

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2  
Coded Character Set  
Secretariat: Japan (JISC)

**Doc. Type:** Draft disposition of comments

**Title:** Draft disposition of comments on SC2 N 4052 (PDAM text for Amendment 7 to ISO/IEC 10646:2003)

**Source:** Michel Suignard (project editor)

**Project:** JTC1 02.10646.00.07

**Status:** For review by WG2

**Date:** 2009-04-16

**Distribution:** WG2

**Reference:** SC2 N4052, 4063, WG2 N

**Medium:** Paper, PDF file

Comments were received from China, Germany, Ireland, Japan, United Kingdom, and USA. The following document is the draft disposition of those comments. The disposition is organized per country.

Note – The full content of the ballot comments have been included in this document to facilitate the reading. The dispositions are inserted in between these comments and are marked in **Underlined Bold Serif text**, with explanatory text in *italicized serif*.

## **China: Negative**

China vote NO to SC2N4052 (PDAM 7 of ISO/IEC 10646:2003) and will change her ballot to YES if the related problems are solved.

### **Technical comments**

#### **T.1 Tangut**

1. In order to keep the original writing style of Tangut scripts, China insists to use the fonts which had been provided before and in WG2#53 (Hong Kong,2008), if the single column format is adopted in UCS.
2. Some missing radical and characters should be added.

The above issues should be discussed by interested experts in WG2

#### **WG2 discussion**

*The Tangut proposal as of now has no separately encoded radicals.*

## **Finland: Negative**

### **Technical comments**

#### **T.1 Tangut**

The Tangut issue has to be solved before approving the text.

#### **WG2 discussion**

*The editor is assuming that it means a consensus between interested parties with conflicting statements (China, Ireland, UK, and USA).*

## **Germany: Positive with comments**

### **Technical comments**

#### **T.1. Katakana Letter Archaic E**

Germany recommends the addition of the character U+1B000 KATAKANA LETTER ARCHAIC E to be located in a new block Historic Kana, located from 1B000-1B0FF. This character was originally proposed in N3388 (L2/07-421) with the name KATAKANA LETTER ORIGINAL E. This character is needed by specialists who wish to discuss early Japanese orthography.

(Note: This comment is identical to the U.S. comment T1 as expressed in the document INCITS/L2/09-083 from 2009-02-06, except being a recommendation instead of a request.).

#### **Proposed acceptance**

*See also comment T.1 from USA.*

#### **T.2 Unified Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics Extended**

Germany recommends the characters be reordered as requested in N3563. Germany further recommends that these characters be moved to AMD 6, to consolidate all UCAS additions in a single Amendment.

(Note: This comment is identical to the U.S. comment T2 as expressed in the document INCITS/L2/09-083 from 2009-02-06.)

#### **Proposed acceptance**

*See also comment T.2 from USA.*

#### **T.3. Old Hungarian**

Germany requests to include the script which is called Old Hungarian in the WG2 document N3531 (by Michael Everson et al.) and Szekler-Hungarian Rovas in document N3527 (by Gábor Hosszú). Germany recommends to follow N3531 (which includes the naming of the script as "Old Hungarian"), with the following deviations:

1. The block shall have the size of 8 columns and shall be allocated at U+10C80 ... U+10CFF, to provide room for some additions like described below (even if these are not added in the first step) these are
2. The code points of the character proposed 10C90...10CF5 and 10CFF shall be shifted downwards by (dec.) 16, thus occupying 10C80...10CE5 and 10CEF. The code points of the character proposed 10CFA...10CFE shall be shifted downwards by (dec.) 17, thus occupying 10CE9...10CED, leaving a gap at 10CEE for a 500 symbol, whether this will added in the first step or not.

Germany favors to encode an additional U+10CEE OLD HUNGARIAN NUMBER FIVE HUNDRED based on the U+1AB5 SZEKLER-HUNGARIAN ROVAS NUMBER FIVE HUNDRED proposed in N3527 (but named according to the rules in N3531), as the evidence of use by an (admittedly very small) minority of the users of Old Hungarian is shown in N5327. This minority would prevented to propagate the use of the 500 symbol, although this symbol is not more novel or idiosyncratic as most of the recently proposed Emoji symbols.

