



DATE: 1999-08-03

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2**

**Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) - ISO/IEC 10646**

**Secretariat: ANSI**

**DOC TYPE:** Meeting Minutes

**TITLE:** Unconfirmed Minutes of WG 2 meeting 36, Fukuoka, Japan, 1999-03-09--15

**SOURCE:** V.S. Umamaheswaran, Recording Secretary, and Mike Ksar, Convener

**PROJECT:** JTC 1.02.18 – ISO/IEC 10646

**STATUS:** SC 2/WG 2 participants are requested to review the attached unconfirmed minutes, act on appropriate noted action items, and to send any comments or corrections to the convener as soon as possible but no later than 1999-08-31.

**ACTION ID:** ACT

**DUE DATE:** 1999-08-31

**DISTRIBUTION:** SC 2/WG 2 members and Liaison organizations

**MEDIUM:** Paper

**NO. OF PAGES:** 66 (including cover sheet)

Mike Ksar  
Convener – ISO/IEC/JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2  
Hewlett-Packard Company  
1501 Page Mill Rd., M/S 5 U – L  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
U. S. A.

Phone: +1 650 857 8817  
Fax (PC): +1 650 852 8500  
Alt. Fax: +1 650 857 4882  
e-mail: [mike\\_ksar@hp.com](mailto:mike_ksar@hp.com)



**ISO**  
**International Organization for Standardization**  
**Organisation Internationale de Normalisation**

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2**  
**Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS)**

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N2003**

**Date: 1999-08-03**

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Unconfirmed Minutes of WG 2 meeting 36, Fukuoka, Japan; 1999-03-09--15</b>
<b>Source:</b>	<b>V.S. UMaaheswaran, Meeting Secretary, Mike Ksar, Convener</b>
<b>Action:</b>	<b>WG 2 members and Liaison organizations</b>
<b>Distribution:</b>	<b>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 members and Liaison organizations</b>

## **1 Opening and roll call**

**Input document:**

1967 2nd Call and draft agenda for WG 2 meeting 36 in Fukuoka ; Ksar; 1999-02-24

Mr. Mike Ksar opened the meeting at 10:07h. He welcomed the delegates and visitors to meeting 36 in Fukuoka, Japan. The host was Japanese Industrial Standards Committee, JISC.

Ms. Toshiko Kimura explained the meeting facilities – arrangements for copying, personal computer, printing and internet connection. Ms. Madoka Katoh will be assisting with copying. A projector for connecting to a Laptop is also available. Coffee service will be at 10:30h and 15:30h.

Mr. Shigenobu Katoh: JISC is inviting the delegates for a dinner Monday evening. A sightseeing trip has been arranged for Sunday the 14th – visits to Aso volcano and other Japanese cultural centres is planned. There are some native festivals to visit. Delegates may be requested to share the cost for the trip up to 3000 Yen. Delegates were requested to confirm their attendance for these functions with Mr. Katoh.

Mr. Takayuki Sato introduced the guests from the South East Asian countries – Thailand and Viêt Nam were ISO members. Nepal, Lao P.D.R., Cambodia, and Myanmar were not. Delegates were encouraged to discuss the scripts of these countries during the next two days, after which the delegates from these countries will be returning home.

Mr. Mike Ksar: The meetings will start at 09:00h the following days. Significant issues will be delegated to ad hoc groups that will be formed as needed – and ad hoc recommendations will be brought to the main WG 2 meeting. All contributions must be given to the convener, for review for relevance to WG 2 work, for assignment of numbers and for distribution to the meeting. The goal is to finish most of the agenda items by Friday. There will be a session on Monday also, but it may not be for a full day. All discussions on items that need resolutions should be held before the review and adoption of the resolutions.

The most recent set of code tables with character names for the next edition of 10646-1 (excluding the Ideographs) is made available to the meeting by AFII. All interested delegates are requested to review and give comments back to Dr. Asmus Freytag.

### **1.1 Roll call**

**Input document:**

1951 Updated WG 2 distribution - pre meeting 36; Ksar

Document N1951 containing the latest distribution list for WG 2 documents was circulated, and the delegates were requested to correct the entries where needed and to assist the convener in removing names from the distribution list.

Mrs. Wera Lundström, Sweden, has proxy from Finland. Chinese delegates were not able to attend the meeting. However, they were communicating via e-mail. Professor Kim from Korea could not be here – he may arrive on Monday, possibly Tuesday of next week.

The following **33** delegates representing **8** national bodies, **3** liaison organizations and **12** guests were present at different times during the five-day meeting.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Alain La Bonté	Canada	Direction du soutien au déploiement de l'inforoute gouvernementale, Gouvernement du Québec
V. S. (Uma) Umamaheswaran	Canada, Recording Secretary	IBM Canada
Michael Y. Ksar	Convener	Hewlett-Packard Company
Michael Everson	Ireland	Everson Gunn Teoranta
Hideki Nakade	Japan	Mitsubishi Research Institute, Inc.
Satoshi Yamamoto	Japan	Hitachi, Ltd.
Shigenobu Katoh	Japan	Toppan Printing Co., Ltd.
Shun Ishizaki	Japan	Keio University
Takayuki Sato	Japan	Independent
Tatsuo L. Kobayashi	Japan	Scholex Co., Ltd.
Tatsuo Shimakura	Japan	Toshiba Corporation
Yoshiki Mikami	Guest	Nagaoka University of Technology
Sath Sokha Mony	Guest – Cambodia	Moritta Co., Ltd.
Phonpasit Phissamay	Guest – Lao P.D.R.	Prime Minister's Office, Science Technology and Environment Organization
Ahmad Zaki Abu Bakar	Guest – Malaysia	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
Aung Maw	Guest - Myanmar	CE Technology
Khin Maung Lwin	Guest - Myanmar	Myanmar Computer Scientists' Association
Kyaw Thien	Guest - Myanmar	University of Computer Studies, Thamang College
Thaung Tin	Guest - Myanmar	KMD Company Limited
Thein Htut	Guest - Myanmar	Geocomp
Allen Bailochan Tuladhar	Guest – Nepal	Computer Association of Nepal
Theppitak Karoonboonyan	Guest - Thailand	National Electronics and Computer Technology Center
Cam Trong	Guest - Việt Nam	National Centre for Social Sciences and Humanities of Vietnam
Elżbieta Broma-Wrzesień	Poland	Telekomunikacja Polska S.A.
Toshiko Kimura	SC 2 Secretariat	Information Processing Society of Japan / Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan
Wera Lungström	Sweden	Statskontoret
Emily Yu-Chi Hsu	Taipei Computer Association	Institute for Information Industry
Asmus Freytag	The Unicode Consortium, AFII	ASMUS, Inc.
Bruce Paterson	U.K.	Independent
Hideki Hiura	U.S.A.	SunSoft, Inc.
Ken Whistler	U.S.A.	Sybase Inc.
Michel Suignard	U.S.A.	Microsoft
Ngô Trung Việt	Việt Nam	Technical Committee on Information Technology / JTC 1

## 2 Approval of the agenda

### Input document:

1967 2nd Call and draft agenda for WG 2 meeting 36 in Fukuoka; Ksar; 1999-02-24

Mr. Mike Ksar briefly went over the main items on the agenda in document N1967. The revised agenda follows the same outline as preliminary agenda distributed earlier, and has been posted to the WG 2 web site for the last 10 days. A paper copy is made available during the meeting.

The focus of this meeting will be item 7 – the Next Edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1. Agenda item 8 is on part 2. Item 9 is on future scripts. Item 10 is on a defect report. Copies of documents that are on the agenda will be made available during the meeting prior to the specific agenda item. (Note: ITTF- Information Technology Task Force -- is the publication arm for ISO/IEC JTC 1 – appears in agenda item 5).

## Comments / discussion:

The following are some additions to the agenda items or new documents to existing agenda items:

- Item 0 add document N1938
- Item 6.3.3 add USA contribution in document N1966
- Item 6.3.4 add Response from Finland – document N1988.
- Item 7.2.1.1 add Criteria for Encoding Symbols – document N1982
- Item 7.2.1.5 add document N1984 on Armenian
- Item 7.3.2 add document N1991 – progress report from AFII
- Item 7.3.4 add document N2010 – from Unicode for item 7.3.4
- Item 9.4.4 Cham – add document N1960
- Item 12.4 add new item - Principles and procedures update – document N2002
- Item 12.5 add new item - Status of WG 2 proposals document N1952S

Several ballots closed on 5 March. The results will be given new document numbers and will be added to the agenda. Other contributions were identified as the meeting progressed.

The modified agenda was accepted and is reflected in the table of contents below. Some rearrangement of the topics and agenda item numbers has been done while preparing these minutes. All the discussions have been captured under the appropriate subject titles.

Mr. Takayuki Sato: if possible can we discuss 6.3.8 and 6.3.9 sometime today? The visitors from the countries affected are here only for two days.

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1 Opening and roll call	1
1.1 Roll call	1
2 Approval of the agenda	2
3 Approval of minutes of meeting 35	5
4 Review action items from previous meeting	5
5 JTC 1 and ITTF matters	13
5.1 JTC 1 plenary and CAW ad hoc meeting	13
5.2 Summary of voting and recent publication announcements	13
6 SC 2 matters 14	
6.1 Recently closed ballots	14
6.1.1PDAM15 - Kang Xi & CJK Radicals	14
6.1.2PDAM28 - Ideographic Description Characters	16
6.1.3PDAM29 – Mongolian script	17
6.1.4PDAM30 - Additional Latin & other characters	20
6.1.5PDAM31 - Tibetan Extensions	24
6.2 Ballot results and disposition of comments	25
6.2.1FPDAM14 - Yi syllables and Yi radicals	25
6.2.2FPDAM17 - CJK extension A	27
6.2.3FPDAM18 - Euro & Others	27
6.2.4FPDAM21 - Sinhala	27
6.2.5FPDAM22 - Keyboard Symbols	27
6.2.6FPDAM23 – Bopomofo and other characters	28
6.2.7FPDAM24 – Thaana script	28
6.2.8FPDAM25 – Khmer script	29
6.2.9FPDAM26 - Myanmar (Burmese) script	30
6.2.10 FPDAM27 - Syriac	31
6.3 Japanese national body recommendations to JTC 1 and responses	31
6.3.1 Japanese national body recommendations to JTC 1 on SC 2 activities	31
6.3.2 Response from Ireland	34
6.3.3 Response from U.S. and Unicode consortium	34
6.3.4 Response from Finland	34
7 Next Edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1	34
7.1 Non-repertoire issues	34
7.1.1 Editorial corrigenda on Zones and other related features	34
7.1.2 Hangul syllable name rules	35
7.1.3 Revision of Annex T for CJK Extension A	36

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
7.1.4 Editorial corrigenda - standing document	36
7.1.5 Working draft for proposed update to Annex N - 2 <sup>nd</sup> edition	37
7.1.6A "fixed collection" for the BMP - 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1	38
7.2 Repertoire issues	38
7.2.1 Non-IRG documents	38
7.2.1.1 Criteria for Encoding Symbols	38
7.2.1.2 Request for addition of Triangular Overlay Character	39
7.2.1.3 Addition of the Drachma Currency Sign	40
7.2.1.4 Repertoire additions - Cumulative List # 8	40
7.2.1.5 Armenia's feedback on Armenian in ISO/IEC 10646-1	40
7.2.2 IRG-specific documents	41
7.2.2.1 Editorial corrigenda on CJK compatibility	41
7.2.2.2 IRG Resolutions – Meeting # 12	41
7.3 Approval process, contents, format, schedule & responsibilities	42
7.3.1 Approval process - input from ITTF	42
7.3.2 Second edition - contents: text & charts	43
7.3.3 Format: what you see is what you get	44
7.3.4 Schedule: synchronization with Unicode 3.0	44
7.3.5 Responsibilities: review for confirmation at WG 2 September 1999 meeting	44
8 10646 part 2 44	
8.1 2nd working draft	44
8.2 Plane 1	46
8.2.1 Plane 1 roadmap	46
8.2.2 Encoding Deseret script	47
8.2.3 Egyptian Hieroglyphs	47
8.2.4 New script proposals	47
8.3 Plane 2 - IRG	48
9 ISO/IEC 10646 - Amendments beyond 2nd edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1	50
9.1 General policy - future of WG 2 program of work - what, when and how?	50
9.2 BMP roadmap	51
9.3 New miscellaneous bucket	51
9.4 BMP – proposed additions	51
9.4.1 Buginese, Glogolitic, Phoenician, Phillipine scripts	51
9.4.2 Ol Cemet', Sorang Sompeng, Varang Kshiti scripts	52
9.4.3 Optimizing Georgian representation in the BMP	52
9.4.4 Cham script	52
10 Defect reports	52
10.1 Defect report index No 5 for 10646-1	52
11 Liaison reports	53
11.1 The Unicode Consortium	53
11.2 CEN/TC304	53
11.3 AFII 53	
11.4 JTC 1/SC 22/ WG 20	53
12 Other business	54
12.1 Web site review	54
12.2 Future meetings	54
12.3 WG 2 report to SC 2	55
12.4 Principles and procedures document	55
12.5 Status of WG 2 proposals – standing document	55
12.6 Request for publishing TR15258 on the web	55
12.7 Collections for European subrepertoires	56
13 Closing 56	
13.1 Approval of resolutions of meeting 36	56
13.2 Adjournment	56
14 Cumulative list of action items	56
14.1 Action items from previous WG 2 meetings -- Meetings no. 25 to 32	56
14.2 Outstanding action items from meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece	57
14.3 Outstanding action items from meeting 34, Redmond, WA, USA	57
14.4 Outstanding action items from meeting 35, London, UK	58
14.5 New action items from meeting 36, Fukuoka, Japan	58

### 3 Approval of minutes of meeting 35

Input document:

1903 Unconfirmed minutes of meeting 35; Uma/Ksar; Pending

Dr. V.S. Umamaheswaran introduced document N1903 containing the minutes of WG 2 meeting 35. Mr. Mike Ksar expressed his appreciation to Dr. Umamaheswaran for the preparation of the minutes.

The minutes were adopted with the following corrections (some of the changes were pointed to the convener and the recording secretary prior to the meeting, a few during the meeting, and the rest were found by the recording secretary). Editorial corrections were received from Messrs. Michael Everson and Asmus Freytag.

Corrections:

- a. Change all occurrences of "Kilden Sami" to "Kildin Sámi".
- b. Change all occurrences of "Burke" to "Bburx" in section 6.7.8 – Khmer script.
- c. Change all occurrences of "member body" to "national body" (per JTC 1 practice, according to Ms. Toshiko Kimura, SC 2 secretariat).
- d. Section 8.1.3, discussion item d), add a new sentence to the end:  
"The requested fonts are to be made available by end of 1998. The editor is to make a selection based on the fonts submitted."
- e. Section 8.1.3, Action item; add a new action item:  
"Dr. Asmus Freytag is to print sample code tables using the fonts received from Mongolia and China and select the more suitable font." Add this to the list of action items in section 15.5, as AI-35-17 on AFII (Dr. Asmus Freytag).
- f. Section 8.1.5.1 – Bucket 35, discussion item d, sixth sentence; change to read:  
"... way of saying *and*." instead of "... way of saying *end*."
- g. Section 8.2.15 – Ruby, add a new discussion item as follows:  
h) Mr. Michael Everson: These characters could be used for general glossing.
- h. Section 15.4, add missing action item on the convener, AI-34-2-f, from section 4 (M34-15.7) list of outstanding action items from meeting 34, Redmond, WA, USA.

### 4 Review action items from previous meeting

Input document:

1903 Unconfirmed minutes of meeting 35; Uma/Ksar; Pending

- **(M35-15.1) -- Action items from previous WG 2 meetings -- Meetings no. 25 to 31**

All the action items from meeting 25, Antalya, Turkey, meeting 26, San Francisco, CA, USA, meeting 27, Geneva, Switzerland, meeting 28, Helsinki, Finland, meeting 29, Tokyo, Japan, meeting 30, Copenhagen, Denmark, and meeting 31, Québec City, Canada, have been either completed or dropped.

- **(M35-15.2) -- Outstanding action items from meeting 32, Singapore**

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 32 Resolutions in document N1504 and Unconfirmed Meeting 32 minutes in document N1503 -with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N1603.)	Status
AI-32-6	<b>USA national body (Messrs. Michel Suignard, John Jenkins)</b>	
b	Mr. John Jenkins, is invited to prepare the draft text on the Deseret script (in document N1498) in a form suitable for inclusion in the future ISO/IEC 10646-Part 2. M33, M34 and M35: in progress.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1891R.</b>

- **(M35-15.3) -- Outstanding action items from meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece**

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions in document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 – with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N1703.)	Status
<b>AI-33-8</b>	<b>Korean national body (Professor Kyongsok Kim)</b>	
<b>b</b>	is invited to submit a proposal summary form to cover requests for Gugyeol characters (original requests in document N936) with possible updates to these documents and submit to WG 2 for consideration at meeting 34. M34, M35 and M36: In progress.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>

- **(M35-15.4) -- Outstanding action items from meeting 34, Redmond, WA, USA**

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 34 Resolutions in document N1704R and Unconfirmed Meeting 34 minutes in document N1703 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N1903.)	Status
<b>AI-34-2</b>	<b>Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar</b>	
<b>b</b>	to set up an ad hoc group of interested experts, along with the editor, to consider and recommend the format for the next edition of 10646-1. M35: In progress.	<b>M36: Completed; Messrs. Everson, Freytag, Whistler, Zhang, and Suignard. See item 7 of meeting 36 agenda.</b>
<b>c</b>	to monitor the progress of the ITTF electronic publication of 10646 on the web - the web edition, to ensure that all the approved amendments are included; and to bring this matter to the attention of SC 2 also. M35: In progress.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1961.</b>
<b>f</b>	to send document N1670 as a liaison document to IETF from SC 2/WG 2. WG 2 is concerned because the initial MLSF proposal is in conflict with UTF-8. M35 – in progress.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>AI-34-3</b>	<b>Editor of 10646-1: Mr. Bruce Paterson</b>	
	to prepare the appropriate AM, DAM or PDAM texts, sub-division proposals, collection of editorial text for the next edition, corrigendum text, or entries in collections of characters for future coding, with assistance from other identified parties, in accordance with the following:	
<b>a</b>	RESOLUTION M34.1 (DTR 15285 Character Glyph Model): ... .. WG 2 further instructs its project editors for ISO/IEC 10646 Part 1 and Part 2 to add TR 15285 as a reference to the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 and to the WD of ISO/IEC 10646-2. M34: It was clarified that the reference should be listed under the non-normative bibliography section. M35: It was clarified that the reference could be included under the annex on "sources for scripts".	<b>M36. Noted.</b>
<b>AI-34-4</b>	<b>Editor of 10646-2: Mr. Michel Suignard</b>	
	to take note of the following and incorporate the needed text in the draft of 10646-2:	
<b>a</b>	RESOLUTION M34.1 (DTR 15285 Character Glyph Model): ... .. WG 2 further instructs its project editors for ISO/IEC 10646 Part 1 and Part 2 to add TR 15285 as a reference to the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 and to the WD of ISO/IEC 10646-2.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>b</b>	RESOLUTION M34.14 (Characters for inclusion in WD of Part 2): WG 2 accepts the following: Plane 14 Characters for Language Tags according to document N1670. ETRUSCAN script in the range Plane 1 0200 to 022F, in accordance with document N1580. GOTHIC script in the range Plane 1 0230 to 024F, in accordance with document N1581, with the last three characters in that document deleted from the repertoire. WESTERN MUSICAL SYMBOLS in the range Plane 1 D100 to D1FF, starting at D103, in accordance with document N1693. and instructs its project editor to include the above accepted characters in the working draft of 10646-2. M35: In progress.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>



Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 34 Resolutions in document N1704R and Unconfirmed Meeting 34 minutes in document N1703 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N1903.)	Status
c	to update the working draft in document 1717 - accommodating the various comments during meeting 34, and to draft some text for inclusion in Part 1 referring to the architectural statements that need to be included in Part 1. M35: In progress.	M36: In progress.
d	RESOLUTION M34.18 (Collection Identifiers in Parts 1 and 2): WG 2 accepts the recommendations of the ad hoc on collection identifiers in document N1726, and instructs the ad hoc on Principles and Procedures to include these in the Principles and Procedures document (N1502R). WG 2 further instructs its project editors to take note of these recommendations for adoption in Parts 1 and Part 2. M35: In progress.	M36: In progress.
<b>AI-34-7</b>	<b>Ad hoc group on principles and procedures (lead - Dr. V.S. UMAhaheswaran)</b>	
	to update the standing document on Principle and Procedures per following:	
d	based on input received on document N1724 - Formal Criteria for Dis-Unification, prepare draft text (with assistance from the Unicode Consortium - Dr. Asmus Freytag ) for inclusion in Principles and Procedures document. M35: In progress.	M36: Completed; see document N2002.
e	based on input received on document N1725 on Formal Criteria for Coding Pre-Composed Characters. prepare draft text (with assistance from the authors - Dr. Ken Whistler and Dr. Asmus Freytag ) for inclusion in Principles and Procedures document. M35: In progress.	M36: Completed; see document N2002.
<b>AI-34-10</b>	<b>The Unicode Consortium (Dr. Asmus Freytag, and some USA experts)</b>	
c	is requested to work with the American Mathematical Society, examine the proposal in document N1716 - Math Symbols, refine the proposals and draft (jointly with the USA national body) an updated document for consideration at the next meeting. M35: In progress.	M36: In progress.
e	is invited to re-format the proposal on Western Musical symbols in document N1693 in a form suitable for inclusion in part 2 -- including appropriate text, in accordance with RESOLUTION M34.14. M35: In progress.	M36: Completed. will be in the next draft of Part 2.
<b>AI-34-13</b>	<b>Irish national body (Mr. Michael Everson)</b>	
h	is invited to create a "Defect Report" on changing the block name IPA Extension to IPA Latin Extension. M35: In progress.	M36: In progress.
j	is invited to provide a revised draft of document N1657 on Buginese script including the answers / examples and incorporating any feed back comment received. M35: In progress.	M36: Completed; see document N1930.
<b>AI-34-14</b>	<b>USA national body (Dr. Ken Whistler and other experts)</b>	
c	is requested to work with the American mathematical society, examine the proposal in document N1716 - Math Symbols, refine the proposals and draft (jointly with the Unicode Consortium) an updated document for consideration at the next meeting. M35: In progress.	M36: In progress.
d	to prepare the proposal on Western Music Symbols in a format suitable for inclusion in Part 2, including the appropriate text, per resolution M34.14. M35: In progress.	M36: Completed.
e	is invited to provide a practical way to show the R-zone Ideographs - keeping in synch with the currently printed R-zone in the standard. M35: In progress.	M36: Completed; see document N1935.

• (M35-15.5) – Outstanding action items from meeting 35, London, UK

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)	Status
<b>AI-35-1</b>	<b>Meeting Secretary - Dr. V.S. UMAhaheswaran</b>	
a	to finalize the document N1903 containing the unconfirmed meeting minutes and send it to the convener as soon as possible.	M36: Completed.
b	to finalize the document N1904 containing the adopted meeting resolutions and send it to the convener as soon as possible.	M36: Completed.

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)	Status
<b>AI-35-2</b>	<b>Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar</b>	
a	RESOLUTION M35.9 (Procedures for character set registration): WG 2 accepts the recommendations from the USA national body contained in document N1839, and instructs its convener to forward the document to SC 2 for endorsement and to the Registration Authority for consideration.	<b>M36: Completed.</b>
b	RESOLUTION M35.19 (TC 211 liaison): In response to the liaison request from ISO/TC 211 in document N1828, WG 2 informs SC 2 that it has no objection to and welcomes the establishment of liaison relationship from ISO/TC 211 to JTC 1/SC 2.	<b>M36: Completed.</b>
c	to contact ITTF (Keith Brannon) about the Error in the Amendment numbers published on the ITTF (ISO) web site.	<b>M36: Completed.</b>
d	to contact ITTF regarding the possible holding back of the publication of FDAM-17 on CJK Extension A, in view of the 2nd edition coming along soon. M36: New deadline middle of April 1999.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
e	to take the revised N1879 along with the disposition of the Netherlands' negative ballot comments on Amendment18 and forward to SC 2 secretariat.	<b>M36: Completed.</b>
f	to contact Maldivian Ministry of Education regarding the ordering of characters in Thaana script with assistance from Mr. John Clews. Mr. John Clews is to do some research to get the contact names, mailing address, fax etc. in the Maldivian Ministry of Education and get the information to the convener.	<b>M36: Dropped.</b>
g	to contact Romanian national body, regarding the acceptability of the Annex P annotation regarding s, S, t and T with comma below, as part of FPDAM-18 disposition of comments (see document N1789R2).	<b>M36: Completed.</b>
h	to check with Korea if the explanatory note to Clause 24.1 regarding two Bangjeom characters proposed in document N1738 meet their requirements.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
i	to check with Korea for their position on the proposal to replace the Korean Hangul long names in Amendment 5 with an equivalent algorithm which generates these names (see defect report in document N1806).	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>AI-35-3</b>	<b>Editor of 10646-1 Mr. Bruce Paterson and contributing editor Mr. Michael Everson</b>	
	to prepare the appropriate AM, DAM or PDAM texts, sub-division proposals, collection of editorial text for the next edition, corrigendum text, or entries in collections of characters for future coding, with assistance from other identified parties, in accordance with the following:	
a	RESOLUTION M35.1 (FPDAM-18 on Symbols and Other characters including EURO): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1789R2, as amended by document N1875 (defect report), and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of DAM-18 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1894 (SC 2 N3188).</b>
b	RESOLUTION M35.2 (FPDAM-21 on Sinhala): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1841R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of DAM-21 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1896 (SC 2 N3190)</b>
c	RESOLUTION M35.3 (PDAM-22 on Keyboard Symbols): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1816R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-22 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1898 (SC 2 N3192)</b>
d	RESOLUTION M35.4 (PDAM-24 on Thaana): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1841R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments and the final text of FPDAM-24 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1909 (SC 2 N3198):</b>
e	RESOLUTION M35.5 (PDAM-25 on Khmer): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1841R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments and the final text of FPDAM-25 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; See document N1911 (SC 2 N3201)</b>

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)	Status
f	RESOLUTION M35.6 (FPDAM-27 on Syriac): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1841R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments and the final text of DAM-27 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; See document N1907 (SC 2 N3196)</b>
g	RESOLUTION M35.7 (FPDAM-17 on CJK Extension A) WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1889, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of DAM-17 with assistance from the IRG editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates. (AI on Convener to get the front page of FDAM-17 for WG 2 distribution)	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1929 (SC 2 N3220); new AI on Mr. Mike Ksar.</b>
h	RESOLUTION M35.8 (FPDAM-23 on Bopomofo Extended and other characters) WG 2 instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments based on the agreements at meeting 35, and the final text of DAM-23 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1905 (SC 2 N3194)</b>
i	RESOLUTION M35.10 (Defect report on Zones): WG 2 accepts the defect report in document N1874 and instructs its project editor to prepare an editorial corrigendum to ISO/IEC 10646-1.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1934.</b>
j	RESOLUTION M35.11 (Mongolian script): WG 2 accepts the 155 characters, their shapes, and their names in document N1878, and assigns them to code positions in the range 1800 to 18AF, and 3 following additional characters in the General Punctuation Block: 202F NARROW NO BREAK SPACE 2048 QUESTION EXCLAMATION MARK 2049 EXCLAMATION QUESTION MARK in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create a new sub division proposal, with the following target dates: WD 1998-09, FPDAM 1998-10, FDAM 1999-04 and AM 1999-07</li> <li>• prepare registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from China, Mongolia, and the contributing editor (for the three additional characters)</li> <li>• forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing.</li> </ul>	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1918 (SC 2 N3208).</b>
k	RESOLUTION M35.12 (Additional Latin and other characters): WG 2 accepts the 66 additional Latin and other characters, their code positions and names as listed in document N1884R2, and their shapes (from the appropriate source documents), for encoding in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create a new sub division proposal, with the following target dates: WD 1998-09, FPDAM 1998-10, FDAM 1999-04 and AM 1999-07</li> <li>• prepare registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from the contributing editor, and</li> <li>• forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing.</li> </ul>	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1920 (SC 2 N3210)</b>
l	RESOLUTION M35.13 (PDAM-14 on Yi script): WG 2 instructs its project editor to prepare the disposition of comments based on the agreements at meeting 35 as summarized in document N1890, and the final text of FPDAM-14 with assistance from China and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1926 (SC 2 N3215).</b>
m	RESOLUTION M35.14 (PDAM-26 on Myanmar / Burmese): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1883R2, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments and the final text of FPDAM-26 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1913 (SC 2 N3203).</b>
n	RESOLUTION M35.16 (PDAM-28 - Ideographic Description Characters): WG 2 accepts the 12 characters, their shapes, and their names in document N1842R, and assigns them to code positions in the range 2FF0 to 2FFF in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from China and the contributing editor, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, with unchanged target dates. Dr. Ken Whistler has volunteered to check the names of characters.	<b>M36 Completed; see document N1892 (SC 2 N3186).</b>

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)	Status
o	RESOLUTION M35.17 (PDAM-15 - KangXi radicals): WG 2 accepts the working draft in document N1869, with corrected names and moving the starting point of the CJK Radicals Supplement to 2E80 from 2E00. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from TCA, China and the IRG project editor, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1923 (SC 2 N3213).</b>
p	Messrs. Michel Suignard, Bruce Paterson and Takayuki Sato -- to address the concerns raised by Japan in document N1819 (regarding definitions for non-graphic characters) and come up with suggested clarification / explanatory text.	<b>M36: Completed. see document N1912.</b>
<b>AI-35-4 Editor of 10646-2: Mr. Michel Suignard</b>		
to take note of the following and incorporate the needed text in the draft of 10646-2:		
a	Messrs. Michel Suignard, Bruce Paterson and Takayuki Sato -- to address the concerns raised by Japan in document N1819 (regarding definitions for non-graphic characters) and come up with suggested clarification / explanatory text.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1912.</b>
b	to take note of the comments regarding the nature of Plane 14 characters during the discussion at this meeting (reference to document N1820 from Japan) in the preparation of the next Working Draft of part 2.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
c	IRG to review the schedule for CJK Extension B with editor of Part 2 -- should be synchronized with Part 2 plan in SC 2 Program of work.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>AI-35-5 IRG (Mr. Zhang Zhoucai, Rapporteur)</b>		
a	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.17 (PDAM-15 - KangXi radicals): WG 2 accepts the working draft in document N1869, with corrected names and moving the starting point of the CJK Radicals Supplement to 2E80 from 2E00. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from TCA, China and the IRG project editor, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1923 (SC 2 N3213).</b>
b	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.7 (FPDAM-17 on CJK Extension A) WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1889, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of DAM-17 with assistance from the IRG editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates. Japan is to provide the missing references for source characters in Extension A Ideographs, to update Annex L in Amendment 17.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1929 (SC 2 N3220).</b>
c	IRG to review the schedule for CJK Extension B with editor of Part 2 -- should be synchronized with Part 2 plan in SC 2 Program of work.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>AI-35-6 Ad hoc group on principles and procedures (lead - Dr. V.S. UMaaheswaran)</b>		
a	to update the principles and procedures document taking into account the feedback at this meeting – format improvements in Annex D tables, 1K boundary principle for allocations in Plane 1 with UTF-16,	<b>M36: Completed; see document N2002.</b>
b	update the procedure for requesting collection identifiers with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stronger demonstrable need for single id for collections of collections</li> <li>• Listing of all collections in a collection</li> <li>• Consistency between fixed and non-fixed collection.</li> </ul> before incorporating into the principles and procedures document.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N2002.</b>
<b>AI-35-7 Chinese national body</b>		
a	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.17 (PDAM-15 - KangXi radicals): WG 2 accepts the working draft in document N1869, with corrected names and moving the starting point of the CJK Radicals Supplement to 2E80 from 2E00. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from TCA, China and the IRG project editor, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1929 (SC 2 N3220).</b>



Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)	Status
b	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.16 (PDAM-28 – Ideographic Description Characters): WG 2 accepts the 12 characters, their shapes, and their names in document N1842R, and assigns them to code positions in the range 2FF0 to 2FFF in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from China and the contributing editor, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1892 (SC 2 N3186).</b>
c	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.13 (PDAM-14 on Yi script): WG 2 instructs its project editor to prepare the disposition of comments based on the agreements at meeting 35 as summarized in document N1890, and the final text of FPDAM-14 with assistance from China and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1926 (SC 2 N3215).</b>
d	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.11 (Mongolian script): WG 2 accepts the 155 characters, their shapes, and their names in document N1878, and assigns them to code positions in the range 1800 to 18AF, and 3 following additional characters in the General Punctuation Block: 202FNARROW NO BREAK SPACE 2048 QUESTION EXCLAMATION MARK 2049 EXCLAMATION QUESTION MARK in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create a new sub division proposal, with the following target dates: WD 1998-09, FPDAM 1998-10, FDAM 1999-04 and AM 1999-07</li> <li>• prepare registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from China, Mongolia, and the contributing editor (for the three additional characters)</li> </ul> forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing. China to supply fonts on Mongolian script to the convener / AFII for printing sample code tables by year end 1998.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1918 (SC 2 N3208); fonts were NOT received by AFII in time. Fonts from Mongolia were used.</b>
<b>AI-35-8</b>	<b>TCA (Ms. Emily Hsu)</b>	
a	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.17 (PDAM-15 - KangXi radicals): WG 2 accepts the working draft in document N1869, with corrected names and moving the starting point of the CJK Radicals Supplement to 2E80 from 2E00. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from TCA, China and the IRG project editor, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, with unchanged target dates.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1923 (SC 2 N3213).</b>
<b>AI-35-9</b>	<b>Mongolian national body (Ms. Myatav Erdenchimeg)</b>	
a	to assist the editor of ISO/IEC 10646-1 with: RESOLUTION M35.11 (Mongolian script): WG 2 accepts the 155 characters, their shapes, and their names in document N1878, and assigns them to code positions in the range 1800 to 18AF, and 3 following additional characters in the General Punctuation Block: 202FNARROW NO BREAK SPACE 2048 QUESTION EXCLAMATION MARK 2049 EXCLAMATION QUESTION MARK in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create a new sub division proposal, with the following target dates: WD 1998-09, FPDAM 1998-10, FDAM 1999-04 and AM 1999-07</li> <li>• prepare registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from China, Mongolia, and the contributing editor (for the three additional characters)</li> </ul> forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing. Mongolia is to send the fonts to convener and AFII by year end 1998 to enable printing of sample code tables.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1918 (SC 2 N3208); fonts were sent to AFII.</b>
<b>AI-35-10</b>	<b>UK national body (Mr. John Clews, Mr. Hugh Ross)</b>	
a	Mr. John Clews is to do some research to get the contact names, mailing address, fax etc. in the Maldivian Ministry of Education and get the information to the convener.	<b>M36: Transferred to Mr. Takayuki Sato.</b>
b	Mr. Hugh Ross is encouraged to approach IEC to ask them to include similar mapping information (as in his contribution document N1818 on mapping of Electrotechnical symbols) in relevant IEC standards.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)	Status
<b>AI-35-11</b>	<b>Irish national body (Mr. Michael Everson)</b>	
a	Mr. Michael Everson is invited to take the comments at this meeting (M35) and prepare a revised contribution on Old Hungarian in document N1758.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>AI-35-12</b>	<b>Japanese national body (Mr. Takayuki Sato)</b>	
a	Messrs. Michel Suignard, Bruce Paterson and Takayuki Sato -- to address the concerns raised by Japan in document N1819 (regarding definitions for non-graphic characters) and come up with suggested clarification / explanatory text.	<b>M36: Completed; see document 2012.</b>
b	is invited to provide the missing references for source characters in Extension A Ideographs, to update Annex L in Amendment 17.	<b>M36: Completed Part of Amd. 17 – see document N1929 (SC 2 N3220).</b>
c	to provide more information on the usage of and the need for "ng" and the need of "ng" in document N1859, taking into account the comments made at this meeting.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
d	to provide more information on the Peso currency sign proposed in document N1858.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
e	to provide additional information on Old Mongolian (document N1855) and its relationship to the Mongolian script proposal in the BMP.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>AI-35-13</b>	<b>The Unicode Consortium (Dr. Asmus Freytag)</b>	
a	to provide more information on use of the three proposed symbols -- SQUARE FOOT, SQUARE INCH, and PROPERTY LINE in document N1887.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
<b>AI-35-14</b>	<b>Finnish national body (Mr. Klaas Ruppel)</b>	
a	Mr. Klaas Ruppel is invited provide additional explanation of the use of A with Dot Above to supplement document N1838.	<b>M36: Completed.</b>
<b>AI-35-15</b>	<b>The U.S. national body (Mr. Michel Suignard)</b>	
a	Mr. Michel Suignard to send the proposed text for Annex P for the two ideographic characters in the R-zone (corresponding to the two that were removed from the earlier Extension A proposal) by 1st week of November 98.	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1935.</b>
b	Dr. Ken Whistler has volunteered to check the names of characters in the PDAM-28 text for Ideographic Description Characters (see resolution M35.16).	<b>M36: Completed; see document N1892 (SC 2 N3186).</b>
<b>AI-35-16</b>	<b>All national bodies and liaison organizations</b>	
a	are encouraged to submit WG 2 contributions in Word 6, plain text or PDF files to the convener suitable for posting on the WG 2 web site.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
b	to review the WG 2 web site and feedback on possible improvements to WG 2 convener.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
c	to review and feedback on the sample charts and name lists for next edition of 10646-1 (in document N1810).	<b>M36: Some feedback; Noted.</b>
d	to review and express their position on the proposal to replace the Korean Hangul long names in Amendment 5 with an equivalent algorithm which generates these names (see defect report in document N1806).	<b>M36: Some feedback; see document N1942.</b>
e	to review and feedback on documents N1846 on Ethiopic extensions.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
f	to review and feedback on documents N1755 on Philippines repertoire.	<b>M36: Feedback from the Unicode Consortium; see document N1933.</b>
g	to review and feedback on document N1757 on Tifinagh script.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
h	to review and feedback on documents N1740 and N1807 on Hebrew Tetragrammaton.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
i	to review document N1818 on mapping of Electrotechnical Symbols and feedback to Mr. Hugh Ross.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
j	to review the scripts that they have contributed in the different amendments 10 through 27 to the standard and provide to WG 2 the source references for the scripts and individual characters for inclusion in Annex L.	<b>M36: In progress.</b>
k	to review document N1848 on UTF-8-EBCDIC and feedback to the author, Dr. Umamaheswaran.	<b>M36: Noted; some feedback from USA / the Unicode Consortium.</b>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>l</b>	all action items related to providing fonts (to the convener / AFII) should be completed in time to enable the printing of the next edition of 10646-1 on schedule. Feedback:IRG will produce the Ideographic Set for 10646-1. Separate the fonts for non-ideographic from ideographic.	<b>M36: Some feedback.</b>
<b>m</b>	to review document N1796 and inform the editor -- Mr. Bruce Paterson -- of any corrections before the next meeting by the end of December 1998.	<b>M36: Some feedback from Mr. Hugh Ross.</b>
<b>n</b>	SC 2 program of work is available from the web site of SC 2. <a href="http://dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2">http://dkuug.dk/JTC1/SC2</a> (check the web site).	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
<b>o</b>	RESOLUTION M35.20 (Future meetings): WG 2 confirms the following future meeting schedule: Meeting 36: 09--15 March 1999, Fukuoka, Japan Meeting 37: 20--24 September 1999 -- Copenhagen, Denmark Meeting 38: March 2000 --China Meeting 39 September 2000, Greece, Finland as fall back WG 2 accepts and confirms the following IRG future meeting schedule: IRG 12: 07--11 December 1998 in Redwood Shores, CA, USA IRG 13: May 1999, Hong Kong.	<b>M36: Noted.</b>
<b>AI-35-17</b>	AFII (Dr. Asmus Freytag)	
<b>a</b>	to print sample code tables using the fonts received from Mongolia and China and select the more suitable font for printing the second edition of 10646-1."	<b>M36: Completed; fonts were received from Mongolia; code tables were made available at this meeting (M36) for delegates to review.</b>

