

**ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 9465**  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1**  
**Information Technology**

2009-01-04

**Document Type:** Summary of Voting

**Document Title:** Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N 9211 – ISO/IEC DTR 29163-1 "SCORM 2004 3rd Edition - Sharable Content Object Reference Model - Overview"

**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:** 8

## Result of voting

### Ballot Information:

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Ballot reference:</b> | JTC001-N-9211   |
| <b>Ballot type:</b>      | DTR   |
| <b>Ballot title:</b>     | ISO/IEC DTR 29163-1 "SCORM 2004 3rd Edition - Sharable Content Object Reference Model - Overview"   |
| <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 (29)</b> | Australia (SA)<br>Belgium (NBN)<br>Canada (SCC)<br>China (SAC)<br>Czech Republic (CNI)<br>Denmark (DS)<br>Ecuador (INEN)<br>Finland (SFS)<br>France (AFNOR)<br>Germany (DIN)<br>India (BIS)<br>Ireland (NSAI)<br>Italy (UNI)<br>Jamaica (BSJ)<br>Japan (JISC)<br>Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)<br>Korea, Republic of (KATS)<br>Malta (MSA)<br>Netherlands (NEN)<br>New Zealand (SNZ)<br>Nigeria (SON)<br>Norway (SN)<br>Singapore (SPRING SG)<br>Slovenia (SIST)<br>South Africa (SABS)<br>Spain (AENOR)<br>Switzerland (SNV)<br>United Kingdom (BSI)<br>USA (ANSI) |
|------------------------|---|

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Comments submitted (2)</b> | Sweden (SIS)<br>Ukraine (DSSU)   |
| <b>Votes not cast (11)</b>    | Algeria (IANOR)<br>Azerbaijan (AZSTAND)<br>Côte-d'Ivoire (CODINORM)<br>Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI)<br>Kenya (KEBS)<br>Malaysia (DSM)<br>Pakistan (PSQCA)<br>Philippines (BPS)<br>Saudi Arabia (SASO)<br>Uruguay (UNIT)<br>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>18 x</b>  | <b>Approval as presented</b> | Australia (SA)<br>Canada (SCC)<br>China (SAC)<br>Czech Republic (CNI)<br>Finland (SFS)<br>France (AFNOR)<br>India (BIS)<br>Ireland (NSAI)<br>Italy (UNI)<br>Japan (JISC)<br>Korea, Republic of (KATS)<br>Netherlands (NEN)<br>New Zealand (SNZ)<br>Nigeria (SON)<br>Singapore (SPRING SG)<br>Slovenia (SIST)<br>United Kingdom (BSI)<br>USA (ANSI) |
| <b>9 x</b>   | <b>Abstention</b>            | Belgium (NBN)<br>Denmark (DS)<br>Ecuador (INEN)<br>Jamaica (BSJ)<br>Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)<br>Malta (MSA)   |

|     |                          |   |
|-----|--------------------------|---|
|     |                          | South Africa (SABS)<br>Spain (AENOR)<br>Switzerland (SNV) |
| 2 x | Disapproval of the draft | Germany (DIN)<br>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)<br>Belgium (NBN)<br>Canada (SCC)<br>China (SAC)<br>Czech Republic (CNI)<br>Denmark (DS)<br>Ecuador (INEN)<br>Finland (SFS)<br>France (AFNOR)<br>India (BIS)<br>Ireland (NSAI)<br>Italy (UNI)<br>Jamaica (BSJ)<br>Japan (JISC)<br>Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)<br>Korea, Republic of (KATS)<br>Malta (MSA)<br>Netherlands (NEN)<br>New Zealand (SNZ)<br>Nigeria (SON)<br>Norway (SN)<br>Singapore (SPRING SG)<br>Slovenia (SIST)<br>South Africa (SABS)<br>Spain (AENOR)<br>Switzerland (SNV)<br>United Kingdom (BSI)<br>USA (ANSI) |
| 1 x  | General   | Germany (DIN)  |
| 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) |
|------|--------|----------------|

|            |            |   |
|------------|------------|---|
|            |            | <b>Belgium (NBN)</b><br><b>Canada (SCC)</b><br><b>China (SAC)</b><br><b>Czech Republic (CNI)</b><br><b>Denmark (DS)</b><br><b>Ecuador (INEN)</b><br><b>Finland (SFS)</b><br><b>France (AFNOR)</b><br><b>India (BIS)</b><br><b>Ireland (NSAI)</b><br><b>Italy (UNI)</b><br><b>Jamaica (BSJ)</b><br><b>Japan (JISC)</b><br><b>Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)</b><br><b>Korea, Republic of (KATS)</b><br><b>Malta (MSA)</b><br><b>Netherlands (NEN)</b><br><b>New Zealand (SNZ)</b><br><b>Nigeria (SON)</b><br><b>Singapore (SPRING SG)</b><br><b>Slovenia (SIST)</b><br><b>South Africa (SABS)</b><br><b>Spain (AENOR)</b><br><b>Switzerland (SNV)</b><br><b>United Kingdom (BSI)</b><br><b>USA (ANSI)</b> |
| <b>2 x</b> | <b>Yes</b> | <b>Germany (DIN)</b><br><b>Norway (SN)</b>  |
| <b>0 x</b> | <b>No</b>  |   |

| Comments from Voters                          |                     |                        |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|
| Member:                                       | Comment:            | Date:                  |
| <b>Germany (DIN)</b>                          | <i>Comment File</i> | 2008-12-19<br>10:43:29 |
| <a href="#">CommentFiles/Germany(DIN).doc</a> |                     |                        |
| <b>Norway (SN)</b>                            | <i>Comment File</i> | 2008-12-18<br>11:04:57 |
| <a href="#">CommentFiles/Norway(SN).doc</a>   |                     |                        |

