REPORT OF VOTING/ANNEX B

Date 2000-07-24	ISO/DIS 639-1
Secretariat SCC	ISO/TC 37/SC 2

Member body	**COMMENTS** Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	**OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT** on each comment submitted
General comments		
convener	**General comment 1** A number of submitted comments relate to the inclusion of specific languages in the tables, and to the language identifiers that have been assigned. These issues are dealt with by the Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) to ISO 639-1 and ISO 639-2. No such issues can be finalized by this commenting process; they will all be deferred to the JAC for further study. Commenters may be contacted by the JAC and requested to submit further information.	
convener	**General comment 2** Some submitted comments relate to the harmonization of the names of individual languages in ISO 639-1 and ISO 639-2. This issue is undergoing a special study by the JAC. All such comments will be submitted to the JAC.	
convener	**General comment 3** Some submitted comments relate to procedural matters that need to be harmonized with ISO 639-2 and the JAC. Such comments will be submitted to the JAC and to the two Registration Authorities for the two parts of ISO 639.	
Finland (disapproval)	The Finnish member body does not agree to the circulation of the above mentioned committee draft (ISO/DIS 639-1) as a FDIS.	*Noted.* The ballot was for <u>DIS</u> circulation, not for <u>FDIS</u> circulation.
France	Par ailleurs, il n'est pas évident de trouver quels sont les codes alpha-3 correspondant à un code alpha-2 présent dans l'ISO/DIS 639-1. Ainsi : – le nf (ndebele) de la norme 639-1 correspond-il au nbl (ndebele du sud) ou plutôt au nde (ndebele du nord) de la 639-2 ? – le st (sesotho) de la 639-1 correspond-il à nso (sesotho du ~~sud~~ nord) ou plutôt au sot (sesotho du sud) de la 639-2 ?	*Accepted.* Both these issues have already been dealt with by the JAC. Resolution: nbl = nr, nde = nd (no "general" entry for Ndebele); sot = st (no entry in 639-1 corresponding to nso).
Norway	In the tables there are a number of differences in the English and French names between 639-1 and 639-2. All these inconsequences should be eliminated.	*See General comment 2.*
Norway	We understand that a number of items presently in Annex C have been finalized by the Joint Advisory Committee to 639-1 and 639-2. Norway is pleased to note that the entries "nb – Norwegian Bokmål" and "nn – Norwegian Nynorsk" have been approved, and that the entry for Northern Sami has been harmonized with 639-2.	*Noted.*
Norway	The terminology in 639-1 and 639-2 is not harmonized. The terminology used in 639-1 should be implemented in 639-2: "code" = the whole standard, "code element" = one row of the table, "language identifier" = items like "en". A comment to this effect should be submitted to 639-2.	*Accepted.*

Member body	COMMENTS Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
Poland	According to Introduction *languages listed in ISO 639-1 are a subset of the languages listed in ISO 639-2; every language code element in the two-letter code has a corresponding language element in the three-letter code […]*. As a consequence, all names of languages given in ISO 639-1 should be identical with those given in ISO 639-2 – in the standard as a whole they serve as identifiers for particular languages. Therefore any differences between names of languages in both parts should be eliminated. Below we list noticed differences with reference to English names; the comment, however, concerns also French ones. *[The comment lists 10 items with different English names in the two parts of 639.]*	*See General comment 2.*
Poland	Formally, names of languages are not the subject of the standard. Nevertheless, the more while taking into account the role which they are play in the standard as a whole (see comment above), we think that only one ("standardized") name should be given for each language – as it was done in ISO 639-2. Giving some variants (such as *Fulah; Fula; Fulani; Fulfulde*) seems to be helpful for users in some cases, but when comparing both parts in order to choose between two- or three-letter code,it can be rather an obstacle. Additionally, including variants of names of languages superfluously enlarges the tables by repeating the same language according to the alphabetical order of each variant. In order to make looking for a code much easier and quicker it would be more helpful to add one more table instead – the table arranged alphabetically by indigenous names.	*Rejected.* It has been accepted as a principle by the JAC that also ISO 639-2 will include more than one name of each language where applicable. The names used in the two parts of 639 will be harmonized. – A table alphabetical by indigenous name: **TO BE DISCUSSED**
Russia	GOST R approves the draft as a whole but should insist on inclusion of the official State languages of some items of the Russian Federation in the main table. These languages (included now only in the Annex C) are listed below: *[The submitted comments give Russian, English, and French name, and identifier.]* Adyge – Chechen – Chuvash – Erzya Mordvin – Ingush – Kalmyk – Komi – Meadow Mari – Moksha Mordvin – Mountain Mari – Nenets – Ossetian, Ossetic – Udmurt Some languages, which are important for linguistics and social practice, are missing in the main table as well as in Annex C. These are for instance: Buryat, Pamir languages (Shugnan, Rushan, Ishkashim, Sarykol). The possibility of inclusion of such languages in the standard should to be examined in future. It is advisable to find more mnemonic codes for some languages on the basis of international names.	*See General comment 1.* The current status is as follows: *Adyge* – deferred (in 639-1 and 639-2); *Chechen* – accepted (ce / che); *Chuvash* – accepted (cv / chv); *Erzya Mordvin* – deferred; *Ingush* – deferred; *Kalmyk* – deferred; *Komi* – accepted (kv / kom); *Meadow Mari* – deferred; *Moksha Mordvin* – deferred; *Mountain Mari* – deferred; *Nenets* – deferred; *Ossetian, Ossetic* – accepted (os / oss); *Udmurt* – deferred. The other languages mentioned have not been formally proposed nor discussed by the JAC. – The gerenal principle is to base language idetifiers on indigenous names.
UK (disapproval)	The UK recognises the increased cooperation between ISO/TC37/SC2 and ISO/TC46/SC4 in relation to both the development of ISO DIS 639-1 and ISO 639-2, and the maintenance agencies of what is currently ISO 639 and ISO 639-2.	*Noted.*