## 5 JTC 1 and ITTF matters

### 5.1 JTC 1 plenary and CAW ad hoc meeting

Input document:

1939 CAW ad hoc meeting results - JTC 1 N5629; JTC 1 Secretariat; 1998-12-11

For information to the delegates – there was no discussion.

### 5.2 Summary of voting and recent publication announcements

The following publication announcements / documents are listed for information – there was no discussion. Copies of final amendments can be obtained from your national bodies or from the JTC 1 Central Secretariat.

<b>Title</b>	<b>Doc. Number</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Amendment 10 - Ethiopic Script</b>	N1916	1998-10-15
<b>Amendment 13 - CJK Unified Ideographs – Horizontal Extensions</b>	N1927	1998-10-15
<b>Amendment 16 - Braille Patterns</b>	N1928	1998-10-15
<b>Amendment 19 – Runic script</b>	N1914	1998-11-01
<b>Amendment 20 - Ogham</b>	N1915	1998-11-01
<b>TR15825 - An Operational Model for Characters and Glyphs</b>		1998-12-15

## 6 SC 2 matters

### 6.1 Recently closed ballots

Ballots on the amendments listed in the following sections closed end of February 1999. Ballot comments were discussed and dispositions were prepared during the meeting – these are detailed below.

#### 6.1.1 PDAM15 - Kang Xi & CJK Radicals

**Input documents:**

- 1923 Text for combined PDAM registration and consideration ballot - PDAM 15 - Kang Xi Radicals and CJK Radical Supplements - SC 2 N3213; Paterson; 1998-10-28
- 1965 Draft Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description characters), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other characters), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan extension); Paterson; 1999-02-23
- 1968 pDAM15 Kang Xi ballot response - SC 2 3247; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-08
- 1969 pDAM15 Ireland ballot response - SC 2 32471; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-08
- 1992 IRG #12 – Resolutions (IRG N620); IRG; 1998-12-11

**Output document:**

- 1965R Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-03-15

There were 15 positive votes, Canada and Ireland voted negative.

- Document N1968 contains the table of replies and ballot responses, and some national body comments.
- Document N1969 contains the Irish negative ballot comments.
- Document N1992 contains the resolutions from IRG meeting no. 12. IRG's input is that the name change is not preferred. If WG 2 considers there is need for change, take Mr. Michael Everson's. IRG document N616 (that was not distributed) was referenced.
- Document N1965 contains a skeleton disposition of comments prepared by the project editor.

An ad hoc group on IRG related amendments, with participation of Messrs. Michael Everson, Ken Whistler, Ngô Trung Việt, Tatsuo Kobayashi, Hideki Hiura, Satoshi Yamamoto, Takayuki Sato and Ms. Emily Hsu was charged with reviewing the ballot comments and recommend proposed disposition of comments.

The ad hoc reported on the disposition of comments:

*A. Comments accompanying Negative ballot from Canada – see document N1968*

Tech Comment 1

Ad hoc agrees with this Analysis. Canadian comment was correct.

Change the name of 2ECF to use CITY in its name instead of MOUND.

Change the name of 2ED6 to use MOUND TWO in its name.

Tech Comment 2 is connected to Canadian Comment 1.

Ad hoc agreed to Canadian Comment 2 – the resolution was to change 2ED5 to CJK Radical Mound one.

Tech Comment 3 – Agree with first part of it.

There is a problem with 2E9A – has no visible difference with 2F46 – and there is no justification for this difference.

The resolution was to remove the SIMPLIFIED NONE at 2E9A – leave a hole and ask IRG for an explanation.

2FC1 and 2EE4 have the nine-stroke to ten-stroke difference. The names are distinct because they belong in different blocks.

Editorial 1 – Accept

Editorial 2 – part 1 was resolved with Tech comment 1.

Second part of Editorial 2 – LEAF.

Safest route would be to correct the names based on the meaning of what the radical character meant – use the traditional dictionary meaning instead of use of the character



by itself. The resolution is to change the name of 2EDA to LEAF from PAGE. Following the same principle, 2EA6 would be named HALF TREE TRUNK.

Editorial 3 – In general this comment could not be accommodated.

This is a wide ranging suggestion that involves a number of experts etc. and will not be reasonable to go after this at this time. 2F33 – named THREAD, versus 2F77 and 2EB0 (SHORT ...). 2F33 should be renamed SHORT THREAD instead of just THREAD. 2F34 change of name was not accepted by ad hoc. The current name stays.

Dr. Umamaheswaran: Canada is satisfied that the issues brought up were addressed by the experts in an ad hoc group and where the comments were not accepted, an explanation is given.

*B. Comments accompanying Negative ballot from Ireland – see document N1969*

Comment 1 was not accepted – if accepted, we risk negative ballots from others.

Comment 2 was not accepted.

The direction was to accept the Kang Xi traditional dictionary than modern usage. If we accept the Irish comments, we risk negative ballots by others.

Mr. Michael Everson: If it would be possible I would still like to have the opportunity to review the names. Ms. Emily Hsu has the information. I would have no problem accepting the ad hoc recommendations. I would like to take a final look at the input.

#### **Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: Are you (Ireland) asking this to be put on hold – till the names such as LONGSTRIDE are fixed? It could be a typographical error. LONG STRIDE is more correct than LONGSTRIDE. Are you asking to put this on hold for TECHNICAL issues or EDITORIAL issues?
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: I have made a number of amendments to the names before the PDAM ballot. Once the names are fixed we cannot change them – let us fix names 2F35 – LONGSTRIDE to LONG STRIDE etc. as editorial fixes.
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: Editorial The IRG did review our paper – we appreciate input from IRG on this.

*C. Comments from UK – the ad hoc group did not have to address these.*

*D. Comments from US*

Issue 1 – 2FA3 – should change to have WINE in the name.

Issue 2 – changing the fonts in the republication will take care of the identified problem.

Issue 3 – Annex T – some additional text is to be prepared and provided to the editor.

The distinction between glyphs in the radicals are not applicable to general Han characters.

Comments 1, 2, 3 – were all accepted.

**Disposition:** WG 2 accepts the above disposition of comments – the editor is to update document N1965 (with assistance from Dr. Ken Whistler), and progress the updated amendment text to FPDAM-15. (Document N1965R contains the updated disposition of comments.)

**Action item:** Dr. Ken Whistler is to provide sources of characters, arising from the amendment on Kang Xi and CJK Radicals (FPDAM-15), to the project editor to include in the Annex T corrigendum text (see section 7.1.3).

#### **Relevant resolution:**

##### **M36.7 (PDAM-15 on Kang Xi and CJK radicals):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments on PDAM-15 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-15 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.

## 6.1.2 PDAM28 - Ideographic Description Characters

### Input documents:

- 1892 PDAM 28 - Ideographic description characters; Paterson/Zhang; 1998-10-19  
1965 Draft Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-02-23  
1970 pDAM28 Ideographic Description Characters - ballot response - SC 2 3241; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-05  
1971 pDAM28 Ireland ballot response - SC 2 32411; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-05

### Output document:

- 1965R Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-03-15

- Document N1892 was the text that was balloted.
- Document N1970 contains the table of replies: There were 15 positive votes, two with comments, and 2 negative votes – from Canada and Ireland.

The IRG ad hoc group also reviewed the ballot comments on PDAM28-IDCs, and reported as follows:

#### *A Canadian negative ballot comments (see document N1970)*

On comment 1 – the system of IDC is inefficient from the bigger picture.

It has limitations. The problem is due to their inclusion for compatibility with existing standard in China – GBK. The problem is known. The deficiency was explained to Canada as known problem – with no quick fixes possible.

On comment 2 – Reference to GBK – as the source document will be included in Annex L.

Editor will need the correct reference to the Source – by end of the month.

Dr. Asmus Freytag: they are taken from GBK standard; are there commercially available font in use? They are not novel. The official name for GBK is needed as referenced source for these characters.

Editorial – nesting is implicitly recognized. Request for Canada was sent back – explicitly requesting specific text from Canada for the example.

Dr. Asmus Freytag: Perhaps a sentence could be added to explicitly recognize that nesting of IDS is allowed. A Note – 'this implies that IDS can in principle be nested'.

Accept Editorial comment from Canada.

Dr. Umamaheswaran: Canada can accept the proposed explanation to their comments and reverses its vote.

#### *B Irish negative ballot comments (see document N1971)*

Comment 1 – Glyphs. The glyphs came from IRG.

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I suggest that the glyphs are not changed from what is in current actual use in the countries.
- b) Mr. Michael Everson: Is this going out as a published amendment.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: There is a request for holding these for publication till next edition.
- d) Mr. Bruce Patterson: Improved glyphs will be provided when this amendment is consolidated with the next edition of the standard. They will be improved when better glyphs are made available.

Accepted in principle.

Comment 2 – Names. 'Character' occurs in the names – these could be removed. Same as UK comment.

- a) Dr. Ken Whistler: The USA would have objection to change of names.
- b) Mr. Takayuki Sato: It is preferable to keep "character" in the names.
- c) Dr. Umamaheswaran: We had a discussion at the last WG 2 meeting and we decided to keep the 'character' in the name.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: You have to make the name of the block and the character names consistent.
- e) Mr. Bruce Paterson: We can align the name of the block and the collection with those of the characters.

Irish comment is accepted in principle.

Comment 3. –requesting name change from OVERLAID to OVERLAY.

- a) Dr. Ken Whistler: I do not think it is necessary to change.
- b) Mr. Michael Everson: It is not correct to leave it as is.
- c) Mr. Bruce Paterson: It is not essential to the technical nature. Remember this is the first PDAM and we do have some flexibility.

No change.

Comment 4. – First part is no longer applicable in light of disposition to 2 above.

Second part not accepted. Third part is not accepted.

Comment 5. – Accepted in principle. A note will be added in section 3.1.

Comment 6. -

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: One can tell an end of an IDS since each one has a fixed number of parameters.
- b) Mr. Michael Everson: request change "(D1, D2, D3)" be changed to "(D1 D2) or (D1 D2 D3)" in the last sentence in clause D.3.1.

Accepted.

Comment 7.—Mr. Michael Everson – Ireland withdraws this comment.

Editorial comments from Ireland:

1. Irish comment is incorrect according to ITTF procedure.
2. EmDash – was in the original text – did not get printed out in SC 2 distributed copy
3. Not accepted.
- 4, 5, 6 – not accepted.
7. Accept in principle

Mr. Michael Everson: Ireland will accept the proposed disposition of comments, and will change our ballot to positive.

#### *C Comments from the UK*

Comment 1 – Same as Ireland Tech no. 2 – same disposition.

Accept in principle.

Comment 2. Suggestion is to move all the examples from in line text in section D3.2 – into another column in Table D.1.

Mr. Bruce Paterson: I have sent a proposed changed table D.1 including the examples and was acceptable to the IRG editor.

Accepted.

Comment 3. Editorial error – Accepted.

