ISO/IEC JTC1/SC 35 – User Interfaces
SC35N0694

ISO
ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION
МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦЯ ПО СТАНДАРТИЗАЦИИ

CEI (IEC)
COMMISSION ÉLECTROTECHNIQUE INTERNATIONALE
INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION
МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ЭЛЕКТРОТЕХНИЧЕСКАЯ КОМИССИЯ

Document type	**Advisory Document**
Title	**Report and draft recommendations to the Berlin JTC 1 Plenary on NP criteria about Cultural and Linguistic Adaptability**
Source	**Alain LaBonté, on behalf of JTC 1/SC 35**
Date assigned	**2004-09-10**
Action identifier	**For ad hoc meeting at the Berlin Plenary and final recommendation approval by the JTC 1 Plenary**

Context

At the 1999 Rio de Janeiro Plenary, on the recommendation of its WG5 (JTC1/WG5 was previously JTC1/SC18/WG9 and later became JTC1/SC35), JTC1 approved a new NP form which was adding a simple question about Cultural and Linguistic Adaptability requirements. For unknown reasons, it seems that this form has not been used by every SC, and SC 36 came out with a more complex version, with the intent to include accessibility requirements, but without any reference to the currently approved JTC 1 NP form (see annex 1).

At its 2003 Singapore Plenary, JTC1 mandated SC 35 to conduct a consultation among SCs on a proposal jointly drafted by SC 35 and SC 36, and approved by their respective National Bodies. This proposal was supposed to be sent out to SCs only but after confusion was sent first to JTC1 NBs. It was later on sent to SCs. At time of editing this draft on time to meet JTC1 Plenary deadline submissions, comments had been received from Canadian SC37 only.

This presents the results of this consultation and will attempt to formulate simple recommendations for approval at the 2004 Berlin JTC 1 Plenary.

SC comments received

SC37

Below please find comments from the National Body of Canada in SC 37 on SC 35 N 653. Please note that the request for review of SC 35 N 653 was received too late for consideration at the June SC 37 meeting in Seoul (indeed, it was received at the end of June and SC 37 met at the beginning of June). Therefore, the document was distributed to SC 37 National Bodies for comment following our Seoul meeting and the only comments received were from the SC 37 National Body of Canada. Therefore, please note that this does not represent a consensus SC 37 position.

<u>Comments from the SC 37 National Body of Canada</u> :

Canada supports the addition of clarification information into the current NWIP form's section E. However, the information that is presented is not completely clear and needs additional but concise explanation of the various criteria. It will not be satisfactory to point to another standard within the NWIP form because few will consult it.

Canada does not support the proposed new D.3. It is too finely granular and therefore not appropriate at the NWI level. If this type of information has relevance to the NWI, then it should be included in the justification statements. If it is believed to be critically important, then a paragraph could be added to the end of the NWI form advising submitters to add these considerations to the justification statement.

NB comments received

SWEDEN

Comments from the Swedish Technical Committee SIS/TC 456 regarding SC35 proposal for additional NP criteria

The proposals may be motivated but the mentioned aspects need in several cases to be better explain or at least provided with more extensive examples. In particular this is evident for "Human functioning". There may be a need for a glossary with references to how the referred aspects/concepts are defined.

US

US National Body comments for SC35 Proposal for Additional Criteria to be added to new work item proposals (NPs), SC22 N 3753

The US is concerned that this request, however simple it may seem, will add considerable burdens to the NP specification and approval process, both for those preparing candidate NP documents and for subcommittees evaluating them to determine that they are ready to be recommended and passed on.
For both this recommendation and any others that might follow, we believe that suggestions to expand the documentation required in a proposal for new work should be held to the same standards JTC 1 now applies to approval of the NP itself, i.e., that the requirement and additional work be justified with an adequate analysis of effort, costs, and benefits.

In addition, in the particular case of this request, our review of the questions being asked causes us to question their applicability, as stated, for many projects in the Programming Languages and Systems area. If there is not a good match between the specific questions being asked and the projects involved, those who are preparing NP documents will be left with a choice between providing considerable (and time-consuming) explanation of the various answers that do not adequately represent the underlying issues. The first choice would increase the burden of replying, the second would require effort without significant value.

