

Participating countries – 20

Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark,
Finland, France, Indonesia, Italy, Japan,
Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Netherlands,
Norway, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation,
Singapore, UK, USA

Observing countries – 9

Australia, Egypt, Germany, Malaysia, Poland,
Saudi Arabia, Serbia, South Africa, Spain

Liaison members – 4

OGP, IACS, IADC (Drilling), MMS

- ISO 19901-1 – “Metocean” Systematic review
- Closed 16th March 2009 - confirmed

- ISO/DIS 19906 – Arctic structures
- DIS closes 29th June 2009

- ISO/FDIS 19901-6 – Marine operations
- FDIS closed 12th May 2009 – Approved!!

- As you know 19901-6 has been out for the Final Vote and received nearly 100 pages of comments. As the FDIS is a yes no vote with no provision for comment - it is only possible for us to put in minor editorial corrections at this stage.
-
- It is therefore impossible for us to process this document for publication and I suggestion the committee takes it back - deals with the comments and then re-submit for FDIS.
-
- I will then commit to dealing with the new FDIS here as a priority to try to get you some time back.
-
- However - I don't see any other option other than a 2nd FDIS.
-
- Let me know if there is anything we can do to help the committee develop it.

- **Why do we edit?**
- ISO's editorial policy has developed over time and is designed to ensure the production of a coherent, comprehensible and high quality standardization *system* rather than a collection of individual documents. The aim is to have a degree of harmonization across the 17000 ISO publications and to ensure that the documents can be understood by those who did not take part in their development.
- **How do we edit?**
- Normally, each ISO standard is fully edited at least once during its development. This will involve bringing it into line with ISO's editorial policy as laid out in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2. It will also involve aligning the drawings with the text and applying the ISO standards governing technical documentation^[1]. The complete document is then also proofread. Complex and difficult issues sometimes arise such as the use of different units and symbols by different industries. This can mean that the document submitted by the secretariat of the ISO committee is substantially changed by ISO Central Secretariat (ISO CS). For this reason, ISO/TC 67 has an agreement giving it the opportunity of a two-week review of changes made during ISO/CS editing.
- **When do we edit?**
- Under normal circumstances, the full edit described above is done when the FDIS draft is submitted to ISO/CS. It is done before the FDIS ballot is launched so that the document submitted for vote looks like the final standard.
- However, committees may ask for a project to be edited at an earlier stage:
- during the DIS ballot,
- before the DIS ballot is launched,
- at the CD stage.
- When requesting an early edit, the committee will need to consider how stable the work is. If the document is substantially changed beyond recognition during its technical development then the early editing, and the time it took, will be lost. There are, however, benefits of editing at an earlier stage. It is certainly useful for revisions of already published standards (where content and format is usually quite stable). It is also useful when dealing with concepts such as *Guidance* standards where the use of the terms 'should' and 'shall' needs to be correct.
- **Requests**
- Please therefore feel free to propose projects for early editing and please also raise any suggestions for improvements. We may not be able to change some things but we will certainly provide an explanation of them.
- **Trevor Vyze ISO/CS** vyze@iso.org.
-

- Hi Malcolm
-
- Very timely enquiry as it came up recently in another SC of 67.
-
- We can certainly mark proposed changes in DISs of revisions - however the technique we ask you to use is the highlights function (see attached).
-
- This means that the reader would need the previous edition side by side with the DIS to see exactly how it has changed.
-
- We use the highlights rather than track changes as track changes is messy and makes the template unstable.
-
- I guess the same could be done for the FDIS if the committee wanted to show proposed changes also at that stage.
-
- We was recently requested to also agree to publish a standard with revision marks - we don't do this however and have thus far declined.
-
- One development in this direction however is the IT department is developing a new template - if it is feasible it will have a feature whereby the purchase of a standard will be able to turn revision marks on or off thus showing what has changed since the previous version.
-
- In summary you can show in DIS and FDIS but presently not in published.
-
- Hope this helps.
-
- Best
- Trevor Vyze
- Technical Group Manager
- ISO Central Secretariat