

JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG

Date : 2014 - 05 - 19

IRGN 1989

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG

Ideographic Rapporteur Group

(IRG)

Source/Contribution Identifier : Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (HKSAR)

Meeting : 42nd IRG Meeting in Qingdao, China

Title : A Reminder of IRGN 1667 from HKSAR

Status : Member Submission

Action Required : For Discussion and Approval

A Reminder of IRGN 1667 from HKSAR

Background

At the 34th IRG meeting, we submitted a paper entitled “Request to Dis-unify H-9D73 with GS-224D under the Encoded Character U+4CA4” (IRGN 1667).

Action Required

Member bodies are invited to consider and support the dis-unification proposal put forward in the IRGN 1667.

End of document

Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)
From: Andrew West <andrewcwest@gmail.com>
Date: 19/3/2014 4:53 PM
To: Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com>
CC: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, Lu qin
<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, Jaemin Chung
<jaemin_chung@hotmail.com>, Michel Suignard
<michel@suignard.com>

On 19 March 2014 00:21, Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com> wrote:

> >

> > The other way to look at the simplified form of U+4CA4 is that it is part of the required portion of GB 18030, which also suggests encoding the traditional form (with an H source) elsewhere, either appended to the UR0 as a single-character UNC submission or thrown in with Extension F (F1).

I personally think that the sooner the mistaken unification is undone the better, so I would advocate adding the traditional form of U+4CA4 to the space at the end of the basic CJK Unified Ideographs block (i.e. at U+9FCD) at the earliest opportunity.

If the IRG meeting in May can agree to submit a document to WG2 in time for September's meeting in Sri Lanka then I would think that it could be put straight on the Amd. 2 ballot. Michel, what do you think?

Andrew

Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)
From: Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com>
Date: 2/4/2014 8:59 PM
To: Lu qin <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>
CC: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, Michel Suignard
<michel@suignard.com>, Andrew West <andrewcwest@gmail.com>,
Jaemin Chung <jaemin_chung@hotmail.com>, Cendy Li
<cendyli@ogcio.gov.hk>, "sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk"
<sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk>, "skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk"
<skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk>

Dr. Lu and others,

As a font developer, and someone who has frequent contact with font developers throughout East Asia, I can chime in (again) with some thoughts, some of which are repeated from previous emails in this discussion.

Anyway, from a "frequency of actual use" point of view, it is correct that the traditional form (as used in Hong Kong SCS) sees much more. Mr. Chen's search results were very predictable.

However, the number of GB 18030-compliant font implementations far outnumber the number of Hong Kong SCS implementation, probably by at least an order or magnitude. GB 18030 compliance represents a barrier to the China market, and this compliance entails support for all of Extension A. It doesn't matter about frequency of usage, but rather that the character is in Extension A.

In other words, it would be much more painful for the font industry if the simplified form would move. There is pain involved with moving the traditional form, but it is far less pain when you consider who would be affected by the process.

My vote would thus be to move the traditional form of U+4CA4, which corresponds to Hong Kong SCS 0x9D73, to U+9FD0.

Regards...

-- Ken

On Apr 2, 2014, at 3:03 AM, Lu qin <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk> wrote:

> > Dear Chen Zhuang,
> >

> > Thank you very much for your response. This is very helpful. Do let us know when you have more information. This might be an over-unification in the super CJK years.

> >

> > Best regards,

> >

> > Lu Qin

> >

> > On 2/4/2014 3:23 PM, chen-zhuang wrote:

>> >> Dear Dr. Lu,

>> >> I searched for U+4CA4 (𠂇) or "𠂇, simplified" on the internet. It seems like that the character is not used in mainland of China. But, the character is specified in GB 18030 which is an important standard, so I am not sure if it is used by some people. I'm asking my colleagues to give me information if they have.

>> >> We are really worrying about moving the simplified one to 9FCx. The character was specified in GB 18030-2000 and GB 18030-2005 (0x8234EB33). Some Chinese fonts vendors such as Founder Group, Jade Bird Huaguang have developed variants types of fonts and other softwares. Besides, lots of Japanese and US companies including Hitachi and Microsoft are following the standard when they are developing or selling products in China. I don't know if the change will impact these products.

>> >> Let me have more information in mainland of China.

>> >> Regards,

>> >> Chen Zhuang

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >> '2014-02-14 14:00' Lu qin<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>

>> >>

>> >> Dear Chen Zhuang,

>> >>

>> >> Can you give some feedback on this issue related to the dis-unification

>> >> issue. Michel needs your input before suggesting a solution.

>> >>
>> >> Thanks,
>> >>
>> >> Lu Qin
>> >>
>> >> On 1/4/2014 2:12 PM, Michel Suignard wrote:
>>> >>> Dear Chen Zhuang
>>> >>> I see you have taken actions on the other 3 UNC
characters on another email thread.
>>> >>>
>>> >>> However I'd like to have your opinion on the proposal to
'dis-unify' 4CA4 which was discussed in the same thread.
Especially important is the following consideration:
>>> >>> <<
>>>> >>>> When one considers the number of existing fonts that
include the simplified form at U+4CA4, they are all GB 18030
ones. The original source for U+4CA4 is Singapore, and the IRG
hasn't heard from them for years. So, from a practical point of
view, the simplified form of U+4CA4, though present in a larger
number of fonts, is not used very much. The Hong Kong form,
which uses the traditional form of the left-side radical, is
arguably in more common use, and can be referenced in an actual
national standard (Hong Kong SCS). It is clear that something
should be done, and the sooner it is done, the less painful it
will be, especially for the losing party.
>>>> >>>>
>>> >>> Clearly Hong Kong would prefer 4CA4 to go their way and
a new character to represent the simplified version, likely in
the 9FCx range along with the 3 UNCs (even though the simplified
version was encoded first in 4CA4). The other way (which Hong
Kong likes much less) is to keep the G source at 4CA4 as it is
and encode/move the H source in a new location (in 9FCx).
>>> >>>
>>> >>> I'd like to have your opinion in the matter. Eventually
the WG2 experts and SC2 National Bodies will decide through
ballot but I'd like to have a starting position as close to the
preferred options by the interested parties.
>>> >>>
>>> >>> Best regards,
>>> >>>
>>> >>> Michel
>>> >>>
>>> >>> -----Original Message-----
>>> >>> From: Lu qin [mailto:csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk]
>>> >>> Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2014 11:59 PM
>>> >>> To: Ken Lunde; Michel Suignard
>>> >>> Cc: Andrew West; chen-zhuang; Jaemin Chung; Cendy Li;

sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk; skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk

>>> >>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Dear Everyone,

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Sorry that I was absent from this discussion because I need to finish up

>>> >>> something this weekend. My opinion is that HKSARG had made a proposal

>>> >>> in IRGN1667 and it will stand for its position. I will advise HKSARG to make a new request with reference to the previous request for an urgent processing request. This document can then reach to all IRG members and also to Michel is the project editor. Michel can of course "tentatively" propose a solution to bring to the attention of WG2 members. This will then come back as a feedback "action" from Michel as input to IRG No. 42.

>>> >>>

>>> >>> I will assign the document number IRG N1989 to HKSARG for their immediate action. Once I receive that document, we can have the sequence of actions.

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Best regards,

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Lu Qin

>>> >>>

>>> >>>

>>> >>> On 20/3/2014 4:42 AM, Ken Lunde wrote:

>>>> >>>> Michel,

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Given the additional details that you provided, I completely agree

>>>> >>>> with your disagreeing with me about the timing. ;-)

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Your suggestion to include the additional character now goes along

>>>> >>>> with "the sooner the better and the less painful" approach. (In fact,

>>>> >>>> given the latitude that you wield, you might even consider going a

>>>> >>>> step further and stick in China's three UNCs, which would effectively

>>>> >>>> short-circuit the possibility of Extension F not being ready to submit

>>>> >>>> to WG2 after IRG #42.)

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Hopefully Dr. Lu and Mr Chen can chime in with some

form of agreement. In the end, it is an issue that primarily affects Hong Kong SAR in terms of actual usage, and secondarily China and Singapore in terms of history.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Regards...

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> -- Ken

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 1:32 PM, Michel Suignard
<michel@suignard.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>>> >>>>> Ken,

>>>>> >>>>> I disagree somewhat on the timing. Amd2 is going in pdam ballot in a month or two (I just need to make sure it is at least 3 months before next WG2 meeting late September. If we did endorse the dis-unification only in September for U+4CA4, that gives just one round of technical ballot (Amd2 is likely to go DAM2 ballot after September).

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> I'd rather put the new character now in amd2 with one option and let IRG #42 discuss about and give suggestions to its member bodies when they vote on amd2. That gives more time to come to a conclusion. When WG2 meets in September the encoding can always be reversed or even pulled out of amd2 if that's the group decision.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> Given the perceived urgency I'd rather make it visible sooner than later. At working group level, the project editor has much more latitude to put things in ballot that has been past habits in WG2. It is only the enquiry phase (DAM or DIS) that requires some formality and an explicit endorsement from SC2 members. With WG2 meeting less and less frequently it is important to use all the flexibility we have.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> However I would like to put the option that is likely to win in pdam2. That's why having opinion from our Chinese colleagues would be useful.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> Michel

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>>> >>>>> From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]

>>>>> >>>>> Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 12:15 PM

>>>>> >>>>> To: Michel Suignard

>>>>> >>>>> Cc: Andrew West; chen-zhuang; Lu qin; Jaemin Chung

>>>>> >>>>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>> >>>> Michel,

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> When one considers the number of existing fonts that include the simplified form at U+4CA4, they are all GB 18030 ones. The original source for U+4CA4 is Singapore, and the IRG hasn't heard from them for years. So, from a practical point of view, the simplified form of U+4CA4, though present in a larger number of fonts, is not used very much. The Hong Kong form, which uses the traditional form of the left-side radical, is arguably in more common use, and can be referenced in an actual national standard (Hong Kong SCS). It is clear that something should be done, and the sooner it is done, the less painful it will be, especially for the losing party.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> I agree that it is difficult to decide which should be moved and encoded elsewhere, but in the end, I think that the decision will be based on which character was there first.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Extension A became part of Unicode in Version 3.0 (09/1999), and the traditional form became part of Hong Kong SCS in its 2001 version, so the simplified form definitely got there first.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Given that the decision cannot happen until WG2 #63, and because IRG #42 takes place before then, I suggest that the IRG take this up and provide a recommendation to WG2.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Regards...

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> -- Ken

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 11:40 AM, Michel Suignard

<michel@suignard.com> wrote:

>>>> >>>>

>>>>> >>>>> My only concern is that some lose in that game.

All commercial fonts targeting Hong Kong will show the traditional shape for U+4CA4 for the foreseeable future. HKSAR had proposed in IRG N1667 to keep the traditional version at 4CA4 and encode the simplified version somewhere else which is the opposite of what is proposed here. At the same time, nothing prevents the HK fonts to show the same character at 4CA4 and 9FCD for a transitional period if we go the opposite way.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> It depends which entity is the biggest user of the current position at 4CA4. Is it GB or Big5? It'd be nice to have Lu Qin opinion. Obviously the original glyph in 4CA4 has always used the simplified radical so it is really in essence a faulty

unification decision from HKSAR when they did HKSCS.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> This was brought 4 years ago, why didn't anything happen until now? I can't find any mention of a decision in either minutes and resolutions of that meeting.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> Logistically it is breeze to bring this to an amendment (Amd 2 for now). I have a lot of latitude in bringing a character in a proposal (has been reaffirmed now several times in WG2). And all the information about sources and the fonts with the glyphs are available. I don't have to wait for September.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> So it is a really a matter to decide which way to go. I understand that going the HKSAR way would require a change in the RSUnicode value for 4CA4. I understand that so far that no one here is proposing to go for what IRG N1667 was proposing. I just want confirmation before proceeding.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> Michel

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>>> >>>>> From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]

>>>>> >>>>> Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 5:53 AM

>>>>> >>>>> To: Andrew West

>>>>> >>>>> Cc: chen-zhuang; Lu qin; Jaemin Chung; Michel Suignard

>>>>> >>>>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> +1

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 1:53 AM, Andrew West <andrewcwest@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> On 19 March 2014 00:21, Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com> wrote:

>>>>>>> >>>>>>> The other way to look at the simplified form of U+4CA4 is that it is part of the required portion of GB 18030, which also suggests encoding the traditional form (with an H source) elsewhere, either appended to the URO as a single-character UNC submission or thrown in with Extension F (F1).

>>>>>>> >>>>>>> I personally think that the sooner the mistaken unification is

>>>>>>> >>>>>>> undone the better, so I would advocate adding the traditional form

>>>>>>> >>>>>>> of U+4CA4 to the space at the end of the basic CJK Unified

>>>>>> >>>>>> Ideographs block (i.e. at U+9FCD) at the
earliest opportunity.
>>>>>> >>>>>>
>>>>>> >>>>>> If the IRG meeting in May can agree to submit a
document to WG2 in
>>>>>> >>>>>> time for September's meeting in Sri Lanka then I
would think that
>>>>>> >>>>>> it could be put straight on the Amd. 2 ballot.
Michel, what do you think?
>>>>>> >>>>>>
>>>>>> >>>>>> Andrew
> >

Subject: RE: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)
From: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>
Date: 3/4/2014 1:05 AM
To: Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com>, Lu qin
<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>
CC: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, Andrew West
<andrewcwest@gmail.com>, Jaemin Chung
<jaemin_chung@hotmail.com>, Cendy Li <cendyli@ogcio.gov.hk>,
"sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk" <sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk>,
"skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk" <skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk>

I am also thinking that it is wiser to do so (ie encode the traditional version in the 9Fxx range). It should be noted that I don't expect fonts designed for the HK market to change their glyph for 4CA4 even if we re-encode the same glyph in another range, at least short term. The transition will take a while. The new position is aimed at provided an unambiguous representation for the H source character. Today a document using 4CA4 will show a different character between HK and the rest of the CJK universe, which is not good.

There are 'errors' in the T fonts that are still there many years after the T sources were fixed in 10646. And I won't even approach Extension B.

Michel

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 2, 2014 6:00 AM
To: Lu qin
Cc: chen-zhuang; Michel Suignard; Andrew West; Jaemin Chung;
Cendy Li; sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk; skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk
Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

Dr. Lu and others,

As a font developer, and someone who has frequent contact with font developers throughout East Asia, I can chime in (again) with some thoughts, some of which are repeated from previous emails in this discussion.

Anyway, from a "frequency of actual use" point of view, it is correct that the traditional form (as used in Hong Kong SCS) sees much more. Mr. Chen's search results were very predictable.

However, the number of GB 18030-compliant font implementations

far outnumber the number of Hong Kong SCS implementation, probably by at least an order or magnitude. GB 18030 compliance represents a barrier to the China market, and this compliance entails support for all of Extension A. It doesn't matter about frequency of usage, but rather that the character is in Extension A.

In other words, it would be much more painful for the font industry if the simplified form would move. There is pain involved with moving the traditional form, but it is far less pain when you consider who would be affected by the process.

My vote would thus be to move the traditional form of U+4CA4, which corresponds to Hong Kong SCS 0x9D73, to U+9FD0.

Regards...

-- Ken

On Apr 2, 2014, at 3:03 AM, Lu qin <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk> wrote:

> > Dear Chen Zhuang,
> >
> > Thank you very much for your response. This is very helpful. Do let us know when you have more information. This might be an over-unification in the super CJK years.
> >
> > Best regards,
> >
> > Lu Qin
> >
> > On 2/4/2014 3:23 PM, chen-zhuang wrote:
>> >> Dear Dr. Lu,
>> >> I searched for U+4CA4 (𠄎) or "f@simplifiedf@+æΔ" on the internet. It seems like that the character is not used in mainland of China. But, the character is specified in GB 18030 which is an important standard, so I am not sure if it is used by some people. I'm asking my colleagues to give me information if they have.
>> >> We are really worrying about moving the simplified one to 9FCx. The character was specified in GB 18030-2000 and GB 18030-2005 (0x8234EB33). Some Chinese fonts vendors such as Founder Group, Jade Bird Huaguang have developed variants types of fonts and other softwares. Besides, lots of Japanese and US companies including Hitachi and Microsoft are following the standard when they are developing or selling products in China.

I don't know if the change will impact these products.

>> >> Let me have more information in mainland of China.

>> >> Regards,

>> >> Chen Zhuang

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >>

>> >> '/2014fí04'-02 14 ±00Σ÷f""Lu
qin"<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>-¥μíƒj

>> >>

>> >> Dear Chen Zhuang,

>> >>

>> >> Can you give some feedback on this issue related to the
>> >> dis-unification issue. Michel needs your input before
suggesting a solution.

>> >>

>> >> Thanks,

>> >>

>> >> Lu Qin

>> >>

>> >> On 1/4/2014 2:12 PM, Michel Suignard wrote:

>>> >>> Dear Chen Zhuang

>>> >>> I see you have taken actions on the other 3 UNC
characters on another email thread.

>>> >>>

>>> >>> However I'd like to have your opinion on the proposal to
'dis-unify' 4CA4 which was discussed in the same thread.

Especially important is the following consideration:

>>> >>> <<

>>>> >>>> When one considers the number of existing fonts that
include the simplified form at U+4CA4, they are all GB 18030
ones. The original source for U+4CA4 is Singapore, and the IRG
hasn't heard from them for years. So, from a practical point of
view, the simplified form of U+4CA4, though present in a larger
number of fonts, is not used very much. The Hong Kong form,
which uses the traditional form of the left-side radical, is
arguably in more common use, and can be referenced in an actual
national standard (Hong Kong SCS). It is clear that something
should be done, and the sooner it is done, the less painful it

will be, especially for the losing party.

>>>> >>>>

>>> >>> Clearly Hong Kong would prefer 4CA4 to go their way and a new character to represent the simplified version, likely in the 9FCx range along with the 3 UNCs (even though the simplified version was encoded first in 4CA4). The other way (which Hong Kong likes much less) is to keep the G source at 4CA4 as it is and encode/move the H source in a new location (in 9FCx).

>>> >>>

>>> >>> I'd like to have your opinion in the matter. Eventually the WG2 experts and SC2 National Bodies will decide through ballot but I'd like to have a starting position as close to the preferred options by the interested parties.

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Best regards,

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Michel

>>> >>>

>>> >>> -----Original Message-----

>>> >>> From: Lu qin [mailto:csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk]

>>> >>> Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2014 11:59 PM

>>> >>> To: Ken Lunde; Michel Suignard

>>> >>> Cc: Andrew West; chen-zhuang; Jaemin Chung; Cendy Li;

>>> >>> sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk; skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk

>>> >>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Dear Everyone,

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Sorry that I was absent from this discussion because I need to finish up

>>> >>> something this weekend. My opinion is that HKSARG had made a proposal

>>> >>> in IRGN1667 and it will stand for its position. I will advise HKSARG to make a new request with reference to the previous request for an urgent processing request. This document can then reach to all IRG members and also to Michel is the project editor. Michel can of course "tentatively" propose a solution to bring to the attention of WG2 members. This will then come back as a feedback "action" from Michel as input to IRG No. 42.

>>> >>>

>>> >>> I will assign the document number IRG N1989 to HKSARG for their immediate action. Once I receive that document, we can have the sequence of actions.

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Best regards,

>>> >>>

>>> >>> Lu Qin
>>> >>>
>>> >>>
>>> >>> On 20/3/2014 4:42 AM, Ken Lunde wrote:
>>>> >>>> Michel,
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Given the additional details that you provided, I
completely agree
>>>> >>>> with your disagreeing with me about the timing. ;-)
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Your suggestion to include the additional character
now goes along
>>>> >>>> with "the sooner the better and the less painful"
approach. (In
>>>> >>>> fact, given the latitude that you wield, you might
even consider
>>>> >>>> going a step further and stick in China's three UNCs,
which would
>>>> >>>> effectively short-circuit the possibility of Extension
F not being
>>>> >>>> ready to submit to WG2 after IRG #42.)
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Hopefully Dr. Lu and Mr Chen can chime in with some
form of agreement. In the end, it is an issue that primarily
affects Hong Kong SAR in terms of actual usage, and secondarily
China and Singapore in terms of history.
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> Regards...
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> -- Ken
>>>> >>>>
>>>> >>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 1:32 PM, Michel Suignard
<michel@suignard.com> wrote:
>>>> >>>>
>>>>> >>>>> Ken,
>>>>> >>>>> I disagree somewhat on the timing. Amd2 is going in
pdam ballot in a month or two (I just need to make sure it is at
least 3 months before next WG2 meeting late September. If we did
endorse the dis-unification only in September for U+4CA4, that
gives just one round of technical ballot (Amd2 is likely to go
DAM2 ballot after September).
>>>>> >>>>>
>>>>> >>>>> I'd rather put the new character now in amd2 with
one option and let IRG #42 discuss about and give suggestions to
its member bodies when they vote on amd2. That gives more time
to come to a conclusion. When WG2 meets in September the
encoding can always be reversed or even pulled out of amd2 if

that's the group decision.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Given the perceived urgency I'd rather make it visible sooner than later. At working group level, the project editor has much more latitude to put things in ballot that has been past habits in WG2. It is only the enquiry phase (DAM or DIS) that requires some formality and an explicit endorsement from SC2 members. With WG2 meeting less and less frequently it is important to use all the flexibility we have.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> However I would like to put the option that is likely to win in pdam2. That's why having opinion from our Chinese colleagues would be useful.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Michel

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>> >>>> From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]

>>>> >>>> Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 12:15 PM

>>>> >>>> To: Michel Suignard

>>>> >>>> Cc: Andrew West; chen-zhuang; Lu qin; Jaemin Chung

>>>> >>>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Michel,

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> When one considers the number of existing fonts that include the simplified form at U+4CA4, they are all GB 18030 ones. The original source for U+4CA4 is Singapore, and the IRG hasn't heard from them for years. So, from a practical point of view, the simplified form of U+4CA4, though present in a larger number of fonts, is not used very much. The Hong Kong form, which uses the traditional form of the left-side radical, is arguably in more common use, and can be referenced in an actual national standard (Hong Kong SCS). It is clear that something should be done, and the sooner it is done, the less painful it will be, especially for the losing party.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> I agree that it is difficult to decide which should be moved and encoded elsewhere, but in the end, I think that the decision will be based on which character was there first.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Extension A became part of Unicode in Version 3.0 (09/1999), and the traditional form became part of Hong Kong SCS in its 2001 version, so the simplified form definitely got there first.

>>>> >>>>

>>>> >>>> Given that the decision cannot happen until WG2 #63,

and because IRG #42 takes place before then, I suggest that the IRG take this up and provide a recommendation to WG2.

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> Regards...

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> -- Ken

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>> >>>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 11:40 AM, Michel Suignard
<michel@suignard.com> wrote:

>>>>> >>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> My only concern is that some lose in that game. All commercial fonts targeting Hong Kong will show the traditional shape for U+4CA4 for the foreseeable future. HKSAR had proposed in IRG N1667 to keep the traditional version at 4CA4 and encode the simplified version somewhere else which is the opposite of what is proposed here. At the same time, nothing prevents the HK fonts to show the same character at 4CA4 and 9FCD for a transitional period if we go the opposite way.

>>>>>> >>>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> It depends which entity is the biggest user of the current position at 4CA4. Is it GB or Big5? It'd be nice to have Lu Qin opinion. Obviously the original glyph in 4CA4 has always used the simplified radical so it is really in essence a faulty unification decision from HKSAR when they did HKSCS.

>>>>>> >>>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> This was brought 4 years ago, why didn't anything happen until now? I can't find any mention of a decision in either minutes and resolutions of that meeting.

>>>>>> >>>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> Logistically it is breeze to bring this to an amendment (Amd 2 for now). I have a lot of latitude in bringing a character in a proposal (has been reaffirmed now several times in WG2). And all the information about sources and the fonts with the glyphs are available. I don't have to wait for September.

>>>>>> >>>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> So it is a really a matter to decide which way to go. I understand that going the HKSAR way would require a change in the RSUnicode value for 4CA4. I understand that so far that no one here is proposing to go for what IRG N1667 was proposing. I just want confirmation before proceeding.

>>>>>> >>>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> Michel

>>>>>> >>>>>>

>>>>>> >>>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>>>> >>>>>> From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]

>>>>>> >>>>>> Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 5:53 AM

>>>>> >>>>> To: Andrew West
>>>>> >>>>> Cc: chen-zhuang; Lu qin; Jaemin Chung; Michel
Suignard
>>>>> >>>>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)
>>>>> >>>>>
>>>>> >>>>> +1
>>>>> >>>>>
>>>>> >>>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 1:53 AM, Andrew West
<andrewcwest@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>> >>>>>
>>>>>> >>>>>> On 19 March 2014 00:21, Ken Lunde
<lunde@adobe.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> The other way to look at the simplified form
of U+4CA4 is that it is part of the required portion of GB
18030, which also suggests encoding the traditional form (with
an H source) elsewhere, either appended to the URO as a single-
character UNC submission or thrown in with Extension F (F1).
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> I personally think that the sooner the mistaken
unification is
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> undone the better, so I would advocate adding
the traditional
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> form of U+4CA4 to the space at the end of the
basic CJK Unified
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> Ideographs block (i.e. at U+9FCD) at the
earliest opportunity.
>>>>>>> >>>>>>>
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> If the IRG meeting in May can agree to submit a
document to WG2
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> in time for September's meeting in Sri Lanka
then I would think
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> that it could be put straight on the Amd. 2
ballot. Michel, what do you think?
>>>>>>> >>>>>>>
>>>>>>> >>>>>>> Andrew
> >

Subject: Re:Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)
From: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>
Date: 8/4/2014 3:56 PM
To: "Lu qin" <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>
CC: "Michel Suignard" <michel@suignard.com>, kenlunde
<lunde@adobe.com>, "Andrew West" <andrewcwest@gmail.com>,
"Jaemin Chung" <jaemin_chung@hotmail.com>, "Cendy Li"
<cendyli@ogcio.gov.hk>, "sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk"
<sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk>, "skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk"
<skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk>

Dear colleagues,

I would like to support moving the traditional form of U+4CA4 (HK
glyph) to U+9Fxx. I got feedback in China, all said this.

Regards,

Chen Zhuang

‘/2014fí04’-03 09 ±45Σ÷f""Lu qin"<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>-
¥μ¿fj

Dear Everyone,
This might be the only solution. I have thought of other
solutions, but
none works better. China may not be using it, but GB18030 is
widely
implemented. I searched in the internet, other than a
number of
dictionaries(with reference to Unicode) and input method
table, this is
not a common character used in HK either. It is unfortunate
that when
inputting this character, the 4 dots/1 dot issue does not
come up. So,
from a cognitive process, people may not be as sensitive to
it.

Best regards,

Lu Qin

On 3/4/2014 1:05 AM, Michel Suignard wrote:

> I am also thinking that it is wiser to do so (ie encode the traditional version in the 9Fxx range). It should be noted that I don't expect fonts designed for the HK market to change their glyph for 4CA4 even if we re-encode the same glyph in another range, at least short term. The transition will take a while. The new position is aimed at provided an unambiguous representation for the H source character. Today a document using 4CA4 will show a different character between HK and the rest of the CJK universe, which is not good.

>

> There are 'errors' in the T fonts that are still there many years after the T sources were fixed in 10646. And I won't even approach Extension B.

>

> Michel

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]

> Sent: Wednesday, April 2, 2014 6:00 AM

> To: Lu qin

> Cc: chen-zhuang; Michel Suignard; Andrew West; Jaemin Chung; Cendy Li; sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk; skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk

> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>

> Dr. Lu and others,

>

> As a font developer, and someone who has frequent contact with font developers throughout East Asia, I can chime in (again) with some thoughts, some of which are repeated from previous emails in this discussion.

>

> Anyway, from a "frequency of actual use" point of view, it is correct that the traditional form (as used in Hong Kong SCS) sees much more. Mr. Chen's search results were very predictable.

>

> However, the number of GB 18030-compliant font implementations far outnumber the number of Hong Kong SCS implementation, probably by at least an order or magnitude. GB 18030 compliance represents a barrier to the China market, and this compliance entails support for all of Extension A. It doesn't matter about frequency of usage, but rather that the character is in Extension A.

>

> In other words, it would be much more painful for the font industry if the simplified form would move. There is pain

involved with moving the traditional form, but it is far less pain when you consider who would be affected by the process.

>

> My vote would thus be to move the traditional form of U+4CA4, which corresponds to Hong Kong SCS 0x9D73, to U+9FD0.

>

> Regards...

>

> -- Ken

>

> On Apr 2, 2014, at 3:03 AM, Lu qin
<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk> wrote:

>

>> Dear Chen Zhuang,

>>

>> Thank you very much for your response. This is very helpful. Do let us know when you have more information. This might be an over-unification in the super CJK years.

>>

>> Best regards,

>>

>> Lu Qin

>>

>> On 2/4/2014 3:23 PM, chen-zhuang wrote:

>>> Dear Dr. Lu,

>>> I searched for U+4CA4 (𠂇) or "𠂇", f@simpifiedf@+æΔ" on the internet. It seems like that the character is not used in mainland of China. But, the character is specified in GB 18030 which is an important standard, so I am not sure if it is used by some people. I'm asking my colleagues to give me information if they have.

>>> We are really worrying about moving the simplified one to 9FCx. The character was specified in GB 18030-2000 and GB 18030-2005 (0x8234EB33). Some Chinese fonts vendors such as Founder Group, Jade Bird Huaguang have developed variants types of fonts and other softwares. Besides, lots of Japanese and US companies including Hitachi and Microsoft are following the standard when they are developing or selling products in China. I don't know if the change will impact these products.

>>> Let me have more information in mainland of China.

>>> Regards,

>>> Chen Zhuang

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> '/2014fí04'~02 14 ±00Σ÷f""Lu
qin"<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>-¥μ¿fj
>>>
>>> Dear Chen Zhuang,
>>>
>>> Can you give some feedback on this issue related to the
>>> dis-unification issue. Michel needs your input before
suggesting a solution.
>>>
>>> Thanks,
>>>
>>> Lu Qin
>>>
>>> On 1/4/2014 2:12 PM, Michel Suignard wrote:
>>>> Dear Chen Zhuang
>>>> I see you have taken actions on the other 3 UNC
characters on another email thread.
>>>>
>>>> However I'd like to have your opinion on the proposal
to 'dis-unify' 4CA4 which was discussed in the same thread.
Especially important is the following consideration:
>>>> <<
>>>>> When one considers the number of existing fonts that
include the simplified form at U+4CA4, they are all GB 18030
ones. The original source for U+4CA4 is Singapore, and the IRG
hasn't heard from them for years. So, from a practical point of
view, the simplified form of U+4CA4, though present in a larger
number of fonts, is not used very much. The Hong Kong form,
which uses the traditional form of the left-side radical, is
arguably in more common use, and can be referenced in an actual
national standard (Hong Kong SCS). It is clear that something
should be done, and the sooner it is done, the less painful it
will be, especially for the losing party.
>>>>>
>>>> Clearly Hong Kong would prefer 4CA4 to go their way and
a new character to represent the simplified version, likely in
the 9FCx range along with the 3 UNCs (even though the simplified
version was encoded first in 4CA4). The other way (which Hong
Kong likes much less) is to keep the G source at 4CA4 as it is
and encode/move the H source in a new location (in 9FCx).
>>>>

>>>> I'd like to have your opinion in the matter. Eventually the WG2 experts and SC2 National Bodies will decide through ballot but I'd like to have a starting position as close to the preferred options by the interested parties.

>>>>

>>>> Best regards,

>>>>

>>>> Michel

>>>>

>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>> From: Lu qin [mailto:csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk]

>>>> Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2014 11:59 PM

>>>> To: Ken Lunde; Michel Suignard

>>>> Cc: Andrew West; chen-zhuang; Jaemin Chung; Cendy Li;

>>>> sckwong@ogcio.gov.hk; skhlaw@ogcio.gov.hk

>>>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>>>

>>>> Dear Everyone,

>>>>

>>>> Sorry that I was absent from this discussion because I need to finish up

>>>> something this weekend. My opinion is that HKSARG had made a proposal

>>>> in IRGN1667 and it will stand for its position. I will advise HKSARG to make a new request with reference to the previous request for an urgent processing request. This document can then reach to all IRG members and also to Michel is the project editor. Michel can of course "tentatively" propose a solution to bring to the attention of WG2 members. This will then come back as a feedback "action" from Michel as input to IRG No. 42.

>>>>

>>>> I will assign the document number IRG N1989 to HKSARG for their immediate action. Once I receive that document, we can have the sequence of actions.

>>>>

>>>> Best regards,

>>>>

>>>> Lu Qin

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> On 20/3/2014 4:42 AM, Ken Lunde wrote:

>>>>> Michel,

>>>>>

>>>>> Given the additional details that you provided, I completely agree

>>>>> with your disagreeing with me about the timing. ;-)

>>>>>
>>>>> Your suggestion to include the additional character
now goes along
>>>>> with "the sooner the better and the less painful"
approach. (In
>>>>> fact, given the latitude that you wield, you might
even consider
>>>>> going a step further and stick in China's three UNCs,
which would
>>>>> effectively short-circuit the possibility of Extension
F not being
>>>>> ready to submit to WG2 after IRG #42.)
>>>>>
>>>>> Hopefully Dr. Lu and Mr Chen can chime in with some
form of agreement. In the end, it is an issue that primarily
affects Hong Kong SAR in terms of actual usage, and secondarily
China and Singapore in terms of history.
>>>>>
>>>>> Regards...
>>>>>
>>>>> -- Ken
>>>>>
>>>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 1:32 PM, Michel Suignard
<michel@suignard.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Ken,
>>>>>> I disagree somewhat on the timing. Amd2 is going in
pdam ballot in a month or two (I just need to make sure it is at
least 3 months before next WG2 meeting late September. If we did
endorse the dis-unification only in September for U+4CA4, that
gives just one round of technical ballot (Amd2 is likely to go
DAM2 ballot after September).
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I'd rather put the new character now in amd2 with one
option and let IRG #42 discuss about and give suggestions to its
member bodies when they vote on amd2. That gives more time to
come to a conclusion. When WG2 meets in September the encoding
can always be reversed or even pulled out of amd2 if that's the
group decision.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Given the perceived urgency I'd rather make it
visible sooner than later. At working group level, the project
editor has much more latitude to put things in ballot that has
been past habits in WG2. It is only the enquiry phase (DAM or
DIS) that requires some formality and an explicit endorsement
from SC2 members. With WG2 meeting less and less frequently it
is important to use all the flexibility we have.

>>>>>
>>>>> However I would like to put the option that is likely to win in pdam2. That's why having opinion from our Chinese colleagues would be useful.

>>>>>

>>>>> Michel

>>>>>

>>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>>> From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]

>>>>> Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 12:15 PM

>>>>> To: Michel Suignard

>>>>> Cc: Andrew West; chen-zhuang; Lu qin; Jaemin Chung

>>>>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>>>>

>>>>> Michel,

>>>>>

>>>>> When one considers the number of existing fonts that include the simplified form at U+4CA4, they are all GB 18030 ones. The original source for U+4CA4 is Singapore, and the IRG hasn't heard from them for years. So, from a practical point of view, the simplified form of U+4CA4, though present in a larger number of fonts, is not used very much. The Hong Kong form, which uses the traditional form of the left-side radical, is arguably in more common use, and can be referenced in an actual national standard (Hong Kong SCS). It is clear that something should be done, and the sooner it is done, the less painful it will be, especially for the losing party.

>>>>>

>>>>> I agree that it is difficult to decide which should be moved and encoded elsewhere, but in the end, I think that the decision will be based on which character was there first.

>>>>>

>>>>> Extension A became part of Unicode in Version 3.0 (09/1999), and the traditional form became part of Hong Kong SCS in its 2001 version, so the simplified form definitely got there first.

>>>>>

>>>>> Given that the decision cannot happen until WG2 #63, and because IRG #42 takes place before then, I suggest that the IRG take this up and provide a recommendation to WG2.

>>>>>

>>>>> Regards...

>>>>>

>>>>> -- Ken

>>>>>

>>>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 11:40 AM, Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>> My only concern is that some lose in that game. All commercial fonts targeting Hong Kong will show the traditional shape for U+4CA4 for the foreseeable future. HKSAR had proposed in IRG N1667 to keep the traditional version at 4CA4 and encode the simplified version somewhere else which is the opposite of what is proposed here. At the same time, nothing prevents the HK fonts to show the same character at 4CA4 and 9FCD for a transitional period if we go the opposite way.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> It depends which entity is the biggest user of the current position at 4CA4. Is it GB or Big5? It'd be nice to have Lu Qin opinion. Obviously the original glyph in 4CA4 has always used the simplified radical so it is really in essence a faulty unification decision from HKSAR when they did HKSCS.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> This was brought 4 years ago, why didn't anything happen until now? I can't find any mention of a decision in either minutes and resolutions of that meeting.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Logistically it is breeze to bring this to an amendment (Amd 2 for now). I have a lot of latitude in bringing a character in a proposal (has been reaffirmed now several times in WG2). And all the information about sources and the fonts with the glyphs are available. I don't have to wait for September.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> So it is a really a matter to decide which way to go. I understand that going the HKSAR way would require a change in the RSUnicode value for 4CA4. I understand that so far that no one here is proposing to go for what IRG N1667 was proposing. I just want confirmation before proceeding.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Michel

>>>>>>

>>>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>>>> From: Ken Lunde [mailto:lunde@adobe.com]

>>>>>> Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 5:53 AM

>>>>>> To: Andrew West

>>>>>> Cc: chen-zhuang; Lu qin; Jaemin Chung; Michel

Suignard

>>>>>> Subject: Re: IRG N1667 (IRG #34)

>>>>>>

>>>>>> +1

>>>>>>

>>>>>> On Mar 19, 2014, at 1:53 AM, Andrew West
<andrewcwest@gmail.com> wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> On 19 March 2014 00:21, Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com>
wrote:

>>>>>>> The other way to look at the simplified form of
U+4CA4 is that it is part of the required portion of GB 18030,
which also suggests encoding the traditional form (with an H
source) elsewhere, either appended to the URO as a single-
character UNC submission or thrown in with Extension F (F1).

>>>>>>> I personally think that the sooner the mistaken
unification is

>>>>>>> undone the better, so I would advocate adding the
traditional

>>>>>>> form of U+4CA4 to the space at the end of the basic
CJK Unified

>>>>>>> Ideographs block (i.e. at U+9FCD) at the earliest
opportunity.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> If the IRG meeting in May can agree to submit a
document to WG2

>>>>>>> in time for September's meeting in Sri Lanka then I
would think

>>>>>>> that it could be put straight on the Amd. 2 ballot.
Michel, what do you think?

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Andrew