

To: South Asian Subcommittee and UTC

From: Deborah Anderson, Rick McGowan, and Ken Whistler

Title: Review of Indic-related L2 documents and Recommendations to the UTC

Date: 2 February 2011

I. GRANTHA

Documents: L2/10-457, L2/10-459, L2/10-464, L2/10-472, L2/11-002, L2/11-006, L2/11-009, L2/11-010, L2/11-011, L2/11-024, L2/11-025, L2/11-026

Discussion:

We reviewed the current L2 documents relating to the encoding of Grantha. The documents fall roughly into three categories, advocating distinct positions regarding further action on Grantha. These three positions are summarized below, with the corresponding lists of documents falling in each category.

(a) Reject Grantha proposal L2/10-426 or defer any decision on it (in part because the Grantha proposal L2/10-426 contains letters that are already in the Tamil block)

- L2/10-472 Letter to Lisa Moore re Grantha Encoding Sudalaimuthu Palaniappan
- L2/11-002 Response to Govt.of India Proposal L2/10-426 Va.Mu.Se. Kaviarasan

(b) Encode the Grantha script, but don't include the 7 Dravidian letters (Letter E, Letter O, Letter NNNA, Letter RRA, Letter LLLA, Vowel Sign E, Vowel Sign O)

- L2/10-457 Feedback on Grantha Unicode Committee meeting minutes - reg. P. R. Nakkeeran
- L2/11-026 INFITT Working Group comments on the Grantha encoding proposals [see pp. 24-25]

(c) Encode the Grantha script with the 7 Dravidian letters

- L2/11-006 My views on Encoding Grantha in Unicode E. Annamalai
- L2/11-011 Diacritic Marks for Short e & o Vowels (Dravidian and Vedic) in Devanagari (North India) and Grantha (South India) N. Ganesan
- L2/11-024 Letter from Prof. S. Raju regarding the addition of 5 Dravidian characters to Grantha block in Unicode
- L2/11-025 Letter from Dr. R. Nagaswamy re Grantha N. Ganesan

The following documents request the UTC delay action until further study can be completed or announce meetings on Grantha, but don't require special review:

- L2/10-459 Response to L2/10-426 and L2/10-447 and any other proposals requesting to add characters to represent Tamil or Tamil Block Va.Mu.Se. Kaviarasan / INFITT
- L2/10-464 Letter from Gov't of Tamil Nadu re Grantha M. Karunanidhi
- L2/11-009 Letter to Mark Davis from Gov't of India
- L2/11-010 Press release from Gov't Tamil Nadu re Grantha Va. Mu. Se. Kaviarasan

Recommendation: We recommend no action on Grantha be taken, pending a Government of India response to Tamil Nadu discussions (as referred to in L2/11-009).

II. OTHER SOUTH ASIAN TOPICS

1. Vedic

Document: L2/11-007 Request to annotate 1CD8 VEDIC TONE CANDRA BELOW Shriramana Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed L2/11-007.

Recommendation: We recommend L2/11-007 be remanded to the Editorial Committee to use it as the basis for drafting a paragraph on the topic to be included in Unicode 6.1.

2. Limbu

Document: L2/11-008 Proposal to Encode the Letters GYAN and TRA for Limbu (WG2 N3975) Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: The two proposed characters were not included in the original Limbu proposal; L2/11-008 documents their use in Limbu language charts and in non-Limbu written materials.

Discussion: We recommend UTC approve U+191D LIMBU LETTER GYAN and U+191E LIMBU LETTER TRA.

3. Devanagari DDA

Document: L2/10-475 Proposal to Encode the Marwari Letter DDA for Devanagari Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: We have reviewed the proposal for Marwari Letter DDA, but noted that collation information was not included.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC accept the character DEVANAGARI LETTER MARWARI DDA at position 0978, but request the author provide collation information in an updated proposal.

4. Devanagari Short Vowels

Document: L2/10-471 Comments on Devanagari short vowels Shriramana Sharma

Discussion: This document requested annotation and editorial changes in section 1 of L2/10-471 and, in section 2 of L2/10-471, offered comments on characters that were originally proposed in L2/09-320.

Only section 1, which recommends changes in annotations, is actionable, because no proposals are currently under consideration for the characters discussed in section 2. (Regarding section 2.1 of L2/10-471 on “Short AI”: the UTC did not approve an earlier request for a short AI, but Shriramana Sharma may put forward a proposal if he wishes.)

Recommendation: We recommend section 1 of L2/10-471 be remanded to the Editorial Committee.

5. Tikamuli

Document: L2/10-465 Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Tikamuli Script (revised; WG2 N3963) Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: The proposal needs to be amended to reflect the revised Roadmap allocation (11940-1198F, and not 11C00-11C3F).

In answer to the question posed in section 4.1 of L2/10-465, regarding the aspirated consonants: In our opinion, the aspirated consonants should be handled as proposed. Section 3.4 of L2/10-465 should be revised to note that although the aspiration sign is part of the graphology, it is not deemed worth adding another level of complexity by encoding the aspiration mark separately.

In response to the question in section 4.2 of L2/10-465, regarding the trilled consonants: We recommend the author add information to clarify whether the combination <KA + virama + LA> is ever distinguished from <KA + trill mark>.

Recommendation: We recommend UTC members provide feedback on the document to the author and request that he provide an updated version.

6. Jenticha

Document: L2/10-466 Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Jenticha Script (revised; WG2

N3962) Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: We reviewed the Jenticha preliminary proposal, noting that the codepoints need to be updated to reflect the current Roadmap allocation: 116D0-116FF.

Recommendation: We recommend UTC members review this proposal, particularly section 3.8 of L2/10-466 on consonant conjuncts, and forward feedback to the author.

7. Khojki

Document: L2/11-021 Final Proposal to Encode the Khojki Script (WG2 N3978) Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: This revised proposal has (a) re-packed the characters, closing up holes contained in the codechart of the earlier proposal (L2/10-326), (b) switched two glyphs (11221 BA and 11222 BBA, see section 3.2 of L2/11-021), and (c) added new specimens. Because some of the characters were moved, the UTC needs to re-approve the proposal.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review the final Khojki proposal and re-approve it.