

DRAFT:

CAG Representatives – addendum to Resolution 1

The ISO/TMB/WG/SR resolves to adopt the following addendum to Resolution 1:

Resolution 1

ISO/TMB/WG SR agrees on the establishment of a Chair's Advisory Group with the following membership:

- WG Chairs and Secretaries
- TG Convenors
- Up to two representatives from each stakeholder categories. The stakeholder categories should determine the period of time in which their representative will remain on the CAG.
- Additional representatives if necessary to ensure balance of representation (gender, regional distribution, etc.) as designated by the WG Chair. There is a clear need to balance representation with the need to maintain a functional size.
- ILO representative

Addendum:

1. The following CAG members may appoint alternates:
 - WG Chairs and Secretaries
 - TG Convenors
 - Stakeholder category groups
 - ILO
2. The alternate must be selected according to a process that is approved by the body being represented, and must not be selected by the absent CAG member alone.
3. The absent CAG member must send prior written notification to the WG Chairs indicating both the reason for their absence and the name of the alternate.
4. If the WG Chairs determine a CAG member's participation to be inadequate and unjustified, the Chair may ask the body being represented to appoint another representative.

TG3 Interim Convenors' Comments:

This is a house-keeping issue. Discussions in Ad Hoc Group 3 (which became TG3) in Salvador indicated a broad support among experts for the nomination of alternates for the stakeholder representatives to the CAG.

Summary:

- The existing Resolution on the selection of stakeholder representatives to the CAG (Resolution 2) requires only 3 things of the stakeholder groups (see Annex A):
 - o Seek to have a twinned representation (i.e. developed & developing country representatives);
 - o Provide information to the WG to justify the leadership role, including a description of the leadership selection process; and
 - o Consider whether or not to have a rotation among their CAG representatives.
- The underlying principle in Resolution 2 is that the stakeholder groups themselves have the responsibility of managing the selection process.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that it is within the existing responsibilities of each stakeholder group to determine whether they would like to appoint alternates to the CAG.
- Further, the TG3 Interim Convenors believe that this is consistent with the primary principle of CAG composition: balanced participation. Enabling stakeholder groups to nominate an alternate will help to ensure that the stakeholder group is able to send a representative to each CAG meeting, particularly where funding is an issue.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that the rationale behind allowing alternates for the stakeholder representatives to the CAG also applied to the following other categories of CAG membership (see Resolution 1, Annex A):
 - o WG Chairs and Secretaries
 - o TG Convenors
 - o ILO representative
- However, the TG3 Interim Convenors believe that the CAG will be most effective if there is some consistency in the CAG membership. As a result, we believe that alternates should only be permitted under the following circumstances;
 - o The alternate is selected according to a process that is approved by the WG, TG, ILO or stakeholder groups as a whole, and is not selected by an individual CAG member alone;
 - o The CAG member must send prior written notification to the WG Chairs indicating both the reason for their absence and the name of the alternate;
 - o If a CAG member regularly misses CAG meetings, the Chair may ask the ILO, or respective WG, TG or stakeholder group to appoint another representative.

As a result of the above, the TG3 Interim Convenors propose the following Operating Procedure on Appointment of CAG Member Alternates:

Annex A:

Selected text from the Salvador Resolutions:

Resolution 1

ISO/TMB/WG SR agrees on the establishment of a Chair's Advisory Group with the following membership:

- WG Chairs and Secretaries
- TG Convenors
- Up to two representatives from each stakeholder categories. The stakeholder categories should determine the period of time in which their representative will remain on the CAG.
- Additional representatives if necessary to ensure balance of representation (gender, regional distribution, etc.) as designated by the WG Chair. There is a clear need to balance representation with the need to maintain a functional size.
- ILO representative

Resolution 2

ISO/TMB/WG SR agrees on the following procedure for selecting their stakeholder representatives to CAG:

- Selection process managed by the stakeholder group itself
- Twinning (developed & developing);
- Provide information to WG to justify leadership role, including a description of the selection process
- Must consider whether or not to have a rotation process, but up to each stakeholder category to decide how, if any.

In addition the WG recommends the stakeholder groups to seek balance on other criteria (e.g. gender, geography and expertise).

Resolution 3

ISO/TMB/WG SR agrees that the chairs shall provide information to WG on the additional members of CAG; who they are and why they were chosen.

Resolution 4

ISO/TMB/WG SR agrees on the following terms of reference for CAG:

The CAG should:

1. Assist the chairs and secretaries of the WG in tasks concerning co-ordination, planning and steering of the WG's work or other specific tasks of an advisory nature.
2. Advise the chairs and secretaries of the WG on:
 - strategic and critical issues
 - balanced representation in the Task groups
 - newly identified developments within the subject area, and gaps between those developments and WG outcome

The CAG is an advisory body, not a decision-making body.

Comment template:

Text reference	Comments	Suggested text change
General		
Paragraph 1		
Paragraph 2		
Paragraph 3		
Paragraph 4		

DRAFT: Media participation

The ISO/TMB/WG/SR resolves to adopt the following operating procedures with respect to media participation:

1. Accredited media will be given full access to all opening and closing plenary meetings of the ISO/WG/SR. Accredited media will also be given full access to all TG meetings of the ISO/WG/SR, except in those cases where the relevant Convenors decide to restrict access. Opening or closing plenary meetings of the ISO/WG/SR will never be closed to the media. Media may not attend any other meetings that take place within the ISO/WG/SR (e.g. stakeholder group meetings, CAG meetings, ...).
2. Media must be accredited in advance of each WG meeting. Accreditation decisions will be taken by the ISO/WG/SR Convenors, in consultation with the CAG. Accreditation to the ISO/WG/SR will result in automatic accreditation to all TGs. Accreditation can be revoked at any time. All decisions on accreditation will be noted in the minutes.
3. TG Convenors may, in consultation with the ISO/WG/SR Convenors, close meetings if they believe that the presence of media may restrict free and open discussions. TG meetings will either be open to all accredited media or closed to all accredited media.
4. Experts may request that TG Convenors close a meeting. Experts may also notify the ISO/WG/SR Convenors of complaints about the participation of the media, either individually or collectively.

TG3 Interim Convenors' Comments:

The ISO Directives give media the right to attend opening and closing plenaries of meetings, but does not give them the right to attend working sessions. The justification for this is that the presence of media “may inhibit the free and open discussion of issues”. While the NWIP addresses media participation, and defers to this policy, it also sets a parallel objective of “open and transparent communications”, which may be served by good media coverage of the work of the ISO/WG/SR.

The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that, in the case of SR standardization, the objective of ensuring transparency does not over-ride the objective of the ISO Directives policy on media access, but that it could over-ride the specific procedures put in place in the Directives to achieve the objective. Further, we believe that a way can be found of increasing media access to TGs while still maintaining an atmosphere that is conducive to open discussions.

Summary:

- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that, in theory, there are three characteristics that differentiate a journalist from an expert and that may therefore dissuade open and honest discussion:
 - o The journalist has the ability to communicate to a wide audience;
 - o The journalist has an interest in reporting conflict or differences of opinion; and
 - o The journalist may “name names” – i.e. report who said what.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that this first characteristic is a false presumption. Many experts’ host organizations have websites that are accessed by thousands of people, and email listservs with literally tens of thousands of email addresses. Therefore it is not necessarily the case that journalists have the ability to communicate to a significantly wider audience;
- While the TG3 Interim Convenors agree that there is a risk that journalists may try to “sell” stories by exaggerating conflicts and differences of opinion, we do not believe that there is a danger to shedding light on these differences, *per se*. Indeed, the general public will be surprised if there are not differences of opinion between the 6 different stakeholder groups, or between different countries, on an issue like SR.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors therefore believe that the primary danger in permitting media access to working meetings is that experts will feel there is a risk that comments made will be attributed to them. This is a danger that must be addressed if the objective of ensuring a free and open discussion is to be achieved.
- However, the ITG3 Interim Convenors believe that the ISO Directives themselves do not do enough to protect against this danger. The ISO Directives allow the media to attend WG meetings, and allow the media to listen in on opening and closing plenaries. It is therefore reasonable to presume that a good journalist will be able to find out what has occurred inside a TG meeting. Experience in other ISO bodies also suggests that a good journalist will also be able to find out who said what and why.
- In this respect, then, the existing ISO Directives seem to fall under that false presumption that simply keeping a journalist out of a meeting room is enough to give experts confidence that their statements will not be reported.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that it would be preferable and more effective to address this principle danger head-on: i.e., to explicitly state that journalists may not attribute any comments made in a WG or TG meeting.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors also believe that the WG Convenors, in consultation with the CAG, should be responsible for accrediting journalists prior to each meeting. This will give the WG a mechanism to restrict access by journalists who do contribute to an atmosphere that is not conducive to free and open discussion.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that all other meetings that take place within the ISO/WG/SR (e.g. stakeholder group meetings, CAG meetings, ...) should be closed to the media.

