

Subject: Recommended US Comments on 2002-July-03, draft Disposition of Comments and draft FDIS Text

From: Joan Aliprand and Edwin Hart

References:

1. draft ISO/IEC FCD 2375: Editors' Disposition of Comments, dated 2002-07-03.
2. draft ISO/IEC FDIS 2375 Text, dated 2002-07-03.

The editor is giving the US and Japan the opportunity to review drafts of documents for the 2375 FCD Disposition of Comments, and the FDIS text. Here are our recommendations for the US comments on these drafts.

Comments on the draft Disposition of Comments

The US thanks the editor for accepting the US comments in the draft Disposition of Comments dated 2002-07-03. However, the US has several concerns with the draft Disposition of Comments and draft FDIS.

1. The US recommends that the editor indicate the changes incorporated as a result of the ISO Central Secretariat comments on the FCD so that the national bodies know the source of several changes. These include:
 - a. Combine clause 2 into clause 1, and the subsequent renumbering of the remaining clauses (plus cross-references and the flowchart).
It would also be helpful to the reader to name the new clause numbers (e.g., in square brackets) in the NB comments and responses. Example:
Comment 1 on Clause 7.3 [Now 6.3].
 - b. Change the format of the definitions.
 - c. Change the introduction to clause 3 [now 2], Normative references.
[Should the editor make this change?]
 - d. etc.
2. For J-3 Annex D, the Disposition (which was Accepted in principle) ends: "... Clause A.1.2.1 will be changed slightly to reflect this." The US recommends that the editor replace that sentence with the following explanation.

The reference to "8-bit (single octet) coded graphic character sets" was deleted from Clause A.1.2.1.1, and a new clause (A.1.2.1.3) on graphic character sets non-conformant to ISO/IEC 2022 was added.

However, the US believes that the new A.1.2.1.3 clause should be removed from the FDIS or rewritten. By implication, it unnecessarily restricts the scope of "coding systems not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022" of clause B.1 to 8-bit codes. Such coding systems are not restricted to 8-bits. Moreover, the IBM series of 8-bit EBCDIC code tables are not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022 and have a different shape than ISO 8-bit code tables (because of the locations for the control characters). If the editor wants to retain the new clause, the US recommends the following new text as a replacement:

The layout of code tables for coding systems not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022 (see Annex B.1) is not defined by this international standard. However, Annex D.6 provides an example layout for an 8-bit code not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022.

3. For comment J-4, the US recommends that the editor add additional explanation.

As a result of comment J-4, the term “may” was changed to “should” to clarify the meaning. In the third paragraph of Clause 12.6 [formerly 13.6], the verb “may” indicates that use of this paragraph is optional. Contrast this with the first paragraph of the same clause where the verb, “shall”, indicates that the first paragraph is mandatory. However, the term, “may”, is not specified in “Annex G (normative) Verbal forms for the expression of provisions” of *ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, Rules for the structure and drafting of International Standards*. We have therefore changed the verb in the third paragraph of Clause 12.6 from “may” to “should”. Whether the third paragraph of Clause 12.6 is ever utilized is entirely at the discretion of the Registration Authority. This means that removing the mapping for separate consideration is preferred but not required.

In addition, the editor reviewed all instances of “may” and decided that replacing “may” with “should” is grammatically appropriate in the second sentence of Clause 12.7.

4. For J-6, the difficulty is that the title used for Clause 13 [formerly 14 in the FCD] is inconsistent in the FCD and the FDIS. It has different text in each of the three places where it appears:

Table of Contents	Technical review of mapping to ISO/IEC 10646 [Note the numeral 1 typo in “1SO”]
In the text	Evaluation of mapping to ISO/IEC 10646
In Appendix G	Technical review of registration applications

The US recommends that the editor *Accept* comments J-6 and J-21, and change the title of clause 13 [formerly 14] to “Technical review of mapping to ISO/IEC 10646” in all places of the FDIS.

5. For J-7, the editor changed the title of Annex A so that the comment should be Accepted in Principle (rather than Rejected). The US suggests the following replacement for the explanation:

The title of Annex A has been changed to “Details of registrations in the International Register” to avoid confusion with the FDIS Clause 4 (formerly 5), which has the title “International Register”.

6. Comment J-11 requests adding a space for “JTC 1” and “SC 2”. According to our reading about the practice in the JTC 1 procedures, the Japanese NB appears to be correct.

Therefore, the US recommends that this comment be Accepted and the text changed accordingly. The editor could either use the NBSP character or manually fix the typographic line-break difficulties when they are encountered. If the editor chooses not to change the text, then the comment should be Accepted in Principle to recognize the validity of the Japanese comment.

7. For J-13, the editor accepted the comment but did not change Clause 10.1.1 [now 9.1.1]. The US requests the editor to reflect this Accepted change into the FDIS text.
8. For J-16, the Japanese apparently requested replacing the text, “If the registration includes a mapping ...”, found in the FCD with the text, “If the application for registration includes a

mapping ...". The US suggests that the editor describe that he replaced "If the registration includes a mapping ..." with "If the application for registration includes a mapping ...".

9. For J-17, the US recommends that this comment be Accepted in principle (rather than Accepted) because the document citation appears to be incorrect. In Clause 16.5.4 [now 15.5.4], the relevant document needs to be changed to the "*Procedures for the technical work of ISO/IEC JTC 1*". The editor also needs to change the last citation in Clause 3 [now 2] to: *Procedures for the technical work of ISO/IEC JTC 1*.
<http://www.jtc1.org/directives/main.htm>

10. For J-19, the US recommends that the editor describe the changes made.

Because of moving annex D.3 with the 8-bit code table to the end of annex D, "annex 0" was replaced with "annex D.4" and "annex D.6" was updated with "annex D.5".

11. For J-20, the US recommends that the FDIS text in Annex A, Clause A.2.11 for bullets 2 and 4 reflect the described name changes to the control characters.
12. For comment J-21, the US recommends that the comment be Accepted in Principle for the reasons cited under its comments on J-6.

Editorial Comments on the draft FDIS

The US has the following editorial comments on the draft FDIS dated 2002-07-03.

1. In the Table of Contents, change "1SO" to "ISO".
2. If the editor retains the present text in the new clause A.1.2.1.3 in the FDIS, add a comma after ISO/IEC 2022.
3. In Annex G, change "ISO supervisory body" to "ISO/IEC supervisory body".
4. In Annex G, in the right column, add closing quote at the end of the bullet beginning with "The term non-spacing character ...".
5. In Annex G, in the right column, the bullet starting with "The possibility to attach ..." does not begin with a sentence like the other bullets. Replace this phrase with "It reduces the registration documentation required for coding systems not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022."