

**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG9 N361r**

27 June 1999

**Disposition of Comments on the SC22 ballot on concurrent CD registration and FCD for ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC22 N2876, ISO/IEC FCD 18009, "Ada: Conformity Assessment of a Language Processor"**

As the vote for approval was 14 'P'-members in favor, and none opposed, the draft has been revised and submitted for the next stage of processing -- FDIS ballot.

Official comments accompanied the SC22 ballot from Japan and the US. (Editorial comments received from the ISO secretariat and participants in WG9 are also reflected in the FDIS.) The comments are reproduced in italics. The editor's responses are interspersed.

Comment 1 (Japan):

*The following guidelines should be referred to in Bibliography. For example, since this standard includes the certificate mechanism, the reference to Guide 65 would be needed. Just like TR 10034, no explicit reference in the main text seems necessary.*

*Guide 38: General requirements for the acceptance of testing laboratories*

*Guide 58: Calibration and testing laboratory accreditation systems - General requirements for operation and recognition*

*Guide 61: General requirements for assessment and accreditation of certification/registration bodies*

*Guide 65: General requirements for bodies operating product certification systems*

Recommended Disposition for Comment 1: Accept. However, after consultation with ISO Central Secretariat, it was determined that Guide 38 has been incorporated into Guide 58. Therefore, it is not necessary to list Guide 38.

Status: Except for Guide 38, these references have been added to the bibliography of the FDIS.

-----  
Comment 2 (Japan):

*We consider that a requirement such as "the designation of ACAA shall be reaffirmed by the ACALs periodically" should be added to 7.1.1. The current requirement in 7.1.1 seems too vague, and some difficulty may arise if a new ACAL is established after the establishment of ACAA.*

Recommended Disposition for Comment 2: Accept.

Status: We added a requirement that the designation of the ACAA should be reaffirmed by the ACALs every two years.

---

Comment 3 (U.S.A):

*The second paragraph of the introduction needs to clarify who is responsible for the certificates of conformity. The standard itself indicates that the certificates are prepared by the ACALs and approved and published by the ACAA. The relevant text in the standard could usefully be clarified as well. If this is a misinterpretation of the intent then that is further evidence for the need to clarify.*

Recommended Disposition for Comment 3: Accept.

Response: The intent is that the testing ACAL is responsible for issuing the certificate of conformity for the tested language processor. The intent is further that the ACAA reviews and approves the test report and the certificate of conformity prior to delivery of the documents to the client of the ACAL. This approval step is part of the desired world-wide commonality of the assessment process.

Status: The following changes have been made in the FDIS:

To address the comment and to detail the role of the ACAA, a sentence was added to the second paragraph of the introduction.

In 8.2.6.2, the text was changed to clarify that the ACAL issues the certificate.

Further clarification was added to 2.1.

---

Comment 4 (Japan):

Japan also provided the following editorial comments:

*Contents: The period in "6.1.5 .Records" should be removed.*

Response: This has been corrected in the FDIS.

*6.1.2.4: "The person responsible for quality" is nothing other than the quality manager defined in 6.1.1.2(e), and thus should be changed to "The quality manager".*

Response: This has been changed in the FDIS as requested.

*6.1.9: The words "test issues" and "complaints" are used with almost the same meaning. Consistent wording is desirable.*

Response: The term "Complaint" was taken from ISO Guide 25. We consider it to be much broader than the term "test issue," which is used in the document in the narrow sense of an issue related directly to the conformity assessment process. For example, delivery of tests on defective media to the client would qualify as a cause for complaint by the client in the sense of 6.1.9, but not as a test issue, in which the ACAA might need to be involved. We therefore have not changed 6.1.9.

*7.1.10-11: "appropriate standard organizations" in 7.1.10 seems equal to "its working group for the Ada language standard" in 7.1.11.*

Response: Official defect reports on ISO standards generally need to be submitted via member organizations of ISO; hence 7.1.10 was formulated accordingly. The comment is nevertheless correctly describing current informal practice for the maintenance of the Ada standard. Still, we felt more comfortable describing the formal process of defect report submission in 7.1.10.

*8.2.7.2: We think that the fourth bullet of 8.2.7.2 should be identical to the second bullet of 8.2.7.1. If this is the case, "any" to "the", and "tested" to "ACAL-tested".*

Response: We have changed "tested" to "ACAL-tested" in the FDIS. We have left the use of "any" unchanged, as for certification by derivation (8.2.7.2) there may, but need not, be additional configurations, while certification by extension (8.2.7.1) will always involve additional configurations.

*10.1.11: "Ada language standard" -> "the Ada language standard".*

Response: This has been corrected in the FDIS as requested.

---

Beyond the comments by the national bodies, the editorial comments received from the ISO Secretariat have been reflected in the FDIS. Other editorial comments submitted by WG9 participants have also been incorporated.