

**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 /N4462**

**2009-08-24**

<b>Document Type</b>	Meeting Minutes
<b>Title</b>	Draft meeting report from the 18-20 May 2009 JTC 1/WG 6 London meeting
<b>Source</b>	JTC 1/WG6
<b>Project</b>	
<b>Status</b>	Final
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Action ID</b>	FYI or ACT
<b>Distribution</b>	AG
<b>No. of Pages</b>	18
<b>Note</b>	

Address reply to: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 Secretariat  
École de technologie supérieure – Department of Software and IT Engineering  
1100 Notre Dame Ouest, Montréal, Québec Canada H3C 1K3  
[secretariat@jtc1-sc7.org](mailto:secretariat@jtc1-sc7.org)

[www.jtc1-sc7.org](http://www.jtc1-sc7.org)

**ISO/IEC JTC 1 Working Group 6 Corporate Governance of IT  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/WG 6 N0028**

**DATE: 2009-07-31**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ISO/IEC JTC 1</b> <b>Working Group 6 Corporate Governance of IT</b> <b>Secretariat: Standards Australia (SA)</b></p>
--

**DOC TYPE:** Meeting Report

**TITLE:** Draft meeting report from the 18-20 May 2009 JTC 1/WG 6 London meeting

**SOURCE:** JTC 1/WG 6 Secretariat

**STATUS:** Draft

**ACTION ID:** ACT

**DISTRIBUTION:** JTC 1/WG 6, JTC 1 Secretariat, JTC 1 National Bodies

**NO. OF PAGES:** 18 (including cover and Annex)

## Draft meeting report of the ISO/IEC JTC 1 WG6 Corporate Governance of IT meeting 18-20 May BSI, London UK

### 1. Opening of meeting 1.1 Welcoming Remarks

### 2. Roll call of participants

<b>ISO/IEC JTC 1/WG 6 meeting London 18-20 May 2009 Attendance</b>					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Body</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>18-May-09</b>	<b>19-May-09</b>	<b>20-May-09</b>
John Graham	JTC1	<b>Convenor</b>	x	x	x
Andrew McKay	SA	<b>Secretary</b>	x	x	x
Steven Russman	ANSI	US HoD	x	x	x
Mark Toomey	SA	AU HoD	x	x	x
Peter Cross	SA	AU	x	x	x
Max Shanahan	SA / ISACA	AU	x	x	x
Pieter Neethling	SABS	SA	x	x	x
Miles Ward	SNZ	NZ	x	x	x
Brian Cusack	SNZ	NZ	x	x	x
Charles Provencher	SCC / SC 27	CA HoD	x	x	x
Jim MacFie	SCC	CA	x	x	x
K.T. Hwang	KATS	KO	x	x	x
Miles Shepherd	BSI	UK	x		x
Chris Ogden	BSI	UK	x	x	
John Lovelock	BSI	UK	x	x	
Phil Brown	BSI	UK	x	x	x
Brian Manning	BSI	UK	x	x	
Peter Restell	BSI	UK	x	x	x
Sixten Bjorkulnd	SIS	SE	x	x	x
Yoshiyuki Hirano	JSA	JP	x	x	x
Hillevi Vuori (for info)	SFS	FI	x	x	x
Sixten Björklund	SIS	SE	x	x	x
Manuel Ballester	AENOR	ES	x	x	x
Knud Fiil-Nielsen	DS	DK	x	x	x
<b>Liaisons awaiting confirmation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>				
François Coallier	SC 7		x	x	x
Wim van Grembergen	ISACA		x		
Robert Stroud	itSMF International		x	x	x

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC1 Working Group 6 Corporate Governance of IT:  
Standards Australia, Level 10, 20 Bridge Street Sydney, NSW 2000  
Telephone: +61 2 9237 6079; Facsimile: +61 2 9237 6020;  
e-mail: [andrew.mckay@standards.org.au](mailto:andrew.mckay@standards.org.au)

