



**ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 9466**  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1**  
**Information Technology**

2009-01-04

**Document Type:** Summary of Voting

**Document Title:** Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N 9212 – ISO/IEC DTR 29163-2 "SCORM 2004 3rd Edition - Sharable Content Object Reference Model - Content Aggregation Model"

**Document Source:** JTC 1 Secretariat

**Reference:**

**Document Status:** As per the results of this ballot, the DTR has passed. SC 36 is instructed to review the comments received, prepare a disposition of comments, and if necessary, a revised text for submission to ITTF for publication.

**Action ID:** Information

**Due Date:**

**No. of Pages:** 9

## Result of voting

### Ballot Information:

<b>Ballot reference:</b>	JTC001-N-9212
<b>Ballot type:</b>	DTR
<b>Ballot title:</b>	ISO/IEC DTR 29163-2 "SCORM 2004 3rd Edition - Sharable Content Object Reference Model - Content Aggregation Model"
<b>Opening date:</b>	2008-07-29
<b>Closing date:</b>	2008-12-29
<b>Note:</b>	This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for a 5 month DTR ballot. National Bodies are asked to vote and submit their comments via the on-line balloting system by the due date indicated.

### Member responses:

<b>Votes cast (30)</b>	Australia (SA) Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Ecuador (INEN) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Nigeria (SON) Norway (SN) Saudi Arabia (SASO) Singapore (SPRING SG) Slovenia (SIST) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Comments submitted (2)</b>	Sweden (SIS) Ukraine (DSSU)
<b>Votes not cast (10)</b>	Algeria (IANOR) Azerbaijan (AZSTAND) Côte-d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI) Kenya (KEBS) Malaysia (DSM) Pakistan (PSQCA) Philippines (BPS) Uruguay (UNIT) Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

Questions:	
<b>Q.1</b>	"Does your National Body approve the attached DTR to go forward to publication?"
<b>Q.2</b>	"If you approve the DTR Text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"
<b>Q.3</b>	"If you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

Answers to Q.1: "Does your National Body approve the attached DTR to go forward to publication?"		
<b>19 x</b>	<b>Approval as presented</b>	Australia (SA) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Nigeria (SON) Saudi Arabia (SASO) Singapore (SPRING SG) Slovenia (SIST) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
<b>9 x</b>	<b>Abstention</b>	Belgium (NBN) Denmark (DS) Ecuador (INEN) Jamaica (BSJ) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Malta (MSA)

		South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV)
2 x	Disapproval of the draft	Germany (DIN) Norway (SN)
0 x	Approval with comments	

**Answers to Q.2: "If you approve the DTR Text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"**

28 x	Ignore	Australia (SA) Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Ecuador (INEN) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) 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)
2 x	General	Germany (DIN) Saudi Arabia (SASO)
0 x	All	
0 x	Editorial	
0 x	Technical	

**Answers to Q.3: "If you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"**

27 x	Ignore	Australia (SA)
------	--------	----------------

		Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Ecuador (INEN) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Nigeria (SON) Singapore (SPRING SG) Slovenia (SIST) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
3 x	Yes	Germany (DIN) Norway (SN) Saudi Arabia (SASO)
0 x	No	

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Germany (DIN)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-12-19 10:37:13
<a href="#">CommentFiles/Germany(DIN).doc</a>		
Norway (SN)	<i>Comment File</i>	2008-12-18 11:06:14
<a href="#">CommentFiles/Norway(SN).doc</a>		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Sweden (SIS)	<i>Comment</i>	2008-12-05 11:10:00
Please find attached SE comments in document " SE comments on ISO_IEC DTR 29163-2 (J1n9212).doc"		

<b>Sweden (SIS)</b>	<b><i>Comment File</i></b>	2008-12-05 11:10:00
<a href="#">CommentFiles/Sweden(SIS).doc</a>		
<b>Ukraine (DSSU)</b>	<b><i>Comment</i></b>	2008-12-25 10:38:27
approval as presented		

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:2009-01-04

Document:

