

**Subject:** Recommendation for US Ballot and Comments on ISO/IEC FDIS 2375  
**From:** Joan Aliprand and Edwin Hart  
**Action Requested:** Approval and Comments by 2002-11-08  
**References:** ISO/IEC FDIS 2375:2002(E)

We recommend that the US vote to approve FDIS 2375. Since under ISO rules the US cannot submit comments with its ballot, we recommend that the US submit editorial comments in a separate document for the consideration of the editors. Here are our recommendations for the US comments:

Overall, the US is very pleased with ISO/IEC FDIS 2375, and wishes to thank and commend the chief editor, Mr. Michael Everson, on his responsiveness and the quality of his work on this standard.

### *Editorial Comments on ISO/IEC FDIS 2375*

The US has the following editorial comments on the FDIS 2375.

1. Using the ISO URLs specified in Clause 6.3 resulted in ISO web errors throughout October. This is not the fault of the editor or SC 2. Rather, ISO has failed to maintain the URLs that ISO explicitly provided to the editors as the pointer to the ISO web pages with the current list of Maintenance Agencies and Registration Authorities (in English and French). The US strongly recommends (a) that this deficiency be corrected before the standard is published, (b) that ISO establish procedures to prevent changes to critical URLs, and (c) that ISO establish a procedure to periodically verify correct operation of these URLs.

To guard against a failure to maintain the URLs published in this standard, the editor may wish to add instructions on what to do when the requested web page is not found: to search the ISO web pages for "Registration Authorities" the English-version is wanted, or "organismes d'enregistrement" for the French version.

2. On first reading of the "Forward", we were confused that ISO is replacing the *third* edition of ISO 2375 with the *first* edition of ISO/IEC 2375. While this may be technically correct, it is confusing. This is not the *first* edition of the 2375 standard, but the *fourth* edition. The US recommends either deleting "first" or replacing it with "fourth". In addition, correct the title of Annex G to "Principal differences between this fourth edition of ISO/IEC 2375 and the third edition of ISO 2375 (1985-11-01)".
3. Introduction, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, last line: Change "assing" to "assign".
4. Clause 2, last item: Correct the reference from "ISO Directives" to "ISO/IEC Directives". (The ISO document [www.iso.org/sdis/directives/](http://www.iso.org/sdis/directives/) states "The procedures described in Part 1 and the ISO Supplement do not apply to ISO/IEC JTC 1, for which reference should instead be made to *ISO/IEC Directives, Procedures for the technical work of ISO/IEC JTC 1 in Information technology*." The title of the actual document (<http://www.jtc1.org/directives/main.htm>) is *ISO/IEC Directives, Procedures for the technical work of ISO/IEC JTC 1*.)
5. In clause 4.2, please correct "internet" to "Internet" for consistency with other occurrences (e.g., in clauses 4.3 and A.2.5).
6. In clause 9.2.2.1, change "from within its respective countries or organizations" to "from within its country, countries, or organizations" to parallel the text in clause 9.2.3.1. Rationale: Since a national

body can be a sponsoring authority, it may receive requests from within the *country* it represents, but not from *countries*. At the same time, an international organization with liaison status with ISO or ISO/IEC may receive requests from any of the various *countries* or organizations that are members of the organization with liaison status.

7. The last sentence of clause 9.2.2.4 has an error. We suggest replacing “that developer of an application” with “that developed the application”.
8. Changes to Clause 9.2.3: (a) Correct the bad column break at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> column on page 4. Rationale: Because clause 9.2.3 is a subtitle, it should appear with the related subclauses. (b) Insert “the” between “of” and “Sponsoring”.
9. In clause 18.4.3, it is not clear who the “interested parties” are. They could be taken to be the members of the subcommittee concerned with coded character sets who are notified in clause 18.3.2. For clarification (as in Clause 17.2.6), add “(see Clause 6.2.4)” between “parties” and “of”.
10. Annex A, Clause A.1.1.1, 15<sup>th</sup> line: To make the verb agree with the singular subject, change “coding system that *use* the standard return” to “coding system that *uses* the standard return”. .
11. Annex A, Clause A.1.1.2, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet: Change the text to “whenever a registration is revised, the date of the revision and description of each change”.
12. Annex A, Clause 1.2.1.3: Insert “of a” between “example” and “layout” Rationale: cf. heading of Annex E.
13. Annex A, Clause 1.2.1.3: Change the terminology from “for an 8-bit *code* not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022” to “for an 8-bit *coded character set* not conformant with ISO/IEC 2022”.
14. Annex A, Clause 1.2.2.3, second sentence: To correct mixing of singular and plural, reword the sentence (“Instead of a character name, ...”) to:  
  