<b>Observer</b>					
Hugh Penri-Williams	ISAKA/ITGI SC 27	ISAKA/ITGI SC 27	x	x	
Angelika Plate	SC 27	SC 27 HoD	x	x	
Jean Stride	BSI	UK	x		
David Fatscher	BSI	UK	x		
<b>Apologies</b>					
Alison Holt	SNZ	NZ			
Colin Nolder	ISO TC 215				
Mika Helenius	SFS	FI			
John Thorp					
<b>Absent</b>					
Anders Carlstedt	SIS / SC 27	SE			
Tomi Dahlberg	SFS	FI			
Pirkko Lahdelma	SFS	FI			
John Thorp	SCC	CA			
Daniel Fitzpatrick	SCC	CA			
Hiroyuki Ogura	JNB	JP			
Graham Coombes	BSI	UK			
Dave Sawdon	BSI	UK			
Gian Pietro Trovesi	UNI/UNINFO	IT			
Pia Elleby Lange	DS	DK			
Donald Deutsch	ANSI	US			
Maria Lopez	AENOR	ES			
Isabelle Valet-Harper	AFNOR	FR			
Jennifer T. Garner	ANSI	US			

### 3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without any additional items.

### 4. Consideration of Meeting Process and Protocols

The working group agreed that the decisions made at this meeting should be made on a National Body basis rather than as individual experts.

### 5. Establishing Resolution and Terms of Reference of Working Group

The Convener explained that the starting point for this Working group is the JTC 1 resolution 41.

It was noted that:

- There is a small error in the JTC 1 resolution establishing WG 6, that being, the resolution mentioned in item 1 c) is a NWI and not a “study group”.
- The WG can produce models which does not exclude the singular.
- Gap analysis is dependent on work done on models.
- The only exclusion is “the operational management of IT”.

- Contact has been made with the liaison bodies requested by JTC 1.
- Membership to WG 6 will be left open at least for the first couple of meetings. Prefer to leave membership open as long as possible.
- It is hoped that those countries that objected to the JTC 1 resolution 41 would eventually participate in WG 6.

## 6. Consideration of Liaisons

### 6.1. External

#### 6.1.1. ISACA/ITGI

As directed by the JTC 1 Resolution 41, ISACA/ITGI was invited to participate in WG 6 as a Liaison organization. The Liaison category considered is category C.

ISACA/ITGI provided background on their organization and presented a statement of expected benefits. It was noted by the ISACA/ITGI that class C Liaison has restrictions, and they would prefer class A Liaison so that their experts can make comments on committee drafts. This issue was noted and the matter was left for ISACA/ITGI to pursue.

There was no dissent from WG 6 members to invite ISACA/ITGI to participate in WG 6 as a Liaison category C.

<b>WG 6 Resolution 001</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that JTC 1 approve the category C Liaison proposal from ISACA/ITGI in order for them to participate actively in JTC 1/WG 6, and requests the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat forward the ISACA liaison benefit case to JTC 1 for approval.</b>
----------------------------	--

#### 6.1.2. ITSMF-I

itSMF International explained that the benefit statement was waiting to be signed off at itSMF

There was no dissent from WG 6 members to invite itSMF-I to participate in WG 6 as a Liaison category C.

<b>WG 6 Resolution 002</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that JTC 1 approve the category C Liaison proposal from itSMF International in order for them to participate actively in WG 6, and on approval will request itSMF International present a liaison benefit case to the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat to forward to JTC 1 for approval.</b>
----------------------------	---

#### 6.1.3. Other external liaison issues

Members agreed to approach a number of international organizations to participate in WG 6 as Category C Liaison:

- **Information Security Forum**
- **The Company Directors Exchange**
- **OECD**
- **International Accounting Standards Board**
- **European commission's European Standards Board**
- **NORMAPME**

<b>WG 6 Resolution 003</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat invite the Information Security Forum (ISF) to participate in JTC 1/WG 6 as a category C liaison. The ISF will be asked to provide a statement of benefit for presentation to JTC 1 for liaison status C approval.</b>
----------------------------	---

It was also noted that not for profit organizations, audit organizations and government should also be targeted, and it was suggested that members produce a list of organizations to approach. The list could be considered at the next meeting.

It was agreed that all members would consider the end users of potential WG 6 products and solicit expressions of interest to participate in WG 6.

**6.2. ISO/IEC**  
**6.2.1. TC 215**  
**6.2.2. TC 68**

<b>WG 6 Resolution 004</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that's its secretariat request liaison from ISO/TC 215 and ISO/TC 68 using the good offices of JTC1/WG 6 members. If liaison is accepted by ISO/TC 215 and ISO/TC 68 the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat will advise the liaison status to JTC 1.</b>
----------------------------	---

**6.2.3. Other ISO/IEC liaison issues**

<b>WG 6 Resolution 005</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that its secretariat request liaison from ISO/TC 176. If accepted by ISO/TC 176 the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat will advise the liaison status to JTC 1 and provide documentation as necessary.</b>
----------------------------	---

Members agreed to consider other TC liaisons with a mutual interest in the work of WG 6 and convey this information to the WG 6 secretariat.

IEC liaisons was discussed however felt that they were more interested in technical standards.

**6.3. JTC1**  
**6.3.1. SC 7**

The SC 7 Liaison will be finalized at their forthcoming plenary. It was noted that the WG 6 convener has full access to SC7 documents and is on the SC 7 distribution list.

### **6.3.2. SC 27**

Members agreed to the Liaison between WG 6 and SC 27.

Members agreed to put an article in the ISO bulletin advertising the work of the group and the meeting.

## **7 Review of JTC1 IT Governance Study Group Report and Activities**

The members noted the JTC 1 IT Governance Study Group Report presented by the convener.

The group noted the Uninfo expert comments on the JTC 1 Study Group Report.

The members discussed the issue of “Information” and “Information Technology” and whether the scope of WG 6 should be changed to incorporate “Information” to reflect the evolution of “IT”. It was also suggested that there is an argument for removing the word “Corporate” from the WG 6 scope.

It was noted that as WG 6 is directly under JTC 1, at this stage must stay within the provided scope however, as corporate governance evolves so will the work of WG 6.

3 important questions were discussed:

- To what extent does the interface to “corporate governance” affect the work of WG 6?
- Are we talking governance of IT or governance of information and IT?
- What are the limitations in the JTC 1 provided scope?

## **8 Discussion and consideration of implications of WG 6 scope**

The members discussed the US NB response to the WG 6 scope.

US explained that they had 3 days to prepare the response. It specifically mentioned the role of SC 7/WG 1a, how the work of WG 6 relates to it, and the future of WG 1a as unresolved issues.

SC 7 stated that JTC1 Plenary, following this meeting, would consider role and scope of SC 7/WG 1A and that the outcome will align with the JTC1 resolution that created WG 6.

ISACA/ITGA noted that the US response recommends narrowing the focus of WG 6. He asked if as part of the discussion around governance and management are we going to restrict ourselves to only what the board is involved in. Any level of governance has to be derived from board authority anyway. Issues with where does governance stop. Concerns expressed with the concept of “operational governance”. He expressed the need for consistency between the work of WG 6 and SC 7/WG 1. Danger of inconsistency due to multiple groups working in the field e.g. WG 25 and “process governance”, leading to a lack of respect for the term “governance”. He sees the term “governance” being used loosely across industry, and we need to discuss the difference between management and governance. Senior managers and executives are responsible for the implementation of governance.

US noted that WG 6 is bound by its scope, as is SC 7/WG 1A, and that WG 6 must go through a process to move beyond those boundaries.

Australia agreed with ISACA/ITGA in that there is need for a clear understanding of what is governance and the relationship between governance and management. Australia’s initial understanding of the US response was that WG 6 should not exist and that the work should be repatriated to SC 7/WG 1a. He stated that he is now hearing words that are quite different to that. He was glad to hear that essentially we should be clear about our scope and if we perceive that our scope needs to be changed that we use the proper channels to deal with that. He hoped that all of the other bodies involved in the boundaries of our work would similarly follow correct processes and honour their boundaries or seek amendment under the JTC 1 directives. Essential that we do not have ISO standards giving different pictures of the same core concepts.