Annex A:

Relevant text from ISO-IEC Directives – ISO Supplement

SO.9 Press attendance at ISO meetings

Interest by the press or other media in ISO work is to be welcomed and the ISO Central Secretariat and many ISO member bodies have public relations and promotion services able to provide information to the press concerning ISO, ISO standards, and work in progress.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest on the part of some of the press to be present during meetings of particular ISO committees. Whilst this interest is, again, welcome, the presence of the press during an ISO meeting may inhibit the free and open discussion of issues. For this reason, members of the press shall not be permitted to be present during working sessions of ISO meetings. However participation by members of the press may be permitted during opening and closing ceremonies of ISO plenary meetings.

When members of the press express interest in a particular ISO meeting, therefore, appropriate arrangements should be made to hold press conferences and briefings outside the meeting sessions.

Relevant text from the NWIP:

1.6 Open and transparent communications

The WG should set up a system to ensure the openness and transparency of the WG's activities to people inside and outside of ISO. (...)

2.5 Observers and the media

(...)

The WG should follow the ISO media policy provided in *ISO/IEC Directive Part 1 Annex SO, 9*.

“...When members of the press express interest in a particular ISO meeting, appropriate arrangements should be made to hold press conferences and briefings outside the meeting sessions...”

Annex B:

Comments from N8, N9, N10, N11rev and N13:

ANSI-USA (N13)	8.1 ANSI and its experts and observers advocate the greatest possible openness and transparency for this ISO work, given the subject itself and the high level of stakeholder interest in it. This will greatly increase the stakeholder confidence and credibility of this ISO effort. Therefore, we suggest that all documentation of the WG and its subgroups should be publicly available on the WG's website. This should include but is not limited to circular letters and numbered documents, meeting minutes and resolutions, compilations of comments and working drafts (WDs) and committee drafts (CDs) of the ISO SR guidance standard. We appreciate that DIS and FDIS versions must be strictly copyright protected and cannot be publicly available. We strongly suggest, however, that meeting minutes do not directly attribute to individuals comments made in meetings.
----------------	---

Comment template:

Text reference	Comments	Suggested text change
General		
Paragraph 1		
Paragraph 2		
Paragraph 3		
Paragraph 4		

DRAFT: Selection Process for TG Convenors

The ISO/TMB/WG/SR resolves to adopt the following operating procedures with respect to the appointment of TG Convenors (Chairs & Secretaries):

1. TG Convenors will be nominated and selected according to the following procedures:
 - a. The WG Convenors will issue a call for nominations for the Convenorship of a TG once its permanent structure and scope has been confirmed. The call for nominations will include:
 - i. an outline of the range of responsibilities and financial and human resources normally required of a TG Convenor;
 - ii. information from TG1 on whether it may be possible to provide funding support to developing countries and other under-funded WG members who may wish to take on a TG Convenorship; and,
 - iii. A deadline for nominations.
 - b. A call for nominations, a deadline for nominations and the appointment of TG Convenors may occur during the same meeting;
 - c. National member bodies and liaison organizations may submit nominations.
 - d. Nominations must be submitted as a package (i.e. including a nomination for both Chair and Secretary) and must be twinned (i.e. involve both a developed and a developing country organization).
 - e. Nominations must be made for a specific TG; if more than one nomination is made they must involve different people.
 - f. Nominations must provide information on:
 - i. Gender balance;
 - ii. Geographic distribution; and
 - iii. Stakeholder categories.
2. Selection criteria for TG Convenors (in no particular order):
 - a. Skills
 - Leadership and meeting management skills (especially for convenors);
 - Adequate level of English language skills (convenors and secretariats); and
 - Understanding of ISO procedures (one of the Convenors).
 - b. Commitment to act neutrally
 - c. Indication of proposed source of relevant human & financial resources
 - d. Commitment to 3 year process
 - e. Expertise in subject area
 - f. Adequate information is provided to enable assessment against criteria
3. Selection process for TG Leadership
 - a. Delegations submit nominations before deadline

- b. WG Convenors, in consultation with the CAG, review nominations against selection criteria and select the best overall nomination, considering among other things:
 - i. Fulfillment of selection criteria; and
 - ii. Gender, geographic and stakeholder balance across all TGs;
- c. WG Secretariat circulates to all WG member bodies and liaison organizations:
 - i. The full list of nominations, and
 - ii. A Resolution appointing the proposed TG Convenors.
- d. WG experts will then be invited to indicate if they have a sustained opposition to the Resolution and, if so, on what basis they oppose it;
- e. The WG Convenors will then decide if the Resolution has consensus support.
- f. If the proposed TG Convenors do not have consensus support, the WG Secretariat will call for an open vote on the original nominations by all member bodies & liaison-D organizations.
- g. The nomination getting the most votes will be appointed Convenor.

