Date: 2002-04-23

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC2/WG2/IRG
Ideographic Rapporteur Group

Source / Contribution Identifier: Japan

Meeting: IRG#19 @ Macao

Title: Comments on IRG N869

Keywords: (none)

Status: Member body contribution

Short Description: Comments on IRG N869 (Font Error (8 Ideograph) In SuperCJK).

Proposed Conclusion / Requested Action: To be discussed by editors

Arguments / Text of Contribution: See next page.

The contribution IRG N869 lists eight unified ideographs.   Its title suggests they are some sort of font errors.   However, most of the statements about errors are highly ambiguous and almost impossible to evaluate.

Japan wants the contribution to be re-submitted with clear indication about:

• What is problem?

• What exactly is the correct shape?   (Just referring to HYD index is insufficient for this purpose, since *hanyu da* is not a shared dictionary by editors.)

• Proof or justification of the statement.   (E.g., a reference to stable information such as a dictionary.)

The last two (000276EB and 0002890F) barely meet the criteria.   Japan's views to these are as follows:

• For 000276EB, Japan agrees the shape shown as 96x96 New Form is more similar to Kangxi than 96x96 Trad and 128x128.   However, Japan is uncertain whether the case is a simple font error, or it is yet another over unification.   Japan wants to hear from TCA what exactly is the shape of T7-2850. If it is just like the shape shown as 96x96 Trad, Japan prefers to keep the current 128x128 Form and to change the Kangxi index to 000276EB to an appropriate virtual value (1124.141, probably.)   If some IRG member wants to have KXI 11241.310 in UCS, we could add it as a separate character. (See below.)

• For 0002890F, Japan agrees the shape shown as 96x96 New Form is more similar to Kangxi than 96x96 trad.   Since the shape of 96x96 New and 96x96 Trad look simply unifiable, Japan sees no problem replacing the 128x128 to a more Kangxi-like shape.

Japan has another concern on issue.

IRG has just closed its enrollment to C1.   Japan is afraid of possible impact of this type of error correction to the Extension-C submission.   Theoretically, there should be no problem to replace a shape with another unifiable one.   However, replacing with non-unifiable shape can be critical. (Please consider the following scenario: An IRG member wanted one ideograph for Ext-C, the member found the shape was in Ext-B and dropped it from its submission, and later IRG changed the shape with something else...)

Errors should be somehow corrected, but we need careful discussion before changing font.

(END OF DOCUMENT)