



**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7
Software Engineering
Secretariat: CANADA (SCC)**

**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC7 N1522
June 17, 1996**

DOC TYPE: Minutes of Meeting

**TITLE: Minutes of Meeting
JTC1/SC7/WG10
Prague, Czech Republic
27-31 May 1996**

SOURCE: WG10 Convenor

PROJECT: 07.29

STATUS:

REFERENCES:

ACTION ID: FYI or ACT

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: Electronic: SC7_AG; Disk: P, O and L

MEDIUM: E-Mail - uuencoded Word ; Diskette - Word

NO. OF PAGES: 16

DISK: 7

WG10/N098

Title: Minutes of WG10 Meeting

Prague, 27-31 May 1996

Source: Convenor JTC1/SC7/WG10

Action: Information

Date: 31 May 1996

1 Attendance

An attendance list for the WG10 meeting is documented in WG10/N091.

2 Minutes

A brief opening plenary meeting was held on Monday 27th May to determine logistical arrangements and to provide a brief status report coming into the Prague meeting.

The work of the OWG was progressed during the week, both by OWG members in Prague and also by those members not present in Prague due to the work expected to have been already completed.

A full status report from the OWG is provided in document WG10/N097 which details a full history of the OWG, the current status of work performed and a schedule of outstanding activities. Following completion of these activities the OWG will be disbanded.

On Wednesday/Thursday 29th/30th May, WG10 proceeded to start work on recommended changes to N017R provided by the US national body.

Due to a deadlock in diametrically opposed views as to the outcome and status of a resulting document from the proposed revisions to N017R, the following options were drafted for presentation to the plenary session of WG10 on Friday 31st May to gain consensus on a decision to move forward. The following notes are relevant:

Note 1a: The US have a member body position that the WG10 PDTRs should not be registered for ballot until a revised requirements document is approved.

Note 1b: Certain of the options may carry a consequential delay in registration of the PDTRs for ballot and commencement of SPICE trials if the US member body position were adopted by WG10 or SC7.

Note 1c: There is no requirement in JTC1 procedures (and clarified by the SC7 secretariat) for PDTRs to be registered only with an associated revised requirements specification.

Option 1

Modify N017R with an official change request [through SC7 from a National Body]

WG10 would [modify, review] and approve the document which would then be submitted by resolution of WG10 to SC7 for review and approval [ballot].

[Other national body changes may have to be sought at the SC7 level if a change request were received]

Option 2

Provide a supplementary document (delta) to N017R documenting all design decisions and consequential potential changes from initial requirements [revised and/or new] from start of project to date by referencing all relevant meeting resolutions, disposition of comments and relevant WG10 N documents.

This document would be a WG10 document, but distributed through SC7 to national bodies as an information document.

Option 3

Changes to requirements [in N017R] subsequent to the PDTR ballot registration should be [highlighted and] documented in the disposition report. [Such revised disposition reports may need to be reviewed and approved by the whole of WG10 prior to submission and registration of the PDTRs]

Option 4

Do nothing because any Requirements document is non-binding

Option 5

(Continue the WG10 tradition and) create a new requirements specification document that reflects the (next) product set [PDTRs]. Submit [this requirements specification document] with the documents [PDTRs] for the next ballot as information documents. Continue to maintain [the requirements specification document] as a living document.

Prior to the plenary meeting, off-line discussions between the WG10 convenor and the US delegation brought forward a further option (Option 6) which appeared to have the support of a number of other national delegates. This option was therefore put forward and unanimous agreement was reached by all WG10 delegates to adopt option 6 below (as finally amended in plenary session).

Option 6

A new WG10 requirements specification supplementary document will be created and maintained. The purpose of this document is to (a) note changes to N017R requirements and preserve their rationale and (b) provide commentary on interpretation of N017R requirements following each completed ballot comment resolution.

This document will be used in a number of key activities, including (a) preparing for and conducting trials and (b) aiding disposition of ballot comments. This document may also be useful to National Bodies in formulating ballot comments.

A team will be chartered to create the initial draft of the requirements specification supplementary document with the intent to distribute it for review to WG10 one month prior to the WG10 Mexico meeting in October. This team will be convened by the project editor (Peter Simms), co-convened by Dave Kitson, and will include any other interested WG10 members.

