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Taking account editorial feedback from the TSB and with agreement of the RG-SC Rapporteur and ITU-T A.23 Editor, some editorial changes to the language have been applied to TD1117 as shown in attached TD, by removing perception of normative language (“shall”, “it is recommended”) and by utilizing non-normative language instead.

**Proposal:**

TSAG is invited to agree attached draft Recommendation ITU-T A.23 Amd.1, "Collaboration with ISO and IEC on information technology – Appendix II: Best practices".

NOTE 1 – Annex A to Rec. ITU-T A.23 is a common text with ISO/IEC JTC 1 where it is called "ISO/IEC JTC 1 Standing Document 3". Annex A already has an Appendix I (introducing the defect report form). To avoid any confusion, it is proposed to use number 'II' for this new appendix with the understanding that (for now) it would apply to Rec. ITU-T A.23 itself but that it would be associated with Annex A if ISO/IEC JTC 1 decides to also adopt it.

NOTE 2 – Best practices II.1 to II.4 are based on ISO/IEC JTC 1 resolutions 12 and 14 (15-20 November 2014, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates) and are the result of joint leadership meetings between ITU-T study group chairmen and ISO/IEC JTC 1 sub-committee chairmen.

NOTE 3 – Best practice II.5 had been determined for TAP consultation by TSAG (and approved by ISO/IEC JTC 1) in 2012 but was eventually not included because of the opposition of only one Member State. Without this text, there is risk that ITU members are not part of the decision when a registration authority (for identifiers) has to be nominated for a common text (this already occurred for joint work between ITU-T SG 16 and ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 31, as well as for joint work between ITU-T SG 17 and ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6). This best practice does not address the case of RAs associated only to ITU-T Recommendations (such as Rec. ITU‑T T.35, Rec. ITU‑T H.248.1, or Recommendations developed by Study Group 2) as this is not joint work with JTC 1.

 Appendix II

Best practices

(This appendix does not form an integral part of this Recommendation.)

This appendix contains best practices to be used when applying Annex A to the cooperation between ITU-T and ISO/IEC JTC 1.

## II.1 Choosing meeting dates

When a text is developed jointly (as a common text or as a twin text, using a Collaborative Team or by Collaborative Interchange) between an ITU-T study group and a JTC 1 subcommittee, it is recommended that the dates of the ITU-T study group and JTC 1 subcommittee meetings (in particular plenary meetings, but also interim meetings) be discussed between both parties and agreed in advance as conveniently as possible (see also clauses 5.1, 7.2 and 8.4).

This is particularly relevant when the draft document is reaching a stable state and is planned for AAP consent or TAP determination in ITU-T, or for DIS ballot in JTC 1.

It is also useful for meetings of Working Level Groups (see clause 1.5.3.5) to ensure that the other party has sufficient time to submit contributions or comments before the deadline.

## II.2 Editing a common text

When an ITU-T study group and a JTC 1 subcommittee have agreed together to develop a common text, it is best practice that a unique file (master copy) is used to avoid ending up with two diverging versions of the same draft Recommendation | International Standard (see also clauses 7.5 and 8.2).

## II.3 Resolving issues of coordination

Should there be any issue of collaboration between an ITU-T study group and a JTC  1 subcommittee for the establishment of a Collaborative Team or a Collaborative Interchange, or during the development of a common or twin text, it is best practice to inform the ITU-T liaison officer to JTC 1 and the JTC 1 liaison officer to ITU-T as soon as possible, so they could play a facilitator role attempting to resolve any issue.

## II.4 Using handy names

It is best practice that a handy name or acronym is defined at the beginning of any collaborative project, to be the usual identification of the work and of the corresponding Recommendation and International Standard when referring to them.

It is also best practice to include the agreed handy name or acronym in the terms of reference of the Collaborative Team or Collaborative Interchange (see clauses 7.1 or 8.1) leading to either common text or twin text, and in the title of the resulting publication.

NOTE 1 – Examples of handy names are:

* HEVC (High Efficiency Video Coding) for Recommendation ITU-T H.265 | ISO/IEC 23008-2;
* RMCP (Relayed MultiCast Protocol) for Recommendation ITU-T X.603 | ISO/IEC 16512-1;
* VVC (Versatile Video Coding) for Recommendation ITU-T H.266 | ISO/IEC 23090-3.

NOTE 2 – Confusion should be avoided if the suggested handy name is already used by pre-existing implementations of the standard with different functionalities or if there is intellectual property rights associated with its use.

## II.5 Synchronizing the appointment of a registration authority

When a joint project includes registration provisions (i.e., the assignment of an unambiguous name to an object in a way which makes the assignment available to interested parties), it is best practice to develop two different common (or twin) texts:

* The first text is the technical standard in which the objects to be registered are defined;
* The second text is the registration procedure standard which defines the procedure according to which the registration authority (i.e., the entity entitled and trusted to perform the registration service) works, and specifies its duties and obligations. The procedure standard also specifies an appeals procedure and a revocation procedure.

NOTE – Annex H to the ISO/IEC Directives provides guidance on how to write the procedure standard in JTC 1.

It is also best practice to follow the following process to ensure that the (same) registration authority is jointly appointed by the ITU-T study group and the JTC 1 sub-committee:

1. The selection process for the registration authority begins with a call for offers made by the ITU-T study group and by the JTC 1 sub-committee. The ITU-T study group and JTC 1 sub-committee ensures that each candidate is an acceptable legal entity according to the rules of each organization.
2. Once nominations have been received for the registration authority (and shared with the other organization), they are initially reviewed by the Collaborative Team (if one exists for the joint project), otherwise by the appropriate ITU-T study group or the appropriate JTC 1 sub-committee (whichever meets first), and a report is produced.
3. The report is discussed within the appropriate ITU-T study group or the appropriate JTC 1 sub-committee (whichever meets first) and presented for approval. Then it is sent as a liaison statement to the next plenary session of the other organization for ratification. It is expected that both plenary sessions reach the same conclusion and agree to nominate the same candidate; otherwise the discrepancy is referred to each organization for further consideration.
4. Once all organizations have reached the same conclusion, the final approval and appointment of the registration authority follows the procedures of each organization.

NOTE – Any discrepancies raised during the approval processes of the organizations are referred to their Chief Executive Officers (for ISO and IEC) and to the TSB Director (for ITU-T) for resolution.
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