CANADA

Canada supports with comments SC35N0653

Canada supports this in principle but considers that the additions need some further refinement.
Canada suggests that the title be changed to "Cultural and Human Adaptability".
Canada further suggests that examples be used to ensure clarity and that the appropriate information is entered.

SOUTH AFRICA

South African response to proposal SC35N0653

We do understand that the questions are proposed as an additional and optional section that is only intended to be mandatory for proposals including features provided for

accommodating culture, language, human functioning or context of use. However, our preferred option would be to NOT include requirements that the NP submitter must state how they support the proposed user functionalities.

However, if the majority response is to include these or similar questions, then we suggest that the question be reversed (i.e. ask how an NP <u>discriminates against</u>, rather than <u>supports</u> various functionalities).

<u>Recommendations</u>

1. Simple reminder.

Section E of the NP form is currently as follows (see annexed <u>pro forma</u> for explanations):

E. Cultural and Linguistic Adaptability	**Yes_____** **No_____**

2. Recommendations.

Given that :

a) the JTC1-mandated consultation was intended for SCs, that the <u>proposal</u> has been duly approved by national bodies of SC35, that it has been edited in cooperation with SC36 (joint meeting on the subject held in Montréal in January 2004);

b) only one SC sent a contribution, this contribution not officially reflecting its consensus position;

c) there are obvious contradictions of national bodies between themselves, some saying that the proposal is not elaborate enough, others saying it is too complex;

d) a neutral person can easily deduce that some national bodies of JTC1/SC35 and JTC1/SC36 are in contradiction with the same national bodies of JTC1.

It is recommended that :

a) the <u>proposal</u> approved at the last Plenary of JTC1/SC35, as reproduced in Annex 2 of this document serve as the basic NP form modification proposal to be adopted by the 2004 Berlin JTC1 Plenary.

b) an ad hoc be held at the 2004 Berlin JTC1 Plenary to try to reconcile contradictory horizontal and vertical positions of national bodies in a constructive way to come to a final proposal.

ANNEX 1 – Current NP Form as of 2004-02

New Work Item Proposal

February 2004

PROPOSAL FOR A NEW WORK ITEM

Date of presentation of proposal: YYYY-MM-DD	Proposer:
Secretariat: National Body	**ISO/IEC JTC 1 N** XXXX ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC XX N XXX

A proposal for a new work item shall be submitted to the secretariat of the ISO/IEC joint technical committee concerned with a copy to the ISO Central Secretariat.

Presentation of the proposal - to be completed by the proposer.

Title (subject to be covered and type of standard, e.g. terminology, method of test, performance requirements, etc.) Specification of Data Value Domain
Scope (and field of application)
Purpose and justification - attach a separate page as annex, if necessary
Programme of work If the proposed new work item is approved, which of the following document(s) is (are) expected to be developed? ____ a single International Standard ___   more than one International Standard (expected number: ....) ____ a multi-part International Standard consisting of .... parts ____ an amendment or amendments to the following International Standard(s) .... ____ a technical report , type .... And which standard development track is recommended for the approved new work item? ____a. Default Timeframe ____b. Accelerated Timeframe ____c. Extended Timeframe
Relevant documents to be considered
Co-operation and liaison
Preparatory work offered with target date(s)
Signature:
Will the service of a maintenance agency or registration authority be required? .... - If yes, have you identified a potential candidate? .... - If yes, indicate name .... Are there any known requirements for coding? .... -If yes, please specify on a separate page Does the proposed standard concern known patented items? .... - If yes, please provide full information in an annex

Comments and recommendations of the JTC 1 or SC XXSecretariat - attach a separate page as an annex, if necessary

Comments with respect to the proposal in general, and recommendations thereon: It is proposed to assign this new item to JTC 1/SC XX		

Voting on the proposal - Each P-member of the ISO/IEC joint technical committee has an obligation to vote within the time limits laid down (normally three months after the date of circulation).