Member body	COMMENTS Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
UK (disapproval)	For most aspects, ISO 639-1 is a positive development. However, there are some editorial and technical points that do need to be addressed. As a result, unless ISO DIS 639-1 is modified to take account of these concerns, the United Kingdom votes NO to this standard. However, the United Kingdom will review our decision in the light of other national member body comments, and in the light of the Disposition of Comments on ISO DIS 639-1. If the editor of ISO 639 can provide suitable modifications of text and/or tables which will satisfy these requirements, the United Kingdom NO vote will be turned to a YES vote, via the UK delegate to ISO/TC37/SC2, at its next meeting. The UK anticipates that a Disposition of Comments, and/or discussions at the forthcoming meeting of ISO/TC37/SC2 and/or ISO/TC37 will provide appropriate chances to resolve this point.	*Noted.*
UK (disapproval)	*Relationship between related standards* ISO DIS 639-1 should state more clearly the relationship between ISO 639, ISO 639-1 and ISO 639-2, and their continued status or otherwise, and the rate of addition of codes to any or all of these, and the rules for when the respective maintenance agencies would add (a) new codes to ISO 639-1 and also ISO 639-2: (b) new codes to ISO 639-1 but not ISO 639-2; (c) no codes in ISO 639-1 while ISO 639-2 had codes added.	*Noted* (but no action taken). ISO 639:1988 is being replaced by ISO 639-1 and will not be updated. Situation (b) in the comment can not occur.
UK (disapproval)	*Avoidance of backwards compatibility problems* Considering that ISO 639 and only ISO 639 is normatively referenced in various ISO/IEC JTC1 standards and non-ISO standards (e.g. ISO/IEC 15897: Procedures for registration for cultural conventions, and the IETF RFC 1766), it is important to ensure that adding additional codes in a new standard does not cause any problems of backwards compatibility to existing indirect users of ISO 639, through their normative referencing in these other standards. In order to avoid conflicts in the use of standards which rely on specifying ISO 639 only, the UK considers that either (a) ISO 639 should be confirmed as a standard in addition to ISO 639-1 if approved. or else (b) a conformance clause should be added to ISO 639-1 which specifies how any standard which normatively reference ISO 639 can continue to do so, without users of ISO/IEC JTC1 and other standards needing to change those standards as a result. This obviously does not preclude other standards committees changing from specifying ISO 639-1 instead of ISO 639 if they wish to, but actions taken by ISO/TC37/SC2 should not force other committees to have to do this, or force users of those other standards to change their data. In addition, it may be necessary to flag, or list separately in addition those 2-letter codes that are different in ISO 639 and ISO 639-1.	*Partly accepted.* ISO 639-1 will replace ISO 639:1988, which will no longer be a valid International Standard. ISO 639-1 will state explicitly that it replaces ISO 639:1988, and any reference to ISO 639 will be understood as a reference to ISO 639-1 (unless the reference is a dated reference). – An annex will be added listing differences between ISO 639:1988 and ISO 639-1. ***TO BE DISCUSSED***
UK (disapproval)	*Written and spoken languages* As voice input is increasingly used in some computer systems, there should be some mechanism to distinguish written and spoken languages in certain situations; currently there is nothing which allows this in ISO DIS 639-1, nor in ISO 639, nor in ISO 639-2.	*Rejected.* However, this is an interesting aspect for future coding standardization.

