

TO: UTC

FROM: Deborah Anderson, Ken Whistler, Roozbeh Pournader, and Liang Hai¹

SUBJECT: Recommendations to UTC #169 October 2021 on Script Proposals

DATE: October 1, 2021

The Script Ad Hoc group met on August 13, 16, 20, and September 10, 2021, in order to review proposals. The following represents feedback on proposals that were available when the group met.

Table of Contents

I. EUROPE	2
1 Latin.....	2
1a. Additional Latin Letters	2
1b. Capital Rams Horn.....	4
1c. Latin subscripts.....	4
1d. Legacy Malayalam (Latin phonetic characters).....	5
II. AFRICA.....	6
2 Egyptian Hieroglyphs	6
2a Format Control Characters.....	6
2b Thoughts on encoding of Egyptian Hieroglyphs	8
3 Kore Sebeli	9
III. MIDDLE EAST.....	10
4 Arabic	10
4a Arabic Allocation in SMP	10
4b Quranic Superscript Alef Motahafar	11
5 Proto-Cuneiform and Proto-Elamite	11
IV. SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA.....	12
6 Chisoi.....	12

¹ Also participating were Fred Brennan, Peter Constable, Craig Cornelius, Lorna Evans, Andrew Glass, Ned Holbrook, John Hudson, Richard Ishida, Cibu Johny, Frank van de Kasteelen, Jan Kučera, Norbert Lindenberg, Kamal Mansour, Lisa Moore, Roozbeh Pournader, Ken Whistler, Lawrence Wolf-Sonkin, and Ben Yang. The text for the comments and recommendations was based on notes taken by Debbie Anderson, Fred Brennan, Norbert Lindenberg, and Jan Kučera.

7 Devanagari	13
8 Old Turkic	13
9 Sunuwar	14
10 Syloti Nagri	14
11 Tulu / Tulu-Tigalari	15
11a. Tulu Documents from the Karnataka Tulu Academy	15
11b. Tulu-Tigalari proposal	16
V. SOUTHEAST ASIA, INDONESIA, AND OCEANIA	18
12 Kawi.....	18
13 Sundanese.....	19
VI. EAST ASIA	20
14 Khitan Small Script	20
VII. OTHER SCRIPTS	20
15 Klingon	20
VIII. SYMBOLS, PUNCTUATION, AND NOTATIONAL SYSTEMS	21
16 Siyaq (Diwani and Ottoman Siyaq).....	21
17 Southern Song Counting Rod Characters.....	21
IX. PUBLIC REVIEW FEEDBACK	22
X. OTHER TOPICS.....	23
18 Script status for Identifiers.....	23
XI. FEEDBACK NOT YET DISCUSSED.....	23

I. EUROPE

1 Latin

1a. Additional Latin Letters

Document: [L2/21-206](#) Proposal to encode additional Latin Letters for languages of Argentina, Canada, and the USA – Denis Moyogo Jacquerye

Comments: We reviewed this proposal for eight Latin characters that appear in orthographies in Argentina, Canada, and the U.S. Examples are provided.

The following summarizes the comments:
[General comments, including formatting]

- To provide more clarity for readers, we recommend sections 1 and 2 be re-organized, making the introduction more concise and moving details to separate sections that discuss each proposed character (with cross-references to the applicable figures).
- For each proposed character, add property data for UnicodeData.txt.
- Add page numbers.

[Comments on specific characters]

- For LATIN CAPITAL/SMALL PHARYNGEAL VOICED FRICATIVE, provide evidence that the existing character U+0242 LATIN SMALL LETTER GLOTTAL STOP could not work as the lowercase. The line of argument in L2/05-194R may not be applicable here. In [L2/05-194R](#) the issue was that there are both uni-cameral and bi-cameral writing systems using glottal stop characters, but using U+0294 (gc = LI) for both would be problematic because the glyph for the uni-cameral usage would more closely resemble the capital letter of bi-cameral usage, not the lowercase letter.
- For LATIN CAPITAL LETTER LAMBDA, use of U+2144 TURNED SANS-SERIF CAPITAL Y in the Letterlike Symbols block is not a good choice, since it has no casing relation to any other character. LATIN CAPITAL LETTER LAMBDA, which has slightly different forms in the examples, does not resemble the Greek capital lambda.
- Latin theta remains very controversial. One of the biggest concerns is that introducing Latin theta (etc.) would create a dual representation for linguists, who have been using Greek characters in their transcriptions, both in the IPA and Americanist traditions. If the International Phonetic Association were to support separate encoding, they need to acknowledge that encoding the new characters will create dual representation of data and this will impact linguists and their data. Introduction of a Latin theta may also have security implications, as it increases the potential spoofing and confusability issues for domain names and other identifiers.

In revising the document, provide arguments demonstrating how using Greek won't work, as well as the architectural issues involving case folding. Note that case folding should remain stable (see Case Folding Stability on the [Unicode Character Encoding Stability Policies](#) page). If Unicode added a lowercase version of an existing uppercase letter, we would need to case fold both to the previously encoded uppercase letter. This would inject some inconsistency in how case folding works in the Latin script, where all other case folding mappings map to the lowercase letter.

- If no new characters are approved for Latin theta (and lambda), an annotation could be added, indicating use of Greek letters in some Latin-based orthographies and phonetic transcriptions.
- In our opinion, the LATIN CAPITAL LAMBDA WITH STROKE would be a good candidate for encoding. Provide a separate proposal for this character (with the property values).
- MODIFIER LETTER SMALL Q has been approved and appears in [Unicode 14.0 as U+107A5](#), so it should be removed from this proposal. However, the details provided would be useful to capture in a separate FYI document.

Debbie Anderson has forwarded the above comments to the proposal author.

Recommendation: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

1b. Capital Rams Horn

Document: [L2/21-205](#) Proposal to add capital rams horn -- Denis Moyogo Jacquerye

Comments: We reviewed this proposal to add one character, LATIN CAPITAL RAMS HORN, which is an uppercase form of U+0264 LATIN SMALL LETTER RAMS HORN. It is used in Eastern Dan orthography of Côte d'Ivoire. The proposal cites various publications which use the orthography and provides ample examples of the upper- and lowercase forms of RAMS HORN.

