To: South Asian Subcommittee and UTC   L2/12-031
From: Deborah Anderson, Rick McGowan, and Ken Whistler
Title: Review of Indic-related L2 documents and Recommendations to the UTC
Date: 27 January 2012

I. ORIYA OM
Documents:
L2/11-258 Proposal to encode 0B50 ORIYA OM - Shriramana Sharma
L2/11-308 A clear policy on encoding OM characters - Shriramana Sharma
L2/11-343 Feedback on Oriya OM - Mamata Mishra

Discussion: We reviewed these documents.

The Oriya OM character proposal, L2/11-258, clearly shows the ligated form, but also notes that the OM can have a shape that is formed by a candrabindu above ORIYA LETTER O.

Document L2/11-308 requested a clear policy be spelled out on encoding OM characters.

Document L2/11-343, feedback on the proposal for ORIYA OM, was previous reviewed by this subcommittee (see L2/11-403), but no action was taken on the feedback document at the UTC.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC approve U+0B50 ORIYA OM as proposed in L2/11-258.

Concerning the request for a clear Unicode policy on OM characters as put forward in L2/11-308, we recommend this not be done, as the OM characters in Indic scripts are idiosyncratic and are best dealt with individually.

The feedback in L2/11-343 is noted.

II. SHARADA
1. SHARADA EKAM
Document: L2/11-430 Proposal to Encode the Sign EKAM for Sharada -Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal for the EKAM character in Sharada.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC approve the EKAM character for Sharada at U+111C9, but the UTC should decide whether the name should be SHARADA EKAM or SHARADA EKAM SIGN. We also recommend the following annotation on the character: "an invocation sign that appears at the beginning of text."

2. SHARADA OM

Document: L2/12-019   Recommendation against use of 111C4 SHARADA OM for now -
Shriramana Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which recommends against the use of U+111C4 SHARADA OM. We note that this character is already in 6.1, and currently has no annotation.

Recommendation: We recommend an action be taken to respond to the author, asking him to draft an appropriate annotation for U+111C4 for a future version of the standard.

3. SHARADA JIHVAMULIYA and UPADHMANIYA

**Document: L2/12-028 Representation of JIHVAMULIYA and UPADHMANIYA in Sharada –
Deborah Anderson**

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which requests the UTC decide on how to represent JIHVAMULIYA and UPADHMANIYA in Sharada, specifically if a virama should be used or not. Note that the UTC recommended *against* use of virama for the Brahmi jihvamuliya and upadhmaniya.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss this issue and make a decision.
Note: This topic is closely related to the document listed below (III), on Brahmi jihvamuliya and upadhmaniya.

III. BRAHMI
**Document: L2/12-020   Special rendering of some jihvamuliya/upadhmaniya characters -
Shriramana Sharma**

Discussion: We reviewed this document.

This document requests three actions:
(a) revise the wording in the Brahmi section of Chapter 10 on jihvamuliya/upadhmaniya characters;
(b) use wording in the new Sharada block introduction similar to that for the two Brahmi characters (in [a]);
(c) change the glyph for U+11003 BRAHMI SIGN JIHVAMULIYA and U+11004 BRAHMI SIGN UPADHMANIYA to one with the characters enclosed in a dotted box.

Recommendation: We recommend the following:
(a) this document be remanded to the Editorial Committee and used as the basis for a text update on the Brahmi section in Chapter 10 in **Unicode 6.1**
(b) the wording on the Sharada block introduction be remanded to the Editorial Committee for the text of **Unicode 6.1** (noting this is dependent upon the decision of II.3., above)
(c) the glyphs for the two Brahmi characters remain as they appear in the code charts today, that is, without the dotted box. (The use of dotted boxes in the Sharada code chart was the result of a long discussion in the UTC, which considered whether the characters should be combining marks or represented by special rendering. Not all special rendering is reflected in the code charts by a dotted box.)

IV. TELUGU

1. TELUGU NAKAARA-POLLU
Document: L2/11-409 On the Telugu nakaara-pollu - Shriramana Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC take no action, but recommend this document be remanded to the Editorial Committee and used as the basis for additions to the text in the Telugu section of Chapter 9 for a future version of the standard.

2. TELUGU REPH
Document: L2/12-017 Request to finalize encoding model for Telugu Reph - Shriramana Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document.

Recommendation: We recommend no action be taken by the UTC, except to verify the model is acceptable to UTC members. We do recommend the Government of Andhra Pradesh review this document, and after their review, this document (and any suggestions from the Government of AP) go to the Editorial Committee for incorporation into the Telugu section of Chapter 9.

3. TELUGU LETTER LLLA
Document: L2/12-015 Proposal to encode 0C34 TELUGU LETTER LLLA – Sharma et al.

Discussion: We reviewed this document. The technical justification for encoding the TELUGU LETTER LLLA seems correct, and there appears to be no problem with the name, glyph, or code point. Additional careful annotations will need to be added on the use of this letter.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC postpone any action, pending feedback from the Government of Andhra Pradesh.

4. TELUGU LETTER RRRA
Document: L2/12-016   Proposal to encode 0C5A TELUGU LETTER RRRA - Sharma, et al.

Discussion: We reviewed this document. The technical justification for encoding the TELUGU LETTER RRRA seems correct, and there appears to be no problem with the name, glyph, or code point. Additional careful annotations will need to be added on the use of this letter.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC postpone any action, pending feedback from the Government of Andhra Pradesh.

V. TAMIL
Document: L2/12-018 Request to deprecate 0B82 TAMIL SIGN ANUSVARA - Shriramana Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document.

Recommendation: We recommend this document be remanded to the Editorial Committee and used as the basis for (a) improving the annotations for U+0B82 TAMIL SIGN ANUSVARA and U+0BCD TAMIL SIGN VIRAMA and (b) a short discussion in the Tamil section of Chapter 9. Both (a) and (b) would be for a future version of the standard.

VI. MALAYALAM
Document: L2/12-021   Request to change the representative glyph of 0D3A MALAYALAM LETTER TTTA - Shriramana Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which states that the current glyph in the code chart for U+0D3A MALAYALAM LETTER TTTA is based on the shape in the original proposal (L2/08-325) from Pedersen, though the glyph does not seem to have actual attestation. Document L2/12-021 says the shape of MALAYALAM LETTER TTTA was originally a borrowing from Grantha TTA, and the representative glyph should be changed to reflect this shape.

Recommendation: As we hold no strong opinion, we defer this topic to the UTC for a decision.

VII. NEWAR
Document: L2/12-003 Proposal to encode the Newar Script - Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: We reviewed this document. In our opinion, the proposal is very advanced and technically sound.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review the proposal but postpone any decision, while feedback from the user community is being solicited.

VIII. WARANG CITI
Document: L2/11-444 Revised Proposal for encoding the Warang Citi script in the SMP - Everson/SEI

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which is fairly mature. There remains an outstanding issue on how to represent "ligatures" in the script (§7, pp. 2-3): whether to use a virama character or a ZWJ. In our opinion, ZWJ is the appropriate choice.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC discuss the "ligature" issue and make a decision. Because community feedback is currently being solicited, we recommend the UTC postpone any final decision on this script.

IX: SIDDHAM
Document: L2/12-011   Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Siddham Script - Anshuman Pandey

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which is only preliminary.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review the proposal and provide the author any feedback.