ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N2989
2005-09-13

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
International Organization for Standardization
Organisation Internationale de Normalisation
Международная организация по стандартизации

L2/05-261

Doc Type: **Working Group Document**
Title: **Proposal to add six additional Uralicist characters to the UCS**
Source: **Ad-hoc on Uralicist characters (Klaas Ruppel, Erkki Kolehmainen, Michael Everson, Asmus Freytag)**
Ken Whistler
Status: **Report from the ad-hoc on Uralicist characters**
Date: **2005-09-13**

With reference to N2958, *Report on progress in implementing the Uralic Phonetic Alphabet with indication of the need for additional characters and symbols* by Juhani Lehtiranta, Klaas Ruppel, Toni Suutari, and Trond Trosterud, the ad-hoc on Uralicist characters recommends that WG2 add the following characters to FPDAM2 of ISO/IEC 10646. This document contains the proposal summary form.

1DFE		COMBINING LEFT ARROWHEAD ABOVE
1DFF		COMBINING RIGHT ARROWHEAD AND DOWN ARROWHEAD BELOW
2C77		LATIN SMALL LETTER TAILLESS PHI
27CA		VERTICAL BAR WITH HORIZONTAL STROKE
A720		MODIFIER LETTER STRESS AND HIGH TONE
A721		MODIFIER LETTER STRESS AND LOW TONE

A. Administrative

1. Title
Proposal to add six additional Uralicist characters to the UCS
2. Requester's name
Klaas Ruppel, Erkki Kolehmainen, Michael Everson, Asmus Freytag, Ken Whistler
3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution)
Report from the ad-hoc on Uralicist characters.
4. Submission date
2005-09-13
5. Requester's reference (if applicable)
6. Choose one of the following:
6a. This is a complete proposal
Yes.
6b. More information will be provided later
No.

B. Technical – General
1. Choose one of the following:
1a. This proposal is for a new script (set of characters)
No.
Proposed name of script
1b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block
Yes.
1b. Name of the existing block
Various blocks.

2. Number of characters in proposal
6
3. Proposed category (see section II, Character Categories)
Category A.
4a. Proposed Level of Implementation (1, 2 or 3) (see clause 14, ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000)
Level 3.
4b. Is a rationale provided for the choice?
Yes.
4c. If YES, reference
Spacing letters and combining marks are in this set.
5a. Is a repertoire including character names provided?
Yes.
5b. If YES, are the names in accordance with the naming guidelines in Annex L of ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000?
Yes.
5c. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review?
Yes.
6a. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered preference: True Type, or PostScript format) for publishing the standard?
Michael Everson. TrueType.
6b. If available now, identify source(s) for the font (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.) and indicate the tools used:
Michael Everson. Fontographer.
7a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided?
In N2958.
7b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached?
In N2958.
8. Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing (if applicable) such as input, presentation, sorting, searching, indexing, transliteration etc. (if yes please enclose information)?
No.
9. Submitters are invited to provide any additional information about Properties of the proposed Character(s) or Script that will assist in correct understanding of and correct linguistic processing of the proposed character(s) or script.
Functions and properties are like similar Latin small letters, modifier letters, and combining marks.

C. Technical – Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before? If YES, explain.
No. A preliminary discussion paper is N2958.
2a. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)?
Yes.
2b. If YES, with whom?
Uralicists at the Research Centre for the Languages of Finland, and other specialists.
2c. If YES, available relevant documents
3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included?
No.
4a. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)
These are characters used in Uralicist linguistics.
4b. Reference
5a. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?
Yes.
5b. If YES, where?
Uralicist databases and dictionaries.
6a. After giving due considerations to the principles in Principles and Procedures document (a WG 2 standing document) must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?
Yes.
6b. If YES, is a rationale provided?
Yes.
6c. If YES, reference
Keep with other Latin letters and combining marks.
7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?
No.
8a. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence?
No.
8b. If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?
8c. If YES, reference

9a. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?

No.

9b. If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?

9c. If YES, reference

10a. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to an existing character?

No.

10b. If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?

10c. If YES, reference

11a. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences (see clauses 4.12 and 4.14 in ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000)?

Yes.

11b. If YES, is a rationale for such use provided?

Yes.

11c. If YES, reference

Two of the characters are combining characters.

12a. Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided?

No.

12b. If YES, reference

13a. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?

No.

13b. If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary)

14a. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility character(s)?

No.

14b. If YES, is the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic character(s) identified?

14c. If YES, reference