

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION  
ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2**

**Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set  
(UCS)**

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 *N*  
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 *N4502*  
2014-01-28

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Principles and Procedures for Allocation of New Characters and Scripts and handling of Defect Reports on Character Names</b>
<b>Source:</b>	<b>Ad hoc group on Principles and Procedures (Edited by: V.S. Umamaheswaran – <a href="mailto:umavs@ca.ibm.com">umavs@ca.ibm.com</a>)</b>
<b>References:</b>	<b>See References section in the document</b>
<b>Replaces:</b>	<b><a href="#">N4102</a></b>
<b>Action:</b>	<b>For use by potential submitters of proposals for new character additions to UCS, and for new collection identifiers</b>
<b>Distribution:</b>	<b>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 and Liaison Organizations</b>

This document incorporates all updates that have been approved by WG 2 up to meeting M 58.

***Table of Contents***

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Allocation of new characters and scripts</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1 Goals for encoding new characters into the BMP	3
2.2 Character categories	3
2.3 Procedure for encoding new characters and scripts	4
<b>3. Handling defect reports on character names</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Collection identification</b> .....	<b>7</b>
4.1 Enumeration of repertoires in other documents	7
4.2 Use of sequence identifiers	7
<b>5. Workflow and stages of progression</b> .....	<b>8</b>
5.1 Checking the status of a proposal	8
<b>6. Roadmaps</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>7. Electronic submissions</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>8. Format of character additions in amendments to 10646</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>9. On the relative ordering of characters</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>10. Referencing ISO/IEC 10646</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>11. WG2 web site</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>12. Case-folding stability principle</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>13. Contiguous encoding of decimal digits</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Annex A: Information accompanying submissions</b> .....	<b>11</b>
A.1 Submitter's responsibilities	11
<b>Annex B: Handling of defect reports on character names</b> .....	<b>19</b>
B.1 Principles used by WG 2	19
B.2 Some guidelines for submitters of defect reports	19
<b>Annex C: Work flow and stages of progression</b> .....	<b>20</b>
C.1 The UCS workflow	20
C.2 Stages of work	20
C.3 Dealing with urgent requests	21
C.4 Some guidelines on proposing new material as ballot comments	22
<b>Annex D: BMP and Supplementary Planes allocation roadmaps</b> .....	<b>23</b>
D.1 Overview	23
D.2 Guidelines for roadmap allotments	23

D.2.1 Block assignment starting on half-row boundary .....	24
D.2.2 1024 code position boundary for supplementary planes .....	24
D.2.3 Empty '00' position in a block .....	24
D.2.4 Gaps in ranges of assigned code positions .....	24
D.2.5 Reserved code points for stability of identifiers.....	24
D.2.6 Reserved code points for right-to-left scripts .....	24
D.2.7 Reserved code points for 'default ignorable' characters .....	25
<b>Annex E: Request for new collection identifiers .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Annex F: Formal criteria for disunification .....</b>	<b>29</b>
F.1 What is disunification? .....	29
F.2 Cost and benefits .....	29
F.3 Criteria of analysis .....	29
F.4 Some examples of precedents .....	30
F.5 Some additional guiding principles .....	31
F.6 Criteria for disunification of combining diacritical marks .....	31
F.7 Criteria for encoding script-specific Dandas .....	32
F.7.1. For currently encoded scripts .....	32
F.7.2. For new scripts proposed for encoding .....	33
<b>Annex G: Formal criteria for coding precomposed characters .....</b>	<b>34</b>
G.1 Criteria .....	34
G.2 Implications of normalization on character encoding .....	34
<b>Annex H: Criteria for encoding symbols .....</b>	<b>36</b>
H.1 Symbols and plain text .....	36
H.2 The 'symbol fallacy' .....	36
H.3 Classification .....	36
H.3.1 Symbols that are part of a notational system.....	36
H.3.2 Symbols that are not part of a notational system.....	36
H.3.2.1 Legacy symbols .....	36
H.4 Kinds of symbols found in ISO/IEC 10646 and Unicode .....	36
H.5 Discussion .....	37
H.6 Some criteria that strengthen the case for encoding .....	37
H.7 Some criteria weaken the case for encoding .....	38
H.8 Completion of a set .....	38
H.9 Instability .....	38
H.10 Perceived usefulness .....	38
<b>Annex I: Guideline for handling of CJK ideograph unification and/or disunification error</b> <b>.....</b>	<b>40</b>
I.1 Guideline for "to be unified" errors .....	40
I.2 Guideline for "to be disunified" errors .....	40
I.3 Discouragement of new disunification request .....	40
<b>Annex J: Guideline for correction of CJK ideograph mapping table errors .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Annex K .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Annex L: Character-naming guidelines.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>History of changes.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>47</b>

## 1. Introduction

This document is a standing document of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 WG 2. It consists of a set of Principles and Procedures on a number of items relevant to the preparation, submission and handling of proposals for additions of characters to the repertoire of the standard ([ISO/IEC 10646](#) and the [Unicode standard](#)). The document also contains procedures and guidelines for adding new collection identifiers to the standard. Submitters should check the standard documents (including all the amendments and corrigenda) before preparing new proposals. Submitters are encouraged to visit the “[where is my character](#)” page on the Unicode web site for more information on checking whether a character or script is already encoded in the standard. Submitters are also encouraged to contact the convener of WG 2 (and the chair of the Unicode Technical Committee) to check if any other proposal on the intended character or script may have been considered earlier.

## 2. Allocation of new characters and scripts

The following sections describe the principles and procedures to be used for assessing whether a proposed script or character(s) could be a candidate for inclusion in the standard, and whether it should be encoded in the BMP or in the supplementary planes.

### 2.1 Goals for encoding new characters into the BMP

#### ***A. The Basic Multilingual Plane should contain all contemporary characters in common use:***

Generally, the Basic Multilingual Plane (BMP) should be devoted to high-utility characters that are widely implemented in information technology and communication systems. These include, for example, characters from hard copy publishing systems that are awaiting computerization, and characters recognizable and useful to a large community of customers. The *utility* of a character in a computer or communications standard can be measured (at least in theory) by such factors as: number of publications (for example, newspapers or books) using the character, the size of the community who can recognize the character, etc. Characters of more limited use should be considered for encoding in supplementary planes, for example, obscure archaic characters.

#### ***B. The characters encoded into the Basic Multilingual Plane will not cover all characters included in future standards:***

It is not necessary, though it may often be desirable, that all characters encoded in *future* international, national, and industry information technology and communication standards are included *in the BMP*. The first edition used characters from pre-existing standards as a means of evaluating the established utility as well as ensuring compatibility with existing practice. Characters encoded in future standards may or may not have proven utility, and may or may not establish themselves in common use.

### 2.2 Character categories

WG 2 will use the following categories to aid in assessing the encoding of the proposed characters.

#### **A Contemporary**

There exists a contemporary community of native users who produce new printed matter with the proposed characters in newspapers, magazines, books, signs, etc. Examples include Myanmar (Burmese), Thaana (Maldivian), Syriac, Yi, Xishuang Banna Dai<sup>1</sup>.

#### **B.1 Specialized (small collections of characters)**

The characters are part of a relatively small set. There exists a limited community of users (for example, ecclesiastical) who produce new printed material with these proposed characters. Generally, these characters have few native users, or are not in day-to-day use for ordinary communication. Examples include Javanese and Pahlavi.

#### **B.2 Specialized (large collections of characters)**

The characters are part of a relatively large set. There exists a limited community of users (for example, ecclesiastical) who produce new printed material with these proposed characters.

<sup>1</sup>Since the writing of this initial set of principles and procedures several scripts proposed following these guidelines have been reviewed and included in the standard.

Generally, these characters have few native users, or are not in day-to-day use for ordinary communication. Examples include personal name ideographs, Chu Nom, and Archaic Han.

**C Major extinct (small collections of characters)**

The characters are part of a relatively small set. There exists a relatively large body of literature using these characters, and a relatively large scholarly community studying that literature. Examples include Old Italic and Linear B.

**D Attested extinct (small collections of characters)**

The characters are part of a relatively small set. There exists a relatively limited literature using these characters and a relatively small scholarly community studying that literature. Examples include Samaritan and Meroitic.

**E Minor extinct**

The characters are part of a relatively small set. The utility of publicly encoding these characters is open to question<sup>2</sup>. Examples are Khotanese and Lahnda.

**F Archaic Hieroglyphic or Ideographic**

These characters are part of a large set (for example, 160 or more characters) of hieroglyphic or ideographic characters. In general, for a large character set, it is difficult to obtain information or agreement on the precise membership of the set. Examples include Lolo, Moso, Akkadian, Egyptian Hieroglyphics, Hittite (Luvian), Kitan, Mayan Hieroglyphics, and Jurchin.

**G Obscure or questionable usage symbols**

The characters are part of a small or large collection that is not yet deciphered, or not completely understood, or not well attested by substantial literature or the scholarly community. Or they are symbols that are not normally used in in-line text, that are merely drawings, that are used only in two-dimensional diagrams, or that may be composed (such as, a slash through a symbol to indicate forbidden). Examples include Phaistos, Indus, Rongo-rongo, logos, pictures of cows, circuit components, and weather chart symbols.

As the standard evolved it was found necessary to provide guidelines on specific aspects of proposals for additional scripts and characters to the standard. See

*Annex F: Formal criteria for disunification, on page 29,*

*Annex G: Formal criteria for coding precomposed characters, on page 34,*

*Annex H: Criteria for encoding symbols, on page 36,*

*Annex I: Guideline for handling of CJK ideograph unification and/or disunification error, on page 40, and*

*Annex J: Guideline for correction of CJK ideograph mapping table errors, on page 41.*

### **2.3 Procedure for encoding new characters and scripts**

The following defines a procedure with criteria for deciding how to encode new characters in ISO/IEC 10646. This procedure shall be used for new scripts only after thorough research into the repertoire and ordering of the characters within the script.

See section *A.1 Submitter's responsibilities* and the attached *Proposal Summary Form* in Annex A on page 11, and Annex L: Character-naming guidelines on page 43.

---

<sup>2</sup>The minor extinct category of characters may be secondary candidates for encoding elsewhere on the BMP or their limited scholarly communities may wish to encode them in the Private Use Area (PUA). Caution: Use of PUA is by agreement between sending and receiving devices and its content is NOT defined by the standard, and proposals for standardization should not include any of the PUA.

## **WG 2 evaluation procedure:**

In assessing the suitability of a proposed character for encoding, WG 2 shall evaluate the credibility of the submitter and then use the following procedure:

1. **Do not encode.**
  - a) If the proposed character is a (shape or other) variation of a character already encoded in the standard and therefore may be unified, or
  - b) If the proposed character is a precomposed character and does not pass the *formal criteria for coding precomposed characters* that is detailed in Annex G on page 34, or
  - c) If the proposed character is a presentation form (glyph), variant, or ligature, or
  - d) If the proposed character may be better represented as a sequence of standardized encoded characters, or
  - e) If the proposed character is a non-Han character, and leads to disunification with an existing character in the standard, and does not pass the *formal criteria for disunification* that is detailed in Annex F on page 29.
2. **Suggest use of the Private Use Area**
  - a) If the proposed character has an extremely small or closed community of customers, or
  - b) If the proposed characters are part of a script that is very complex to implement and the script has not yet been encoded in the standard (the Private Use Area - PUA, may be used for test and evaluation).  
(**Note:** Use of PUA is not standardized; its use is by agreement between sending and receiving devices, and its use should not be included in any proposal made to the standardization body for consideration.)
3. **Encode on a supplementary plane**
  - a) If the proposed character is used infrequently, or
  - b) If it is part of a set of characters for which insufficient space is available in the Basic Multilingual Plane, or,
  - c) If the proposed character is part of a small number of characters to be added to a script already encoded in one of the supplementary planes (for example, the characters can be encoded at unallocated code positions within the block or blocks allocated for that script).
4. **Encode on the Basic Multilingual Plane**
  - a) If the proposed character does not fit into one of the previous criteria (1, 2, or 3 above), and
  - b) If the proposed character is part of a well-defined character collection not already encoded in the standard, or
  - c) If the proposed character is part of a small number of characters to be added to a script already encoded in the Basic Multilingual Plane (for example, the characters can be encoded at unallocated code positions within the block or blocks allocated for that script).

### **3. Handling defect reports on character names**

In principle, the character names in the standard are not to be changed.

The main purpose of having this international standard is the interoperability of characters of all the world scripts represented by their assigned code points. Within each language version of the standard, the names of individual characters must be unique and fixed. The initially assigned names will be somewhat meaningful to the user community. However, it may be found to have some errors or found to be less satisfactory later on. Once standardized, these names must not be changed.

The short identifiers defined in the standard (in clause 6.3) can be used for identifying the standardized characters in a language-independent manner or between different language versions of the standard. The relevant text extracted from the standard is given below:

*“Clause 6.3 Short identifiers for code positions (UIDs):*  
ISO/IEC 10646 defines short identifiers for each code position, including code positions that are reserved. A short identifier for any code position is distinct from a short identifier for any other code position. If a character is allocated at a code position, a short identifier for that code position can be used to refer to the character allocated at that code position.”

These short identifiers are independent of the language in which this standard is written, and are thus retained in all translations of the text. The full syntax of the notation of a short identifier, in Backus-Naur form, is  $\{ U | u \} [ \{ + \} (xxxx | xxxxx | xxxxxx) / \{ - \} xxxxxxxx ]$ , where “x” represents one hexadecimal digit (0 to 9, A to F, or a to f).

Some examples -- U+DC00 identifies a code position that is permanently reserved for UTF-16, and U+FFFF identifies a code position that is permanently reserved. U+0025 identifies a code position to which a character is allocated; U+0025 also identifies that character (named PERCENT SIGN). The short identifier for LATIN SMALL LETTER LONG S may be notated in any of the following forms: 0000017F, -0000017F, U0000017F, U-0000017F, 017F, +017F, U017F or U+017F. Any of the capital letters may be replaced by the corresponding small letter.

One can view the names in each language version of the standard as unique long identifier of arbitrary character sequences *in that language*. Even in the English language version of the standard these names may not be very meaningful to casual readers of the standard. Such long identifiers are used to establish correspondences with names of characters in other character collections or standards in the same (and sometimes in a different) language.

The English language version, which is developed in WG 2, is also the reference document from which other language versions are created. This makes the invariance of names in the English version even more mandatory. Translated versions are generated by groups other than WG 2 - for example, the Canadian and French national bodies helped ITTF create the French language version of ISO/IEC 10646 (F).

If the names in the English language version of the standard are not suitable for clarity or accuracy for non-English users, these names can be translated in non-English versions of the standard, or in technical supplements in other languages. However, in all cases technical equivalence with the English version of the standard must be maintained from the viewpoint of all normative aspects of the standard including most importantly the interoperability of code points assigned to the characters.