Germany favors to encode the eight ligatures which correspond to single Latin letters:

U+10CF0 OLD HUNGARIAN CAPITAL LETTER Q  
U+10CF1 OLD HUNGARIAN CAPITAL LETTER W  
U+10CF2 OLD HUNGARIAN CAPITAL LETTER X  
U+10CF3 OLD HUNGARIAN CAPITAL LETTER Y  
U+10CF4 OLD HUNGARIAN SMALL LETTER Q  
U+10CF5 OLD HUNGARIAN SMALL LETTER W

U+10CF6 OLD HUNGARIAN SMALL LETTER X

U+10CF7 OLD HUNGARIAN SMALL LETTER Y

as in the context of the concurrent use of the script with the Latin script, there especially names written in Latin must be able to be represented uniquely and reversibly in the Old Hungarian script, not confined to names which are inherently Hungarian.

Thus, unlike the other ligatures proposed in N3527, these ligatures get the quality of letters like the Latin Æ/e (Æ/æ, U+00C6/U+00E6) which are ligatures in origin but due to their usage context qualify as letters to be encoded. Recurring to mechanisms like ZWJ is considered a pseudo-encoding which as such is to be avoided..

#### **Out of scope**

*Because Old Hungarian was not part of the ballot document, this comment is totally out of scope in this context, and should be made in a separate document. Proposal for repertoire addition should be made for blocks which are either added or modified by characters already in ballot. Especially, requests for encoding whole new scripts do not belong here.*

#### **T.4. Dingbat addition**

Germany requests the addition of two symbols according to the WG2 document N3565, which are already accepted by UTC #118:

U+275F HEAVY LOW SINGLE COMMA QUOTATION MARK ORNAMENT

U+2760 HEAVY LOW DOUBLE COMMA QUOTATION MARK ORNAMENT

#### **Out of scope**

*The Dingbat block is not under ballot. See disposition of previous comment*

#### **T.5. Latin Letters for Janalif**

Germany requests the addition of four Latin letters needed for Janalif to the "Latin Extended D" block, according to the WG2 document N3581.

These were proposed (in the original version of N3581 dated 2008-11-03):

U+A794 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER N WITH DESCENDER

U+A795 LATIN SMALL LETTER N WITH DESCENDER

U+A792 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER I WITH RIGHT BOWL

U+A793 LATIN SMALL LETTER DOTLESS I WITH RIGHT BOWL

However, Germany recommends to use the following names and code points:

U+A790 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER N WITH DESCENDER

U+A791 LATIN SMALL LETTER N WITH DESCENDER

U+A792 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER YERU

U+A793 LATIN SMALL LETTER YERU

The first letter pair (A790/1) are already accepted in this way by UTC #117.

Regarding the second letter pair, this letter in fact resembles an existing Cyrillic letter superficially but has a completely different function, namely the one of the Cyrillic yeru (which it does not resemble), similar to the dotless i in Turkish. As the Janalif variant of the Latin alphabet was used consistently for a quite long time (more than 10 years) in the Soviet Union for several languages belonging to different groups, it deserves to be encoded completely. After having the N with descender encoded, the yeru is in fact the only Latin letter of the Janalif not yet encoded, and there is no need to require to use an optical similar but functionally different Cyrillic letter instead. At one time, it was chosen Latin and Cyrillic letters differently even if they are functionally similar (like the Latin and Cyrillic A). There is no reason to mutilate this principle just to save a single pair of code points.

#### **Noted**

*Although strictly speaking, the Latin repertoire is being augmented through this amendment, this request is not related to the two Latin characters under ballot (A78D and A78E). It should be processed outside of the*

*disposition of comment. This does not preclude these new characters to be incorporated in a new phase of this amendment.*

#### **T.6. Latin letters for pre-1921 Latvian orthography and pre-1950 Sorbian orthography**

Germany requests the addition of ten Latin letters with diagonal stroke according to the WG2 document N3587.

**Noted**

*See resolution of comment above*

#### **T.7 Florin symbol**

Germany requests to encode a Florin symbol in the Currency Symbols block, this disunifying it from U+0192m according to the WG2 document N3588.

**Noted**

*See resolution of comment above*

## **Ireland: Negative**

Ireland **disapproves** the draft with the technical and editorial comments given below. Acceptance of these comments and appropriate changes to the text will change our vote to approval.

### **Technical comments**

#### **T1 Page 23, Clause 28, Character names and annotations.**

For “using their five hexadecimal digit value”, read “using their five-hexadecimal-digit value” (using hyphens to connect the adjectival modifier (cf. “a two-year-old horse”).

