A. Administrative

1. Title: Revised Proposal to Encode Additional Latin Orthographic Characters

2. Requester's name: UTC, Lorna A. Priest

3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution): Individual contribution


5. Requester's reference (if applicable): L2/04-372R

6. Choose one of the following:
   - This is a complete proposal: Yes
   - More information will be provided later: No

B. Technical – General

1. Choose one of the following:
   - This proposal is for a new script (set of characters): No
   - The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block: Yes
     - Name of the existing block: Latin Extended

2. Number of characters in proposal: 5

3. Proposed category (select one from below - see section 2.2 of P&P document):
   - A-Contemporary
   - B.1-Specialized (small collection)
   - B.2-Specialized (large collection)
   - C-Major extinct
   - D-Attested extinct
   - E-Minor extinct
   - F-Archaic Hieroglyphic or Ideographic
   - G-Obscure or questionable usage symbols

4. Proposed Level of Implementation (1, 2 or 3) (see Annex K in P&P document): 1

   If a rationale provided for the choice? No

   If Yes, reference:

5. Is a repertoire including character names provided? Yes

   If YES, are the names in accordance with the “character naming guidelines” in Annex L of P&P document? Yes

   Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review? Yes

6. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered preference: True Type, or PostScript format) for publishing the standard? SIL International

   If available now, identify source(s) for the font (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.) and indicate the tools used:

7. References:
   - Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided? Yes
   - Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached? Yes

8. Special encoding issues:
   - Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing (if applicable) such as input, presentation, sorting, searching, indexing, transliteration etc. (if yes please enclose information)? Yes, suggested character properties are included, as are lower case representations (see section D)

9. Additional Information:

   Submitters are invited to provide any additional information about Properties of the proposed Character(s) or Script that will assist in correct understanding of and correct linguistic processing of the proposed character(s) or script. Examples of such properties are: Casing information, Numeric information, Currency information, Display behaviour information such as line breaks, widths etc., Combining behaviour, Spacing behaviour, Directional behaviour, Default Collation behaviour, relevance in Mark Up contexts, Compatibility equivalence and other Unicode normalization related information. See the Unicode standard at [http://www.unicode.org](http://www.unicode.org) for such information on other scripts. Also see [http://www.unicode.org/Public/UNIDATA/UCD.html](http://www.unicode.org/Public/UNIDATA/UCD.html) and associated Unicode Technical Reports for information needed for consideration by the Unicode Technical Committee for inclusion in the Unicode Standard.

---

C. Technical - Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before?  No
   If YES explain _______________________________

2. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)?  Yes
   If YES, with whom?  linguists
   If YES, available relevant documents:  Email correspondence. See also References.

3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included?  Yes
   Reference: See comments in Section E

4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)  Common
   Reference: Orthographic characters are used in literacy materials, liturgical books and general literature.

5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?  Yes
   If YES, where?  Reference:  See comments in Section E

6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?  Preferably
   If YES, is a rationale provided?  If possible, should be kept with other related blocks in the BMP.
   If YES, reference: _______________________________

7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?  Preferably together with other related blocks

8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence?  No
   If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?  _______________________________
   If YES, reference: _______________________________

9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?  Yes
   Characters with stroke or bar might be construed as precomposed forms of sequences with combining overlay marks.
   If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?  _______________________________
   If YES, reference: (Cf. §F.1 of L2/04-047.)

10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to an existing character?  Yes
    If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?  _______________________________
    If YES, reference: See comments in Section E

11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences?  No
    If YES, is a rationale for such use provided?  _______________________________
    If YES, reference: _______________________________
    Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided?
    If YES, reference: _______________________________

12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?  No
    If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary) _______________________________

13. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility character(s)?  No
    If YES, is the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic character(s) identified?  _______________________________
    If YES, reference: _______________________________

