ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2 N4420

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N4680

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2**

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS**

**FOR ADDITION OF CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646**

**Please fill in all the sections below.**

**Please read the Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from** <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg41/IRGN1975PnPv6.doc>

**for guidelines and details before filling in this form.**

**Please ensure that you are using the latest Form from**

<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg41/IRGN1975_PnP_BlankDataFile.xls>

**See also** <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irgwds.html> **for the latest *Unifiable Component Variations*.**

**A. Administrative**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |  | | | | | | | |  |
| 1. **IRG Project Code:** | | |  | | | | | | | |  |
| 2. **Title:** | | | Japanese Submission for UNC proposed to IRG#44 | | | | | | | |  |
| 3. Requester's Region/Country Name: | | | | Japan | | | | | | |  |
| 4. Requester Type (National Body/Individual Contribution): | | | | | National Body | | | | | |  |
| 5. Submission Date: | | | | | 2015-09-18 | | | | | |  |
| 6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs) | | | | | Unified Ideographs | | | | | |  |
|  | | If Compatibility, does the requester have the intention to register them as IVS (See UTS #37) with the IRG’s approval? (Registration fee will not be charged if authorized by the IRG.) | | | | | N/A | | | |  |
| 7. Request Type (Normal Request or Urgently Needed) | | | | | Urgently Need | | | | | |  |
| 8. Choose one of the following: | | | | | | | | |  | |  |
|  | This is a complete proposal | | | | | Yes | | | |  |
|  | (or) More information will be provided later. | | | | | - | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | |  | | |  |

**B. Technical – General**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | |  | | |  |
| 1. Number of ideographs in the proposal: | | | | | | *2* | | | |  |
| 2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 Bitmap files or TrueType font file) | | | | | | *128 x 128 Bitmap* | | | |  |
|  | | If Bitmap files, are their file names the same as their source references? | | | *Yes* | | |  | | |
|  | | If TrueType font file, are all the proposed glyphs put into BMP PUA area? | | | *-* | | |  | | |
|  | | If TrueType font file, are data for source references vs. character codes provided? | | | *-* | | |  | | |
| 3. Source references: | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper source reference (member body/international consortium abbreviation followed by no more than 9 alphanumeric characters)? | | | Yes  JMJ-dddddd | | | | |  | |
| 4. Evidence: | | |  | | | | | | |  |
|  | a. Do all the proposed ideographs have a separate evidence document which contains at least one scanned image of printed materials (preferably dictionaries)? | | | No | | | | |  | |
|  | b. Do all the printed materials used for evidence provide enough information to track them by a third party (ISBN numbers, etc.)? | | | Yes | | | | |  | |
| 5. Attribute Data Format: (Excel file or CSV text) | | | | | | *Excel* | | | |  |

**C. Technical - Checklist**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | |  | |  | |
| **Understanding of the Unification Policy** | | | |  | |  | |
| 1. Has the requester read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and does the requester understand the unification policy? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| 1. Has the requester read the “Unifiable Component Variations” (contact IRG technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the latest version) and does the requester understand the unifiable variation examples? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| 1. Has the requester read the P&P document and does the requester understand the 5% Rule? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| **Character-Glyph Duplication (**<http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm> contains all the published ones and those under ballot**)** | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| 1. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are ***not unifiable*** with any of the unified or compatibility ideographs of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
|  | | If the checking has been done against an earlier version of ISO/IEC 10646, please specify the version? (e.g. 10646:2011) | 10646:2014 | | | |  |
| 1. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are ***not unifiable*** with any of the ideographs in the amendments, if any, of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
|  | | If yes, which amendment(s) has the requester checked? | Amendment 1 | | | |  |
| 1. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are ***not unifiable*** with any of the ideographs in the proposed amendments, if any, of ISO/IEC 10646? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
|  | | If yes, which draft amendment(s) has the requester checked? | - | | | |  |
| 1. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are ***not unifiable*** with any of the ideographs in the current working M-set and D-set of the IRG? (Contact IRG chief editor and technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the newest list) | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
|  | | If yes, which document(s) has the requester checked? | IRG CJK F1,F2 | | | |  |
| 1. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are ***not unifiable*** with any of the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (See Annex E of the P&P document). | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| 1. Has the requester checked whether the proposed ideographshave any ***similar ideographs*** in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| 1. Has the requester checked whether the proposed ideographs have any ***variant ideographs*** in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| **Attribute Data** | | | |  | |  | |
| 1. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the Kangxi radical code and stroke count? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| 1. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in簡化字總表) among the proposed ideographs? | | | | *No* | |  | |
|  | If yes, does the proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in the attribute data? | | | *-* | |  | |
| 1. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in the attribute data? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
| 1. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in the attribute data? | | | | *Yes* | |  | |
|  | If no, how many proposed ideographs do not have the IDS? | | | *-* | |  | |
| 1. If the answer to question 9 or 10 is yes, do the attribute data include any information on similar/variant ideographs for the proposed ideographs? | | | | *No* | |  | |
|  | | | | |  |  | |