




IEC ACADEMY WEBINAR Q&A

IEC Directives 2021 – What's new?

Questions	Answers
The question is related to the extension of the WG convenor. Now it is 3 years regardless of the upcoming plenary meeting so who should keep track of the term of office end date, and what is the procedure for its extension?	The procedure for the extension has not changed, this is a committee decision which can be made at a plenary meeting (globally for all Convenors) or by correspondence. Regarding keeping track of the term of office, we recommend that every two years, all the terms are extended for 3 years by a global decision at a plenary meeting.
What if a P-member appointed some members a long time ago but they are no longer active in the WGs/MTs? Is the member still considered to have "appointed experts to technical work" for the purpose of § 1.7.4?	This is the role of the Convenor to monitor the inactive members and to report to the Secretary. See Clause 1.12.3 for more details.
If a Secretary wishes to appoint an Assistant Secretary, how should that process be conducted, who do I inform?	The nomination of an Assistant Secretary is the decision of the Secretariat. Please contact the Secretary of your National Committee.
New wording of § 1.12.1: Does this mean that if a plenary meeting is not held exactly 3 years after the last one that appointed the convenors for a 3-year term, the convenors automatically end their term? There should be some leeway so to extend their term until the next plenary meeting is held, if that happens in the same year of the end of the 3-year term.	Most of the Technical Committees hold plenary meetings every year. I would recommend extending for 3 years by a single global plenary decision. Then the next extension could be two years later. There would be no problem missing the deadline by extending one year in advance.
Physical participation in meetings faced obstacles, most of which were financial, and these difficulties have increased since the Corona pandemic. We prefer that active participation, regardless of whether it is physical or remote, be the decisive factor in determining membership.	With this 2021 edition of the Directives, remote participation is considered like physical participation.
Reg cl 1.12.1, I understand that Committee A having liaison with Committee B can now appoint representatives on WGs of Committee B. However, do we need committee approval (via Questionnaire) for such appointment of representatives on WGs?	This is not new; this is just clearly stated. Like when appointing a liaison officer, appointing members in a liaison WG is a committee decision.
Will liaison members in WGs subsequently be able to register for their meetings in the ISO meeting registration system? Of course, it would be more relevant to address my question on ISO liaison registration to ISO.	This is still an open issue and IEC is currently discussing with ISO CS to have ISO formally registering the IEC experts in ISO lead JWGs.
What if an NP is already approved in IEC and is in WD stage and then ISO wants to join the Project?	ISO needs to approve an NP on its side. Then the CD will be circulated simultaneously on both sides.
What if we want to add new parts & NOT subdivide?	No problem, this is a new project. An NP is needed.
'§ 2.4.3: Only P-members are counted when calculating the two thirds majority for the change of the scope (like when balloting for a NWP), or O-members can vote too?	No, only P-Members can vote.
Changing the scope of the project: who decides if the change is significant? Chair, secretary and Project Leader together maybe?	This is a Secretary decision, which should be made in concertation with the Convenor/Project Leader. At a CD, CDV, or FDIS ballot, if a P-Member considers that the scope has changed significantly, it can also place an appeal.

What will happen to a Working Group that now exists, but its convenor has not been appointed? Does such a Working Group need to be disbanded?	No, the rule applies for newly established WGs (Working Groups). Regarding existing WGs without Convenors, the resolution of the issue is up to the committee. A key criterion could be the current programme of work. If the WG has completed its programme of work, it can be disbanded. Another option can be to consider merging with another WG.
'§ 3.1.3 and 3.2.4: Does the withdrawal of a TS or PAS require a particular majority (e.g. 2/3 of the P-members voting, like for the approval of a NWP), or a simple majority of P-members is enough? Are O-members entitled to vote, or the withdrawal may be voted upon only at a plenary meeting (where only P-members attend)?	As the 2/3 rd majority is not mentioned in the Directives, a simple majority is required. O-Members cannot vote. A withdrawal is a committee decision which can be made like any committee decision: either by correspondence or at plenary meeting.
What is the "Fast-Track" Procedure?	See Annex F, Clause F.2. https://www.iec.ch/members_experts/refdocs/iec/isoiecdir1-consolidatedIECsup%7Bed17.0%7Den.pdf
I cannot find a new term "assistant secretary" in D.1.2, nor new sub-clause D.4; could you please help?	This was an oversight when posting the file on the IEC website. This is now updated, and you should find the Clauses D.1.2 and D.4 when downloading the Directives.
Can PAS not follow the structure and requirement of DIR 2?	Yes, Clause 3.2.3 states that "The PAS is published after verification of the presentation". When processing a document originating from outside IEC, a consortium for example, the IEC CO checks the layout and does not change it if it is acceptable. Only the headers, the foreword, and the cover pages are added.
'§ 3.3.3: Does a review of a Technical Report need to be carried over by a MT or may it be accomplished by a single project leader (possibly nominated by the P-member asking for the update of the TR), as is the case when a new TR is drafted (draft TRs do not need to be managed by a WG or PT)?	A review of the TR should be carried out in a similar way than for ISs: seek input from the P-Members, initiate a project with a Project Leader and experts (if needed), open the DTR ballot.
Scope change of a running project, can CDV voting be considered as committee decision for approval?	Yes, we recommend that the attention to the scope change is raised by a specific sentence on the CDV cover. Approval of the CDV ballot means approval of the scope change.
Inactive P-member is related to absence to 2 meetings and expert nomination. So no requirement on document voting?	Document voting is also a requirement (See Clause 1.7.4). A P-Member is considered inactive if: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- It failed to vote OR <ul style="list-style-type: none">- It failed to attend 2 successive meetings AND failed to nominate Experts
About Liaison acceptance reply explained on p14, is there a fixed format?	No, there is no fixed format. We recommend informing the P-Members by circulating an INF document and share this INF to the requesting committee.
In my opinion, the common term COMMITTEE may add confusion since different committees have different responsibility. Could you please explain this?	In page 8 of the Directives there is a table defining the terms used in the Directives. The term Committees is defined as "TCs, SCs, PCs, and SyCs". In the same terminology table the IEC National Committees are called "Member Bodies". Thus no confusion is expected in the Directives.
Can an Assistant Secretary and Secretary be from the same country?	Yes.
How to manage invited experts not having registered in ISO or IEC system?	They have to be managed manually. If the invited experts are expected to attend several meetings, you may ask

