Per the results of this ballot, since there was no majority vote for either position, WG 20 will continue.
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----------------------------------------------------------------------

The following responses have been received on the subject of the future of SC 22/WG20

"P" Members supporting Choice 1 (Disbandment)
6 (Finland, Ireland*, Japan, Netherlands*, Sweden*, United States)

"P" Members supporting Choice 2 (Continuation of WG20)
6 (Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Norway, Republic of Korea)

"P" Members abstaining
4 (Czech Republic, Romania, Russian Federation, United Kingdom*)

"P" Members not voting
7 (Austria, Belgium, Brazil, China, DPR of Korea, Slovenia, Ukraine)

*Denotes that comments were submitted

---------------------------------------

National Body Comments

Canada
A home is required in JTC1 for internationalization. It makes no sense to abolish this WG to re-create it later on with the same mission.

However, this WG should work in much closer relationship with SC35 (user interfaces) and SC2 (charset coding).

All three planes of the infrastructure necessary for cultural and linguistic
adaptability should be covered in any new projet:
- programming functionality required for CLA and cross-language,
cross-culture, cross-nation interoperability;
- user interface necessary to control parameters;
- coding requirement

Ireland
"Ireland's preference to disband WG20 and to reassign its existing
projects to ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC22 entails one exception. Maintenance of
the ISO/IEC 14651 (International String Ordering) and tables for TR's
(Annex A to TR 10176) which need to track newly added characters to
ISO/IEC 10646 should be done in a committee that is intimately
familiar with the repertoire and properties of additional characters,
namely SC2/WG2."

Netherlands
With the condition that there will be a liaison-officer

Sweden
Divide the ongoing work into SC 22 and forward the work with 14651 to
SC 2.

United Kingdom
Comments:

1. There is no consensus in the UK to either continue WG20 as is, given
the problems that have been associated with its work, or to close it,
given the importance that the UK attaches to the issue of
Internationalization.

2. It is our understanding that the existing Convenor will not be
continuing at the end of his appointed term, should WG20 not be closed.
In these circumstances the UK believes that it will be in a position to
submit a nominee for the position (Professor Pat Hall, Open
University).