| Comments from Commenters   |                |                        |
|--|----------------|------------------------|
| Member:  | Comment:       | Date:                  |
| <b>Sweden (SIS)</b>  | <i>Comment</i> | 2008-12-05<br>11:10:36 |
| Please find attached SE comments in document " SE comments on ISO_IEC DTR 29163-1 (J1n9211).doc" |                |                        |

|  |                            |                        |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Sweden (SIS)</b>                          | <b><i>Comment File</i></b> | 2008-12-05<br>11:10:36 |
| <a href="#">CommentFiles/Sweden(SIS).doc</a> |                            |                        |
| <b>Ukraine (DSSU)</b>                        | <b><i>Comment</i></b>      | 2008-12-25<br>10:36:55 |
| approval as presented                        |                            |                        |

|      |               |  |    |   |  |
|------|---------------|--|----|---|--|
| DE01 |               |  | ge | <p>In general, Germany appreciates very much the standardization project SCORM and the work that have been spent during the last years, and supports it!</p> <p>It is a great and important initiative for ITLET standardization at large!</p> <p>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.</p> | ---  |
| DE09 |               |  |    |   |  |
| NO   | ALL           |  | TE | The document should be written in such a manner that knowledge and understanding of the other "books" or other parts of this TR should not be necessary. References to external documents, both normative and non-normative documents should be more explicit.  | All external references should be listed in the Reference section, for uniformity.   |
| 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 supports Accessibility and usage free of barriers.   | Write a section on how SCORM supports Accessibility. And how SCORM supports web accessibility requirements.  |
| SE   | ALL           |  | TE | The document should be written in such a manner that knowledge and understanding of the other "books" or other parts of this TR should not be necessary. References to external documents, both normative and non-normative documents should be more explicit.  | All external references should be listed in the Reference section, for uniformity.   |
| 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 supports Accessibility.  | Write a section on how SCORM supports Accessibility. And how SCORM supports web accessibility requirements.  |
| SE   | ALL           |  | TE | It is unclear how different parts of SCORM relates to other 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.   | It need to be made clear how SCORM relates to and maps to JTC1/SC36 specification.   |
| DE08 | Appendix B    |  | ge | The meaning of the appendix is unclear and the appendix is not complete.  | Delete Appendix B or add more details within the reference list.   |
| NO   | Section 1.2.1 |  | TE | Definition of Accessibility should be in-line with the definition used by other ISO standards.  | <p>We suggest to change the word Accessibility to Availability to avoid confusion and perception of the word Accessibility.</p> <p>We also recommend that the word Accessibility be changed to Availability throughout the document.</p> |

|      |  |              |    |  |   |
|------|--|--------------|----|--|---|
|      |  |              |    |  | documents/books to ens  |
| NO   | Section 1.2.1                                  |              | GE | Removing the specific ADL jargon "ADL-'ilities'" on page SCORM 1-5   | Rewrite the part  |
| SE   | Section 1.2.1                                  |              | TE | Definition of Accessibility should be in-line with the definition used by other ISO standards (see above).   | Term Accessibility should be used throughout all SCORM documents for consistency.   |
| DE06 | clause 1.2.3 on page SCORM 1-7 (= PDF page 16) |              | ge | Change the number from four up to five organizations and add SC36 also working on the future of SCORM within its special SCORM Study Group.  | Change "four" to "five" and add SC36 within the list of organizations.  |
| NO   | RTE 1-3  |              | 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. The scope for SCORM is training within the military. Where users do not have any known special needs.   |
| NO   | RTE 1-3  |              | TE | All specific terminology used in the document should be defined.   | Add a section with definitions for Learning Management System (LMS), Content Object (SCO), and Activity (ACT).  |
| SE   | RTE 1-3  |              | 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. The scope for SCORM is training within the military. Where users do not have any known special needs.   |
| SE   | RTE 1-3  |              | TE | All specific terminology used in the document should be defined in compliance to the terminology in related specifications within JTC1.  | Add a section with definitions for Learning Management System (LMS), Content Object (SCO), and Activity (ACT) terminologies where applicable.   |
| DE07 | clause 1.3 on page SCORM 1-8 (= PDF page 17)   |              | 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 is currently developing the new standard MLR (Metadata for Learning Resources). The major issues that SC36 is addressing are non-hierarchical and simple referencing and combination of resources."  |
| DE02 | page i (= PDF page 4)                          |              | ge | The standard will not be available at "ADLnet.gov" but at ISO.   | Delete the note concerning "ADLnet.gov".  |
| 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>Delete the two sentences about copyright and ownership in the footer.</li> <li>Clarify the copyright ownership by the Department of Defense as the owner of the content. The Co-Laboratory should be in contact to avoid any legal discussions about clarification concerning the issues of the introduction.</li> <li>Add a clear copyright statement and specific relation to the regulation.</li> </ol> |
| 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  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete the sentence about distribution.</li> </ol>   |

|      |                        |              |    |   |  |
|------|------------------------|--------------|----|---|--|
|      |                        |              |    | other German comments above and below).   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. Clarify the distribution of the Co-Laboratory H contact to avoid discussions about the Department of L owner of the co</li><li>3. Add a clear distribution</li></ol>  |
| 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). | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Delete the sentence about reproduction.</li><li>2. Clarify the reproduction of the Department of L owner of the co Co-Laboratory H contact to avoid discussions about</li><li>3. Add a clear reproduction</li></ol> |