#### *D Comments from USA:*

Comment 1:

Coded ideographic component – is an IRG concept. It is not a concept in ISO/IEC 10646-1 – as yet. USA suggestion is to remove the third bullet in section D3.1 first paragraph.

Accepted.

### **Disposition:**

Accept the above disposition of comments – editor to update document N1965 and progress the updated amendment text to FPDAM-28 on IDCs. Document N1965R contains the updated disposition of comments.

#### **Relevant resolution:**

##### **M36.8 (PDAM-28 on Ideographic description characters):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-28 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-28 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.

### **6.1.3 PDAM29 – Mongolian script**

#### **Input documents:**

- 1918 Text for Combined PDAM registration and consideration ballot - SC 2 N 3208; Paterson; 1998-10-28
- 1965 Draft Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-02-23
- 1972 pDAM29 Mongolian ballot response - SC 2 3249; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-12

1973 PDAM29 Ireland ballot response - SC 2 32491; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-12  
1980 Report of ad hoc Mongolia meeting; China; 1999-01-15

**Output document:**

1965R Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-03-15

There were 12 positive votes, 4 additional votes with comments and 1 negative vote from Ireland.

- Document N1918 – Mongolian text that was balloted.
- Ballot responses and comments are in documents N1972 and N1973.

*A Comments from China:*

Comment 1: Missing character name for 48 – Suggested Exclamation Mark.

This is an error between the editor and the printing process.

Comment 2: Proposed text for Narrow No-break space – explanation.

- a) Mr. Bruce Paterson: Clause 21 contains a list of space characters. We do not have descriptive text at this point in time. We could add descriptive text to Annex D. This comment is similar to USA comment 3.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: China is asking for clarification about this character. Annex P is the appropriate place for brief explanation on characters.
- c) Mr. Bruce Paterson: Annex D has other space characters. ACCEPT these comments in principle. We will add the name to clause 21 – normative. We will construct some text for Annex D – with assistance from Dr. Asmus Freytag or Dr. Ken Whistler. (Also deals with USA comment number 3).

Comment 3: Explanatory text for Annex D. Similar to USA comment 1 and comment 4.

Accept in principle. The editor will prepare text offline with help from USA and others.

*B Comments from USA:*

Comments 1 and 4 belong together (see disposition to Chinese comments above)

Comment 2:

There is confusion as to which is the correct font to use. Both orientations are known and are acceptable.

Response:

There is no need to change the orientation. The glyph chosen would be the final one chosen for the next edition by AFII.

Mr. Michael Everson: At one time AFII asked me to confirm the choice – and I referenced sources and confirmed these are OK.

*C Comments from Ireland*

Comment 1: Editorial – Accepted.

Comment 2: AG – be changed to ALI GALI.

There are about 44 characters with AG in their names instead of ALI GALI. These are short forms put by Chinese / Mongolian in their databases. In most literature it is called ALI GALI.

**Discussion:**

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Minor practical issue – looking at the drafts I have been working on – there are several names which may overflow a line for names in the code tables. It appears Mongolian has seen often-difficult cooperation between different countries – there is a common understanding achieved between them with assistance from this committee. In this instance there is no indication that there is any dissatisfaction with the current proposal. If the parties – China and Mongolia – were at this meeting we could get a confirmation from them as to the acceptability of the name change. In the absence of these parties here, we should not be changing.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: In the light of Mongolia / China not being at this meeting, it would be possible to put a note in Annex P for a group of characters – to accommodate the Irish comment. Remember that this is the first time the PDAM is being balloted.
- c) Dr. Umamaheswaran: It should be possible to contact Mongolia / China – to get their input on this subject.

- d) Dr. Ken Whistler: This abbreviated name is in the earlier working documents on Mongolian.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: I believe this is an error – it is an artifact. With the WG 2 process would we accept a change in the name if Mongolia comes up with a request for change?
- f) Dr. Asmus Freytag: There will be an issue with synchronization with Unicode. In London, we asked China to create the PDAM text. Did that document have AG in it or ALI GALI in it? AG. In principle, the interested parties had no objection to it in London meeting. We should stick with what we had then.
- g) Mr. Mike Ksar: In principle, this PDAM has been accepted with a positive ballot. We should not change the name, and we accept the Annex P annotation. This text is based on what Mongolian / China have submitted. Preference is to get a note in Annex P for a group of names – AG to ALI GALI. If it was an error in the review of the earlier work, then the error has been made by WG 2.
- h) Mr. Alain LaBonté: Should we clarify with Mongolia if there was an error or not? It will be a mistake to accept names if there is a mistake. Is it possible that we could have an answer before end of the meeting from Mr. Richard Moore?
- i) Mr. Bruce Paterson – An email was received from Mr. Richard Moore who is the co-editor – he will not be able to attend – "Since there is no real technical problem raised – we need not attend". There are no rules in Annex K that states that a name cannot be abbreviated in the English transliterated names. Let us remember that.
- j) Mr. Michael Everson: Customary names should be used. I would like to get clarification by sending an email to Mr. Richard Moore / Mongolian expert.
- k) Mr. Mike Ksar: I do not think Mongolian input is needed. I do not believe it is a mistake. We should accept Mr. Bruce Paterson's suggestion for a note in Annex P. It would be the method of disposition to Irish negative comments. I am prepared to get the feedback before end of the day. The discussion is put on HOLD till we got feedback from Mr. Richard Moore. / China.  
Action item – on Mr. Michael Everson. Even if Mr. Richard Moore may have an objection – since the PDAM has passed, it would not be acceptable to change the name.

Mr. Mike Ksar got messages from China and Mr. Richard Moore. China is still hoping to get to the meeting. Mr. Mike Ksar read out the note that was sent from Mr. Michael Everson to Mr. Richard Moore. It contained part of what was said by Mr. Mike Ksar. I also wanted to let them know that the PDAM has passed. Mr. Richard Moore's response – he was not present at the meeting when the draft was prepared by the Mongolian ad hoc; it would have been simply a convenience of creating the tables. They do not have a strong preference to whether AG or ALI GALI is used. Based on this message, we go with what we have resolved earlier – to keep the names with AG. There was also a message from China - from Mr. Chen – their Mongolian expert will be here if they get the visa by Friday. In the character name – if AG means ALI GALI the full name should be used. We would agree to it if this comment is accepted. The arrangement of digits in the PDAM – should be in the vertical arrangement orientation – as it is in the current text.

- l) Mr. Michael Everson: Mr. Richard Moore's assumption is that the truncation is to avoid expansion of names. If we do an annotation we have to put in two additional characters with \* in it. China and Mongolia have indicated that they do not have objection to change the names.
- m) Mr. Alain LaBonté: Knowing that from the translatability point of view AG – has to be expanded before translation – it would be preferable to expand into ALI GALI.
- n) Dr. Umamaheswaran: I submit that the objections to expanding the names are mainly gone. We should go for reversing our preliminary decision and go for expanding the name.
- o) Dr. Asmus Freytag: One of the reasons is the approval process – and another reason is that the amount of work to add 42 \*s. Ireland is correct – in the normal circumstances moderate correction is correct at the PDAM stage, it is not yet at FPDAM stage. It is also not wise to use the Annex P for situations like this – where it

is showing to be more expensive. It would be the same effort to add the ASTERISK as to expand AG to ALI GALI in the names with AG in them.

- p) Dr. Ken Whistler: The amount of work is probably more to add into the database. If we are going to change the names for Mongolian – we definitely should do it NOW rather than at FPDAM stage.
- q) Mr. Bruce Paterson: I have no objection either way as an editor. From the UK position – having heard the arguments and having heard that China and Mongolia would not object – we would support the expanded name.
- r) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Japan would not care if the name is expanded. I would not be in favor of names simply for translation reasons only – however, in this case we do not object.
- s) Mrs. Elżbieta Broma-Wrzesień: Poland will have no problem in changing the name at this time.

Disposition: We will accept Irish Technical Comment 2 – AG expands to ALI GALI.

*D All the editorial comments – left to the editor to handle.*  
Glyph improvement on NNBSB will be made in the next edition of the standard (already done by AFII). Amendment 29 may never be published separately.

**Disposition:**

The editor is to prepare revised text and disposition of comments, and send them to SC 2 for FPDAM-29 processing (including the AG to ALI GALI name change). Document N1965R will contain disposition of comments.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.9 (PDAM-29 on Mongolian script):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-29 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-29 with assistance from China, Mongolia and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.

## 6.1.4 PDAM30 - Additional Latin & other characters

**Input documents:**

- 1920 Text for combined PDAM registration and consideration ballot - PDAM 30 - Additional Latin and characters for other scripts - SC 2 N3210; Paterson; 1998-10-28
- 1938 On the Greek Letter Koppa; Everson; 1998-12-10
- 1965 Draft Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-02-23
- 1974 pDAM30 Latin and others ballot response - SC 2 3252; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-12
- 1975 PDAM30 Ireland ballot response - SC 2 32521; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-12

**Output document:**

- 1965R Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-03-15

- Document N1920 contains the text balloted – closing February 5, 1999.
- Document N1974 contains the table of replies.
- Document N1965 contains proposed disposition of comments.

There were 17 positive votes and a negative vote from Ireland (see document N1975).

*A Irish comments:*

Technical Comment 1 – several items:

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Michel Suignard: Drachma Sign was known – from Greece – its formal introduction to WG 2 was a time delay problem. Trying to get the other characters in at the FPDAM ballot stage is probably not proper. Other related characters – should be submitted as separate proposal.

- b) Mr. Michael Everson: The combining Cyrillic Ten Thousand Sign – was in the original proposal. The question was raised at the London meeting and was left as a question as to whether it can be rectified. After the London meeting – this character was discussed and it was proposed that it should not be unified. The Cyrillic SemiSoft Sign should be included to complete the Kildin Sámi. The Greek characters are in the same bucket. The Overlay Sign was missed from the previous go around – was accepted by the Unicode consortium – and is proposed to be added. Since this is only a PDAM, it is proper to propose these characters at the PDAM stage.
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: There are reasons for including or not including characters. But the status of this PDAM is different due to the publication deadline of the next edition. The UTC has discussed the KOPPA sign. It is of the opinion that these could be treated separately. From the AFII point of view – the shape we have in the first edition is the SIGMOID shape for KOPPA. We cannot go ahead and change the shapes as a two stage change – it will be tantamount to moving the character in the standard. In the standard we should not have TWO SHAPES of these characters. In Unicode 1.0 we used to show two glyphs at this location. We cannot change the shape of what exists and use the removed shape for new characters – this is moving character in the standard.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: At the present time, the ALPHABETIC ones will be unencoded.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We have encoded one of the two sets – there are two sets of KOPPAs. It is also correct to disambiguate them. In terms of the proposed remedy the suggestion is to go with a separate amendment.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: Principle stated by Dr. Asmus Freytag should be kept in mind – it is an important one. I do not believe Mr. Michael Everson is proposing to move the character – though that would have been the consequence. If we had a disambiguating text in Annex P it would be helpful.
- g) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We are currently coding both the Alphabetic and Numeric at the same code position – ambiguously. We can take away the use of one of these – it is one of the options. I am trying to relate the proposed characters to those in the current amendment. In terms of CYRILLIC characters – it is a straight forward question as to whether we accept the Unification of the Cyrillic Ten Thousand Sign with the combining circle or not. The unification is probably acceptable since this is not something which a processor would be able to disambiguate. With the Kildin Sámi – the SemiSoft sign character could be considered as additional characters for processing now – based on the arguments presented by Ireland. The Drachma sign – we have the situation of being informed in advance that it is coming. From the AFII point of view it will be easier to accommodate this. From the Unicode point of view we know that it is in the pipeline and is coming. The Overlay character – is also coming – but we do not see the urgency in having to add to the next edition. At this time, we need additional text in Unicode 3.0, which will take a little more effort. So we prefer to postpone these characters to a future amendment.
- h) Dr. Umamaheswaran: What was the output from the London ad hoc?
- i) Dr. Ken Whistler: The combining Cyrillic Ten Thousand Sign was left out. But there seems to be some further discussion on it. We knew about Drachma sign, but there was no source document. The Sámi characters are new ones. As to the Overlay sign, there was no request at the London meeting.
- j) Mr. Mike Ksar: At this point in time the Drachma sign is probably a candidate for inclusion. The others could be made into a new proposal. The SemiSoft Signs may be required for completion of the Kildin Sámi set. The intent was for completion of the Kildin Sámi set. At the London meeting these were considered to be same as Yat. Now we have more evidence.
- k) Mr. Michael Everson: We are happy enough to put in the Drachma sign. If the overlay sign is not needed by the UTC at this time, it could wait. If the UTC has problem with the Combining Cyrillic Ten Thousand Sign, it can also wait. The Koppa needs a resolution. The numeric Koppa is apparently more frequently used than the Alpha version. As a minimum I would like the glyph corrected.
- l) Dr. Ken Whistler: The USA position would be to agree to the three characters – Drachma sign and the SemiSoft Signs. There is advantage in keeping the additional characters to a minimum to the next edition. In document N1938 there are eight pages saying essentially that these characters are historically the same. The last page says that these should be separated. There is still some question on the technical merits of separating these. There is a USA comment on this – comment 3 – the specifics of the Glyph changes can be accepted.

- We do not advocate the Sigmoid shapes. We also propose a separate proposal than handling at the PDAM disposition stage.
- m) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We do not see opposition for placing some of the proposed characters in a separate bucket at this stage for future discussions and do a proper job on it, rather than rushing it into the PDAM disposition.
  - n) Mr. Bruce Paterson: There is already Greek Letter Koppa, which looks smaller than what is shown in 03D9. The Glyph in the final edition should differentiate between the Greek Letter and Greek Small Letter Koppa.

**Disposition:**

The SemiSoft Signs, and the Drachma Sign are accepted for inclusion now. The q-like glyph at 03DF – should be corrected to the glyph shown at 03D9 from document N1975. The name stays the same as in the PDAM. This is the minimum to be done to the PDAM.

Technical Comment 2 – was accepted.

Technical Comment 3

- a) Dr. Ken Whistler: USA prefers not to change – but can go along with it since it does not break the publication schedule.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: From the UK's view point – it looks more like a TICK.  
NOT ACCEPTED.

Technical Comment 4: Moves to a new proposal bucket.

Mr. Michael Everson: Ireland changes its negative ballot to positive with above disposition.

- B* *Israel* – comment noted. No action required.
- C* *Sweden* – comment noted. No action required.
- D* *UK comments*

Comment 1 is the same as one of Irish comments – which was accepted.

Comment 2 is to make the wording to be more aligned with the other similar wordings in Annex P.

Both Mr. Michael Everson and Dr. Asmus Freytag -- should be accepted.

Accepted.

*E* *USA comments:*

Comments 1 and 4 – FFF9, FFFA and FFFB – interlinear characters

These should be annotated, or failing that they should be removed from this PDAM.

These characters need further explanation and the text is not available. In London, there was some discussion about the proper text for annotations to be used in the Annex P. Having a proper definition for these characters – addressing the comments from the Japanese national body as well as the comments from within USA – is important.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The proposed text should be like other control characters – the explanation should be in Annex D.
- b) Mr. Michel Suignard: The concern was that unless these characters are used with care in plain text, they could be problematic. These are meant for local processing than interchange.
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The editor can be given the choice of including in the appropriate section in the standard.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: How much work would be there for inclusion of the text in the standard?
- e) Mr. Bruce Paterson: There are too many terms that are outside the current definitions in the standard. I will need to work with the USA member body experts and come up with appropriate text.

**Disposition:** Accept in principle the text in item 4 – editor to work on the appropriate wording of the text. Annex D -- alternate format characters – will contain a section or note to address the concern.



## **Discussion on document SC 2 N2007 – Proposed text for Annex D**

- a) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Additional definition may be needed for 'Interlinear', 'Annotation' etc. Annotation may include even marks like Tone Marks. Probably it would be useful to explain what Interlinear Annotation Character would be. Others had difficulty in understanding the meaning of Interlinear.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Interlinear – is a standard English dictionary term, so is Annotation. I do not think we have defined these. The editor has used the shortest wordings. Would you like to see an example – such as Japanese Ruby?
- c) Mr. Bruce Paterson: Whatever is within the "Agreement" between two parties need not be explicitly stated in the standard.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: One perfect example is Japanese Ruby, and would be understandable by implementers. I would make it clear that it is only an example. The proposed text is "An example of Interlinear Annotation would be Japanese Ruby".
- e) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I would like to see some kind of generic explanation – I can understand Japanese Ruby – others may not know what it is.
- f) Mr. Hideki Hiura: I do not think the example is necessary.
- g) Mr. Michael Everson: An example of interlinear annotation could be annotations to Old English text.
- h) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We seem to be going towards saying that an example of interlinear annotation is interlinear annotation. We should stay with what is proposed.
- i) Mr. Mike Ksar: Mr. Takayuki Sato seems to indicate that Ruby example may not be understood by people not familiar with Ruby. We should stay then with what is proposed. Does it satisfy the USA comments? Additional implementation notes would be useful – probably in the next edition.
- j) Mr. Michel Suignard: I think it would be.
- k) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We have in a number of instances where Unicode standard gives implementation guidelines etc. Is there a place in ISO/IEC 10646-1 to provide a relationship between the Unicode and ISO/IEC 10646-1 etc.?
- l) Mr. Mike Ksar: We will be referencing to Unicode standard as a normative reference.
- m) Mr. Bruce Paterson: I do not see this proposal of Normative Reference to Unicode so far in writing. When it is proposed we can take a look.

A message from Dr. Martin Duerst, on behalf of the w3c was read out by Mr. Mike Ksar -- w3c i18n WG - message on Annotation Characters – " ... hope that the explanatory text for the Annotations would be a big help. ... ".

USA comment 2 – why not use ZeroWidthSpace instead of SOFTSPACE for Thai ?

### **Discussion:**

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: In the UTC we had a parallel discussion. Strongly avoid coding a character which has an uncertainty of exact behavior. The interpretation was that the current ZeroWidthSpace will do the function. We need more information.
- b) Mr. Michel Suignard: I beg to differ with the UTC view. Mr. Maurice Bauhan – had given information on the fact the character is different from zwsp. Its scope is word by word than – character by character. It is true that the function needs a little more clarification. Within UTC we need more consensus.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: If there is still question about this character – we could withdraw this character for future addition. An ad hoc at this meeting should come up with some interpretation as to the function of this character.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: At the London meeting the ad hoc decided that this character was needed.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The document we had for review did not have enough information on the usage of this character.

Experts on scripts that would use the SOFTSPACE versus ZeroWidthSpace for Thai, Khmer etc. – were invited to participate in the ad hoc.

Ad hoc reported:

- a) Mr. Michel Suignard: We do not see the need for a proposal – if this annotation is not satisfactory.

- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: It is also the Unicode Liaison position – to withdraw these characters from the amendment. We have not received information on its precise usage. What is the exact definition of its behavior.
- c) Mr. Michel Suignard: We could not see a justification – after consulting with the East Asian guests at the meeting. We could solve the problems with Dai, Myanmar etc. with existing character. The new character could not be justified.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: The East Asian guests were consulted. There was no justification. So we will accept the Removal of SOFTSPACE – per USA Technical comment.

USA Comment 3

We had a discussion on this – slightly different from Irish view. Accommodated by disposition to Irish technical comment 1.

**Disposition:**

WG 2 will progress Amendment 30 to FPDAM-30 with the above dispositions – see document N1965R. The COMBINING UPWARD POINTING TRIANGLE OVERLAY character with shape shown in document N1975, at position 20E2 - moves to a new proposal bucket M36.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.10 (PDAM-30 on Additional Latin and other characters):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-30 ballot in document N1965R, and the proposed clarification text for Annex D regarding Interlinear Annotation Characters in document N2007, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-30 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.

Note the disposition of comments includes:

- Deletion of SOFT SPACE at 204F
- Addition from document N1975 of:
  - 048C CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER SEMISOFT SIGN
  - 048D CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER SEMISOFT SIGN
- Addition from documents N1975 and N1946 of:
  - 20AF DRACHMA SIGN

**M36.19 (New character bucket M36):**

**Unanimous**

With reference to document N1941, WG 2 accepts the proposed Triangular Overlay character, with the new name COMBINING ENCLOSING UPWARD POINTING TRIANGLE, with its proposed shape, and allocates it the code position 20E4 in the BMP. WG 2 instructs its project editor to create a new list of characters accepted for processing beyond the 2nd edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.

**6.1.5 PDAM31 - Tibetan Extensions**

**Input documents:**

- 1922 Text for combined PDAM registration and consideration ballot - PDAM 31 - Tibetan Extension - SC 2 N3212; Paterson; 1998-10-28
- 1965 Draft Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-02-23
- 1977 PDAM31 Ireland ballot response - SC 2 32542; SC 2 Secretariat; 1999-02-12
- 1979 PDAM31 China ballot response - SC 2 32541; China; 1999-01-27

**Output document:**

- 1965R Disposition of Comments for pDAM 15 (Kang Xi & CJK Radicals), pDAM 28 (Ideographic description char.), pDAM 29 (Mongolian), pDAM 30 (Additional Latin and other char.), and pDAM 31 (Tibetan ext.); Paterson; 1999-03-15

- Document N1922 – has the source text of PDAM-30.
- Document N1976 – for ballot comments and table of replies.
- Document N1977 contains comments from China.

*A Comments from China*

Comment 1: AD, B1, B2 – the glyphs got changed from Amd.6. BA, BB, and BC were agreed to be added – however not to interchange the glyphs.

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: The glyphs were changed to be consistent with the rest of the characters, and some new characters which were added would have been confusing.

- b) Dr. Ken Whistler: The glyphs were changed in the draft as presented for further progression in London meeting. The draft for Amd.31 were accepted. Not changing these glyphs from Amd.6 would have caused more confusion.
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We need to avoid the possible misinterpretation that these glyphs have been MOVED. We should put in some annotation in Annex P to remove the possible misinterpretation. The proposal is only to the NON-FIXED form.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: If an annex P material is to be added it should include all the characters.
- e) Dr. Ken Whistler: At the London meeting, Chinese Tibetan experts were not present and there was no consensus.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: Dr. Ken Whistler can work with Mr. Bruce Paterson to get appropriate text from document N1864 – the ad hoc group report.
- g) Mr. Bruce Paterson: Are these three characters cited by China the only ones that have problems. I am concerned about similar comments for other similar characters.
- h) Mr. Mike Ksar: The ballot has passed following the procedure – this is not the time for starting to changing things. We will accept Chinese comment 1 – editor to prepare Annex P annotation with help of Dr. Ken Whister.

Comment 2 – (also from UK, US)

Editorial inconsistency has been pointed out. Accepted.

Also Ireland editorial, UK –page 4 and USA.

Comment 3 – Two glyphs look identical. 0F6A and 0F62.

Disposition – a note in Annex P – fixed form versus nominal form for the existing characters is causing some of these glyph duplication, however, the separate character encoding is required per coding experts on Tibetan.

#### *B Irish comments in document N1977*

Technical comment 1- proposal is to add two new characters. Not Accepted.

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: We can accept this in principle and not change the Ballot at the PDAM stage.
- b) Dr. Ken Whistler: USA would agree to that position certainly. Editorial comments have already been addressed.

#### *C UK comments*

UK suggestion is to keep the current temporary editor's note in the final Amendment text.

Remove the word 'temporary'. Accepted.

Accepted others.

#### *D USA comments*

Accepted – see earlier discussions.

### **Disposition:**

Editor is to prepare and progress revised text as FPDAM 31 based on the above discussion. Disposition of comments will be in document N1965R.

#### **Relevant resolution:**

##### **M36.11 (PDAM-31 on Tibetan extensions):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-31 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-31 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.

## **6.2 Ballot results and disposition of comments**

### **6.2.1 FPDAM14 - Yi syllables and Yi radicals**

#### **Input documents:**

1925 Disposition of Comments - PDAM14 - Yi - SC 2 N3214; WG 2; 1998-11-02

1926 Text of FPDAM 14 - Yi - SC 2 N3215; Paterson; 1998-11-02

1987 Summary of voting and Table of replies – Amendment 14 – Yi script and Yi radicals (SC 2 N3268); SC 2 Secretariat; 03-05

**Output document:**

**1945R Ad hoc report on Yi script and Yi radicals – Meeting 35, London; Everson, Whistler; 1999-03-15**

Document N1987 has table of replies and ballot comments. Ireland had voted Negative. An ad hoc group – Mr. Michael Everson, Dr. Ken Whistler – met and reviewed the comments. Yi is a Chinese script.

Dr. Ken Whistler reported on the ad hoc group discussion and recommendation:

Only Yi radicals are impacted, Yi script is untouched. On Yi-Radicals -- there is disagreement on what the radicals should be and what the order should be. Best way to resolve with the highest level of consensus would be to remove China's additional radicals – which do not have supporting evidence other than these characters exist and there is contention about them. Also, not to add the extra characters Ireland claims exist. We take the intersection of the Chinese and Irish contributions. We leave holes for future additions once agreement is reached. The order would be based on numerous other contributions and those from Ireland. This would be similar to previous resolutions on similar contentious matter. This would allow us to have the least contentious way of progressing on this. If we would go based on this approach – it would satisfy Ireland. We don't know how this would impact China's position. This would leave open the possibility to add the dropped contentious characters in the future. The easiest way to see this is to look at the Irish comment – a suggested new layout is provided. Eliminate all the gray boxes. Eliminate all the dotted boxes. Eliminate all the square boxes. There are seven characters in the amendment that will be removed. Those Ireland is asking for as additions will also not be included. There is also some shuffling from the PDAM to the proposed chart in Irish comment. The big issue is what we end up with. If this is agreed to – then we can go point by point.

