

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2  
Coded character sets  
Secretariat: JISC (Japan)

**Document type:** National Body Contribution

**Title:** Japanese National Body Proposal on the process for future disposition of comments

**Status:** This document is circulated for consideration at the 20th SC 2 Plenary Meeting, Matsue, Japan, 2015-10-19 and 23.

**Date of document:** 2015-10-09

**Source:** Japan

**Expected action:** ACT

**Action due date:** 2015-10-19

**No. of pages:** 3

**Email of secretary:** [kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp](mailto:kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp)

**Committee URL:** <http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink/open/jtc1sc2>

Document type:	National Body Contribution
Title:	Proposal on the process for future disposition of comments
Status:	Circulated for information
Source	Japan
Actions:	For consideration by SC2
Date:	October 9, 2015

On SC2 N4418, Japan NB requested to discuss the document "IRG position on the disposition of PDAM2.2 ballot comments" (SC2 N4415) at the 20th Plenary Meeting of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 in Matsue, Japan. We appreciate for taking the time to discuss on SC2 plenary.

This contribution is to propose the process for future disposition of comments in order to resolve the concerns described in N4415.

Regarding the background information of things happened at the disposition of PDAM2.2 ballot comments, please refer N4415. In summary, the whole set of CJK Unified Ideograph Extension F once proposed to include Amendment 2 was removed at the PDAM ballot due to several comments which IRG expert already made the consensus. Note that N4426 prepared by UTC would also help to understand the chronology on this issue.

At first, Japan NB understands there was no problem on the process for disposition of PDAM2.2 ballot comments taken by the project editor at this time. It properly followed the resolution at the last SC2 Plenary Meeting in Colombo (N4377 RESOLUTION M19-06: Progression of Project for Amendment 2 to ISO/IEC 10646: 2014), mentioning "SC 2 delegates its authority to the Project Editor in consultation with the WG 2 experts for disposition of comments, preparing revised texts and recommendations on further processing of this project until the next SC 2 Plenary."

Also Japan NB does not want to discourage any NB to submit the ballot comments on IRG outcome, even if the person in NB is not IRG expert.

Japan NB thinks what unfortunately happened this time is the inefficiency caused by duplicate discussions induced by the ballot resolution on matters which are already discussed and resolved among IRG experts. And also, there might be some reasons that it is difficult to consult with WG 2 and/or IRG expert before the disposition. Of course we recognize the project editor dealt with the disposition of comments with his best effort.

There is the procedure for this kind of situation to appeal the disagreement to the disposition of comments as described in ISO/IEC Directives Part 1 2.5.3, i.e. "after the circulation of a revised

compilation of comments, P members could notify the disagreement with the proposal and if within 2 months from the date of dispatch, 2 or more P members disagree with proposal of the secretariat, the committee draft shall be discussed at a meeting.”

However, Japan NB thinks it is desirable to have mutual communication easily among concerned NBs before the appeal of disagreement.

Therefore, Japan NB would like to propose the following actions in order to improve the communication among concerned NBs and IRG experts for the disposition of comments.

1. To have the face-to-face meeting for the comment disposition as we used to do. Currently, we have the WG2 meeting once a year jointly with SC2 plenary. We may be able to seek a possibility to have another WG 2 meeting in a year jointly with IRG meeting.
2. If above 1 is difficult to organize, next possibility is to have the mutual communication for the comment disposition using Discussion forum of the WG 2 e-committee or to circulate the project editor’s proposed disposition of comments as an SC 2 document for review for a certain period, e.g., 30 days.

Finally, Japan NB expects the project editor continues to closely consult with WG 2 and IRG experts when preparing the draft disposition of comments.

(End of document)