ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC2/WG2/ Ideographic Rapporteur Group

Source / Contribution Identifier: Japan

Meeting: IRG#28 @ Xi'an, China

Title: Propose to clarify the development process

Keywords: (none)

Status: For your information

Short Description:

Proposed Conclusion / Requested Action: None

Arguments / Text of Contribution: See attachments.

Propose to clarify the development process

CJK extension C has missed the chance to be included in the AMD4 of 10646 and is put into the PDAM 5, this means the standardized schedule delayed at least 6 month. The main reason was the quality not enough yet, namely the unifiable characters still remain after IRG's review work. It's true that adding characters into the set of several-ten thousand without duplication is very tough work. It is very difficult to make clean (error free) repertoire. However, Japan thinks that there are some cases that could be possible to prevent errors with small attention.

This document tries to clear what we were doing and then propose how to improve reviewing process to keep the quality on the future development. The ballot of PDAM 5 is already opened and will be closed in August. IRG should keep effort to improve CJK extension C not to miss the AMD5 again.

Result of the PDAM4 ballot, problems can be categorized into two cases. Some reasons can be considered for each case.

[Case 1] Glyph shape should be changed

- When finalizing CJK C, some members delayed submitting final font and IRG couldn't review them before submitting the final code chart to WG2.
- There are some cases already agreed to change the shapes of characters from original bitmap but such agreement was not recorded or couldn't refer easily. Consequently such characters reported as errors.

[Case 2] Unification / Duplication issue

- Decisions through reviewing weren't reflected to the new revision of the document. Moreover member editors couldn't find them or don't care such irregularity.
- IDS analysis is adopted to detect the possible unification/duplication automatically but it doesn't work well because of incorrect IDS input.

Propositions to improve this situation:

- **KEEP THE PLANNED TARGET DATE.** Otherwise submission should be dropped. (This is already agreed several times. e.g. IRG N1266(for CJK D, in meeting #27), and N880 (for CJK C))
- **RECORD AND SHARE DECISIONS** made through reviewing for reference. (In IRG N1171, for example, Japan mentioned such concern.)
- Members should **BE VERY CAREFUL MAKING IDS**. It is true that making IDS is still new to IRG work and sometimes difficult but Kawabata san is now checking all submissions and making feedback to members. In IRG N1298 pointed some typical mistakes and explanations. Members should study IRG N1183 (IDS guideline) and N1298 for future IDS production.

(END OF DOCUMENT)