

Webinar of 2026-10-01
Webinar 2 'The EN Development Process - First batch of changes'

1	What about CEN lead parallel development?	For CEN lead, the handling of ENQ and FV are managed by ISO Central Secretariat and the preparation for ENQ/DIS and FV/FDIS follow the same rules as an ISO lead project.
2	Despite mentioned ISO is not in the content today.	Not relevant.
3	Why is necessary to keep the translation phase for the Enquiry? It reduces the standard development time. I think it is better to proceed with the translation just for FV. All experts working in standardization are writing standards on English. It is important to have the main input from Enquiry in the standardization language.	French and German remain official languages of CEN and CENELEC. BTs decided that it was important to strive to provide the translations on time for the Enquiry.
4	Has AFNOR validated the change to launch the Enquiry without the French translation? It does not seem to comply with the French legislation on the use of French language.	The Technical Boards - where also France is represented - have formally approved this process.
5	Nearly all the time a CEN Enquiry is approved (positive) but with some good technical comments that the TC/WG agrees to accept and incorporate in the CEN Enquiry draft, so a FV procedure will be necessary.	Thank you, this is indeed part of the mindset change we want to introduce with batch 2. The goal is to defer comments to a next revision where possible and proceed to publication of the ENQ draft.
6	Regarding batch 2 change "Mindset change: a negative vote on the publication shall be explicitly communicated through a negative ENQ (or FV) vote and accompanied by comments", does this mean that a national TC's vote on adoption should be raised in the national foreword of the adoption?	Question is not clear.
7	How will the TC leadership communicate if a (FV) is required within six weeks after the Enquiry stage: by correspondence or through the submission interface?	We are working on an automatic workflow to avoid exchange by correspondence and limit risk of miscommunications.
8	What about the possibility to start drafting during the Preliminary stage?	This is part of batch 2 of changes. More information will follow in due time.

9	Where is the dedicated webpage that communicates about all EN changes?	You can find these on the CEN and CENELEC Expert Sites: https://experts.cen.eu/key-initiatives/improving-the-en-ts-and-tr-development-process and https://experts.cenelec.eu/key-initiatives/improving-the-en-ts-and-tr-development-process/
10	When the NWIP is shortened from 8 to 4 weeks, is that optional or an obligation? Because at national level we always deduct 2 weeks of the voting period, so that leaves 2 weeks for national input gathering and finding experts. Please realise that is a rather short period.	This aspect was discussed in detail at Technical Boards level. As challenging as it might look, CEN and CENELEC Members are committed to make this change possible at national level too.
11	In my opinion, the 60 weeks' time gain in Scenario 2 are overinflated and shouldn't be communicated in this way. You're currently comparing the automatic skip of the FV according to the new process to a case where the FV is carried out although it could be skipped even in the current process	Correct, but statistics show that currently FV is skipped in very few cases. We want to revert this trend and make publication after ENQ the norm - with FV taking place in exceptional cases. This will require a cultural mindset change, which will require active effort from TCs.
12	For standards intended to be harmonized, the HAS assessment would still be needed, and sometimes it is very time consuming because the Consultant is not always available. Do you have plans for improving that matter?	This process is not impacting the HAS assessments as those steps are covered in the areas prior to ENQ, during ENQ and FV.
13	Who will be in charge of French and German translations under the revised system?	There are no changes in the preparation of the translations. DIN, DKE and AFNOR are in charge.
14	In my experience, the FV is rarely skipped because there are technical comments in most ENQ. I don't think this is going to change	There are cases of ENQs without technical comments, so it is possible and there are cases.
15	When it comes to harmonized standards, the Commission is the bottleneck, not the standardisation process. After an EN is published, it can take months—and sometimes years—for the standard to be published in the OJEU as an hEN. Do you know if the Commission also reviewing its internal process to get the standards released more quickly?	Not relevant.

16	At national level, how the mirror committee will receive the document for enquiry for the national preparation period? Will it be dispatched via ISolution balloting portal?	
17	Will the FV happen automatically if technical comments arrive during ENQ or is it required to start that process manually?	Technical comments do not necessarily result in technical changes to the final draft - also in the current process. It is the prerogative of the TC to decide how to handle those comments and whether they can be deferred to a later revision.
18	Speed up in timeline helps to implement faster the EN standards :-)	Not relevant.
19	If drafting can already begin during the NWIP ballot, will the work item under consultation also be available in OSD for processing prior to the end of the NWIP ballot?	Yes, that is the plan i.e. to start drafting in OSD.
20	A risk I can see with the reduction of the NP ballot is to have no support to actively participate in the development of standard or specification, with the need to still extend the process of obtain the needed extra participants. The global benefit may be null in a lot of cases.	Not relevant.
21	So, is it useful to start the - in our case - German translation directly after 30.99 (submission of draft to CCMC)?	No, translation shall take place on the edited version by CCMC
22	DO you have data on what percentage of standards have no technical comments at the ENQ stage. I suspect that it is currently a low number	We do not have data because there is no electronic tool to track this aspect. But yes, in the majority of cases there are technical comments.
23	If no TC feedback is received within the six weeks after a positive Enquiry and CCMC proceeds to publication, how will it be verified that all Enquiry comments have actually been considered and that no technical changes are still under discussion?	It is the responsibility of the TC leadership to make sure that comments have been addressed and that a way forward is communicated to CCMC.
24	Can you please update the CEN Timeframe Calculator so that it reflects all timeline changes across every stage, including updated target dates, durations, etc?	The calculator is updated as of 6 October.

