

Revision Cycle Schedule for CSA C22.2 No. 107.3 / UL 1778

Proposal Submission Due Dates:

January 21, 2004

November 1, 2006 (next cycle)

If the project gets ahead of schedule, then the SDOs (Standards Development Organizations) may publish the revision pages early. However, the proposal submittal date for the next cycle will not change.

The cycle plan follows, and serves as a supplement to, the procedures provided in Section 6, Revising a binational or trinational standard, of the Procedures for Harmonizing ANCE / CSA / UL Standards.

Scheduled Dates	Description of Activity	Comment
September 1, 2006	Reminder for proposals to be submitted.	Reminder sent to harmonization committee members (THC, THSC, WG, etc.), UL STP members, and CSA TSC/TC members to submit proposals.
November 1, 2006	<p>Due date for proposals to be submitted.</p> <p><i>Proposals should be forwarded to the applicable SDO, who will forward them, after consolidation, to the Publication Coordinator shown below:</i></p> <p>David Hulford, P.Eng, Canadian Standards Association, 5060 Spectrum Way, Suite 100, Mississauga, ON, Canada L4W 5N6. E-mail: david.hulford@csa.ca Phone: (416) 747-2740</p>	Proposals are collected by each of the participating SDOs (and the THC, if it exists). Proposals should be forwarded to the Publication Coordinator for centralized collection. The Publication Coordinator is designated to be one of the participating SDOs and is assigned by the participating SDOs.
December 1, 2006	All proposals provided to the THC.	Each SDO may choose to review or otherwise respond to proposed suggestions based on their own approved SDO procedures.
December 1, 2006 through February 1, 2007	<p>THC reviews all proposals, and returns recommendations for the handling of the submitted proposals to the Publication Coordinator and SDO's.</p> <p>All those proposals supported by the THC are updated as necessary and provided to all involved SDOs.</p>	<p>This step allows for coordination of proposals with the THC. It is important that a proposal formally submitted through the standards review process be reviewed at this stage to see if it preliminarily meets the needs of all countries involved.</p> <p>Those proposals not supported by the THC are to be returned to the appropriate SDO with an explanation. The SDO then determines how to handle these proposals (e.g., provide THC comments to submitter to determine if submitter still wants proposals to be balloted, modified, or withdrawn.).</p>
February 1, 2007 through March 1, 2007	Publication Coordinator and SDO's prepare the proposed changes for SDO-specific pre-ballot reviews.	

Scheduled Dates	Description of Activity	Comment
March 1, 2007	<p>UL conducts a Preliminary Technical Review with the STP and the UL Subscribers.</p> <p>Proposals distributed for review to CSA TSC.</p>	<p>The UL preliminary technical review may be conducted by posting the document on UL's website, sending the draft via email, or loading the document into CSDS, whichever is most appropriate for the proposals.</p>
April 15, 2007	UL's preliminary technical review and CSA's TSC review end.	<p>UL and CSA receive comments from their respective committees.</p>
May 15, 2007	<p>SDO's compile comments received. All comments to be provided to THC and SDOs.</p>	<p>UL and CSA each compile and organize the comments received in response to the proposal, and share them with the THC and the other involved SDOs.</p>
May 30, 2007	<p>A variety of activities can occur at this point depending on the number and nature of comments received. For example:</p> <p>THC "meets" to discuss comments & involves commentors in discussions as appropriate.</p> <p>SDOs are able to respond to comments without THC and STP involvement. THC & STP may provide a cursory review of the responses.</p>	<p>THC "meets": This step may be accomplished through a meeting, teleconference, a UL CSDS Work Area, or by correspondence if few comments were generated.</p> <p>The THC, STP, STP commentors, other commentors, and SDOs as appropriate may be involved in comment resolution.</p>
June 30, 2007	<p>THC responses and corresponding suggested changes to proposals provided to SDOs.</p>	
July 15, 2007	<p>SDOs review the THC's resolution of comments and any proposed changes.</p> <p>For CSA, a comment resolution matrix is likely issued to the TSC, to obtain support for resolutions.</p>	<p>For UL, the comments received in response to a UL preliminary technical review do not require a response.</p>
July 15, 2007	<p>CSA editorial staff conducts its editorial reviews (PAE) and Public Review of all proposals, to prepare for balloting.</p> <p>Editorial comments to be resolved between SDOs. Comments that are not strictly editorial may require the input of the THC.</p>	
September 30, 2007	<p>UL loads proposals into CSDS for balloting by UL's STP and review by UL's Subscribers.</p> <p>CSA distributes all proposals to CSA TC for review and ballot.</p>	

Scheduled Dates	Description of Activity	Comment
November 15, 2007	<p>UL ballots due and public review ends.</p> <p>CSA ballots due.</p>	
November 30, 2007	All comments to be provided to THC.	Each SDO compiles comments and provides to THC and other SDOs, as appropriate.
December 15, 2007	<p>A variety of activities can occur at this point depending on the number and nature of comments received. For example:</p> <p>THC “meets” to discuss comments & involves commentors in discussions as appropriate.</p> <p>STP “comment resolution meeting” held in conjunction with THC and commentors.</p> <p>SDOs are able to respond to comments without THC and STP involvement. THC & STP may provide a cursory review of the responses.</p>	<p>THC “meets”: This step may be accomplished through a meeting, teleconference, a UL CSDS Work Area, or by correspondence if few comments were generated.</p> <p>The THC, STP, STP commentors, other commentors, and SDOs as appropriate may be involved in comment resolution.</p>
January 30, 2008	THC responses and corresponding suggested changes to proposals provided to SDOs.	
February 30, 2008	<p>SDOs review THC input and formally respond to comments.</p> <p>Recirculation of negatives and any substantive changes.</p>	<p>CSA distributes changes, if any, to CSA TC for review and ballot.</p> <p>For UL, the responses to comments are entered into CSDS at this point. For UL, a recirculation of proposals would also occur at this point.</p>
March 30, 2008	<p>CSA change ballot due.</p> <p>For UL, responses to recirculation due.</p>	CSA ballot comments, if any, to be resolved.
June 2008	Publication of Revisions by participating SDOs	

What if the project concludes early?

If the project gets ahead of its schedule, then the SDOs will publish the revision pages early. However, the proposal submittal date for the next cycle will not change, it will continue to be July 1, 20XX.

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, UL and the other involved SDOs will work with the THC to formalize the proposal and process it separate from the other proposals. The standard may be

revised with revision pages, or UL may even elect to process the issue, if significantly critical, as a Provisional ANSI requirement, requiring simpler review steps than typical revisions.

What if Revision Cycles Are Not Wanted for a Particular Standard?

For some industries, it may be more important to mirror activities 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, UL and CSA proposes 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 UL staff, and the time of the others involved in the process – are efficiently used.