

Title: Addition of seven CJK Unified Ideographs  
 From: Ken Lunde and Eric Muller, Adobe Systems Inc  
 Date: February 5, 2007

The seven CJK ideographs proposed here are present in the K-JIS and Sha-ken character collections. The K-JIS collection is developed by 共同通信社 and 配信先新聞社 for writing newspaper articles in Japan. The Sha-ken collection is part of a proprietary typesetting system widely used in Japan. These characters are also present in the Adobe-Japan1 collection, which is the basis for many desktop fonts, and at the time of this proposal are the only characters of that collection not present in Unicode / ISO/IEC 10646.

Glyph	Source collection	Adobe-Japan1 CID
燠	K-JIS #2191	15429
壻	K-JIS #4431	15431
𪗇	K-JIS #5304	15434
萑	Sha-ken Index 7666	20068
薺	Sha-ken Index 7614	20069
誼	Sha-ken Index 7163	20070
鵠	Sha-ken Index 7907	20071

We propose to encode those seven characters in the CJK Unified Ideographs Extension A block, at positions U+4DB5 through U+4DBB.

At its last meeting, the IRG did not object to the fast-tracking of those characters, nor to their inclusion in Amendment 4. However, the IRG asked that those seven characters not be interleaved in Extension C, hence the proposed code points.

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2**  
**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS**  
**FOR ADDITIONS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646<sup>1</sup>**

Please fill all the sections A, B and C below.

Please read Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/principles.html> for guidelines and details before filling this form.

Please ensure you are using the latest Form from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html>.

See also <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/roadmaps.html> for latest Roadmaps.

**A. Administrative**

1. Title:	<b>Addition of seven CJK Unified Ideographs</b>	
2. Requester's name:	<i>Adobe Systems</i>	
3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution):	<i>Individual contribution</i>	
4. Submission date:	<i>2007-02-05</i>	
5. Requester's reference (if applicable):		
6. Choose one of the following:		
This is a complete proposal:	<i>Yes</i>	
(or) More information will be provided later:		

**B. Technical – General**

1. Choose one of the following:	
a. This proposal is for a new script (set of characters):	<i>No</i>
Proposed name of script:	
b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block:	<i>Yes</i>
Name of the existing block:	<i>CJK Unified Ideographs Extension A</i>
2. Number of characters in proposal:	<i>7</i>
3. Proposed category (select one from below - see section 2.2 of P&P document):	
A-Contemporary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B.1-Specialized (small collection) <input type="checkbox"/> B.2-Specialized (large collection) <input type="checkbox"/>	
C-Major extinct <input type="checkbox"/> D-Attested extinct <input type="checkbox"/> E-Minor extinct <input type="checkbox"/>	
F-Archaic Hieroglyphic or Ideographic <input type="checkbox"/> G-Obscure or questionable usage symbols <input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Proposed Level of Implementation (1, 2 or 3) (see Annex K in P&P document):	<i>1</i>
Is a rationale provided for the choice?	<i>no</i>
If Yes, reference:	
5. Is a repertoire including character names provided?	<i>yes</i>
a. If YES, are the names in accordance with the "character naming guidelines" in Annex L of P&P document?	<i>yes</i>
b. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review?	<i>yes</i>
6. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered preference: True Type, or PostScript format) for publishing the standard?	<i>TrueType, Adobe Systems</i>
If available now, identify source(s) for the font (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.) and indicate the tools used:	
7. References:	
a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided?	<i>Yes</i>
b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached?	<i>No</i>
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)?	<i>No</i>

**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> for such information on other scripts. Also see <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.

<sup>1</sup> Form number: N3002-F (Original 1994-10-14; Revised 1995-01, 1995-04, 1996-04, 1996-08, 1999-03, 2001-05, 2001-09, 2003-11, 2005-01, 2005-09, 2005-10)

### 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.)?	No
If YES, with whom?	
If YES, available relevant documents:	
3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included?	No
Reference:	
4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)	rare
Reference:	
5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?	Yes
If YES, where? Reference: K-JIS and Sha-ken	
6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?	no
If YES, is a rationale provided?	
If YES, reference:	
7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?	yes
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?	no
If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?	
If YES, reference:	
10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to an existing character?	no
If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?	
If YES, reference:	
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:	