X3T11 DRAFT CHANGE CONTROL PROCEDURE

Revision 2, dated 3/28/95

Issue

The X3 Rules and Procedures include an excellent change control procedure for drafts in Public Review. All of the comments are obtained in writing, and the committee is required to respond in writing and to give reasons why comments are rejected. The issue is that there is no equivalent change control for items that arise:

a)   Directly from discussions during Ad Hoc groups;

b)   In response to requests from X3T11 members and other individuals.

In several recent projects, it has been this class of late changes which have caused the most problems. It is very easy when making major changes late in the development of a draft to overlook some of the ramifications of those changes on the existing text. Thus the effect of those changes often has a destabilizing effect on the draft which can far outweigh the benefits of the features being incorporated through the changes.

Intent

This procedure is being defined to provide an equivalent level of change control for all changes made to a draft standard after it reaches a point of stability. When this point is reached is will be a decision made on a project by project basis, but will be achieved at the latest by the beginning of the X3T11 Letter Ballot on forwarding a draft for an OMC Review and a First Public Review. At this time, it is strongly recommended that a electronic version of the draft standard be made available in order to expedite the process of generating change requests.

Procedure

Once this procedure is invoked, then all requests for change to a draft standard must follow this procedure, other than comments received as part of the Public Review process. Note that this includes the changes originated by the Technical Editor!

Under this procedure, two types of change request are recognized. If cases of doubt with regards to the appropriate type, the X3T11 Vice Chair will arbitrate.

Errata Change Requests

Errata Change Requests correct the description and consistency of items within the existing draft, and the layout and typographical errors in the existing draft.

The procedure to be followed for Errata Change Requests is as follows:

1)   The originator of request creates an ASCII file containing 1-n detailed comments in the following format:

        #nnn (?) x.xx.x yth paragraph zth sentence

        {body of comment}

        where nnn is a 3 digit number (i.e. use leading zeros)
                ? is one of E editorial, T technical
                x.xx.x is a full reference to the document

        Note that changes for consistency can be technical changes if they exclude options which were previously allowed.

2)   The originator of the request shall send the ASCII file (preferably via e-mail) to the Technical Editor for the relevant document with a copy to the X3T11 Vice-Chair

3)   The Technical Editor reviews the comments and makes responses to each comment. The responses shall follow one of the following formats:

        Accepted
        Accepted in Principle (followed by "editors discretion" or details of the actual changes to be incorporated)
        Rejected (followed by the reason)
        Contentious

        The Technical Editor shall incorporate changes resulting from requests which are Accepted or Accepted in Principle into the next revision of the draft document, wherever possible. A short document detailing the changes between this revision and the previous one shall also be created.

4)   The comment responses shall be returned to the originator by the same mechanism as they were delivered, with a copy to the X3T11 Vice-Chair, and to the appropriate e-mail reflector.

5)   If the originator is dissatisfied with the comment responses, the onus is on the originator to attend the next relevant Ad Hoc meeting or X3T11 Plenary to pursue the subject further.

6)   The X3T11 Vice Chair shall maintain a document showing the overall status of comments against a particular draft. This document will be included along with the X3T11 Project Status in each X3T11 mailing.

7)   It is recognized that there are a set of Errata Change Requests which are difficult to describe without resorting to markups of the original text. These requests are mostly related to layout and other style issues. The objective of this procedure is to minimize the use of such methods, but such requests described by such methods will still be accepted if there is no alternative. They will, however, still be tracked by the procedure described above. It is also strongly recommended that each request be based upon a different copy of the original text.

8)   Any Errata Change Requests which are identified as Contentious in 3) above shall automatically be regarded as Enhancement Change Requests, and the onus shall be on the originator of the request to re-initiate processing of the request using the procedure identified below for such requests.

Enhancement Change Requests

Enhancement change requests add new features to the existing draft, and modify the features contained in the existing draft to be consistent with this new definition.

The procedure to be followed for Enhancement Change Requests is as follows:

1)   The originator of request creates a complete description of the requested enhancement, in the style of the draft and including the appropriate section numbering wherever possible.

2)   The originator of the request shall provide a binary copy of the request to the Technical Editor in a format which is deemed acceptable, and shall send a paper copy to both the X3T11 Chair and the X3T11 Vice-Chair.

3)   The X3T11 Chair will assign an agenda item at the next X3T11 Plenary for discussion of the Enhancement Change Request.

4)   The "two week rule" shall apply to Enhancement Change Requests. Therefore the paper copy shall be provided to the X3T11 Chair in time to be included in the regular X3T11 bimonthly mailings, or the requestor will undertake to mail a copy directly to all X3T11 Principal and Alternate members at least two weeks in advance of the Plenary (the X3T11 Chair will provide a set of address labels for this purpose).

5)   The originator shall whenever possible attend the X3T11 Plenary meeting at which the Enhancement Change Request is to be discussed.

6)   In order to be adopted, the Enhancement Change Request shall have to be approved by a majority vote (as defined in the SD-2) at the X3T11 Plenary. Where the Request is not approved, the members voting against the Request will be requested to state their reasons, and those reasons will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

7)   The X3T11 Vice Chair shall maintain a document showing the overall status of comments against a particular draft. This document will be included along with the X3T11 Project Status in each X3T11 mailing.