

DATE: 2014-05-28/revised 2014-09-01

<p>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2</p> <p><b>Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) - ISO/IEC 10646</b></p> <p>Secretariat: ANSI</p>
--

<b>DOC TYPE:</b>	IRG Work
<b>TITLE:</b>	Summary Report of IRG #42, Qingdao, China, May 19 – 23, 2014
<b>SOURCE:</b>	Lu Qin, IRG Rapporteur
<b>PROJECT:</b>	JTC 1.02.18 – ISO/IEC 10646
<b>STATUS:</b>	
<b>ACTION ID:</b>	
<b>DUE DATE:</b>	
<b>DISTRIBUTION:</b>	SC2/WG2 members and Liaison organizations
<b>MEDIUM:</b>	Electronic
<b>NO. OF PAGES:</b>	2

This is a summary to IRG Meeting No. 42(IRGN2010 WG2N4582)

**1. Future Meetings: Resolution IRG 42.1 (for Information and Approval)**

The following gives the IRG future meeting schedules:

- IRG #43 San Jose, USA (2014-11-17~21) (Approved by WG2)
- IRG #44 Seoul, ROK (2015-06-15~19) (Needs approval)
- IRG #45 Hong Kong SAR, to be hosted by Hong Kong Polytechnic University (2015-11-16~20)(Tentative) (Needs approval)\*

After meeting Note: A request after the meeting by the host to change the date to 2015-10-26-30, 2014 was informally accepted by IRG members. So, HK would like to request for a conditional approval based on the new proposed date provided IRG officially approves this change in IRG Meeting No. 43 )

**2. Extension F Work: IRG M42.2 (for review)**

The IRG Ext. F(IRG internally referred as F1) work has gone 3 rounds of review and will be submitted to WG2 for review by Aug. 15 and the WG2 document number is WG2N4580. The number of characters submitted is 3,852.

After Meeting Note: SAT project pulled out 50 characters in the last minutes which makes the total submission to be 3,803. That is 49 characters are SAT characters. In order not to affect the review result, the 49 characters are still included in this submission, but a separate mapping list is provided for review purpose.

**3. Extension G Working Schedule: IRG M42.3 (for Information)**

Has scheduled the work on Ext G(IRG internally referred as F2). The first round of review for Ext. G will be done before IRG No. 43 for discussion at IRG No. 43 in San Jose in Nov. 2014.

#### **4. Disunification Proposal for U+4CA4: Resolution IRG 42.4(for Action)**

The IRG resolves to disunify GS-224D and H-9D73 currently coded in U+4CA4 and further resolves to keep GS-224D in the code point of U+4CA4. The Rapporteur is instructed to inform WG2 to assign a new code point for H-9D73(tentatively assigned U+9FD0)..

#### **5. Unification Issue of U+2827C: Resolution IRG42.5(for Information)**

The request for dis-unification of a T-source character and an H-source characters are considered, and IRG decided not to disunify them.

#### **6. Concern on Non-cognate Unification: Resolution IRG42.6 (for Information):**

The IRG received a study report on possible over-unification of CJK coded characters due to non-cognate rule. Members are requested to review and respond in IRG No. 43.

#### **7. IRG Working Document Series: Resolution IRG 42.7(for Information)**

The IRG has scheduled to confirm the last set of unification and disunification examples before IRG Meeting No. 43. Also, plans to add new revisions to be finalized after IRG Meeting No. 43.

#### **8. 3 UNC characters from China: IRG 42.7(for action)**

For the 3 UNCs from China and approved by WG2, IRG agrees for their encoding at the end of the CJK block with the codepoints U+9FCD, U+9FCE and U+9FCF and further resolves to withdraw from CJK\_F1 the two corresponding characters.

#### **9. UNC characters from UTC and SEI: Resolution IRG 42.7(for action)**

IRG resolves to accept the proposals for 20 UNCs used for transcribing Slavonic and the UTC proposal for 5 UNCs and instructs the IRG Rapporteur to send the proposal documents(WG2N4583 for SEI and WG2N4584 for UTC) to WG2.

#### **10. IRG PnP Issues: Document Format, Website for Large Documents and UNC Process: Resolution IRG 42.7(for Information)**

IRG has agreed to use open web resource for large file posting and will also provide a mirror site in China. We further revised the principle for UNC acceptance review process which now includes the following statement as criteria for consideration of urgency:

“ Evidence of current use is not in and of itself evidence of urgent need. The type of use also needs to be taken into account. For example, requirements of government, industry, science, or scholarship would generally be taken as evidence of urgent need.”

#### **11. Representative Glyph Error Report for U+8B04 T-Source: Resolution IRG 42.7(for Information)**

This gly error was discussed in WG2 No. 62 and IRG was informed of the mistake. The updated font was submitted to the Project Editor, Michel Suignard already.

**End of Document**