

## TC46 - BSI NWIP - Request for Comments

The MLTF needs to technically, legally, and politically evaluate the attached BSI proposal to IDO TC46 in a careful and neutral manner. It also wants to investigate the possible risks it might induce for international, trade, and Internet stability due to the referent role that ISO 3166 plays in human society and its uses for the Internationalized ASCII Internet IDN(cc)TLDs.

In so doing, the MLTF wants to cool the controversy over that NWIP in consensually resolving what is possibly at its root: the probable difference between ISO user's expectations about the way a language is to be understood in documents from ISO TC37 and ISO TC46.

The authors of this TC46 NWIP are involved in the TC37 ISO 639 series.

At an ISO/BSI/AFNOR/ICANN/MLTF ad hoc conciliatory meeting, they blocked the concept of a joint proposition with the TC46. Subsequently, the NWIP was distributed by the TC46 Secretariat without being deferred to the TC46 Chair, and reviewed by the TC37/TC47 JAC.

Concerned ISO users blame the MLTF's Moderator for having supported this during that meeting (which in reality he did not). As part of the clarification, he had to, therefore, sustain he sent, and published in his own meeting report, a note to his fellow meeting attendees in order to end this restlessness. This note mentions that he has finally received a copy of the NWIP from one of these users, in which the MLTF will proceed to a review and possibly comment if deemed necessary, and will then formally support the NWIP or propose modifications to its text.

The MLTF's initial concerns are:

- the technical soundness of the use of the word "internationalization" in the not unanimously accepted way that it is used
- what are ASCII, Japanese, or Romanized scripts in a normative context defined by ISO 15924?
- patents' possibly infringed upon
- what are the languages of the world and the scripts and writings that represent them? Are they the ones that are defined in ISO 3166-1 or in ISO 639 and 15924, which seem to have totally different normative and legal meanings?
- the general pertinence of the computer oriented ASCII concept in a general country coding.
- the main application seems to be for passports. Is there no current standardization in that area?
- Which countries are specifically concerned? Should this not be indicated in ISO 3166-1 as complementary information.
- how will ISO 3166-1 be affected by this new work?
- why is ISO 3166-1 only considered and not ISO 3166-2 and 3166-3?
- the lack of a link with any other existing document, effort, etc. seems to imply a stand alone project that everyone in the world would however be concerned about (international transportation)
- the lack of a description of how the project manager budget fits in with the ISO TC46 Business Plan, and what the planned cross-subsidizations are with regard to the TC37 ISO 639-6 project.
- some Project Leader's meeting or mailing list comments on project financing, creation of new country codes, national sovereignty reshaping, ISO 3166-1 language information removal, ethical considerations in the use of country codes.
- contradiction with the technical doctrine implied in ISO 3166-1:2006 to support the multilingualism that the MLTF has detailed.
- the NWIP differences with the practical and political recommendations from entities having been publicly quoted as supportive. This seems to concern the MINC, ICANN/GNSO with its extensive Final Report on New Generic Top Level domains (parts on Internationalised Domain Names issues), and ICANN ccNSO/GAC expressing similar positions. This is of interest because the first purpose of the NWIP (and the reason why ICANN participated in the concillation meeting) was the support of the IDN(cc)TLDs, and the effective organisation of the intended project seems to stay unchanged.
- the inappropriate economic intelligence climate which seems to exist around that proposition.

Thank you in advance for your private non-polemical comments and alternative constructive suggestions. The only thing we want to know is if the proposed NWIP permits a clear, documented, and valid decision.

jfc morfin  
MLTF Moderator.  
<http://mltf.org>

## **NEW WORK ITEM PROPOSAL**

**Date of presentation** : 2007-06-15

**Proposer** - BSI

**Secretariat** - AFNOR

**Reference number** - ISO/TC46/SC2 N 450 N 2046/WG

The proposal will be circulated to the P-members of the technical committee or subcommittee for voting, and to the O-members for information.

**Note 1:** *This NWIP, however, is supposed to have been reshaped from an initial Internet oriented proposition by an ad hoc ISO/BSI/AFNOR/ICANN/INTLNET conciliatory meeting, in which Intlnet was not present when this occurred, was not copied the final AFNOR report of the meeting, which furthermore does not consider any of its objections, and was until now denied access to this proposal that conveys no intellectual property mention. This text results from a uncertified typography of the document by a an expert protesting its supposed approbation by Intlnet.*

**Note 2:** *Pas de texte français proposé malgré le secréariat de l'AFNOR.*

*Le fait que les titres et textes soient en anglais est une particularité des formulaires ISO hérité du temps ancien où après que Wilson ait répondu au Kaiser de voir les conditions de la réition avec Foch qui avait gagné la guerre, son ignorance du français commune avec Lloyd George et la connaissance de l'anglais par le Quai d'Orsay a conduit à un bilinguisme de courtoisie qui est certainement (comme le souligne David) un avantage pour la précision, la clarté et l'exactitude de perception et de compréhension des utilisateurs que l'ISO semble être en train de perdre.*

### **Title of the proposal**

Internationalized (non-ASCII script) code for the representation of names of countries and other significant geopolitical entities.

