

### **Introduction to Revision Cycles**

Establishing revision cycles for a co-published standard is one method for coordinating activities among SDOs. Upon publication of a co-published standard, the Technical Harmonization Committee (THC), or Technical Harmonization Subcommittee (THSC) if applicable, is strongly encouraged to establish a revision cycle for the co-published standard. Having a revision cycle in place allows all involved – including the THC, members of the SDOs committees, the SDO staff, and others interested in the standard – to have an understanding of the next steps for that standard. A revision cycle additionally helps to coordinate activities to reduce the need for multiple revisions in a short time period.

Revision cycles provide an orderly and manageable system for revising co-published standards. They provide for a more focused mechanism for updates, and also promote better use of resources.

### **What if a standard needs to be revised outside of its revision cycle?**

Occasionally, it may be necessary to revise a standard outside of its established revision cycle. For example, a safety critical issue may arise which needs to be addressed before the normal scheduled revision of the standard. In these rare instances, the SDOs will work with the THC to formalize the proposal and process it separate from the other proposals. (See the note to the “THC reviews all proposals” step in the Three-Year Revision Cycle example).

### **What if revision cycles are not wanted for a particular standard?**

For some industries, it may be more important to mirror activities or schedules of other groups, such as the IEC, than it is to maintain a particular revision cycle. For example, a standard based on an IEC standard may want to take the lead of the IEC and propose changes to the standard in line with the IEC proposals. Where revision cycles are not feasible for a particular industry, the THC and the SDOs may choose to implement a managed approach towards revising a binational or trinational standard. The general philosophy will be to consolidate the work as much as possible so that all resources, including the THC, the SDO staff, and the time of others involved in the process, are efficiently used.

### **What if a project concludes early?**

If the project gets ahead of its schedule, then the SDOs may agree to publish the revision or amended pages (or new edition) early. However, the proposal submittal date for the next cycle will not change.

### **What if after the “call for proposals” step, there are no proposals from any sources?**

The particular revision cycle is halted. The SDOs and THC then discuss plans for initiating another call for proposals down the road. For example, the next call for proposals may be deferred for 1 year or 2 years, when a new revision cycle can be re-initiated

### **Proposed 3-year Revision Cycle Schedule for Binational and Trinational Standards**

The following timeline illustrates how a 3-year cycle would work. Each THC is encouraged to use this timeline as a sample approach, and modify as needed to address the particular needs and considerations of the standard and parties involved.

**Note:** On the timeline, there is an indication of “P” process steps. These correspond to steps used in the companion document, Comparison of UL, CSA and ANCE Standards Development Processes Guide.

### Example of Three-Year Revision Cycle

(THC Secretary is asked to input appropriate dates for full revision cycle and maintain the schedule throughout the process)

<b>Dates for 3-Year Cycle</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Comment</b>
September 1, 2005 – December 1, 2005  (3 months)	Call for proposals is issued on September 1, 2005, with proposals due by December 1, 2005	Request sent from publication coordinator to THC Secretary and Chair and to other SDOs. Each SDO to then send a call for proposals to its committee members (UL STP members, CSA TSC/TC members, ANCE SC members).  THCs or task groups may meet during this time to develop proposals.
December 1, 2005 - January 1, 2006  (1 month)	SDOs compile proposals and provide applicable proposals to the THC.  Proposals received after the due date will be deferred to the next revision cycle.	Each SDO may choose to review or otherwise respond to proposals based on their own SDO procedures.

Dates for 3-Year Cycle	Step	Comment
<p>January 1, 2006 - April 1, 2006</p> <p>(3 months)</p> <p>(7 months total to call in, review and develop proposals)</p>	<p>THC reviews all proposals, and develops recommendations on how to handle all proposals.</p> <p>THC provides these recommendations to the publication coordinator and SDOs.</p>	<p>This step allows for coordination of proposals within the THC to see if it preliminarily meets the needs of all countries involved.</p> <p>All those proposals supported by the THC are updated as necessary and provided to all involved SDOs.</p> <p>Those proposals not supported by the THC are returned to the appropriate SDO with an explanation. The SDO then determines how to handle these proposals (i.e., provide THC comments to submitter to determine if submitter still wants proposals to be balloted, modified, or withdrawn).</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> THC members, SDOs or other industry members may request that a certain proposal or proposals be processed before other proposals under consideration. The request may be generated to address a safety critical issue, new technology, or other similar issues. In order to accelerate particular proposals, the involved SDOs and the THC members (representing all involved countries) need to agree to process the accelerated proposals first, with the understanding that the remaining proposals will not be processed until the accelerated proposals have gone through the entire standards development process for each SDO (including preliminary technical review, balloting, and comment resolution). After the publication of the accelerated proposals, the revision cycle for the remaining proposals can commence or can be resumed.</p>		
<p>April 1, 2006 – May 15, 2006</p> <p>P1 begins (1-1/2 months)</p>	<p>Publication Coordinator and SDOs prepare the proposed changes for SDO-specific preliminary technical reviews.</p>	