TG3 Interim Convenors' Comments:

The vast majority of ISO working groups (WG) exist under a parent ISO technical committee (TC) or sub-committee (SC). The ISO/WG/SR is unusual in that it operates under the direct responsibility of the ISO Technical Management Board (TMB). As a result, while the ISO Directives include some guidance on WGs, it is not always very detailed and not always enough to determine the intent of the Directives. It is therefore useful in some situations – such as this – to also review also the guidance in the Directives on TCs and SCs (see Annex A).

Summary:

- The ISO Directives sets out the following general principles when appointing Chairs and Secretariats;
 - o The parent committee is responsible for appointing Secretariats; Secretariats are responsible for nominating Chairs, who must then be approved by the parent committee.
 - o If there are multiple applications for a Secretariat, the parent committee is responsible for making the final decision;
- The ISO Directives also state that the Convenor of a WG is to be appointed by its parent committee.
- In the case of the ISO/WG/SR, the TMB is the parent committee (the TMB appointed the ISO/WG/SR Secretariat to ABNT-SIS); in the case of TGs, the ISO/WG/SR is the parent committee;
- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that, in this context, the selection of TG Convenors is most analogous to the appointment of WG Convenors.
- Since the TMB has given the ISO/SR/WG the freedom to propose its own procedures, the ISO/SR/WG can appoint TG Convenors according to those procedures that it determines most appropriate.
- Comments during the Salvador meeting suggests that there are 2 main considerations that experts want addressed in the selection process for TC Convenors:

- Ensuring a balance of genders, geographic representation and stakeholder categories across the WG and TG Convenorships; and
 - Ensuring that nominees for Convenors are aware of, and able to fulfill, the full scope of their responsibilities, noting the human and financial resource implications;
- In relation to this last point, comments in N13 indicate that some experts believe that it is unrealistic to expect individual experts to be able to effectively undertake the responsibilities of a TG Secretariat, and that Secretaries must therefore have the support of their national member body or liaison-D organization.
- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that, in the interest of speeding up the process, the selection process should enable the ISO/WG/SR to appoint all remaining TG Convenors at the same meeting at which their scope and structure has been confirmed. It is anticipated that this will occur at the meeting in Bangkok, Thailand, from 26-30 September 2005.
- Given the time spent on the issue of TG Leadership selection in Salvador, the TG3 Interim Convenors believe that it would be appropriate to base this draft on that text.

Annex A:

Relevant text from ISO-IEC Directives – ISO Supplement:

1.8 Chairmen of technical committees and subcommittees

1.8.1 Appointment

The Chairman of a TC is nominated by the secretariat of the TC, and approved by the Technical Management Board. The Chairman of an SC is nominated by the secretariat of the SC, and approved by the technical committee.

Duration of initial appointment: Maximum of six years

Extensions of term: Maximum of three years

Maximum number of extensions: No limit specified

Each extension needs to be approved by the parent committee.

Relevant text from ISO-IEC Directives:

1.9 Secretariats of technical committees and subcommittees

1.9.1 Allocation

The secretariat of a technical committee shall be allocated to a national body by the technical management board.

The secretariat of a subcommittee shall be allocated to a national body by the parent technical committee. However, if two or more national bodies offer to undertake the secretariat of the same subcommittee, the technical management board shall decide on the allocation of the subcommittee secretariat.

For both technical committees and subcommittees, the secretariat shall be allocated to a national body only if that national body

- a) has indicated its intention to participate actively in the work of that technical committee or subcommittee, and
- b) has accepted that it will fulfil its responsibilities as secretariat and is in a position to ensure that adequate resources are available for secretariat work (see **Error! Reference source not found.**).

Once the secretariat of a technical committee or subcommittee has been allocated to a national body, the latter shall appoint a qualified individual as secretary (see **Error! Reference source not found.**).

1.11 Working Groups

0.1 Technical committees or subcommittees may establish working groups for specific tasks (see **Error! Reference source not found.**). A working group shall report to its parent technical committee or subcommittee through a convenor appointed by the parent committee.

Draft text from Salvador meeting:

The ISOTMB/WG/SR resolves to adopt the following operating procedures for the process of nominating and selecting permanent TG Leadership:

4. Permanent leadership of the standard-setting TGs will be nominated and selected according to the following procedures:
 - a. The WG Secretariat will re-issue a call for nominations once the structure and scope of the TGs has been confirmed.
 - b. The WG Secretariat will prepare and circulate an outline of the range of tasks and financial and human resources normally involved in assuming Leadership of a TG.
 - c. TG1 will communicate through the WG Secretariat whether it's scope of activity includes fundraising to support the TG leadership by developing countries and other under-funded WG members.
 - d. All national member bodies and liaison organizations may submit nominations. These nominations must demonstrate how they meet the criteria.
 - e. Nominations must be submitted as a package (i.e. including a nomination for both Chair and Secretary) .
 - f. Nominations must be made for a specific TG; if more than one nomination is made they must involve different people.
 - g. Nominations must be twinned.
 - h. Nominations must provide information on how they have sought to balance
 - i. Gender
 - ii. Geographic distribution
 - iii. Stakeholder categories
5. Selection criteria for TG Leadership – in no particular order:
 - a. Skills
 - i. Leadership and meeting management skills (especially for convenors)
 - ii. Adequate level of English language skills (convenors and secretariats)
 - iii. Understanding of ISO procedures (one of them)
 - b. Commitment to act neutrally
 - c. Indication of proposed source of relevant resources & funding
 - d. Commitment to 3 year process
 - e. Expertise in subject area
 - f. Adequate information is provided to enable assessment against criteria
6. Selection process for TG Leadership
 - a. Delegations submit nominations
 - b. WG Secretariat, in consultation with the CAG, reviews nominations against selection criteria
 - c. WG Secretariat circulates all nominations that it determines fulfill the selection criteria to all WG member bodies and liaison organizations
 - d. WG decides on TG leadership prior to the next meeting through letter ballot of member bodies & liaison delegations.

OR

- q. WG decides on TG leadership prior to the next meeting through letter ballot of experts. The Chair, in consultation with the CAG, should consider developed/developing country and stakeholder representation when assessing the final selection of the TG leadership.

Annex B: Member comments

Member body	Comment
ANSI-USA	(N13) 7.2 (...) For example, in document N3 it seems to suggest individual experts may offer to assume TG convener and secretary roles in twinned partnerships, but this is inconsistent with the information in document N6. Indeed, we do not think it will be feasible or appropriate for individual experts to establish twinned partnerships to assume these roles. These will be better achieved by ISO NSBs working together and offering to lead, as the ISO NSBs will have infrastructures in place and resources to support the convener and secretariats.
ANSI-USA	(N13) 7.3 Detailed procedures need to be developed to govern the processes for nominating and selecting the leaders of TGs and the experts to participate on TGs.

Comment template:

Text reference	Comments	Suggested text change
General		
Paragraph 1		
Paragraph 2		
Paragraph 3		

DRAFT: TG3 Responses & Recommendations – addendum to Resolution 10

The ISO/TMB/WG/SR resolves to adopt the following addendum to Resolution 10:

Resolution 10

The ISOTMB/WG/SR resolves to create a Task group 3 – Operating Procedures, with the following terms of reference:

- address the comments received before the 1st meeting relating to operating procedures that have not already been considered
- receive and respond to questions on the application or interpretation of procedures
- make recommendations, if necessary, on revised or new procedures to the chairs in consultation with the CAG to be presented to the WG for approval
- compile a consolidated set of WG operating procedures.

The ISO Central Secretariat will Co-Chair this Task Group.

All recommendations of the TG OP will be submitted to the WG for approval; any special procedures shall be submitted for approval by the ISO TMB

Addendum:

1. Questions on the application or interpretation of procedures will be addressed by the TG3 Convenors except under the following circumstances:
 - a. The Convenor, national member body, liaison-D organization, expert or observer seeking a response also requests that the response be formally recorded;
 - b. the Convenor, national member body, liaison-D organization, expert or observer seeking a response also requests that the TG3 Convenors seek the advice of TG3 experts before providing a response; and
 - c. The TG3 Convenors believe that the response given should be formalized in either:
 - A revision to existing procedures; or
 - A new procedure.
 - d. A TG3 Expert believes either that the response given is erroneous or that it should be formalized in either:
 - A revision to existing procedures; or
 - A new procedure.
2. All questions on the application or interpretation of procedures, and all responses given to these questions, will be documented in a register kept by the TG3 Secretary and made available to all TG3 experts.
3. All recommendations for revised procedures, or recommendations for new procedures, will be made with the full input of TG3 experts before being

submitted to the full WG for approval. The WG will be given a minimum period of one month in which to voice objections and to provide comments.

TG3 Interim Convenors' Comments:

The TG3 Interim Convenors' consideration of a procedure on this issue began in early April, after WG Secretariat had been informed that the Secretary of ITG4 had to step down. The WG Secretariat asked the TG3 Convenors for an urgent clarification on the procedures for replacing a TG Convenor.

In this case, and given the sensitivities over the appointment of Convenors in Salvador, the TG3 Interim Convenors decided that it would be prudent to issue detailed advice – in effect, a detailed operating procedure. Although the procedure has a very limited scope (the replacement of Secretaries of interim task groups), strictly speaking, this operating procedure should have been circulated to TG3 experts for comment, then revised and circulated again to determine consensus, before finally being circulated to the full WG *before* it was implemented. ISO imposes a minimum comment period of 1 month prior to administrative decisions (a period of 3 months is imposed on substantive decisions); therefore, according to the normal process, the situation could not have been resolved in anything less than roughly 2 months.