Member body	COMMENTS Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
UK (disapproval)	*Sign languages* There is a means of identifying Sign languages via a mechanism in ISO 639-2, but no similar one in ISO DIS 639-1. If "mixing and matching" is intended to take place between the two standards, this should be explicitly specified.	*Rejected.* The JAC has rejected "sign languages" for inclusion in ISO 639-1.
UK (disapproval)	*Tables* There is too much repetition of name elements, through using three columns: one column "Language names" would be preferable to the current three columns. The entry for "code element" om (Afan/Oromo) gives an example.	*Rejected.*
UK (disapproval)	Under "Indigenous name" [in the tables] there are clear printing limitations which produces forms of name that cannot be allowed to stand in the final international standard.	*Accepted.* All characters will obviously be represented correctly in the final version.
UK (disapproval)	No policy is provided regarding whether language names should be represented in (a) the script that language is normally written in, or (b) in transliteration or other Latin-script fallback. It would be useful for assistance to be sought from ISO/TC46/SC2 (Conversion of Written Languages) on this point.	*Accepted.* The editor recognizes this as a major problem that has not been adequately resolved. It is noted that the Chairman of ISO/TC46/SC2 is active in the work with ISO 639 (both parts).
UK (disapproval)	The United Kingdom hopes that these various points can be dealt with by the editor, either in his Disposition of Comments, and/or at the forthcoming meeting of ISO/TC37, its SCs, and its WGs.	*Noted.*
Specific comments		
France	**Titre** Ecrire : « Code<u>s</u> pour la représentation des noms de langues – Partie 1 : Code alpha-2 » (concerne la page de garde du projet de norme).	*Accepted.* The title page has this misprint for both the French and the English title.
UK (disapproval)	**Clause 2** *Normative references* This section contains references that are not used normatively, and which should therefore be removed. These are ISO 1087-1 and ISO 5127-1. Their citation in definitions (for "code") is insufficient.	*Accepted.*
UK (disapproval)	**Clause 3** In addition the terms "code" and "code element" have caused confusion and these definitions should be made less ambiguous. The term "code" is used in ISO DIS 639-1 where from the definitions "code element" is used. Rather than merely subsitute "code element" in the text, it would be better to use a different term for what is currently defined as "code", and use something like "language coding system" and "language code" in place of what is currently defined as "code", and "code element".	*Rejected.* The use of the defined terminology is intended to be consistent throughout the document.

Member body	COMMENTS Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
UK (disapproval)	**Clause 4.1** *Principles for constructing code elements* In section 4.1, Form of the language identifiers, there are additional problems. It should be made clear what would be the likely scale and size of code ISO 639-1, after a period of maintenance (is it finite?) as for some of the main points in clause 4.1 (e.g. on form of name being mnemonic, based on the name of the language in that language, and on the number of codes that are possible) there is a decided scaleability problem, beyond a critical number of codes. There are conflicting aims between 4.1, and meeting the needs of users of language codes, and these built-in conflicts could well cause problems in maintenance if there issues are not resolved.	*Noted* (but not understood …).
Finland (disapproval)	**Clause 4.2** The reason for the negative vote from the Finnish member body is the suggested procedure for registration of language identifiers (see 4.2. Registration for new language indentifiers). The procedure suggested in the draft makes it possible to apply for registration of language identifiers without notifying the responsible national ISO Member Body. In order to prevent this the registration criteria should clearly acknowledge that if there is a national ISO Member Body all application should first be addressed to this authority. In case no national ISO Member Body exists, the application could be sent directly to the Registration Authority together with the supporting decision from another acknowledged national body. For the above mentioned reasons we suggest the following wording for chapter 4.2 of the DIS: ***4.2 Registration of new language identifiers*** Everyone is free to apply for or propose a language to be coded in ISO 639-1. The application shall be first addressed to the responsible national ISO Member Body which will send the application to the Registration Authority. In case no national ISO Member Body exists in a country the application can be sent directly to the Registration Authority. Each application shall be accompanied by a) … (no changes suggested) b) a recommendation and a support from a national ISO Member Body or if it does not exist from another national authority (governmental body, linguistic institution, or cultural organization).	*See General comment 3.* SC 2 will propose that the interaction with any relevant National Member Body/Bodies be strengthened in clause 4.2 and/or in annex A.
France	**Paragraphe 4.2 Enregistrement de nouveaux indicatifs de langue** Il y a lieu de traduire « The Registration Authority » par « les Autorités d'enregistrement » (au lieu d'« agences »). Ce commentaire concerne également les pages 17, 18 et 19.	*Probably to be accepted.* The French terminology will be adjusted to general ISO practice.
France	**Paragraphe 4.4 Utilisation des indicatifs de pays** Les trois parties de l'ISO 3166 utilisent le mot codet, dans le sens défini dans l'ISO 639-2. En conséquence, nous proposons de libellé le titre de ce paragraphe comme suit : « **Utilisation des codets de pays** ». A la troisième ligne, remplacer « région » par « subdivision »	*Accepted.*
Norway	**Clause 4.4** "Application of the country code" should be modified to reflect the possibility also to use Part 2 (and theoretically also Part 3) of ISO 3166. A simple (and acceptable) solution would be to add an example using 3166-2.	*Accepted*