There may be situations where annotations to names of characters in the English version of the standard may be warranted. Requests for such annotations to character names may be made by submitting a defect report. The principles of dealing with such defect reports by WG 2 are described in Annex B on page 19.

The following policy adopted by WG 2 at its meeting [M41.11](#) in Singapore on 2001-10-31 captures the above paragraphs.

*RESOLUTION M41.11 (Policy regarding acceptable changes to 10646):*

WG 2 requests SC2 adopt the following policy regarding acceptable changes to ISO/IEC 10646 and convey the same to JTC1 for information and to SC2 membership to take note:

- a. Once a character is assigned a code position in the standard it cannot be reassigned in the interest of ensuring interoperability of standardized characters.
- b. The arrangement of the characters in the standard is fixed; sorting and collation of the characters is outside the scope of the standard.
- c. The character names chosen by WG 2 for the English version of the standard are unique, fixed and may be arbitrary; once a character name is assigned, it cannot be changed even if additional information is provided later. These name strings are used, for example to establish correspondences with characters in other standards.
- d. Any inconsistencies in names could be adjusted in other language versions either when the standard is translated or in supplementary external documentation.

## 4. Collection identification

ISO/IEC 10646 has the following definitions regarding collections:

*“Clause 4.11 - Collection:*

A set of coded characters, which is numbered and named, and which consists of those coded characters whose code positions lie within one or more identified ranges.

NOTE – If any of the identified ranges include code positions to which no character is allocated, the repertoire of the collection will change if an additional character is assigned to any of those positions at a future amendment of this International Standard. However it is intended that the collection number and name will remain unchanged in future editions of this International Standard.”

The intent is to require a new collection identifier when that new collection either involves an expansion of identified range(s) or addition of new range(s) compared with an existing collection. Implementations may have associated a collection identifier using the outer bounds of defined ranges for an existing collection, and an expansion or addition of new ranges can negatively impact such an implementation.

*“Clause 4.19 – Fixed collection:*

A collection in which every code position within the identified range(s) has a character allocated to it, and which is intended to remain unchanged in future editions of this International Standard.”

A number of collections -- some marked as *fixed collections* with an asterisk (\*) in the positions column -- are defined in Annex A on *Collections of graphic characters for subsets* in ISO/IEC 10646.

A collection identifier and a collection name are usually assigned whenever a new script is added to the standard. A collection could be referenced in an application by its identifier or as a collection of collections by enumerating the collection identifiers or collection names. However, there may be situations where an application needs a single identifier for a specific collection, and

- the required collection is not readily identified in the standard, or
- a reference to the required collection by an enumeration of standardized collections is not acceptable.

Annex E on page 26 provides a format and guidelines for requesting new collection identifiers in the standard.

When a new collection is a proper superset of an existing collection the name of the new collection should be chosen to be able to easily identify the superset subset relationship between these collections.

### 4.1 Enumeration of repertoires in other documents

There may be a need to enumerate a repertoire of characters in different documents such as national standards, resource definition documents or others. Such an enumeration can be in the form of:

- a listing of a sequence of one or more ranges of short identifiers (see section 3 on page 5), or
- a listing in the form of identifiers of one or more standardized collections, or
- a combination of the above - in the form of a list of one or more collection identifiers and a list of one or more ranges of short identifiers for the characters either removed from that collection or added to the listed collections.

### 4.2 Use of sequence identifiers

Where there is a need to identify a sequence of ‘n’ standardized characters that represents an element of a repertoire, the UCS Sequence Identifier (USI) (defined in clause 6.6 in the standard) should be used.

*“Clause 6.6 UCS Sequence Identifiers*

ISO/IEC 10646 defines an identifier for any sequence of code positions taken from the standard. Such an identifier is known as a UCS Sequence Identifier (USI). For a sequence of n code positions it has the form: <UID1, UID2, ..., UIDn>, where UID1, UID2, etc. represent the short identifiers of the corresponding code positions, in the same order as those code positions appear in the sequence. If each of the code positions in such a sequence has a character allocated to it, the USI can be used to identify the sequence of characters allocated at those code positions. A COMMA character (optionally followed by a

SPACE character) separates the UIDs. The UCS Sequence Identifier shall include at least two UIDs; it shall begin with a LESS-THAN SIGN and be terminated by a GREATER-THAN SIGN.

NOTE – UCS Sequences Identifiers cannot be used for specification of subset and collection content. They may be used outside this standard to identify: composite sequences for mapping purposes, font repertoire, etc.”

Use of a combination of short identifiers, the collection identifiers, and UCS sequence identifiers in the manner described above provides a language-neutral way of enumerating a specific repertoire of characters. Whereas the USI definition permits code positions to which characters may not have been assigned, such a USI is not useful in defining character repertoires.

## 5. Workflow and stages of progression

To give the submitters of proposals for new scripts an understanding of how WG 2 deals with a proposal from its initiation to completion, Annex C on page 20 contains a description of the workflow and the various stages of progression of submissions to WG 2.

### 5.1 Checking the status of a proposal

The minutes and resolutions adopted by WG 2 at each of its meeting are made available at the WG 2's web site linked from the [meetings.html](#) page. The texts of any amendments in progress are also available from the WG 2's web site or through the national standard organizations that are the national member bodies of ISO. The Unicode Consortium also maintains a document called [pipeline.html](#) listing all the characters that have been accepted for inclusion in the next version of the standard. These documents can be checked for the status of any proposal that has been submitted for consideration by the UTC and WG 2.

## 6. Roadmaps

A summary of the scripts and characters that have been included in the standard, and known scripts which are either work in progress in WG 2 (for which some initial discussion documents have been made available to WG 2), or scripts which are known for future possible inclusion in the standard but have not matured are addressed in Annex D on page 23.

## 7. Electronic submissions

Contributions for consideration by WG 2 (and to the Unicode Technical Committee) should be made in electronic form. The preferred formats are Word .DOC, or printable .PDF formats, with unprotected text portions and possibly copyrighted font portions. Whereas, files could be compressed to reduce the size, it should be noted that .EXE files may not be accepted in many organizations as part of their Security Policy and self-extracting .EXE files should be avoided.

## 8. Format of character additions in amendments to 10646

Per resolution [M39.23](#), WG 2 has resolved that the format for amendments that involve character additions will be in the form of complete replacements of tables and character name lists where they exist, with an explanatory text listing the code positions to which new characters are assigned. If it is a new block it will be presented as a complete new table and names list.

## 9. On the relative ordering of characters

The repertoire encoded in the standard is intended for use by many languages. When characters of the same script are used in multiple languages they are unified. That makes it impossible to reflect the preferred alphabetical arrangement of characters for each language; a common arrangement of the characters is used instead. When scripts are encoded in the standard, the relative ordering of characters within that script is given due consideration. To ensure stability and interoperability, that arrangement remains fixed, even if additional characters of the same script are added at a later time.

Ensuring correct ordering of the characters encoded in ISO/IEC 10646 is outside the scope of the standard. [ISO/IEC 14651](#) together with appropriate tailoring may be used to address the problem of ordering data encoded in ISO/IEC 10646 meeting the requirements of a given language or user community. The Unicode Collation Algorithm (UCA) is synchronized with ISO/IEC 14651 and is available at <http://www.unicode.org/unicode/reports/tr10>.



## 10. Referencing ISO/IEC 10646

Referencing ISO/IEC 10646 should follow the format used for listing in the ISO directory. Note that the standard was published in two parts prior to end of year 2003.

*Generic:*

ISO/IEC 10646: Information Technology – Universal Coded Character Set (UCS).

For specific editions, for example, the third edition of 2012 is referenced as:

ISO/IEC 10646: 2012 Information Technology – Universal Coded Character Set (UCS)

*(Note: the phrase 'Multiple-Octet' has been dropped from the title of the standard from 2011 edition onward.)*

If you need to refer to versions of the standard that were published in two parts prior to the 2003 edition, for example

ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000 Information Technology – Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) – Part 1: Architecture and Basic Multilingual Plane

ISO/IEC 10646-2: 2003 Information Technology – Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) – Part 2: Supplementary Planes

Please note that the 1993 edition of 10646-1 was amended significantly for the Hangul script by its Amendment 7 and must not be used.

## 11. WG2 web site

WG2 maintains its own web site at [www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2](http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2), hosted courtesy of Danish Unix User Group (dkuug). WG2 meeting notices, minutes, resolutions, document register, documents and standing documents are made available at this site. Since many of the documents at this site are referenced by many other documents WG2 has recognized the need for the stability of the URL of this site and has taken the following resolution:

[M45.31](#) (Stability of URLs for the web site):

WG2 notes the critical importance of stable URLs for the existing collection of electronically available working group documents and authorizes its convener to take the necessary precautions and steps to ensure that all past, current and future URLs for working group documents remain stable.

## 12. Case-folding stability principle

*(WG2 has adopted the following per resolution [M47.1](#))*

WG2 acknowledges the need for guaranteeing stability of case folding of characters in scripts having two cases, and accepts to adopt the guidelines in the following text in its principles and procedures:

### **Stability of Case Folding**

For text containing characters from scripts having two cases (bicameral scripts), case folding is an essential ingredient in case-insensitive comparisons. Such comparisons are widely applied, for example in Internationalized Domain name (IDN) lookup, or for identifier matching in case-insensitive programming and mark-up languages. Because such operations require stable identifiers and dependable comparison results it is important that the standard be able to provide the guarantee of complete stability. For historic reasons, and because there are many characters with lowercase forms but no uppercase forms, the case folding is typically done by a lowercasing operation, and this also matches the definition used by the Unicode Standard for *case folding*.

In order to guarantee the case-folding stability, WG2 adopts the following principle when evaluating proposals for encoding characters for bicameral scripts:

"Subsequent to the publication of Amendment 2 of ISO/IEC 10646: 2003, if a character already has an uppercase form in the standard but no lowercase form, its corresponding lowercase form can not be added to the standard; the only way a lowercase form can be added, if proved to be absolutely essential, is by entertaining a new pair of uppercase and lowercase forms for encoding. If only a lowercase form exists and an uppercase form is deemed to be needed it can be added without affecting the stability of case folding."

Note that all the characters having only the uppercase forms in the current standard have been dealt with by resolution [M47.5](#).

### 13. Contiguous encoding of decimal digits

*(WG2 has adopted the following per resolution [M58.27](#))*

When script-specific decimal digits are encoded in UCS, the decimal digits will be encoded contiguously and in order, with room left for missing digits so that, if digits are later used as part of a place-value notation (i.e. a decimal radix notation) they can be used in that manner. Exceptions may be made only where (like numeric ideographs) the digits also serve as letters, or otherwise their use in decimal-radix notation can be safely excluded.

## Annex A: Information accompanying submissions

The process of deciding which characters should be included in the repertoire of the standard by WG 2 depends on the availability of accurate and comprehensive information about any proposed additions. WG 2, at its San Francisco meeting 26, designed a form (template) that will assist the submitters in gathering and providing the relevant information, and will assist WG 2 in making more informed decisions.

This form has been revised over the years and the latest version is included in the following pages of this annex. This form is also made available on line from the WG 2 web site – see <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html>.

A duly completed proposal summary form must accompany each new submission. The latest version of this form must be used in submissions. Such a form will assist WG 2 to better evaluate the proposal, and progress the proposal towards a speedier acceptance and inclusion in the standard. Submitters are also requested to ensure that a proposed character does not already exist in the standard.

Submitters are encouraged to visit the “[Where is my Character](#)” page on the Unicode web site for more information on checking if their proposed character or script is already encoded in the standard, or a similar proposal has already been made by someone else. There are also several electronic discussion lists maintained by the Unicode consortium that one could use to discuss with other experts internationally on various subjects related to the standard. Submitters are also encouraged to familiarize themselves with ISO/IEC TR15285 – Character Glyph Model. The latest version of ISO/IEC 10646 as well as ISO/IEC TR15285 are available on line under 'Freely Available Standards' at: <http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/>.

National bodies should take note of the guidelines in *C.4 Some guidelines on proposing new material as ballot comments*.

In addition to text extracted from the standard in *Annex L: Character-naming guidelines* in the P&P document, the following definitions from the standard are also referenced in the proposal summary form:

*Clause 4.12 Combining character:*

A member of an identified subset of the coded character set of ISO/IEC 10646 intended for combination with the preceding non-combining graphic character, or with a sequence of combining characters preceded by a non-combining character (see also 4.14).

NOTE – ISO/IEC 10646 specifies several subset collections, which include combining characters.

*Clause 4.14 Composite sequence:*

A sequence of graphic characters consisting of a non-combining character followed by one or more combining characters (see also 4.12).

NOTE 1 – A graphic symbol for a composite sequence generally consists of the combination of the graphic symbols of each character in the sequence.

NOTE 2 – A composite sequence is not a character and therefore is not a member of the repertoire of ISO/IEC 10646.

### A.1 Submitter's responsibilities

The national body or liaison organization (or any other organization or an individual) proposing new character(s) or a new script shall provide:

1. Proposed category for the script or character(s), character name(s), and description of usage.
2. Justification for the category and name(s).
3. A representative glyph(s) image on paper:

If the proposed glyph image is similar to a glyph image of a previously encoded ISO/IEC 10646 character, then additional justification for encoding the new character shall be provided.

**Note:** Any proposal that suggests that one or more of such variant forms is actually a distinct character requiring separate encoding should provide detailed, printed evidence that there is actual, contrastive use of the variant form(s). It is insufficient for a proposal to claim a requirement to encode as characters in the Standard, glyphic forms which happen to occur in another character encoding that did not follow the Character-Glyph Model that guides the choice of appropriate characters for encoding in ISO/IEC 10646.

**Note:** WG 2 has resolved in Resolution [M38.12](#) not to add any more Arabic presentation forms to the standard and suggests users to employ appropriate input methods, rendering and font technologies to meet the user requirements.

4. Mappings to accepted sources, for example, other standards, dictionaries, accessible published materials.
5. Font resource:

A font must be provided to the Editor promptly after the characters have been approved by WG2 for use in printing the charts. If a font is not provided, the Editor cannot include the glyphs in the charts and, as a result, the repertoire of characters corresponding to these glyphs will not be included in draft amendments. Fonts must be in one of the following formats (in preferential order): OpenType, TrueType, Postscript Type 1.

