

Date: 1999-08-27

**Title:**

Personal Comments on "Working draft for the revision of ISO 2375", dated 1999-05-30

**Doc Type:**

Personal Contribution

**Source:**

Edwin Hart

**Status:**

For review and discussion at the WG 3 Meeting in Denmark in September

**Action ID:** ACT

**Due Date:**

**Distribution:** SC 2/WG 3 Members and Liaison Organizations

This document lists several concerns about the 1999-05-30 working draft for the revision of ISO/IEC 2375. I ask for WG 3 to discuss them and decide how to accommodate them in a new draft. This cover letter lists these concerns.

I appreciate Michael Everson's effort to initiate the revision of ISO 2375 and have read the working draft. In general, I personally like the idea of identifying a character in a registration by using the corresponding character in ISO/IEC 10646. WG 3 is doing this for its 7-bit and 8-bit standards for coded character set, and extending it to ISO 2375 is an excellent idea. I also appreciate having the desired format for the code table in the standard without a Submitting Authority needing to obtain a second document, "Practices of the Registration Authority for ISO 2375".

The attachment to this document is the 1999-05-30 working draft with several comments embedded in the text. Many of the comments are editorial. However, others identify concerns that WG 3 needs to resolve before proceeding to standardize a new edition of ISO/IEC 2375. The next part lists these concerns.

**List of Concerns**

1. What should be the division of duties of the Submitting Authority (SA) versus the Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) with respect to providing the ISO/IEC 10646 short identifiers and names for the proposed registration?

The Working Draft states that the JAC will provide the mapping to ISO/IEC 10646. This is an unreasonable amount of work to expect of volunteers on the JAC. The SA should provide a proposed mapping for the JAC to review. However, if the SA has difficulty mapping a few characters, then it is

reasonable for the SA to ask the JAC for assistance. However, “assistance” does not mean that the JAC will define and document all of the character mappings to ISO/IEC 10646 for the full proposal.

My recommendation is that the SA provides the mapping from the characters in the proposed registration to ISO/IEC 10646 but that the SA may ask the JAC for assistance with a small subset of characters from the proposal.

2. Should the names of the characters in the registration be only in English?

Given the availability of ISO/IEC 10646 in languages other than English, does SC 2 want the revision of 2375 to get into the issue of providing English names for the proposed registration, or merely provide the ISO/IEC 10646 short identifier (code position)? Moreover, when ISO 2375 was approved, SC 2 had the philosophy of using the English name of a character to uniquely identify it. Now, SC 2 is using the ISO/IEC 10646 code position to identify characters. Given that the current registry uses the character name in English, do we want to make this change in philosophy? If so, should the existing registrations be updated?

I recommend that ISO/IEC 2375 retain the character names in English as an identifier. I also recommend that the RA not require that the existing registrations be updated to any new requirements that may be in the next edition of ISO/IEC 2375. However, since SC 2 has recently revised its standards to use the ISO/IEC 10646 character names and code positions as identifiers, it may be reasonable for SC 2 to decide to update these registrations.

3. Should someone from the Unicode Consortium and someone knowledgeable in ideographic characters be required by the revised standard to be on the JAC?

From time to time the JAC will need the help of someone from the Unicode Consortium, for example, with mapping characters in proposed registrations to ISO/IEC 10646. Also, the JAC will need the help of a representative from Eastern Asia and perhaps, the entire SC 2/WG 2/IRG, with applications for ideographic characters. I see two alternatives: (a) Have both a representative from the Unicode Consortium and another representative from the IRG be permanently on the JAC. (b) Have both a Unicode representative and an IRG representative as non-voting liaison members of the JAC.

My recommendation is to have both a Unicode representative and an IRG representative as non-voting liaison members of the JAC.

4. If a question or disagreement arises as to the proper mapping of a proposed character into 10646, who should have the final authority to resolve the question: SC 2, the SA, SC 2/WG 2, the JAC, the RA?

I would recommend that the JAC have this responsibility. However, the SA should be allowed to identify an alternate mapping in the registration.

5. What if a “character” in a proposed registration does not map directly into ISO/IEC 10646?

Examples of this would include the “characters” rejected for inclusion in ISO/IEC 10646 from the coded character sets of TC 46.

I would recommend that this be noted in the registration. However, the fact that a registration includes one or more “characters” that do not map directly into ISO/IEC 10646 is not sufficient justification for encoding them in ISO/IEC 10646. SC 2 must decide whether to encode or not encode characters proposed for ISO/IEC 10646 on the merits of a specific proposal.

6. Should the JAC identify to SC 2/WG 2, “characters” in new, proposed registrations but not in ISO/IEC 10646?

I recommend that the JAC not be required to identify “characters” in proposals but not in ISO/IEC 10646. If a SA or anyone else wants to propose adding characters to ISO/IEC 10646, it may do so via the normal procedure.

7. If at a later time, a “character” in a registration is encoded in ISO/IEC 10646, who has the responsibility for updating the registration with this information.

I would recommend that the SA have this responsibility. However, the SA should not be required to make such an update. Anyone who learns of this situation should notify the SA for the particular registration so that the SA may decide about making the request to update the registration.

8. How much more of the document, “Practices of the Registration Authority”, should be incorporated directly into the revised standard?

If the revised 2375 standard can provide all of the needed information and still provided the RA with any needed flexibility, why require an SA to obtain both the 2375 standard plus a “Practices of the Registration Authority” document?

9. Since the RA is publishing the 2375 Registry on the WWW, what additional information (like fonts) should be required from the SA for registration?

I have seen comments that the scanned ideographic characters are very difficult to distinguish in the WWW copy of the 2375 Registry. Having fonts or bitmaps could help eliminate the readability problem.

10. Does ISO 2375 allow duplicate registrations of the same code page?

The first bullet of clause B.6.2 seems to imply that duplicate registrations are allowed.

## **Requested Action**

I ask that WG 3 review these comments at its September, 1999 Meeting in Denmark and decide how to accommodate them in the next draft of ISO/IEC 2375.

[END OF DOCUMENT]