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: The ad hoc recommendation is to go with common denominator between the Irish and China's set.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The YI RADICALS – I want to be given a single replacement font for publication.
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: The Irish comment 6 is on names of characters. China comment 1 agrees with one of the Irish proposed names.

Dr. Ken Whistler: Point by point disposition of the various comments:

China 1 – Should be accepted – names should be interchanged; also Annex E should be updated.

China 2 – Also be accepted – as a result of China 1. Annex E should be corrected based on correct names and numbers – there are several others.

UK – All of UK comments should be accepted. 1st and last are cleanup editorials.

Turkey – NOTED.

Ireland 1 and 2 are Background information – noted.

Ireland 3 – This comment leads up to the solution. Background to what needs to be done. Noted.

Ireland 4 – This comment has the requirement stated in it. To reorder according to Bburx and leave 5 missing positions. It should be accepted. This disposition is the minimum requirement to turn Ireland's negative vote to positive.

Ireland 5 – "These should not be encoded ..." -- should be accepted.

Ireland 6 – First one – WO and DO interchange – should be accepted.

Ireland 6A – Noted -- does not ask for any change.

The ad hoc group did not discuss others. China has one name, Ireland proposes others. We should leave them as they are.

Mr. Michael Everson: Ireland – withdraws the second part.

Ireland 7 – Superseded by ad hoc recommendation. It is accepted in part. Ad hoc also recommended removal of three other characters. The recommendation is to remove all contention by removing: - A4BD, A49F, A4B7 – which were otherwise unattested characters. One of these is intended to be the TONE MARK – Yi Hi Tone mark. A tone mark is NOT a radical, and this is problematic to be coded as a radical. The ad hoc discovered this problem. There is a notable lack of dialog on these contentious characters. These and others can be brought forward in the future.

## Output document N1945

Document N1945 contains the ad hoc report. It summarizes the proposed disposition of comments and the rationale for removal of characters and reordering of characters in FPDAM-14.

**Action item:** Mr. Michael Everson will provide the editor with a new chart; fonts should also be sent to AFII for the second edition.

**Disposition:** Accept the above disposition of comments; the editor is to update document N1945 (will be document N194R), prepare and progress a revised text of the amendment as FDAM-14.

### Relevant Resolution:

#### M36.1 (FPDAM-14 on Yi syllables and Yi radicals):

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the ad hoc report in document N1945R on ballot comments on FPDAM-14. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments and the final text of FDAM-14, based on document N1945R and discussion at meeting 36, with assistance from China and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with revised target dates --- FDAM 99-05 and AM 99-08

Note that the disposition of comments includes, as shown in document N1945R:

- Deletion of the 7 character positions – A49F, A4B3, A4B7, A4BD, A4C1, A4C2, A4C3.
- Rearrangement of character code positions in the range from A490 to A4CF

## 6.2.2 FPDAM17 - CJK extension A

### Input document:

1929 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM 17 - CJK Unified Ideograph Extension A - SC 2 N 3219; WG 2  
SC 2 N3220 Revised Text of ISO/IEC 10646-1/FPDAM 17, Information technology – Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) -- Part 1: Architecture and Basic Multilingual Plane --AMENDMENT 17: CJK Unified Ideograph Extension A; Project editor; 1998-11-02

This amendment is out for DAM ballot closing on May 4 1999. The FDAM text was NOT circulated to WG 2 – it has been sent as an SC 2 document for JTC 1 ballot. (See action item AI-M35.7 g – in section 4 above).

**Action item:** Convener is to send FDAM-17 text cover page and sample code tables for WG 2 circulation.

## 6.2.3 FPDAM18 - Euro & Others

### Input document:

1894 Revised Text of FPDAM18 - Symbols, including EURO, and others - SC 2 N 3188; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-22

The amendment text has gone for DAM ballot closing May 4, 1999. There was no discussion.

## 6.2.4 FPDAM21 - Sinhala

### Input documents:

1895 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM21 - Sinhala - Updated from N1841R - SC 2 N 3189; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-22  
1896 Revised Text FPDAM 21 - Sinhala - SC N 3190; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-22

The amendment text has gone for DAM ballot closing end of March 1999. There was no discussion.

## 6.2.5 FPDAM22 - Keyboard Symbols

### Input documents:

1897 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM22 - Keyboard Symbols - SC 2 N3191; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-22  
1898 Text for FPDAM22 - Keyboard Symbols - SC 2 N3192; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-22  
1990 Summary of voting and Table of replies – Amendment 22 – Keyboard Symbols (SC 2 N3263); SC 2 Secretariat; 03-05

### Output document:

2016 Disposition of comments on FPDAM22, and FPDAMs 24 to 26; Bruce Paterson, project editor; 1999-03-12

The ballot results were: 21 votes in favor; and no disapproval. USA and UK had minor comments.

**A** *UK Comments:*

Comment 1: Annex E – list of alphabetically sorted names – 238A and 238B show notes in parenthesis. These should be deleted.

- a) Mr. Bruce Paterson: UK comment may not be appropriate – since the Annex E names do include the notes along with names etc. This was forgotten in case of Amendment 6 – at the time of fixing Amendment 31– the Tibetan names list should include the notes as well.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Once we automate the procedure to include the names we may end up in correcting some of the errors that we may have created in processing the various DAMs. We may need a resolution to accept such editorial changes.

UK comment is not accepted.

**B** *USA Comment:*

Mr. Bruce Paterson: The USA comment is on the decimal separation marker – the Glyph should be ENLARGED. We had a comment from Germany to make it smaller.

- a) Mr. Michael Everson – we had made it smaller based on comment from Germany.
- b) Dr. Ken Whistler – it is not iconically like a Comma – but being consistent with other symbols – make it more like a COMMA but an arbitrary symbol over a BASE LINE..
- c) Mr. Alain LaBonté: All the SYMBOLS from Keyboard Symbol set are over the BASE LINE. ISO 9995 specifies that the shape is mandated, the size is not mandated.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We are being caught between to and from – between the various comments on GLYPHS. Perhaps we should note that the glyphs are NOT normative. I suggest that the proposal be not to make any changes to the Amendment text. The glyph that we have for the second edition should be verified to be acceptable. The glyph was verified with Germany.
- e) Mr. Mike Ksar: The shape proposed by USA is in the Draft for the next edition proposed by AFIL. It is acceptable to Mr. Alain LaBonté.

Accept the USA comment.

**Disposition:** Accept above dispositions of comments. The editor is to prepare a revised text and process it as FDAM-22. See disposition of comments in document N2016.

**Action item:** Mr. Michael Everson and Dr. Asmus Freytag to work together to come up with the correct Glyph for the DECIMAL SEPARATION MARKER.

**Relevant Resolution:**

**M36.2 (FPDAM-22 on Keyboard symbols):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.22, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-22, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.

## 6.2.6 FPDAM23 – Bopomofo and other characters

**Input documents:**

- 1899 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM23 - Bopomofo plus other - SC N3193; Paterson / Everson; 1998-10-22
- 1905 Text for FPDAM23 - Bopomofo plus others - SC 2 N3194; Paterson / Everson; 1998-10-22

FPDAM 23 is out for DAM ballot – closes end of March 1999. No discussion.

## 6.2.7 FPDAM24 – Thaana script

**Input documents:**

- 1908 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM24 - Thaana - SC 2 N 3197; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-23
- 1909 Text for FPDAM 24 - Thaana - SC 2 N 3198; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-23
- 1989 Summary of voting and Table of replies – Amendment 24 – Thaana (SC 2 N3268); SC 2 Secretariat; 03-05

**Output document:**

- 2016 Disposition of comments on FPDAM22, and FPDAMs 24 to 26; Bruce Paterson, project editor; 1999-03-12

There were 20 votes in favor; none negative. Japan had comments. The amendment progresses to FDAM stage.

*Comment from Japan (with positive vote):*

It is desirable to get comments from and get contact with Maldives. Mr. Takayuki Sato has an action item to contact Maldives -- transferred from Mr. John Clews.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: Two weeks delay can be tolerated before finalizing the FDAM text – to hear from Maldives.
- b) Dr. Amsus Freytag: What would be the resulting action item even if we hear some comments from Maldives? We do not have another opportunity to review the Amendment to be able to make any changes.
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: I had contacted the Ministry of Education in Maldives, before we went to PDAM. They have seen the previous document and they had some comments – one on the alphabetical ordering and the other on some glyph shapes. The Maldivians have seen this proposal – via email and fax – between June and September 1998. They had plenty of time to comment. We had an action item on Mr. John Clews to contact them to encourage them to get the FPDAM review.

**Disposition:** Accept the above dispositions – see disposition of comments document N2016. Process revised text of the amendment as FDAM 24.

**Action item:** Japan is encouraged to contact the Maldivian sources. Any feedback Japan gets from Maldives can be reviewed after the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 is published.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.3 (FPDAM-24 on Thaana script):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.24, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-24, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.

## 6.2.8 FPDAM25 – Khmer script

**Input documents:**

- 1910 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM25 - Khmer - SC 2 N3199; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-23  
1911 Text of FPDAM 25 - Khmer - SC 2 N3201; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-23  
2006 Summary of Voting / Table of Replies, FPDAM-25: Khmer (SC 2 N3265); SC 2 secretariat; 1999-03-03

**Output document:**

- 2016 Disposition of comments on FPDAM22, and FPDAMs 24 to 26; Bruce Paterson, project editor; 1999-03-12

The table of replies is in document N2006 (SC 2 N3265). There were 18 approval votes and no negative votes. There was one minor editorial comment. The FPDAM is approved and goes ahead as FDAM.

*Editorial comments from UK* – does not affect the technical substance of Khmer.

The first page of the Amendment text, should be after Runic (Amd.19) for entry of Block names – accepted.

The place of insertion of the list of combining characters is in the wrong location – it should be after the last Tibetan combining character – accepted.

- a) Mr. Sath Sokh Mony : The Ministry of Education, Cambodia, would like not to progress this work item so fast. We have some feedback to give to WG 2. There is a process running in Cambodia – it is not finished and we would like to give you feedback.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: Do you have a proposal – so that the change can be entertained at this meeting, without delaying this subject?
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: For all practical purposes, the current proposal is frozen. We would like to know what are your major objections to this document.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: We do not want to delay this – has passed a JTC 1 SC 2 ballot. What we would like to know what your technical objections to the accepted FPDAM is? We do have the process open for further amendments.
- e) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Cambodia does not have a concrete proposal. But they do have a number of questions – but would like to have answers. If the questions are significant and cannot be answered then we may have some issues against the FPDAM.

- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: An ad hoc group consisting of Messrs. Ken Whistler, Michael Everson, Asmus Freytag, Takayuki Sato, Mr. Bruce Paterson, Yoshiki Mikami and Sath Sokh Mony (the Cambodia representative) can meet and discuss the concerns from Cambodia

The Khmer ad hoc group report was presented by Mr. Takayuki Sato.

- a) Mr. Takayuki Sato: There was question of Sources of characters. Cambodian people stated that there are unnecessary characters – they were right about these. An implementation note is requested because these cannot be removed. Some characters are missing. These will be proposed for addition to the standard in a future edition by the Cambodian representative. There are two Character Shape Issues – ONE of them is NOT good even for current version of the DAM. May be we can reach agreement on the correct glyph for the Currency Sign (RIAL ??). The other character's shape is controversial – however it is not a useable printable character. Cambodia can make a proposal for correcting the Glyph for the second character – can be accommodated in the future – there is no need for change currently.
- b) Dr. Ken Whistler: 17D1 – an example of text that is requested for clarification. Mr. Maurice Bauhan claimed that the character exists – we will get some more example of use of this.

The editorial comments were accepted. Based on the input from Cambodia, the shape of 17DB – the Rial Sign – will have an extra vertical line underneath the glyph.

**Disposition:** Accepted the revised text for FDAM 25 processing, with correction of Glyph for the Rial Sign at 17DB. See disposition of comments in document N2016.

**Action item:** Mr. Michael Everson to get the final font as soon as possible to AFII for preparation of the next edition.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.4 (FPDAM-25 on Khmer script):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.25, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-25, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.

**6.2.9 FPDAM26 - Myanmar (Burmese) script**

**Input documents:**

- 1912 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM26 - Burmese - SC 2 N 3202; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-23  
 1913 Text of FPDAM26 - Myanmar/Burmese - SC 2 N3203; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-23  
 1985 Summary of voting and Table of replies – Amendment 26 – Myanmar (SC 2 N3266); SC 2 Secretariat; 03-05

**Output document:**

- 2016 Disposition of comments on FPDAM22, and FPDAMs 24 to 26; Bruce Paterson, project editor; 1999-03-12

There were 20 votes in favor. Turkey voted negative.

*A Comment from Turkey:*

"we have no information on these characters. We are against this amendment, since ISO/IEC 10646-1 has not solved the Latin proposals". Comment Noted – NO ACTION CAN BE TAKEN.

