

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set UCS

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/IRG N 1855

Date: 2012-10-20

Doc. Type:	Member body contribution
Title:	TCA's submission for the CJK extension F
Source:	TCA
Status:	Input to IRG
Action:	For review by the IRG and WG2
Distribution:	IRG Member Bodies and Ideographic Experts
No. of pages:	3
Appendixes	8 xsl files and 4 pdf files, see "2. Attached Documents" below.
Medium:	Electronic

1. Preface

In accordance with IRG N1870 Resolution M38.3 (CJK Extension F Project), TCA would like to propose 4,000 new ideographs that are not yet encoded in the UCS as the candidates for IRG Extension F Project. This document includes submission forms, list of proposed ideographs with source information and evidences in 4 parts of excel files.

2. Attached Documents

- a. for source information and evidences: IRGN1885_TCA_Submission_for_CJK-F_part-1.xls, -part-2.xls, -part-3.xls and -part-4.xls, and their pdf files.
- b. for attributes: IRGN1885_TCA_CJK-F_part-1(no-evidence).xsl, -part-2.xls, -part-3.xls and -part-4.xls.

A. Administrative

1. IRG Project Code:	Extension-F
2. Title:	TCA's Submission for CJK-F
3. Requester's region/country name:	TCA
4. Requester type (National Body/Individual)	National Body
5. Submission date:	2012/10/20
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs)	Unified Ideographs

If Compatibility, does requester 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.)	No
7. Request Type (Normal Request or Urgently Needed)	Normal Request
8. Choose one of the following:	
This is a complete proposal:	
(or) More information will be provided later:	✓ (IDS)

B. Technical – General

1. Number of ideographs in the proposal:	4,000
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 “bmp” files or TrueType font file)	128×128 bmp files
If ‘bmp’ files, their file names are the same as their Source IDs?	yes
If TrueType font, all proposed glyphs are put into BMP PUA area?	
If TrueType font, data for Source IDs vs. character codes are provided?	
3. Source IDs:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper Source ID (country/region code and less than 9 alphanumeric characters)?	yes
4. Evidence:	
a. Do all the proposed ideographs have the 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)	Excel

C. Technical - Checklist

Understandings of the Unification Checklist	
1. Has the requester read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and did the requester understand the unification policy?	yes

2. Has the requester read the “Unifiable Calligraphic Variations” (contact IRG technical editor through the Rapporteur for the latest one) and did the requester understand the unifiable variation examples?	yes
3. Has the requester read this P&P document and did the requester understand the 5% rule?	yes
Character-Glyph Duplication Checklist (http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm contains all the published ones and those under ballot)	
4. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the unified or compatibility ideographs of ISO/IEC	yes
If yes, which version of ISO/IEC 10646 did requester check?	10646:2012
5. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the ideographs in Amendments of current ISO/IEC 10646? (As of 2009, Amendment 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8 have CJK ideographs.)	no
If yes, which amendments did requester check?	
6. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the ideographs in the current IRG working sets or proposed amendments of ISO/IEC 10646? (As of 2009, PDAM 6 and PDAM 8 have CJK ideographs.)	no
If yes, which draft amendments did requester check?	
7. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with 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 did requester check?	CJK-E v8.1
8. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (Check Annex E of this document).	no
9. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs has similar ideograph(s) with the ideographs in the current standardized or working set mentioned above?	yes
10. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs has variant ideograph(s) with the ideographs in the current standardized or working set mentioned above?	yes
Attribute Data Checklist	
11. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the KangXi radical code, stroke count and first stroke?	yes
12. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in 簡化字總表) in the proposed ideographs?	no

If YES, does your proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in attribute data?

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

yes (within pdf files)

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

not yet, will provide later

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?

no, but they are available in [the Dictionary of Chinese variants](#).