Form 8A: Committee decision for DIS

Secretariat: JISC	ISO/TC 268/SC 1 N 285
Project number and title: ISO/CD 37155 - Framework for integration and operation of smart community infrastructures -- Part 1: Opportunities and challenges from interactions in smart community infrastructures from all aspects through the life-cycle	

This form should be sent to the ISO Central Secretariat (http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/si/), together with the draft of the project, by the secretariat of the technical committee or subcommittee concerned.

The accompanying document is submitted for circulation to member body vote: ☒ As a DIS
Consensus has been obtained from the P-members of the committee: on 2018-02-24 ☐ At the meeting of . See Resolution number . In document N . ☒ By ballot initiated on 2017-11-30 Please attach a copy of the ballot results (if applicable)

Listing of the P-members (NWIP, CD or Resolution)
P-members in favour: 12 China (SAC), Greece (NQIS ELOT), India (BIS), Japan (JISC), Korea, Republic of (KATS), Netherlands (NEN), Norway (SN), Romania (ASRO), Russian Federation (GOST R), Rwanda (RSB), Ukraine (DSTU), United Kingdom (BSI)
P-members voting against: 0

FORM 8A – Committee decision on

P-members abstaining:	11
Austria (ASI), Canada (SCC), Denmark (DS), France (AFNOR), Germany (DIN), Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI), Mexico (DGN), South Africa (SABS), Spain (UNE), Sri Lanka (SLSI), Sweden (SIS)	
P-members who did not vote: 2	
Chile (INN), United States (ANSI)	
Remarks:	

I hereby confirm that this draft meets the requirements of Part 2 of the ISO/IEC Directives:		
Secretariat:	**Date:**	**Name/Signature of TC/SC Secretary:**
JISC	2018-05-21	Chiba, Yusuke Mr

FORM 8A – Committee decision on

Result of voting

Ballot Information	
Ballot reference	ISO/CD 37155
Ballot type	CD
Ballot title	Framework for integration and operation of smart community infrastructures -- Part 1: Opportunities and challenges from interactions in smart community infrastructures from all aspects through the life-cycle
Opening date	2017-11-30
Closing date	2018-02-22
Note	Based on the SC1/WG2 recommendation 58 (which was approved by SC1), SC1 secretariat circulate CD ballot for this project for 12 weeks (30th of Nov 2017 - 22nd of Feb 2018). *Recommendation 58 (Mexico city-02/2017)* *ISO/TC 268/SC 1/ WG 2 agreed to finalize the WD 37155 with comments on the discussion in Mexico City and start ballot for CD 37155 at ISO/TC 268/SC 1*

Member responses:	
Votes cast (23)	Austria (ASI) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Greece (NQIS ELOT) India (BIS) Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Mexico (DGN) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Romania (ASRO) Russian Federation (GOST R) Rwanda (RSB) South Africa (SABS) Spain (UNE)

Sri Lanka (SLSI)
Sweden (SIS)
Ukraine (DSTU)
United Kingdom (BSI)

Comments submitted (0)

Votes not cast (2)   Chile (INN)
                            United States (ANSI)

Questions:	
Q.1	"Do you approve the circulation of the draft as a DIS?"

Votes by members	Q.1
Austria (ASI)	Abstention
Canada (SCC)	Abstention
China (SAC)	Approval
Denmark (DS)	Abstention
France (AFNOR)	Abstention
Germany (DIN)	Abstention
Greece (NQIS ELOT)	Approval
India (BIS)	Approval
Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI)	Abstention
Japan (JISC)	Approval
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	Approval with comments
Mexico (DGN)	Abstention
Netherlands (NEN)	Approval
Norway (SN)	Approval with comments
Romania (ASRO)	Approval
Russian Federation (GOST R)	Approval
Rwanda (RSB)	Approval
South Africa (SABS)	Abstention
Spain (UNE)	Abstention
Sri Lanka (SLSI)	Abstention
Sweden (SIS)	Abstention
Ukraine (DSTU)	Approval
United Kingdom (BSI)	Approval