#### **Accepted**

#### **T2. Page 30-1348, Clause 34, Code Tables and list of character names.**

If T4 below is accepted, change “18B0-18D1, 18D3-18D7, 18D9-18DA” to “18B0-18C5, 18E0-18F2” in FPDAM 7.

#### **Propose acceptance in principle**

*If the whole repertoire is added to Amendment 6 as suggested by the USA and Germany, the ranges “18B0-18D1, 18D3-18D7, and 18D9-18DA” will be simply removed from this amendment.*

#### **T3. Page 1358, Annex B, List of combining characters.**

Replace 11 current entries as follows:

For 1BE7 BATAK VOWEL SIGN KEBERETEN read BATAK VOWEL SIGN E

For 1BE8 BATAK VOWEL SIGN KETOLONGEN read BATAK VOWEL SIGN PAKPAK E

For 1BE9 BATAK VOWEL SIGN TALINGA read BATAK VOWEL SIGN EE

For 1BEA BATAK VOWEL SIGN ULUA read BATAK VOWEL SIGN I

For 1BEB BATAK VOWEL SIGN HALUAN read BATAK VOWEL SIGN KARO I

For 1BEC BATAK VOWEL SIGN SIALA ULU read BATAK VOWEL SIGN O

For 1BED BATAK VOWEL SIGN HATULUNGAN read BATAK VOWEL SIGN KARO O

For 1BEE BATAK VOWEL SIGN BORUTA read BATAK VOWEL SIGN U

For 1BEF BATAK VOWEL SIGN HAVORITAN FOR SIMALUNGUN SA read BATAK VOWEL SIGN U FOR SIMALUNGUN SA

For 1BF0 BATAK CONSONANT SIGN AMISARA read BATAK CONSONANT SIGN NG

For 1BF1 BATAK CONSONANT SIGN HAJORINGAN read BATAK CONSONANT SIGN HA

#### **Accepted**

*Pending status of the Batak script in Amendment 7 (see comment T.3 from USA)*

#### **T4. Page 15, Row 18B: Unified Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics Extended.**

With reference to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N3533R “Proposed Revision for Unified Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics Extended Block”, Ireland requests that the characters shown in yellow in PDAM 7 be rearranged as shown in the third of the three charts in that document. Ireland is confident in the technical content of this repertoire and would not oppose the transfer of all of these characters to FDAM 6, but does not insist on such a transfer.

#### **Propose acceptance**

*See also comment T.2 from Germany and T.2 from USA. Both NBs propose to move all these characters to Amendment 6.*

### **T5. Page 17, Row 1BC: Batak.**

Ireland reiterates its support for the repertoire and character names as presented in PDAM 7, which is based on the encoding model described in ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N3320R “Proposal for encoding the Batak script in the UCS”.

Ireland would oppose a proposal to unify any of the letters here on the basis of superficial glyph resemblance. Ireland would not oppose improvements to the glyphs of U+1BFA and U+1BFB, but notes that these characters, whilst having long glyphs inconvenient for the UCS charts, are nevertheless proper characters, used to indicate the beginnings of texts. Other scripts, like Tibetan, also have characters which serve this function. Other large characters which have been shrunk to fit the code charts include U+12031 CUNEIFORM AN PLUS NAGA SQUARED. Ireland will investigate the possibility of making the glyphs slightly smaller. We suggest that an editorial note such as “• can be rendered to fill the horizontal length of a column of text” be added. In short, however, Ireland believes that the encoding model and repertoire for Batak as presented is correct and that all of these characters are required for the proper representation of the languages which make use of the Batak script.

#### **WG2 discussion**

*See also comment T.3 from USA. It is not clear that ornaments that fill the whole horizontal length of a column of text can be considered ‘character’. There is no precedent of that magnitude in the standard. To fit in the chart they have to be reduced by a factor of more than 5! It is not a matter of chart inconvenience, but instead of encoding appropriateness.*

### **T6. Page 31, Row FB5: Arabic Presentation Forms-A.**

With reference to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N3575 “Consistent naming and general category of ‘Arabic Pedagogical Symbols’”, Ireland requests that the following character names be used:

