Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
International Organization for Standardization
Organisation Internationale de Normalisation
Международная организация по стандартизации

Doc Type: Working Group Document
Title: Proposal to encode two Letterlike Symbols for Canadian legal use in the UCS
Source: Karl Pentzlin
Status: Individual Contribution
Action: For consideration by JTC1/SC2/WG2 and UTC
Date: 2010-02-28

Letterlike Symbols Supplement (New Block proposed at 2FE0...2FEF)

^{MC}   U+2FE0   RAISED MC SIGN
= Marque de Commerce
· Canadian legal use
→ 2122 TRADE MARK SIGN
≈ <super> 004D M 0043 C

^{MD}   U+2FE1   RAISED MD SIGN
= Marque Déposée
· Canadian legal use
→ 00AE REGISTERED SIGN
≈ <super> 004D M 0044 D

Properties:
```
2FE0;RAISED MC SIGN;So;0;ON;<super> 004D 0043;;;;N;;;;;
2FE1;RAISED MD SIGN;So;0;ON;<super> 004D 0044;;;;N;;;;;
```

The properties are modeled after U+2122 TRADE MARK SIGN.
This also applies to the use of the term "SIGN" in the name, while otherwise the characters are named referring to their constituent letters, as the denoted terms are not English.

As the "Letterlike Symbols" block (2100...214F) is full, there is no appropriate block where the proposed symbols fit into. As they are not enclosed, they do not belong into the "Enclosing Alphanumeric Supplement" (1F100...1F1FF) where otherwise would be enough space to include them near otherwise similar symbols.

Therefore, it is proposed to utilize a small gap in the BMP as a new "Letterlike Symbols Supplement" block. To allocate a one-column block seems appropriate, as there seem to be no other symbols discussed at this time which would fit primarily into this new block.

Note: In an earlier proposal (L2/09-035: Proposal to encode a modifier letter "C" for Canadian legal use; Author: Alexander Blaise; see Acknowledgements), it was proposed to encode the MC and MD signs as sequences of modifier letters Capital M + capital C resp. capital M + capital D, of which only modifier letter capital C is not yet encoded.
However, UTC #118 decided by Action Item 118-A17: "Reply to author proposing to encode a modifier letter "C" that the UTC would consider adding two compatibility symbols for MC / MD". Therefore, the proposal now is resubmitted taking that way into account.

Introduction

In some regions where French is an official language, the raised letter combinations MC and MD are used for "Marque de Commerce" and "Marque Déposée", like ™ and ® are used in English texts for "trade mark" and registered trade mark".

These two symbols in fact are used in Canada on a regular basis, as Canada is bilingual (English and French), and therefore the parallel use of both languages in equal extent is enforced even for abbreviations.

The typographic appearance of these two symbols resembles that of ™, and like their English counterparts, they have a distinctive semantic value, and must be enabled to be written in plain text.

Information of the use is e.g. found on the site of the Canadian Intellectual Property Office. The following paragraph "Marking requirements" is taken from that site at:
http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cipointernet-internetopic.nsf/eng/h_wr00856.html

Marking requirements

Canada's *Trade-marks Act* does not contain any marking requirements. However, trade-mark owners often indicate their registration through certain symbols, namely, ® (registered), ™ (trade-mark), SM (service mark), MD (marque déposée) or MC (marque de commerce). Although the Act does not require the use of these symbols, it is advisable to use them. The symbols TM, SM or MC may be used regardless of whether the trade-mark is registered. The ®, or MD, on the other hand, should be used only if the mark is registered.

Acknowledgements

This proposal continues the work of Alexander Blaise (from Morningstar Research Inc.), who submitted "L2/09-035: Proposal to encode a modifier letter "C" for Canadian legal use". He has kindly given permission to incorporate his work into this proposal.

Examples

Fig. 1: Source: http://www.investissementsrenaissance.ca/fr/

The above example displays the "MC" character combination, which has a typographic appearance that resembles "Trademark" ™ – the English equivalent of Marque de Commerce (MC). This example is being used to communicate both the company's identity and marketing slogan have both been trademarked.

Fig. 2: Source: http://www.cibc.com/ca/portfolio-solutions/axiom-portfolios-fr.html

The above example depicts a product line that has been trademarked (Portefeuilles Axiom). CIBC is a Canadian financial institution that operates in both English and French – Canada's two official languages.

Consequently, the "MC" is displayed in the French text the same way as the "TM" in the English text.

Fig. 3: Source: http://www.portefeuillesaxiom.com/funds/975.asp

Another example of an identity bearing the "MC" (marque de commerce).

Fig. 4: Source: http://www.desjardins.com/fr/particuliers/produits_services/comptes-services-relies/forfaits/index.jsp

An example showing "MD" (marque déposée) in plain text within an HTML page. The "MD", in absence of an encoded character, is simulated by superscripting, which yields in an unpleasant deviation of the line spacing between the first and second line.

Qui est Iceberg Select^{MD}?

Iceberg Select^{MD} est la meilleure marque de moules produites en Amérique du Nord. Ces moules de classe mondiale sont produites par Badger Bay Mussel Farms Ltd. ainsi que huit autres producteurs affiliés qui, ensemble, forment Iceberg Select^{MD}. La cueillette de nos

Fig. 5: Source: http://www.icebergselect.com/fr/iceberg-f.php

Another example showing "MD" in plain text within an HTML page. Here, the "MD" also is simulated by superscripting, which here yields in different heights relative to the baseline, resulting in a discordant typographical appearance.

Fig. 6: Source: http://www.cibc.com/ca/small-business/mortgages-fr.html

An example showing both "MD" and "MC" (both at the bottom; "MD" also after the first underlined link).

A. Administrative

1. **Title:** *Title: Proposal to encode a modifier letter for French legal use in the UCS*
2. Requester's name: *Karl Pentzlin, continuing work started by Alexander Blaise*
3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution): *Individual Contribution*
4. Submission date: *2010-02-28*
5. Requester's reference (if applicable):
6. Choose one of the following:
   This is a complete proposal: *Yes*
   (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): *No*
      Proposed name of script:
   b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block: *No*
      Name of the existing block: *A new block is proposed: Letterlike Symbols Supplement*
2. Number of characters in proposal: *2*
3. Proposed category (select one from below - see section 2.2 of P&P document):
   A-Contemporary **X**   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. Is a repertoire including character names provided? *Yes*
   a. If YES, are the names in accordance with the "character naming guidelines"
      in Annex L of P&P document? *Yes*
   b. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review? *Yes*
5. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered preference: True Type, or PostScript format) for
   publishing the standard? *Karl Pentzlin, having released that font into the Public Domain*
   If available now, identify source(s) for the font (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.) and indicate the tools
   used: *http://www.europatastatur.de/material/MCMD.ttf (containing the chars at U+0043 and U+0044)*
6. References:
   a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided? *Yes*
   b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources)
      of proposed characters attached? *Yes*
7. 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)? *No*

8. 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.

C. Technical - Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before? **No**
   If YES explain *(Note: L2/09-035 addressed the same symbols in another way; thus that is superseded by this proposal)*

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? **Yes**
   Reference: *See text*

4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)
   Reference:

5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community? **Yes**
   If YES, where? Reference: *Canada (mainly Quebec)*

6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely
   in the BMP? **Yes**
   If YES, is a rationale provided? **Yes**
   If YES, reference: *Existing similar characters are in the BMP*

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

8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing
   character or character sequence? **Yes**
   If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?
   If YES, reference: *They are closely related semantically*

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)?
    If YES, is the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic character(s) identified? **No**
    If YES, reference: