



ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 N 3337

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 3 N 482

Date : 1999-07-15

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 3
7-bit and 8-bit codes and their extension
SECRETARIAT : ELOT**

DOC TYPE :	Summary of Voting/Tables of Replies
TITLE :	Summary of voting on SC 2 N 3302, Subdivision Proposal on JTC 1.02.20 for 8859-16, 8-bit single-byte coded graphic character sets -- Part 16: Latin No. 10
SOURCE :	Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2
PROJECT:	JTC 1.02.20
STATUS :	This voting summary is forwarded to WG 3 for consideration. WG 3 is requested to prepare a recommendation to the SC 2 Secretariat on further processing.
ACTION ID :	ACT
DUE DATE :	----
DISTRIBUTION :	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 WG Conveners, Secretariats ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat ISO/IEC ITTF
MEDIUM :	Defined
NO OF PAGES :	6

Contact 1: Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 3 ELOT Mrs K.Velli (acting)
Acharnon 313, 111 45 Kato Patissia, ATHENS – GREECE
Tel: +30 1 21 20 307 Fax : +30 1 22 86 219 E-mail : kkb@elot.gr

Contact 2 : Convenor ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 3 Mr E.Melagrakis
Acharnon 313, 111 45 Kato Patissia, ATHENS – GREECE
Tel: +30 1 21 20 301 Fax : +30 1 22 86 219 E-mail: eam@elot.gr

Summary of Voting on SC 2 N 3302

Vote:

Q1: Do you support the addition of the subproject to the Programme of Work of SC 2?

Yes: 15, Yes with comment: 1, No: 3

Participation:

Q2: Do you commit yourself to participate in the development of this subproject?

Yes: 5

Q3: Are you able to offer a project editor who will dedicate his/her efforts to the advancement and maintenance of this subproject?

Yes: 2

P-member	Q1	Q2	Q3	Comment
Armenia				
Australia	Yes	No	No	
Austria				
Belgium				
Brazil				
Canada	Yes	Yes		Attachment 1
China	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Denmark	Yes	No	No	
Egypt	Yes			
Finland	No	No	No	Attachment 2
France	Yes			
Germany				
Greece	Yes	Yes	No	
Iceland				
India				
Iran, Islamic Republic of				
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Attachment 3
Israel				
Italy	Yes	No	No	
Japan	Yes	No	No	Attachment 4
Korea, Rep. of	Yes			
Morocco				
Netherlands				
Norway	Yes	No	No	
Poland				
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Attachment 5
Russian Federation	Yes	No	No	
Singapore				
Slovenia				
Sweden	No	No	No	Attachment 6
Thailand				
Tunisia				
Turkey	Yes	No	No	
UK	Yes			
USA	No			Attachment 7
Viet Nam				
Yugoslavia				

Attachment 1 - Canada

Q2: Canada - Can participate in coding related matters

Editorial:

Either remove "1-16" in the first sentence in Annex A, section A.1, or change it to "parts 1-4, 9, 10, 13-16".

Reasons:

In Annex A, section A.1, the first sentence reads: "The following parts 1-16 of ... based on the Latin alphabet." Only parts 1-4 and parts 9, 10, 13-16 are listed.

In section A.2, the first sentence reads: "The following parts of ... other than the Latin alphabet". Parts 5-8, and 11 are listed here.

While it is true that all 8859-x contain Latin alphabets, the two opening sentences in A.1 and A.2 can be confusing. It's best to remove "1-16" in A.1 from the opening sentence in A.1 or to change it to "1-4 and parts 9, 10, 13-16", which is very clumsy.

Attachment 2 - Finland

Q1: In our discussions with the Swedish National Body we have come to the conclusion that their stated reasons are equally applicable to us.

Attachment 3 - Ireland

Regarding ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2 N3302 ballot, closing date 1999-06-30:

Title: Subdivision Proposal on JTC 1.02.20 for 8859-16, 8-bit single-byte coded graphic character sets -- Part 16: Latin Alphabet No. 10

Q.1 Do you support the addition of the subproject to the programme of work of SC2?

Ireland votes Yes with Comments.

While in general Ireland does not favour the addition of many new work items involving 8-bit character sets, it is clear to us that this project subdivision is a natural part of Romania's intention to deprecate the use of U+015E, U+015F, U+0162, U+0163 (or the base Latin letters plus U+0327) for writing Romanian in favour of the preferred use of U+0218, U+0219, U+021A, U+021B (or the base Latin letters plus U+0326).

Since data encoded in ISO/IEC 8859-2 maps to the former set of characters in ISO/IEC 10646, it seems a logical part of Romania's migration policy to recode data from ISO/IEC 8859-2 to the new ISO/IEC 8859-16 which will map to the latter set of characters in ISO/IEC 10646. It is assumed that Romania has assessed the costs of making such a migration and that this new part of ISO/IEC 8859 should be accepted in order to assist the Romanians.