The following comments were made:

- The character appears to be a good candidate for encoding. We recommend the proposal be revised and brought back to the Script Ad Hoc for a final review.
- Instead of U+A7F0, use the code point U+A7CB.
- Provide the property values for UnicodeData.txt for both the proposed character and for the lowercase U+0264 (since it will be changing because of the casing relationship).

Debbie Anderson has forwarded the above comments to the proposal author.

Recommendation: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

1c. Latin subscripts

Document: [L2/21-207](#) Unicode request for Latin subscript letters -- Kirk Miller

Comments: We reviewed this proposal for 17 Latin subscripts used in various phonetic traditions. An earlier version of this proposal ([L2/21-043](#)) was seen by the Script Ad Hoc, with comments in [L2/21-016R](#).

The following was noted during discussion:

- Provide more sources, preferably from at least two different authors and publishers.
- Check with Denis Moyogo Jacquerye, whose 2013 preliminary proposal ([L2/13-172](#)) proposed a number of subscripts used in dialectology. The 2013 proposal provided examples.
- In the proposal, cite the earlier version(s) posted in the document register and refer to any Script Ad Hoc recommendations. In the header, note "Replaces: [doc numbers of earlier posted versions]." This helps in tracking the development of the proposal.
- The comment on page 2 that letters in small type were typographic variants of subscripts needs bolstering. Demonstrate that the conventional practice of using both subscripts and small forms were used interchangeably for the same semantic purpose.

We recommend the author revise the proposal, taking the above comments into consideration.

Recommendations: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

1d. Legacy Malayalam (Latin phonetic characters)

Document: [L2/21-156](#) Unicode request for legacy Malayalam -- Kirk Miller

Comments: We reviewed this proposal for six Latin small letters with a left hook, used to represent retroflex consonants in Romanized Malayalam. The Script Ad Hoc saw an earlier version of this proposal.

The proposed letters appear in Scripture translations dating to the early 20th century, which are now part of a digitization project by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The characters were also used in IPA for a period of time. Capital letters are not used.

For full coverage, one might expect LATIN SMALL LETTER Z WITH LEFT HOOK, but a retroflex z is not part of the phonetic system for Malayalam, and no printed examples of its use in IPA have been found, so it is not proposed.

In the future, we recommend the author provide a chart showing the entire block, so the proposed characters can be seen in context.

Examples are provided and the location is acceptable. We recommend the six Latin characters for encoding.

Recommendations: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:

SAH-UTC169-R1: Accepts the following six characters for a future version of the standard:

1DF25 LATIN SMALL LETTER D WITH LEFT HOOK

1DF26 LATIN SMALL LETTER L WITH LEFT HOOK

1DF27 LATIN SMALL LETTER N WITH LEFT HOOK

1DF28 LATIN SMALL LETTER R WITH LEFT HOOK

1DF29 LATIN SMALL LETTER S WITH LEFT HOOK

1DF2A LATIN SMALL LETTER T WITH LEFT HOOK

(Reference [L2/21-156](#))

Action Item for Ken Whistler to update the Pipeline. (Reference [L2/21-156](#))

Action Item for Debbie Anderson and Kirk Miller to provide the font to Michel. (Reference [L2/21-156](#))

II. AFRICA

2 Egyptian Hieroglyphs

2a Format Control Characters

Document: [L2/21-208](#) Additional control characters for Ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic texts -- Glass et al.

Comments: We reviewed this proposal for additional control characters for Egyptian hieroglyphs.

Of the set of proposed control characters in Table 2 the following comments were made:

- **Middle Insertion:** A single middle insertion control is justified, in our opinion. A single character will be simpler and avoid a too-detailed requirement for graphic representation of text where the slight adjustment of a glyph does not have any significant difference in meaning.

Adding additional controls to more accurately match the presentation of an inscription (etc.) will introduce an equivalence problem for the text. Are both sequences (i.e., middle insertion and bottom insertion) equivalent or not? Different in presentation, but do they "mean" the same thing? Should they both be found in a search? Or not? Effectively, the more fine distinctions you bake into the text model, the more "spelling variants" you have introduced into the text processing and searching tasks.

- **Enclosures:** The set of four proposed format controls for enclosures was deemed reasonable. They will better represent text for Egyptologists, including those working with hieratic. The four include: EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPH BEGIN ENCLOSURE, EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPH END ENCLOSURE, EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPH BEGIN WALLED ENCLOSURE, EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPH END WALLED ENCLOSURE.

The addition of U+1342F EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPH V011D is justified. It fills the last available code point in the current Egyptian Hieroglyph block.

- **Mirroring:** While some concerns were raised about added equivalencies (i.e., U+13117 is mirrored version of U+13118), the group had consensus on encoding the mirroring control character. (Each time one creates another way to represent something, another potential equivalence is created that may or may not be recognized.) How will equivalencies be handled?
- **Rotation:** In our opinion, rotations should be specified by variation sequences. Because the rotated signs are semantically the same as unrotated signs, but differ in their presentation, they closely match what variation sequences were designed for. (See [FAQs on Variations Sequences](#))


Note: This topic was taken up with Egyptologists on September 8, 2021. At that meeting, the Egyptologists pushed back against the use of Variation Selectors for rotation, recommending a control character and a separate registration database. One concern from Egyptologists was about using a VS for a variant, in cases where the variant was rotated. However, sequences of multiple VSes cannot be combined or used additively; only <base + VS > ----> [particular glyph] is allowed. During the September 10, 2021, Script Ad Hoc meeting, the SAH recommended listing the variant shapes that need to be represented, then define a VS for each one (which could be a

rotated sign). This will require identifying the base characters and registering a VS for all the required variants, but it won't require "VS1" be defined as the rotated variant and "VS2" as being a variant.

Example: U+133DB (Y001). For 90 degree clockwise rotated version of Y001, one could register <133DB, VS1>. For an older version of Y001 that is not rotated, one could register <133DB, VS2> and an older version of Y001 that is rotated <133DB, VS3>.