The requirements specification supplementary document will be kept up to date to reflect the actual content of product set ballot releases. An updated document will be released as part of ballot materials or as soon as possible thereafter so that National Bodies may use the document to facilitate their review of the product set. Since the next ballot is likely to begin before the first version of this new document is available, WG10 will take reasonable measures to make it available to National Bodies during the upcoming PDTR ballot.

The requirements specification supplementary document will be distributed to SC7 for information purposes.

The requirements specification supplementary document will not alter the scope of project 7.29 as defined in the new work item proposal (JTC1/N2104).

Following unanimous adoption of option 6, a team was established to prepare the requirements specification supplementary document consisting of Peter Simms (convenor), Dave Kitson (co-convenor), Terry Rout, Al Graydon, Bob Smith, Peter Krauth, Harry Barker and Arnoldo Diaz.

The team remains open for any member of the WG10 to participate. Mary Campbell the US delegation was specifically invited.

Revised working drafts of parts 2, 3 and 4 were distributed following baselining by the OWG. Working copies of part 5 were made available on diskette to those who had an urgent need.

A status update was provided by the SPICE Management Board Chair and the SPICE International Trials Coordinator on relevant activities and decisions made. For information purposes only a brief snapshot is provided below. SPICE resources are provided with relevant information through defined channels within the SPICE project.

By a request from the SC7 secretariat, the WG10 convenor asked the SPICE International Trials Coordinator to provide the WG10 convenor with a brief information document and powerpoint slides (if available) on the SPICE trials for further distribution to the SC7 advisory group membership within one month.

SPICE Management Board

- a SPICE policies document is prepared for distribution to all SPICE resources
- method, model and tool providers may make their products known to the SPICE trials according to criteria established in a new policy and may have this information placed on the official SPICE WWW
- any problems on availability of PDTRs for SPICE trials at a national level should be informed to the WG10 convenor for potential action

SPICE Trials

- trying to re-focus on trials objectives
- master document list is being produced
- significant discussions taking place on trials operations to make things run smoothly around the regions
- activities still to be completed are design, publicity, materials, briefing, trial data records, trial operations
- trials planned start date is 1 September 1996

3 Other Business

Mr Terry Rout informed WG10 that a plaque was to be erected at the SQI in Australia in memory of Michelle Neilson and Greg Jenkins, funded by the generous donations given by WG10 at the Paris meeting.

4 Dates of Next Meetings

07-11 October 1996, Acapulco, Mexico (agenda and joining instructions are contained in documents WG10/N092 and WG10/N093)

March 1997, Singapore

09-13 June 1997, Walnut Creek, California, USA (SC7 Plenary)

October 1997, Fuji Mountain, Tokyo, Japan (to be confirmed)

5 Post Meeting Note

At the SC7 plenary the following relevant resolution was passed:

'JTC1/SC7 hereby formalise its policy that all multi-part standards shall have a prime project editor who has prime responsibility for the maintenance of the multi-part document as per JTC1 Directives, and has also the responsibility and authority to ensure consistency and harmonisation of the multi-part document. AT this point in time, the following projects have prime project editors:

- 7.13 M.Azuma (Japan)
- 7.28 J.Berube (Canada)
- 7.29 P.Simms (UK)
- 7.31 P.Morris (Australia)

Title: **Report From the Other Working Group(OWG)**

Source: **Convenor JTC 1/SC 7/WG 10/OWG**

Action: **Information**

Date: **31 May 1996**

Report To Working Group 10

Status of the Work Performed by The OWG From November 1995 to May 1996

Creation Of the OWG in Pilanesberg - November 1995

This is a report to JTC1/SC7 Working Group 10 committee on the status of the work being performed by the OWG(Other Working Group). This report is an update of the report WG10/N083, "Report from Other Working Group (OWG)" which was distributed to all WG10 delegates in Paris in February, 1996. The OWG was setup by JTC1/SC7 WG10 at its Pilanesberg meeting in South Africa in November, 1995. The main purpose of the OWG was to act upon decisions taken at the Pilanesberg meeting regarding the overall architecture of the draft Standard for Software Process Assessment. The details of the proposal are contained in WG10/N080, "Proposal for changes to the Architecture" and this document formed the basis for the work performed by the OWG.