25	certain timing are not synchronized - eg. LCA needs additional time, which is not foreseen at ISO but should be considered when we define gates. Or certain process time could work in parallel, which we do currently sequentially ending up in additional time not considered	Not relevant.
26	I may have missed this, but can you confirm that the exceptional Formal Vote is triggered whenever technical comments are received on the ENQ, irrespective of whether the technical comments stem from a Member voting positively on the ENQ ?	Technical comments do not necessarily result in technical changes to the final draft - also in the current process. It is the prerogative of the TC to decide how to handle those comments and whether they can be deferred to a later revision.
27	Standards from our Technical Committee are often used for limit value monitoring and in European legislation. Important technical corrections are frequently raised during the ENquiry process. There this new mindset shows a high a risk of postponing comments until the next revision and proceeding directly with the publication of the ENQ draft.	The TC will remain in the driving seat and will decide how to handle technical comment.
28	".. statistics show that currently FV is skipped in very few cases. We want to revert this trend and make publication after ENQ the norm - with FV taking place in exceptional cases. This will require a cultural mindset change, which will require active effort from TCs." How realistic is this? It is very hard to get agreement at national level on the content of these documents as many can impact economic operators. Resistance is likely TO INCREASE as the process is implemented. It is wrong to characterise this as a "mindset" problem, when it is often at root an economic problem.	live answered.
29	https://standards.cencenelec.eu/FlexibleTimeframeCalculator/	Changes are going to be implemented as of 6 October.
30	Is it basically the concept that the TC/WG evaluates whether or not to have a FV based on the ENQ comments? If not, who makes that decision?	The TC leadership will communicate to CCMC about publishing or holding Formal Vote, based on discussions within WG and/or TC.

31	Does the possibility for 9-months-tolerance still remain?	Yes, and we encourage TCs to use it whenever target dates cannot be met. Of course, the one-change option shall be the first route to be considered.
32	If a currently ongoing Enquiry ends after October 5th will the Formal Vote be optional? This would have a huge impact on voting behaviour and needs to be clearly communicated	The change about publication after ENQ is part of batch 2, entering into force in Q1/2027. So, the answer is no.
33	I believe HAS assessments for harmonised standards are currently sequential, any change to this, e.g. will they be more parallel?	No changes to the sequence of Quality Check and HAS assessment as currently foreseen by the Innovative Process will be introduced.
34	The FV is skipped by default even if there are positive technical comments?	No document can go to publication with technical changes introduced after ENQ. Again, technical comments do not necessarily have to result in technical changes in the publication. They could be deferred to a future revision. This decision is a prerogative of the TC.
35	Is there an overview of contacts for process related topics? For example: Whom do I have to contact if a FV is required?	A workflow is being developed for this purpose, and you will be informed in due time.
36	Just to be clear, the need to communicate to CCMC that a FV will be necessary starts in Q1/2027 (not from 5 Oct 2026)?	Correct. This is why it was mentioned in batch 2.
37	With ISO having extended the tolerance period from 9 months to up to 12 months, could you please clarify whether CEN intends to retain the current 9-month tolerance request or align with the revised ISO timeframe? In the same context, ISO has reduced the permitted duration of a PWI from 36 months to 24 months. Is CEN considering a similar amendment, or will the existing CEN provisions continue to apply?	
38	Will negative ENQ votes change anything on the process of skipping the FV?	No, negative ENQ will still have to be followed either by a 2nd ENQ or a FV. TC can also decide to abandon the WI.

39	So, if we receive comments to enquiry, is up to TC if to do or not the FV? It is not done by default?	Correct. The TC decides on the follow-up process.
40	When will the updated target date calculator be available to be used?	Changes are going to be implemented as of 6 October.
41	Is it needed da TC decision on that? or the FV is done by default if the draft receive comments at the enquiry?	This is all part of batch 2 changes and will be communicated in due time.
42	When may we expect the publication of the new Guide 36 on the CEN website?	I would suggest contacting the sectoral PM on this matter.
43	Can you post the registration for batch 2 webinar?	The registrations for the webinars about the 2 nd batch of changes are not yet open. We will communicate to all CEN and CENELEC Technical Bodies in due time.