- Brackets: The two Egyptian-specific brackets were considered acceptable by the group. Because they are Egyptian hieroglyph-specific, they should be moved from the Ancient Symbols block to Egyptian Hieroglyph Format Controls block. (The Egyptian Hieroglyph Format Controls block need not be limited to characters with General_Category=Cf property, but would be the logical place for these brackets and blanks [see below], which are being added to make the quadrat formation syntax work correctly, by using other format controls.)
 - o The names need to be vetted and will require a full set of properties, since they touch lots of properties, Bidi mirroring, etc.
- Blanks: The group agreed on two characters, with names potentially BLANK and HALF BLANK (rather than FULL BLANK and QUARTER BLANK).
 - o These should be moved from the Ancient Symbols block to Egyptian Hieroglyph Format Controls block.
 - o The names need to be vetted and will require a full set of properties. Another topic yet to be resolved involves searchability of the blanks.
- "Shading": This topic resulted in a long discussion, primarily as the distinction between plain text and what Egyptologists regard as necessary for display.

To identify uncertainty, the Script Ad Hoc was agreeable to sign shading, but not group shading, since it is difficult to know which text element is marked with uncertainty when appearing in a group layout. One option was to consider using the existing controls for positioning of the shade text element. Andrew Glass reported this approach won't work. In future discussions, the Script Ad Hoc group recommended having examples on shading (and other format controls) available to make clear the options.

- Michel Suignard requested clarity on how to handle the *hwt* rectangular enclosures, such as , in cases where signs appear inside the enclosure. The *hwt* enclosures are very productive, but the majority only contain a single sign. Should such *hwt* enclosures be handled as <*hwt* , INSERT AT MIDDLE, sign> or should they be handled with the cartouche/enclosure mechanism?

Example: For , which of the following sequences should be employed?

(a) < , INSERT AT MIDDLE control character,  >


(b) <O0006B, BEGIN ENCLOSURE, sign, END ENCLOSURE, O0006F >

The Script Ad Hoc group felt that the current cartouche enclosure solution (b, above) for *hwt* was preferred, because it would already be supported and doesn't require encoding additional base signs for the different *hwt* bases (with the box insert in each corner).

Andrew Glass will relay the comments above to the Egyptologists.

Note: The UTC will eventually need to go on record to formally extend the Egyptian Hieroglyph Format Controls block to add another column, hence to go from U+13430...U+1344F. The current Egyptian Hieroglyph Format Controls block has only 7 open slots.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

2b Thoughts on encoding of Egyptian Hieroglyphs

Document: [L2/21-190](#) Thoughts on the Unicode sign list of Ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs – Grotenhuis, Nederhof, Polis and Rosmorduc

Comments: We reviewed this document, which relays the viewpoints of the authors, who are Egyptologists, on the Unicode approach to encoding, as reflected in the currently encoded characters and in more recent proposals, such as [L2/20-068R](#) and [L2/21-108](#). The authors advocate relying on the work of the analysis and documentation of characters done by Thot Sign List before proposing them to Unicode.

In our view, the goal of Unicode is to provide a practical way for text to be represented, whether it is “correct” or “incorrect” in the view of scholars. Particular signs may have been created by an author, for example, but if they appear in a document or publication, they do exist and are worthy of being represented.

Offline, it was noted that several of the glyph errors in Table 2 of L2/21-190 have been corrected in Unicode 14.0.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

3 Kore Sebeli

Document: [L2/21-209](#) Proposal for the encoding of « KORE SEBELI » -- Mohamed Bentoura Bangoura et al.

Comments: We reviewed this revised proposal, which has been seen by the Script Ad Hoc in an earlier version ([L2/20-180](#)). Some of the comments made in the Script Ad Hoc recommendations [L2/21-016R](#) and [L2/20-169](#) have been addressed, but not all of them.

The following comments and questions were noted:

- Is the author of the proposal Mohamed Bentoura Bangoura, the creator of the script, or is it a joint proposal between Mohamed Bentoura Bangoura, Lucille Guigon and Mohamed Lamine Sylla?
- Provide examples of the script that are not from the creator or his student. Especially sought are printed materials (such as newspapers, books [in the script], and pamphlets).
- Answer those questions posed earlier by the SAH, but not yet answered, including:
 - o Why can't the inverted exclamation mark be unified with U+00A1 INVERTED EXCLAMATION MARK?
 - o Can the author provide statistics from a third-party, such as a governmental source, on the use of the script today, which shows its use as growing?
 - o The dots appear at an angle in the glyph for LETTER WE on the bottom of page 12, but in some handwritten examples, such as in figure 11, they appear horizontal: Is the angle important or is this just a feature of the font?
 - o Provide several examples of the division sign in use.
- Instead of "BASIS" in the character names, we recommend naming the base character after the vowel, with an annotation noting the character is used in the orthography only with combining marks, such as:
 - [glyph] CAPITAL LETTER VOWEL A
 - * used only with combining marks
- Please provide an analysis of the writing system as a whole, in particular explaining the function of the dots on letters. The current listing could be confusing; it shows consonants with dots (without explaining the function of the dots), and vowels without dots (but which expect the application of some dots). A justification for this approach would be required, so that in each case it is clear whether the dot should be treated as a separately encoded element, or not.
- Format:
 - o In section 5 "Bibliography and References," just list books and articles about the script. Are there any linguistic discussions on the script? If so, add them.
 - o Number the pages.

- o Identify who wrote the text in Figures 8, 14, and other figures in section 6.
- o Put the ISO proposal summary form at the end.

Fred Brennan has forwarded the above comments to the author(s).

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

III. MIDDLE EAST

4 Arabic

4a Arabic Allocation in SMP

Document: [L2/21-181](#) Allocating Arabic Extended-C in SMP and Arabic code point changes – Pournader

Comments: We reviewed this request for a new block of Arabic characters, Arabic Extended-C (U+10EC0..U+10EFF) to accommodate requests for Arabic characters that are expected in future. The document also recommends the remaining open Arabic slots on the BMP be reserved for modern non-technical characters. If this is agreed to, the document then recommended moving three Quranic characters that were approved at UTC meeting #168 July 2021 (168-C22) to the new block, and three pending characters also be moved to the new Arabic block. (The three pending characters have been discussed by the SAH but have not yet been recommended for approval: Western Cham mark, FEH WITH THREE DOTS POINTING DOWNWARDS ABOVE and NOON WITH TWO DOTS VERTICALLY ABOVE.)