In addition, like ISO/IEC 8859-13 does for Lithuanian and Latvian, the proposed ISO/IEC 8859-16 contains preferred Romanian quotation marks as well as the euro sign and integral French characters, and is generally a superior 8-bit code table to meet Romanian requirements.

Q.2 Do you commit yourself to participate in the development of this subproject?

Yes, Ireland commits to participation in the development of this subproject.

Q.3 Are you able to offer a project editor who will dedicate his/her efforts to the advancement and maintenance of this project?

Yes, Michael Everson of Everson Gunn Teoranta, who was project editor of ISO/IEC 8859-14 and assistant editor of ISO/IEC 8859-15, has offered to prepare the text. He has been asked to do so by IRS, Institut Român de Standardizare.

Attachment 4 - Japan

Q1: It would be appreciated by Japanese national body if proceeding to NP process is considered for this proposal. (to avoid unnecessary question from JTC 1)

Attachment 5 - Romania

Q3: Michael Everson

Attachment 6 - Sweden

1. Swedish position on Project Subdivision for Romanian code set

The Swedish NB fully recognizes the Romanian needs for correct naming of the letters S and T WITH COMMA BELOW, as different from S and T WITH CEDILLA, in character coding standards.

However the Swedish NB has some doubts whether the proposed new part of ISO/IEC 8859, as documented in JTC 1/SC 2 N3302, is the best solution to this character identification problem. It appears that some further work should be performed to determine exactly how the Romanian needs are best satisfied.

The Swedish NB therefore disapproves of the proposal for a Project Subdivision according to N3302, but will – if so desired – participate in continued other work on the matter.

2. Reasons for Swedish position

There are three main reasons for the Swedish disapproval.

2.1 Existing partial solution

In the view of the Swedish NB, new parts of ISO/IEC 8859 should be created only when user requirements can not be satisfied in any other way. Also it is most desirable that any new part can be based on a stable and implemented scheme.

In the latest revision of ISO/IEC 8859-2 the Romanian character identity problem was recognized, and text was introduced stating that the S and T WITH CEDILLA can be used to represent S and T WITH COMMA BELOW. This was intended as a formalization of existing actual practice.

This 8859-2 solution will naturally cause problems if it is required to differentiate in data processing between S WITH CEDILLA, as used in Turkish, and S WITH COMMA BELOW, as used in Romanian (T WITH CEDILLA appears to not be used in any major language, and differentiation from T WITH COMMA BELOW should therefore not be needed).

The need to differentiate between the two S variants has previously been mentioned in discussions. Since however the S WITH CEDILLA is not included in the proposed Romanian new part, such differentiation is obviously not needed in Romania.

2.2 Possibility of part 2 modification

A simple solution to the identity problem would be to change the identification of the two letters in ISO/IEC 8859-2 (and reverse the text about alternative use, stating that S and T WITH COMMA BELOW can be used to represent S and T WITH CEDILLA).

Sweden is aware of the stated position of SC 2 to not change established code set standards technically. An exception to this position should however be considered, since A) it appears that the original coding was based on a misunderstanding and B) no serious effects should result from a changed identification, the glyphs being practically identical, and Romania being the only country directly concerned (Turkey, with the letter S WITH CEDILLA, uses ISO/IEC 8859 part 9, not part 2).

2.3 Suitability of proposed coding scheme

It could appear natural that a new coding scheme for Romania would be based on ISO/IEC 8859-2, with the problematic S and T WITH CEDILLA exchanged for letters WITH COMMA BELOW. This would insure an acceptable automatic "fall-back presentation" if data was transferred from a system based on the new scheme to another still using ISO/IEC 8859-2, and vice versa.

The proposed scheme is however completely different from the ISO/IEC 8859-2 (obviously being based on the new ISO/IEC 8859-15 instead). It seems this could cause difficulties in installations adopting the proposed scheme, both in communication with other installations and in "legacy applications".

Further the proposed scheme has a smaller language coverage than ISO/IEC 8859-2, not satisfying Czech, Slovak and Sorbian needs; covering French instead. Although this matter has naturally been carefully considered by Romania, the Swedish NB thinks it unfortunate that the language coverage has been reduced as compared to part 2, since this may make the acceptance of the scheme more problematic.

The present ISO/IEC 8859-2 contains several diacritical signs, most of which should have insignificant - if any - use as free-standing characters. It seems that the possibility of exchanging diacritical signs for the specifically French letters should first be considered if a completely new part is designed, and complete coverage of French is essential.

Attachment 7 - USA

The U.S. vote is to DISAPPROVE. The reasons for disapproval are as follows:
The recommends to use ISO 10646 or ISO 8859-2, unless a marketing requirement for the repertoire of ISO 8859, part 16 is proven.