Member body	COMMENTS Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
UK (disapproval)	**Clause 4.4** *Use of sub-tags* In ISO DIS 639-1 clause 4.4, the specification of which combinations of languages and other elements (e.g. combining codes from ISO DIS 639-1 with elements from ISO 3166) are permissible, which are not, which are counterproductive, or which could be ambiguous is not at all clear. Specification should be much clearer in using sub-tags using country codes and other subdivisions from ISO 3166.	*Accepted.*
UK (disapproval)	**Clause 4.4** ISO 3166-2 and ISO 3166-3 are listed as normative references, but there is no information on how ISO 3166-2 in particular might be used. Information on use of ISO 3166-2 should be added to use of ISO 3166 in ISO 639-1, section 4.4, OR information that ISO 3166-2 should NOT be used should be included in ISO DIS 639-1, section 4.4.	*Accepted.*
Norway	There should be a mechanism (included as a new clause 4.5) allowing for local modifications of the language identifiers (dialectal, etc.).	***TO BE DISCUSSED***
France	**Annexes A, B et C** Il manque dans le titre le e final de Annex<u>e</u> dans la partie française.	*Accepted.*
France	**Paragraphe A.3.3 Ajout et suppression dans le code, modification d'indicatifs** Nous proposons le titre suivant en français qui correspond mieux à la version agnlaise: « ***Ajout et suppression à la liste des entités, modification d'indicatifs*** ».	*Probably to be accepted.*
France	**Paragraphe A.3.5 Création d'indicatifs de langues** A la 2e ligne, la 1ère apparition de 639-2 est en fait 639-1 dans la partie française (la partie anglaise est correcte).	*Accepted.*
UK (disapproval)	**Annex B: Bibliography** This lists only standards developed by ISO/TC46/SC2 (Conversion of Written Languages). (a) It is noted that these are not normative, but note that several of those listed are not widely used at all, though some are. The list is also out of date, and does not list draft standards in development, which is possible in a bibliography. (b) There should be other bibliographic references listed as well, especially any others relevant to language coding, or to language typology, for example the Linguasphere Directory, and the Ethnologue, and a major languages encyclopedia too, among others.	*Accepted.* Contributions to the Bibliography are invited.
UK (disapproval)	**Annex C: Possible additional languages** This is very much in a draft stage (e.g. many "code elements" are represented merely by "?". This is more of a working paper and a document in this state should not be circulated as part of a DIS, particularly as it could be missed by some national member bodies in commenting. It is not clear whether these are intended to have any outcome on ISO DIS 639-1. Was this annex in the previous draft that was sent to national member bodies?	*Noted.* Annex C was never intended for inclusion in the final document. It has been a working tool that has proven very useful to trigger comments on individual langauges studied by the JAC. Annex C was not included in the previous version of the document.

