

Result of voting

Ballot Information:

Ballot reference:	JTC1/SC34N1035
Ballot type:	NWIP
Ballot title:	Proposal for New Work Item on OpenDocument Format (ISO/IEC 26300) / Office Open XML (ISO/IEC 29500) Translation
Opening date:	2008-04-29
Closing date:	2008-07-29
Note:	

Member responses:

Votes cast (28)	Brazil (ABNT) Bulgaria (BDS) Canada (SCC) Chile (INN) China (SAC) Colombia (ICONTEC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
Comments submitted (3)	Greece (ELOT) Mexico (DGN) Spain (AENOR)
Votes not cast (11)	Côte-d'Ivoire (CODINORM)

Cyprus (CYS)
 Egypt (EOS)
 Lebanon (LIBNOR)
 Luxembourg (ILNAS)
 Pakistan (PSQCA)
 South Africa (SABS)
 Sri Lanka (SLSI)
 Thailand (TISI)
 Trinidad and Tobago (TTBS)
 Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

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?"

Answers to Q.1: "Do you accept the proposal in the attached NWI Proposal document as a sufficient definition of the new work item?"

18 x	Yes	Bulgaria (BDS) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) USA (ANSI)
7 x	Abstain	Chile (INN) Colombia (ICONTEC) India (BIS) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)

		Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MSA) Switzerland (SNV)
3 x	No	Brazil (ABNT) New Zealand (SNZ) 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?"

19 x	Yes	Bulgaria (BDS) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) USA (ANSI)
8 x	Abstain	Chile (INN) Colombia (ICONTEC) India (BIS) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MSA) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI)
1 x	No	Brazil (ABNT)

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

13 x	No	Brazil (ABNT) Bulgaria (BDS) China (SAC) Denmark (DS) Italy (UNI) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN)
------	----	---

		Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV)
8 x	Yes	Canada (SCC) Czech Republic (CNI) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) USA (ANSI)
7 x	Abstain	Chile (INN) Colombia (ICONTEC) India (BIS) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Malaysia (DSM) New Zealand (SNZ) 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?"

19 x	No	Brazil (ABNT) Bulgaria (BDS) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
6 x	Abstain	Chile (INN) Colombia (ICONTEC) India (BIS) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Malaysia (DSM) New Zealand (SNZ)
3 x	Yes	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Germany (DIN)

Answers to Q.5: "Do you have a major contribution or a reference document ready for submittal?"

22 x	No	Brazil (ABNT) Bulgaria (BDS) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
5 x	Abstain	Chile (INN) Colombia (ICONTEC) India (BIS) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Malaysia (DSM)
1 x	Yes	Germany (DIN)

Answers to Q.6: "Will you have such a contribution in ninety days?"

19 x	No	Brazil (ABNT) Bulgaria (BDS) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Romania (ASRO) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI)
-------------	-----------	---

		USA (ANSI)
7 x	Abstain	Canada (SCC) Chile (INN) Colombia (ICONTEC) France (AFNOR) India (BIS) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Malaysia (DSM)
2 x	Yes	China (SAC) Germany (DIN)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Brazil (ABNT)	Comment	2008-07-29 14:52:46
The local committee considers that, since ISO/IEC 29500 has not been published yet and it is still on the appeals phase, this is not the adequate time to approve the creation of this working group. If the official version of ISO/IEC 29500 becomes widely available by ISO, this committee will again deliberate if it considers this working group worth of creation.		
Canada (SCC)	Comment	2008-07-14 16:18:57
John Weigelt - johnwei@microsoft.com		
China (SAC)	Comment	2008-07-16 05:18:20
Fang Chunyan		
Germany (DIN)	Comment	2008-07-28 07:31:28
Mario Wendt		
New Zealand (SNZ)	Comment	2008-07-25 06:04:09
ODF will be progressing to v1.2 soon and OOXML will presumably be updated to another version by the time work on this project starts. There is little point in translating between ODF 1.0 and OOXML 1.0. New Zealand expects that the project team would work on the latest versions available.		
Provided as mentioned above, that the work is based on the latest versions of the docs available and not restrict the development work to Version 1.0 only. New Zealand would like to see plans for ongoing work and continuing alignment with the developing ODF standard		
Switzerland (SNV)	Comment File	2008-07-28 14:02:48
CommentFiles/Switzerland(SNV).doc		

