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1. Overview
In the past several ballot comments of ISO/IEC 10646 from Japan National Body, we pointed out the issue about the review process of CJK repertoire in IRG. For example, in the ballot comment of ISO/IEC 10646(Ed.5) PDAM2.2, we commented as follows.

“According to IRG recommendation M49.2 from last IRG meeting, IRG still continue for one more round of review for WS (Working Set) 2015, after it has been submitted as CJK G to WG2 for the inclusion into PDAM. Japan NB thinks this is incorrect procedure. It should be submitted after the completion of development work within IRG.”

We know that IRG has been working very hard to develop CJK Unified Ideograph repertoire and this happens because IRG is always trying to improve it as times permit. However, the ISO procedure should be observed, then we request IRG to consider other approach.

2. What happened so far
Following figure shows the review process of CJK unified ideograph Extension–B (or WS2015). The upper line shows what happened in IRG, and the lower line shows what happened in SC2/WG2.

Here is a summary.

- At IRG meeting #49 in October, 2017, IRG agreed to submit WS 2015 V5.0 as Extension G to ISO/IEC10646 Project Editor to generate the code chart. Then, it was included in PDAM2.2 and circulated for the ballot.
- IRG continued for one more round of review after it was submitted for PDAM ballot.
- At IRG meeting #50 in May, 2018, the review comments on CJK Extension G raised at
the PDAM2.2 ballot and from IRG experts were disposed, then IRG agreed to submit WS 2015 V6.0 to WG2 #67. Then, it was included in ISO/IEC 10646 CD text and circulated for the ballot.

- IRG continued for one more round of review after it was submitted for CD ballot.
- At IRG meeting #51, IRG reviewed experts' comments on CJK Extension G which was still in the CD ballot. Then, IRG decided to take one round of review prior to submitting the revised repertoire to WG2.

The problems we think are

- IRG always continues the review after submitting the CJK repertoire to WG2 for the inclusion into ballot text.
- During the ballot period, IRG discussed CJK-G in the ballot text at IRG meeting.

3. Suggestions
Our suggestions to improve this situation are

- If IRG members think the further review of CJK repertoire is still required after submitting to the WG2, voting members in IRG could review it and submit the ballot comments.
- To schedule IRG meeting after each ballot period. So that IRG could timely dispose the review comments of CJK repertoire raised by the ballot as the following figure.
Appendix: Some recommendations from past IRG meetings related to CJK-G and WS2015 review activity

IRG Meeting #49 (San Jose : 2017-10-16 to 2017-10-20)

- Recommendation IRG M49.2: Review of IRG Working Set 2015 Version 4.0
  IRG reviewed comments on the IRG WS 2015 version 4.0 from experts and accepts the editorial report IRG N2263.
  IRG agrees to produce IRG WS 2015 V5.0 and submit it as Extension G to ISO/IEC10646 Project Editor to generate the code chart and continue for one more round of review based on the following review schedule:

IRG Meeting #50 (Beijing, China : 2018-05-21 to 2018-05-25)

- Recommendation IRG M50.2: Review of IRG Working Set 2015
  IRG reviewed comments on the IRG Working Set 2015 version 5.0 (IRGN2269) from experts, dispositions of comments in PDAM2.2 ballot by ISO/IEC 10646 Project Editor (IRGN2304) and accepts the editorial report IRGN2291. IRG agrees to submit WS 2015 V6.0 (IRGN2308) to WG2 #67 and also have one more round of review.

IRG Meeting #51 (Hanoi, Vietnam : 2018-10-22 to 2018-10-26)

- Recommendation IRG M51.2: Review of IRG Working Set 2015
  The IRG reviewed experts' comments on IRG Working Set 2015 Version 6.0 (IRG N2308R) and the DRAFT CJK Unified Ideographs Extension G code chart, and accepts the Editorial Report (IRG N2327). The IRG recommends one final round of review prior to submitting the revised repertoire to WG2.
  - 2018-11-23: IRG experts submit consistency review comments to the IRG Chief Editor
  - 2018-12-07: The IRG Chief Editor distributes consolidated comments and proposed dispositions to IRG experts
  - 2018-12-14: IRG experts submit confirmation of proposed dispositions to the IRG Chief Editor
  - 2018-12-21: The IRG Chief Editor submits updated data to the WG2 Project Editor and IRG experts for producing IRGN2346 (WS 2015 V7.0)
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