It was noted by Canada/SC 27 that since WG 6 was set up much has changed in the world in terms of governance due to regulations and shareholders. We are rediscovering the identity of governance. There is now an opportunity to redefine governance and management at this level. WG 6 has the opportunity to address some of the ambiguities surrounding governance and management.

The meeting went through the document point by point.

**Re: 1.1.**



ISACA/ITGA noted that it refers to the ISACA submission on ISO/IEC 38500 principles and that these thoughts should be considered in their proper context.

**Re 1.2.**

Convenor commented on semantics of governance and that we should be talking about governance of... rather than ...governance. It is arguable that we should not be placing qualifiers before the word "governance".

Australia noted that there is a serious problem with the over use and misuse of the term "governance", and there should be a distinction between management and governance. Governance is not something that is layered, it is pervasive. We need to ensure that the whole industry understands the distinction and is able to respond in a consistent way to these concepts.

UK believed the US has misunderstood the scope of WG 6. WG 6 does have the ability to develop new standards, which is contrary to the US opinion.

The Convener reminded members that the scope of WG 6 was provided by JTC 1, is inclusive, and that the definition of governance within that scope comes from ISO/IEC 38500. He wondered if the problem was the term "corporate". The term "corporate" is increasingly used in relation to larger organizations.

Australia explained the term corporate is now being interpreted narrowly and we now have a very good case to remove the term. It then removes the opportunity for people to misuse the term. Corporate governance is not a job it is a system.

Finland believed that WG 6 should keep the scope very wide and not narrow like the US opinion, and the standards that WG 6 produces should be for large and small organizations and government. Also Finland believes that WG 6 should concentrate on governance and not management as management was outside the WG 6 scope.

Canada supported the statement of Finland.

SC 7 noted you cannot have a firm boundary between governance and management, there will need to be overlaps and hooks, there will be interface but need t be defined.

ISACA/ITGI noted that the US opinion uses the ISACA statement as a reason to narrow the scope of WG 6, however, that was not the intent of

the ISACA statement, it was to ensure that terminologies were defined. We need to give guidance to ensure consistent use of the ideas.

Meeting agreed that the statement is not relevant because approval of NWIs will be required at the JTC1 level. Scope of WG 6 is wide enough to accommodate a broad range of work items.

**Re 1.3.**

Refers to ISACA submission. US position noted.

**Re 1.4**

Refers to ISACA submission. US position noted.

**Re 1.5.**

Refers to ISACA submission. US position noted.

**Re 2.**

Agreed that there were communication and timing issues. Comments on WG6N0011 noted and some issue taken with definition comments.

**Re 3.**

Most issues will be covered later in meeting.

Members agreed that they have resolved the issue of the US response and the document was noted.

**9 Discussion of principles governing work of the Working Group**

**Principle 1 - *Should be anchored in accepted fundamental concepts of Corporate Governance such as those of the OECD:***

The members agreed to this principle.

**Principle 2 - *Should be equally applicable to large and small organisations, both public and private, profit and not for profit:***

It was noted that the implementation guides would differ for large and small businesses and that a generic framework would need to be produced that can be subdivided as the scale of the organization goes up.

**Principle 3 - *should be “principles based” wherever appropriate and sensible:***

It was noted that the styles of ISO/IEC 38500 and ISO 15504 should be considered, however, more work will be required on this subject.

**Principle 4 - *should be as short and simple as appropriate:***

The members agreed to this principle.

**Principle 5 - *must use a common vocabulary with clear definitions:***

The members agreed to this principle.

**Principle 6 - *must conform to a common framework (e.g. Evaluate, Direct, Monitor) for both individual documents and sets of documents:***

Deferred discussion on this subject to agenda item 12.

**Principle 7 - *must be both internally and externally consistent, external consistency should be with other relevant products:***

The members agreed to this principle.

**Principle 8 - *should be able to be applied on a consistent basis without prescribing a particular organisation or process:***

The members agreed to this principle.

**Principle 9 - *must clearly show objectives and minimise exceptions:***

The members agreed to this principle.