In addition to WG10/N080, the OWG kept in mind the various national body concerns expressed at the Pilanesberg meeting, and addressed these as appropriate. It may be noted that some of the concerns expressed were in conflict with each other, and every effort was made to find solutions acceptable to all participants.

OWG Activities After Pilanesberg(Nov./95) and Prior to Paris(Feb./96)

Following the Pilanesberg meeting, the OWG established a series of weekly telephone conference calls (usually every Thursday) beginning in late November, 1995 and continuing up to the Paris meeting in February, 1996. These calls facilitated the work that was tasked the OWG to perform from Pilanesberg. The OWG team consisted of a Core set of team members who participated on a regular basis on the conference calls and performed the writing/changes to the defined scope of documents(Parts 2, 3,4 & 5). In addition, the OWG team included a set of Extended Core(Ecore) team members who were able to participate in the OWG Core team activities, were kept up to date on the activities of the OWG team by receiving the weekly minutes of the weekly conference calls as well as any documents that were being produced by the OWG team. The OWG progressed work on the defined document set from the end of November, 1995 up to the Paris meeting in February, 1996. The work of the OWG between these 2 meetings focused mainly on the Reference Model with work on the Exemplar Model also being initiated during this period of time.

Input to the Paris meeting from the OWG was a completed redraft of Part 2 of the draft standard which was consistent with the requirements set out in the WG10/N080 document. This draft was Part 2 Version 1.01, document WG10/N082 which was a major revision of Part 2 Version 1.00 which had been distributed for PDTR Registration ballot. The new version(1.01) was circulated to all delegates of WG10 by email prior to the Paris meeting. This new version(1.01) of Part 2 contained a major revision of the framework for process assessment, together with new requirements for the migration and/or harmonization of existing or new models. In light of the magnitude of the changes, the name of the document was changed to "A Reference Model for Processes and Process Capability".

The scope of the revision of the changes to the framework in Part 2 for Paris included:

- **Alignment with ISO 12207**
The process dimension of the model was restructured to obtain a mapping to the processes defined in ISO 12207 and this mapping was explicitly stated in Notes sections. In line with the evolutionary approach requested in WG10/N080, existing process names were retained wherever possible. The number of processes were reduced from 35 to 31.
- **Simplified Process Descriptions**
The process descriptions were simplified by removing the concept of Base Practices (BP's) and ensuring that each process description contained: a statement of purpose which stated at a high level the overall objectives of performing the process, a series of goals of the process which represented in measurable terms what had to be achieved in order to realize the objectives and one or more notes providing further information about the process and its relation to ISO 12207.
- **Restructured Capability Dimension**
The five levels of maturity were redefined into a series of Capability attributes which represented attributes of the process that demonstrate the achievement of the level of capability for a particular process. There was a total of nine capability attributes, with one at level 1 and two at each of the other levels (two through five).
- **Migration/Harmonization Requirements**
In line with the requirements set out in WG10/N080, Part 2 contained a set of requirements for the migration and/or harmonization of new or existing models for process assessment.

Proceeding into Paris, OWG had not completed redrafts of any of the other parts of the Standard, but had performed some preliminary work on the scope and likely changes necessary to Parts 3, 4 and 5. The view of the OWG going into Paris was to remove all normative elements from Part 5 into Part 3, and that Part 5 should become exclusively guidance material, containing all Base and Generic Practices and the current set of indicators, mapped to the new framework. This would necessitate a change to the name of Part 5. In addition, it was viewed that Parts 3 and 4 would need significant revision and expansion, and that Part 3 would become the key part of the standard in terms of conformance. Only Parts 2 and 3 would be normative, with Part 2 defining requirements for models, and Part 3 defining requirements for conformant assessments. The principle issues unresolved going into Paris were: a proposal for radical change to the capability dimension which proposes that the concept of capability levels be eliminated and a radical proposal for deleting the Management Process category (formerly the Project Process category) in favor of a single Management process.