FBB2 ARABIC SYMBOL DOT ABOVE  
FBB3 ARABIC SYMBOL DOT BELOW  
FBB4 ARABIC SYMBOL TWO DOTS ABOVE  
FBB5 ARABIC SYMBOL TWO DOTS BELOW  
FBB6 ARABIC SYMBOL THREE DOTS ABOVE  
FBB7 ARABIC SYMBOL THREE DOTS BELOW  
FBB8 ARABIC SYMBOL THREE DOTS POINTING DOWNWARDS ABOVE  
FBB9 ARABIC SYMBOL THREE DOTS POINTING UPWARDS BELOW  
FBBA ARABIC SYMBOL FOUR DOTS ABOVE  
FBBB ARABIC SYMBOL FOUR DOTS BELOW  
FBBC ARABIC SYMBOL TWO DANDAS BELOW  
FBBD ARABIC SYMBOL TWO DOTS VERTICALLY ABOVE  
FBBE ARABIC SYMBOL TWO DOTS VERTICALLY BELOW  
FBBF ARABIC SYMBOL RING  
FBC0 ARABIC SYMBOL SMALL TAH ABOVE  
FBC1 ARABIC SYMBOL SMALL TAH BELOW

As always, Ireland strongly recommends the use of consistent naming conventions wherever possible.

#### **WG2 discussion**

*While the goal of consistent naming is good, it is not clear that all the new names are in fact consistent. For example, replacing ‘DOUBLE DANDA’ with ‘TWO DANDAS’ is not necessarily an improvement. On another hand, adding ‘SYMBOL’ in all names and using ‘DOT’ instead of ‘NUKTA’ are probably good.*

### **Page 48, Row 1700: Tangut.**

Ireland requests the removal of Tangut from PDAM 7. We believe that the script is not yet mature for progression to FPDAM. There are several reasons for this.

**7.1.** The character repertoire is inadequate. It does not take into account the additional characters and new glyphs in Lǐ Fàn wén's Tangut-Chinese Dictionary published in June 2008 (《夏汉字典》增订版 / 李范文编著。— 北京：中国社会科学出版社、2008年6月)。

**7.2.** The current character repertoire has no explicit ordering principles, and many characters are clearly misordered. We consider explicit ordering principles to be essential so that users of the code chart can find

characters within it. This is particularly important as Tangut glyphs are very similar and there are thousands of them.

**7.3.** The proposed encoding model for the Tangut repertoire on the ballot follows one Tangut scholar's prescriptive unifications of Tangut characters and expects the use of Variation Selector sequences to distinguish graphically-distinct characters that are used contrastively in the same source. Ireland rejects the proposal to use Variation Selector sequences to make character distinctions in Tangut.

**7.4.** With reference to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N3948 "Expert Feedback on the proposed Tangut character set in PDAM 6.2", it is clear that the user community of experts does not believe that the character repertoire (which was on PDAM 6.2 and now unchanged on PDAM 7) script is mature for encoding and does not agree that its tacit encoding conventions (including the use of Variation Selector sequences) are sufficient for their needs.

**7.5.** WG2 made provision for progressing Tangut. In ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N3541, the "Report from the Ad Hoc on Tangut" from Meeting 53 in Hong Kong:

"China, Ireland, the UK and the US have agreed to come up with a common position before the next WG2 meeting. A resolution should be made to request these national bodies to work together for a documented common position on Tangut, and also to invite other interested national bodies to participate in this work. It is understood that if an agreed-upon position cannot be reached before the Dublin meeting, Tangut will be removed from Amendment 7."

It does not seem that it will be possible to get a comprehensive agreed-upon position between all four of these National Bodies before the Dublin meeting, and therefore Tangut must be removed from Amendment 7 as agreed. However, Ireland proposes in T7.6 below a way forward.

**7.6.** With reference to document N3577 "Proposal for a revised Tangut character set for encoding in the SMP of the UCS", Ireland believes that the character repertoire and encoding model proposed succeeds in meeting the requirements of the user community. We believe that the encoded character repertoire needs to be able to represent all of the graphically distinct characters found in all the major modern Tangut dictionaries. This is a cornerstone of Tangutology. Accordingly, Ireland requests that the repertoire in N3577 be balloted in a new PDAM 8. We believe that the set requires two rounds of balloting, and would oppose placement of this large, reorganized repertoire in FPDAM 7.

### **WG2 decision**

*See comment T1 from China, T.1 from Finland, T.1 from UK, and T.4 from USA. Generally agree that a major re-ordering would require two rounds of balloting.*

## **Editorial comments**

### **E1. Amendment text.**

Delete "Tangut," from the title of the Amendment.

For "Page 1, Clause 1 Scope", read "Page 1, Clause 1, Scope".

For "Page 2, Clause 3 Normative references", read "Page 2, Clause 3, Normative references".

For "Page 2, Clause 4 Terms and definitions", read "Page 2, Clause 4, Terms and definitions".