From this experience, the TG3 Interim Convenors recognized a need for a procedure by which TG3 can give urgent advice or clarifications on the application of procedures. But during the course of discussions amongst the TG3 Interim Co-Convenors, it became clear that there was a larger issue that could be addressed.

The Resolution establishing TG3 states that one of its tasks is to “receive and respond to questions on the application or interpretation of procedures”. The WG Secretariat's request for clarification on the appointment of a new Secretary for TG4 is probably a good indication of how many of these requests will happen. It is quite conceivable, for example, that requests for clarifications arise at a WG meeting where there is no TG3 meeting scheduled, or where a TG3 meeting has already been held.

If we cannot give advice in under 2 months, TG3's contribution to the smooth operation of the ISO/WG/SR will be greatly reduced. The likely outcome, therefore, would be that people seeking immediate clarifications would either:

- a) ask for advice informally;
- b) not ask for advice at all.

Since one of the objectives of TG3 is to provide a consistent source advice on procedural issues, this is clearly something that we have to address. In addressing it, we have to balance the need for timely advice against the need to ensure that advice is given and decisions are taken according to our agreed processes.

Summary:

- The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that the effectiveness of TG3 will depend on providing consistent advice in a timely fashion. It should therefore be anticipated that some requests for advice on the application or interpretation of

- procedures will need to be addressed more urgently than would allow a full consideration of the issue by the TG3 experts, and a full ISO/WG/SR approvals process.
- At the same time, the TG3 Interim Convenors note that there are three kinds of advice that TG3 has been mandated to provide:
 - o Responses to questions on the application or interpretation of procedures;
 - o Recommendations on revised procedures; and
 - o Recommendations on new procedures.
 - The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that, in most cases, responses to questions on the application or interpretation of procedures do not require the input of the full group of TG3 experts, nor the prior approval of the full WG.
 - The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that there is a need for transparency, and therefore suggest that all questions posed to TG3 via its Convenors, and all responses given by the Convenors, should be noted in a register kept by the TG3 Secretary and made available to all TG3 experts.
 - The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that the following circumstances require the full involvement of the TG3 experts, and the full approval of the WG:
 - o The expert, Convenor, national member body or liaison-D organization seeking a response also requests that the response be formally recorded;
 - o The expert, Convenor, national member body or liaison-D organization seeking a response also requests the TG3 Convenors to seek advice from the TG3 experts before providing a response; and
 - o The TG3 Convenors believe that the response given should be formalized in either:
 - A revision to existing procedures; or
 - A new procedure.
 - o A TG3 Expert believes either that the response given is erroneous or that it should be formalized in either:
 - A revision to existing procedures; or
 - A new procedure.
 - The TG3 Interim Convenors believe that, in all cases, recommendations on revised procedures or recommendations on new procedures must be undertaken with the full involvement of TG3 experts and must be approved in advance by the full WG. The WG will be given a comment period of at least one month.

As a result of the above, the TG3 Interim Convenors propose the following Operating Procedure on Responses & Recommendations provided by TG3:

Proposed Procedure for urgent clarifications on Operating Procedures:

1. Urgent requests for clarification can be made by a WG/TG if there is consensus on the urgency among the relevant WG/TG Convenors (i.e. the Chairs and the Secretaries of the respective TG or WG);
2. The TG3 leadership must also agree it is urgent enough to warrant direct clarification without full TG3 involvement and consensus;
3. The TG3 leadership must immediately inform the TG3 experts that they have received an urgent request, including a justification for why they have or have not agreed to the urgency;
4. The TG3 leadership propose a clarification and check that it is consistent with existing TG3 resolutions i.e. that it does not constitute a "new procedure";
5. the ISO CS Co-Chair of TG3 must confirm that any clarification given is consistent with normal ISO procedures as well
6. all issues for which urgent clarification has been sought (i.e. whether urgent clarification was or was not provided) will be referred to TG3 for consideration. TG3 will decide if a) the clarification provided is satisfactory; or b) another procedure should be implemented.
7. The clarification or new procedure approved by consensus in TG3 will be submitted for approval by the WG at the earliest possible instance.

Annex A:

Text establishing TG3:

Resolution 10

The ISOTMB/WG/SR resolves to create a Task group 3 – Operating Procedures, with the following terms of reference:

- address the comments received before the 1st meeting relating to operating procedures that have not already been considered
- receive and respond to questions on the application or interpretation of procedures
- make recommendations, if necessary, on revised or new procedures to the chairs in consultation with the CAG to be presented to the WG for approval
- compile a consolidated set of WG operating procedures.

