Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
International Organization for Standardization

Doc Type: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG

Title: UNC Proposal for Two U-Source Ideographs

Source: The Unicode Consortium

Status: Liaison Contribution

Action: For consideration by IRG

Date: 2020-08-31

This is a proposal to encode two U-Source Ideographs, UTC-02993 and UTC-03009, as Urgently Needed Characters (UNCs).

Per IRG N2430R and IRG N2433R, which are a five-ideograph UNC proposal from Macao SAR and an overlapping single-ideograph UNC proposal from TCA, respectively, along with IRG N2437 (aka L2/20-203) that references both proposals, two of the five ideographs are included in IRG Working Set 2017 as U-Source ideographs. This completely overlapping UNC proposal simply provides the representive glyphs, attributes, and evidence for these two U-Source ideographs, which helps to bolster the UNC proposal from Macao SAR.

The table below provides the source references, representative glyphs, PUA code-point assignments in the *UTCHan.ttf* TrueType font that is used for code chart production, IDSes, *kRSUnicode* property values, and *kTotalStrokes* property values for these two U-Source ideographs, along with the corresponding M-Source from IRG N2430R and IRG N2437:

Source Reference	Glyph	PUA	IDS	kRSUnicode	kTotalStrokes	M-Source
UTC-02993	褧	U+F3B0	▨甫人氺	85.9	14	MC-00137
UTC-03009	塬	U+F3C0	▨士郎	32.9	12	MC-00139

NOTE #1: The IDS and *kTotalStrokes* property value as provided in IRG N2430R for MC-00137, ▨甫氽 and 13, are inaccurate, and should instead be specified as shown in the table above, specifically ▨甫人氺 and 14.

NOTE #2: Both ideographs are included in IRG Working Set 2017 as serial numbers 00746 (UTC-03009) and 02004 (UTC-02993), and should therefore be removed if these U-Source ideographs are accepted as UNCs.

NOTE #3: China is expected to prepare and submit a parallel UNC proposal, because they submitted the same two ideographs for IRG Working Set 2017 with the following G-Source source references: GDM-00085 (UTC-02993 & MC-00137) and GDM-00031 (UTC-03009 & MC-00139).

Evidence

The primary evidence for UTC-02993 and UTC-03009 come from China's SJ/T 11239-2001 standard as the ideographs in positions 35-92 (褰) and 21-68 (墔), respectively, the annotated excerpts of which are shown below:

The above evidence images, along with additional evidence images for these two U-Source ideographs, are provided as PDF attachments.

The attributes are also provided as a PDF attachment in the form of an Excel file.

That is all.

IRG Repertoire Submission Summary Form

A. Administrative

1. **IRG Project Code:**	IRG N2439
2. **Title:**	UNC Proposal for Two UTC-Source Ideographs
3. Submitter's Region/Country Name:	The Unicode Consortium
4. Submitter Type (National Body/Individual Contribution):	Liaison
5. Submission Date:	2020-08-31
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs)	Unified Ideographs
If Compatibility, does the submitter have the intention to register them as IVS (See UTS #37) with the IRG's approval? (Registration fee will not be charged if authorized by the IRG.)	N/A
7. Proposal Type (Normal Proposal or Urgently Needed)	Urgently Needed
8. Choose one of the following:	
This is a complete proposal	X
(or) More information will be provided later.	

B. Technical – General

1. Number of ideographs in the proposal:	*2*
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 Bitmap files or TrueType font file)	*TrueType*
If Bitmap files, are their file names the same as their source references?	*N/A*
If TrueType font file, are all the proposed glyphs put into BMP PUA area?	*Yes*
If TrueType font file, are data for source references vs. character codes provided?	*Yes*
3. Source references:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper source reference (member body/international consortium abbreviation followed by no more than 9 alphanumeric characters)?	Yes
4. Evidence:	
a. Do all the proposed ideographs have a separate evidence document which contains at least one scanned image of printed materials (preferably dictionaries)?	Yes
b. Do all the printed materials used for evidence provide enough information to track them by a third party (ISBN numbers, etc.)?	Yes
5. Attribute Data Format: (Excel file or CSV text)	*Excel File*

C. Technical - Checklist

Understanding of the Unification Principles

1. Has the submitter read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and does the submitter understand the unification principles? — *Yes*

2. Has the submitter read the "Unifiable Component Variations" (contact the IRG technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the latest version) and does the submitter understand the unifiable variation examples? — *Yes*

3. Has the submitter read the IRG PnP document and does the submitter understand the 5% Rule? — *Yes*

Character-Glyph Duplication (http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm contains all the published ones and those under ballot)

4. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the unified or compatibility ideographs of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? — *Yes*

   If the checking has been done against an earlier version of ISO/IEC 10646, please specify the version? (e.g. 10646:2012) — ISO/IEC 10646:2017

5. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the ideographs in the amendments, if any, of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? — *Yes*

   If yes, which amendment(s) has the submitter checked? — Amendments 1 and 2 (2019)

6. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the ideographs in the proposed amendments, if any, of ISO/IEC 10646? — *Yes*

   If yes, which draft amendment(s) has the submitter checked? — Extension G

7. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the ideographs in the current working M-set and D-set of the IRG? (Contact IRG chief editor and technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the newest list) — *Yes*

   If yes, which document(s) has the submitter checked? — IRG Working Set 2017

8. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (See Annex E of the IRG PnP document). — *Yes*

9. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any *similar ideographs* in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above? — *Yes*

10. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any *variant ideographs* in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above? — *Yes*

Attribute Data

11. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the Kangxi radical code and stroke count? — *Yes*

12. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in简化字總表) among the proposed ideographs? — *Yes*

   If yes, does the proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in the attribute data? — *Yes*

13. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in the attribute data? — *Yes*

14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in the attribute data? — *Yes*

   If no, how many proposed ideographs do not have the IDS?

15. If the answer to question 9 or 10 is yes, do the attribute data include any information on similar/variant ideographs for the proposed ideographs? — *Yes*

16. Do all the proposed ideographs contains the total stroke count(kTotalStrokes)? — *Yes*