Fonts submitted must have no license restrictions that prevent embedding into PDF documents. Because of synchronization between ISO/IEC 10646 and The Unicode Standard, any grant of license must cover use in publishing both standards and related documents (see resolution [M45.30](#)). For technical reasons, the editors must be able under that license to freely modify or replace glyph outlines in their copies of the fonts. The submitter should be prepared to provide fonts of suitable quality and license conditions, unless equivalent fonts are already available to the editors.
6. List of all the parties consulted:

Towards ensuring that all significant stakeholders have been consulted, WG 2 requests that submitters solicit feedback from other groups who use the proposed characters, and list these contacts. Submitters are encouraged to provide the email id-s of the submitters as well as other experts who have been consulted to facilitate any clarification queries.
7. Equivalent glyph images:

If the submission intends using composite sequences of proposed or existing combining and non-combining characters, a list consisting of each composite sequence and its corresponding glyph image shall be provided to better understand the intended use.
8. Compatibility equivalents:

If the submission includes compatibility ideographic characters, identify (per resolution [M45.29](#)):

  - the source, which contains two distinct code positions that correspond to a single unified CJK Ideograph character of ISO/IEC 10646
  - the ISO 10646 unified CJK Ideograph
  - the code position in the source for the unified CJK ideograph
  - the code position in the source for the proposed compatibility ideograph
9. Properties that may affect the BiDi processing

Any BiDirectional algorithm related properties associated with the characters should be spelled out (see UAX#9 - <http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr9/>).
10. Any additional information that will assist in correct understanding of the different characteristics and linguistic processing of the proposed character(s) or script.
11. If any of the proposed characters are suitable as *syntax* characters please take note of guideline D.2.5 (on page 24) and of Unicode Standard Annex 31 at <http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/>.
12. If the proposal is for a new script, identify the standardized characters that are commonly used directly in the script, or proposed to be unified with the characters of the script, in particular standardized characters allocated in different blocks. Examples include punctuation marks and combining marks. Such information will assist in assigning properties for characters shared across multiple scripts or in identifying character repertoires needed to support particular languages.
13. If you are aware of already standardized characters that are visually close to any of the proposed characters, you are invited to list them in the proposal. This will assist in the analysis of the script for 'visually confusables', towards providing additional guidance on use of the standard from a security perspective (see UTR#36 - Unicode Security Considerations – at <http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr36/>).

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2  
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS  
FOR ADDITIONS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646<sup>3</sup>**

Please fill all the sections A, B and C below.

Please read Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/principles.html> for guidelines and details before filling this form.

Please ensure you are using the latest Form from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html>.

See also <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/roadmaps.html> for latest Roadmaps.

**A. Administrative**

1. Title: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Requester's name: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution): \_\_\_\_\_
4. Submission date: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Requester's reference (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_
6. Choose one of the following:  
This is a complete proposal: \_\_\_\_\_  
(or) More information will be provided later: \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Technical – General**

1. Choose one of the following:
  - a. This proposal is for a new script (set of characters): \_\_\_\_\_  
Proposed name of script: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block:  
Name of the existing block: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Number of characters in proposal: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Proposed category (select one from below - see section 2.2 of P&P document):  
A-Contemporary  B.1-Specialized (small collection)  B.2-Specialized (large collection)   
C-Major extinct  D-Attested extinct  E-Minor extinct   
F-Archaic Hieroglyphic or Ideographic  G-Obscure or questionable usage symbols
4. Is a repertoire including character names provided?
  - a. If YES, are the names in accordance with the "character naming guidelines" in Annex L of P&P document? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Fonts related:
  - a. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font to the Project Editor of 10646 for publishing the standard? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Identify the party granting a license for use of the font by the editors (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_
6. References:
  - a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Special encoding issues:  
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)? \_\_\_\_\_

**8. Additional Information:**

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. Examples of such properties are: Casing information, Numeric information, Currency information, Display behaviour information such as line breaks, widths etc., Combining behaviour, Spacing behaviour, Directional behaviour, Default Collation behaviour, relevance in Mark Up contexts, Compatibility equivalence and other Unicode normalization related information. See the Unicode standard at <http://www.unicode.org> for such information on other scripts. Also see Unicode Character Database ( <http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr44/> ) and associated Unicode Technical Reports for information needed for consideration by the Unicode Technical Committee for inclusion in the Unicode Standard.

<sup>3</sup> Form number: N4502-F (Original 1994-10-14; Revised 1995-01, 1995-04, 1996-04, 1996-08, 1999-03, 2001-05, 2001-09, 2003-11, 2005-01, 2005-09, 2005-10, 2007-03, 2008-05, 2009-11, 2011-03, 2012-01)

**C. Technical - Justification**

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before?  
If YES explain
2. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)?  
If YES, with whom?  
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?  
Reference:
4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)  
Reference:
5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?  
If YES, where? Reference:
6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?  
If YES, is a rationale provided?  
If YES, reference:
7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?
8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence?  
If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?  
If YES, reference:
9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?  
If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?  
If YES, reference:
10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to, or could be confused with, an existing character?  
If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?  
If YES, reference:
11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences?  
If YES, is a rationale for such use provided?  
If YES, reference:  
Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided?  
If YES, reference:
12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?  
If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary)
13. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility characters?  
If YES, are the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic characters identified?  
If YES, reference:

**Example 1**  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2**  
**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS**  
**FOR ADDITIONS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646<sup>4</sup>**

Please fill all the sections A, B and C below.  
Please read Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/principles.html> for guidelines and details before filling this form.  
Please ensure you are using the latest Form from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html>.  
See also <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/roadmaps.html> for latest Roadmaps.

**A. Administrative**

1. Title:	<i>Braille</i>	
2. Requester's name:	<i>Kohji Shibano, Japan</i>	
3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution):	<i>Individual Contribution</i>	
4. Submission date:	<i>1994-10-10<sup>5</sup></i>	
5. Requester's reference (if applicable):	<i>J2-94-xy</i>	
6. Choose one of the following:		
This is a complete proposal:		<input type="checkbox"/>
(or) More information will be provided later:		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

**B. Technical - General**

1. Choose one of the following:		
a. This proposal is for a new script (set of characters):		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Proposed name of script:	<i>Braille</i>	
b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block:		<input type="checkbox"/> No
Name of the existing block:		
2. Number of characters in proposal:		
		<i>448</i>
3. Proposed category (select one from below - see section 2.2 of P&P document):		
A-Contemporary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	B.1-Specialized (small collection) <input type="checkbox"/>	B.2-Specialized (large collection) <input type="checkbox"/>
C-Major extinct <input type="checkbox"/>	D-Attested extinct <input type="checkbox"/>	E-Minor extinct <input type="checkbox"/>
F-Archaic Hieroglyphic or Ideographic <input type="checkbox"/>	G-Obscure or questionable usage symbols <input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Is a repertoire including character names provided?		
a. If YES, are the names in accordance with the "character naming guidelines" in Annex L of P&P document?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
b. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review?		<input type="checkbox"/> No-will provide
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
5. Fonts related:		
a. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font to the Project Editor of 10646 for publishing the standard?		
	<i>Japan</i>	
b. Identify the party granting a license for use of the font by the editors (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.):		
	<i>IBM Japan (ftp://ifi.jp/pub/font)</i>	
6. References:		
a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided?		<input type="checkbox"/> ISO/TC 173
b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached?		<input type="checkbox"/> No (will provide)
7. Special encoding issues:		
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)?		<input type="checkbox"/> No

**8. Additional Information:**

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. Examples of such properties are: Casing information, Numeric information, Currency information, Display behaviour information such as line breaks, widths etc., Combining behaviour, Spacing behaviour, Directional behaviour, Default Collation behaviour, relevance in Mark Up contexts, Compatibility equivalence and other Unicode normalization related information. See the Unicode standard at <http://www.unicode.org> for such information on other scripts. Also see Unicode Character Database ( <http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr44/> ) and associated Unicode Technical Reports for information needed for consideration by the Unicode Technical Committee for inclusion in the Unicode Standard.

<sup>4</sup> Form number: N4502-F (Original 1994-10-14; Revised 1995-01, 1995-04, 1996-04, 1996-08, 1999-03, 2001-05, 2001-09, 2003-11, 2005-01, 2005-09, 2005-10, 2007-03, 2008-05, 2009-11, 2011-03, 2012-01)

<sup>5</sup> The date of this example is retained as originally created even though the form has been revised since that date.

**C. Technical - Justification**

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before? If YES explain	No
2. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)? If YES, with whom? If YES, available relevant documents:	No
3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included? Reference: <i>People with impaired vision (info will be provided)</i>	
4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare) Reference: <i>on-line database services for Braille-translated text (e.g. www: braille.dknet.dk)</i>	Common
5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community? If YES, where? Reference: <i>Worldwide</i>	Yes
6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP? If YES, is a rationale provided? If YES, reference:	Yes
7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?	
8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence? If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? If YES, reference:	No
9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters? If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? If YES, reference:	No
10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to, or could be confused with, an existing character? If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? If YES, reference:	No
11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences? If YES, is a rationale for such use provided? If YES, reference: Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided? If YES, reference:	No
12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics? If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary)	No
13. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility characters? If YES, are the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic characters identified? If YES, reference:	No



**Example 2**  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2**  
**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS**  
**FOR ADDITIONS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646<sup>6</sup>**

Please fill all the sections A, B and C below.  
Please read Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/principles.html> for guidelines and details before filling this form.

Please ensure you are using the latest Form from <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html>.  
See also <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/roadmaps.html> for latest *Roadmaps*.

**A. Administrative**

1. Title: *Addition of two Latin characters*

2. Requester's name: *Danish Standards Association*

3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution): *NB*

4. Submission date: *1995-03-10<sup>7</sup>*

5. Requester's reference (if applicable):

6. Choose one of the following:

This is a complete proposal:  *Yes*

(or) More information will be provided later:

**B. Technical – General**

1. Choose one of the following:

a. This proposal is for a new script (set of characters):  *No*  
Proposed name of script:

b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block:  *Yes*  
Name of the existing block: *Table 4 - Row 01: Latin Extended-B*

2. Number of characters in proposal: *2*

3. Proposed category (select one from below - see section 2.2 of P&P document):

A-Contemporary  B.1-Specialized (small collection)  B.2-Specialized (large collection)

C-Major extinct  D-Attested extinct  E-Minor extinct

F-Archaic Hieroglyphic or Ideographic  G-Obscure or questionable usage symbols

4. Is a repertoire including character names provided?  *Yes*

a. If YES, are the names in accordance with the "character naming guidelines" in Annex L of P&P document?  *Yes*

b. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review?  *Yes*

5. Fonts related:

a. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font to the Project Editor of 10646 for publishing the standard? *Michael Everson*

b. Identify the party granting a license for use of the font by the editors (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.): *Michael Everson*

6. References:

a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided?  *Yes*

b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached?

7. Special encoding issues:

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)?  *Specifications enclosed*

8. Additional Information:

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. Examples of such properties are: Casing information, Numeric information, Currency information, Display behaviour information such as line breaks, widths etc., Combining behaviour, Spacing behaviour, Directional behaviour, Default Collation behaviour, relevance in Mark Up contexts, Compatibility equivalence and other Unicode normalization related information. See the Unicode standard at <http://www.unicode.org> for such information on other scripts. Also see Unicode Character Database ( <http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr44/> ) and associated Unicode Technical Reports for information needed for consideration by the Unicode Technical Committee for inclusion in the Unicode Standard.

<sup>6</sup> Form number: N4502-F (Original 1994-10-14; Revised 1995-01, 1995-04, 1996-04, 1996-08, 1999-03, 2001-05, 2001-09, 2003-11, 2005-01, 2005-09, 2005-10, 2007-03, 2008-05, 2009-11, 2011-03, 2012-01)

<sup>7</sup> The date of this example is retained as originally created even though the form has been revised since that date.

**C. Technical - Justification**

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before? If YES explain	No
2. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)? If YES, with whom? If YES, available relevant documents:	Yes <i>Irish National Body, Oxford University</i> <i>Enclosed</i>
3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included? Reference:	Yes
4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare) Reference:	Rare <i>The Community of Gothic and Medieval English Literature</i>
5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community? If YES, where? Reference:	Yes <i>Scholar Communities</i>
6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP? If YES, is a rationale provided? If YES, reference:	Yes Yes <i>Enclosed</i>
7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?	No
8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence? If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? If YES, reference:	No
9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters? If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? If YES, reference:	No
10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to, or could be confused with, an existing character? If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? If YES, reference:	No
11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences? If YES, is a rationale for such use provided? If YES, reference: Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided? If YES, reference:	No
12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics? If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary)	No
13. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility characters? If YES, are the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic characters identified? If YES, reference:	No

## **Annex B: Handling of defect reports on character names**

Since the first publication of ISO/IEC 10646 in May 1993, WG 2 has received several defect reports requesting changes to character names. In principle, the names in the standard are not to be changed. However, there may be situations where an annotation to the character name may be warranted.

### **B.1 Principles used by WG 2**

The following paragraphs describe the principles of dealing with defect reports on character names:

- A. Explanatory information in Annex P on *Additional information on characters* in the standard:  
If WG 2 decides that the request is justified, WG 2 will first consider accommodating the request by adding explanatory text to Annex P of the standard.
- B. Non-normative parenthetical annotation of the name:  
If WG 2 considers that the request falls within the guidelines of Rule 12 in Annex L on *Character naming guidelines* in the standard, then an appropriate annotation will be added to the character name.
- C. In instances where a name causes a potential problem for compliance by implementations of existing standard, and if the concern expressed in the defect report may be handled with a simple explanatory note, a note may be added.
- D. Deprecation:  
If WG 2 considers that the character identified in the defect report should not have been in the standard, for reasons such as duplication, or incorrect inclusion in a block, then that coded character will be marked with the annotation (*deprecated character*) after its name. Note, however, that the character will never be removed from the standard.
- E. Reject:  
In all other situations, where WG 2 considers that the request is not sufficiently justified or none of the above-mentioned measures is warranted, the defect report will be rejected with an explanation.

### **B.2 Some guidelines for submitters of defect reports**

As a supplement to the above information on dealing with defect reports, the submitters can assist the working group by following the guidelines given below:

- a. report all defects associated with characters from the same block or set of characters as a single defect report (for example, use a single one for all defects from within a character block such as Malayalam), instead of one for each character.
- b. avoid including defective characters from different character blocks or sets in the same report.
- c. please check if the defect has already been reported by some one else or considered earlier by WG 2. Copies of the dispositions of prior defect reports can be obtained from the SC 2 Secretariat.
- d. if one or more new character(s) - with their own new name and glyph - is proposed to be added in conjunction with a defect report, please submit the addition requests separate from the defect report along with the Proposal Summary Form for the new characters.

## Annex C: Work flow and stages of progression

This annex contains a description of the UCS workflow and stages in progression from initial proposal to final publication.

### C.1 The UCS workflow

UCS workflow can be illustrated in a simplified form as follows:

Communication to WG 2 and communication inside WG 2 related to populating the standard				Communication from WG 2 to the world outside	
Input		Process	Output	Output	
From whom	What	Under meetings	After meetings	What	To whom
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convener</li> <li>• SC 2</li> <li>• JTC 1</li> <li>• ITTF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda; (see <a href="#">meetings.html</a>).</li> <li>• Ballots</li> </ul>	Resolutions; (see <a href="#">meetings.html</a> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes (see <a href="#">meetings.html</a>)</li> <li>• Action Items</li> </ul>	Result of request: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance</li> <li>• Rejection</li> </ul>	Requester
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBs</li> <li>• WG experts</li> <li>• IRG-group</li> <li>• Liaisons</li> </ul>	Input documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests (e.g. <a href="#">N2555</a>)</li> <li>• Defect reports (e.g. <a href="#">N1806</a>)</li> <li>• Working documents</li> <li>• Liaison statements (see <a href="#">documents.html</a>) (see Note 1)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Editorial corrigenda.</li> <li>• Technical corrigenda (e.g. N1393)</li> <li>• Amendments (e.g. <a href="#">ISO/IEC 10646:2012/Amd 1:2013</a>)</li> <li>• Standards (e.g. <a href="#">ISO/IEC 10646:2012</a>) (see Note 2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SC 2</li> <li>• JTC 1</li> <li>• ITTF</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretary</li> <li>• Editor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes (see <a href="#">meetings.html</a>).</li> <li>• Action Items (included in latest Minutes)</li> <li>• Standing documents (see <a href="#">principles.html</a> and <a href="#">roadmaps.html</a>)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IRG</li> </ul>
<b>Types of Documents</b>			<b>How</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretary</li> <li>• Editor</li> </ul>	Standing documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG 2 distribution list (e.g. N1351)</li> <li>• Document register (e.g. N1300)</li> <li>• Summary of WG 2 work (e.g. N1302)</li> <li>• List of character names and code positions allocated (e.g. N1675)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Principles and procedures</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Roadmaps to BMP and Supplementary Planes</a></li> </ul>			Presentation forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paper documents</li> <li>• Web site (the <a href="#">WG 2 web site</a> at DKUUG and the <a href="#">IRG web site</a> in HKSAR)</li> </ul>	

Note 1: Review and feedback by national bodies and from user communities are highly encouraged at this first stage, in order to identify and work through potential problems (such as naming, character repertoire, order, etc.).

Note 2: Editorial and Technical corrigenda may be rolled into an amendment that may be in progress by consensus at a WG2 meeting. This permits ITTF to publish and maintain less number of separate documents associated with the standard.

### C.2 Stages of work

Any new proposal for addition of new characters will pass a number of stages from initial proposal to finalized publication. The stages are:

- Initial proposal
- Provisional acceptance
- Final acceptance (Bucket)
- Hold for ballot

This terminology indicates the stage of maturity of the proposal and the WG's confidence in the proposal.

		In process within WG 2			Further progression			
Stage ⇒		Initial proposal	Provisional acceptance	Final acceptance (allocation of bucket)	Hold for ballot	Progression/ Publication status		
Item ↓						SC 2 Ballot	JTC 1 Ballot	ITTF Publication
		1	2	3	4	5**	6**	7**
1*	Character shapes	1.1	2.1					
2*	Character names	1.2	2.2					
3*	Code position allocation	1.3	2.3					
4*	Text to be included in the standard	1.4	2.4					
5*	Font**	1.5	2.5					
6	Other items from proposal summary form	1.6	2.6					

\* Items 1 through 5 are mandatory for entering 'final acceptance' stage

\*\* Outline fonts of publication quality are needed for charts prepared from SC2 ballot onwards. For information on the format of the font see the *Proposal summary form* in Annex A (item on *Outline font resource* on page 12).

- Stages 1 to 3 may contain provisionally allocated code positions. When a proposal enters stage 4 the code positions are final.  
*Note: As part of the approval process, before a proposal reaches Stage 4, WG 2 should ensure various user communities who use the proposed characters have been actively solicited for their feedback. In this way consensus can be reached on the proposed characters. Last-minute controversies with stake-holders can jeopardize the approval process, so early contact and dialog with communities is highly recommended.*
- The contents of the Buckets are reviewed at every meeting to decide whether the content shall progress for balloting (stage 4).
- The progress of each proposal is recorded in the WG 2 meeting minutes and resolutions.
- When a proposal reaches stage 4 its status is included in *List of character names and code positions allocated* (see also [pipeline.html](#), which is in synch with 10646 repertoire additions).

### C.3 Dealing with urgent requests

Progression through the different stages involves at least one ballot at SC2 before the JTC1 ballot and subsequent publication of an amendment or a revision to the standard. However, WG2 has received requests where more expediency is required to meet the customer requirement in a timely fashion. WG2 has adopted the following guideline (per resolution [M47.3](#)), to deal with such exception cases.

#### **Guideline to deal with requests for direct addition to an FDAM being generated:**

If:

- a) the request for additions is for a small set of characters to be added to an already standardized script or collection, or consists of a technical change with minor impact
- b) the proposal is sound and stable after exercising due diligence
- c) the proposal does not introduce potential difficulties for existing implementations
- d) the request is received at a meeting when an FDAM would be generated, and
- e) the normal processing time of at least one ballot cycle (FPDAM balloting) is demonstrated to be unacceptable for the user requirement from timeliness point of view

then, with the consensus of the experts at the meeting, WG2 may elect to include the mature solution directly in the FDAM.

In all other cases the normal steps will be followed.

#### ***C.4 Some guidelines on proposing new material as ballot comments***

In meeting [M49](#) WG2 had a discussion on guidelines for national body comments in ballot responses, which you should follow in order to assist the project editor in evaluating and drafting the proposed disposition of comments that get reviewed and adopted at WG2 meetings.

As far as possible, ballot comments should be restricted to the text, characters or scripts that are under ballot. If a proposal for new text or additional characters is deemed necessary to be included in the ballot response, for example it modifies a collection of characters under ballot, the national body should clearly indicate its relationship to the text under ballot, along with the usual justification required of any proposal. The national body should indicate in the ballot response how its ballot position may be affected if WG2 decision on the proposal is unfavourable.

All other proposals for new characters or new material for the standard should be made as independent contributions outside the ballot comments. If a proposal does not influence the national body's ballot position adversely, or if there is no clear relationship to the text or characters under ballot, the proposal should be submitted as a separate contribution with an indication of any urgency or preference to include it in a specific amendment under ballot. The net result may be that WG2 decides in favour of the request.

The project editor has the prerogative of ruling unrelated proposals contained in ballot comments to be “out of order”, as not related to the text under ballot and ignore them completely in preparing the proposed disposition of comments.

## Annex D: BMP and Supplementary Planes allocation roadmaps

### D.1 Overview

The intent of the *roadmaps* document is to show a visual layout of the coding space for further allocation of scripts in ISO/IEC 10646 (also in the Unicode Standard), in the BMP and in the Supplementary planes. The roadmap document is to be used as a general guideline – it *does not attempt to make detailed allocations of characters*.

The planes described in the roadmap document, as well as all other planes accessible by UTF-16 are explicitly enumerated in the following table.

**Allocations for Planes in ISO 10646**

Range of Code Positions (Hex)	Plane #	Name of Plane
00000000 ... 0000FFFF	<b>0</b>	Basic Multilingual Plane - <b>BMP</b> ; envisioned for encoding all contemporary scripts and symbols including most frequently used ideographs.
00010000 ... 0001FFFF	<b>1</b>	Supplementary Multilingual Plane for scripts and symbols – <b>SMP</b> ; envisioned for encoding future non-ideographic and non-CJK ideographic scripts and symbols.
00020000 ... 0002FFFF	<b>2</b>	Supplementary Ideographic Plane - <b>SIP</b> ; envisioned as containing future CJK unified ideographic characters.
00030000 ... 0003FFFF	<b>3</b>	Tertiary Ideographic - <b>TIP</b> ; envisioned for encoding additional repertoire of ideographic characters that need more space than available in planes 0 or 2. <i>(Note: The name 'Tertiary Ideographic Plane' is a tentative name for this plane.)</i>
00040000 ... 0004FFFF to 000D0000 ... 000DFFFF	<b>4 to 13</b>	Reserved for Future Allocations.
000E0000 ... 000EFFFF	<b>14</b>	Supplementary Special-purpose Plane - <b>SSP</b> ; envisioned for encoding special characters such as alphabet used for language tagging.
000F0000 ... 000FFFFF	<b>15</b>	Reserved for Private Use.
00100000 ... 0010FFFF	<b>16</b>	Reserved for Private Use.

The roadmap layouts are maintained by an ad hoc group on Roadmaps. This group's latest working document is located at [Roadmaps to Unicode](#). The roadmap layouts show the different scripts in various stages of progression – published, accepted but not yet published, under evaluation in UTC and WG 2, exploratory having some preliminary documentation, or open with no proposal documents.

The status of script proposals and their progress at any given time can be found in the meeting resolutions, meeting minutes as well as from WG 2's document register (the document number for registers by convention is a multiple of 50 and will be the latest xx00 or xx50), available from [WG 2's web site](#).

A snapshot of the roadmap layouts is submitted for acceptance at each WG 2 meeting for the continued work on ISO/IEC 10646 and is closely coordinated with the work on the Unicode Standard in liaison with the Unicode Consortium. Please note that this roadmap snapshot consolidates the information for each of the planes 0, 1, 2 and 14 in one document. The latest snapshot is located at:

Roadmaps.html – <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/roadmaps.html>.

See that document for more information.

### D.2 Guidelines for roadmap allotments

Some principles that are followed in assigning scripts in the roadmaps and for encoding in the standard are given below.

### D.2.1 Block assignment starting on half-row boundary

When allocating code space to a block requiring fewer than 128 positions, these positions should not cross a 128-code position (half row) boundary. Wherever possible, if the number of positions is close to 128, it is preferable to start the collection at the half-row boundary. For blocks slightly larger than 128 positions the highest frequency characters should all be allocated within the first 128 positions. This highest frequency allocation principle may be overridden when there is justification to do otherwise. The purpose of this guideline is to insure greater compression ratios for run-length compression techniques. (See resolution [M33.11](#)). Further, for blocks requiring closer to 128 positions it is desirable to start at a half-row boundary.

### D.2.2 1024 code position boundary for supplementary planes

Supplementary planes 1 to 16 are accessed using pairs of High and Low S-zone values employing UTF-16 transformation. Each High S-zone value corresponds to a block of 1024 code positions. When large blocks are considered for encoding in the supplementary planes it is desirable to start the block at the 1024-code position boundary. This facilitates range-checking operations for particular blocks in the supplementary planes by examining the High S-zone value alone.

### D.2.3 Empty '00' position in a block

Proposals for code allocations should not leave position 00 unassigned in each block unless there are compelling documented reasons for doing so.

### D.2.4 Gaps in ranges of assigned code positions

At the time of initial encoding of a script or a set of related characters, gaps may have been left in the range of assigned code positions. These gaps are reserved for future assignment of characters that are related in terms of its properties to the surrounding characters, for example a gap in a range of superscripted characters can be assigned a future superscripted character. In the supplementary planes, specifically in Plane 1, some gaps in the Math Alphanumerics and in the Western Musical symbols blocks are left there for transient mappings, since some of the characters needed for these scripts were already encoded in the BMP before their encoding in Plane 1. Transient mappings permit more efficient processing of scripts that are split across the BMP and a supplementary plane.

### D.2.5 Reserved code points for stability of identifiers

Implementers of programming languages, markup languages, scripting languages, regular expression engines, character-based protocols, and similar programs or systems require the ability to clearly distinguish between characters that can serve in identifiers, and those that are for syntactic elements. Moreover, a high degree of stability is required. To provide the necessary level of stability, all of the reserved code points in the following blocks are reserved for syntax characters.

[U+2300-U+23FF]	Miscellaneous_Technical
[U+2400-U+243F]	Control_Pictures
[U+2440-U+245F]	Optical_Character_Recognition
[U+2600-U+26FF]	Miscellaneous_Symbols
[U+2700-U+27BF]	Dingbats
[U+27C0-U+27EF]	Miscellaneous_Mathematical_Symbols_A
[U+2B00-U+2BFF]	Miscellaneous_Symbols_And_Arrows
[U+2E00-U+2E7F]	Supplemental_Punctuation

What this means is that **no** new letters suitable for identifiers (letters, combining marks, or numbers) will be allocated in these ranges. In addition, it is strongly encouraged (but not required) that any new characters that are suitable as programmatic syntax characters be allocated in these blocks. (For more information, see *Unicode Standard Annex #31 Identifier and Pattern Syntax* at <http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/>.)

### D.2.6 Reserved code points for right-to-left scripts

(See resolution [M55.35](#))

The [Unicode Bidirectional Algorithm](#) uses the property *Bidi\_Class* (see [UCD](#)) that is assigned to each character in the standard. Default *Bidi\_Class* property values for unassigned code points are also defined depending on the code point and are detailed in [DerivedBidiClass.txt](#).



The following ranges of code points are reserved for use with right-to-left scripts with default property assignments to one of the strong right-to-left types - either R (right-to-left) or AL (Arabic Letter)). **These ranges will be used by WG2 and UTC for encoding new right-to-left scripts.** The ranges are also shown as *right-to-left ranges* in the [Roadmap](#).

U+0590-U+08FF, U+FB1D-U+FB4F, U+FB50-U+FDCE, U+DF0-U+DFFF and U+FE70-U+ FEFE in the BMP,

and,

U+10800-U+10FFF and U+1E800-U+1EFFF (new) in the SMP.

Once a new character is assigned to an unassigned code point the property assignment may change, though only to values appropriate for right-to-left scripts.

### D.2.7 Reserved code points for 'default ignorable' characters

(See resolution [M55.35](#))

The Unicode Standard defines a range of code points with the property of *default ignorable*, and these are detailed in [DerivedCoreProperties](#). Default ignorable code points (see <http://www.unicode.org/versions/Unicode5.0.0/ch05.pdf>, section 5.20) are those that should be ignored by default in rendering unless explicitly supported. They have no visible glyph or advance width in and of themselves, although they may affect the display, positioning, or adornment of adjacent or surrounding characters. Some default ignorable code points are assigned characters, while others are reserved for future assignment. An implementation should ignore default ignorable characters in rendering whenever it does not support the characters.

To allow a greater degree of compatibility across versions of the standard, the ranges U+2060-U+206F, U+FFF0-U+FFFB, and U+E0000-U+E0FFF are reserved for format and control characters (General Category = Cf). Unassigned code points in these ranges should be ignored in processing and display. These ranges are designed and reserved for future default ignorable characters. It facilitates forward compatibility by permitting existing programs to ignore them until they are supported in some future version of the program. All new characters with this property should be encoded in one of these ranges.