The ISO Central Secretariat will Co-Chair this Task Group.

All recommendations of the TG OP will be submitted to the WG for approval; any special procedures shall be submitted for approval by the ISO TMB

Selected text from “Operational details of the Working Group on Social responsibility” (contained in the NWIP):

1.1 General

The Working Group on Social Responsibility (WG) should be managed effectively and efficiently. The WG may request the Technical Management Board (ISO/TMB) for special amendments, exceptions or exemptions from the ISO/IEC Directives where there is a WG consensus that such an exception/exemption is warranted. Each request shall be accompanied by the rationale.

Comment template:

Text reference	Comments	Suggested text change
General		
Paragraph 1		
Paragraph 2		
Paragraph 3		

Steve Cornish

From: Leonor Ceruti [leonor.ceruti@inn.cl]
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2005 11:30 AM
To: Alejandro Lorea (E-mail); Alicia Ruiz Luna (E-mail); Amanda Tucker (E-mail); Andreas Henkel (E-mail); Bjarne Pedersen (E-mail); Brennan G Allen (E-mail); Chaiyut Chavalitnitikul (E-mail); Chen Yuanqiao (E-mail); Christophe Margot (E-mail); Dwight W. Justice (E-mail); Emilie Brun (E-mail); Frank Ebinger (E-mail); Franz Fiala (E-mail); Hans Hofmeijer (E-mail); Hugo Vergara (E-mail); IMNC (E-mail); Jason Potts (E-mail); Jeanette Cortes; Joanne Petrini (E-mail); Joe Cascio (E-mail); Kai Bethke (E-mail); Kristina Sandberg (E-mail); Lilia Granillo Vázquez (E-mail); Luis TRAMA (E-mail); Maibritt Agger (E-mail); Marcelo Abrantes Linguitte (E-mail); MARÍA TERESA SACCUCCI (E-mail); Mario FONT GUIDO (E-mail); Patricia Ruiz Velasco (E-mail); Patrick Mallet (E-mail); Perla Puterman (E-mail); Peter Houghton (E-mail); Ramón Madriñán (E-mail); Sara Ellstrom (E-mail); Sebastian Quek (E-mail); Sophie Clivio (E-mail); Staffan Söderberg (E-mail); Steven P. Cornish (E-mail); Susanna Vahtila (E-mail); Thomas SZABO (E-mail); Tom Rotherham (E-mail); Tomosaburo Yano (E-mail)
Subject: Observers & Additional Experts
Importance: High

Dear TG3 Experts,

Comments on the first 4 draft operating procedures (sent on 10 May) are due on 8 June. Below please find an email requesting input on 2 of the final 3 issues: "the role of observers" and "additional expertise: CAG recommendation". We still have to send to you a draft operating procedure on the last of the 7 priority issues (WG/TG meetings), which we hope to get to you in one week's time. There are also a number of other issues that we will have to address in Bangkok.

In the process of drafting the operating procedures for Observers/additional experts it became clear that both these issues must be dealt with - at least in part - in the context of a consideration of the more fundamental issue of "balanced participation". This, in turn, is probably the most difficult of all the procedures - including because of the fact that we are in a WG, not a TC. Because TCs have formal ISO member body and liaison body representation at a delegation level, it is easier to address representation issues that cannot be done as straightforwardly in a WG that only has independent expert representation (experts are strictly speaking not even responsible to their national delegations and mirror committees).

The problem is that, while in most cases in ISO a WG is "indivisible", and the ISO Directives have been written without anticipating that WGs would be made up of individual TGs, all the real standard-setting work in our WG is going to happen at the TG level. So, if we are really interested in ensuring balanced stakeholder participation we have to focus on a balance at the TG-level - at the moment, the guidance from the TMB and most of the WG discussions have been focused at the WG level (size and composition of delegation to the WG, not the TG). We cannot presume that, because there is a balance at the WG level, there will be a balance at the TG level: if an NGO expert from a national delegation goes to TG5, it necessarily means that they cannot participate in any of the other TGs meeting occurring simultaneously. Also, what if all of the Consumers decide individually to go to TG4 and not TG6?

It seems that there are two basic ways to address balanced stakeholder composition at the TG level:

1. We can agree to set limits on the number of experts participating in a TG, and leave it to the Convenors - in consultation with the WG or CAG - to ensure that there is a balanced

representation among the experts. This is actually consistent with the ISO Directive's approach to WGs: they recommend that the number of experts participating in a WG be limited. But this would mean that not every ISO member body and/or not every liaison would be able to participate in their preferred TG. Alternatively, it could mean that all ISO member bodies and liaisons would be able to participate in their preferred TG, but that some of them would have to participate as observers (no right to hold up consensus), but not as an expert. Either way, someone would have to dictate to a WG expert that they cannot be an expert in a specific TG. That has obvious limitations.

