of the 2 week deadline (or 3 week extended deadline), upon request the editor will send the files back to the TC for a final check. However, if the files are returned on or after the deadline, the text will go directly to the next step (e.g. translation).</p>
<p>If there is a need for a BT decision to realize a technical change, how much time is there to initiate it? Does this have to be done within the two weeks period?</p>	<p>Once the need for a BT decision is identified, the finalisation process is stopped and the TC will liaise with the sectoral PM and the NSB BT Member (CEN) or Permanent Delegate (CENELEC) to trigger the dedicated procedure: BT 48/2014 & D149/017. The BT consultation is 4 weeks, after which the changes will be implemented and the text sent to translation.</p>
<p>We have made editorial changes into our draft that passed Enquiry and the changes are only editorial matters. Must we repeat the Enquiry or can we go forward to Formal Vote?</p>	<p>Even if this decision only applies to the publication procedure (drafts at FV), its principle can be extended to drafts for enquiry skipping the FV. However, in this specific case, there is no need to repeat the Enquiry and the draft can go to FV</p>

<p>If the changes are concerning structure (totally changed) as asked by the HAS Consultant, but no technical changes are done. Can we proceed to Formal Vote or must we go back to a new Enquiry as asked by some of our members?</p> <p><i>Clarification:</i> the standard had passed Formal Vote, but structure changed by the HAS Consultant. No technical changes. Now suggested to repeat Enquiry instead of going to repeat Formal Vote.</p>	<p>It is difficult to understand how a 'totally changed structure' cannot give rise to a <i>technical</i> change. However, the draft before FV can be still modified, while a draft at FV cannot. It is up to the TC to decide whether to go to a 2nd enquiry or 2nd FV.</p>
<p>Please remind NSBs/National Committees the following: They should submit Technical comments on the CEN Enquiry and that submitting them at the Formal Vote stage is too late. It's not helpful to submit a load of Technical comments on a Formal Vote document. The FV is a YES/No ballot to publish.</p>	<p>CCMC enthusiastically agrees; it is better do everything possible to improve the text before the start of the formal vote, as it is easier to fix the quality of the text, especially technical elements, at beginning of the process. The goal of this decision is to increase the overall quality of standards, and this is possible if we start with a high-quality text.</p> <p>This is why the decision reads explicitly: 'all experts in CEN and CENELEC Technical Committees be urged to ensure the highest possible quality of text for submission to Formal Vote'</p>
<p>What happens for parallel IEC/CENELEC projects when the comments and the changes are made at IEC level?</p>	<p>Where CENELEC is in parallel with an IEC deliverable, IEC is responsible for handling and assessing the comments at the publication stage (same comments as for ISO).</p>
<p>Is it the same procedure for harmonized standards?</p>	<p>This decision covers all types of deliverable which go to publication.</p>
<p>Are conditional votes are accepted?</p>	<p>No. This process has not been put into place by members. Votes are 'Yes' or 'No'.</p>

<p>Can you still use the simple template (instead of the STD template) to upload a draft for FV?</p>	<p>In order to ensure the highest quality text, the Technical Bodies must base the Formal Vote draft on the CCMC edited Enquiry draft. Additionally it should provide a marked up version of Formal Vote texts in order to show the modifications made regarding the previous Enquiry stage (see clause 3.1 of the translation procedure on the CEN BOSS).</p>
<p>What is the procedure to ask for BT decision to include a change after formal vote? Is there a TC CIB (Committee Internal Balloting) necessary on beforehand?</p>	<p>The TC will liaise with the sectoral PM and the NSB BT Member (CEN) or Permanent Delegate (CENELEC) to trigger the dedicated procedure: BT 48/2014 & D149/017BT . The consultation is 4 weeks.</p>
<p>Does this applies to all deliverables (also for Technical Reports (TRs))?</p>	<p>This decision covers all types of deliverable which go to publication.</p>
<p>Will the BT decision lead to an increasing number of Correction Notices and/or Corrigenda?</p>	<p>The goal of this decision is to increase the overall quality of standards, and this is possible if we start with a high-quality text when submitted to FV. FV should not be seen as the last-minute stage to introduce changes in the standard. This is why the decision reads explicitly: 'all experts in CEN and CENELEC Technical Committees be urged to ensure the highest possible quality of text for submission to Formal Vote'.</p>
<p>Is it possible to get access to the template for comments WITH the observations of CCMC and TC?</p>	<p>The TC secretary will be able to provide this information upon request. Please contact them directly.</p>