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE01			ge	In general, Germany appreciates very much the standardization project SCORM and the work that have been spent during the last years, and supports it! It is a great and important initiative for ITLET standardization at large! Germany votes "No" (disapprove) to the current DTR ballot due to major concerns (see following comments): The German NB will change its voting to "Yes" if the following comments will be resolved.	---	
DE08						
NO	ALL		TE	The document should be written in such a manner that knowledge and understanding of the "other books" should not be necessary. References to external documents, both normative and non-normative documents should be more explicit. There is references to the other books of SCORM – however the reference to this documents is impossible to find.	All external references should be put in the Reference section, for unique identification.	
NO	ALL		TE	Since this document is proposed as a TR3, and is intended for wider usage than traditionally for SCORM standards, we find that Accessibility should be addressed and how SCORM-CAM supports Accessibility	Write a section on how SCORM-CAM addresses accessibility.	
SE	ALL		TE	The document should be written in such a manner that knowledge and understanding of the "other books" should not be necessary. References to external documents, both normative and non-normative documents should be more explicit. There are references to the other books of SCORM – however the reference to this documents is impossible to find.	All external references should be put in the Reference section, for unique identification.	
SE	ALL		TE	Since this document is proposed as a TR3, and is intended for wider usage than traditionally for SCORM standards, we find that Accessibility should be addressed and how SCORM-CAM supports Accessibility	Write a section on how SCORM addresses accessibility. And how SCORM meets traditional web accessibility requirements. Refer to other relevant and, related specifications for accessibility.	
SE	ALL		TE	It is unclear how different parts of SCORM relates to other	It need to be made clear how the different parts of	

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:2009-01-04

Document:

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				specifications within JTC1 – it need to be better placed into context. Otherwise this may lead to confusion regarding the scope and responsibility of different specifications within JTC1.	SCORM relates to and make use of other ISO JTC1/SC36 specifications.	
DE06	clause 1.1.1 on the pages CAM 1-3ff (= PDF page 14ff)		ge	SC36 is currently developing the metadata standard MLR, it would be good to mention this progress as it is done by many ADL notes within the four SCORM books on current IMS standardization activities.	Add a note: “Note: The ISO standardization is developing the new standard for metadata MLR (Metadata for Learning Resources). One of the major issues that SC36 is resolving deals with non-hierarchical and simplified metadata and their referencing and combination.”	
NO	CAM 1-3	Section 1	GE	There is no scope statement, which makes it hard to evaluate the parts of the document and the completeness of the proposed TR	Add a section with a scope statement	
NO	CAM 1-3	Section 1	TE	All specific terminology used in the document should be defined.	Add a section with definitions used in the TR, e.g. Learning Management System (LMS), Sharable Content Object (SCO), Asset etc.	
SE	CAM 1-3	Section 1	GE	There is no scope statement.	Add a section with a scope statement	
SE	CAM 1-3	Section 1	TE	All specific terminology used in the document should be defined.	Add a section with definitions used in the TR, e.g. Learning Management System (LMS), Sharable Content Object (SCO), Asset etc. Refer to other terminologies where applicable.	
DE02	page i (= PDF page 4)		ge	The standard will not be available at “ADLnet.gov” but at ISO.	Delete the note concerning the availability at “ADLnet.gov”.	
DE07	clause 4.1 on the pages CAM 4-1ff (= PDF page 92ff)		ge	SC36 is currently developing the metadata standard MLR, it would be good to mention this progress as it is done by many ADL notes within the four SCORM books on current IMS standardization activities.	Add a note: “Note: The ISO standardization is developing the new standard for metadata MLR (Metadata for Learning Resources). One of the major issues that SC36 is resolving deals with non-hierarchical and simplified metadata and their referencing and combination.”	
DE03	page iv (= PDF page 7)	copyright	ge	The copyright shall not be reserved by the Department of Defense.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete the two sentences about the copyright and on all pages within the footer.</li> <li>2. Clarify the copyright issues with the Department of Defense as the claimed</li> </ol>	



# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:2009-01-04

Document:

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					owner of the copyright and/or the ADL Co-Laboratory Hub as the mentioned contact to avoid any further problems or discussions about it. Include also the clarification concerning the copyright issues of the included IMS specifications 3. Add a clear copyright statement with specific relation to a named copyright regulation.	
DE04	page iv (= PDF page 7)	distribution	ge	The conditions for distribution shall be changed also according to the other necessary changes (see all the other German comments above and below).	1. Delete the sentences about the distribution. 2. Clarify the distribution issues with the Department of Defense as the claimed owner of the copyright and/or the ADL Co-Laboratory Hub as the mentioned contact to avoid any further problems or discussions about it. 3. Add a clear distribution statement.	
DE05	page iv (= PDF page 7)	reproduction	ge	The conditions for reproduction shall be changed also according to the other necessary changes (see all the other German comments above and below).	1. Delete the sentences about the reproduction. 2. Clarify the reproduction issues with the Department of Defense as the claimed owner of the copyright and/or the ADL Co-Laboratory Hub as the mentioned contact to avoid any further problems or discussions about it. 3. Add a clear reproduction statement.	