

## ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N2005B R

Date: 2014-05-15

## 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 <a href="http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg31/IRGN1562.pdf">http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg31/IRGN1562.pdf</a>
for guidelines and details before filling in this form.

Please ensure you are using the latest Form from <a href="http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/SubmissionForm.pdf">http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/SubmissionForm.pdf</a>.

See also <a href="http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/UCV.html">http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/UCV.html</a>. for latest <a href="http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/UCV.html">Unifiable Calligraphic Variations</a>.

## A. Administrative

1. IRG Project Code:	LITC/US Urgantly	Noodod Characters		
	UTC/US Urgently Needed Characters			
2. Title:	UTC/US Urgently Needed Characters			
3. Requester's region/coun	try name:	USA		
4. Requester type (National Body/Individual contribution): Nation		National B	ody	
5. Submission date: 5 Mag		5 May 20	14	
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs) Unified Id		Unified Ideog	graphs	
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		Urgently Ne	eded	
8. Choose one of the follow	ving:			
This is a complete proposal:			Yes	
(or) More information will be provided later:				
B. Technical – General				
1. Number of ideographs in	the proposal:		5	
Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 "bmp" files or TrueType font file)			TrueType	
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?		a?	Yes	
If TrueType font, data	for Source IDs vs. character codes are pr	rovided?	Yes	
3. Source IDs:		i,		
	deographs have a unique, proper Source I alphanumeric characters)?	ID (country/region	Yes	
contains at least one	d ideographs have the separate evidence docu scanned image of printed materials (preferably	erably dictionaries)?	Yes	
	naterials used for evidence provide enoug (ISBN numbers, etc.)? Excel file or CSV)	n information to track	Yes  Excel file	

Understandings of the Unification Checklist	
1.Has the requester read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and did the requester understand the	Yes
unification policy? Has the requester read the "Unifiable Calligraphic Variations" (contact IRG technical editor through the Rapporteurfor the latest one) and did the requester understand the unifiable variation examples?	Yes
Has the requester read this P&P document and did the requester understand the 5% rule?	Yes
Character-Glyph Duplication Checklist( <a href="http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm">http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm</a> contains all the published ones and those under ballot)	
Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is <i>not unifiable</i> with the unified or compatibility ideographs of ISO/IEC 10646?	Yes
If yes, which version of ISO/IEC 10646 did requester check? (e.g. 10646:2003)	10646:2011
Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is <b>not unifiable</b> with the ideographs in Amendments of current ISO/IEC 10646? (As of 2009, Amendment 1, 4, 5, 6and 8 have CJK ideographs.)	N/A
If yes, which amendments did requester check?	N/A
Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is <b>not unifiable</b> 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.)	Yes
If yes, which draft amendments did requester check?	Extension E
Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is <b>not unifiable</b> 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)	Yes
If yes, which document did requester check?	RGN 1979 (CJK Ext. F1. v2.0)
Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is <b>not unifiable</b> with the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (Check Annex E of this document).	Yes
Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs <i>has similar ideograph(s)</i> with the ideographs in the current standardized or working set mentioned above?	Yes
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?  Attribute Data Checklist	Yes
Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the KangXi radical code, stroke count and first stroke?	Yes
Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in簡化 字總表) in the proposed ideographs?	Yes
If YES, does your proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in attribute data?	Yes
Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in attribute data?	Yes
Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in attribute data?	Yes
If NO, how many proposed ideographs do not have the IDS?	
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