2. We can agree to let delegations send one expert per stakeholder category to each TG, not just to the WG. This would avoid the need for limiting participation in TGs, but it would result in a situation where national delegations could be up to 36 experts (and liaisons could be up to 6 experts). And practically speaking, it would almost certainly favor richer countries and liaisons that can afford to send full delegations.

So, the basic issue is: Do we improve the balanced participation in TGs by LIMITING participation (option 1), or do we improve the balanced participation in TGs by EXPANDING participation (option 2).

One possibility that has been considered is a hybrid option:

The TG Convenors would limit the number of experts in order to ensure balanced representation, but other WG experts not selected by the Convenor can participate in the TG as observers. In this scenario, delegations would be allowed to nominate a number of additional observers to the WG to ensure that all of their stakeholder groups are adequately represented on each TG.

(The only difference between an observer and an expert still being that observers cannot vote or sustain opposition). This has the weaknesses of both approaches (limiting expert involvement in a TC; potentially leading to a situation where richer country delegations far outnumber those of poorer countries) - but we are not sure if it also has the strengths of each.

Given the sensitivities over this issue, and the anticipated logistical implications of greatly increasing the potential size of the WG, we asked the WG Secretariat for its thoughts on the issue. Their position was basically the following:

- Initial reaction is that it would be very difficult for a TG Convenor to tell an expert that he/she is not allowed to participate in a specific TG, and it would particularly hard for the Convenor to select which one of the "over represented" experts should not be allowed to participate.
- If we don't have any limitations (or allow, for example, for 6 additional experts per TG/country), there is an obvious risk that some countries would be able to send more people than others due to resource issues.
- Some of the problems we might encounter by limiting participation are that we might lose competence and experience just because someone comes from a geographical area or a stakeholder category that is already well represented in the TG. Another problem is to actually monitor delegates and to agree on criteria for where/when/how the limits should be applied.
- One possible approach might be to check on an ongoing basis the stakeholder balance in the TGs and see if there is a problem with the balance. If so, the Convenor of these TGs could make recommendations for how to address the imbalance.
- Overall, it seems preferable to improve balanced participation by expanding the group rather than by limiting the number. But in order to limit the downside of focusing on the number of experts each delegation can send to each TG (rather than the WG in general), we could make the TG Convenors responsible for continually monitoring and reporting on their stakeholder balance, and leave it to them - in consultation with the WG Leadership and CAG - to encourage/invite additional experts if there is a need for that.
- Also, we should remember that all decisions will be subject to the WG's approval, so if we don't have perfect balance in the TGs, their outputs will anyway

be subject to the approval of the more fully balanced WG.

Prior to drafting a specific operating procedure on this we thought that we should first invite TG3 experts to provide their opinion on four issues:

First, which general approach is better: should we ensure balance by

- a) limiting the TG membership;
- b) expanding the TG (and hence WG) membership; or
- c) by giving the TG and WG Convenors and CAG the responsibility of monitoring and ensuring adequate balance in the TGs.

Second, if we are to expand the TG membership, should these additional participants be:

- a) able to participate only in discussions in the specified TG;
- b) able to participate in discussions in both the specified TG and the WG; or
- c) able to participate in any discussions in either the WG or any of its TGs.

Third, if we are to expand the TG membership, should the additional participants be:

- a) observers in both the WG and the specific TG;
- b) observers in the WG but experts in the specific TG; or
- c) Experts in both the WG and the specific TG.

Fourth, if we are to limit the TG membership, should the responsibility for making decisions on limitations be made by:

- a) the TG Convenors alone;
- b) the TG Convenors, in consultation with the WG Leadership and the CAG;
- c) the WG leadership in consultation with the CAG; or
- d) the full WG.

Fifth, do you think that it is desirable to finalize this operating procedure before Thailand, in case it has implications for the size of delegations to that meeting?

Given the important implications and timeliness of this issue, please provide comments on these issues no later than 8 June 2005. Please note that you will still have time after this to provide comments on the draft operating procedure - so if you cannot make comments on these guiding issue by that time, your voice will still have an opportunity to be heard.

Thanks very much for your understanding and patience while waiting for this issue to be sent to you.

Best regards,

Tom Rotherham, TG3 Interim Co-Convenor
Sophie Clivio, TG3 Co-Convenor
Leonor Ceruti, TG3 Interim Secretary