

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2
Coded Character Sets
Secretariat: [Japan \(JISC\)](#)**

DOC. TYPE	National Body Contribution						
TITLE	Comments from Canada on SC 2 N 3949, Draft SC 2 Business Plan (September 2006 -- September 2007)						
SOURCE	National Body of Canada						
PROJECT							
STATUS	All of the comments in this document have been accepted. The updated Business plan is in SC 2 N 3962. This document is forwarded to OWG-SORT. OWG-SORT is requested to consider Draft Business Plan, 3.2.1 Risk 6), in SC 2 N 3949 together with Canadian Comment C. in this document and to send its recommendation to SC 2.						
ACTION ID	FYI						
DUE DATE							
DISTRIBUTION	P, O and L Members of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 ; ISO/IEC JTC 1 Secretariat; ISO/IEC ITTF						
ACCESS LEVEL	Def						
ISSUE NO.	283						
FILE	<table border="1"><tr><td>NAME</td><td>02n3961.pdf</td></tr><tr><td>SIZE (KB)</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>PAGES</td><td></td></tr></table>	NAME	02n3961.pdf	SIZE (KB)	5	PAGES	
NAME	02n3961.pdf						
SIZE (KB)	5						
PAGES							

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 - IPSJ/ITSCJ (Information Processing Society of Japan/Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan)* Room 308-3, Kikai-Shinko-Kaikan Bldg., 3-5-8, Shiba-Koen, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-0011 Japan *Standard Organization Accredited by JISC
Telephone: +81-3-3431-2808; Facsimile: +81-3-3431-6493; E-mail: [kimura @ itscj.ipsj.or.jp](mailto:kimura@itscj.ipsj.or.jp)

Ref: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 N 3949 DATE: 2007-07-25 SC2 Business Plan
(2006-09--2007-09)

Canada has the following comments on the above document: Two of these comments are on omissions / discrepancies. The third comment is on our objection to proposed solution on Risk 6.

a. Project Report section 1.3 in business plan says Current Status of Amd 3 is FDAM.

whereas, <http://std.dkuug.dk/jtc1/sc2/open/pow.htm> page shows Amd. 3 is still at FPDAM3 stage ..

This seems to have NOT progressed to FDAM3 with ITTF. Have not seen JTC1 ballot yet?

(in section 1.3 of business plan)

- Project 02.10646.00.03 (10646/Amd 3), Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) --

Amendment 3: Lepcha, Ol Chiki, Saurashtra, Vai, and other characters

Current status: FDAM

(in SC2 pow page)

10646 00.03 ISO/IEC 10646/FPDAM3 Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) -- Amendment 3: Lepcha, Ol Chiki, Saurashtra, Vai, and other characters M.Suignard 3 06-06/ 06-06 06-10/06-12 07-05

b. 10646 / Amd 4 is MISSING in the list in section 2.2 ACHIEVEMENTS

[to reflect the entry in section 1.3 for: Project 02.10646.00.04

(10646/Amd 4), Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) --

Amendment 4: Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) --

Amendment 4: Lanna,

Cham, Game Tiles, and other characters]

c. Canada strongly disagrees with the solutions proposed for risk 6 in this business plan.

Our country has experience in managing issues involving discrepancies between legal texts. Our laws in both languages (English and French) are equally official, and none of the languages has precedence over the other one. The Directives should perhaps say that in case of real inconsistency, the SC

should decide which meaning is correct, rather than making possibly non-experts bless ambiguities blindly at once out of context. If there is a potential discrepancy, it

is very likely that it is because there was a misunderstanding about one sentence in any of the languages involved. That would potentially be a hidden problem even more if there were only one language involved, because not all experts are native in the original language, whichever it is; the existence of two language

versions at least allows to discover those issues, which are very real all the time.

The solution is in the clarification by the experts themselves of the sentences with discrepancies, and certainly not in blessing one language over the other and deciding in advance that something possibly not understood in the same way by all people is not a problem.

Discovery of unseen discrepancies a posteriori should be considered as matter for technical corrigenda, and be also considered an exception process.

In the meanwhile, when an International Standard is produced in 2 languages by experts, we have to assume that there is no discrepancy in technical meaning a priori. This does not preclude ITTF to check if they have resources to do so and ask appropriate questions to the SC if that is beyond their technical capability, but it would be a mistake and an international loss to leave different language versions to non-experts when experts are able to handle them at once. It also gives a chance for public review by different national bodies.

It is finally inexact to say that "we" have no way to find inconsistencies. Who is "we"? In fact in the balanced-worldwide-ISO-review process, "we" is in principle "The World". Japan (part of the "we", and that was spontaneous in the last two years that the issue happened) proved in the past that there were misunderstandings in ISO/IEC 14651, and both the English and French texts have been corrected. That led to better-quality International Standards just because there were two language versions. In other committees too in JTC1 (SC35, SC22), other countries also did review French and English Draft International Standards at once during ballots, and most of the time these countries were not French- or English-speaking (like Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden, other countries in the past too, and so on). Those countries were linguistically neutral and could then ask better questions about their understanding (or misunderstanding) of both texts, and better find discrepancies and ambiguities of one language relatively to the other. Without the two texts, they would have understood a meaning which was not necessarily the one understood by all.

We experienced that too in making Canadian standards in English and in French. And sometimes not all natives of one language agree with all natives of the same language, which is even more embarrassing when everybody believes that the text was well understood. That means that all understood when they agreed on the text, but sometimes different things. That leads to bad-quality standards and this sometimes has serious consequences for years to come, as some strategic standards have a very long duration (this one will be in this case for sure as it standardizes a fundamental process of information technology). It is better to maximize the possibilities that everybody agrees on the same thing, and that is better made at once in two or more languages than one.

Canada strongly believes that developing a standard in different languages at once results in better International standards.

Furthermore for translation into other languages, the presence of two linguistic references will necessarily also lead to better translations into those languages because there will potentially be two quality sources to rely upon.