**Concerns known patented items** - No

**Envisaged publication type** - International standard

### **Scope of proposed project**

To provide, as a new part of ISO 3166, an additional code for the names of the entities represented within ISO 3166-1 in the scripts and writing systems that represent the languages of the world. To provide guidelines for maintenance and registration procedures.

### **Purpose and justification**

For the purpose of this document, the term "internationalization" is used to describe adding or improving the handling of non-ASCII text for example in IT the handling of text is generally associated with one script. Currently, applications and protocols use ASCII (A-Z, 0\_9) but this creates a barrier for non-ASCII users, e.g. users writing in Japanese.

Since this barrier has been identified, a need has transpired for the Internationalization of codes within ISO 3166-1. For example, many countries that do not use Romanized scripts have no country code information printed on their passports. This means that they are not able to be machine read internationally. By creating codes in the scripts that are used within the countries themselves this will facilitate related applications and protocols for both local and international use.

This standard will create codes in the scripts of the world's writing systems currently in use and harmonize the Romanized codes of ISO 3166-1 with their Internationalized counterparts.

**Proposed development track** - 36 months.

**Relevant documents to be considered** - None

**Need for coordination with** - None

**Preparatory work (at minimum an outline should be included with the proposal)** - None

## Proposed Project Leader

Debbie Garside  
GeoLang Ltd  
Corner House  
Barn Street  
Haverfordwest  
Pembrokeshire SA61 1BW  
Wales UK

## Name and signature of the Proposer

Sheeba Mukadam  
BSI

## Comments of the TC or SC Secretariat:

- **Supplementary information relating to the proposal** - this proposal relates to a new ISO document;  
- **Voting information**

The ballot associated with this proposal comprises a vote on: adoption of the proposal as a new project

**Annex(es) included with the proposal** - None

**Date of Circulation** - 2007-06-15

**Closing date for voting** - 2007-09-15

## Signature of the TC or SC Secretary

Marie-Martine Guillabert  
AFNOR

## Guidelines on the completion of a proposal for a new work item

(see also ISO/IEC Directives Part 1)

a) **Title:** Indicate the subject of the proposed new work item.

b) **Scope:** Give a clear indication of the coverage of the proposed new work item. Indicate for example, if this is a proposal for a new document, or a proposed change (amendment/revision). It is often helpful to indicate what is not covered (exclusions).

c) **Envisaged publication type:** Details of the types of ISO deliverable available are given in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1 and/or the associated ISO Supplement.

d) **Purpose and justification:** Give details based on a critical study of the following elements wherever practicable. *Wherever possible reference should be made to the information contained in the related TC Business Plan.*

1) The specific aims and reason for the standardization activity, with particular emphasis on the aspects of standardization to be covered, the problem it is expected to solve or the difficulties it is intended to overcome.

2) The main interests that might benefit from or be affected by the activity, such as industry, consumer, trade, governments, distributors.

3) Feasibility of the activity: Are there factors that could hinder the successful establishment or global application of the standard?

4) Timeliness of the standard to be produced: Is the technology reasonably stabilized? If not, how much time is likely to be available before advances in technology may render the proposed standard outdated? Is the proposed standard required as a basis for the future development of the technology in question?

5) Urgency of the activity, considering the needs of other fields or organizations. Indicate target date and,

when a series of standards is proposed, suggest priorities.

6) The benefits to be gained by the implementation of the proposed standard; alternatively, the loss or disadvantage(s) if no standard is established within a reasonable time. Data such as product volume or value of trade should be included and quantified.

7) if the standardization activity is, or is likely to be, the subject of regulations or to require harmonization of existing regulations, this should be indicated.

If a series of new work items is proposed having common purpose and justification, a common proposal may be drafted including all elements to be clarified and enumerating the titles and scopes of each individual item.

e) Relevant documents and their effects on global relevancy: list any known relevant document (such as standards and regulations) regardless of their source. When the proposer considers that an existing well-established document may be acceptable as a standard (with or without amendment). Indicate this with appropriate justification and attach a copy to the proposal.

f) cooperation and liaison: List relevant organizations and bodies with which cooperation and liaison should exist.