OWG Activities In Paris(Feb./96)

The OWG team continued to progress Parts 2 through 5 in Paris based on the strategy established in the document WG10/N083, "Report from Other Working Group (OWG)". A series of OWG task groups were set up in Paris to progress these parts of the Standard as follows:

- Part 2 - Reference Model for Process Assessment

This task group was headed up by Allan Graydon whose purpose was to examine the new version(1.01) of Part 2 taking into consideration and resolving the appropriate comments from the WD ballot for the new Part 2. Work proceeded during the week in Paris on this task, first by determining which of the "old" Part 2 ballot comments were still applicable to the "new" Part 2 and then provided detailed resolution on these applicable comments. All of the applicable comments had resolutions documented against them in one of the following categories (editorial, accepted, rejected or no longer applicable). The resolution actions were documented and provided to the WG10 convenor. In addition to resolving comments still applicable to version 1.01 of Part 2, a number of comments had been received on version 1.01. Note: Version 1.01 had been emailed to all WG10 delegates prior to Paris. These comments were also reviewed and resolved as applicable. The nature of these new comments provided the OWG with a favorable view of the revised version of Part 2 due to the fact the none of the new comments were deemed to be "major". One of the concerns coming into Paris was to determine the need for a Management Process category. It was agreed by consensus that this category would remain in the model with some minor revisions.

Another task group which was headed up by Mac Craigmyle had the task of refining the Process Capability dimension of the model. This group also had the task of resolving one of the major concerns coming into Paris, the proposal to eliminate the concept of capability levels. This subgroup did come to consensus on the following: the concept of capability levels would remain, the concept of goal statements would be eliminated in favor of a series of result statements and the wording of the attributes statements were refined.

Part 2 was progressed in Paris with the resulting document being Version 1.02 which was released on February 28, 1996 containing the above task groups Paris activities and the comment resolution efforts.

- Part 5 - Exemplar Model Revisions

This task group was headed up by Helen Thomson whose purpose was to rework the guidance material from Part 5, incorporate the base and generic practices from the old Part 2, restructure the material to align to the new model and to resolve any applicable comments from the WD ballot for Parts 2 & 5 as applicable. The main effort of this team was to modify the old Part 5 to align to the new model. This was performed by subteams for the process and the capability dimensions of the model. An additional task was to resolve comments still applicable from old Parts 2 & 5, this work was performed by another subteam who by the end of the week had documented the resolutions of all of the applicable comments in a spreadsheet which was handed over to the convenor of WG10.

- Migration Requirements

This task group was headed up by Arnaldo Diaz whose purpose was to consolidate the migration requirements of the normative elements of the various parts of the standard documents. This small group completed their task which was incorporated as Section 7 into the new Part 2.

- Parts 3 and 4 Comment Resolution

This task group was headed by Harry Barker whose purpose was to review and resolve the remainder of comments pending from Pilanesberg and to incorporate the impact of any changes resulting from the new Part 2. Comment resolution on these documents was completed in Paris with new drafts being completed. However, the full effects of the changes from Parts 2 and 5 could not be fully implemented.

In addition to the work highlighted above, in order to fully communicate and document the changes that were being made to the standard based on the restructuring of Parts 2, 3, 4 & 5, the document WG10/N088, "Restructuring Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5, was produced. This document captured the key points of the revised structure of Parts 2-5 and the rationale taken in arriving at that structure. It provided a key mechanism to communicate the changes being made to defined parts of the standard to the WG10 delegates. A key part of this document was a section that documented the decisions and agreements made at the Paris meeting which were carried forward for resolution and agreed upon, these included: N088 was a true record of the agreements made in Paris, the OWG under the direction of Allan Graydon should continue the outstanding technical work based on WG10/N088 without further referral back to WG10, the OWG was instructed to ensure that a one week review cycle be declared with its nominated OWG core and extended core groups for the completion of the technical work on parts 2, 3, 4 & 5 prior to baselining by the OWG and following OWG baselining of Part 2-5 by the OWG, WG10 instructs the WG10 Project Editor to coordinate final completion of the complete document set in conjunction with the project editors of Parts 1-9 to ensure consistency across the document set.