Answers to Q.1: "Do you approve the circulation of the draft as a DIS?"		
10 x	Approval	China (SAC) Greece (NQIS ELOT) India (BIS) Japan (JISC) Netherlands (NEN) Romania (ASRO) Russian Federation (GOST R) Rwanda (RSB) Ukraine (DSTU) United Kingdom (BSI)
2 x	Approval with comments	Korea, Republic of (KATS) Norway (SN)
0 x	Disapproval	
11 x	Abstention	Austria (ASI) Canada (SCC) Denmark (DS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI) Mexico (DGN) South Africa (SABS) Spain (UNE) Sri Lanka (SLSI) Sweden (SIS)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Germany (DIN)	*Comment File*	2018-02-13 16:14:14
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	*Comment File*	2018-02-21 06:17:50
Norway (SN)	*Comment File*	2018-02-16 14:13:42

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:2018-05-11	Document:	Project:

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
SN 001				ge	This will be a useful standard as an example of what a smart city can be.	none	Agreed.
SN 002			Figure 3		Figure 3 Benefits of applying this standard, does not quite reflect the way the processes and involvement of citizens is in Norway and the way the regulations work.	None	Noted. When you provide us with the example cases in Norway, these could be added in Annex.
DE 003				ge	The proposed CD 37155-1 is adressing the „System of System"-approach and the issue of interactions including the different „Life-cycle" stages. In principle this fits to the TC268/SC1 „philosophy". But it´s seen critically, that the formulation in the document is not in line with structures and approaches in city planning und city developing from German perspective. Definitions and the description of the role of „developers", „operators" and „consultant" e.g. are not applicable in a way, which is used in German communities and cities.		Adapted with below changes; ・ "Supplier" is changed to "Solution provider". ・ "Service provider" is included in operator ・ Add the sentence on 3.4/3.5/3.6/3.10 "Note: sometimes tasks of 3.4,3.5,3.6,3.10 are included in same organisation." In addition, concerning concept and wording "life-cycle" will be commented in DIS stage
DE 004				ge	Because there are too much text-contents written only in the form of bullet points, the CD has the character of an checklist. That´s to poor.		Adopted with no modification: the specific description to some clauses are invited during DIS stage
KR 005	126	Introduction	Figure 1	te	The life cycle phase names should be consistent with those of Clause 6. Figure 1 contains several phase names in square box forms. There are two issues to be resolved: 1. "Redevelopment" and "rehabilitation" are life cycle phase names in Clause 6 but they are not presented in square box forms. 2. "decommissioning" is addressed as a phase name in Clause 6 and it corresponds to "End of lives" which is NOT presented in Clause 6.	1. Make a square box in the backward line and put "Redevelopment/Rehabilitation" in the box; and 2. Replace "End of lives" with "Decommissioning".	Adopted. Add the explanation to figure 1.

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
KR 006	259	04.02		te	The "first" layer always cause people to expect the second, third and others. But there are no other layers except for the "first" layer. Thus, there is no need for "first".	Change from "Smart community infrastructure can be structured using first layer functional blocks" to "Smart community infrastructure can be structured using _**layered**_ functional blocks".	Adopted.
KR 007	262	04.03		te	The same reason with KR2	Change from "This is the layer of the first and subsequent layer functional block of an individual smart community infrastructure" to "This is the layer of the _**layered**_ functional _**blocks**_ of an individual smart community infrastructure".	Adopted.
KR 008	339	06.03.1	Title	te	Usually sub-phase names are referred to as they are. In the case, there may be together "Basic concept" of 6.3.1 and "Smart community concept" of 6.2.1 and people may be confused against which one works first because the two sub-phase names share "concept". Any standard should provide clarity.	Change from "basic concept" to "infrastructure concept".	Not accepted. The scope of SC1 is just about "Smart community infrastructures". And the name of clause 2 "Design of target infrastructures" shows the following contents are about infrastructures.
KR 009	491		Figure 12	te	"3.2 Verification" is defined as _"confirmation, through the provision of objective evidence, that specified requirements have been fulfilled"_. "3.3 Validation" is defined as _"confirmation, through the provision of objective evidence, that the requirements for a specific intended use or application have been fulfilled"_. The only difference between the two terms is: - _"specified requirements"_ for the verification; and - _"the requirements for a specific intended use or application"_ for the validation. Figure 12 at the document line number 486 shows scopes and related associations of validation and verification. Logically they look good. But a concerning issue is they are not clearly and technically distinguished each other. The _"specified requirements"_ of verification can cover every requirement and even _"the requirements for a specific intended use or_	Consider adoption of the definition principle of ISO 14064-1 on validation and verification.	Adopted with the modification : The definition of V/V on ISO 14064-1 is not applicable to ISO 37155-1 because it is too specific. The figure 12 is modified in order to clarify the meaning of Verification and Validation on this standard.