**Unassigned code points in the above-mentioned ranges will be used by WG2 and UTC for encoding new *default ignorable* characters.**

## Annex E: Request for new collection identifiers

(Source: [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1877](#) -1998-09-20 - modified based on discussion at M35; AI-M35-6b)

<b>Request For Collection Identifier For a Sub-Repertoire Of ISO/IEC 10646</b>	
	Date: _____
<b>SOURCE:</b>	_____
<b>Email address of source:</b>	_____
<b>Phone number of source:</b>	_____
<b>Fax number of source:</b>	_____
<b>Address of source:</b>	_____ _____ _____ _____
<b>WG 2 SPONSOR</b>	_____
<b>(Preferably a member body or liaison organization of ISO/IEC JTC 1 or its subcommittees and working groups)</b>	
<b>SUBMITTER'S REFERENCE:</b>	_____

### SUBMITTER AND THE SPONSOR SHOULD DO THE FOLLOWING:

- A. Ensure that no existing collection identified with a Collection Identifier in ISO/IEC 10646 satisfies their needs. If a single collection does not exist, provide justification why an enumeration of two or more identified collections cannot satisfy the need.
- B. Ensure that the proposed collection of characters is a true subset of the repertoire of characters of ISO/IEC 10646 (including all its amendments and corrigenda). The list of character names in Annex G of ISO/IEC 10646 can be used as an aid. If any character is NOT currently encoded in the standard, that character should be submitted for inclusion in the standard, following the guidelines documented in section 1 on page 1, and in Annex A on page 11 of this document.
- C. Prepare a list of existing collections that are fully contained in the proposed collection. Ensure that you have considered all the approved amendments of the Standard while preparing this list of collections.
- D. List any code positions that are included in the proposed collection, but are NOT included in the list of existing collections identified in step C above.
- E. For each of the existing collection that is identified in step C above, list any code position that is to be excluded from the proposed collection.
- F. If the proposed collection is to be marked as FIXED, provide a list of individual code positions that are NOT allocated in each of the collections identified in step C above and therefore to be excluded from the proposed collection.
- G. Decide if the collection is to be marked as a FIXED collection (see section 4 on page 7 of this document).
- H. Prepare a background document, including the rationale and intended use of the collection and forward it to the Convener of ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 for consideration, acceptance and assignment of a Collection Identifier by WG 2.
- I. If the proposed collection is a superset or subset of an existing collection select a suitable collection name to easily identify the subset superset relationship. The following WG2 resolution is relevant in this context:  
[M45.32](#) (*Stability of IICORE collection*):  
With reference to document N2780 on International Ideograph Core subset, WG2 accepts that any future amendments of the International Ideograph Core should be recorded as new collections with their own unique collection names. The new collection must be a true superset of all existing IICORE and any of its amended collections in an upwardly compatible manner.

## Format to be used for sub-repertoire submission

An example format of the proposal for collection definition is given below. The final form of documenting the sub-repertoire in the standard is at the discretion of the project editor(s).

**Collection Name:** EXAMPLE COLLECTION<sup>8</sup>

**Collection to be marked as Fixed (Yes / No):** YES

Plane 00	
<u>Rows</u>	<u>Positions (Cells)</u>
00	20-7E, A0-FF
01	00-13 16-2B 2E-4D 50-7E
02	C7 D8-DB DD
1E	80-85 F2 F3
20	15 18 19 1C 1D AC
21	22 26 5B-5E 90-93
26	6A

### Collections containing the proposed sub-repertoire

The following UCS collections from Annex A of ISO/IEC 10646 contain characters of the above-proposed collection:

<b>ID</b>	<b>UCS-Collection Name / Code Positions</b>	<b>Positions to be included or excluded</b>
1	BASIC LATIN 0020-007E	All are included
2	LATIN-1 SUPPLEMENT 00A0-00FF	All are included
3	LATIN EXTENDED-A 0100-017F	0114, 0115, 012C, 012D, 014E, 014F, and 017F are excluded.
6	SPACING MODIFIER LETTERS 02B0-02FF	Only 02C7, 02D8—02DB and 02DD are included.
30	LATIN EXTENDED ADDITIONAL	Only 1E80—1E85, 1EF2, and 1EF3 are included.
32	GENERAL PUNCTUATION 2000-206F	Only 2015, 2018, 2019, 201C and 201D are included.
34	CURRENCY SYMBOLS 20A0-20CF	Only 20AC is included.
36	LETTERLIKE SYMBOLS 2100-214F	Only 2122 and 2126 are included.
37	NUMBER FORMS 2150-218F	Only 215B—215E are included.
38	ARROWS 2190-21FF	Only 2190—2193 are included.
47	MISCELLANEOUS SYMBOLS 2600-26FF	Only 266A is included.

### Justification for a Single Collection Identifier Request

(For example) A single collection identifier is required to tag textual data in a particular protocol with a character set identifier.

### Format for Ideograph Collections

Large collections such as IICORE containing a number of ideographs taken from different sources from Asia Pacific countries/regions are documented differently. Given its large size (9810 characters) and the large number of sparse ranges, the collection is not specified by Rows/positions but instead by a linked content. Supplementary informative references are included as a guide to the use of each ideograph in the collection in the different countries/regions. The following is how the fixed collection 370 IICORE is recorded in the standard:

The content linked to is a plain text file (IICORE.txt), using ISO/IEC 646-IRV characters with LINE FEED as end of line mark, that specifies, after a 11-lines header, as many lines as IICORE characters; each containing the following information in fixed length field:

- 1st field: BMP or SIP code position (0hhhh), (2hhhh), normative.
- 2nd field: Hanzi G usage identifier (G0a), (G1a), (G3a), (G5a), (G7a), (G8a), (G9a), or (GEa), informative.
- 3rd field: Hanzi T usage identifier (T1a), (T2a), (T3a), (T4a), (T5a) or (TFa), informative.
- 4th field: Kanji J usage identifier (J1A), informative.
- 5th field: Hanzi H usage identifier (H1a), informative.

<sup>8</sup>This example is based on an input document on Latin Characters based on ISO/IEC 6937:1994, from Mr. Johan van Wingen, Netherlands; the Euro Sign has been added; see WG 2 [N2211](#) - Request for Collection Identifiers for European Repertoires.

- 6th field: Hanja K usage identifier (K0a), (K1a), (K2a) or (K3a), informative.
- 7th field: Hanzi M (for Macao SAR) usage identifier (M1a), informative.
- 8th field: Hanja KP usage identifier (P0a), informative.
- 9th field: General category, informative (A, B or C in decreasing order of priority).

The usage information provided with each entry describes the usage and priority level of individual IICORE characters in the context of each source (G, T, J, H, K, M, and KP). This should not be confused with the source references for CJK Ideographs in clause 27 of the standard, which establish the identity of all CJK Ideographs.

Example:

(Note: additional spaces between fields shown in the example below will not be present in IICORE.txt file)

```

Fields (Column positions) ...
  1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9
00000 000 011 111 111 112 222 222 2
12345 678 901 234 567 890 123 456 7
-----
048D3 G3D                                     C
049D1 G9D                                     C
04A12                                     K3D   C
04AB8                                     K3D   C
04C7D                                     H1F   C
04C81      T4B                               C
04C85      T4B                               C
04CB3      T3B                               C
04D08      T4B                               C
04E00 G0A T1A J1A H1A K0A M1A P0A A
04E01 G0A T1A J1A H1A K0A M1A P0A A
04E03 G0A T1A J1A H1A K0A M1A P0A A
04E07 G0A      J1A      K0A      P0A A

```

## Annex F: Formal criteria for disunification

(Source: [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1724](#) - 1998-03-05- adopted with revisions at M34 - action item M34-7d.)

There have been repeated proposals to disunify existing characters. These proposals cannot be fully evaluated without a more rigorous framework concerning the disunification / unification of characters. Without such formal criteria, all decisions are 'ad-hoc' and different proposals may get different levels of review. Both WG 2 and the Unicode Technical Committee need to spend some time in evaluating and possibly formalizing the criteria that we use to decide these cases. This is similar to the formalization we have done for script prioritization, but uses different criteria.

Note: The unification criteria used for the Han script are very thorough and quite sufficient. This document attempts to establish formal criteria for use in other scripts. There is no attempt to change the procedures used in Han unification.

A special case of the disunification question is whether or not to encode script-specific Dandas -- punctuation or decorative marks that look approximately like a single or double vertical stroke -- used in several Brahmi-derived scripts - see section *F.7 Criteria for encoding script-specific* on page 32.

### **F.1 What is disunification?**

Disunification is the introduction of a new character that can also be encoded by an existing character. A strong case of disunification occurs where there is prevalent practice of using the existing character. A weak case of disunification occurs where there is little or no use of the existing character for the purpose for which the new character is intended.

*Example:* Adding a period in a new script is a weak disunification if we assume that nobody has an existing implementation of that script using the regular period. Adding a clone of a Latin letter for use with Cyrillic script is a strong disunification as mixed Latin/Cyrillic character sets exist and have been used for encoding the languages that the new characters are intended for.

### **F.2 Cost and benefits**

Proposals always claim that disunification brings benefits. Formal criteria attempt to critically evaluate those benefits, but also compare them to the costs. Any disunification, especially strong disunification, introduces several types of cost to *all* complete implementations of the Standard.

1. Any complete implementation will have to add and support both an additional entry in the properties as well as an additional glyph, or glyph mapping for the disunified character.
2. Whenever the character in question has no appearance distinction, there is the cost of accidental confusion and mis-identification. All implementations will need sophisticated handling of equivalencies, especially, where disunification occurs on well-established characters (as opposed to among the characters of an entirely new script being fine-tuned in the proposal stage).
3. Keyboards that support the disunification need to be widely (and by default) available; this is especially troublesome for strong disunification of Latin characters as most keyboards have a Latin layer from which it is easy to type the existing and now-disunified character.

### **F.3 Criteria of analysis**

#### **I. Costs**

The following questions are designed to evaluate the costs associated with the disunification.

1. Is there a glyphic distinction?
2. Is there a behaviour difference?
3. Is the use of the new character restricted to a new context (for example, use with a novel script)?
4. Is the use of the existing, ambiguous character instead of the proposed new character common, prevalent or established practice?
5. Does the character exist in ASCII (ISO 646 IRV)?

See additional guidelines in section F.5 on page 31.

## II. Benefits

1. Appearance: does disunification help to allow multilingual monofont text in an environment where this is commonly needed? In what way?
2. Layout: does disunification solve common layout differences (this would mostly be true for punctuation)?
3. Searching/sorting: Is there a *common* case where disunification allows better support for these?
4. Mapping to another standard: Is there a widely used standard that disunifies the characters in question? Are the characters in question the *only* ones that prevent cross mapping?

## III. Alternatives

Finally, the analysis must explore whether other alternatives are possible.

1. Can the desired effect be achieved by changes to the display layer?
2. Can the desired effect be achieved by changes to protocols?
3. Can the desired effect be achieved by processing algorithms?

## IV. Previously rejected proposals

WG 2 may have rejected previous proposals for a character on the basis of it being a glyphic variant of an already coded character. Any proposal, which later suggests that one or more of these variant forms is actually a *distinct* character requiring separate encoding, should provide detailed printed evidence that there is actual, contrastive use of the variant form(s). It is insufficient for a proposal to claim a requirement to encode *as characters* in 10646, glyphic forms that happen to occur in another character encoding that did not follow [TR 15285 - Character-Glyph Model](#) that guides the choice of appropriate characters for encoding in 10646.

(For example, the forms in the American Library Association / Latin Cyrillic Romanization tables were considered during the development of the original Cyrillic repertoire for 10646, and the variant glyph forms were explicitly unified, so that duplicate characters would not be encoded for Cyrillic. Later, a proposal was being prepared by TC46 on the basis that some of the variant forms were in an existing ISO standard, without due consideration for the Character Glyph Model - and hence Rejected.)

### F.4 Some examples of precedents

#### Example 1:

**Character:** *Generic Decimal Separator Mark*

In 1991 the proposal was made to add a new punctuation character in the General Punctuation block that would have the semantic property of decimal separator, but could be imaged as period, comma, space or apostrophe depending on the locale.

*Asserted benefit:* Solve the locale dependent display of numbers.

*Costs:* This new character would have disunified four widely used characters. Mapping from existing character sets would have become locale dependent. Users would have to turn on a special show-invisible-character mode to distinguish the new character from existing characters. Such modes exist, but are limited to word processing software, where numbers usually occur embedded in text, which in turn is 'frozen' into a given language. Database software, where locale dependent numeric displays are much more of an issue, does not normally need or support a show-invisible-character mode. Finally, in 1991 there were no keyboards supporting this new character, but it would be needed in *all* languages and applications, and *all* software would have to be specially adapted for it.

*Alternatives:* There already is an established technology to deal with locale differences, and in a way that is not limited to decimal numbers.

*Result:* **Rejected.** The costs outweigh the benefits.

## **Example 2:**

**Character:** *Angstrom Symbol*

*Asserted benefit:* Provide roundtrip mapping for East Asian character sets.

*Costs:* This character disunifies A WITH RING, which is in wide use in only a limited number of languages that all use Latin-1. In the Latin-1 context, it would be natural to use A WITH RING as the Angstrom Symbol. The Angstrom unit is not one of the preferred powers for the metric units of SI, but it is still commonly used in some disciplines, as it is convenient for atomic length scales. Disunifying the A WITH RING adds the important round trip mapping capabilities for East Asian character sets, but makes it harder to use the Standard as a pivot between these character sets and Latin-1. However, almost none of the other SI units that have explicit character codes in East Asian character sets can be mapped 1:1 with Latin-1, so the Angstrom Symbol adds little to that problem. Searching needs to support equivalencies; however, in the East Asian context the need for extended equivalencies (beyond simple case equivalence) is common.

*Alternatives:* None.

*Result:* **Accepted.** The benefits far outweigh the costs.

### **F.5 Some additional guiding principles**

(See resolution [M47.4](#))

Some additional guiding principles to preserve the pre-disunification use of existing characters also after disunification are provided here.

F5.1 The representative glyphs of existing characters will not be changed in such a way as to change their identity, and the range of glyphs expected for existing characters will not increase as a result of disunification.

F5.2 Very significant character properties (such as case) for existing characters shall not be changed, because of the large risk of adverse impact on existing implementations of the standard.

If a character disunification cannot be achieved by adding one new character without requiring a change in very significant properties of the existing character and without changing the representative glyph or range of expected glyphs for the existing character, then new characters will be added for each of the distinct, specific letterforms required. The existing character will not be intended for use in scenarios in which the distinct, specific letterforms are used. This may result in visually duplicate characters, which may be necessary under the above conditions. While it is desirable that a character name be fully appropriate to the given character and its representative glyph, concern over less-than-ideal names will not provide a sufficient basis for overriding these guidelines. Exceptions will be permitted only after careful consideration of hits on existing implementations and on the basis of substantial rationale.

The following additions to the standard at meeting M45 are some examples that have shown some particular difficulties for existing implementations (see document N2987 for more details).

