

Result of voting

Ballot Information

Ballot reference	SC2N5062 - Draft ToR of ISO/IEC 10646/MA
Ballot type	CIB
Ballot title	[For consultation] Preliminary Draft, Terms of Reference of the ISO/IEC 10646 Maintenance Agency (ISO/IEC 10646/MA)
Opening date	2026-07-15
Closing date	2026-10-07
Note	In accordance with Action Item 1 agreed at the SC 2 Plenary held in Paris, France, 2026-06-22 and 26, this document is circulated to the SC 2 members for a consultation purpose. Please submit your comments via the ISO balloting system by the due date indicated. Please note the following. This document is a preliminary draft of the Terms of Reference (ToR) intended for a Maintenance Agency proposed to be established pursuant to Clause 2.11 of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, for the maintenance of the character repertoire and associated data files of ISO/IEC 10646. This draft is based on discussions held within AHG 1 during its meetings in Paris on 23 and 25 June. AHG 1 reached consensus that this draft should be submitted to SC 2 for consultation purposes. The proper names appearing in this draft (for example, "JISC") are provisional placeholders and do not represent final conclusions.

Member responses:

Votes cast (20)	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CAS) France (AFNOR) Greece (ELOT)
------------------------	--

	Hungary (MSZT) India (BIS) Indonesia (BSN) Ireland (NSAI) Japan (JISC) Kazakhstan (CTRM) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Norway (SN) Poland (PKN) Russian Federation (GOST R) Serbia (ISS) Sri Lanka (SLSI) United Kingdom (BSI) United States (ANSI) Viet Nam (STAMEQ)
Comments submitted (0)	
Votes not cast (2)	Germany (DIN) Ukraine (SE UkrNDNC)

Questions:	
Q.1	"Do you have any comments on the draft ToR?"

Votes by members	Q.1
Canada (SCC)	Yes
China (SAC)	Yes
Czech Republic (CAS)	No
France (AFNOR)	No
Greece (ELOT)	No
Hungary (MSZT)	No
India (BIS)	Yes
Indonesia (BSN)	No
Ireland (NSAI)	No
Japan (JISC)	Yes
Kazakhstan (CTRM)	No
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	No
Norway (SN)	Yes
Poland (PKN)	No
Russian Federation (GOST R)	No
Serbia (ISS)	No
Sri Lanka (SLSI)	No

United Kingdom (BSI)	No
United States (ANSI)	Yes
Viet Nam (STAMEQ)	No

Answers to Q.1: "Do you have any comments on the draft ToR?"		
6 x	Yes	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) India (BIS) Japan (JISC) Norway (SN) United States (ANSI)
14 x	No	Czech Republic (CAS) France (AFNOR) Greece (ELOT) Hungary (MSZT) Indonesia (BSN) Ireland (NSAI) Kazakhstan (CTRM) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Poland (PKN) Russian Federation (GOST R) Serbia (ISS) Sri Lanka (SLSI) United Kingdom (BSI) Viet Nam (STAMEQ)

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Canada (SCC)	Comment	2026-09-28 20:51:14
1. Canada has no major objections to present MA Terms of Reference in general. 2. The MA model has benefit of a smaller granularity for decisions, on a rolling schedule, vs current SC2 annual all-or-nothing granularity. 3. Our MC feels document and code chart infrastructure be accessible to and available to ISO, i.e., we should be able to escrow tools in another jurisdiction as a future-proofing measure. 4. The Unicode Consortium should make a formal reciprocal commitment to the Maintenance Agency process. 5. Finally, we propose that SC2 formally document criteria for supporting encoding proposals from the ISO side. Our representatives to AHG1 will be happy to elaborate as required.		
China (SAC)	Comment File	2026-09-29 10:08:46
CommentFiles/SC2N5062 - Draft ToR of ISO_IEC 10646_MA_SAC.docx		
India (BIS)	Comment	2026-10-06 13:48:45
Comment file attached.		