The request for the new block and the recommended set of moves is reasonable in our opinion.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following dispositions:

SAH-UTC169-R2 Accepts: a new block allocation, Arabic Extended-C, with the range U+10EC0..U+10EFF. (Reference: L2/21-181)

SAH-UTC169-R3: Moves the following characters
U+0895 ARABIC SMALL LOW WORD SAKTA to U+10EFD
U+0896 ARABIC SMALL LOW WORD QASR to U+10EFE
U+0897 ARABIC SMALL LOW WORD MADDA to U+10EFF
(Reference: L2/21-181)

We also recommend the UTC make the following dispositions:

Action Item for Debbie Anderson and Ken Whistler to confirm that the Roadmap is updated with the new Arabic Extended-C block allocation (Reference: L2/21-181)

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to make ballot comment on ISO/IEC 10646:2020/Amd. 1 to move
U+0895 ARABIC SMALL LOW WORD SAKTA to U+10EFD
U+0896 ARABIC SMALL LOW WORD QASR to U+10EFE

U+0897 ARABIC SMALL LOW WORD MADDH to U+10EFF
and for the new Arabic Extended-C block (U+10EC0..U+10EFF).
(Reference: L2/21-181)

4b Quranic Superscript Alef Motahafar

Document: [L2/21-204](#) Proposal to encode Quranic Superscript Alef Motahafar used in Quran published in Libya -- Lateef Shaikh

Comments: We reviewed this proposal for one Arabic character that appears in a Quran from Libya: a *lam* with a superscript *alef*.

The character was referred to as X7 in [L2/19-306 on page 31](#) and mentioned earlier by Abudena in [L2/15-329](#) (characters #28 [ALDANI] ARABIC ALEF MOTHAFAR WITH LAM and #29 [ALDANI] ARABIC ALEF MOTHAFAR WITH LAM AND MADDH ABOVE).

L2/19-306 says:

Abudena, in L2/15-329, proposes two *lam-alef* ligature forms common in Northwest African orthographies (his characters 28 and 29), which are actually a ligature of *lam* with a superscript *alef*. Encoding these as an atomic ligature could be problematic, since each part can take a different harakat. But it's unclear if we should encode another combining superscript *alef* form or treat the whole thing as a ligature of U+0644 ARABIC LETTER LAM and U+0670 ARABIC LETTER SUPERScript ALEF.

More information is needed in order to understand the character better.

The following questions should be relayed to the proposal author:

- Does this “superscript” alef only occur with a *lam*?
- Cite the actual Arabic word transcribed in the character name as MOTAHAFAR.
- How does the superscript alef work with multiple diacritics in the context of [UTR #53](#) (that is, specify the order of the diacritics and provide details on how they interact as described in UTR #53)?

Recommendations: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Debbie Anderson: Relay comments in Section 4b of L2/21-174 to the author of L2/21-204 and send the proposal to Marijn van Putten for his comments.

5 Proto-Cuneiform and Proto-Elamite

Documents: [L2/21-185](#) Proto-Elamite: Comparison of Sign Images and Glyphs -- Anshuman Pandey
[L2/21-184](#) Proto-Cuneiform: Comparison of Sign Images and Glyphs -- Anshuman Pandey

Comments: We reviewed these two documents, which compared the reference glyphs from the Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative (CDLI) in .eps form versus a font that was created for proposal work. The font shows some errors, which are pointed out in the documents.

The SAH would like Anshuman Pandey to revise the document, adding a column containing his glyph improvements. This suggestion has been forwarded to Anshuman Pandey.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes these documents but takes no further action.

IV. SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA

6 Chisoi

Document: [L2/21-183](#) Proposal to Encode Chisoi in the Universal Character Set – Biswajit Mandal

Comments: We reviewed this proposal for the Chisoi script, which is an alphabet used to write the Kudmali (Kurmali) language (ISO 639-3: kyw), spoken in the eastern states of Assam, Jharkhand, West Bengal and Odisha, India, and, according to the proposal author, Bangladesh and Nepal. The language is currently written in Devanagari, Bengali, Odia and Chisoi. Chisoi was invented in 1986 by Jayanta Kumar Mahata.

The following comments were made:

- Explain the origin of the name Chisoi for the script (since the language is called Kurmali).
- This script does not require an Indic encoding model. Hence CHISOI SIGN ANUSVARA should have canonical combining class 230.
- CHISOI SIGN VIRAMA does not behave as a traditional virama, so another name would be more appropriate. We recommend CHISOI SIGN SISO (or SISA?) to match its native name per transcription of “sis’ô.” Its ccc should be 220.
- CHISOI LETTER JARAH is transcribed as “jôṛô’hô,” so wouldn’t the spelling JARAHA be more accurate?
- Section 3.2: One member suggested the possible use of U+030A COMBINING RING ABOVE for anusvara.
- Section 3.3: The text says JARAH always is used after consonants, but it *does* appear in the backing store after a “virama” (i.e., <consonant, “virama,” anusvara>), but not in rendered text, so slight re-adjustment to the wording is needed regarding JARAH.
- Section 3.4.1 needs revision. Possible re-wording: “The ‘virama’ is used to represent a glottal stop phoneme when the final consonant of a word contains a ‘virama’ or in the sequence <consonant, ‘virama’, A>.” The wording in the section for “Virama with LETTER I” should also be revised to be clearer.
- Explain why the gap is left before the danda in the code chart.
- Formatting:
 - Renumber the figures: Re-check references to the figures. (For example, p. 2 refers to use of script in a newspaper and magazine in figure 20, but figure 20 is a logo of “Education for All.” The page 2 reference probably should refer to figures 10 and 11, which show the newspaper and/or figure 26, which shows the magazine referred to.)

- Put the entire list of letters and names on pages 3-4 onto one page. It was noted that the order in this list varies from that in figures 6, 7, and 11, where CA, JA, and PA come before ANUSVARA, YA, and DDA. If the list on pp. 3-4 is intended to reflect a traditional order, adjust the order to match that in figures 6, 7, and 11.