- a. Addition of HEBREW POINT QAMATS QATAN
- b. Addition of HEBREW ACCENT ATNAH HAFUKH
- c. Addition of LATIN CAPITAL LETTER GLOTTAL STOP to cater for orthographies that use the phonetic symbol LATIN LETTER GLOTTAL STOP as a lower case letter. (Note: a separate LATIN SMALL LETTER GLOTTAL STOP was added at M47 based on further input and discussion.)

### **F.6 Criteria for disunification of combining diacritical marks**

(See resolution [M47.2](#))

A number of criteria may be considered when deciding whether a proposed combining diacritical mark for a particular script should be unified with an existing encoded combining diacritical mark. One or more of these the criteria could favour a decision to disunify when encoding.

- a) The main criterion is that of the shape of the glyph, since that is the chief identifier of a diacritical mark. When the range of glyphic appearance of a diacritical mark may be markedly different from

the range typical of the generic diacritical mark, disunification may be preferred. When the mark has been borrowed from another script, but has been significantly modified to fit with the ductus of the borrowing script, disunification may be preferred. These and other criteria have been used in the past, and may be used in the future, as deciding factors in whether to encode separate diacritical marks (or to disunify) for particular scripts.

- b) The mark forms part of a set of marks in the script (for example a set of tone marks), but only some members of the set could be considered candidates for unification with existing marks.
- c) The mark has a specific function fundamentally unrelated to the generic diacritical mark; for instance, the use of the mark as a vowel sign as opposed to the use of a similar-shaped mark as a modifying diacritic. In such a case the two uses might also require explicit differences in their character properties.
- d) The display behaviour is fundamentally different and requires different support. For example, U+A806 SYLOTI NAGRI SIGN HASANTA looks like a combining circumflex, but requires different display support.

The more of these criteria are satisfied, and the stronger the degree to which each is satisfied, the stronger the case for encoding a script-specific diacritical mark. It is not a matter of a rule that deterministically yields a “yes/no” decision; rather, it is a question of degree, which can then form a basis for a proper judgment of the encoding question. In general, these criteria are not much different from those used for assigning script-specific punctuation.

### **F.7 Criteria for encoding script-specific Dandas**

(See resolution [M52.5](#))

The recommendations for encoding Danda characters are parallel but somewhat distinct in the case of already encoded scripts and for new scripts not yet encoded. For clarity, these recommendations are written out completely for each case.

#### **F.7.1. For currently encoded scripts**

1. If the orthographies using the existing script do not make use of Dandas, do not encode any script-specific Dandas for it. Example: Sinhala;
2. If the orthographies using the existing script do make use of Dandas, and there are already encoded script-specific Dandas, use those Dandas in the context of that script. List: Tibetan, Myanmar, Khmer, Balinese, Phags-pa, Lepcha, Ol-Chiki, Saurashtra, Kayah Li, Cham;
3. If the orthographies using the existing script do make use of Dandas, and there are no script-specific Dandas already encoded, then a clear determination should be made between one of several possible alternatives. And to ensure the stable representation of text, that determination, once made, should not be reversed. The options are:
  - a) Specify the use of particular, already-encoded Dandas from another block in the standard; or,
  - b) Encode new, script-specific Dandas for use with the existing script; or,
  - c) If and only if it can be demonstrated that orthographies using the existing script have a plain text contrastive use between two types of Dandas, use a combination of option a) and option b) above, to represent the distinction.

To change existing practice, there should be demonstrable evidence that there is a need to change.

*(Note: WG2 has an action item to validate the following existing practice. Once the final determination is made, the recommendations will be clearly documented here and will not be changed in the future.)*

Use of already-encoded Dandas from another block:

- 1735/1736 in the Hanunoo block - in Tagalog, Buhid, Tagbanwa, (and Hanunoo itself).
- 0964/0965 in the Devanagari block - in Bengali, Gurmukhi, Gujarati, Oriya, Syloti Nagri, Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam, (and Devanagari itself).

Existing practice notwithstanding, the existence of the use of Dandas in orthographies for one of these scripts **might** be taken as supporting a determination to encode script-specific Dandas for that script, if evidence of formal difference is persuasive.

All the other Brahmi-derived scripts have their own Dandas where needed.



*Note* that use of Dandas is not usual for South Indian scripts (Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam), but is seen for Sanskrit texts rendered in those scripts (and Tamil Grantha).

*Note* that contrastive use of Dandas is reported for the Bengali script, which should be taken into account for determining whether a decision to encode script-specific Dandas along side the already-encoded Dandas is appropriate for that particular script.

#### **F.7.2. For new scripts proposed for encoding**

1. If the orthographies using the proposed script do not make use of Dandas, do not encode any script-specific Dandas for it.
2. If the orthographies using the proposed script do make use of Dandas, then a clear determination should be made between one of several possible alternatives. And to ensure the stable representation of text, that determination, once made, should not be reversed. The options are:
  - a) Specify the use of particular, already-encoded Dandas from another block in the standard; or,
  - b) Encode new, script-specific Dandas for use with the proposed script; or,
  - c) If and only if it can be demonstrated that orthographies using the existing script have a plain text contrastive use between two types of Dandas, use a combination of option a) and option b) above, to represent the distinction.

The existence of the use of Dandas in orthographies for a script proposed for encoding is generally taken as sufficient justification for encoding of script-specific Dandas for that script. However, there may be considerations that would favor use of particular already-encoded Dandas from another block instead. In any case, the determination **must** be made when the script is approved for encoding.

## Annex G: Formal criteria for coding precomposed characters

(Sources: [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1725](#) (1998-03-17) - adopted with revisions at M34 - action item M34-7e; [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N2176R](#) (2000-03-07- adopted at M38 - action item M38-5d.)

WG2 evaluation procedure 1b on page 5 addresses precomposed characters. This annex addresses in brief the criteria that support or rule against encoding of any specific proposed character as a precomposed character instead of as a combining character sequence. It also describes the impact of normalization of multiple representations of characters arising out of combining sequences in the standard on proposals for new precomposed characters.

### G.1 Criteria

The positive criteria are of the form of necessary conditions, but not in themselves sufficient to make the decision. Proposals that meet the negative criteria should use composed character sequences instead. The cost criteria are provided as a help to gauge the impact of encoding new precomposed forms.

#### Positive:

- Existence in another character encoding standard (for the purpose of 1:1 character conversion)
- Existence of a precomposed letter in a well-established or official alphabet.

#### Negative:

- If it were to introduce multiple spellings (encodings) for a script where NO multiple spellings existed previously.
- If combining character sequences can be shown to meet the stated information processing needs (e.g. archival use)
- If solely intended to overcome short-term deficiency of rendering technology.
- If the intended use of the character is solely for transliteration purposes.

#### Cost criteria

- Incremental cost for each additional character
- Incremental cost for each new multiple spelling
- Declining benefit if immediate and widespread use is not anticipated.
- Effect on system / products that use pre-composed form as canonical (since addition of precomposed characters makes this set of canonicals unstable).

**Note:** some existing and widely available implementations of internal processes (collation) may use decomposed characters even where the editing interface does not support them. For these cases, additional multiple spellings provide explicit additional costs without *any* benefit.

- Short-term solution versus permanent cost

**Note:** the level of support for combining characters in Latin, Greek and Cyrillic documents is not as widespread as was anticipated when the first edition of the standard was published. It may be tempting to introduce precomposed forms as a short-term solution as long as the level of support for combining characters in Latin, Greek and Cyrillic documents is not yet widespread. Key font technologies with support for combining characters have been developed and at the same time, an increasing number of platforms routinely know how to handle combining marks for other scripts. Adding new precomposed characters could be a permanent unwarranted cost for such newer technologies versus the short-term benefit of being able to reuse not-so-new technologies. See also the discussion in the next section.

### G.2 Implications of normalization on character encoding

As the standard has become more prevalent in implementations and in other standards, it has become necessary to produce very stable specifications for the comparison of text. In particular, a unique, normalized form of text is required for comparisons in domain names, XML element names, and other areas where a precise, stable, comparison of strings is required. Programs that require uniqueness also require forward compatibility: programs all over the web *must* be able to depend on the unique format not changing over time.

There are characters that are equivalently represented either as sequences of code points or as a single code point (called a *composite character*). For example, the *i* with 2 dots in *naïve* could be presented

either as *i + diaeresis* (0069 0308) or as the composite character *i-diaeresis* (00EF). There are other cases where the order of two combining characters does not matter. For example, the pair of combining characters *acute* and *dot-below* can occur with either one first; both alternate orders are equivalent. In response to the need for a unique form, the Unicode Consortium has produced an exact algorithmic specification of normalized forms (see *UTR #15: Unicode Normalization Forms* - <http://www.unicode.org/unicode/reports/tr15>).

One of these forms, Normalization Form C, is designed to favour precomposed characters such as *ã* over combining character sequences such as *a + ~*. The W3C Character Model for the World Wide Web (<http://www.w3.org/TR/charmod>) requires the use of Normalization Form C for XML and related standards (this document is not yet final, but this requirement is not expected to change). See also the W3C Requirements for String Identity Matching and String Indexing (<http://www.w3.org/TR/WD-charreq>) for more background. We expect that the number of standards and implementations requiring normalization will continue to grow. Such implementations must produce precisely the same result for normalization *even if* they upgrade to a new version of Unicode / 10646. Thus it is necessary to specify a fixed version for the composition process, called the *composition version*. The composition version is defined to be Version 3.0.0 of the Unicode Character Database, which corresponds to ISO/IEC 10646-1:2000.

To see what difference the composition version makes, suppose that a future version of the standard adds the composite *Q-caron*. For an implementation that uses that version of the standard, strings in Normalization Forms C or KC will continue to contain the sequence *Q + caron*, and **not** the new character *Q-caron*, since a canonical composition for *Q-caron* was not defined in the composition version. The implications for encoding new characters are that new precomposed characters are important to recognize. If *Q WITH CARON* were added to a future version of Unicode or 10646, then it would represent a duplicate encoding. This could be tolerated before Unicode 3.0 because canonical equivalence could be used to equate the two forms. But due to the need for stability in comparison by so much of the world's infrastructure, this situation cannot be tolerated in the future. For stability, characters that can be currently represented as sequences will always stay represented only as sequences. These include the following examples:

Character	Code Point Sequence	Comments
ch	<0063, 0068>	Slovak, traditional Spanish
ḥ	<0074, 02B0>	Native American languages
ḫ	<0078, 0323>	
ḷ	<019B, 0313>	
ą	<00E1, 0328>	LATIN SMALL LETTER A WITH OGONEK AND TILDE
ï	<0069, 0307, 0301>	LATIN SMALL LETTER I WITH DOT ABOVE AND ACUTE
ṽ	<30C8, 309A>	Ainu in kana transcription

Moreover, the need for separate precomposed characters is diminishing quickly. The major GUI vendors are currently in the process of upgrading their systems to handle accurate positioning of combining marks, with such technologies as Open Type and AAT. By the time new precomposed characters could be added, there would be little need for them. It is possible to add future precomposed characters in the case where they cannot already be represented by combining character sequences. In such cases the situation is reversed; the component characters that would make up an equivalent combining character sequence cannot be added.

## Annex H: Criteria for encoding symbols

(Source: [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1982](#) - 1998-02-26 - adopted at M36 - action item M36-6a.)

### H.1 Symbols and plain text

The primary goal of ISO/IEC 10646 and Unicode is plain text encoding. Only a very limited class of symbols are strictly needed in plain text, if it is understood that an e-mail message is representative for plain text. A more expanded interpretation of plain text acknowledges plain text as the backbone for more elaborate and rich implementations. An example of such expanded use are the plain text buffer for a rich document, or searchable representation of text or notational system, such using character codes to access unit symbols in a CAD package, or to implement a complex notational system such as musical notation.

In the latter cases, the class of symbols for which encoding makes sense becomes much larger. It encompasses all symbols for which it is not enough to merely be able to provide an image, but whose identity and semantics must be able to be automatically interpreted and processed in ways that are similar to processes on text.

### H.2 The 'symbol fallacy'

The 'symbol fallacy' is to confuse the fact that '*symbols have semantic content*', with '*in text, it is customary to use the symbol directly for communication*'. These are two different concepts. An example is traffic signs and the communication of traffic engineers about traffic signs. In their (hand-) written communication the engineers are much more likely to use the words *stop sign* when referring to a stop sign, than to draw the image. On the other hand, mathematicians are more likely to draw an integral sign and its limits and integrands than to write an equation in words.

### H.3 Classification

Symbols can be classified in two broad categories, depending on whether a symbol is part of a symbolic notational system or not.

#### H.3.1 Symbols that are part of a notational system

Symbols that are part of a notational system have uses and usage patterns analogous to the notational systems used for writing. They feature a defined<sup>9</sup> repertoire and established rules of processing and layout. In computers they are treated similar to a complex script, i.e. with their own layout engines (or sub engines). Core user groups have shared legacy encodings, which allow at least their data to be migrated to the new encoding.

#### H.3.2 Symbols that are not part of a notational system

There are many distinct repertoires of non-notational symbols, some with very small frequency of occurrence. The design and use of many of these symbols tends to be subject to quick shifts in fashion; in many cases they straddle the realms of the informative and the decorative. Layout is usually quite simple and directly equivalent to an inline graphic. In computers they are treated as un-encoded entities today: they are provided as graphics or via fonts with ad-hoc encodings, with no additional support for rendering. Because of the ad-hoc nature of the legacy encodings for these symbols, data migration is near impossible.

##### H.3.2.1 Legacy symbols

An important subclass of non-notational symbols is the class of technical symbols found in legacy implementations and character sets for which plain text usage is established. Prominent examples are compatibility symbols used in character mode text display, e.g. terminal emulation.

### H.4 Kinds of symbols found in ISO/IEC 10646 and Unicode

1. Part of a notational system
  - Mathematical operators
  - Electrotechnical symbols
  - APL
  - Braille

<sup>9</sup> All large repertoires can have a sizeable 'gray zone', even if they can be called 'defined' here.

- Musical notations (accepted for Plane 1)
- 2. Compatibility for text mode display
  - Chess pieces
  - Forms and blocks
  - Control pictures
  - Integral pieces
- 3. Text ornaments
  - Dingbats
  - Enclosed/parenthesized
- 4. Traditional signs and icons
  - Astrological symbols
  - Religious symbols
- 5. Abbreviations or units used with text or numbers
  - Currency symbols
  - Units
  - Prescription etc.
- 6. Other
  - Environment protection related symbols

### ***H.5 Discussion***

Any proposal to encode additional symbols must be evaluated in terms of what the benefit will be of cataloguing these entities and whether there is a realistic expectation that users will be able to access them by the codes that we define. This is especially an issue for non-notational, non-compatibility symbols.

