ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2 N4539
ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N4831

Date: 2017/07/20
Title: Proposal to add two Urgently Needed Characters in UCS
Source: Japan
Document Type: Member body contribution
Status: For the consideration by WG2

Japan proposes to add two Urgently Needed Characters in UCS CJK part. The two characters are attached with application form in accordance with PnP. The proposal has been reviewed at last IRG meeting in Korea (IRG #48), then submitted according to its recommendation.

During the process of standardization work on CJK Unified Ideographs Extension F, Japan NB and IPA (Information-technology Promotion Agency, Japan) had been continued to review the correspondence between UCS CJK parts and IPA MJ (Moji_Joho) glyph collection.
Then, with the completion of CJK Unified Ideographs Extension F as a part of ISO/IEC 10646 5th edition, the mapping table between CJK Extension F and IPA MJ glyph collection is finally fixed, so that we could identify a few characters which could not be unified with any CJK characters including Extension F.
Same as other characters in MJ collection, these characters also should be mandatory distinguished by UCS code position to be used in Japanese governmental IT systems, which are already in operation or will be launched in near future. That is the reason why Japan proposes these characters as UNC.

Attachment-1: Proposal Summary Form
Attachment-2: List of two chars with glyph image, source reference and attribute data

[Attachment-1: Proposal Summary Form]

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/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/irg/irg45/IRGN2092PnP_BlankDataFile.xls

See also http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irgwds.html **for the latest *Unifiable Component Variations*.**

A. Administrative

1. **IRG Project Code:**	
2. **Title:**	Japan Submission for UNC proposed
3. Submitter's Region/Country Name:	Japan
4. Submitter Type (National Body/Individual Contribution):	National Body
5. Submission Date:	2017-07-20
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.)	N/A
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 format*
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 JMJ-dddddd
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)?	No (Because they are originated from e-government systems)
b. Do all the printed materials used for evidence provide enough information to track them by a third party (ISBN numbers, etc.)?	No
5. Attribute Data Format: (Excel file or CSV text)	*Yes*

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?	*Yes*
If the checking has been done against an earlier version of ISO/IEC 10646, please specify the version? (e.g. 10646:2012)	10646:2014
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?	*Yes*
If yes, which amendment(s) has the submitter checked?	Amendment 2
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?	*Yes*
If yes, which draft amendment(s) has the submitter checked?	10646:2016
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)	*Yes*
If yes, which document(s) has the submitter checked?	IRG WS2015
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?	*No*
If yes, does the proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in the attribute data?	
13. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in the attribute data?	*No*
14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in the attribute data?	*Yes*
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*
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.

[Attachment-2: List of two chars with glyph image, source reference and attribute data]

Glyph image & Source Reference	KangXi Radical Code	Stroke Count	kTotalStrokes	IDS (Ideographic Description Sequence)
 JMJ-057449	R053.0	10	13	⿸广带
 JMJ-060040	R119.0	10	16	⿰物⿰𠂉米