Recommendations: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Debbie Anderson: Relay comments in Section 6 of L2/21-174 to the author of L2/21-183.

7 Devanagari

New Block for Devanagari Extended-A

Comments: Due to an oversight, the July SAH recommendations missed recommending the UTC accept a new block allocation for Devanagari Extended-A block, which was mentioned in [section 7b of the July 2021 SAH Recommendations](#) (on Devanagari ‘bhale mīṇḍu’). Since block ranges are normative, a consensus from the UTC is needed.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

SAH-UTC169-R4: Accepts a new block, Devanagari Extended-A, with the range U+11B00..U+11B5F. (Reference: Section 7 of L2/21-174).

8 Old Turkic

Document: [L2/21-153](#) Proposal to revise the glyph of one Old Turkic character – Everson and West

Comments: We reviewed this request to revise the glyph for U+10C47 OLD TURKIC LETTER ORKHON OT, a character that only appears in one manuscript. The current glyph does not reflect its actual appearance in the manuscript, as shown in the examples provided. The original proposal, [L2/08-071](#), had cited only the glyph that appears in the code chart today.

We agree with this request to change the glyph.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

SAH-UTC169-R5: Accepts a glyph change for U+10C47 OLD TURKIC LETTER ORKHON OT as documented in L2/21-153 for correction in a future version of the standard.

We also recommend the following dispositions:

Action Item for Rick McGowan and the EdComm to issue a glyph erratum for U+10C47, based on L2/21-153.

Action Item for Debbie to ask Michael Everson for a font. (Reference L2/21-153)

9 Sunuwar

Document: [L2/21-157](#) Proposal to encode the Sunuwar script in Unicode -- Pandey

Comments: We reviewed this proposal for the Sunuwar script, used to write the Sunuwar language (ISO 639-3: suz), spoken in Nepal and Sikkim, India. Earlier versions of the proposal appeared with the name “Jenticha” (L2/10-466R and L2/11-218). It was noted that the language is written with Devanagari and to a lesser extent Sunuwar. A third script, Tikamuli, was created to write the Sunuwar language, but it is not used, according to the proposal. (The rationale for the name “Sunuwar” is described on pages 4-5.)

The following comments were made during discussion:

- The group was divided on how to represent the vowel-length mark, which resembles a colon. The MODIFIER LETTER TRIANGULAR COLON, recommended on page 9, doesn’t reflect the evidence. In our view, U+003A COLON (gc=Po) or alternatively U+A789 MODIFIER LETTER COLON (gc=Sk) could be used. U+003A is widely available in fonts, but U+A789 less generally available in fonts, though some orthographies use it. The proposal suggests MODIFIER LETTER TRIANGULAR COLON be used, and the font adjust the glyph so it is distinguished from the colon.
- The group did not agree that U+0310 COMBINING CANDRABINDU should be used to represent the nasal sign (*taslathenk*). Instead, a new character should be proposed, in our view, because of its nontraditional shape.
- The Sunuwar Welfare Society is recommending tone marks be used (section 7.3). The group did not reach consensus on whether generic diacritics should be used for the tone marks (and legacy diacritics in section 7.2), or whether script-specific signs should be proposed. The group did agree that clear guidelines are needed so script proposal authors know whether to use such generic diacritics, such as those in the U+0300 block, or script-specific characters.
- PVO should have gc=So on page 11; it is correct on page 12.

The above comments have been sent to the proposal author.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

10 Syloti Nagri

Document: [L2/21-187](#) Proposal to Encode Syloti Nagri Numerals – Mandal and Mowbray

Comments: We reviewed this revised version of [L2/21-140](#), with modified glyphs, a table comparing Syloti Nagri digits versus those in Bengali, Arabic, and “International Digits,” additional information and examples.

In our view, the evidence still relies heavily on examples from single sources or in limited-distribution—certain primers, calendars, or social media (Facebook)—rather than examples suggesting widespread usage. The evidence does not yet appear convincing. Additional evidence showing numbers in active usage is needed for the proposal to advance.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to send the comments in Section 10 of L2/21-174 to the proposal authors of L2/21-187.

11 Tulu / Tulu-Tigalari

11a. Tulu Documents from the Karnataka Tulu Academy

Documents:

[L2/21-213](#) Karnataka Tulu Academy - Unicode Reply -- Dr. Akashraj Jain, et al.

[L2/21-189](#) Tulu Lipi Parchaya (translation) – Dr. Radhakrishna Bellur

[L2/21-188](#) Tulu documents – Forwarded by Dr. Akashraj Jain, et al.. Karnataka Tulu Sahitya Academy

[L2/21-220](#) Comments on L2/21-213 Karnataka Tulu Academy – Unicode Reply – Vaishnavi Murthy

Comments: We reviewed three submissions from the Karnataka Tulu Academy, which is identified as a government body under the “Government of Karnataka.”

The first document from the Tulu Academy, [L2/21-213](#), is a reply to questions posed by the Script Ad Hoc in [L2/21-016](#). This document mentions that the characters “finalized” by the Karnataka Tulu Sahitya Academy have been approved by the Government of Karnataka.

The other documents include:

[L2/21-189](#) which is a translated copy of the book *Tuli Lipi Parichaya* (Tulu Script), giving the history and evolution of Tulu and an “explanation to the Tigalari script”;

[L2/21-188](#) which contains examples of glyphs from an updated font, with examples showing stacking (pages 1-100); pictures showing Tulu being used in public locations (pages 101-144); and a selection from a drama book written in Tulu script (pages 145-164).

Vaishnavi Murthy’s comments on the Karnataka Tulu Academy Unicode Reply ([L2/21-213](#)) are contained in [L2/21-220](#).

The following points were raised:

- While the Academy states in their “Unicode Reply” that they accept the name “Tulu-Tigalari” as proposed by Murthy/Rajan ([L2/21-086](#)), they disagree that Tulu and Tigalari are the same. A question that remains is how the Tulu script differs from the Tigalari script, identified by the Academy as a sister script? Murthy requested evidence showing the difference between the Tulu and Tigalari script based on actual manuscripts or inscriptions in [L2/21-220](#) (cf. [article](#) by Murthy on “Naming the Tulu-Tigalari Script”).
- The translated copy of *Tuli Lipi Parichaya* includes images of stone inscriptions (figures 1-24), though many are not very clear. Does the proposal by Murthy/Rajan cover the epigraphical texts shown here? (Their proposal [L2/21-210](#) has one stone inscription, figure 2.)
- The wide variety of examples of modern text usage in signs in [L2/21-188](#) (pages 101-144) requires, in our opinion, a re-examination of the situation of the two scripts. The Script Ad Hoc

had been supportive of moving forward with Tulu-Tigalari for historical use ([L2/21-073](#)), in part, because it is unclear whether modern Tulu use and orthography are stable. Do the signs also reflect instability of the characters?

- Note that there are many similar letters between the Academy's Tulu and Tulu-Tigalari, but some letters are used differently: long vowels in Tulu-Tigalari, for example, are used for short vowels in the Academy Tulu.
- Are there schools teaching the (Academy) "Tulu" script to students today? If so, how many?
- According to the Academy, horizontal conjuncts would not be accepted by the native users. Are Murthy/Rajan agreeable to a joiner character used only for historic use?

Recommendations: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to forward questions and comments in Section 11a of L2/21-174 to Dr. Akashraj Jain of the Academy and Vaishnavi Murthy/Vinodh Rajan

11b. Tulu-Tigalari proposal

Document: [L2/21-210](#) Updated proposal to encode Tulu-Tigalari script in Unicode -- Vaishnavi Murthy and Vinodh Rajan

Related documents:

[L2/21-211](#) A list of common Tulu-Tigalari conjuncts – Murthy

[L2/21-212](#) Two letters of support for the Tulu-Tigalari proposal by Vaishnavi Murthy and Vinodh Rajan

Comments: We reviewed this revised proposal, which incorporated some comments made by Script Ad Hoc members.

8.1 PUSHPA

The glyph for the PUSHPA symbol is considered an eight-petalled lotus.

- Discuss the relation of *pushpa* to U+2055 FLOWER PUNCTUATION MARK, also known as *ful*, which was intended for use across Indic scripts. (See §II.1.4 of [L2/02-388](#) [Documentation in support for encoding Syloti Nagri in the BMP], and UTC consensus [95-C23](#) for background on U+2055). Should it be unified with U+2055 or separately encoded? Cf. U+1104D BRAHMI PUNCTUATION LOTUS, U+10A55 KHAROSHTHI PUNCTUATION LOTUS, U+111CD SHARADA SUTRA MARK. Vaishnavi Murthy mentioned that the different religious groups could use the marks for different things.
- The authors agreed to remove the character as they can propose it at a later point.

8.2 TIDDU

- *Tiddu* is a correction or insertion mark that usually appears between orthographical syllables, above or below the baseline. The character should be spacing and have the general category Po.
- Because this character can be used for Tulu-Tigalari and other scripts, we recommend it be encoded in the Supplemental Punctuation block at U+2E5E, the next available code point, with the name PLUS SIGN CARET. The proposal should specify that script=Common

- We recommend Tulu, Grantha, and Malayalam be added to the set of scripts in the ScriptExtensions property for this character.
- The glyph should not have the dotted circle, which is used for combining marks (general category of Mn or Mc).
- The *tiddu* merely encodes the glyph of the text critical mark, and doesn't participate in the complex shaping of orthographical syllables. A higher-level protocol should be used to provide complete rich text formatting for insertions marked by the *tiddu*.

VOWELS

- There was agreement on atomically encoding TULU-TIGALARI LETTER AI and TULU-TIGALARI LETTER AU, but no consensus on whether they should have canonical decompositions. Note that once characters are encoded with (or without) decompositions, they cannot be changed.

Different approaches were discussed:

1. Encode the independent vowels AI and AU as atomic characters with canonical decompositions.
2. Encode independent vowels AI and AU without canonical decompositions, but have a Do Not Use list, the practice followed generally by other Indic scripts. (Note that Tamil LETTER AU, as a special case, does have a decomposition.) However, it was noted that the Do Not Use list can be (and has been) neglected by implementers.

The danger of deviating from approach #2 is that users of other more widely used scripts (such as Malayalam, which is structurally similar) may ask for their script to be fixed, so it works in the same way. However, a script such as Malayalam has a large user community, so developers may try to implement the Do Not Use list, whereas a script such as Tulu-Tigalari has a very small user base, and is unlikely to get help from developers for anything beyond TUS's standard mechanisms like the canonical decomposition.

- The rare forms of the independent vowels letters II and UU (shown in pink on page 2) should be handled by sequences, with the exception of the vowel II glyph, which may be merely an occasional borrowing and which the authors agreed to remove from the proposal.
- The representative form of TIGALARI LETTER UU is shown on page 13 (and the left-hand column on page 2). The form with the extra loop is a common scribal variation.
- The direction of discussion seemed to be that TULU-TIGALARI VOWEL SIGN AI, VOWEL SIGN OO and VOWEL SIGN AU should be atomically encoded, VOWEL SIGN AI has no decomposition and VOWEL SIGN OO and VOWEL SIGN AU have canonical decomposition. However, the decomposition of vowels still requires further discussion.
- The proposal authors can update their proposal, but the UTC needs to make a decision about the decompositions.
- A document needs to be presented to the UTC that discusses the benefits and drawbacks of using canonical decompositions for some or all of the forms. What are the benefits and drawbacks of a Do Not Use table?

Cibu and Lawrence mentioned the Nisaba project, which has “visual normalization,” extending secondary equivalences that are often documented in the Do Not Use tables (see <https://github.com/google-research/nisaba> ; https://github.com/google-research/nisaba/tree/main/nisaba/scripts/brahmic#visual-norm-visual_norm)

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Peter Constable to work on a document for the UTC discussing the pros and cons of decomposition for the vowels. (Reference: Section 11b of L2/21-174)

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to forward the comments in Section 11b of L2/21-174 to the proposal authors of L2/21-210.