Date of circulation: YYYY-MM-DD	**Closing date for voting:** YYYY-MM-DD	**Signature of Secretary:**

NEW WORK ITEM PROPOSAL - ***PROJECT ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA***		
Criterion	**Validity**	**Explanation**
A. Business Requirement		
A.1 Market Requirement	Essential ___ Desirable ___ Supportive ___	
A.2 Regulatory Context	Essential ___ Desirable ___ Supportive ___ Not Relevant ___	
B. Related Work		
B.1 Completion/Maintenance of current standards	Yes ___ No___	
B.2 Commitment to other organisation	Yes ___ No___	
B.3 Other Source of standards	Yes ___ No___	
C. Technical Status		
C.1 Mature Technology	Yes ___ No___	
C.2 Prospective Technology	Yes ___ No___	
C.3 Models/Tools	Yes ___ No___	
D. Conformity Assessment and Interoperability		
D.1 Conformity Assessment	Yes ___ No___	

D.2 Interoperability	Yes ___ No___	
E. Cultural and Linguistic Adaptability	**Yes____** **No_____**	
F. Other Justification		

Notes to Proforma

A. Business Relevance. That which identifies market place relevance in terms of what problem is being solved and or need being addressed.

A.1 Market Requirement. When submitting a NP, the proposer shall identify the nature of the Market Requirement, assessing the extent to which it is essential, desirable or merely supportive of some other project.

A.2 Technical Regulation. If a Regulatory requirement is deemed to exist - e.g. for an area of public concern e.g. Information Security, Data protection, potentially leading to regulatory/public interest action based on the use of this voluntary international standard - the proposer shall identify this here.

B. Related Work. Aspects of the relationship of this NP to other areas of standardisation work shall be identified in this section.

B.1 Competition/Maintenance. If this NP is concerned with completing or maintaining existing standards, those concerned shall be identified here.

B.2 External Commitment. Groups, bodies, or fora external to JTC 1 to which a commitment has been made by JTC for Co-operation and or collaboration on this NP shall be identified here.

B.3 External Std/Specification. If other activities creating standards or specifications in this topic area are known to exist or be planned, and which might be available to JTC 1 as PAS, they shall be identified here.

C. Technical Status. The proposer shall indicate here an assessment of the extent to which the proposed standard is supported by current technology.

C.1 Mature Technology. Indicate here the extent to which the technology is reasonably stable and ripe for standardisation.

C.2 Prospective Technology. If the NP is anticipatory in nature based on expected or forecasted need, this shall be indicated here.

C.3 Models/Tools. If the NP relates to the creation of supportive reference models or tools, this shall be indicated here.

D. Conformity Assessment and Interoperability

D.1 Indicate here if Conformity Assessment is relevant to your project. If so, indicate how it is addressed in your project plan.

D.2 Indicate here if Interoperability is relevant to your project. If so, indicate how it is addressed in your project plan

E. Cultural and Linguistic Adaptability Indicate here if cultural and linguistic adaptability is applicable to your project. If so, indicate how it is addressed in your project plan.

F. Other Justification Any other aspects of background information justifying this NP shall be indicated here

ANNEX 2 – Proposal sent out to NBs and SCs for comments

ISO | IEC   ISO/IEC JTC1/SC 35 – User Interfaces
SC35N0653

ISO
ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION
МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ПО СТАНДАРТИЗАЦИИ

CEI (IEC)
COMMISSION ÉLECTROTECHNIQUE INTERNATIONALE
INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION
МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ЭЛЕКТРОТЕХНИЧЕСКАЯ КОМИССИЯ

Document type	**Working document**
Title	**SC35 Proposal For Additional Criteria To Be Added To New Work Item Proposals (NPs)**
Date	**2004-06-03**
Source	**SC35/WG5**
Status	**To be forwarded to all JTC1 SCs for comments to be received before September 1st, so that SC35 can present the outcome one month before the next JTC1 Plenary in Berlin (which will be held 2004-10-25), as mandated by the JTC1 2003 Singapore Plenary.**
Action identifier	**For comments**
References	**JTC1 SC35 N0538RR** **JTC1 SC36 N0457**

[To Be Added as Section E]

NOTE: The following criteria do not mandate any feature for accommodating culture, language, human functioning[1] or context of use. The following criteria require that if any features are provided for accommodating culture, language, human functioning or context of use by the New Work Item Proposal, then the proposer is required to identify these features.