An unused position shall be indicated by the text “(This position shall not be used)” instead of a character name.
15. Annex A, Clause A.2.9: For consistency with ISO/IEC 10646 practice, capitalize “Basic Multilingual Plane”.
16. For clause C.5, the meaning of “control function” at the end is unclear. We believe that the second “control function” in the text means the ISO/IEC 2022 F<sub>s</sub> ESC sequence used to identify the first “control function” specified in the ISO/IEC 2375 registration. We recommend replacing the last “control function” with “function via a registered ISO/IEC 2022 ESC F<sub>s</sub> sequence”.
17. For Annex D for both the code tables of control characters and graphic characters, please even the horizontal space between the b<sub>5</sub>, b<sub>6</sub>, and b<sub>7</sub> bits in the 7-bit code tables and the b<sub>5</sub>, b<sub>6</sub>, b<sub>7</sub> and b<sub>8</sub> bits in the 8-bit code tables. While the 8-bit code tables have better spacing for these bits than the 7-bit code tables, the bits still appear to be not quite evenly spaced.
18. For the Multi-octet table in clause D.3.2, the size of the bit subscripts appears to be larger than those in the 7-bit and 8-bit tables. The larger size is preferable.
19. For the three tables in clauses D.4 and D.5, correct the first “1” bit in the “0 1 1 0 06” row to be the same size as the other “1” bits in these tables.
20. Annex E, page 23, Notes on “5D LEFT HALF OF LIGATURE SIGN AND OF DOUBLE TILDE” (beginning at end of left column): This text does not discuss “(described under the following characters)” to describe the alternatives and the second paragraph (top of right column) refers to two discrete “halves”, which also are not described. The enclosure has suggested replacement text.

[END OF COMMENTS]

**Enclosure:**  
**Replacement text for “5D LEFT HALF OF LIGATURE SIGN AND OF DOUBLE  
TILDE”**

5D LEFT HALF OF LIGATURE SIGN AND OF DOUBLE TILDE

This character is used in two different ways. As the left half of the ligature sign, it is used with various letters in transliterations of languages of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union written in Cyrillic script. (The example of use shows transliterated Russian.) As the left half of the double tilde, it is used with the letter “n” (upper or lower case) in the ligature “ng with tilde” of Tagalog.

This character is mapped to U+FE20 COMBINING LIGATURE LEFT HALF because it is more commonly used in transliterations representing Cyrillic letters, and because the ISO 5426 example of use is as the left half of a ligature sign.

It is possible to devise a more exact mapping for this character by taking the other half into account:

IF 0x5D and its base character in the ISO 5426 source string is followed by 0x5F (right half of double tilde)

THEN map 0x5D to U+FE22

ELSE map 0x5D to U+FE20

\* covers both use of 0x5D as left half of ligature and pathological condition of an unpaired half \*

Alternatively, the pair of “halves” representing either the ligature used in romanization of Cyrillic script or the “double tilde” of Tagalog can be mapped to the corresponding “double diacritic” character, U+0361 COMBINING DOUBLE INVERTED BREVE or U+0360 COMBINING DOUBLE TILDE, instead of to the compatibility “halves” by examining following characters. Unpaired “halves” should be mapped to the appropriate compatibility “half” according to the table above.

[END OF DOCUMENT]