V. SOUTHEAST ASIA, INDONESIA, AND OCEANIA

12 Kawi

Documents:

[L2/21-176](#) Proposal to Unencode KAWI VOWEL SIGN VOCALIC L -- M. Mahali Syarifuddin

[L2/21-180](#) Note on Kawi Sign Vocalic L U+11F3C and Possible Cognate of U+1B00 -- Aditya Bayu Perdana, Ilham Nurwansah

Reference document:

[L2/20-284](#) Proposal to encode Kawi -- Aditya Bayu Perdana, Ilham Nurwansah

Comments: We reviewed the two documents on KAWI VOWEL SIGN VOCALIC L. We agree with Mahali Syarifuddin's and Bayu's recommendation to remove U+11F3C KAWI VOWEL SIGN VOCALIC L from the set of Kawi characters approved for the Standard, as the character is attested only once and it's not entirely clear whether it's a vowel sign or a conjunct form.

We appreciate the information about a possible Kawi cognate of U+1B00 BALINESE SIGN ULU RICEM.

A separate pending issue for Kawi is the name of the conjunct-forming character. During an earlier discussion of Tulu-Tigalari we recognized that CONJOINER is a more appropriate name than SUBJOINER for scripts that have pre- or post-base conjunct forms in addition to subjoined forms (see [L2/21-073 page 10](#)). This requires a UTC decision, but no separate document.

Recommendation: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:

SAH-UTC169-R6: Accepts the following changes:

1. Removes U+11F3C KAWI VOWEL SIGN VOCALIC L.
2. Renames U+11F42 KAWI SUBJOINER to KAWI CONJOINER.

(Reference: Section 12 of L2/21-174)

We also recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Debbie Anderson: Make a ballot comment on ISO/IEC 10646:2020/Amd. 1 to remove U+11F3C KAWI VOWEL SIGN VOCALIC L and change the name of U+11F42 KAWI SUBJOINER to KAWI CONJOINER.

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to send L2/21-176 and L2/21-180 for posting in WG2 document register.

Action Item for Ken Whistler to update the Pipeline, noting the character removal and name change (Reference: Section 12 of L2/21-174)

13 Sundanese

Document: [L2/21-221](#) Wrong Identities of Three Historical Sundanese Character -- Ilham Nurwansah

Comments: We reviewed this document which provided a thorough discussion of three Sundanese characters for which the original proposal ([L2/09-251R](#)) referred to incomplete, outdated, or erroneous information.

The following points were raised during discussion:

- For U+1BBA SUNDANESE AVAGRAHA, we agree with the document's recommendation to add the informative name alias "= gemination mark."
- For U+1BBD SUNDANESE LETTER BHA, it appears that scholars no longer consider "bha" a correct reading of the character used in the Kawali inscriptions, and instead agree that the correct reading is "i." Ilham confirmed that this is the case. It therefore seems more appropriate to add a formal name alias SUNDANESE LETTER ARCHAIC I (a SUNDANESE LETTER I is already encoded at U+1B84).
- For U+1BBF SUNDANESE LETTER FINAL M, if the character is deprecated, a note recommending correct usage should be added: "1B99 1BAA should be used instead." However, this character should not be deprecated, because it was used – even if in error – in "Direktori Aksara Sunda untuk Unicode." This situation is similar to that of many Chinese characters that occur only as one-offs in historic dictionaries. Instead of deprecation, the reference glyph of this character should be updated to reflect the one used in "Direktori" (with representative glyph as shown on page 2 of L2/21-221 and informative notes be added.

Recommendations: We recommend that the UTC make the following dispositions:

SAH-UTC169-R7: Adds a formal name alias of type correction for U+1BBD SUNDANESE LETTER BHA. The formal name alias will be SUNDANESE LETTER ARCHAIC I. (Reference: L2/21-221)

SAH-UTC169-R8: Changes the representative glyph for U+1BBF SUNDANESE LETTER FINAL M as shown on page 2 of L2/21-221 to reflect the one used in "Direktori Aksara Sunda untuk Unicode." (Reference: L2/21-221)

We also recommend that the UTC make the following dispositions:

Action Item for Ken Whistler and the Editorial Committee: Add an informative name alias "= gemination mark" to 1BBA SUNDANESE AVAGRAHA, add the annotations "used in a 21st century document" and "for actual final m, use 1B99 1BAA" to U+1BBF SUNDANESE LETTER FINAL M. (Reference: L2/21-221)

Action Item for Norbert Lindenberg and the Editorial Committee: Make modifications to Section 17.7 Sundanese of the Core Spec, based on Section 2.3 of L2/21-221.

VI. EAST ASIA

14 Khitan Small Script

Document: [L2/21-182](#) Request to modify U+18CCA glyph in Khitan Small Script block – Chan et al.

Comments: We reviewed this request to change the glyph for U+18CCA, since in the charts U+18CCA and U+18BDE are identical. This request states that most sources do differentiate the characters, and five of the eight sources differentiate the glyphs. Andrew West, who was one of the authors of the proposal ([L2/156-245R](#)) agrees with the glyph change. Another co-author on the proposal however, Prof. Wu Yingzhe, considers the two characters unifiable, a position shared by Dr. Peng Daruhan.

Despite some disagreement, we agree that a glyph update is acceptable. An erratum notice should be issued however, and the names list updated to make sure there is a cross-reference between U+18CCA and U+18BDE.

Recommendations: The Script Ad Hoc recommends to the UTC the following disposition:

SAH-UTC169-R10: Accepts a glyph change for U+18CCA KHITAN SMALL SCRIPT CHARACTER-18CCA as documented in L2/21-182 for correction in a future version of the standard.

We also recommend the UTC make the following dispositions:

Action Item for Rick McGowan and the EdComm to issue a glyph erratum for U+18CCA based on L2/21-182.

Action Item for Ken Whistler and the EdComm to add a cross-reference between U+18CCA and U+18BDE. (Reference: L2/21-182)

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to ask Eiso Chan for a font. (Reference: L2/21-182)

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to make sure L2/21-182 has been posted in the WG2 document register. (Reference: L2/21-182)

VII. OTHER SCRIPTS

15 Klingon

Document: [L2/21-155](#) Request to Remove Klingon from the “Not on the Roadmap” List -- Mark Shoulson

Comments: We reviewed this document which requested the UTC rescind the motion [87-M3](#) in which Klingon was rejected for encoding and appeared on the [Archive of Notices of Non-Approval](#).