E. Accommodation for Culture, Language, Human Functioning and Context of Use

E.1 Features for the Accommodation of *Culture*
___ Yes
___ No
Rationale:

E.2 Features for the Accommodation of *Natural Language*
___ Yes
___ No
Rationale:

E.3 Features for the Accommodation of *Human Functioning*
___ Yes
___ No
Rationale:

E.4 Features for the Accommodation of *Context of Use*
___ Yes
___ No
Rationale:

E.5 Other Features for Accommodation
___ Yes – Specify:
___ No
Rationale:

E.6 Harmonization
___ Yes
___ No
Rationale:

Notes to Pro forma

E. Accommodation for Culture, Language, Human Functioning and Context of Use.
Aspects of this NP that concern the accommodation of varying cultures, languages, human abilities and context of use.

---

[1] See http://www3.who.int/icf/beginners/bg.pdf

E.1 Features for the Accommodation of *Culture*. Aspects of the NP that concern the accommodation of various cultures. The proposer shall identify what features, if any, support culture accommodation.

E.2 Features for the Accommodation of *Natural Language*. Aspects of the NP that concern the accommodation of various natural languages. The proposer shall identify what features, if any, support language accommodation.

E.3 Features for the Accommodation of *Human Functioning*. Aspects of the NP that concern the accommodation of human *functioning*. The proposer shall identify what features, if any, support human functioning accommodation[2].

E.4 Features for the Accommodation of *Context of Use*. Aspects of the NP that concern the accommodation of various contexts of use[3]. This includes the physical constraints of interaction devices and constraints imposed by the environment in which the user is acting (noisy or silent environments, eyes-busy situations, user wearing gloves, etc.). The proposer shall identify what features, if any, support the accommodation of various contexts of use.

E.5 Other Features for Accommodation. Aspects of the NP that concern other accommodation capabilities. The proposer shall identify what features, if any, support other kinds of accommodation for users and implementers of the standard.

E.6 Harmonization. The proposer shall describe how the meaning and use of the standard will be harmonized across various cultures, languages, human *functioning*, contexts of use and other accommodations. The proposer shall identify any significant harmonization issues across "national translations"[4] and national adoptions of the standard, in particular when extra functionality has to be added to accommodate different cultures, languages, human *functioning* and context of use.

[To Be Added to: D. Conformity Assessment and Interoperability]

D.3 Use of Taxonomies, Classification Schemes, Value Domains, Code Sets and/or Coded Domains
___ Yes
___ No

---

[2] For assistance see:

- ISO/IEC Guide 71:2001 – Guidelines for standards developers to address the needs of older persons and persons with disabilities.

ISO/TS 16071 – Ergonomics of human-system interaction – Guidance on accessibility for human-computer interfaces

[3] as, for example, in ISO 9241-11:1998 (Ergonomic requirements for office work with visual display terminals (VDTs) -- Part 11: Guidance on usability)

[4] "National translation " in the context of this text is a term that is broader than a translation into a different natural language, it is linked to adaptation of a standard for a particular country. [Alternative text for « *across "national translations" and national adoptions of the standard »*: "in the adoption and translation of the standard by countries in their languages"]

Rationale:

Notes to Pro forma

D.3 Use of Taxonomies, Classifications Schemes, Value Domains, Code Sets and/or Coded Domains. Aspects of the NP that concern the use, re-use, adaptation, and development of taxonomies, classification schemes, value domains, code sets, and/or coded domains. The proposer shall identify what standards and specifications will be used, re-used, adapted, and developed. For existing standards and specifications, the proposer shall indicate what coordination and liaising activities will be undertaken to assure harmony and consistency with existing standards and specifications. For taxonomies, classification schemes, value domains, code sets, and/or coded domains that will be adapted or developed under this NP, the proposer shall identify the quality methodologies, data description methodologies, harmonization methodologies, etc. that will be used during the development, publication, and maintenance of the standard.