OWG Activities After Paris(Feb./96) to Present(May/96)

Following the Paris meeting in February, 1996, the OWG team continued its work with the reinforced mandate(document N088) from WG10 received in Paris. Immediately after Paris the main focus of the OWG was to complete the Reference Model. This was due to fact that Part 2 which contained the Reference model had a direct impact on other documents in the OWG mandate, namely Parts 3, 4 & 5. The mechanism for work on Part 2 was similar to that used prior to Paris, via a series of weekly conference calls with members of the team participating during the call and performing/reviewing technical work on various sections of the document between the calls. Work on Part 2 continued during the remainder of February, 1996 through to the release of the OWG baselined version(Version 1.09) in May, 1996 just prior to the Prague meeting. The changes to Part 2 after version 1.02 which was released after the Paris meeting included: revision of the Introduction and Clauses 1(Scope) and 4(Structure of the Reference Model) to be consistent with the new model and to incorporate the ballot comments, revision to the Process dimension for consistency of expression and some minor changes to purpose statements based on ballot and OWG member comments, revisions of the Capability dimension and Compatibility requirements and the addition of an Annex B to provide a summary list of the processes and process attributes similar to an Annex provided in Part 2 version 1.00. The resulting number of processes contained in Part 2 was reduced to 29.

The changes to Part 2 were published to the OWG Core and Extended teams via versions 1.03 through 1.08. The OWG team agreed on the 960502 conference call to baseline the document and place the document out for a final one week review. At the conclusion of the one week review Mr. Terry Rout incorporated one last revision to revise the purpose statement of the "Maintain system and software" (ENG.7) process and then handed an OWG baselined version, Version 1.09 of Part 2 dated May 10, 1996, over to the WG10 Project Editor(P.Simms) for a final consistency check prior to issuing the next set of WG10 documents for ballot. A paper copy of this version of Part 2, Version 1.09, was also provided to all members of the WG10 delegation in Prague.

In parallel with the effort on Part 2, changes to the other Parts (3, 4 & 5) were in progress following Paris and leading up to and including the Prague meeting in May, 1996. The following is a synopsis of the work completed on these Parts prior to and including Prague:

- Part 3 - Conducting An Assessment

The changes necessitated to Part 3 were included: ensure it's compatibility with the new model architecture in Part 2 and ensure that all ballot comments had been resolved. This work was undertaken by P.Simms with the support of the OWG Core and Ecore teams. Versions 1.01 - 1.05 addressed comments received from the Registration ballot. Version 1.06 & 1.07 addressed changes in the new model architecture. Version 1.07 was distributed to the OWG Core & Ecore on April 22, 1996 for baselining. During the review period comments were received and minor editorial changes were made to the document by Terry Rout and version 1.08 dated May 10, 1996 was created as the OWG baselined version of Part 3 and handed over to the WG10 Project Editor(P.Simms) for consistency checking prior to issuing of the document set for the next ballot. A paper copy of this version of Part 3, Version 1.08, was also provided to all members of the WG10 delegation in Prague.

- Part 4 - Guide to Conducting Assessments

Following the Paris meetings, revisions 1.02 & 1.03 were made to this Part of the standard based on agreements made in Paris regarding the disposition of comments. After the completion of the restructuring of Part 2, the OWG agreed to restructure Part 4 to align it with the new architecture in Part 2, these changes included: reference to the Part 5 Compatible model and the two dimensions of the model described in Part 2, the selection and use of a compatible model based on the requirements set out in Part 2 (model purpose, scope, elements and indicators, mapping and translation). Part 4 also now includes a clause on the selection and use of instruments and tools which discusses the implementation of indicators during an assessment. The document was released to the OWG Core and Ecore teams for their review as Version 1.04 on April 26, 1996. During the review period comments were received from Terry Rout and Peter Krauth. The version of Part 4 input to the Prague meetings was version 1.06. An OWG subteam was established in Prague headed by Harry Barker to perform the final changes to Part 4 which included: changes to Clause 6 by Mac Craigmyle based on comments from Terry Rout, changes to Clause 7 from Peter Simms and changes to various parts of the document based on comments from Peter Krauth. Changes were made to Part 4 resulting in the creation of Version 1.07 dated May 28, 1996 and handed over to the WG10 Project Editor(P.Simms) for consistency checking prior to issuing of the document set for the next ballot. A paper copy of this version of Part 4, Version 1.07, was also provided to all members of the WG10 delegation in Prague.

- Part 5 - An Assessment Model and Indicator Guidance

The preliminary schedule as agreed to by the Part 5 team for the Part 5 document as input to the Prague meeting was:

Draft document completed: June 10, 1996

OWG 1 week review period: June 10 - 17, 1996

Part 5 subteam incorporates comments: June 17-18, 1996

OWG Baseline tentatively available: July 1, 1996 for project editor and project editors coordination reviews.

This schedule may vary depending on the number of substantive comments received and the need to alter the drafts due to the impact of review comments from subsequent team members.

The detail of the work to be completed on Part 5 as input to the Prague meeting was: Clauses 1-4 development, Process dimension edit re comment ratification, capability dimension update re indicators and associated work products and review for consistency and update of mapping tables and various Annexes (Style Guides, Work Products & characteristics, references and Proof of consistency) to be completed and reviewed.

The above Part 5 schedule reflects the fact that other documents for which Part 5 is dependent were not completed as originally scheduled. To assist the Trials team in starting as soon as possible, the Part 5 subteam team members will concentrate first on the indicator sets in the Process dimension, capability dimension and the work products characteristics table.

During the week of May 27, 1996 in Prague, work on Part 5 included: included guidance for use of indicators into sections 1-4 and updates to the capability dimension were made to reflect review comments. Work was also being progressed by team members whom did not attend the Prague meeting but this work was not reflected in the document. The plan was to issue a paper copy of version of Part 5, Version 1.05, to all members of the WG10 delegation in Prague. Anyone taking this draft copy in Prague will do so with the understanding this is not reflective of the final version to be passed to the OWG for comments on and about June 10, 1996.

The schedule as indicated above (July 1, 1996 end date) still appeared to be achievable at the end of the Prague meeting.

OWG Document Status Summary

In summary, the OWG team has made substantial progress on its task of incorporating significant changes to the architecture of the model as outlined in the Pilanesberg proposal contained in WG10/N080, "Proposal for changes to the Architecture" and reinforced in the WG10/N088 document, "Restructuring Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5". These changes have resulted in the OWG baselining the following documents:

OWG Baselined Documents

- Part 2: A Reference Model For Processes and Process Capability
Version 1.09 - Dated May 10, 1996

- Part 3: Conducting An Assessment
Version 1.08 - Dated May 10, 1996

- Part 4: Guide To Conducting Assessments
Version 1.07 - Dated May 28, 1996

The only document that remains outstanding is Part 5: An Assessment Model and Indicator Guidance, which as stated above is planned completion on July 1, 1996.

OWG Documents To Be Baselined

- Part 5: An Assessment Model and Indicator Guidance
Planned Baseline date: July 1, 1996

After the release of the Part 5 document, the OWG will consider the job of restructuring of Parts 2 through 5 to be completed and thereby its mandate completed. As such, the OWG will cease to exist after the Part 5 document is handed over to the WG10 Project Editor(P.Simms) soon after the July 1, 1996 date.

Allan Graydon
Convenor, WG10/OWG

WG10/N091

Title: **WG10 Attendance List**
JTC1/SC7/WG10
Prague
27-31 May 1996

Source: **Convenor JTC1/SC7/WG10**

Action: **Information**

Date: **31 May 1996**

The following is a list of WG10 attendees at the Prague meeting. Full contact details are contained in the relevant SC7 document containing the attendee list for the SC7 Prague Plenary meetings.

Alec Dorling	UK	Convenor
Marc Morel-Chevillet	France	
Richard Him Lok	South Africa	
Alastair Walker	South Africa	
Lily Li	South Africa	
Jean Normand Drouin	Canada	
Claudete Maria Rego	Brazil	
Nancy George	USA	
Peter Marshall	UK	
Catriona Mackie	UK	
Robert Smith	ESI	C Liaison
Harry Barker	UK	
Yossi Winograd	USA	
Jerome Pesant	Canada	
Francis Suraweera	Australia	
Freddie Vogelius	Denmark	
Allan Graydon	Canada	
Terry Rout	Australia	
Hakan Wickberg	Sweden	
Roger Brandt	Sweden	
Dave Kitson	USA	
Steve Masters	USA	
Emmanuel Lazinier	France	
Jean-Pierre Legras	France	
Sven Anderson	Norway	
Frederic Babey	France	
Zdenek Vanek	Czech Republic	
David Hajek	Czech Republic	
Sergio Duran	Mexico	
Arnoldo Diaz	Mexico	
Mary Campbell	USA	
Denis Roy	Canada	
Munish Khurana	UK	
Bruce Hodgen	Australia	
Mario Fusani	Italy	
Marie Sebestova	Czech Republic	
Peter Krauth	Hungary	