D. Proposed Characters

A code chart and list of character names are shown on a new page.
### D.1. Proposed Characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2C6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D.1. Character Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codepoint</th>
<th>Character Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U+2C60</td>
<td>LATIN CAPITAL LETTER DOUBLE-BARRED L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+2C61</td>
<td>LATIN SMALL LETTER DOUBLE-BARRED L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+2C62</td>
<td>LATIN CAPITAL LETTER L WITH MIDDLE TILDE</td>
<td>• lowercase is U+026B ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+2C63</td>
<td>LATIN CAPITAL LETTER P WITH STROKE</td>
<td>• lowercase is in the pipeline (proposed codepoint is U+1D7D) p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+2C64</td>
<td>LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL</td>
<td>• lowercase is U+027D ř</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.3. Unicode Character Properties

U+2C61 should have a general category of Ll. Other properties for this character should match those of similar characters, such as U+0061 LATIN SMALL LETTER A.

Other characters should have a general category of Lu. Other properties for these remaining characters should match those of similar characters, such as U+0041 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER A.

E. Other Information

E.1 Latin Extended

LATIN SMALL LETTER DOUBLE-BARRED L and LATIN CAPITAL LETTER DOUBLE-BARRED L are used orthographically in the Melpa and Nii languages of Papua New Guinea. They represent a velar fricative lateral. The Nii originally used one bar (tı), but have more recently (since the early 90s) used the double-barred l (tı).

The lowercase counterpart to LATIN CAPITAL LETTER L WITH MIDDLE TILDE is U+026B.
LATIN CAPITAL LETTER L WITH TILDE is used orthographically by both the Letuama and Tanimuka (two distinct ethnic groups that speak the same language) of Colombia, South America. It represents a bilabial fricative. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER P WITH STROKE has been used in publications since 1987. The lowercase to this is already in the pipeline (proposed codepoint is U+1D7D). If this character is accepted, the upper and lower case should be placed contiguously.

LATIN CAPITAL LETTER P WITH STROKE is used orthographically by both the Letuama and Tanimuka (two distinct ethnic groups that speak the same language) of Colombia, South America. It represents a bilabial fricative. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER P WITH STROKE has been used in publications since 1987. The lowercase to this is already in the pipeline (proposed codepoint is U+1D7D). If this character is accepted, the upper and lower case should be placed contiguously.
LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL is used orthographically in a number of Sudanese languages. There is confirmed orthographic usage in Heiban, Koalib, Moro and Otoro. Two different forms have been in use but R is the preferred form (over €). The lowercase counterpart is U+027D.

4 Ṛṣaŋ ṿnopja ṿnjgi implode,  
    Ḳidi ḷorbaḫa taltal,  
    Eda ḷerio implode gelageṭo loman,  
    Walla Ḹoṅhinia walla Ḹasana,  
    Illi Ḹapa Ḹonto.  

5 Yesu Ṿobia da-Daud ṿdid aŋiruwa,  
    Ḹromwa Ḹelo, Ḹibințiŋja Ḹride,  
    ḸLtol lebara Ḹalmalaiyika yabaŋu.  
    Lorldaŋ implode Ḹagara.  

Figure 7. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL (SLC, 2000, p. 100) [Moro language]
14. Seṭan yēḇadía ūa daṇidi?

Seṭan yēḇadía leda ṭadōn, na yēḇadía isi yaleda iromitu ūn ūnta alerṭe iwoṇata detem el-Āḥmasiya na ᾱlaiwari deṣe (R). Ramwa ūa lēnshul aḷiī ūn nēcū jage ḳo Ramwa, na yeṣakil Ramwa nān ᾱnlo ḳo ḳi uanglaŋ.

Marius 4:15

Dālwa iği ḋano edad ṭarōn leda ildi ọna ūn, orn Seṭan naṣeṣla taltal niyemate leda ḳalwa iği ḋeņejoŋu ene ṭe enen.

Figure 8. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL (SLC, 1999, p. 27) [Moro language]

Figure 9. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL (Annggaico, 2000, p. 29) [Moro language]

Figure 10. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL (MLC, 2002, p. 46) [Moro language]
Figure 11. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL (Kafi, 1996, p. 27) [Heiban language]

Figure 12. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL (Kodi, 2002, p. 29) [Otoro language]
F. References


