afnor
NORMALISATION

ISO JTC 1 IEC
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 35 N 1661

REPLACES N 1649

DATE: 2011-08-19

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 35
User Interfaces
Secretariat: AFNOR

DOC TYPE: **Summary of voting**

TITLE: **Results of voting on NP Specification methods for cultural conventions**

SOURCE: **35**

STATUS: **Approved**

NOTE: The US wished to change their position and add comments after closure of the vote.
This document records the voting results as published in N1649 with <u>no change in results, positions or comments</u>.

The new US Position is simply informally appended to the previous version of the file.

ACTION ID: **FYI**

DUE DATE:

DISTRIBUTION: **Def**

MEDIUM: **E**

NO. OF PAGES: **7**

Result of voting

Ballot Information

Ballot reference	N 1616, 1563 NP Cultural conventions
Ballot type	CIB
Ballot title	Specification methods for cultural conventions
Opening date	2010-11-25
Closing date	2011-02-21
Note	

Member responses:

Votes cast (17)	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Romania (ASRO) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (AENOR) Sweden (SIS) Ukraine (DSSU) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
Comments submitted (1)	Ghana (GSB)
Votes not cast (1)	Greece (ELOT)

Questions:

Q.1	"Do you accept the proposal in the attached NWI Proposal document as a sufficient definition of the new work item?"
Q.2	"Do you support the addition of the new work item to the programme of work of the joint technical committee?"
Q.3	"Do you commit yourself to participate in the development of this new work item?"
Q.4	"Are you able to offer a project editor who will dedicate his/her efforts to the advancement and maintenance of this project?"
Q.5	"Do you have a major contribution or a reference document ready for submittal?"
Q.6	"Will you have such a contribution in ninety days?"

Q.7	"Which standard development track is proposed?"

Votes by members	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6	Q.7
Canada (SCC)	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
China (SAC)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
Denmark (DS)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
Finland (SFS)	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
France (AFNOR)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
Germany (DIN)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
India (BIS)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
Italy (UNI)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
Japan (JISC)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
Romania (ASRO)	Yes	Abstain	Abstain	No	No	No	Extended timeframe (48 months)
Russian Federation (GOST R)	Abstain	Abstain	No	No	No	Abstain	Default timeframe (36 months)
Spain (AENOR)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Default timeframe (36 months)
Sweden (SIS)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Accelerated timeframe (24 months)
Ukraine (DSSU)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Accelerated timeframe (24 months)
United Kingdom (BSI)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)
USA (ANSI)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Default timeframe (36 months)

Answers to Q.1: "Do you accept the proposal in the attached NWI Proposal document as a sufficient definition of the new work item?"
11 x   **Yes**   **China (SAC)** **Denmark (DS)** **France (AFNOR)** **Germany (DIN)** **India (BIS)**

		Italy (UNI) **Japan (JISC)** **Korea, Republic of (KATS)** **Romania (ASRO)** **Sweden (SIS)** **USA (ANSI)**
2 x	**No**	**Canada (SCC)** **Finland (SFS)**
4 x	**Abstain**	**Russian Federation (GOST R)** **Spain (AENOR)** **Ukraine (DSSU)** **United Kingdom (BSI)**

Answers to Q.2: "Do you support the addition of the new work item to the programme of work of the joint technical committee?"

10 x	**Yes**	**Canada (SCC)** **China (SAC)** **Denmark (DS)** **France (AFNOR)** **Germany (DIN)** **India (BIS)** **Italy (UNI)** **Japan (JISC)** **Korea, Republic of (KATS)** **Sweden (SIS)**
2 x	**No**	**Finland (SFS)** **USA (ANSI)**
5 x	**Abstain**	**Romania (ASRO)** **Russian Federation (GOST R)** **Spain (AENOR)** **Ukraine (DSSU)** **United Kingdom (BSI)**

Answers to Q.3: "Do you commit yourself to participate in the development of this new work item?"

