

**Title: Considerations on PDAM and CD development process**

**Source: Michel Suignard, Project Editor**

**Status: Individual Contribution**

**Distribution: WG2**

**Reference: SC2 N4549 WG2**

**Summary:** This document is providing input and feedback concerning the document SC2 4549 'Request to discuss the development process of PDAM and CD at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Plenary Meeting of ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2. It suggests that only modest steps such as posting of proposals in the WG2 registry prior to PDAM/CD balloting should be sufficient.

In document SC2 N4549, the Japanese NB expressed some concerns about inclusion of repertoire in Proposed Draft Amendment (PDAM) for which a lack of maturity could be perceived for the following reasons:

- lack of WG2 proposal documents,
- no discussion in SC2 and/or WG2

This concern was especially about the Small (historic) Kanas. To remedy this, the Japanese NB is suggesting the following measures as possibilities:

- Prior submission to SC2 and WG2 registry,
- Discussion at WG2 meeting or reviewed for some period of time by WG2 mailing list.

It should be noted that for these 9 characters, there was a formal proposal document for two characters (WG2 N3987 'Proposal to add two kana characters', concerns the small kanas KO), and the other 7 characters were endorsed by WG2 N4803 'Feedback for the two proposals to encode additional small kana characters L2/16-334 and L2/16-354'). While N4803 was somewhat short of a full proposal document, the proposal characters were described and one could easily have found evidence in the referenced documents.

A second note is the type of ballot in questions. The current flexibility in adding repertoire only applies to committee level ballot (CD and PDAM). It does not apply to enquiry level ballot (DIS and DAM) where a solid consensus at the SC2 level is required.

The process of 10646:2016: Amendment 1 has been hampered by its timing in relation to WG2 meeting schedule. PDAM1 was initiated few months before meeting #65, to give a chance to experts to provide feedback during the disposition of comments. Its initial content was mostly based on work done by the Unicode Consortium and the main repertoires considered were: Dogra, Gunjala Gondi, Makasar, Medefaidrin, and Indic Siyaq Numbers. At the meeting #65, Khitan Small Script and Xiangqi Game symbols were added. Before PDAM 1.2 was issued, few more characters were added: a new block: Mayan Numerals, and a few miscellaneous characters including the 9 small Kanas. These had been extensively discussed within the Unicode Consortium. When PDAM1.2 ballots were disposed, based on strong objection from Japan, some of these characters (the small Kanas) were moved to PDAM2.

Few considerations are in order:

- WG2 meets only once a year, making any progress in encoding proposal very complicated, especially given that any enquiry ballot requires a 5-month ballot (+ preparation this is over a 6-month cycle).

- At the same time, the Unicode UTC meets 4 times a year with a very broad representation of repertoire encoding experts. Therefore, it seems natural to use these opportunities to make progress on repertoire proposals.
- While the Unicode Consortium is only a liaison A organization in the ISO context, it has acquired considerable expertise in character encoding and many implementations aspects related to it. For example, the Common Locale Data Repository Project (CLDR) is an important complement to the repertoire encoding.
- Concerning document registry, the Project Editor has explored various combinations of document postings, and while it was considered for a while to mostly use the UTC registry for repertoire encoding proposals, the latest strategy is to have all repertoires considered for inclusion in ISO/IEC 10646 also included in the WG2 registry. This should be obvious from the recent status of the WG2 registry and the latest WG2 meeting agenda.
- In addition, all recent PDAM documents have included a preamble with repertoire and WG2 document numbers for all repertoires added between WG2 meetings.

To comment on the Japanese suggestions:

The Project editor agrees on submitting all encoding proposal considered for inclusion in the WG2 registry. However, it should not be necessary to duplicate them in SC2, but it is obviously at the discretion of the submitters.

Discussing proposals at WG2 meetings is useful, but given the yearly occurrence, it is not that beneficial.

Reviewing for some period after posting the document(s) by WG2 mailing list would delay even more the process. After all, the PDAM process is a review mechanism, and the mailing list has been extremely quiet, even when documents were posted.

At this point, with the current mechanisms which consist of a) posting proposals to the WG2 registry, b) initial review by UTC experts, it seems that the encoding proposals would reach a level of maturity sufficient for initial balloting at committee level. This does not exclude discussions at WG2 meetings when appropriate.

Considering the specific case of small historic Kanas, there were clearly some issues in some of the proposal documents and their posting in the WG2 registry. This can be avoided in the future. In addition, the draft disposition of comment concerning these characters has proposed to accept the Japanese comment to discuss these additions during the WG2 meeting #66 in Hohhot China.

In conclusion, the Project editor does not see the need to formalize a new process, if new proposals are posted to the WG2 registry prior to ballot issuance. The PDAM ballot is already a committee level review process.

--