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NOT how the specification happens.

A problem is identified and a volunteer climbs some mountain and interacts with a higher power
The higher power delivers a complete and perfect specification to the volunteer.
The volunteer delivers the perfect specification to the community.
Also NOT how the specification is created. A need is dropped in the middle of a clowder of cats. The cats may or may not do something about it.
It is something that comes from a community pursuing their separate businesses and wants who come together to identify common needs and come to a compromise that helps all.
The formal process for a need that fits into an existing workgroup flows from need to the specific group via the R&D workgroup and the technical committee.
The process for a need that requires a new workgroup includes the RESO board who charters a new workgroup to work on the need.
Individual workgroup chairs have some flexibility to keep changes within the workgroup where the changes are from an existing specification. Data Dictionary also has a slightly different process to add fields where the field is submitted to the chair and it is discussed and adopted at a workgroup meeting. However, the collection of fields that makes up a data dictionary version does follow the process above.
The change proposal is published to the workgroup for comment and discussion before inclusion in the specification document. Here’s a portion of an adopted change for the RETS 1.x with the information and synopsis shown.
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**Synopsis**

See the attached document under the tools menu for the original submission, including the diagrams. We are working to resolve the issue.

This proposal adds support for Child Rows to the RETS Update Transaction.
The changes in the proposal section are incorporated into a new version of one of the standards. New text is shown in green and strike-through shows text that has been removed.
The change may span several sections of a standard.
Concrete -> Comment

• Publish to the workgroup for comment
• Collect the comments
• Resolve the conflicts between proposal and comments

Once the initial edit is completed, the new version of the specification is published to the workgroup for comment.
Here’s some comments for the change, applied in the specification document - comments may also be applied earlier to the change proposal document.
Comment -> Revision -> Voting

• Revised proposal published
• Comments on revision
• Electronic vote (optional in-person or teleconference vote)

Comments are incorporated to a revised version of the standard as appropriate. The cycle may repeat more than once. When completed, the chair bring the new version of the specification to the workgroup for a vote to recommend.
Once the workgroup has recommended a new version of the specification, it is sent for review to the technical committee. When the technical committee is satisfied that the change does not have other side effects to other workgroups, it is sent to the board for adoption.
Board -> Specification

• RESO Board adopts the change into the standard

The RESO board has the final say in the adoption of the new version of the specification.
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