JTC 1/SC2/WG2/IRG N 1161

Date: 2005-11-28

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC2/WG2/ Ideographic Rapporteur Group

Source / Contribution Identifier: Japan
Meeting: IRG#25 @ Berkeley, CA
Title: Japan Concern on CJK C1 Quality
Keywords: (none)
Status:
Short Description: to be discussed on IRG #25
Proposed Conclusion / Requested Action: to be discussed at IRG #25
Arguments / Text of Contribution: See attachments.

The IRG#23 resolved to postpone the completion of the CJK C1 project for at least one year because of its quality concern. One year has passed since we had the resolution, and we've finished the additional reviews as scheduled. Now we need to evaluate if the quality of CJK C1 has reached the level we can decide whether to move CJK C1 to the next step or not.

1. Is CJK C1 sufficiently stable?

Other members may have different views, but Japan feels the quality of CJK C1 is not stable enough yet.

One of the reasons is the number of errors member reported at each review cycle, which is not showing the decreasing tendency as we see in the attached material in this document. If the quality is being stabilized, the number of errors in the consolidated list at each review cycle should be fewer than that of the previous result. This non-decreasing error rate indicates that CJK C1 has not exhaustively reviewed yet and it contains possibly more errors unless we carry out more thorough reviews.

2. Potential pitfalls in the review process?

We first expected that the more we review the better the quality of C1 becomes. We assumed reviewing six times in a year might be sufficient for this purpose. However, not all parts were reported every time. We're afraid no report for a specific part might not guarantee no problem is found in that part. (For example, members might not have had enough resource to carry out an assigned review.)

If it happens the case, we still have parts not reviewed by members and as a consequence, we haven't finished the scheduled reviews yet.

3. Conclusion

Thinking above two situations, we're NOT convinced that the quality of CJK C1 is good enough yet.

We think one of the problems when we discuss the quality is that we only have the target date to finalize but we don't set any target for quality assessment. We strongly feel the need of the development of criteria for the quality of CJK C1 and the realistic way to get there.

(End of Report)

【Attachment: summary of each review work】

	v30	v31	v32	v40	v41	v42	v50	v51	v52
China	001-160 ○			391-505 ○	271-390 ○		001-130 ○	341-420 ○	401-523 ○
TCA	161-320 ○			271-390	391-503 ○		131-260	001-130 ○	200-320 ○
Japan	321-370 ○	○	○	181-270 ○	091-180 ○		261-340 ○	131-260 ○	321-400 ○
Vietnam	421-440						341-420 ○	261-340	121-300
Korea	371-420			091-180	181-270 ○		421-500	501-526	041-120
Hksar	461-480 ○		○	001-030 ○	061-090		501-535 ○	421-500 (*1)	001-040 ○
MSAR	481- ○		○	031-060 ○	001-030 ○				
US/Unicode	441-460			061-090	031-060				
Singapore									

(*1) because reported late,
items are confirmed at v52 review time

#items in (*2) cosolidated report	(*3)	89	?	152	322	?	254	257	374

(*2) with attachments, there are more items

(*3) reviewed only on SC because the N954 revised

? ... report consolidation not distributed.