United Kingdom (BSI)	Comment	2008-07-16 17:26:13
While in principle we support the general goals of such a project, in the absence of a final text for DIS 29500 it is impossible to determine what the precise scope or programme of work, and especially the timescale, should be. The draft supplied with the Proposal has many gaps and only serves to highlight the problem of not having a final text to work with. An accelerated timescale for producing such a Technical Report would seem unrealistic given the uncertainty as to if and when a final text will be made available.		
USA (ANSI)	Comment	2008-07-28 21:02:11
TR should be based on both ISO/IEC standards when they become available.		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Greece (ELOT)	Comment	2008-07-29 15:41:05
<p>ELOT answers to Q 1-6</p> <p>Answer to Q1: Yes</p> <p>Answer to Q2: Yes</p> <p>Answer to Q3: No</p> <p>Answer to Q4: No</p> <p>Answer to Q5: No</p> <p>Answer to Q6: No</p>		
Mexico (DGN)	Comment File	2008-07-24 16:48:29
CommentFiles/Mexico(DGN).doc		
Spain (AENOR)	Comment	2008-07-29 10:42:35
Spain abstain on the mentioned document.		

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2008-07-28

Document: 34N1035 NWI

1 ¹	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CH	1	3rd paragraph "graphical fidelity"	te	It is easily overlooked that the preservation of page breaks, page numbers and line breaks is often of much greater importance than other aspects of graphical fidelity, because page numbers and line numbers are often used in referencing a particular point in a document, and the ease and reliability of communication about such references is greatly reduced if page breaks, page numbers or line breaks can change during document translation.	Explain at the end of the paragraph that the preservation of page breaks, page numbers and line breaks is often of particular importance, in order to preserve the accuracy and validity of refernces to points in the document from outside the document.	
CH	2.3.4		te	It should be explained that the lastRenderedPageBreak element of OOXML is not only useful for assistive technologies (as often falsely claimed), but that it can also be used to provide a useful tool for the preservation of page-break information across document format conversions. (Does ODF have an equivalent feature?)	Provide the info.	

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.



VOTE ON NEW WORK ITEM PROPOSAL	
Date of circulation 2008-04-06	Reference number of associated New Work Item Proposal
Closing date for voting 2008-07-29	ISO/TC JTC1 /SC 34 N 1035

ISO/TC JTC1 /SC 34
Title Document Description and Processing Languages

Secretariat **National Body (Mx)**

Circulated to P-members of the committee for vote and to O-members for information, in accordance with 2.3.4 of part 1 of the ISO/IEC Directives.

P-members of the technical committee or subcommittee concerned have an obligation to vote.

Please send this form, duly completed at all points, **to the Secretariat indicated above.**

Title of proposal Proposal for New Work Item on OpenDocument Format (ISO/IEC 26300) / Office Open XML Translation (ISO/IEC 29500).

Evaluation of market relevance of the proposal: *(Not applicable to those member bodies who are abstaining. It is recommended that this evaluation be carried out by a reasonably large number of stakeholders and the average of the various points given be subsequently reflected on the voting forms.)*

	low		high		
	1	2	3	4	5
1. What is the potential of this project to contribute to international trade and production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. What is the potential of this project to contribute to economic efficiency, health, safety, or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. How great is the need to harmonize national approaches in this subject area that may serve as barriers to international trade?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. What is the feasibility of achieving consensus on International Standard(s) in this subject area by the proposed target dates?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. What priority should be assigned to the development of International Standard(s) in this subject area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(Comments, including proposals for modification of the scope, may be annexed.)

Total points

Do you agree, as the responsible member body, that the requirements in Annex Q of Part 1 of the ISO/IEC Directives on the *Justification of proposals for the establishment of standards* have been met by this proposal?

YES

NO

1 We agree to the addition of the proposed new work item to the programme of work of the committee:

YES NO

We abstain/have no interest

2 We are prepared to participate in the development of the project (even if voting against), i.e. to make an effective contribution at the preparatory stage, at least by commenting on working drafts:

YES* NO

* Name(s) and address(es) of nominated experts (mandatory)

3 We would agree with direct submission of the draft attached to the new work item proposal as a DIS

YES NO (Submission as a DIS requires approval by a two-thirds majority of those voting)

4 Standard(s), regulation(s), and other relevant documentation existing in our country, with any remarks concerning their application if necessary, are attached:

YES NO

If "yes", please give references here, or as a separate annex:

An annex is attached to this form

P-member voting **Mx**

Date **July 11th, 2008.**

Name **Mexican committee**