Source: Title:	Masahiro Sekiguchi Proposal to Reschedule to the Ext-C1 Development Plan
Actions required Distribution: Medium :	For discussion at IRG #23 IRG Members Electronic

Proposal to Reschedule the Ext-C1 Development Plan

An Expert's Contribution
Masahiro Sekiguchi

In the IRG Chengdu meeting, we agreed to finalize Ext-C1 draft during this Jeju meeting and to submit it to the WG2 Fujian meeting.   When we discussed the schedule, we assumed (or hoped) that we could make the draft sufficiently stable in time.

I have to say, however, that we failed to do so.

The following is my understanding of the current status of the Ext-C1:

- After the last IRG meeting, we got less-than-expected review feedbacks from member editors.
- Editorial group is now feeling that it is impossible to complete reviewing all comments against the latest D set.   It is doubtful that the group completes even the most important unify/not-unify comments only.
- Approx. 80 Ext-C1 characters out of 300 suspicious cases are considered to be duplicates with existing (CJK/A/B) characters, although no such characters should be included in C1 submission.   (See NOTE.)
- During the review, editors found that the current draft still needs several glyph changes and that it contained two new duplicates that have never been pointed out previously.
- Our review efforts have long focused on the D sets, and the E sets may not have been reviewed sufficiently.

Considering the above observation, I propose to give up the current target date and reschedule the Ext-C1 development as follows:

- I feel that we need at least two more full review cycles, i.e., two more IRG meetings, before finalizing the Ext-C1 draft.
- I want members to remember the "5% rule", i.e., "If a submission from a member contained more than 5% errors, the entire submission from the member should be postponed to C2 cycle."   We need to make clear when we apply this rule.   I propose apply it immediately after this meeting.
- The reference glyph is our primary source of review, so changing the glyph should be avoided.   I propose to set a glyph freeze deadline several weeks after this meeting, and if any needs for glyph change is recognized after the deadline, just drop that character from C1 cycle rather than correcting.
- Attributes should be reviewed and froze before evaluating unification issues, since one of the purpose we assign various attributes such as radical, first stroke, etc. is to make it easy to find duplicates.   It doesn't make sense to update those attribute after the set is fix.
Given that the purpose of such attributes are to help consolidation process, spending a lot of time to correct such attributes does not make sense.   So we should stop updating attributes after some deadline.   I propose to freeze attributes before the next IRG meeting.
- Current draft contains several characters that are believed to be "error or typo" and "only used as a part of a name of one particular person."   I don't want to simply introduce a big set of such characters into UCS.   I propose to organize a small group to discuss how to handle such characters in UCS. Before the group finds a good way, tentatively remove such characters from the C1 draft.

I know my proposal is somewhat radical, but I cannot find better way to make a stable C1 draft.   Comments or suggestions are welcome.

NOTE:

IRG Resolution M18.2 from Tokyo meeting reads:

> Submission for Ext. C will be divided into two categories, Ext. C1 which is for characters that are ***clearly not unifiable*** with SuperCJK, and Ext. C2 which is for characters that may be unifiable with SuperCJK or the application of the Unification Rules is debatable.

> (abridged)

> Criteria accepted by IRG:

> (abridged)

> 2. Unification Rules must be followed strictly for Ext. C1 submission (Please note that Source Code Separation is no longer applicable in

the current unification process). ***Characters which are questionable in respect of Unification Rules should be submitted in a separate set to Ext. C2***;

3. Characters should be fully checked against SuperCJK to eliminate duplication;

Editorial works discovered that the quality of C1 submissions were far from the above expectation...