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Chapter 1
Proposal

1.1 Acknowledgements
Thanks to Deborah Anderson, Roozbeh Pournader and all the other members of the Script Ad Hoc.

1.2 New character
After taking on board the advice of the Script Ad Hoc, I propose a new character be added:

• Ⓢ, U+1715, Tagalog Sign Pamudpod

The name pamudpod is correct. It is a loanword from Hanuno’o into Tagalog and is spelled identically in both language. My new proposed character is confusable with U+1734.

1.2.1 Property info

UnicodeData.txt: 1715;TAGALOG SIGN PAMUDPOD;Mc;9;L;;;;;N;;;;;"IndicSyllabicCategory.txt: Pure_Killer
IndicPositionalCategory.txt: Bottom_And_Right

1.2.2 Evidence
Evidence for my requested character can be found in L2/20-257 in the Unicode Document Register.

1.3 In re U+1734

U+1734, the Hanunoo Sign Pamudpod, should have its class changed to Mc and receive the same Indic data. It should be marked confusable with U+1715.

1.4 New proposed paragraph for Unicode Standard

I propose the following be added to ¶ Punctuation of chapter 17 §1 (Philippine Scripts) of The Unicode Standard:

“Prior to Unicode 14.0, U+1734, Hanunoo Sign Pamudpod was being incorrectly used by some for both the Tagalog and Hanuno’o scripts. In response to this, U+1715 Tagalog Sign Pamudpod was encoded. In Tagalog texts which call for a pamudpod, U+1715 is to be used. In Hanuno’o texts, U+1734.”
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2  
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS  
FOR ADDITIONS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646.¹
Please fill all the sections A, B and C below.  
See also http://std.dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2/WG2/docs/summaryform.html for latest Roadmaps.

A. Administrative

1. **Title:** Amended proposal to encode the Tagalog pamudpod

2. Requester’s name: Fredrick R. Brennan

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

4. Submission date: 3 October 2020

5. Requester’s reference (if applicable): Unicode Consortium Individual Member

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):  
   b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block:  

   Proposed name of script:  
   Name of the existing block: Tagalog

2. Number of characters in proposal: 1

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? Fredrick R. Brennan  
   b. Identify the party granting a license for use of the font by the editors (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.):  

   Google Inc. Font name is Noto Sans Tagalog, made for them by me (Brennan). It’s SIL OFL licensed.

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? Yes

7. Special encoding issues:  
   Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing (if applicable) such as input, presentation, sorting, searching, transliteration etc. (if yes please enclose information)? Yes  

   It’s a single new character with equal collation and transliteration to U+1714

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.

---

## 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?  
   | Norman de los Santos, subject-matter expert |
   | Yes |
   If YES, available relevant documents:  
   | Correspondence |

3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included?  
   | Yes |
   Reference:  
   | See L2/20-257 |

4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)  
   | Rare |
   Reference:  
   | |

5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?  
   If YES, where?  
   | Twitter, Facebook, etc. See L2/20-257 |
   | Yes |

6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?  
   | Yes |
   If YES, is a rationale provided?  
   | Yes |
   Reference:  
   | Tagalog block is in the BMP and has space |

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 |
   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?  
   | No |
   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?  
    | Yes |
    If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?  
    | Yes |
    Reference:  
    | All other scripts have different characters for their respective viramas. |

11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences?  
    | No |
    If YES, a rationale for such use provided?  
    | |
    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?  
    | |