	your National Committee to create an IEC profile. This will make the administration easier.
Can we have the same main Number to maintain the Series & Topic Continuity?	Yes, in a series, the main number remains the same.
How many experts may be nominated in a committee (WG) on behalf of an NC?	<p>There is no limit set in the Directives, but the Directives allow for a committee decision limiting the number of Experts.</p> <p>Extract of Clause 1.12.1 "(...) It is recommended that working groups be reasonably limited in size. The technical committee or subcommittee may therefore decide upon the maximum number of experts appointed by each P-member and liaison organizations. (...)”</p>
Is there a new similar rule (Secretary/Assistant Secretary) for assisting Convenor – so, a co-Convenor?	No. The Directives allow for Co-convenors for JVGs only.
Question related to pages 15 and 16 (Clause 1.12.6): How are these liaisons managed on the member list in the WG's homepage?	<p>In the list of members on the WG home page, there is a column with the NC of the Experts, in the case of a liaison, the liaison organization is mentioned.</p>  <p>Regarding TC to TC liaison, our IT system does not allow to distinguish liaisons Experts in a WG.</p>
Are co-leads allowed for New Work Item Proposals?	NO.
Regarding the four weeks' time for appointing more experts to an NP, does it start from the deadline for vote or from the circulation of the RVN by the Secretary?	It starts from the closing of the NP ballot and not from the circulation of the RVN.
TRs can be confusing, I find, since many use the IEC IS template including normative clauses, which contradicts the prescript that TR must not contain normatives. In addition, some TRs use "should" as a recommendation, which are also inconsistent with the prescript that provisions (e.g. "shall" and "should") are normative.	Agreed. In principle TRs are purely informative and shall not contain "shall" or "should". The problem is that this is not always known by the WG developing the TR. The IEC CO is editing the TR once the DTR is approved. Thus it is too late to go back to the WG and ask to remove the "shall" and "should".
Can a WG change or amend the scope of the standard (or a new edition of a standard)?	Yes, but it needs the further approval of the P-Members.
During your presentation you mentioned different terms for leaders and secretaries: Chair, Secretary, Convenor; Secretary, Project Leader, Secretariat. Is there a consistent or preferred term for a Convenor of the TC and for a Convenor of a WG? The same question is for the role of Secretary; are there different terms used for a Secretary of a TC or Secretary of a WG?	<p>A TC is managed by a Chair and a Secretary. A WG is managed by a Convenor. A project is managed by a Project Leader. The Secretariat is not a person but the National Committee behind the Secretary.</p> <p>The role of a TC Secretary is defined through the role of the Secretariat in Clause 1.9 and the competencies of the Secretary in Annex L</p>
If an IEC NC is O-member, what is the procedure to become a P-member? And same question for a "non-member" NC?	An email to the Technical Officer, copy to the SPA is enough. IEC CO will then register the new status in the IEC information system.
Is there a procedure for removing a working group convenor?	There is no procedure. The Convenor was appointed via a Committee decision, another Committee decision will remove the convenor. This is a delicate topic which needs to be handled cautiously and the help of the IEC Technical Officer can be useful.

<p>Please advise about the change of clause 2.10.4.</p> <p>What time is the revision that you explained effective from?</p> <p>When the project of maintenance for the next edition of publication has already been started, in case that the current version had one amendment and one corrigendum, should it be changed to a project of the second amendment of former edition of publication?</p>	<p>The revision is effective from May 2021. This does not apply to the maintenance projects initiated prior to May 2021.</p>
<p>For any further questions, please contact the IEC Academy, academy@iec.ch, and/or download the latest editions of the ISO/IEC Directives and Supplement</p>	