The trend so far has not been encouraging there. The last few years have seen enormous progress in the end-user available support of ISO/IEC 10646 and Unicode as encoding for letters and punctuation. Instead of a collection of fonts with legacy encodings, system and font vendors now provide fonts with a common encoding, and, where scripts have similar typography, with combined repertoire. The most widely available fonts for symbols, however, have **not** followed that trend. Users of these symbols continue to use ad-hoc fonts in their documents.

Existing data encoded using legacy encodings for letters and punctuation can be converted to ISO/IEC 10646 and Unicode quite easily, and many systems and applications provide such translations in a transparent matter. A different story holds for symbols. Because almost all legacy data use ad-hoc encodings or even in-line images for non-notational symbols, one cannot easily convert existing data. Therefore there is more resistance to changing the status quo.

As a conclusion, any successful proposal would need to contain a set of non-notational symbols for which the benefits of a shared encoding are so compelling that its existence would encourage a transition.

### ***H.6 Some criteria that strengthen the case for encoding***

The symbol

- is typically used as part of computer applications (e.g. CAD symbols)
- has well defined user community / usage
- always occurs together with text or numbers (unit, currency, estimated)
- is required to be searchable or indexable
- is customarily used in tabular lists as shorthand for characteristics<sup>10</sup>  
(for example, check mark, maru etc.)
- is part of a notational system
- is used in 'text-like' labels (even if applied to maps and 2D diagrams)
- has well-defined semantics
- has semantics that lend themselves to computer processing
- completes a class of symbols already in the standard
- is letter-like (i.e. ordinarily varies with the surrounding font style)
- itself has a name, (for example, *ampersand*, *hammer-and-sickle*, *caduceus*)
- is commonly used amidst text

<sup>10</sup> The typical camping, boating, or hiking symbols are often used in that way.

- is widespread, i.e. actually found used in materials of diverse types/contexts by diverse publishers, including governmental

### **H.7 Some criteria weaken the case for encoding**

There is evidence that

- the symbol is primarily used free-standing (traffic signs)
- the notational system is not widely used on computers (dance notation, traffic signs)
- the symbol is part of a set undergoing rapid changes (short-lived symbols)
- the symbol is trademarked (unless encoding is requested by the owner) (logos, Der grüne Punkt, CE symbol, UL symbol, etc)
- the symbol is purely decorative
- the symbol is an image of something, not a symbol for something
- the symbol is only used in 2-Dimensional diagrams, (e.g. circuit components)
- the symbol is composable (see diacritics for symbols)
- the identity of the symbol is usually ignored in processing
- font shifting<sup>11</sup> is the preferred access and the user community is happy with that (logos, etc.)

Or, conversely, there is not enough evidence for its usage or its user community.

### **H.8 Completion of a set**

Completion of an incomplete set of symbols for which some are already encoded is given higher priority. Otherwise, for lack of usability, alternative encodings or mark-up will become the method of choice, stranding the large repertoire already encoded.

By extension, a proposal that contains incomplete repertoires of a given category of symbol should be given a very low priority until they reach a level of completeness that makes a compelling case for a given user community.

### **H.9 Instability**

The case has been made that either *rapid changes in the glyph representation*, or *changes in the meaning of the character* have nothing to do with encoding (defined as a purely positional assignment), as long as the general category of use of the symbol does not change.

The counter example to that is the recent decision to encode the euro sign as a new character and not to reclaim the Euro-Currency sign based on a definite change in glyph. There are glyph changes that cannot be absorbed quietly since the new glyph bears so little relation to the old one that the change exceeds the implied range of glyphic variation.

It is normally allowable for a symbol (same glyph) to acquire some additional meaning(s) over time. However, for some symbols (part of a notational scheme) this could mean that the symbol would need to be processed differently (i.e. a change in operational semantics a.k.a. character properties). Such a change would necessarily affect coding.

In either case, rapid change means by definition that the situation is not settled, and reliable information on the range of acceptable glyphic variation or character properties is unavailable. Therefore it is a good reason to wait with coding.

### **H.10 Perceived usefulness**

The fact that a symbol merely *seems to be useful or potentially useful* is precisely not a reason to code it. Demonstrated usage, or demonstrated demand, on the other hand, does constitute a good reason to encode the symbol. The euro sign is the classical example of the latter. It is a novel symbol for which there is demonstrated and strong demand.

It is important to distinguish the perception of ‘usefulness’ from the question of whether a symbol is in widespread use or not. ISO/IEC 10646 and Unicode cater to both general and specialized users, from modern world languages to historic and minority scripts. Widespread use will influence the prioritization, but should be somewhat independent from the decision of whether a symbol is an encodable entity in the first place. In order to be truly useful, an encoded symbol must be accessible to the user community in its

<sup>11</sup> Shifting of fonts, however, is not a reliable method for the web.

encoded form. It requires implementers ready to supply implementations using the new encoding, and user community ready to migrate to those implementations.

## Annex I: Guideline for handling of CJK ideograph unification and/or disunification error

(Source: [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N2576R](#) – 2003-10-21)

There are two kinds of errors that may be encountered related to coded CJK unified ideographs.

Case 1: *to be unified* error - Ideographs that should have been unified are assigned separate code points.

Case 2: *to be disunified* error - Ideographs that should not have been unified are unified and assigned a single code point. An example of this is the request from TCA in document [N2271](#).

When such errors are found, the following guidelines will be used by WG 2 to deal with them.

### ***1.1 Guideline for “to be unified” errors***

- A. The “*to be unified*” pair will be left disunified. Once a character is assigned a code position in the standard, it will not be removed from the standard.
- B. If necessary, an additional note may be added to an appropriate section in the standard.

### ***1.2 Guideline for “to be disunified” errors***

(Source: [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N3859](#) – 2010-06-28)

- A. The ideographs to be disunified should be disunified and should be given separate code positions as soon as possible (disunification in some sense, and character name change in some sense also). These ideographs will have two separate glyphs and two separate code positions. One of these ideographs will stay at its current encoded position. The other one will have a new glyph and a new code position.
- B. For the ideographs that are encoded, the code charts in ISO/IEC 10646 are presented in multiple columns, with possibly differing glyph shapes in each column. The question of which glyph shall remain in the current code point will be resolved by the IRG on a case by case basis.
- C. The disunified ideograph will have a glyph that is different from the one that retains the current code position.
- D. The net result will be an addition of new ideograph character and a correction and an additional entry to the source reference table.

### ***1.3 Discouragement of new disunification request***

There is a possibility of “pure true disunification” request. This is almost like the new source code separation request. This kind of request shall not be accepted disregarding the reasoning behind. Key difference between “TO BE DISUNIFIED” and “SHALL NOT BE DISUNIFIED” is as follows.

- a) If character pair is non-cognate (meanings are different), that pair of characters is TO BE DISUNIFIED.
- b) If a character pair is cognate (means the same but different shape), that pair of characters SHALL NOT BE DISUNIFIED.

Disunification request with reason of mis-application (over-application usually) of unification rule should NOT be accepted due to the principle in resolution [M41.11](#).



## **Annex J: Guideline for correction of CJK ideograph mapping table errors**

(Source: [ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N2577](#) – 2003-09-02)

In principle, mapping table or reference to code point of existing national/regional standard (in the source reference tables) must not be changed. But once a fatal error is found it should be corrected as early as possible, under following guidelines:

### **J.1 Priority of error correction procedure**

- A. Consider adding new code position and source-reference mapping for the character in question rather than changing the mapping table.
- B. If change of mapping table is unavoidable, correction should be done as soon as possible.

### **J.2 Announcement of addition or correction of mapping table**

Once any addition or correction of mapping table is made, an announcement of the change should be made immediately. Usually this will be in the form of a resolution of a WG 2 meeting, followed by subsequent process resulting in an appropriate amendment to the standard.

### **J.3 Collection and maintenance of mapping tables that are not owned by WG 2**

There are many mapping tables, which are included in national/regional standards or developed by third parties. These are out of WG 2's scope. Any organization (such as Unicode Consortium) that collects mapping information, maintains it consistently and makes this information widely available is invited and encouraged to do so.

## **Annex K**

The content of this Annex has been deleted per resolution [M49.26](#).

## Annex L: Character-naming guidelines

(Refer to ISO/IEC 10646: 2012 available at

[http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c056921\\_ISO\\_IEC\\_10646\\_2012.zip](http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c056921_ISO_IEC_10646_2012.zip))

The clause 28 of this standard specifies rules for name formation and name uniqueness. These rules are used in other information technology coded character set standards such as ISO/IEC 646, ISO/IEC 6937, ISO/IEC 8859, and ISO/IEC 10367.

Annex L in the standard provides additional guidelines for the creation of these entity names.

These guidelines do not apply to the names of CJK Ideographs and Hangul syllables which are formed using the rules specified in clause 28.2 and 28.3 respectively.

Take also note that, WG2 has adopted the following guideline (in resolution M56.22):

*Guideline on spelling for English character names:*

WG2 will use the Oxford English Dictionary as the primary reference for spelling of English words in character names, unless a proposal document provides credible evidence to use alternative spellings.

## History of changes

This document was originally prepared by Messrs. Mark Davis, Edwin Hart and Sten G. Lindberg, as document N946 (1994-10-11), based on N884 (1993-04-06) (authored by Messrs. Rick McGowan and Joe Becker). It has been enhanced by an ad hoc group on principles and procedures set up at the San Francisco WG 2 meeting no. 26. The result was presented as WG 2 document [N1116](#) (1994-10-12). The following is a summary of changes made since that time:

1. At the Geneva WG 2 meeting no 27 (1995-04-07), where some enhancements were proposed. The result was presented as document [N1202](#) (1995-06-26)).
2. At the Helsinki WG 2 meeting no 28 (1995-06-26), some enhancements were proposed and adopted. The result was presented as document [N1252](#) (1995-06-27). The document was accepted, following Resolution M28.6 at that meeting.
3. At the meeting no 31 (1996-08-16) a new Annex C: Description of the UCS workflow and stages in progression from initial proposal to final publication were added. Furthermore a new question (C 10) regarding some properties of proposed characters has been included in the proposal summary form.
4. At the meeting no 32 (1997-01-24) a new Annex D: BMP and Supplementary Planes Allocation Roadmap was added. The Annex D is the inclusion of the US contribution N1499 (1996-12-27) only with minor editorial changes. Minor editorial changes have been made to align the different standing documents.
5. Principles regarding allocation of '00' position in a block (resolution M33.12) and regarding considerations for half-block boundary (per resolution M33.11) have been added from meeting M33 (1997-07-04).
6. The ad hoc report on collection identifiers for parts 1 and 2 (document [N1726](#) - 1998-03-19) from meeting 34 (1998-03-20), and a form for submission of requests for collection identifiers (document [N1735](#) - 1998-03-23, amended per AI-35-6-b) were consolidated into document [N1877](#) - 1998-09-20; and has been incorporated in this document.
7. Formal Criteria for Disunification (per AI-34-7-d, based on document [N1724](#) - 1998-03-05) was added.
8. Formal Criteria for Coding Pre-Composed Characters (per AI-34-7-e, based on document [N1725](#) - 1998-03-17) was added.
9. The principle of '1K boundary for allocations in Plane 1 for ease of use with UTF-16' (per Action Item AI-35-6-a - 1998-09-25) has been added.
10. The unused 'WG 2 administration section D' has been removed from the proposal summary form (at meeting 36 - 1999-03-15).
11. A note has been added on the need for stronger justification for proposals to include 'Glyph Variants'.
12. A sample picture of the 'spread sheet' illustrating the skeleton format and column headings used in the parallel WG 2 standing document 'Status summary of WG 2 work items' has been removed, with the reference to that standing document.
13. The document has been reorganized slightly for better readability. This is presented as document [N2002](#) at M36 (1999-03-15) (the revised Annex D is left as 'to do' pending acceptance of other roadmap contributions).
14. A new Annex on criteria for encoding symbols based on document [N1982](#) (1998-02-26) has been added, per action item M36-6a (1999-03-15).
15. Annex on Pre-Composed characters has been enhanced with information on implications of Unicode normalization - based on document [N2176R](#) (2000-03-07), per action items M37-6a and M38-5d.
16. Information on use of UCS Sequence Identifier, based on document [N2230](#) (2000-07-21) has been incorporated, per action item M39-5a.
17. Annex D has been updated to reference WG 2 standing documents containing the Roadmaps (documents [N2316](#) - 2001-01-10, [N2314](#) - 2001-01-10, [N2215](#) - 2000-03-30, and [N2216](#) - 2000-03-30) - details have been moved and updated from this document.
18. References to different clauses in 10646-1 in the document and in the Proposal Summary Form have been updated to the renumbered clauses and Annexes of 10646-1:2000.
19. References to relevant clauses and Annexes of 10646-2: 2001 have been added.
20. Refinements based on discussion at meeting M40 - 2001-04-02/05:
  - a) Section 3 on Character names was expanded.
  - b) Added a note about open collection identifiers when there is need to expand the ranges or add new ranges.
  - c) Section 9 on Relative Ordering of Characters was added with references to ISO/IEC 14651 and Unicode Collation Algorithm.
  - d) Under section B - General section of the proposal summary form, a new item 9 was added inviting more information regarding properties of the character(s) or script along with a condensed statement in section A.1.
  - e) Under technical justification section of the proposal summary form, a new question 9 was added along with a similar statement under A.1, renumbering questions 9,10, and 11 to 10, 11 and 12 respectively; new question 13 was added.