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					application" of validation due to no specific application targets. Thus, those definitions of validation and verification cannot resolve that ambiguity.		
					The related descriptions of Clause 9 on validation and verification do not provide clear identification factors. For example, the descriptions of 9.3.1 and 9.3.2 cannot be easily and technically distinguished. Their contributors and document authors may distinguish them clearly. But, people who haven't joined the development work of ISO 37155 cannot understand ISO 37155 well after it is published and then there will be a risk of ignoring ISO 37155 due to ambiguity for use.		
					Korean MB suggests ISO 14064-1 to be referred to for the definitions of validation and verification.		
					ISO 14064-1 contains *"validation: systematic, independent and documented process for the evaluation of a greenhouse gas assertion in a GHG project plan against agreed validation criteria"*; and *"verification: systematic, independent and documented process for the evaluation of a greenhouse gas assertion against agreed verification criteria"*.		
					The key difference between them is execution time. The validation is an activity which shall be performed before a GHG mitigation project is fulfilled. So the proposed GHG project plan is evaluated whether it is appropriate and justified or not.		
					Only if the GHG project plan is passed from the validation process, it is allowed to be implemented.		
					After the GHG project is finished, GHG reduction results are accounted and shall be verified. Thus, the validation process is called ex-ante approval process for a project plan before it starts and the verification process is called ex-post approval process for the implementation result after the project has been finished.		

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)
2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

MB/ NC[1]	Line number	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					Thus, such before-and-after distinction factor is very easy to identify validation and verification targets.		
KR 010	510	09		te	Most of guideline statements are specified as "should be clarified". The notes of "3.2 Verification" and "3.3 Validation" read: - *"The objective evidence needed for a verification can be the result of an inspection or of other forms of determination such as performing alternative calculations or reviewing documents."* - *"The activities carried out for verification are sometimes called a qualification process."* - *"The objective evidence needed for a validation is the result of a test or other form of determination such as performing alternative calculations or reviewing documents."* That is, the validation and verification implies a third-party independent evaluation process and possibly a certification process as well. In order to realize that, all the requirements or recommendations should be clearly and specifically stated to avoid any ambiguity and related misinterpretations. Such statements of "should be clarified" must not be appropriate.	Option #1: all the recommendations should be rephrased to provide specific activities to be fulfilled, validated and verified properly if a third-party independent evaluation process and a possible certification process are expected or planned. Option #2: if all the recommendations are expected to be implemented voluntarily for self-assessment, self-management and self-improvement, then such recommendation statements can be acceptable because some ambiguity will not cause significant problems. But that purpose should be stated in the scope section of ISO CD 37155.	Not Accepted. Such statement would be adequate because the users of this standard are not limited to specific stakeholders such as governments or Certification bodies. We are going to add specific cases on Annex in the future.

D:\ISO\data\prod_iso_comment-collation\work\temp\ISO_CD 37155_DIN.doc: Collation successful

D:\ISO\data\prod_iso_comment-collation\work\temp\ISO_CD 37155_KATS.docx: Collation successful

D:\ISO\data\prod_iso_comment-collation\work\temp\ISO_CD 37155_SN.doc: Collation successful

Collation of files was successful. Number of collated files: 3

SELECTED   (number of files): 3

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

MB/NC[1]	Line number	Clause/Subclause	Paragraph/Figure/Table	Type of comment[2]	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat

PASSED TEST   (number of files): 3

FAILED TEST   (number of files): 0

CCT - Version 4.0/2015

1   **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)
2   **Type of comment:**   **ge** = general   **te** = technical   **ed** = editorial

Page 5 of 5