6 x	**Yes**	**Canada (SCC)** **Denmark (DS)** **France (AFNOR)** **Germany (DIN)** **Japan (JISC)** **Sweden (SIS)**
7 x	**No**	**China (SAC)** **Finland (SFS)** **India (BIS)** **Italy (UNI)** **Korea, Republic of (KATS)** **Russian Federation (GOST R)** **USA (ANSI)**
4 x	**Abstain**	**Romania (ASRO)** **Spain (AENOR)** **Ukraine (DSSU)** **United Kingdom (BSI)**

Answers to Q.4: "Are you able to offer a project editor who will dedicate his/her efforts to the advancement and maintenance of this project?"		
1 x	Yes	Sweden (SIS)
14 x	No	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Romania (ASRO) Russian Federation (GOST R) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
2 x	Abstain	Spain (AENOR) Ukraine (DSSU)

Answers to Q.5: "Do you have a major contribution or a reference document ready for submittal?"		
0 x	Yes	
15 x	No	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Romania (ASRO) Russian Federation (GOST R) Sweden (SIS) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
2 x	Abstain	Spain (AENOR) Ukraine (DSSU)

Answers to Q.6: "Will you have such a contribution in ninety days?"		
0 x	Yes	
14 x	No	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS)

		Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
3 x	Abstain	Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (AENOR) Ukraine (DSSU)

Answers to Q.7: "Which standard development track is proposed?"		
14 x	Default timeframe (36 months)	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (AENOR) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
2 x	Accelerated timeframe (24 months)	Sweden (SIS) Ukraine (DSSU)
1 x	Extended timeframe (48 months)	Romania (ASRO)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Canada (SCC)	*Comment File*	2011-01-26 16:13:04
See below		
Denmark (DS)	*Comment*	2011-02-01 13:48:39
Helle Bjarnø would like to participate in the WG on this NWIP - hbj@visinfo.dk		
Finland (SFS)	*Comment*	2011-02-18 12:55:39
See below		
Finland (SFS)	*Comment File*	2011-02-18 12:55:39
See below		
Sweden (SIS)	*Comment*	2011-02-04

		15:09:42
Sweden recently realised that since JTC 1 adopted the ISO/IEC regulations, part 1, there are not three types of TR anymore. This document should therefore be designated a Technical Specification, TS, instead of a TR. As already indicated, Sweden nominates Mr. Keld Simonsen as editor of thie work item		
USA (ANSI)	***Comment File***	2011-02-18 22:15:59
See below		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Ghana (GSB)	***Comment***	2011-02-15 09:41:20
Abtain		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/N ote (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-m ent[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FI-01			ge	This NP should be more concise and focused to have any real value. There should be a concerted effort to avoid adding data content, and instead to refer to documents such as ISO/IEC 10646 and the Unicode Consortium's CLDR (Common Locale Data Repository). Where data items are needed, they should be synchronized with CLDR. Otherwise we are left with the untenable situation of adding another depository of data which must be kept up-to-date, as the needs of developers continually evolve. The industry has moved towards using LDML (Locale Data Markup Language) as the specification method for the locale data that is commonly stored in CLDR. The 1.0 version of CLDR was hosted on the OpenI18N site before the CLDR project moved to the Unicode Consortium (already in 2004). In addition to LDML and the Repository, the CLDR Technical Committee has developed the Survey Tool to easily enter the data for a large number of language/region combinations (currently over 500 locales) by any individual or company submitters and to agree on its validity by the vetting process. (A bug reporting mechanism is also available.) The data is stored in an XML interchange format that is subsequently transformed into forms optimized for use in actual implementations based on ICU (Internationalization Components for Unicode), POSIX, OpenOffice, dojo (an open source modular JavaScript library), and others. As a result, one cannot expect that this NP		

US				ge	would have any practical use to improve the localization situation for the users or the industry.		
					First, the WD document accompanying the NP ballot is a minor revision of a nearly decade-old document that was the object of an unsuccessful project to create a TR of the same title in the context of JTC 1/SC 22. (See http://std.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC22/WG20/docs/projects #14652.) No consensus could be reached at that time due to extensive technical concerns with the draft as well as concerns other larger concerns questioning the value of the TR. As observed in ballot comments at that time, "Germany sees little use in this DTR. It has only very limited support in the industry (not even in the Linux community..." (See "Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N 6721", ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 22/N3405.) The same technical and general concerns exist today. The document is inextricably tied to POSIX conventions that were already dated in 2001 and have little interest in 2011. Moreover, in the meantime different technical solutions have emerged that have generated a strong following and are defining best practices in a way that render the present document irrelevant and obsolete. Beyond the specifics of the WD document that accompanied the NB ballot, the US has more general concerns with this project proposal. On the one hand, there is merit to the idea of specifying methods to describe various culturally-dependent conventions for one or many cultures and, in particular, of doing so in ways that facilitate easy development of user interfaces or other types of applications so as to be culturally-relevant for users of many different cultures. That is an objective that the US strongly supports. However, we strongly object to this NP because it completely overlooks the fact that this objective is already being achieved		

| | | | | | in the context of existing and vigorous standardization activities outside of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 35. This project would directly compete with the Common Locale Data Repository (CLDR) project of the Unicode Consortium. This project in SC 35 would needlessly duplicate efforts, and it is doubtful that it would be possible to match the depth of participation and collaboration of the CLDR effort.

The CLDR project has been underway since 2002. It is widely adopted across the software industry; it has support from standards associations in several countries and is building on the ongoing contributions of hundreds of contributors. The project has compiled and provides data specifying a wide range of cultural data categories of use in user interfaces and applications with coverage spanning 187 languages and 166 territories. In addition to the data repository, the CLDR project has developed a standard that specifies a data format for interchanging cultural-convention data, "Unicode Technical Standard #35, Unicode Locale Data Markup Language" (LDML). Moreover, the proposed project covers only a small fraction of the depth and scope of types of data covered by LDML.

The justification for the NP states,

"The purpose of the proposed specification is to make it possible for a program to adapt itself to the cultural and linguistic environment that it is being used in. It would thus be possible to write programs, that can via these specifications be given a number of cultural and linguistic user interfaces, without changing the program itself."

The reality is that this purpose, thanks to the success of the CLDR project, has already been largely achieved, and that the CLDR approach is | | |

					widely considered to represent best practice in this area. Nearly a decade of experience with CLDR has shown that this is an area that is eminently suited to its chosen approach, which is a broad-based, open source collaboration of cultural and industry experts from all areas of the globe. Because of this, it is unlikely that a competing specification developed by JTC 1/SC 35 could add significant value and it is equally unlikely that there would be any significant adoption of such a specification by industry. Instead, if such a project were to be approved, the attempt could lead to a fragmentation of effort and waste of resources. In summary, the WD submitted is not an appropriate basis to develop best-practice recommendations today, and the very project would stand in direct competition to existing standards efforts elsewhere that are widely endorsed. Therefore, this proposal should not be approved as an SC 35 project.		
CA				ge	Athough Canada supports the intent of this work item and agrees that it should be worked upon, Canada does not accept the proposal in the attached NWI Proposal document as a sufficient definition of the new work item for the following reason: The scope should be adjusted to deal with the following 4 remarks: i) These documents completely ignore the work of the Common Locale Data Repository (CLDR) project (see: http://cldr.unicode.org/) and the Local Data Markup Language (LDML) (see:		

				http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr35/) specification over the last 10 years. CLDR data is now the accepted reference for most common locale specific data, and to do anything else is pressing an agenda that is simply not sustainable.		
				By ignoring the work in the industry on CLDR the author(s) of the NP from Swedish NB are not presenting the complete background information on the subject matter.		
				Also B.3 Other Source of Standards .. says NO. This is not acceptable. There was work done before in ISO/IEC: TR 11017: 1998 then past work in CEN/TC304, as well as the work on LDML and CLDR (outside of ISO/IEC), and possibly others in the ISO/IEC arena exist.		
				ii) It should be clarified whether APIs (which deals with "application coding"), whose requirements show up in the WD is a requirement for coding. This item showed that it is not clear in Canada what coding really means in the NP form.		
				iii) SC35 should state what is the synch with the taxonomy TR already approved.		
				iv) Answer to A.1 ... says DESIRABLE. In fact no product can really market worldwide without Globalization and Localization support .. it is ESSENTIAL ... not just DESIRABLE.		

US Change of position as expressed after closure of the vote

This is appended here for information only and is not part of the result of the formal voting process closed prior to this position being communicated to the Secretariat. This change of vote was communicated to the Secretariat on 2011-02-23.

US Vote for SC 35 N 1616, New work item for a TR titled Specification method for cultural conventions

Questions and answers

1. Do you accept the proposal in the attached NWI Proposal document as a sufficient definition of the new work item? **NO.**

2. Do you support the addition of the new work item to the programme of work of the joint technical committee? **NO.**

First, the WD document accompanying the NP ballot is a minor revision of a nearly decade-old document that was the object of an unsuccessful project to create a TR of the same title in the context of JTC 1/SC 22. (See http://std.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC22/WG20/docs/projects#14652.) No consensus could be reached at that time due to extensive technical concerns with the draft as well as concerns other larger concerns questioning the value of the TR. As observed in ballot comments at that time, "Germany sees little use in this DTR. It has only very limited support in the industry (not even in the Linux community..." (See "Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N 6721", ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 22/N3405.)

The same technical and general concerns exist today. The document is inextricably tied to POSIX conventions that were already dated in 2001 and have little interest in 2011. Moreover, in the meantime different technical solutions have emerged that have generated a strong following and are defining best practices in a way that render the present document irrelevant and obsolete.

Beyond the specifics of the WD document that accompanied the NB ballot, the US has more general concerns with this project proposal. On the one hand, there is merit to the idea of specifying

methods to describe various culturally-dependent conventions for one or many cultures and, in particular, of doing so in ways that facilitate easy development of user interfaces or other types of applications so as to be culturally-relevant for users of many different cultures. That is an objective that the US strongly supports. However, we strongly object to this NP because it completely overlooks the fact that this objective is already being achieved in the context of existing and vigorous standardization activities outside of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 35. This project would directly compete with the Common Locale Data Repository (CLDR) project of the Unicode Consortium. This project in SC 35 would needlessly duplicate efforts, and it is doubtful that it would be possible to match the depth of participation and collaboration of the CLDR effort.

The CLDR project has been underway since 2002. It is widely adopted across the software industry; it has support from standards associations in several countries and is building on the ongoing contributions of hundreds of contributors. The project has compiled and provides data specifying a wide range of cultural data categories of use in user interfaces and applications with coverage spanning 187 languages and 166 territories. In addition to the data repository, the CLDR project has developed a standard that specifies a data format for interchanging cultural-convention data, "Unicode Technical Standard #35, Unicode Locale Data Markup Language" (LDML). Moreover, the proposed project covers only a small fraction of the depth and scope of types of data covered by LDML.

The justification for the NP states,

"The purpose of the proposed specification is to make it possible for a program to adapt itself to the cultural and linguistic environment that it is being used in. It would thus be possible to write programs, that can via these specifications be given a number of cultural and linguistic user interfaces, without changing the program itself."

The reality is that this purpose, thanks to the success of the CLDR project, has already been largely achieved, and that the CLDR approach is widely considered to represent best practice in this area. Nearly a decade of experience with CLDR has shown that this is an area that is eminently suited to its chosen approach, which is a broad-based, open source collaboration of cultural and industry experts from all areas of the globe. Because of this, it is unlikely that a competing specification

developed by JTC 1/SC 35 could add significant value and it is equally unlikely that there would be any significant adoption of such a specification by industry. Instead, if such a project were to be approved, the attempt could lead to a fragmentation of effort and waste of resources.

In summary, the WD submitted is not an appropriate basis to develop best-practice recommendations today, and the very project would stand in direct competition to existing standards efforts elsewhere that are widely endorsed. Therefore, this proposal should not be approved as an SC 35 project.

3. Do you commit yourself to participate in the development of this new work item? **NO**

4. Are you able to offer a project editor who will dedicate his/her efforts to the advancement and maintenance of this project? **NO**

5. Do you have a major contribution or a reference document ready for submittal? **NO**

6. Will you have such a contribution in ninety days? **NO**

7. Which standard development track is proposed? **Not applicable.**