Comments were received from the following P-Members: Ireland, Japan, and UK. In addition a comment was made by ITTF. The following document is the disposition of those comments. The disposition is organized per country in alphabetical order. The ITTF comment and its disposition are appended.

Note – The full content of the ballot comments (minus some figures and charts) 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.

As a result of these dispositions all countries with negative vote have changed their vote to positive.
Ireland: Positive with comments:
Ireland approves the draft with the technical and editorial comments given below.

Technical Comments:

T.1 Amendment text. Page 3, Annex F.2, Script-specific format characters.
The text in the sub-clause has something missing. We suggest: “TIFINAGH CONSONANT JOINER (2D7F): This character suppresses an (or the?) inherent vowel, and functions to indicate that the previous character and the following character are part of a bi-consonantal cluster.”

Accepted

New text:
TIFINAGH CONSONANT JOINER (2D7F): This character suppresses an inherent vowel, and functions to indicate that the previous character and the following character are part of a bi-consonantal cluster.

T.2 Page 13, Row 1BC: Batak.
a) Ireland reiterates its support for the repertoire and character names as presented in FPDAM 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 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.

Noted

b) Ireland also requests the re-instatement of two characters to the PDAM. Discussion with Uli Kozok has confirmed that the “fancy” glyph behaviour the two characters have shown in palm-leaf manuscripts is not necessary in terms of a font and encoding. Most modern writers have not used the characters since the 1920s. Scholars, however, require to be able to represent the characters as they are found in the historical manuscripts. The code positions, glyphs, and names of the characters that should be added back into the FPDAM are:

1BFA BATAK SYMBOL BINDU GODANG
1BF BATAK SYMBOL BINDU PINARJOLMA.

Not accepted
These graphic elements need more evidence as text elements before being encoded as characters. Furthermore, they have not been in current use since the 1920s. Therefore there is no urgency, especially because encoding them in amendment 7 at this stage gives other NBs no chance to review them further. It was agreed to include these characters in FPDAM8 for further review.

Editorial Comments:

Ireland suggests that the following notes be used for consistency:

Khanty letters
0510 CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER REVERSED ZE

..

Aleut letters
051E CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER ALEUT KA

..

Accepted in principle
The group header in front of 0510 is changed to Khanty letters as suggested, but annotations are modified for 0511 and 0513 to read as follows:

Khanty letters
0510 CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER REVERSED ZE
0511 CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER REVERSED ZE
* also used for Enets
0512 CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER EL WITH HOOK
0513 CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER EL WITH HOOK
* also used for Chukchi, Itelmen
The group header for ‘Aleut letter’ is changed to ‘Aleut letters’ as suggested.

**E2. Page 10, Row 0D0: Malayalam.**
Ireland reiterates its recommendation that the rather inconsistent font used for Malayalam be replaced with the one given in the table shown below. (see SC2 N4086 for chart)

*Not accepted*

Doing a full replacement for the Malayalam block is delayed until the new edition.

**E3. Page 16, Row 2D3: Tifinagh.**
Ireland suggests that the informative note to 2D7F TIFINAGH CONSONANT JOINER be revised along the lines of the resolution of our comment T1.

*Accepted*

**Japan, Negative**

**Technical Comments:**

**JP.1 Page 2 Historic Kana block**
The name of a new block "HISTORIC KANA" may confuse users when considering the discussion in the last WG2 meeting that this block may be used for allocation of so-called hentai gana, because hentai gana can be considered a part of modern Japanese writing system, although it is clear that they are not a part of official Japanese writing system.

*Accepted in principle*

The new block name is ‘Kana Supplement’.

**Editorial comments**

**E.1 Page 42, Historic Kana chart**
The shape of the glyph for 1B000 KATAKANA LETTER ARCHAIC E looks inappropriate; the horizontal line is too wide and the diagonal line from the upper right to lower left is too curved.

*Accepted in principle*

Based on reception of an updated glyph by the editor.

**E.2 Page 33, Arabic Presentation Forms-A**
The glyphs for FDF2 and FDFB slightly sprawl out from the top of their code chart cells. They should fit in the cells.

*Acceptance*

As a result of these dispositions, Japan changed its vote to Yes.
UK, Positive with comments

Editorial comments

E1: Page 1351, Annex A.1 (page 2 of FPDAM7)
“In the alphabetical list of keywords in Note 3, add collection “1042” to the entries “Hiragana” an “Katakana”.”

“and” is misspelled as “an”

Accepted

It will read: “In the alphabetical list of keywords in Note 3, add collection “1042” to the entries “Hiragana” and “Katakana”.”

ITTF comment

Editorial comments

E1: Clause 3, Normative references
The proposed changes to the normative references have already been made by Amd.6, which is on the point of being published.

Proposed: Delete the change to Clause 3.

Accepted

-end