In our view, the UTC *could* reconsider moving Klingon off the list of non-approved scripts, but only after a document that satisfactorily addresses the IP claims and encoding issues mentioned in Section 25 of the Script Ad Hoc recommendations from July 2020 ([L2/20-169](#)).

Debbie Anderson has forwarded the comments above to the proposal author.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

VIII. SYMBOLS, PUNCTUATION, AND NOTATIONAL SYSTEMS

16 Siyaq (Diwani and Ottoman Siyaq)

Document: [L2/21-186](#) Proposal to unify the Diwani Siyaq numerals with the Ottoman Siyaq numerals.pdf -- Eduardo Marín Silva

Comments: We reviewed this suggestion that Diwani and Ottoman Siyaq be unified, and considered stylistic variants of one another.

The author is encouraged to review relevant documents in the Unicode document register which have taken up the topic:

[L2/15-340](#) Unification of ‘Diwani’ and ‘Ottoman’ Siyaq Numbers – Pandey,

[L2/16-017](#) Proposal to Encode Arabic Siyaq Numbers in Unicode,

[L2/16-116](#) Comments on Proposal for Diwani/Ottoman Siyaq Unification (L2/15–340)

[L2/16-156](#) Recommendations to UTC #147 May 2016 on Script Proposals (p. 15).

An informed decision on any future action will require more information, but the document provides no new information.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Rick McGowan to forward comments from Section 16 of L2/21-174 to the proposal author of L2/21-186.

17 Southern Song Counting Rod Characters

The UTC approved five Southern Song counting rod characters (U+1D379..U+1D37D) in August 2017 meeting #152, based on [L2/17-187R](#). In 2019, TAO Yang (Chinese Characters Repertoire group) recommended the characters (properly “Suzhou numerals”) be removed until more comprehensive and systematic research could be done ([N5071](#) = [L2/19-225](#)).

WG2 agreed to (and SC2 accepted) the request to remove the characters from the CD2 of the 6th edition of ISO 10646 ballot (WG2 [N5054](#) and SC2 N4686). In the meantime, these characters have been carried forward on the Pipeline but not included in a published Unicode release, and have been removed from ISO ballots.

In our opinion, the UTC should rescind the approval for the five characters ([152-C14](#)), until a full, more comprehensive study can be done.

Recommendation: We recommend that the UTC make the following disposition:

SAH-UTC169-R11: Rescinds the following characters:

1D379 SOUTHERN SONG COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT FOUR

1D37A SOUTHERN SONG COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT FIVE

1D37B SOUTHERN SONG COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT NINE

1D37C SOUTHERN SONG COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT FIVE

1D37D SOUTHERN SONG COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT NINE

We also recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Ken Whistler to update the Pipeline. (Reference: Section 17 of L2/21-174)

IX. PUBLIC REVIEW FEEDBACK

Document: [L2/21-169](#) Comments on Public Review Issues

Date/Time: Mon Aug 2 10:58:51 CDT 2021

Name: Rod Lockwood

Report Type: Other Question, Problem, or Feedback

Opt Subject: Superscripted Ordinal Suffixes

Because you did not make a complete superscript set of the Latin alphabet, there is no way to create the superscripted ordinal suffixes *st*, *nd*, *rd*, or *th* without changing the font.

Comments: We reviewed this feedback from a submitter who claims he cannot create superscripted ordinal suffixes *st*, *nd*, *rd*, or *th* without changing the font, and suggests a complete superscript set of Latin characters is needed.

Typically, superscripted ordinal suffixes are handled as rich text, though support for them can vary between fonts. However, some users may be using superscript modifier letters in plain text to represent superscript ordinal suffixes, rather than relying on rich text options. Section 22.4 of *TUS* states: “the preferred means to encode superscripted letters or digits, such as “1st”...is by style or markup in rich text.”

Because superscript ordinal suffixes are not considered plain text, encoding additional superscript Latin characters is not necessary.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:

Action Item for Debbie Anderson to respond to submitter of the feedback dated Aug. 2 2021 in L2/21-169 (Reference: Section IX of L2/21-174)

X. OTHER TOPICS

18 Script status for Identifiers

Document: [L2/21-030R2](#) Changing Script Status for Identifier Use -- Asmus Freytag

Related document: [L2/20-164](#) Identifier_Status of Limited_Use scripts in UTS #39 -- Goregaokar

Comments: This document by Asmus Freytag discusses how scripts should be classified for identifier types in [UTS #39](#), based on the definitions in [UAX #31](#). The document outlines various factors in deciding which scripts should be “Recommended” (“widespread common everyday use”), as opposed to “Limited_Use” and “Excluded” for scripts with hardly any living native users. A concern is the potential harm posed by allowing a script be “Recommended” when it poses serious security issues in identifiers.

The topic arose after a request from the Indonesian domain name registrar PANDI was received in 2020 (see [L2/21-012, page 3](#)), asking for Javanese to be changed from “Limited_Use” to “Recommended.”

Discussion of L2/21-030R2 request raised the following questions:

- What criteria are being used for deciding the classification “Recommended” vs. “Limited_Use”?
- What process is in place for communities to request a change in identifier type? Most comments will be from communities wanting to change from “Limited_Use” to “Recommended,” and the burden will be on the requestor to make a case for the change.
- Who will create the decision-making process to address the two questions above?

The SAH did not recommend specific actions or changes to L2/21-030R2, but did recognize that the process for deciding which scripts are “Recommended” (“vs. Limited_Use”) needs to be better rationalized.

Those interested are encouraged to read [UAX #39 \(section 3.1\)](#), where the path described is to start conservatively by identifying characters as “Restricted,” then allow additions as required.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC make the following disposition:
Notes this document but takes no further action.

XI. FEEDBACK NOT YET DISCUSSED

The following feedback items have not yet been discussed:

Feedback from Brian Sullendar dated Sept. 8 and Sept. 9 2021 ([L2/21-169](#) Comments on Public Review Issues)

Feedback from Eduardo Marín Silva on Old Hungarian proposal dated August. 30 2021