Title: report of Lisu Mono-Syllabic discussion in WG2 #68 (2019/June/18)
Date: 2019/July/14
Place: Microsoft Building 40 (Redmond, US)
Source: suzuki toshiya
Relevant docs: N5047 Proposal To Encode The Lisu Monosyllabic Script in UCS (China)

Sun Bojun explained the outline of the proposal by the document WG2 N5047. The chart of the proposed characters with digital fonts (p.14-21) is laid out horizontally (the next character is placed in the right cell of the current character). The property of each character is described in Appendix C table in p.22-76. The order of the characters is determined by their phonetic values, and in Pinyin order. The main part of the document has a problem caused by missing font, so the discussion is mainly done based on the code chart and Appendix.

Andrew West and Michael Everson commented about the ordering system. The proposed character set is ordered by the phonetic value, but it is better to have a shape-based ordering system for such huge character set, like CJK Ideographs and Tangut, because it is hard to guess the phonetic value from the glyph shape and spot it from the repertoire. Han Gang, original author of the proposal, responded the ordering system & the repertoire in the proposal have been used for long time, including the education of this writing system to Lisu children, so it should be regarded as stable.
Many experts were still concerned about the stability of the proposed code chart, because of the following points.

- The relationship with older character lists (using different ordering rule, and the number of characters are different) is unclear. The property table in Appendix C might have the mapping information `lisu_0001_0011_06_04`, but its syntax is not defined.
  - The experts analyzed as: the first 4 digits `0001` points “維西傈僳族自治縣志”, the 2nd 4 digits `0011` is the page number of the chart, the 3rd 2 digits `06` is the row number, and the 4th 2 digits `04` is the column number. But these information should be written clearly.
- The property table has the stroke count (some of proposed characters have same phonetic values and distinguished by their semantics), but sometimes they are incorrect. For example, character #786 consists of 1 or 2 strokes only, but the value in the table is 5. The next character #787 consists of multiple strokes, but the value in the table is 1. Maybe they are mistakenly exchanged.
  - Sometimes the glyph of digitized font and original handwritten material might have different stroke counts. For example, the handwritten example of the character #155 cannot be written

by 7 strokes.

Because of the difference of the historical handwritten materials and digitized font in the proposal, a question about the purpose of the proposal was raised; if this proposal is for the preservation and digitization of the historical materials, some glyph designs are questionable. Hang Gang responded the primal purpose of this proposal is the standardization as the currently used script. The glyph shapes of the digital font in the proposal have been used as the normalized glyphs in the education, so they are prioritized than the corresponded glyph shapes in the historical materials. Also Hang pointed that the proposed character set is defined by the currently used set, not the summation of whole historical materials.

Considering that this proposal is for currently used script and not for half-deciphered historical script, the majority of the experts accepted the ordering rule by phonetic values. But there were some comments on the script name “Lisu Monosyllabic” being still inappropriate. The experts proposed to consider other names “Lisu Syllabary” or “Lisu Syllables”.

In summary, the experts recommend the authors to improve the proposal and resubmit it, to resolve the suggestions and questions raised in this meeting.