

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

**Doc. Type:** Disposition of comments

**Title:** Disposition of comments on PDAM2.3 to ISO/IEC 10646 4<sup>th</sup> edition

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

**Project:** JTC1 02.10646.00.02.00.04

**Status:** For review by WG2

**Date:** 2015-04-24

**Distribution:** WG2

**Reference:** SC2 N4389 4395 WG2 N4651 N4662 N4663

**Medium:** Paper, PDF file

Comments were received from the following members: Japan, Korea (ROK), Mongolia, UK, and USA. The following document is the disposition of those comments. The disposition is organized per country.

Note – With some minor exceptions, 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*.

This disposition makes very little change to the repertoire, adding 5 characters: 9FD1..9FD5, and removing one character: 1F900. It also changes the name of 16 characters. While there are some disagreement on the rationale for removing CJK Extension F from this amendment, it does not remove the consensus for the rest of the proposed repertoire. There are still some unresolved issues on the Emoji additions (see Japanese comment). It is counterbalanced by the urgency of encoding and keeping intact the synchronization with the Unicode Standard repertoire. Finally, it should be noted that the enquiry ballot which is the normal continuation of this committee ballot is still a technical ballot and allows technical changes.

Based on these disposition, there are no change for the positive votes (14) or the negative votes (2). Note that one negative vote, Mongolia, was related to matters not part of this amendment content.

## **Japan: Negative**

### **Technical/Editorial comments (T or E prefix):**

#### **T1. CJK Unified Ideographs Extension F removal**

CJK Unified Ideographs Extension F proposed on PDAM 2.2 has been deleted on this PDAM. Looking at the disposition of comments on the PDAM2.2 (WG2 N 4656), this deletion is issued by the UK comments on CJK F. Japan NB does not think the comments by UK are valid reasons to delete whole set of CJK F. Please refer the detail explanation on the document separately sent to the project editor. (Note it will be soon registered as WG2 document).

##### Proposed change by Japan

Restore CJK F which had been once proposed on the PDAM2.2.

[Extract from WG2 N4663:]

#### **Preface**

Comments of PDAM2.2 ballot are disposed by project editor as WG2 N4656 and ballot of revised draft for PDAM has been started. However Japan NB is not satisfied with this revision because CJK F is removed without making consensus, for example. Most decisions regarding CJK are made following UK comments but most of them are already discussed in IRG in the past or ignoring rule defined in ISO/IEC 10646.

Japan sees that IRG's submission was mature enough and it is not appropriate to remove because of very small number of faults. Japan also think that IRG should examine dispositions in WG2N4656 carefully and discuss what IRG should do.

This paper describes Japan's view on the disposition regarding CJK so that IRG can review easily. Japan also expects that CJK F will be moved back to amendment 2 draft if the issues became clear.

#### **Summary**

Japan expects only three characters should be discussed at IRG meeting. Japan also requests IRG to confirm that other issues are not necessary to discuss if any other reasonable rationale is submitted.

...

#### **Postscript**

It was usual manner in the past that disposition of ballot comments are discussed at WG2 meeting in F2F manner to reach consensus, however, it is difficult because frequency of the meeting was changed to 12 month interval. This may be the first case that project editor makes disposition without expert's consensus. Japan expects WG2 to discuss about the procedure of how the work progress under JTC1 directives, and IRG should be more careful how the work is discussed after submitting to WG2.

#### **Not accepted**

*(The not acceptance is strictly for the request of putting back CJK Extension F into Amendment 2. The status of the extension stays as proposed for inclusion in the next vehicle for addition: 5<sup>th</sup> edition of 10646.)*

*Removal of controversial repertoires from amendment for new submission in a consequent amendment or new edition has been a common practice for many years in WG2. It has happened for small repertoires such as the MIDDLE DOT, the OLD ITALIC LETTER TTE, medium size repertoire like ZANABAZAR SQUARE in this amendment, or large repertoires such as TANGUT or NUSHU in the past. Sometimes, the proposal is simply postponed to the next amendment, in other occurrences the repertoire is delayed for a longer period because more study is necessary.*

