

ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 9019
ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

2008-04-04

Document Type: Summary of Voting/Table of Replies

Document Title: Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N 8879 – Application by the OASIS for renewal of ISO/IEC JTC 1 PAS Submitter Status.

Document Source: JTC 1 Secretariat

Reference:

Document Status: This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for information. Based upon the results of this ballot, OASIS has been approved as a Recognized PAS Submitter for a period of two years ending 30 April 2010. OASIS is requested to provide a written response to the accompanying comments as soon as possible.

Action ID: Information

Due Date:

No. of Pages: 7

Result of voting

Ballot Information:

Ballot reference:	JTC001-N-8879
Ballot type:	CIB
Ballot title:	OASIS Application for renewal of ISO/IEC JTC 1 PAS Submitter Status.
Opening date:	2008-01-03
Closing date:	2008-04-03
Note:	This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for a three month letter ballot. Please submit your vote via the online balloting system by the due date indicated.

Member responses:

Votes cast (26)	Australia (SA) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Nigeria (SON) Norway (SN) Singapore (SPRING SG) Slovenia (SIST) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
------------------------	---

Comments submitted (1)	Ukraine (DSSU)
Votes not cast (14)	Algeria (IANOR) Belgium (NBN) Côte-d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Ecuador (INEN) Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Kenya (KEBS) Malaysia (DSM) Pakistan (PSQCA) Philippines (BPS) Saudi Arabia (SASO) Turkey (TSE) Uruguay (UNIT) Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

Questions:

Q.1	"Does your National Body approve of renewing the OASIS group PAS Submitter recognition?"
------------	--

Answers to Q.1: "Does your National Body approve of renewing the OASIS group PAS Submitter recognition?"

17 x	Yes	Australia (SA) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Norway (SN) South Africa (SABS) USA (ANSI)
7 x	Abstain	Finland (SFS) Malta (MSA) Nigeria (SON) Singapore (SPRING SG) Slovenia (SIST) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV)
2 x	No	Denmark (DS) United Kingdom (BSI)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Denmark (DS)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-04-03 08:50:21
CommentFiles/Denmark(DS).doc		
France (AFNOR)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-04-02 18:37:04
CommentFiles/France(AFNOR).txt		
Japan (JISC)	<i>Comment</i>	2008-03-27 09:06:30
<p>Our earlier experiences reveal that the cooperative stance of the OASIS ODF TC has not been satisfactory. Japan cordially requests improvements as below:</p> <p>(1) Timely responses to liaison statements (e.g., SC34 N847) from SC34 to OASIS ODF TC</p> <p>(2) Notification of ODF extension plans via liaison statements from OASIS ODF TC to SC34</p> <p>(3) Timely publication of draft technical corrigenda for ODF defects</p>		
Norway (SN)	<i>Comment</i>	2008-04-02 19:58:14
<p>We recommend that active participants from ISO and OASIS work together to come up with a joint proposal for further work on ODF that allows input from all competent contributors, and that is acceptable to both governing bodies.</p> <p>Problems have been identified with the multiple versions of the ODF standard and the cooperation with OASIS and ISO/IEC (example described in JTC 1/SC 34 N 0735 - http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/def/0735.htm).</p> <p>We propose that these problems would be addressed in a cooperation agreement. An example of cooperation agreement is the one used for IS 9945 POSIX, see ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 34 N 0587 (http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc34/open/0587.pdf).</p>		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Ukraine (DSSU)	<i>Comment</i>	2008-04-01 11:55:34
abstain		

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2008-03-27

Document: **JTC 1 N 8879**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DK	page 3-4		te	ISO and IEC member bodies need to be able to work directly on ISO/IEC standards that were submitted thru the PAS process. This would apply both to standards under maintenance, and under revision, but not to the initial PAS submission. ISO and IEC member body experts need to be able to work directly on maintenance and revision to produce revised ISO/IEC standards.	<p>We propose that the maintenance and revision agreements of specifications submitted by OASIS via the PAS proceess be changed so that this be carried out by ISO/IEC alone, or in a joint cooperation with OASIS along the lines stipulated in SC 34 N0587, ad that this agrrement be described in the ballotted document before it is approved. Proposed text for page 3 last paragraph and first paragraph on page 4</p> <p>Each submission includes terms for approval, coordination and future versioning. For revisions and maintenance OASIS will be prepared to hand over this to ISO/IEC, or work jointly with ISO/EC according to the rules set out in SC34 N0587. In exceptional cases ISO/IEC will delegate the maintenance of the standard to OASIS:</p>	

¹ **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

In order to ensure good coordination and to encourage effective collaboration between JTC 1 and OASIS, would it be possible for OASIS to:

- indicate if possible a more precise schedule for further submissions to JTC 1, particularly for revisions to ISO/IEC 26300;
- indicate whether JTC1 can take an active part in the maintenance and evolution of ISO/IEC 26300 and of future submissions, and what would be the preferred mode of organisation for doing so . Does OASIS intend to perform the maintenance of ISO/IEC 26300 in close cooperation with SC 34 via the existing Liaison A relationship, or internally, within the responsible OASIS TC?

UK National Body Comment

"The UK is unwilling to support the renewal of PAS Submitter Status due to the wholly unsatisfactory way in which ISO/IEC 26300 Open Document Format

(ODF) is being maintained on behalf of JTC1 by the submitter. In our opinion the agreement originally reached between OASIS and JTC1 for the maintenance of ISO/IEC 26300 was contrary to the JTC1 Directives, but the situation has been exacerbated further by the submitter's failure to maintain ISO/IEC 26300 even in accordance with the terms of the existing agreement with JTC1.

OASIS have ignored defect reports and have revised their own standard upon which ISO/IEC 26300 was based without taking into account these defect reports.

For the UK to approve renewal of OASIS' PAS Submitter Status it will be necessary for the existing agreement between JTC1 and OASIS on the maintenance of ISO/IEC 26300 to be replaced, with responsibility for maintenance being transferred, in accordance with the JTC1 Directives, to the appropriate sub-committee of JTC1 (probably SC34).

We would strongly recommend that the maintenance of all future standards developed from PAS and Fast Track submissions should be arranged in accordance with JTC1 Directives, assigning responsibility for maintenance of each standard to whichever sub-committee of JTC1 is most appropriate according to the nature and purpose of the standard. It would be the responsibility of the sub-committee to reach agreement with the submitter in each case as to their role in the maintenance process, but overall responsibility for the process would not be transferrable."