**10. Initial consideration of work program including tentative schedule**

The members agreed that the initial work program will be the model/framework, the maintenance of ISO/IEC 38500, and the implementation guide. TR3 suggested as the appropriate vehicle for model/framework.

**11. Relationship with SC 7 and SC 27 work items and study groups**

**SC 7**

SC 7 informed the meeting that it is very clear from the JTC 1 resolution that the ISO/IEC 38500 and the associated guide have been transferred to WG 6, and explained that all that is required is for the transfer paperwork to be completed. SC 7 will investigate the transfer of the NWI for the ISO/IEC 38500 revision.

**SC 27**

The SC 27 project WD 27014 has a risk management based approach. SC 27 believes governance should be aligned to business objectives. This NWI is for directors and upper management, those that have to seek budgets for information security.

Members agreed that once the liaison between WG 6 and SC 27 is complete, WG 6 will be able to provide comments on this document for consideration at the next SC 27 meeting.

## 12 Presentations on models relating the Governance of IT and Management of IT

This item was used by members to get some consensus on a model relating to governance of IT, including information and information technology.

## 13 Initial work on model relating to Governance of IT and Management of IT including development of NP and consideration of responsibility for project

This item was used by members to present prepared material on models relating governance and management of IT:

1. "Taking Governance Forward"
2. "Framework for Governance and Management of IT"
3. "Basic Organizational Components"
4. "Technology Partners: Underpinned by Governance"

The meeting agreed that the model diagram in presentation 1 was easy to understand and that it would generally fit within their views of governance and that it coped well with organizations of all sizes, with or without boards.

The meeting noted presentation 4, but thought standards in this field were outside the scope of WG 6 and indeed any ISO or JTC 1 committee.

Members agreed that a Project Team be set up in order to draft an NWI draft a model relating to Governance of IT and Management of IT.

### Presentations relevant to other work items

SC 7 presented ISO/IEC NP 29151. Its purpose is to address the unresolved comments in the ISO/IEC 38500 ballot process. SC 7 offered to transfer the project to WG 6. It was suggested that a change of number, title and target dates should be requested during the transfer process.

The members agreed to set up a Project Team to look after the maintenance of ISO/IEC 38500 and ISO/IEC NP 29151.

<b>WG 6 Resolution 006</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends JTC 1 endorse the transfer of the JTC 1/SC 7 project <i>ISO/IEC NP 29151 Software and System Engineering -- Corporate Governance of Information Technology</i> to JTC 1/WG 6 on the confirmation of an appropriate JTC 1/SC 7 resolution on this item,</b>
----------------------------	---

	<b>and ensure that the timetable is reset to reflect the date of the transfer.</b>
--	--

<b>WG 6 Resolution 007</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends JTC 1 endorse the transfer of the JTC1/SC 7 project <i>ISO/IEC NP 29184 Information Technology -- Corporate Governance of IT Implementation Guide</i> to WG 6 on the confirmation of an appropriate JTC 1/SC 7 resolution on this item, and ensure that the timetable is reset to reflect the date of the transfer.</b>
----------------------------	--

WD ISO/IEC 29184 project was presented to the meeting. Its purpose is to create a guide in the application of the ISO/IEC 38500 concerning Corporate Governance of IT, and used established ISO terminology. Members agreed that a Project Team should be established to work on this NWI.

ISACA presented a submission which are suggestions to improve ISO/IEC 38500. ISACA do not expect a response and believe that most of the issues will be picked up in the project groups. They believe that one issue that needs to be addressed is the link to risk management. Risk should be of interest to boards as it should drive the control levels. It was suggested that ISACA submit the document as contribution to the project team on ISO/IEC 38500 maintenance.

SC 27 noted that it is also interested in risk management.

It was noted that WG 6 products should look at harmonizing with ISO 31000 and ISO 27005.

The Convener noted that there has been no market development in standardization in this field, and JTC 1 has tasked WG 6 to conduct market research. He suggests that a project team be set up to conduct the research. He noted that there was very good market analysis conducted by SC 7/WG 25. WG 6 members will receive a copy once it is released. The members agreed to set up a project team to conduct market research.

