**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 (WG2N4580)**

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS FOR ADDITIONS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646**

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


Please ensure you are using the latest Form from [http://std.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html](http://std.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html) for latest Roadmaps.

**A. Administrative**

1. Title: Proposal for CJK Unified Ideograph Extension F

2. Requester's name: IRG

3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution): Working Group under WG2

4. Submission date: 2014-08-18

5. Requester's reference (if applicable): IRGN2017 CJK_F1v3

6. Choose one of the following:

   - This is a complete proposal: Yes
   - More information will be provided later: No

**B. Technical – General**

1. Choose one of the following:
   - This proposal is for a new script (set of characters): No
   - The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block: Yes
     
     - Name of the existing block: CJK Unified Ideographs

2. Number of characters in proposal: 3803

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?
   - No

5. Fonts related:
   - Who will provide the appropriate computerized font to the Project Editor of 10646 for publishing the standard? IRG member bodies and related organizations
   - Identify the party granting a license for use of the font by the editors (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.):

6. References:
   - Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided? Yes, see attached excel file
   - Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached? No, but evidences were provided and reviewed in IRG before characters were accepted.

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)? 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](http://www.unicode.org) for such information on other scripts. Also see Unicode Character Database ([http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr44/](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.

---

### C. Technical - Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before?  
   **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.)?  
   **Yes**
   - If YES, with whom?  
     - All submitters are either national bodies or the regions official representatives approved by IRG.

3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included?  
   **No**
   - Reference: Evidence of use of these characters were reviewed by IRG at the time of submission for inclusion.

4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)  
   - Reference: Most of the characters come from historic literature and are not in wide use. However, some are for modern use in e-publishing and also some are personal names in current use (not historic persons). All can potentially be used.

5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?  
   **No**

6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?  
   **No**

7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?  
   **Yes**

8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence?  
   **No**

9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?  
   **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?  
    - **No**

11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences?  
    - **No**
    - Reference: Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided?

12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?  
    - **No**
    - If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary)

13. Does the proposal contain any ideographic compatibility characters?  
    - **No**
    - If YES, are the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic characters identified?

- Reference: Evidence of use of these characters were reviewed by IRG at the time of submission for inclusion.