- f) Added a new section in Annex D, explaining the use of reserved positions in the gaps in a range of assigned code positions.
  - g) Removed WG 2 administrative portion from Annex E on collection identifier submissions.
  - h) Numbers for sub items under item 1 of WG 2 Evaluation Procedure were corrected and reordered.
  - i) Footnote for bullet 3 under H.7 was replaced with a parenthetical phrase.
  - j) New footnote was added for last bullet on font shifting under H.7.
  - k) Deleted the note about allowing use of USIs in a collection submission
  - l) 96x96 bit-mapped format has been removed as one of the acceptable formats for printing the standard or its amendments - in section A.1, item 5 and in the submission form Section B, item 6.
21. The first HTML version of this document has been created in July 2001. The broken links have been repaired since then.
22. The following changes are made in this version dated October 2003:
- a) The HTML version of this document is discontinued. Only .doc and .pdf versions are generated.
  - b) Changed all references to 10646-1 and 10646-2 to consolidated 10646 single part edition.
  - c) Item 3c is added to section 2.4.
  - d) Pointers to the roadmap annex from section 2 are removed.
  - e) Resolution M41.11 – Policy regarding acceptable changes to 10646 - is reproduced in Section 3.
  - f) Text referring to resolution M34.18 on documentation of collections spanning 10646-1 and 10646-2 has been deleted, in view of the consolidated edition of 10646: 2003.
  - g) Section 5.1 on 'Checking the status of a proposal' is added.
  - h) Section 10 on 'Referencing ISO/IEC 10646' is added.
  - i) Annex I on 'Guideline for handling of CJK unification and/or disunification error' is added.
  - j) Annex J on 'Guideline for correction of mapping table error is added.
  - k) Annex K on 'Levels of implementation in ISO/IEC 10646', giving a brief summary of the levels 1, 2 and 3 is added.
  - l) Annex L on 'Character-naming guidelines' (reproduced from the standard) is added.
  - m) Pointer to "where is my character" on the Unicode web site is added in section 1 and in Annex A.
  - n) Additional guideline paragraphs referencing TR15285 – Character Glyph Model, how to check the status of a proposal, and optional email ids of submitters and experts who were consulted, added in Annex A.
  - o) Added extracted clauses 4.12 and 4.14 into section A.1 for reference from proposal summary form.
  - p) Expanded item 3 in section B of summary form to a checklist.
  - q) Changed references from the standard to extracted annexes in P&P document for items 4 and 5 in section B. Updated reference to UCD.html in item 9.
  - r) Updated links in UCS work flow in Annex C.
  - s) Minor edits to section C items 6, 10 and 11 of proposal summary form.
  - t) Updated references list, removing entries that are no longer relevant and fixing changed hyper links.
23. The following changes are made in this version dated January 2005:
- a) Added a sentence at the end of section 4.1 noting that the USI definition includes unassigned code positions.
  - b) Reworded section 9 on Ordering of Characters to read better.
  - c) Reworded section 10 on referencing of ISO/IEC 10646.
  - d) Added new section on WG2 web site reflecting resolution on stable URL.
  - e) Reworded item 5 in Annex A.1 to reflect updated font requirements, and reflecting resolution on font policy. Also updated the footnote in table in section C.2 reflecting the need for quality fonts to create amendment text.
  - f) Expanded item 8 in Annex A.1 to reflect details regarding mapping information on CJK Compatibility Ideographs.
  - g) Added new item 9 requiring BiDi property information, renumbering current item 9 to 10.
  - h) Item c in B.1, changed ... name change causes ... ' to ... 'name causes ...'.
  - i) Removed reference in section C.3, to spread sheet on 'Status of Summary of WG2 work items', which has not been kept up to date.
  - j) Updated links in UCS work flow in Annex C.
  - k) Deleted section C.3 containing an example of names list.
  - l) Added a footnote regarding plane 3 in table showing allocation of planes in section D.1.
  - m) Added item í regarding stability of collections such as IICORE in Annex E.
  - n) Fixed errors in the Example collection in Annex E.
  - o) Added a sentence to the first paragraph in Annex G linking the annex to evaluation procedure 1b in the main body.
  - p) Reworded first paragraph in section H.8 in Annex H.
  - q) Reworded items a and b in Annex I.3 to read better.
  - r) Update Annex L, rule 4, to reflect changes from Amendment 1 to ISO/IEC 10646:2003.
  - s) Made a number of minor editorial changes and updated links in different sections of the document.
24. The following changes are made in this version dated September 2005:
- a) Added section D.4 pointing to ranges of code positions for Syntax characters.

- b) Added section F.5 on additional guiding principles for disunification of characters.
  - c) Added a new section on format used for IICORE collection 370 in Annex E.
  - d) Updated content of Annex L to reflect changes in the standard (Amendment 2 to 10646:2003)
  - e) Added more references to the reference list.
  - f) Added 'CJK ideograph' in the titles of Annexes I and J.
25. The following changes are made in this version dated October 2005:
- a) Added section C.3 Dealing with urgent requests.
  - b) Updated the links to different roadmap pages in section D.1 to align with latest roadmap snapshot document N2986.
  - c) Modified section F.5 Some additional guiding principles, based on discussion at M47.
  - d) Added section F.6 Criteria for disunification of combining diacritical marks
  - e) Added new section 12 on Case-Folding stability principle.
  - f) Updated Annex L to reflect disposition of comments on FDAM2, post M47
26. The following changes are made in this version dated March 2007:
- a) Edits to Annex D on roadmaps to align with and eliminating duplication with roadmaps.html page.
  - b) Delete contents of Annex K on Levels of Implementation, based on removing the question on Levels of implementation in the proposal summary form.
  - c) Updated part B of the proposal summary form in Annex A to remove question on Level of Implementation; updated material in Annex A (before section A.1) accordingly.
  - d) Added new section C.4, providing some guidelines to the national bodies on proposing new material as part of ballot comments.
  - e) Added hyperlinks to several references including to the Freely Available ISO/IEC 10646.
  - f) Now that 10646 is accessible on the web, deleted texts extracted from the standard in Annex L replacing with pointers to the standard.
27. The following changes are made in this version dated May 2008:
- a) Added text seeking input from experts from the user community and identifying them to ensure the input to WG2 is more stable.
  - b) Added criteria regarding using script-specific Dandas in Annex F on disunification criteria.
  - c) Added the corresponding input documents for these to the references list.
28. The following changes are made in this version dated November 2009:
- a) Added sections D.2.6 on Reserved code points for right-to-left scripts and D.2.7 on Reserved code points for 'default ignorable' characters based on resolution M55.35 (referencing document [N3675](#)).
  - b) Reworded question 5 in the Proposal Summary Form section B, related to fonts, based on resolution M55.35 (referencing document [N3709](#)). Also reworded first few lines in item 5 under section A.1 Submitter's Responsibilities to reflect the wording of Note 1 under q 5a from document [N3709](#).
29. The following changes are made in this version dated March 2011:
- a) Replaced text under section I.2 Guideline for "to be disunified" errors, to reflect Multi-column charts for unified CJK ideographs in the supplementary planes, per resolution M57.25 (referencing document [N3859](#)).
  - b) Changed sentence in q13 section C of the summary form to plural from mixed.
  - c) Updated reference to Unicode Character Database to TR44 changed from UCD.html
30. The following changes are made in this version dated January 2012 per resolution [M58.27](#) referencing document [N4049](#):
- a) Added new section 13
  - b) Added new item 12 in "Submitter's responsibilities" attached to the proposal summary form
  - c) Inserted 'or could be confused with' in Q 10 in Section C – Technical Justification, along with new item 13 in "Submitter's responsibilities"
  - d) Added a note pointing to dropping of 'Multiple-Octet' in the title of the standard, in 'Section 10 – Referencing ...'
  - e) Added new references and updated changed hyperlinks relevant to the above items.
31. The following changes are made in this version dated February 2014:
- a) Added in Annex L a new paragraph 'Guideline on spelling for English character names:' per resolution [M56.22](#). (Note this action item was missed during updates listed under 29 above).
  - b) Updated reference to ISO/IEC 10646 from 2003 to 2012 edition, in several sections.
  - c) Fixed broken link to document N3709 under references.

The ad hoc group on principles and procedures had different members over time. The current members of the ad hoc group are:

Messrs. V.S. Umamaheswaran (Current editor of this document), Mike Ksar; and Ken Whistler.

## References

Document numbers in the first column in the following table refer to WG 2 working documents (ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2/ Nxxxx), except where noted otherwise. For those documents for which a link is not given, you may try <http://www.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs>; some of the older documents are available only in paper form (contact the convener of JTC1/SC 2/WG 2 – Mr. Mike Ksar).

Doc. No.	Title	Author(s)	Date
N884	Concerning Future Allocations	Joe Becker/Rick McGowan, Unicode Inc.	1993-04-6
N946	Proposed principles and procedures for allocation of new characters and scripts	Davis /Hart /Lindberg	1993-11-03
N947	A proposed initial list of character allocations	Davis /Hart /Lindberg	1993-11-03
N995	10646-1 Proposed Draft Amendment 3 (section 9-a-i.3)	Mark Davis WG 2 Project Editor	1994-03-03
N1002	Comments on N 947 - Proposed categorization and allocation of characters	Japan (TKS)	1994-03-28
N1061	IRG Comments to WG 2 N 946 (Proposed Principles and Procedures for Allocation of New Character and Scripts)	IRG	1994-09-14
N1137	Handling of Defect Reports on Character Names	Ad hoc group on Principles and Procedures - Messrs. V.S. Umamaheswaran, Sven Thygesen, Peter Edberg	1995-01-27
N1218	Comments on Character Addition Proposal Summary Form ( <a href="#">N 1116</a> )	Japan - TKS	1995-05-03
<a href="#">N1464</a>	Guidance and Assistance in the Prioritization of the Allocation of Code Positions in ISO/IEC 10646	Sven Thygesen	1996-10-02
<a href="#">N1502</a>	Update of <a href="#">N1402</a> - Principles & Procedures of WG 2; <a href="#">N1502.xls</a> and .doc	Sven Thygesen	1997-01-24
<a href="#">N1724</a>	Formal criteria on disunification	US/Unicode - Asmus Freytag	1998-03-05
<a href="#">N1725</a>	Formal criteria for coding precomposed characters	Expert contribution - Asmus Freytag, Ken Whistler	1998-03-17
<a href="#">N1726</a>	Report of Ad Hoc on Collection Identifiers for Parts 1 and 2	Ad Hoc on Collection ID at M34	1998-03-18
<a href="#">N1735</a>	Request for Collection Identifier in ISO/IEC 10646	Ksar / Uma	1998-03-21
<a href="#">N1791</a>	Repertoire additions for 10646-1 - Cumulative List 7	Paterson	1998-06-08
<a href="#">N1876</a>	Proposed replacement text for Annex D of N1502, Principles and Procedures document	Uma + ad hoc	1998-09-20
<a href="#">N1877</a>	New Annex in Principles and Procedures document N1502 - Request for Collection Identifiers	Uma	1998-09-20
<a href="#">N1982</a>	Towards criteria for encoding symbols	Unicode Consortium/US Member Body (Asmus Freytag)	1997-02-27
<a href="#">N2176R</a>	Implications of Normalization on Character Encoding	Unicode Technical Committee	2000-03-06
<a href="#">N2230</a>	Proposal for Unique Sequence Identifiers (USI-s) and repertoire specifications including these USI-s	US national body (Author: V.S. Umamaheswaran)	2000-07-21
<a href="#">N2271</a>	Propose to amend two source code changes in BMP CJK Unified Ideographs block	Tseng, Shih-Shyeng, TCA	2000-09-15
<a href="#">N2576R</a>	Annex I for N2352R (Guideline for Handling of CJK Unification and/or Disunification Error)	T. L. Kobayashi, T.K. Sato, V.S. Umamaheswaran	2003-10-21
<a href="#">N2577</a>	Annex J for N2352R (Guideline for correction of mapping table error)	T. L. Kobayashi, T.K. Sato, V.S. Umamaheswaran	2003-09-02
<a href="#">N2687</a>	IRG #21 Summary report of IICore Ad Hoc Group	IRG Rapporteur	2003-11-20
<a href="#">N2987</a>	Proposed additions to P&P Document	US and UTC (ed: Uma)	2005-09-05
<a href="#">N3441</a>	Proposed additions to Principles and Procedures (N3102)	USNB	2008-04-14
<a href="#">N3457</a>	Criteria for the encoding of script-specific dandas	Unicode and USNB	2008-03-02
<a href="#">N3675</a>	Proposed Additions to Principles and Procedures document	Ad Hoc on P&P (ed by Umamaheswaran)	2009-09-14
<a href="#">N3709</a>	Proposed Change to Proposal Summary Form	Deborah Anderson	2009-10-28
<a href="#">N3832</a>	Spelling of character names in English	Deborah Anderson and Umamaheswaran	2010-04-22
<a href="#">N3859</a>	Revision text for Annex I of WG2 P&P	IRG Rapporteur	2010-06-28
<a href="#">N4049</a>	Proposed additions to WG2 principles and procedures and Proposal Summary Form	V.S. Umamaheswaran	2011-06-09

Doc. No.	Title	Author(s)	Date
<a href="#">WG 2 meeting minutes and resolutions</a>	Links to Minutes and Resolutions WG2 meetings	Mike Ksar, Convener	
<a href="#">WG2 document register</a>	The document register is linked from the WG2 home page	Mike Ksar, Convener	
ISO/IEC 10646: 2011	Universal Coded Character Set (UCS) – <a href="http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c051273_ISO_IEC_10646_2011(E).zip">http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c051273_ISO_IEC_10646_2011(E).zip</a> See WG2 document register for the latest Amendments to the 2003 edition	Michel Suignard, Project Editor	2011-03-15
ISO/IEC TR 15285	An Operational Model for Characters and Glyphs - <a href="http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c027163_ISO_IEC_TR_15285_1998(E).zip">http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c027163_ISO_IEC_TR_15285_1998(E).zip</a>	ISO Publicly Available Specifications	1998
ISO/IEC 14651	International string ordering and comparison – Method for comparing character strings and description of the common template tailorable ordering - <a href="http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c044872_ISO_IEC_14651_2007(E).zip">http://standards.iso.org/ittf/PubliclyAvailableStandards/c044872_ISO_IEC_14651_2007(E).zip</a>	ISO Publicly Available Specifications	2007
UAX 9	Bidirectional Algorithm UAX9 - <a href="http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr9/">http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr9/</a>	Unicode	
UTS 10	Unicode Collation Algorithm - UTS#10 – <a href="http://www.unicode.org/unicode/reports/tr10">http://www.unicode.org/unicode/reports/tr10</a>	Unicode	
UAX-15	Unicode Standard Annex #15 – <a href="http://www.unicode.org/unicode/reports/tr15">http://www.unicode.org/unicode/reports/tr15</a>	Unicode	
UAX-31	Unicode Standard Annex #31` - Identifier and Pattern Syntax <a href="http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/">http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/</a>	Unicode	
UTR 36	Unicode Security Considerations <a href="http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr36/">http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr36/</a>	Unicode	
Unicode Versions	Versions of the Unicode Standard: <a href="http://www.unicode.org/unicode/standard/versions/">http://www.unicode.org/unicode/standard/versions/</a>	Unicode	
Unicode Database	Unicode Character Database <a href="http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr44/">http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr44/</a>	Unicode	
Unicode Pipeline	Proposed Unicode Characters <a href="http://www.unicode.org/unicode/alloc/Pipeline.html">http://www.unicode.org/unicode/alloc/Pipeline.html</a>	Unicode	
Roadmaps	<a href="http://www.unicode.org/roadmaps/">http://www.unicode.org/roadmaps/</a>	Unicode	
w3c character model	Character Model for the World Wide Web: <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/charmod">http://www.w3.org/TR/charmod</a>	W3C i18N WG	
W3c-charreq	W3C Requirements for String Identity Matching and String Indexing - <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/WD-charreq">http://www.w3.org/TR/WD-charreq</a>	W3C i18N WG	
Open Type	<a href="http://www.microsoft.com/typography/tt/tt.htm">http://www.microsoft.com/typography/tt/tt.htm</a>		
Apple Type Services - AAT	<a href="http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Carbon/Reference/ATSUI_Reference/">http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Carbon/Reference/ATSUI_Reference/</a>		