For "Page 4, Clause 5 General structure of the UCS", read "Page 4, Clause 5, General structure of the UCS".

For "Page 8, Sub-clause 6.4 Naming of characters", read "Page 8, Sub-clause 6.4, Naming of characters".

For "Page 14, Sub-clause 20.3 Format characters", read "Page 14, Sub-clause, 20.3 Format characters".

For "Page 23, Clause 28 Character names and annotations", read "Page 23, Clause 28, Character names and annotations".

For "Page 25, Clause 29 Named UCS Sequence Identifiers", read "Page 25, Clause 29, Named UCS Sequence Identifiers".

For "Page 1351, annex A.1", read "Page 1351, Annex A.1".

For "Page 1358, Annex B List of combining characters", read "Page 1358, Annex B, List of combining characters".



For “Page 1379, Annex F.2 Script-specific format characters”, read “Page 1379, Annex F.2, Script-specific format characters”.

**Partially accepted**

*The “Page, Clause name’ format has been used for a long time in many existing amendments and does not need to be changed at this time. Furthermore ‘annex A.1’ will be replaced with ‘Annex A.1’”. Finally, editorial comments should not assume technical disposition. It is part of the Editor’s responsibility to update amendment title when a script is removed. No need to mention Tangut here.*

**E2. Page 7, Row 050: Cyrillic Supplement.**

Ireland suggests that that the following notes be used for consistency:

Letters for Enets and Khanty

0510 CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER REVERSED ZE

..

Letters for Chukchi, Itelman, and Khanty

0512 CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER EL WITH HOOK

..

Letters for Aleut

051E CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER ALEUT KA

..

Letters for Abkhaz

0524 CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER PE WITH DESCENDER

0525 CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER PE WITH DESCENDER

• used in modern Abkhaz orthography

→ 04A7 cyrillic small letter pe with hook

**Accepted in principle**

*The editor will work with Ireland and the Unicode editor to come up with a mutually acceptable content for these editorial annotations.*

**E3. Page 12, Row 0D0: Malayalam.**

Ireland recommends the replacement of the rather inconsistent font used for Malayalam with the table shown below. [please refer to SC2 N4063 for tables]

**Accepted in principle**

*Although not for this amendment. This is possible for the new edition.*

## **Japan, Negative**

Japan votes against ISO/IEC 10646:2003 PDAM 7 (SC2N4052) with two comments below. Japan will change its vote if the comment JP.2 is addressed appropriately.

### **Technical comments**

#### **JP.1: Tertiary Ideographic Plane**

The current draft amendment introduces a new term "Tertiary Ideographic Plane" to refer to the plane 3. Japan considers this is not a good name, partly because the word does not sound like a continuation to the word "supplementary", and partly because the word is hard to translate to Japanese (and possibly to other languages.) Japan wants another name for the plane 3.

#### **WG2 decision**

*There are really no good terms to use as a continuation to the word 'supplementary'. At the same time, Plane 3 is the third plane containing ideographic character. The editor is open to suggestion for a term agreeable to all parties.*

#### **JP.2: HIRAGANA LETTER YE location**

The current draft amendment adds a new character "HIRAGANA LETTER YE" to the standard. Although Japan does not object to the addition of this character, Japan is not fully comfortable with the proposed code position. Japan wants to allocate it in a separate block from HIRAGANA (possibly on the plane 1) to make sure it is not a part of modern set of hiragana.

#### **WG2 decision**

*The editor does not see any issue with moving it to a new block if that is preferred by Japan.*

## United Kingdom: Negative

### Technical comments:

#### T.1. Tangut

In view of the extensive issues with the current character repertoire, we request that Tangut be removed from Amd.7, and the new and reordered set of 6,221 characters proposed in WG2 N3577 (in accordance with Resolution M53.10) be added to a new amendment for two rounds of technical balloting.

The set of Tangut characters currently under ballot has had extensive review by Tangut experts, who unanimously agree that it is seriously flawed and inadequate for their needs (see WG2 N3498). In consultation with Tangut experts and other national bodies, as requested by Resolution M53.10, we have identified the following issues with the set of Tangut characters under ballot.

#### A. Character Repertoire

The proposed character repertoire unifies graphically distinct characters that are used contrastively in modern dictionaries. Consultation with the user community has indicated that they need to be able to represent all distinct characters that are used in modern dictionaries and works of scholarship. In particular the current character repertoire does not reflect the revised edition of Li Fanwen's Tangut dictionary that was published in 2008. The 2008 edition includes a number of new characters not in the current repertoire, as well as glyph disunifications of some characters that in the 1997 edition have the same glyph and so are unified in the PDAM7 repertoire. The following 298 characters should be disunified into two or more characters based on the glyph forms used in Han Xiaomang 2004 and/or Li Fanwen 2008.

U+1700F

...

[Long discontinuous list of 298 code positions from U+1700F to +18711, see SC2 N4063 for complete list]

...

U+18711

#### B. Glyphs

The 2008 edition of Li Fanwen's Tangut dictionary includes significant glyph changes to the following 68 characters. Note that some of the glyph changes necessitate a reordering of the character to a different radical or reordering of the character within the same radical

U+170C2

...

[Long discontinuous list of 68 code positions from U+170C2 to +1846D, see SC2 N4063 for complete list]

...

U+1846D

#### C. Character Ordering

The Tangut font used for PDAM7 is different to that used for PDAM6, and has many glyph differences, with the result that some characters that in PDAM6 were correctly ordered according to their representative glyph shape are no longer correctly ordered in PDAM7. As the original Tangut proposal (N3297) does not include any explicit character ordering principles, it is not always obvious what the correct ordering of characters should be.

Nevertheless we have noticed the following misordered characters according to the radical and stroke count of the glyph in the new font used for PDAM7. The following 39 characters are misordered due to change in stroke count of their radical:

U+17383 (radical has 4 strokes rather than 3)

U+17C35 (radical has 5 strokes rather than 4)

U+17FE1..U+17FEB (radical has 6 strokes rather than 5)

U+1808B (radical has 6 strokes rather than 5)

U+180E2..U+180E8 (radical has 6 strokes rather than 5)  
U+184A7 (radical has 8 strokes rather than 7)  
U+1867F (radical has 8 strokes rather than 9)  
U+18680..U+18686 (radical has 8 strokes rather than 9)  
U+18687..U+18688 (radical has 8 strokes rather than 9)  
U+186CD..U+186D3 (radical has 9 strokes rather than 10)

The following 120 characters are ordered under the wrong radical:

U+17000

...

[Long discontinuous list of 120 code positions from U+17000 to +18695, see SC2 N4063 for complete list]

...

U+18695

**WG2 decision**

*See comment T1 from China, T.1 from Finland, T.7 from Ireland, and T.4 from USA. Generally agree that a major re-ordering would require two rounds of balloting.*

## **USA: Positive with comments**

The U.S. National Body is voting Yes with comments on the following SC2 ballot: SC2 N4052: Information technology - - Universal Multiple - Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) - - AMENDMENT 7: Mandaic, Batak, Brahmi, Tangut, and other characters.

### **Technical comments:**

#### **T.1. Kana**

We request the addition of the character U+1B000 KATAKANA LETTER ARCHAIC E to be located in a new block Historic Kana, located from 1B000 - 1B0FF. This character was originally proposed in N3388 (L2/07 - 421) with the name KATAKANA LETTER ORIGINAL E. This character is needed by specialists who wish to discuss early Japanese orthography.

#### **Propose acceptance**

*It could go in a new block in plane 1 along with the moved Hiragana Letter Ye.*

#### **T.2. Unified Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics Extended**

The U.S. recommends the characters be reordered as requested in N3563. The U.S. further recommends that these characters be moved to AMD 6, to consolidate all UCAS additions in a single Amendment.

#### **Propose acceptance**

*See also comment T.2 from Germany and T.4 from Ireland.*

#### **T.3. Batak**

The U.S. requests Batak be removed from Amendment 7, as there remain open questions about the repertoire. Two ornamental symbols, U+1BFA BATAK SYMBOL BINDU GODANG and U+1BFB BATAK SYMBOL BINDU PINARJOLMA, are graphic objects that do not belong in plain text in our opinion. The second issue concerns sets of dialect - specific shapes currently disunified; we believe these should be unified.

#### **WG2 discussion**

*See also comment T.3 from USA.*

#### **T.4. Tangut**

The U.S. reaffirms its strong support for the inclusion of Tangut in amendment 6. A revised multi - column chart now includes data from a font from PRC. This proposal has had extensive review.

#### **WG2 decision**

*See comment T1 from China, T.1 from Finland, T.7 from Ireland, and T.1 from UK. Generally agree that a major re-ordering would require two rounds of balloting.*

*----end--*