<b>Dates for 3-Year Cycle</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>May 15, 2006 – June 15, 2006</p> <p>P1 continues (1 month)</p>	<p>UL conducts a Preliminary Technical Review with the STP and the UL Subscribers.</p> <p>CSA conducts a Preliminary Technical Review with the CSA TSC.</p> <p>ANCE conducts a Preliminary Technical Review with the SC.</p>	<p>The preliminary technical review stage provides commentors the opportunity to review the proposals and identify issues to be addressed before the more formal ballots take place.</p> <p>UL, ANCE, and CSA receive comments from their respective committees.</p> <p>Comments resulting from the UL preliminary technical review may optionally be sent directly to the THC.</p>
<p>June 15, 2006- August 1, 2006</p> <p>P1 finishes (1-1/2 months)</p>	<p>Preliminary Technical Review ends.</p> <p>The SDOs compile all comments on the proposals and submit them, if appropriate, to the THC and the other involved SDOs for resolution.</p>	
<p>August 1, 2006 – October 1, 2006</p> <p>P2 (2 months)</p>	<p>THC discusses comments. After considering the comments the THC recommends any changes to the proposals, if necessary.</p> <p>THC responses and corresponding suggested changes to proposals provided to SDOs by November 1, 2006.</p>	<p>Comment resolution may be accomplished through a live meeting, teleconference, by participating in a UL CSDS Work Area, by participating in a CSA SDOW Forum, by participating in an ANCE SDOW Forum, or by correspondence.</p> <p>The THC, UL STP, CSA TSC, ANCE SC, other commentors, and SDOs may be involved in comment resolution.</p>

<b>Dates for 3-Year Cycle</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>October 1, 2006 – November 1, 2006</p> <p>P2 (a) and (b) (1 month)</p>	<p>SDOs review THC input regarding response to comments and any proposed changes, and formally respond to commentors, if necessary.</p>	<p>For UL and ANCE, the comments received in response to a UL or ANCE preliminary technical review do not require a response.</p>
<p>November 1, 2006 - January 15, 2007</p> <p>P3, P4, P5 and P6, (2-1/2 months)</p>	<p>CSA editorial staff conducts its Public Review, Pre-Approval Edit (PAE) review and Quality Review for all proposals, to prepare for balloting.</p> <p>After all SC comments have been resolved, the draft is translated into Spanish (ANCE).</p> <p>Editorial comments are resolved among the SDOs. Comments that are not strictly editorial may require the input of the THC, which should be addressed within this period.</p>	<p>Revisions affecting more than 65 pages or 10 figures will require more editing time (PAE) by CSA.</p>

<b>Dates for 3-Year Cycle</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>January 15, 2007 - February 15, 2007</p> <p>P7 begins (1 month)</p>	<p>All proposals are finalized and prepared for balloting at each SDO.</p>	<p>Near the end of this step, or earlier, CSA may submit ballot draft for translation to French, if this is required for Canada. Translation activity can continue simultaneous with the upcoming CSA ballot period, as it is not a prerequisite to begin balloting, unless it relates to markings that may be required to be in French. Also, for an amendment to a national standard for Canada (one with a “CAN/CSA” prefix), full French text translation must be prepared and published by CSA, concurrently with the English version.</p>
<p>February 15, 2007 – April 15, 2007</p> <p>P7 continues (2 months)</p>	<p>Ballot period</p> <p>UL submits the proposals for ballot to UL’s STP and for review by UL’s subscribers and public reviewers.</p> <p>CSA submits the proposals for ballot to CSA’s TC.</p> <p>ANCE submits draft proposal for public review.</p>	<p>Ballot or public review period may be extended by the SDOs, when necessary.</p>
<p>April 15, 2007 - June 1, 2007</p> <p>P8 (1-1/2 months)</p>	<p>The SDOs compile all comments/negatives and submit them, if appropriate, to the THC and the other involved SDOs for resolution.</p>	<p>SDOs may respond to comments without THC input if the input does not result in a change to the draft.</p>

<b>Dates for 3-Year Cycle</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>June 1, 2007 – September 1, 2007</p> <p>P8 (a) loop (3 months)</p>	<p>THC discusses comments/negatives. After considering these THC recommends any changes to the proposals, if necessary.</p> <p>THC responses and corresponding suggested changes to proposals provided to SDOs.</p>	<p>Comment/negative resolution may be accomplished through a live meeting, teleconference, by participating in a UL CSDS Work Area, by participating in a CSA SDOW Forum, by participating in an ANCE SDOW Forum, or by correspondence.</p>
<p>September 1, 2007 - October 15, 2007</p> <p>P9 (1-1/2 months)</p>	<p>SDOs review THC input and prepare to formally respond to comments.</p> <p>Recirculation, to resolve negatives and any substantive changes.</p>	<p>CSA responds to comments / negatives, and prepares to ballot substantive changes, if any, to CSA TC.</p> <p>UL responds to comments and recirculates substantive changes via CSDS.</p> <p>For ANCE, if the draft had substantive changes, a new public comment review is required by law.</p>
<p>October 15, 2007 - December 1, 2007</p> <p>P10 and P11 (1-1/2 months)</p>	<p>For CSA, this is the TC ballot period (second-round ballot for substantive changes only), if needed</p> <p>For UL, this is the recirculation period, if needed.</p> <p>For ANCE, this is a second review period, if needed.</p>	<p>Additional time may be needed if a SDO committee does not achieve approval by end of the ballot period.</p>
<p>December 1, 2007 – February 15, 2008</p> <p>P12 and P13 (2-1/2 months)</p>	<p>Publication of revisions by participating SDOs.</p> <p>SDOs prepare proposals for final publication, including establishing a common publication date.</p>	<p>Revisions affecting more than 65 pages or 10 figures will require more publication-preparation time by CSA.</p>



<b>Dates for 3-Year Cycle</b>	<b>Step</b>	<b>Comment</b>
February 15, 2008 - September 1, 2008  (6-1/2 months)		No activity in this period, but this time can be used if any earlier steps require more time.
September 1, 2008	THC initiates the next revision cycle.	

**Legend:**

CSDS: UL's Collaborative Standards Development System

SDOW: CSA's Standards Development Online Workspace

SDOW: ANCE's Standards Development Online Workspace