

Annex F: IRG Repertoire Submission Summary Form

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2/IRG
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS
FOR ADDITIONS OF CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646**

Please fill in all the sections below.

Please read Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg31/IRGN1562.pdf>
for guidelines and details before filling in this form.

Please ensure you are using the latest Form from <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/SubmissionForm.pdf>.
See also <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/UCV.html> for latest *Unifiable Calligraphic Variations*.

A. Administrative

1. IRG Project Code:	SEI Urgently Needed Characters
2. Title:	SEI Urgently Needed Characters
3. Requester's region/country name:	USA
4. Requester type (National Body/Individual contribution):	Liaison via NB (US)
5. Submission date:	November 2013
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs)	Unified Ideographs
If Compatibility, does requester 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. Request Type (Normal Request 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:	20
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 "bmp" files or TrueType font file)	
If 'bmp' files, their file names are the same as their Source IDs?	
If TrueType font, all proposed glyphs are put into BMP PUA area?	Yes
If TrueType font, data for Source IDs vs. character codes are provided?	Yes
3. Source IDs:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper Source ID (country/region code and less than 9 alphanumeric characters)?	Yes
4. Evidence:	
a. Do all the proposed ideographs have the 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)	Excel File

C. Technical - Checklist

Understandings of the Unification Checklist	
1. Has the requester read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and did the requester understand the unification policy?	Yes
2. Has the requester read the “Unifiable Calligraphic Variations” (contact IRG technical editor through the Rapporteur for the latest one) and did the requester understand the unifiable variation examples?	Yes
3. Has the requester read this P&P document and did the requester understand the 5% rule?	Yes
Character-Glyph Duplication Checklist (http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm contains all the published ones and those under ballot)	
4. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the unified or compatibility ideographs of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which version of ISO/IEC 10646 did requester check? (e.g. 10646:2003)	Yes 10646:2012
5. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the ideographs in Amendments of current ISO/IEC 10646? (As of 2009, Amendment 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8 have CJK ideographs.) If yes, which amendments did requester check?	N/A N/A
6. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the ideographs in the current IRG working sets or proposed amendments of ISO/IEC 10646? (As of 2009, PDAM 6 and PDAM 8 have CJK ideographs.) If yes, which draft amendments did requester check?	Yes Extension F
7. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with 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 did requester check?	Yes IRGN1921 (CJK Ext. F. v1.0)
8. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (Check Annex E of this document).	Yes
9. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs has similar ideograph(s) with the ideographs in the current standardized or working set mentioned above?	Yes
10. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs has variant ideograph(s) with the ideographs in the current standardized or working set mentioned above?	Yes
Attribute Data Checklist	
11. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the KangXi radical code, stroke count and first stroke?	Yes
12. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in 簡化字總表) in the proposed ideographs? If YES, does your proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in attribute data?	No
13. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in attribute data?	Yes
14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in 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