India (BIS)	Comment File	2026-10-06 13:48:45
CommentFiles/SC2N5062 - Draft ToR of ISO_IEC 10646_MA_BIS.doc		
Japan (JISC)	Comment	2026-10-05 10:24:35
JNB supports this draft as a whole for reasons including the following. However, further revisions to details, including wording corrections, will be necessary. - ISO/IEC 10646 consists of two parts: the core text, which defines the fundamental principles and rules of character encoding, and the code charts and related data referenced by that core text. This draft clarifies that the scope of the Maintenance Agency (MA) is limited to “maintain the coded character assignments and code tables for the UCS, along with other components that are subject to on-going change particularly when new coded characters are assigned.” (Section 1.2). This limits the MA’s scope not to the body of the standard itself, but rather to those parts referenced from the body of the standard that require frequent modification. This approach is consistent with the intent of Clause 4.8 of the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1 (2026). It is also aligned with the policies of many existing Maintenance Agencies. - The draft establishes two decision-making methods: “consensus” and “approval vote.” It also divides voters into the National Body Voting Group (NBVG), whose members are appointed by National Bodies (NBs), and the Implementation Agency Voting Group (IAVG), whose members are appointed by Implementation Agencies (IAs). The joint body comprising the NBVG and IAVG is called the Joint Voting Group (JVG). “Consensus” is achieved within the JVG. In this process, there is no specified voting threshold, and the IAVG does not possess veto power (Section 2.4.4). For an “approval vote,” approval requires both a two-thirds majority of the NBVG members present and support from the IAVG (Section 5.4.2.4). As a result, the IAVG effectively has veto power at this stage. However, if a proposal is rejected in this vote, a JVG meeting will be convened, and through consensus at that meeting, the proposal may be returned to the commenting phase instead of being rejected at that stage (Section 5.4.1.8.b). Therefore, opposition by the IAVG does not automatically result in final rejection, and the NBs retain substantial authority over the ultimate decision. Even under the current decision-making process used by SC 2 and SC 2/WG 2, encoding proposals that conflict with technical requirements are never accepted. Encoding decisions are made through discussions involving both experts with deep knowledge of the relevant cultural and linguistic backgrounds and experts with expertise in overall standard consistency and implementation requirements. Chapter 5 of the draft reflects these existing procedures and does not alter the fundamental nature of the decision-making process. In this sense, Chapter 5 is consistent with the statement at the beginning of Section 1.2 of the draft: “The ISO/IEC 10646/MA is established and governed by ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2.” JNB believes that making these procedures explicit will improve the transparency of the decision-making process. - The draft states that the IRG, which is currently positioned as an ad hoc group under WG 2 and conducts studies at WG 2’s request, will be redefined as an Advisory Group (Section 4.2). As a result, it is expected that the IRG will be able to conduct its activities in a more autonomous and sustainable manner, consistent with the ISO/IEC governance framework. In addition, Section 2.2 describes the procedure for adding an Advisory Group (AG) to serve as a CCA. This provides a transparent mechanism for accommodating additional scripts as future needs arise. ---- Editorial Corrections		

1. The term "NBVG" appears in four places: - Section 2.4 - Section 2.4, Note 3 - Section 5.4 output 4a - Section 5.6.2 These appear to be typographical errors and should be corrected to "NBVG." 2. The final sentence of Section 2.4.4, Note 3 ends with a comma. Either the comma should be replaced with a period, or the missing text following the comma should be restored. 3. In Section 5.4.2.4 b), "NOTE 1" appears to be improperly attached to the end of the sentence. 4. NOTE 4 in Section 5.4.2 appears to be a typographical error and is believed to have been intended as NOTE 2.		
Norway (SN)	Comment	2026-10-07 21:34:18
SN considers this draft of ToR for the projected ISO 10646 MA to be an excellent starting point. The document needs some editing for clarity as well as proofreading, but in terms of substance, it looks like a workable operating procedure that represents a significant step in the right direction. Care should be taken to distinguish between Representatives and Voting Representatives. "2/3 of P-members" should probably be clarified to "at least 2/3". On substance, we would like to point out that it may not be wise to specify a particular NSB as the MAS (JISC in the draft, but the point applies to any agency). The consequence is that one would have to revise the ToR in order to change the secretariat, which seems overly burdensome. A further point is that for balance, one might consider allowing non-voting Representatives from P-members to participate in the NBVG for the purpose of discussing the CRs, just as Representatives from the IA can take part in the IAVG. In the current ToR, this is solved by including Observers, but if so, the same nomenclature should perhaps be used for the IAVG? The Observer role as defined in 2.5 arguably is much broader (allows for more active participation) than one would normally expect based on the term "Observer".		
United States (ANSI)	Comment File	2026-10-06 21:59:08
CommentFiles/SC2N5062 - Draft ToR of ISO_IEC 10646_MA_ANSI.docx		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date: