

Universal Multiple - Octet Coded Character Set
UCS

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N2390_TCA

Date: 2019-5-24

Source:	TCA
Title:	TCA's UNC Proposal for WG2 submission
Meeting:	IRG #52, HongKong
Status:	Member's submission
Actions required:	To be considered by IRG
Distribution:	IRG
Medium:	Electronic
Page:	4
Appendix:	Attributes (in an excel file)

1. Introduction

In IRG#52 meeting, IRG accepts the UNC proposal with 12 characters from China, and agrees to add the traditional form for GKJ-00206 as a total of 13 characters. IRG also agrees for TCA to submit the corresponding source references to WG2. See IRG M52.8 (IRGN2378, IRGN2365).

2. Proposed Characters

About the traditional form of these UNCs, TCA would like to submit 5 characters: 3 characters need to be included by horizontal extension, and 2 characters need to be encoded with China together.

2.1 Proposed Horizontal Extension

UCS Code	T-source	Glyphs	kRSUnicode	Radical Form	Other References	ISO/IEC 10646
27C0E	TB-275F	𪛗	151.12	豆	UCS GHZ	27C0E 𪛗 151.12 𪛗 𪛗 UCS2003 GHZ-63570.03
9B97	TE-6A24	𩺰	195.5	魚	GE H J0 K1 V3	9B97 𩺰 195.5 𩺰 𩺰 𩺰 GE-4673 H-9FDE 𩺰 𩺰 𩺰 J0-723C K1-5D60 V3-3625
2CD68	TB-7242	𩺱	195.11	魚	JK	2CD68 𩺱 195.11 𩺱 JK-66032

2.2 Proposed Characters as UNCs

T-source	PUA	Glyphs	G-source	Radical Form	Strokes	Total Stroke	IDS	Total Stroke	FS	T/S
TC-3465	U+E000	𠂔	GKJ-00202	玉 96.0	4	8	𠂔王巴	8	5	0
TB-7241	U+E001	𩺰	GKJ-00207	魚 195.0	11	22	𩺰魚舵	22	2	0

(End of document)

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2/IRG

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS
FOR ADDITION OF CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646**

Submitters are reminded to:

1.Fill in all the sections below.

2. Read the Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) available at

<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg45/IRGN2092PnPv8.pdf>

for guidelines and details before filling in this form.

3. Use the latest Form from

http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg45/IRGN2092PnP_BlankDataFile.xls

See also http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg45/IRGN2092PnP_BlankDataFile.xls for the latest Unifiable Component Variations.

A. Administrative

1. IRG Project Code:	IRGN2	
2. Title:	TCA's Proposal on 2 TCA's UNC's to IRG #52	
3. Submitter's Region/Country Name:	TCA	
4. Submitter Type (National Body/Individual Contribution) :	Member body	
5. Submission Date:	2019-5-23	
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs)	Unified Ideographs	
If Compatibility, does the submitter 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. Proposal Type (Normal Proposal or Urgently Needed)	Urgently Needed	
8. Choose one of the following:		
This is a complete proposal	Yes	
(or) More information will be provided later.		

B. Technical – General

1. Number of ideographs in the proposal:	2
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 Bitmap files or TrueType font file)	Both
If Bitmap files, are their file names the same as their source references?	Yes
If TrueType font file, are all the proposed glyphs put into BMP PUA area?	Yes
If TrueType font file, are data for source references vs. character codes provided?	Yes
3. Source references:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper source reference (member body/international consortium abbreviation followed by no more than 9 alphanumeric characters) ?	Yes
4. Evidence:	
a. Do all the proposed ideographs have a 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 text)	Excel

C. Technical - Checklist

Understanding of the Unification Principles	
1. Has the submitter read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and does the submitter understand the unification principles?	Yes
2. Has the submitter read the “Unifiable Component Variations” (contact the IRG technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the latest version) and does the submitter understand the unifiable variation examples?	Yes
3. Has the submitter read the IRG PnP document and does the submitter understand the 5% Rule?	Yes
Character-Glyph Duplication (http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm contains all the published ones and those under ballot)	
4. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the unified or compatibility ideographs of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? If the checking has been done against an earlier version of ISO/IEC 10646, please specify the version? (e.g. 10646:2012)	Yes ISO/IEC 10646:2014 (E)
5. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the amendments, if any, of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which amendment (s) has the submitter checked?	Yes
6. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the proposed amendments, if any, of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which draft amendment (s) has the submitter checked?	Yes
7. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of 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) If yes, which document (s) has the submitter checked?	Yes WS2015, WS2017
8. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (See Annex E of the IRG PnP document) .	Yes
9. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any similar ideographs in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	Yes
10. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any variant ideographs in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	Yes
Attribute Data	
11. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the Kangxi radical code and stroke count?	Yes
12. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in 簡化字總表) among the proposed ideographs? If yes, does the proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in the attribute data?	Yes Yes
13. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in the attribute data?	Yes
14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in the attribute data? If no, how many proposed ideographs do not have the IDS?	Yes
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?	Yes
16. Do all the proposed ideographs contains the total stroke count (kTotalStrokes) ¹ ?	Yes

¹ The IRG understands that kTotalStrokes can be ambiguous and subject to different interpretations. The IRG takes no responsibility to check the correctness of the submitted attribute data.