Member body	COMMENTS Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
UK (disapproval)	The UK also notes that a list of languages sent by CEN/TC304 to the maintenance agency for ISO 639 has been included in this annex, and notes with please that several European languages seem to have now got consideration.	*Noted.*
UK (disapproval)	However, before languages and codes in Annex C can be considered, it would have to be decided whether (a) these codes should instead be placed in the main Normative tables, or (b) they should be dropped.	*See General comment 1.*
UK (disapproval)	Annex C is unacceptable as it stands, and in formal terms it is difficult to see how it can remain in an international standard. Why some code elements should be normative, and some informative, seems to defeat the purpose of a language code standard.	*Noted.*
UK (disapproval)	Further, the UK notes that several major languages with millions of speakers lack codes, and recommends that both the developers of ISO DIS 639-1, ISO 639-2, the maintenance agencies, and/or the ISO 639 Joint Advisory Committee defined in Annex A of ISO DIS 639-1 should urgently add these to the ISO 639 "system" if the ISO 639 "system" is to retain credibility among linguists worldwide.	*See General comment 1.*
UK (disapproval)	As an example, the UK notes Sylheti, a language related to Bengali, used by millions in northern Bangladesh, and with over a million Sylketi speakers in the UK, and with its own historical script (Sylheti nagri), related to other scripts derived ultimately from Brahmi script or variants of that. This is just one of several languages which are unrepresented.	*See General comment 1.* No proposal to add this language to ISO 639-1 or ISO 639-2 has so far been submitted.
France	**Tableau C1** *istro-roumanien* (24) : corriger en *istro-roumain*.	*Accepted.* However, the item has been rejected by the JAC for inclusion in both 639-1 and 639-2.
France	**Tableau C1** *ladine* (24) : corriger en *ladin* (nom français)	*Accepted.* However, the item has been rejected by the JAC for inclusion in both 639-1 and 639-2.
France	**Tableau C1** Page 25 – l'indicatif « fn » est utilisé pour deux noms différents : le frison du nord et le cieaux perse.	*Accepted.* However, the former item has been rejected by the JAC for inclusion in both 639-1 and 639-2, and the latter item is included in 639-2 alone.
Specific comments relating to individual language entries		
Poland	**am** *Abyssinian* is a completely obsolete name and should be removed.	*See General comment 2.*
France	**fa** *farsi* (pages 6, 8, 10) : le terme doit être exclu totalement, ce n'est pas plus une dénomination française de la langue ne le sont « Deutsch » ou « English » pour l'allemand et l'anglais.	*See General comment 2.*
France	**hy** Armenian : Forme locale : « *hayeren lezou* » et non « hayeren lezow ».	*See General comment 2.*
Poland	**hz** (identifier changed from **oh**) The indigenous name of *Herero* should be *otjiherero* (not *otshiherero*).	*See General comment 2.*

Member body	COMMENTS Comments shall be reproduced as received either by re-typing them, or directly by pasting them on this form	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
France	**kl** Ajouter le tréma pour : *ouïgour* (pages 8, 11) et *groënlandais* (pages 6, 7, 10).	*See General comment 2.* The current spelling (*groenlandais*) is found in a number of French sources, and it is used in ISO 639-2.
Korea (disapproval)	**ko** KATS agrees to Alpha-2 code for the representation of names of languages. But we notice that "Korean" is encoded to "ko" in the table, while "Kanuri" is expressed as "kr". Considering that "kr" is the code for "Korea" in ISO3166-1, we'd like to suggest to change the language code of "Korean" to "kr". We think it will be helpful to avoid confusion.	*See General comment 1.* It needs to be pointed out that the identifier "ko" was assigned to Korean in ISO 639:1988, and that no proposal for change has been received since then.
France	**ku** *kurde* (pages 11, 14) : ajouter au nom autochtone : *zmanê kurdî*	*See General comment 2.*
Poland	**om** The name *Galla* is outdated (from 1974) and should be removed.	*See General comment 2.*
France	**se** *sami* (pages 11) : ajouter l'entrée « lapon » (ce n'est pas péjoratif en français).	*See General comment 2.*
France	**to** *tonga* (pages 8, 12) : plutôt *tongien.*	*See General comment 2.* ISO 639-2 currently uses *tongan.*
France	**ug** Ajouter le tréma pour : *ouïgour* (pages 8, 11) et *groënlandais* (pages 6, 7, 10).	*See General comment 2.* The current spelling (*ouigour*) is a misprint.
Poland	**ve** The indigenous name of *Venda* should be simply *Tshivenda* (no circumflex is necessary)	*See General comment 2.*