

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: December 5, 2011

Document: SC 35 N 1743, PDTR 20007

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US			T.1.	The goal of this TR is unclear to us. Until the goal is more clearly defined, it is not possible for us to evaluate whether the content as currently drafted is ready for approval. At a minimum, the document cannot be approved until the goals and content are sufficiently clarified to enable effective review.	Please clarify the goals and content.	
US			T.2.	<p>It is difficult to provide concise definitions of the terms under discussion, such as "character", "glyph", "symbol", etc. Such terms can only be understood in a context, and the definitions are often constructed to be read in that context.</p> <p>A good example is that of the definition of "graphical symbol" in ISO/IEC 10646: "the visual representation of a graphic character or of a composite sequence", which make very little sense outside of ISO/IEC 10646.</p> <p>The definition of "pictogram" also does not seem correct.</p>	Please correct these defects in the document.	
US			T.3.	Clause 7, first paragraph, first sentence. The wording can be interpreted to imply that standardized symbols will result more or less systematically in the encoding of characters. We do not believe there is such a implication, nor that searchability can only be achieved via character encoding.	Please change the wording so as : - to remove the implication of systematic encoding - not to imply that searchability requires encoding as characters	
US			T.4.	Clause 9, second paragraph "ISO/IEC 10646 can be seen as a universal registry of characters". The term "registry" is really unfortunate here, as ISO/IEC 10646 does not function at all like a ISO/IEC registry.	Please change this clause to an annex, with different subsections giving references to ISO standards, registries, etc. for the different types of entities. Also, do not characterize ISO/IEC 10646 as a registry.	

<sup>1</sup> MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: **ge** = general    **te** = technical    **ed** = editorial

NOTE    Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

**Template for comments and secretariat observations**

Date: December 5, 2011

Document: SC 35 N 1743, PDTR 20007

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				Clause 9, as a whole, may give the impression that the various repertoires are parallel and are just different ways to looking at the same underlying objects. There may be points of overlap but the collections are of distinct types and should not be presented in this way as though somehow unified.		
US			T.5.	Clauses 3.4 and 3.5, uses ISO/IEC 9541-1:1991, which seems a bit old.	Please correct to a current edition.	
US			E.1.	References to "ISO/IEC 10646-1:2010" are incorrect (there was no parts in the 2010 edition) and should be changed to "ISO/IEC 10646:2011".		

1 MB = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.