SC 27 announced that the Global Standards Collaboration (GSC) will be meeting in July (GSC14) and have requested a presentation on governance from the Standards Council of Canada (SCC). It will be presented by the Canadian JTC 1 Head of Delegation. The SCC will also present the WG 6 governance model if ready. Charles noted that JTC 1 will not be presenting to the GSC, however, they will be attending to answer questions. It is also a possibility that the ITU-T will be requesting liaison status with WG 6.

## 15. Initial development of projects and NPs

The members agreed to set up 5 project teams:

### **Project 1: Model relating to Governance of IT and Management of IT**

The Convener explained that the genesis of the model project is the JTC 1 resolution establishing WG 6. His interpretation of the model is a summary model showing the position of governance, governance systems, management and management systems, and it should position who is governing on behalf of whom. There is also a need to position governance of IT with corporate governance in general.

The members agreed that a working draft should be with WG 6 by the end of July for review and approval. It will then be sent to JTC 1 by Standards Australia as an NWIP at the end of August for letter ballot.

### **Project 2: Glossary of Terms and definitions**

It was noted that both JTC 1 and SC 7/WG 22 are producing a vocabulary document and the project team should liaise with those groups.

### **Project 3: Market research**

### **Project 4: Ongoing maintenance of 38500**

Drivers for us to make a decision:

- Review the original NWI for restrictions; this will determine the impact of any required revision
- Review the implications with the inclusion of “information” into scope
- Review the implications of the removal of “Corporate” out of scope
- Review the outstanding country issues
- ISACA

This project requires the outcomes of the following:

- Market research
- Working Draft Model
- consensus on the working draft by the WG;
- Gap analysis – no gap analysis will be completed in time.
- Is it evolution or is it revision

The project timeframe reset of ISO/IEC NP 29151 is crucial to the work of this project moving forward.

### **Project 5: Implementation Guide project**

It was agreed that a draft should be available for the next meeting of WG 6.

The Convener asked that the Project Teams to commit themselves to having their documents to WG 6 members in 60 days. These documents will need to be with the JTC 1 secretariat at the latest by Friday September 10th.

The Convener explained that there is no expectation from JTC 1 for WG 6 to provide NWIs at the next plenary however, he would like to provide them with a flavor of what WG 6 will be producing.

Members discussed the inclusion of “Information” in the WG 6 scope. It was noted that the buyers of ISO/IEC 38500 see it only for IT only and not for the output of that IT.

The Convener reminded members that the JTC 1 definition of IT does not include “Information” however, ISO/IEC 38500 does include “Information” in its definitions.

It was noted that the inclusion of the term “Information” would provide more specific direction to Boards as WG 6 is dealing with information and the mechanism of systems.

The members agreed to seek clarification from JTC 1 on the inclusion of “Information” in the WG 6 scope.

<b>WG 6 Resolution 008</b>	<b>To ensure the proper understanding of scope for users and the public, WG 6 request JTC 1 to approve the following clarification to include “Information” in the JTC 1 scope of “Corporate governance of IT”, to read “Corporate Governance of Information and IT”.</b>
----------------------------	---

The Convener added that he would like to remove the term “Corporate” from the scope as the word corporate has a different meaning now.

It was noted that by removing “Corporate” it would allow small and medium businesses to adopt the standards of WG 6. It was also recognized that the word “corporate” is difficult to translate into languages other than English.

Members agreed that a document should be drafted requesting JTC 1 to remove “Corporate” from the scope of WG 6.

The Convener explained that if the scope is changed by JTC 1 he would prefer that WG 6 use the term “Governance of IT and not “IT Governance”.

<b>WG 6 Resolution 009</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends to JTC 1 that it be granted a delegation of authority to provide recommendations to JTC 1 based on consensus achieved by official electronic and/or teleconferencing means.</b>
----------------------------	--

Members agreed that further recommendations will be proposed and agreed via email and a recommendation will be made to JTC 1 for a delegation of authority to provide JTC1 with recommendations achieved by official electronic and/or teleconferencing means.

Members agreed that work should be conducted electronically in order to move the projects on.

Members agreed to present Recommendation 009 to their respective National Bodies and JTC 1 HoDs requesting their support to the Recommendation.

#### **16. Summary of progress**

Achieved the basis of a NWI on a Model relating to Governance of IT and Management of IT.

Achieved the basis for a NWI for maintenance of ISO/IEC 38500.

NWI on the implementation guide.

#### **17. Preparation of resolutions for JTC1**

Draft recommendations will be forwarded to WG 6 members after the meeting.

#### **18. Consideration of future meeting schedule**

SC 7 offered the possibility of co-locating the WG 6 meetings with the annual SC 7 plenary.

A meeting plan for 2010 will be discussed at the next meeting.

The Convener told the members that he would prefer that WG 6 hold only one face to face meeting per year.

Members agreed to hold the next meeting in October at a venue to be determined.

#### **19. Appreciations**



JTC 1/WG 6 expressed its appreciation to the National Body of UK for hosting the inaugural WG 6 meeting in London.

JTC 1/WG 6 expressed its appreciation to the National Body of UK for holding a function for WG 6 members on Monday evening, and the invitation to the IT Governance Conference function on Wednesday evening.

JTC 1/WG 6 expressed its appreciation to its Secretariat, Andrew McKay for his continued efforts.

JTC 1/WG 6 expresses its appreciation to all of its Officers and contributors for their efforts in support of the work of JTC 1/WG 6.

Annex 1

Resolutions adopted at the 1st meeting of JTC 1 WG 6 London 18-20  
May 2009

<b>WG 6 Resolution 001</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that JTC 1 approve the category C Liaison proposal from ISACA/ITGI in order for them to participate actively in JTC 1/WG 6, and requests the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat forward the ISACA liaison benefit case to JTC 1 for approval.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>
<b>WG 6 Resolution 002</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that JTC 1 approve the category C Liaison proposal from itSMF International in order for them to participate actively in WG 6, and on approval will request itSMF International present a liaison benefit case to the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat to forward to JTC 1 for approval.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>
<b>WG 6 Resolution 003</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat invite the Information Security Forum (ISF) to participate in JTC 1/WG 6 as a category C liaison. The ISF will be asked to provide a statement of benefit for presentation to JTC 1 for liaison status C approval.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>
<b>WG 6 Resolution 004</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that's its secretariat request liaison from ISO/TC 215 and ISO/TC 68 using the good offices of JTC1/WG 6 members. If liaison is accepted by ISO/TC 215 and ISO/TC 68 the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat will advise the liaison status to JTC 1.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>
<b>WG 6 Resolution 005</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends that its secretariat request liaison from ISO/TC 176. If accepted by ISO/TC 176 the JTC 1/WG 6 secretariat will advise the liaison status to JTC 1 and provide documentation as necessary.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>
<b>WG 6 Resolution 006</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 requests JTC 1 to endorse the transfer of the JTC 1/SC 7 project <i>ISO/IEC NP 29151 Software and System Engineering -- Corporate Governance of Information Technology</i> to JTC 1/WG 6 on the confirmation of an appropriate JTC 1/SC 7 resolution on this item.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>

<b>WG 6 Recommendation 007</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends JTC 1 endorse the transfer of the JTC1/SC 7 project <i>ISO/IEC NP 29184 Information Technology -- Corporate Governance of IT Implementation Guide</i> to WG 6 on the confirmation of an appropriate JTC 1/SC 7 resolution on this item, and ensure that the timetable is reset to reflect the date of the transfer.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>
<b>WG 6 Recommendation 008</b>	<b>To ensure the proper understanding of scope for users and the public, WG 6 request JTC 1 to approve the following clarification to include “Information” in the JTC 1 definition of “Corporate governance of IT”, to read “Corporate Governance of Information and IT”.</b>  <b>Unanimous</b>
<b>WG 6 Recommendation 009</b>	<b>JTC 1/WG 6 recommends to JTC 1 that it be granted a delegation of authority to provide recommendations to JTC 1 based on consensus achieved by official electronic and/or teleconferencing means.</b>