*Removing characters or blocks from an amendment does not require consensus.*

*Consensus at the committee level is required to move from Committee ballot (SC2 level) to Enquiry ballot (JTC1 level). Also worth noting that consensus is not unanimity.*

*IRG is not a body making encoding decisions. It proposes repertoire to WG2 which then recommends to SC2 to conduct ballot with votes from SC2 members for SC2 ballots and votes from JTC1 members for JTC1 ballots (once*

*SC2 ballots have created a committee consensus in order to proceed with an enquiry ballot). IRG is simply an entity created under WG2 to facilitate the proposal of CJK Unified Ideographs and has no part in the eventual encoding decision process.*

*It is not the first time that disposition has been done without a WG2 face to face meeting. It has happened in the past when amendments were iterated at the committee level (such pdamX, pdamX.2, pdamX.3, etc... Typically the editor works with various WG2 members to come with a satisfactory outcome. This time the circumstances were peculiar:*

- *The PDAM had largely failed with many disputed repertoires: CJK Extension F, Nushu, Zanabazar Square.*
- *Therefore the PDAM ballot comments could not be disposed to declare a consensus allowing to create a DAM ballot (enquiry level).*
- *Issues could not be resolved by the editor without the help from IRG which will only meet in June 2015. This meant that a new PDAM (like Pdam2.3) containing CJK Extension F could not be fully addressed until after June 2015, making impossible to run a DAM ballot in time for the next WG2 face to face in October 2015.*
- *This meant that the whole Amendment 2 repertoire including CJK Ext F would have to be delayed by at least 6 months or even a year. (The DAM2 could only be initiated in November 2015 and possibly only disposed a year later).*
- *Part of the Amendment 2 repertoire were deemed extremely urgent. There is intense pressure to modify the Emoji content to make it more diverse, and this is represented by the various Emoji characters proposed for encoding this amendment.*
- *The calendar did not provide a lot of time to the editor to consult various parties at the committee level.*

*Based on these considerations, the editor thought that the best course of action was to remove from the amendment all controversial repertoires, this meant: OLD ITALIC LETTER TTE, NUSHU, and CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS EXTENSION F (and some other CJK Unified Ideographs proposed in the main block). This was deemed the best course of action to get a positive outcome for the new Pdam2.3, which is exactly what happened. There are only two negative votes, one is out of scope, Mongolia, because it refers to repertoires that are not part of the Amendment, the other, Japan, having issues with Emoji mostly on procedural ground (see details on disposition of Japanese comment concerning Emoji in T5 and T6).*

*At the end, postponing the proposed CJK Extension F encoding to the 5<sup>th</sup> edition is not delaying its encoding, because maintaining it in Amendment 2 would have delayed the schedule of that amendment. The current tactic (creating a streamlined Amendment 2) allows to get its non-controversial content to be adopted earlier. It also clears the path to start the work on the 5<sup>th</sup> edition (containing the CJK Extension F) as soon as possible.*

## **T2. Page 31 Sub-clause 23.1 List of source references**

It is proposed that “Replace all J1 and JA sources that are also included in JIS X 0213:2004 by the values defined in JIS X 0213:2004.”

As Japan NB commented on the PDAM2.2 ballot, the replacement of CJK source references has the significant user impact. Japan NB still strongly objects the change of source references for J1 and JA sources’ characters. It causes the confusion to the existing users who need J1 and JA source information and who believe the compatibility is preserved on this standard.

On the disposition of comments on PDAM2.2 (WG2 N 4656), there are some statements about the obsolescence of current J source information and glyphs. For example, “Furthermore, many J source glyphs as described until now in ISO/IEC 10646 have been obsoleted by JIS X 0213:2004, resulting in an imperfect view of characters used in Japan for these sources.” Japan NB does not agree with this decision.

WG2 N 4656 also mentioned “the information is still available through the existing collection 372 JAPANESE IDEOGRAPHS SUPPLEMENT (J1 sources) and the newly added collection 373 JAPANESE IT VENDORS CONTEMPORARY IDEOGRAPHS-1993 (JA sources).” However, it is almost useless to open and retrieve the collection file to find J1 and JA source information.

### Proposed change by Japan

Do not change J1 and JA sources’ references.

and

Remove NOTE 3 and NOTE 4.

Or, as alternative,

1) Please use difference source format from original J4 source information, such as “J4A-xxxx” for current J1 source characters and “J4B-xxxx” for current JA source characters. The “Kanji J sources” should be updated to include these information.

2) Also, please add the description about the relationship between J1 and JIS X0213, and JA and JIS X0213 into Annex P. Japan NB is willing to prepare the information for additional text into Annex P..

### **Accepted in principle**

*The second alternative is adopted with the following source names:*

- J3B-xxxx for JIS X 0213:2004 level 3 characters replacing current J1 characters
- J3C-xxxx for JIS X 0213:2004 level 3 characters replacing current JA characters.
- J4B-xxxx for JIS X 0213:2004 level 4 characters replacing current J1 characters
- J4C-xxxx for JIS X 0213:2004 level 4 characters replacing current JA characters.

*Then after the Table P.1 in Annex P, the following new text will be added:*

The Japanese Industrial Standard JIS X 0213:2004 contains characters in its levels 3 and 4 which were part of previous JIS standards. The set consists of 2828 characters, of which 2723 were part of JIS X 0212-1990 (referred as J1 sources in this International Standard) and 85 were part of the ‘Unified Japanese IT Vendors Contemporary Ideographs, 1993’ (referred as JA in this International Standard). Among these 2828 characters, 205 had their glyph representation slightly modified. These 2828 characters use the ‘J3B, J3C, J4B, and J4C’ notations in their prefix four source identification as described in sub-clause 23.1.

### **T3. Page 2423 Annex I.2 Syntax of an ideographic description sequence – subgroups**

“Tangut Ideograph” is proposed as one of DCs (Description Component). Considering that CJK Ideographs and Tangut Ideographs are standardized as different script and they have different unification rule, IDS should not be mixed. An IDS for CJK Ideograph should be distinctive from an IDS for Tangut Ideograph.

#### **Proposed change by Japan**

The beginning of I.2 “Syntax of an ideographic description sequence” should be updated as follows:

#### **I.2 Syntax of an ideographic description sequence**

An IDS consist of an IDC followed by a fixed number of Description Component (DC). This international standard defines following subgroups of IDS. Each subgroup has its collection of possible DCs. An IDS should be classified to only one subgroup, to clarify the script that it belongs to.

- CJK IDS, including following DCs:
  - CJK Unified Ideographs
  - CJK Unified Ideographs Extension A
  - CJK Unified Ideographs Extension B
  - CJK Unified Ideographs Extension C
  - CJK Unified Ideographs Extension D
  - CJK Unified Ideographs Extension E
  - CJK Compatibility Ideographs
  - CJK Compatibility Ideographs Supplement
  - CJK Radicals
  - CJK Radicals Supplement
  - Kangxi Radical
  - The character FF1F FULL WIDTH QUESTION MARK to represent an otherwise un-described DC
  - a private use character (as long as the interchanging parties have agreed that the particular private use character represents a particular CJK ideograph or component of a CJK ideograph)
  - another CJK IDS

- Tangut IDS, including following DCs:
  - Tangut Ideograph
  - Tangut Radicals
  - The character FF1F FULL WIDTH QUESTION MARK to represent an otherwise un-described DC
  - a private use character (as long as the interchanging parties have agreed that the particular private use character represents a particular CJK ideograph or component of a CJK ideograph)
  - another Tangut IDS

NOTE 1 – The above description implies that any IDS may be nested within another IDS in same subgroup.

#### **Accepted in principle**

*The principle of not mixing CJK ideographs and other ideographs in the same sequence is accepted. It is however not necessary to describe in details each block which would require extra maintenance steps each time a new block part of the same category is added to the standard.*

*In addition, the Tangut IDSs only use a subset of what is proposed, and at this time it seems prudent to only allow in the description what is actually used in a repertoire which is much more stable than the CJK ideographs. The following text is proposed (see comment T4 and its disposition concerning CJK strokes):*

### **I.2 Syntax of an ideographic description sequence**

An IDS consist of an IDC followed by a fixed number of Description Component (DC) organized in subgroups corresponding to script category, such as CJK ideographs or Tangut ideographs. An IDS should only use items belonging to a single subgroup, to clarify the script that it belongs to. The subgroups and their contents is as follows:

- CJK IDS, including DCs which may be of any one of the following:
  - a coded CJK ideographs, which consists of any coded character from the CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS block or the CJK COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPHS blocks,
  - a coded CJK radical, which consists of any coded character from the CJK RADICALS blocks or the KANGXI RADICALS block,
  - a coded stroke, which consists of any coded character from the CJK STROKES block,
  - the character FF1F FULL WIDTH QUESTION MARK to represent an otherwise un-described DC,
  - a private use character (as long as the interchanging parties have agreed that the particular private use character represents a particular CJK ideograph or component of a CJK ideograph),
  - another CJK IDS.
- Tangut IDS, including DCs which may be of any one of the following:
  - a Tangut Ideograph, which consists of any character from the TANGUT block,
  - a Tangut component, which consists of any coded character from the TANGUT COMPONENT block,
  - a coded stroke, which consists of any coded character from the CJK STROKES block,
  - another Tangut IDS.

NOTE 1 – The above description implies that any IDS may be nested within another IDS in same subgroup.

### **T4. Page 2423 Annex I.2 Syntax of an ideographic description sequence – CJK STROKES**

(“A coded stroke”, the character on the CJK STROKES block (U+31C0 - U+31EF), is proposed as one of DCs (Description Component). But, the characters on CJK STROKES should not be allowed to use as DC with the following reasons.

- Some characters on CJK STROKES block have similar shape to the CJK ideographs, such as U+31D0 and U+4E00 ( “—” ), U+31E0 and U+4E59 ( “乚” ). Inclusion of CJK STROKES would introduce unexpected ambiguity into IDS, because there could be several variations of IDS for one ideograph character.
- CJK STROKES are too elementary as a glyphic component to describe the structure of CJK Ideographs. Even if there is a component that is widely shared but not coded as a single coded character, its component shape would be more complicated than CJK STROKES. The usage of CJK STROKES in IDS to describe such structure would introduce further ambiguity and make IDS lengthy.

- The purpose to include CJK STROKES would be the description of detailed glyph shape of the unencoded character. From the experience of practical usages for IDS in IRG, the too detailed and lengthy IDSs are difficult to reproduce the original glyph shape and not useful to find the unifiable existing character. The inclusion of CJK STROKES would have negative impact against the working process in IRG.
- The characters on CJK STROKES are originated from the stroke symbols on HKSCS. It should be carefully considered whether these HKSCS unique stroke symbols are appropriate to be used as DC.

Proposed change by Japan

Delete the item “a coded stroke, which consists of any coded character from the CJK STROKES block.”

**Not Accepted**

*CJK strokes should not be removed from the list of IDC elements, as characters such as 𐤀𐤁𐤂 can only be represented as IDS sequences if the 𐤀 stroke (U+31E3 CJK STROKE Q) is allowed (some people use U+3007 IDEOGRAPHIC NUMBER ZERO O, but that is not correct).*

*The argument that allowing CJK strokes will introduce ambiguous sequences as some strokes are visually the same as some encoded characters is not convincing as already all Kangxi radicals and most CJK radicals supplement characters are visual clones of unified ideographs, and so a process dealing with IDS sequences already needs to deal with visual ambiguity.*

*Concerning their elementary shape, it is true that they should only be used in cases as above where they bring shapes not available elsewhere and should not be used to decompose characters in lengthy sequences where more complex components (such as radicals or other ideographs) should be used instead. In other words, CJK STROKES should only be used sparingly but they nevertheless have some good use cases.*

*Finally, despite their names, and because of their generic shapes, these strokes have use cases beyond the CJK domain. For example, for Tangut IDS sequences which require dot or slanted strokes.*

## **T5. Page 136 Miscellaneous Symbols and Pictographs – Emoji additions**

As described in WG2 N 4656, these characters are currently under review by the Unicode Technical Committee (UTC). As the general rule, the characters that are not yet approved even by the proposed organization, such as UTC, should not be included in the SC2 ballot document. Also, Japan NB does not find the reasonable rationale for the urgent inclusion of these characters with taking a shortcut.

Proposed change by Japan

Delete 37 Emoji characters newly added that are also listed on WG2 N 4656.

**Not accepted**

*See also comment T3, T4 from UK and TE2, TE3 from US.*

*As explained in the answer to comment T1, there is an extreme urgency to encode additional Emoji characters. The Unicode Consortium has been under pressure to add that set to improve diversity. While it is true that at the time when WG2 N4656 was written, the characters were under review by the Unicode Technical Committee, most of them were approved for inclusion in Unicode 8.0 (one deletion and one name change) in early February 2015, thus at the very beginning of this ballot period..*

*There were put under ballot in PDAM2.3 to offer a chance to ISO NBs to provide feedback, which was done by several countries. It can be seen as a bit accelerated, but in line with was done before for urgent request such as currency symbols encoding proposals.*

## **T6. Page 147 Miscellaneous Symbols and Pictographs – Religious symbols**

In addition to the comment above, Japan NB has the concern on the religious symbols. Please refer the detail explanation on the individual contribution by Toshiya Suzuki sent to the project editor. (Note it will be soon registered as WG2 document).

[Summary of document WG2 N4662 mentioned above]:

In summary, I think L2/235 is insufficient to start the ballot for the religious symbols into ISO/IEC 10646. If the proposed symbols are designed for the tourism or geographic context, the symbols based on the building structures would be appropriate. If the proposed symbols are designed to specify a religion itself, the review by the authorized organization is essential to prevent the conflict with religious feeling. I do not think ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2 is willing to take the responsibility to calm such conflict, I propose such symbols (to point a religion) should be considered after the official proposal from the religious organization.

Proposed change by Japan

Delete the religious symbols on U+1F54B, U+1F54C, U+1F54D, U+1F54E and U+1F900.

**Partially accepted**

*See comment T4 from UK and TE3 from US.*

*The document L2/235 at <http://www.unicode.org/L2/L2014/14235r3-relig-sym.pdf> contains in its preface:*

*The objective has been to have symbols and structures of major belief systems worldwide represented with an emphasis on filling up existing gaps in the encoded symbol repertoire (e.g. to present Abrahamic religions, or for those major belief systems with specific, strong focus on places of worship as centers of community ). The other criteria have been an existing or potential common usage among the user community.*

*Then says:*

*In the style of existing emoji for buildings and other structures, an individual, distinct symbol would be assigned to each class of religious structures.*

*And later:*

*This is a list of religious and religious structure symbols to be considered for incorporation in Unicode.*

*Therefore it cannot be said that these new symbols are there to represent ‘religions’, but instead representation of structure and symbols of religion. This is a very important distinction. Most of the already encoded symbols (many in the Miscellaneous Symbols block at 2600..26FF came from geographic context. L2/235 muddles the issue by using the expression “e.g. to present Abrahamic religions,”, but this is not supported by the rest of the document.*

*At the same time, there was recognition of sensitivities to symbols representing persons as this can be problematic in this context and this was reflected by the following comment from Michael Everson during the review by the Unicode Consortium of these 37 characters, in: <http://www.unicode.org/L2/L2015/15032r-pri286-fdbk-disp.pdf>*

*I am adamantly opposed to the addition of more anthropomorphic symbols or pictographs (unless they are part of writing systems like Naxi Tomba). There is absolutely no way to avoid somebody getting upset about the depiction of a person, demigod, or deity, whether the character embodies a cosmic principle or what. The DHYANI BUDDHA is particularly problematic as there are really FIVE of them, not one. It is in fact misleading to encode one as though it were a generic category.*

*As a result, that character proposed as 1F900 DHYANY BUDDHA was removed from the proposed repertoire and the decision is in agreement with the request from Japan to remove 1F900. However the other 4 characters stay.*

## **Mongolia: Negative**

### **General comment:**

We would like to share our opinion and the latest research outcomes with researcher scholars who specialized on Soyombo script at Tokyo meeting in October 2015.

We have to start research project on Soyombo script of the historical and cultural heritage which are found from Mongolia as soon as possible. This year some conferences will held on Zanabazars' Soyombo script in abroad and Mongolia. The research outcomes on Soyombo script from the conferences will bring significant result for Encoding project of Soyombo script, therefore we would like to implement careful research on Soyombo script for further 2 years. Thank you for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Ms. Undraa.B /secretary of ICT TC, senior officer of MASM/

Mr.Otgonbaatar.R /Research worker in The Institute of Language and Literature at Mongolian Academy of Sciences/

Mr.Demberel.S /Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy and Religious studies, National University of Mongolia/

### **Noted**

*Neither Zanabazar Square nor Soyombo are part of the amendment under ballot.*

### **Technical comment**

(Note that references for sections and pages are related to the document WG2 N4655, not the amendment which contains nothing related to this repertoire.)

### **T1. Soyombo**

#### **Section 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 Attachement..., page 22-25, 27, 28**

Proposal to Encode the Soyombo Script in ISO/IEC 10646, page 22-25, 27, 28 11A50, 11AAF, 11AA0

It is not appropriate to change the traditional alphabetical order of Zanabazar's Soyombo script in the amended version of the encoding project.

#### **Proposed change by Mongolia**

Mongolian researchers are holding the traditional alphabetical order of the script.

/It is not acceptable the revised version of the project, even he improved glyphs of the script. The script, text source of Soyombo script, which he used in the encoding project, is unable to affirm precise version of glyphs and signs of the Soyombo script./.

### **Noted**

*Again there is nothing here related to the amendment under ballot. The editor would encourage the Mongolian to create a feedback document related to WG2 N4655 and request posting of such a document in the WG2 web site. It should be noted that a WG2 ad hoc meeting is tentatively planned to take place in Tokyo just before the next WG2 meeting in October 2015 to address encoding of both the Zanabazar Square repertoire and the Soyombo repertoire.*



## **Korea (ROK): Abstention with comment**

### **General comment**

- abstention

- reason: There are changes to J3A, J3, J4, J1, and JA.

However, KR could not figure out exactly what changes are made to them and therefore wants to abstain for this ballot.

### **Noted**

*See also comment T2 from Japan.*

*These changes were described in document WG2 N4620 which was discussed at the last WG2 meeting in Colombo Sri Lanka, with representatives from Korea present and consequently included in the recommendation M63.04 adopted by majority of participants (Korea in favor), document WG2 N4604R.*

## **UK: Positive with comment**

### **Technical/Editorial comment (T or E prefix)**

#### **E1. Tangut**

176CE has been moved to 176A1 as requested in GB comment T11 for PDAM 2.2, but the glyph has not been amended to show the correct stroke count.

Proposed change by UK:

Correct the glyph for 176CE as described in WG2 N4650.

**Accepted**

#### **T2. CJK Ideographs – 9FD1..9FD5**

As CJK-F has been removed from Amd. 2, it is no longer appropriate to move 9FD1..9FD5 into CJK-F.

Proposed change by UK:

Add 9FD1..9FD5 back to Amd. 2.

**Accepted**

*See also comment TE1 from US.*

*The removal from amendment 2 was a side effect of the request from UK to move these 5 characters into CJK Extension F in the ballot for PDAM2.2, not an issue with the characters themselves.*

#### **T3. Miscellaneous Symbols and Pictographs – BADMINTON RACQUET AND BIRDIE**

The name for U+1F3F8 should not be BADMINTON RACQUET AND BIRDIE as the object hit in the game of badminton is properly called a shuttlecock.

Proposed change by UK:

Change the name for U+1F3F8 to BADMINTON RACQUET AND SHUTTLECOCK.

**Accepted**

*See also comment TE2 from US.*

#### **T4. Supplemental Miscellaneous Symbols and Pictographs – Dhyani Buddha**

1F900 DHYANI BUDDHA should not be encoded as it sets a precedent for encoding an open-ended set of characters representing deities and supernatural beings. Additionally, some users may consider it offensive to have a figure of worship or reverence encoded as a Unicode character, especially if it is represented in a cartoon style as an emoji character.

Proposed change by UK:

Remove 1F900 from Amd. 2.

**Accepted**

*See also comment T6 from Japan and TE3 from US.*

## **USA: Positive**

### **Technical comments:**

#### **TE.1. CJK – 9FD1..9FD5**

The U.S. requests that U+9FD1..9FD5 in the CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS block be re-inserted into Amendment 2. The U.S. sees no reason to further delay encoding these characters which have passed all other review simply to avoid using these code points on the URO. Delaying these for consideration in Extension F will significantly postpone the ability of implementers to use these characters.

Proposed change by US:

Make the change as requested.

**Accepted**

*See also comment T2 from UK and its disposition.*

#### **TE.2. Miscellaneous Symbols and Pictographs – BADMINTON RACQUET AND BIRDIE**

The U.S. requests the name for 1F3F8 BADMINTON RACQUET AND BIRDIE be changed to BADMINTON RACQUET AND SHUTTLECOCK. “Shuttlecock” is the more usual name found in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Proposed change by US:

Make the name change as requested.

**Accepted**

*See also comment T3 from UK.*

#### **TE.3. Supplemental Miscellaneous Symbols and Pictographs – Dhyani Buddha**

The U.S. requests the removal of 1F900 DHYANI BUDDHA, as the character is still controversial.

Proposed change by US:

Remove the character.

**Accepted**

*See also comment T6 from Japan and T4 from UK.*

#### **TE.4. Tamil Supplement – character name changes**

The U.S. requests the following Tamil Supplement block names be modified as noted in the list below. The name changes are based on feedback received from the user community.

11FD0 TAMIL FRACTION DOWNSCALING FACTOR KIIZH

Change to: TAMIL FRACTION DOWNSCALING FACTOR KIIL

11FD2 TAMIL SIGN SUVADU

Change to: TAMIL SIGN CUVATU

11FD3 TAMIL SIGN AAZHAAKKU

Change to: TAMIL SIGN AALAAKKU

11FD5 TAMIL SIGN MUUVUZHAKKU

Change to: TAMIL SIGN MUUVULAKKU

11FD6 TAMIL SIGN PADAKKU

Change to: TAMIL SIGN PATAKKU

11FD8 TAMIL SIGN PAISAA

Change to: TAMIL SIGN PAICAA

11FDA TAMIL SIGN KAASU

Change to: TAMIL SIGN KAACU

11FDD TAMIL SIGN VARAAGAN

Change to: TAMIL SIGN VARAAKAN

11FDE TAMIL SIGN BAARAM

Change to: TAMIL SIGN PAARAM

11FDF TAMIL SIGN GEJAM

Change to: TAMIL SIGN KAJAM

11FE0 TAMIL SIGN KUZHI

Change to: TAMIL SIGN KULI

11FE1 TAMIL SIGN VELI

Change to: TAMIL SIGN VEELI

11FE8 TAMIL SIGN MUDALIYA

Change to: TAMIL SIGN MUTALIYA

11FE9 TAMIL SIGN VAGAIYARAA

Change to: TAMIL SIGN VAKAIYARAA

11FEA TAMIL SIGN CIRANJIIVI

Change to: TAMIL SIGN CIRANCIIVI.

Proposed change by US:

Make the name changes as noted.

**Accepted**

*Note that these name changes did imply changing the text of many annotations related to these new characters in the charts. Experts are invited to review these annotation for accuracy.*

## **Editorial comments:**

### **ED.1. Tamil Supplement – block annotation**

Please update the Tamil Supplement and Tamil block annotations and name aliases so they are consistent with the name changes above. (For background, see Tamil Virtual Academy input in UTC document 15-060R <http://www.unicode.org/L2/L2015/15060r-tva-minutes.pdf> .)

Proposed change by US:

Update the annotations and name aliases as noted.

**Accepted**

---end