Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
International Organization for Standardization
Organisation internationale de normalisation
Международная организация по стандартизации

Doc Type: **Working Group Document**
Title: **Proposal to encode one Latin letter in the UCS**
Source: **Michael Everson**
Status: **Individual Contribution**
Action: **For consideration by JTC1/SC2/WG2 and UTC**
Date: **2002-11-10**

N2457, a contribution from the US National Body, proposed two double diacritics used widely in US lexicographical practice, in order to ensure that such data could be encoded in the UCS. One character from that tradition remains to be encoded.

1D6B   ue   LATIN SMALL LETTER UE

A. Administrative

1. Title
Proposal to encode one Latin letter in the UCS.
2. Requester's name
Michael Everson
3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution)
Individual contribution.
4. Submission date
2002-11-10
5. Requester's reference (if applicable)
6. Choose one of the following:
6a. This is a complete proposal
Yes.

6b. More information will be provided later
No.

B. Technical -- General

1. Choose one of the following:
1a. This proposal is for a new script (set of characters)
No.
Proposed name of script
1b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block
Yes.
1b. Name of the existing block
2. Number of characters in proposal
1
3. Proposed category (see section II, Character Categories)
Category A.
4a. Proposed Level of Implementation (1, 2 or 3) (see clause 14, ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000)
Level 1.
4b. Is a rationale provided for the choice?
No.
4c. If YES, reference
5a. Is a repertoire including character names provided?
Yes.
5b. If YES, are the names in accordance with the character naming guidelines in Annex L of ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000?
Yes.
5c. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review?
Yes.
6a. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered preference: True Type, or PostScript format) for publishing the standard?
Michael Everson.
6b. If available now, identify source(s) for the font (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.) and indicate the tools used:
Michael Everson, Fontographer.
7a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided?
Yes. Gove, Philip Babcock, ed. 1993 (1961). *Webster's Third New International Dicitionary of the English Language, Unabridged.* Cologne: Könemann. ISBN 3-8290-5292-8
7b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached?
Yes.
8. Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing (if applicable) such as input, presentation, sorting, searching, indexing, transliteration etc. (if yes please enclose information)?
No.
9. Submitters are invited to provide any additional information about Properties of the proposed Character(s) or Script that will assist in correct understanding of and correct linguistic processing of the proposed character(s) or script. Examples of such properties are: Casing information, Numeric information, Currency information, Display behaviour information such as line breaks, widths etc., Combining behaviour, Spacing behaviour, Directional behaviour, Default Collation behaviour, relevance in Mark Up contexts, Compatibility equivalence and other Unicode normalization related information. See the Unicode standard at http://www.unicode.org for such information on other scripts. Also see Unicode Character Database http://www.unicode.org/Public/UNIDATA/ UnicodeCharacterDatabase.html and associated Unicode Technical Reports for information needed for consideration by the Unicode Technical Committee for inclusion in the Unicode Standard.
Spacing letter, category "Lo", bidi category "L" (strong left to right)
    1D6B

C. Technical -- Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before? If YES, explain.
No.
2a. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)?
No.

2b. If YES, with whom?
2c. If YES, available relevant documents
3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included?
Dictionary users.
4a. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)
Phonetic transcription.
4b. Reference
Merriam-Webster dictionaries.
5a. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?
Yes.
5b. If YES, where?
By dictionary publishers.
6a. After giving due considerations to the principles in Principles and Procedures document (a WG 2 standing document) must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?
Yes.
6b. If YES, is a rationale provided?
Yes.
6c. If YES, reference
Latin phonetic character.
7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?
8a. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence?
No. While conventional font ligation can produce a glyph similar to <ɯe>, this letter is a unitary character with a precise phonetic value, as <æ> and <œ> are in the IPA tradition.
8b. If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?
8c. If YES, reference
9a. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?
No.
9b. If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?
9c. If YES, reference
10a. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to an existing character?
No.
10b. If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided?
10c. If YES, reference
11a. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences (see clauses 4.12 and 4.14 in ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000)?
No.
11b. If YES, is a rationale for such use provided?
11c. If YES, reference
12a. Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided?
No.
12b. If YES, reference
13a. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?
No.
13b. If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary)
14a. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility character(s)?
No.
14b. If YES, is the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic character(s) identified?

3