*B Comment with approval from UK*

Technical comment – proposing additional characters. These will be considered in a future amendment.

Lack of many Tonal Vowels is pointed out as required for processing Myanmar text and correct spelling of Myanmar. If this proposal cannot be accommodated under the proposal of this FPDAM, a note is requested.

The proposed new characters will be reviewed when a submission for new characters is received. The UK comment is noted – No action is required at this time.

*Editing comments from the UK:*

This table should be added to the list of scripts for correct spelling rules for Level 2. There was an editorial corrigendum that included unique spelling rules for Indic scripts when using Level 2.

Dr. Asmus Freytag: The Unicode consortium heartily accepts the proposed change.



Accepted.

Glyph at position 1020 should be corrected. Accept in principle – editor to work with Myanmar delegation to get the corrected glyph.

100A – MYANMAR NNYA – the name change was requested to NYNYA.

Dr. Ken Whistler: There was no agreement for this change at the London ad hoc on this particular character.

1037 – DOT BELOW – UK proposal is to change to original Myanmar name ANKMYEIT. Dot Below is the English Name for it. Myanmar – have no objection, either way – to keep or change.

Not accepted.

Annex B – entries for combining characters – are all off by one or two code positions . These should be corrected. Accepted.

Disposition of comments prepared by the editor is in document N2016.

**Disposition:** The editor is to prepare the revised text based on the above discussion and progress it as FDAM 26. See disposition of comments in document N2016.

**Action item:** The updated glyph – font – must be provided to Dr. Asmus Freytag, for inclusion in the next edition of the standard by Mr. Michael Everson by the end of next week.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.5 (FPDAM-26 on Myanmar script):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.26, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-26, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.

### 6.2.10 FPDAM27 - Syriac

**Input documents:**

1906 Disposition of Comments - FPDAM27 - Syriac - SC 2 N 3195; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-22

1907 Text for FPDAM27 - Syriac - SC 2 N3196; Paterson/Everson; 1998-10-22

1986 Summary of voting and Table of replies – Amendment 27 – Syriac (SC 2 N3267); SC 2 Secretariat; 03-05

The ballot results were Unanimous acceptance with no comments.

**Disposition:** Accepted for FDAM 27 processing. No disposition of comments needed.

**Relevant resolution**

**M36.6 (FPDAM-27 on Syriac script):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 notes the ballot responses in document N1986 on FPDAM-27, which contained no comments, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-27, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.

## 6.3 Japanese national body recommendations to JTC 1 and responses

### 6.3.1 Japanese national body recommendations to JTC 1 on SC 2 activities

**Input document:**

3243 JTC 1 Request for Comments on the Activities of SC 2 (JTC 1 N 5754); Attachment: JTC 1 N 5698, Japanese National Body Recommendation to ISO/IEC JTC 1 Concerning the Activities of JTC 1/SC 2; JTC 1; 1999-02-10 (also in WG 2 document N1966)

**Output documents:**

2009 WG 2 Charter document; Ad hoc on WG 2 charter; 1999-03-12

2017 WG 2 Comments on ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2 N 3243, the Japanese National Body Recommendation to ISO/IEC JTC 1 Concerning the Activities of JTC 1/SC 2; ad hoc on WG 2 response to SC 2; 1999-03-12

SC 2 document N3243 (JTC 1 document N5698) contains input from Japanese national body to JTC 1 concerning the activities of JTC 1/SC 2.

Mr. Takayuki Sato: Let me express that Japan's SC 2 secretariat, SC 2 chair, and MITI, are NOT happy with this paper. There is some misunderstanding about this paper. If somebody wrote this document, the response would be like other responses we have received from other national bodies.

This paper is driven by Netherlands contribution about SC 2 activities. We have already reviewed the Netherlands paper. This paper is an over reaction to Netherlands paper. This paper also implies that the activities of SC 2 is not visible enough to the outside world. How long will SC 2 continue to add characters? Is there any way SC 2 activity can be made more productive? Specifically, most of our activities are done via subdivisions rather than an NP. It is agreed by SC 2 plenary – and endorsed by JTC 1. Most JTC 1 people do not know what is going on. Please make it clear to all JTC 1 – what we are doing, what we are going to do and if possible go via the NP route to have better visibility.

We explained that we have a roadmap, we have a guideline – and is not a random access. The roadmap was created almost in 1993 – before JTC 1 re-engineering. The key word is and has been 'Market Driven'. So another recommendation is to review our projects after re-engineering, from market relevance view point. If a project plan does not meet these guidelines then change the direction.

We need to provide new justification – JTC 1 has changed the directions after we prepared the guidelines.

#### Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: Does it mean that national bodies cannot make contributions if they are no market driven?
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We are going beyond the number of written contributions. If we are posing the question on each character – the vision is not met and the cause is lost.
- c) Mr. Takayuki Sato: It may lead to new guidelines for new projects / scripts etc. It leads us to open our thinking. Please consider distributed maintenance etc. of new specialized scripts. If certain professions have need for certain scripts – they can worry about it. They can finalize the repertoire, SC 2 can absorb and let them maintain it. It is almost like registration – but in ISO/IEC 10646-1. One group may say we need certain character repertoire – we could assign the code range. The background of the paper is along the above description I have given you – though it is not written in the paper.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: This document did not originate from Japan SC 2 committee, SC 2 chair or SC 2 secretary. It is from JTC 1 Japan committee. You were aware of it – you tried to discourage them from submitting it. J-SC 2 did not succeed. These are facts that are not known to others in WG 2, SC 2 – for example, Finland.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: There are two separate things for us to do – one could be:
  - Specific responses to the Japan document – similar to what has been prepared by some of the national body responses.
  - Other thing would be to state the SC 2 charter in a positive manner. We could revisit the SC 2 charter, program of work etc.
- f) Dr. Umamaheswaran: I think we need to do both.
- g) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We can create an ad hoc group to consolidate the comments received from WG 2 – for forwarding to SC 2. We need some 'marketing statement' – not just scope revision. We take it for granted that others are aware of SC 2 activities etc.
- h) Mr. Michael Everson: If SC 2 activities are not visible in JTC 1 – then the national body contributions to JTC 1 will change that picture.
- i) Mr. Bruce Paterson: Mr. Takayuki Sato has made a suggestion that because amendments have been made via Subdivisions – rather than the NP – perhaps, after we prepare the second edition – we could state that we are stopping the work and new work could be entertained only with an NP. This would give us opportunity to come up with revised proposals, market justification etc. After we publish the second edition – we should ask the question do we want to continue? We may want at that time to create an NP for additional amendments etc. Some of these items we may have to address under the future of ISO/IEC 10646-1 anyway.
- j) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I almost agree with Dr. Asmus Freytag. Besides this paper JTC 1 took a resolution – somehow the SC 2 chair has to explain about the plan of SC 2 at the next JTC 1 – in October in Korea. If Professor Shibano makes a response which is direct response to the paper of Japan – it may create more political problems. Professor Shibano may have to explain that we would like to have more justification etc. for SC 2 work.
- k) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Using the NP methodology – is both beneficial and risky. It would be a disaster if there is situation where some of the minority scripts get voted down. It also blows apart the synchronization between the Unicode and the SC 2 today. national bodies can come and potentially derail it.

- l) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Besides the direct answer – Professor Shibano has to make a presentation in October. We need to make a proposal to SC 2.
- m) Dr. Umamaheswaran: We have to come up with our view of 'Market justification of work' – make it part of SC 2 program of work, policy etc. and get it accepted by JTC 1.
- n) Mr. Mike Ksar: I will quote from the JTC 1 resolutions:
  - Resolution 18 – function of SC 2
  - SC 2 response was forwarded to Netherlands as response to their concerns.
  - Resolution 19 – activities of SC 2
  - Japanese concerns in 5698 – secretariat sends this document to SC 2 for comment and from national bodies for their inputs.
  - The comments from national bodies is sought by October 1.
- o) Mr. Michael Everson: Three national bodies – have responded long before the deadline.
- p) Dr. Asmus Freytag: There is one important thing to note. We have not explored this. There is an implied invitation to all of us to go work through our hierarchy of national committees to go to the JTC 1 level and educate them on the contributions and rationale for SC 2 work etc.
- q) Mr. Mike Ksar: We can have an ad hoc group from WG 2 to prepare a consolidated response to carry forward to SC 2 – for commenting on the Japanese document. In addition – it would be advantageous to look into our process and try and make some recommendations on the Principles and Procedures to look at after the next edition.
- r) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We need something higher than a work item etc. we need to look at our charter.
- s) Dr. Umamaheswaran: We should look at the standing SC 2 program of work document, the scope, the title etc.
- t) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Professor Shibano has already prepared a response document prior to the Japanese comments.
- u) Mr. Mike Ksar: Who would like to participate – revisiting the charter, reviewing the SC 2 program of work, and suggest methodology? Ad Hoc – Messrs. Asmus Freytag, Alain LaBonté, Takayuki Sato, Mike Ksar, Michel Suignard, Everson, and Ms. Toshiko Kimura – will address the future policy for WG 2 work also.

The following points are to be addressed by the ad hoc:

- Where do we go after 2nd edition of 10646-1?
- What constituency are we serving?
- What are success factors for providing the service?
- What should be the process?
- In the HOW part -- contrast the discussion on Registration. (Why does registry cannot work in the context of UCS?).
- What is the future program of work of WG 2?
- Why distributed ownership is doomed to be failure – but distributed working mode is already in place?

The ad hoc report is contained in document N2009.

Dr. Asmus Freytag reported on the ad hoc deliberations on WG 2 charter – document N2009 was prepared in response to the Japanese national body concerns and incorporates the responses from other national bodies. It is a record of the key points discussed by the ad hoc.

Several comments were made to reorganize the material in the document. Some time was also spent on whether a list of the scripts in the pipeline should be attached to the document being forwarded to SC 2 or not. The feeling was that it may do a disservice to SC 2's cause by attaching the list.

**Disposition:** accept document N2009 –forward to SC 2 with a request for review and adoption by SC 2; further, request SC 2 to forward it to JTC 1 in support of the SC 2 business plan.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.22 (WG 2 charter):**

**Sweden Abstained**

WG 2 accepts document N2009 and forwards it to SC 2 for consideration and adoption towards improving the SC 2 process. WG 2 further requests SC 2 to forward it to JTC 1 as an attachment to the SC 2 business plan. (as part of response to Resolution 19 of JTC 1 resolutions document JTC 1 N5748).

## Output document N2017

An ad hoc – with Messrs. Takayuki Sato, Michel Suignard, Amus Freytag and Mike Ksar – prepared a report, which is a consolidation of the comments from US, Ireland and Finland to WG 2.

Mr. Takayuki Sato: The content of document N2017 is probably too long for inclusion in the SC 2 response and will need to be condensed.

**RESOLUTION M36.23 (WG 2 response to JTC 1 resolution on Japanese NB concerns on SC 2):**  
**Sweden Abstained**  
WG 2 accepts document N2017 and forwards it to SC 2 as input into SC 2 response to JTC 1 Resolution 19 regarding Japanese National Body's concerns on SC 2 activities in JTC 1 resolutions document N5748.

### 6.3.2 Response from Ireland

Input document:

1963 Ireland's response to Japanese National Body recommendation to ISO/IEC JTC 1 concerning the activities of JTC 1/SC 2 (JTC 1 N5698); Ireland - Everson; 1999-02-16

See

Output document N2017 in section 6.3.1 above.

### 6.3.3 Response from U.S. and Unicode consortium

Input document:

1966 USA response to Japanese national body recommendations to JTC 1 (5698); U.S./Unicode; 1999-02-11

See

Output document N2017 in section 6.3.1 above.

### 6.3.4 Response from Finland

Input document:

1988 Finnish comment on Japanese National Body to JTC 1; Finland

See

Output document N2017 in section 6.3.1 above.

## 7 Next Edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1

### 7.1 Non-repertoire issues

#### 7.1.1 Editorial corrigenda on Zones and other related features

Input document:

1934 Editorial Corrigendum on Zones and related features of 10646-1; Paterson; 1998-11-11

Mr. Bruce Paterson: The main part of this paper is to implement the instruction to the editor in September – to remove zones from the standard. Document N1934 shows the necessary corrections to be made to the standard. The paper shows existing text in the left column and proposed replacement text on the right column. It does not show strike through text. New text is shown underscored in the new text. The terms A-zone, I-zone, O-zone and R-zone have been removed. S-zone is kept, Private-Use zone is kept. Explanation of special use of presentation and compatibility use characters is added. Editor has also suggested moving the new proposed clause 11 – containing the presentation form and compatibility characters.

There was a proposal from Israel to consolidate the Hebrew pieces into a single Block Name – Hebrew. We had a similar situation for Arabic. The split between Basic Arabic and Extended Arabic were not consistent with how they were shown as Table Split. The block names were unified. Block names are

being also unified for Greek, Arabic and Georgian. There is NO change to the Collection Names – these are normative.

**Discussion:**

- a) Dr. Umamaheswaran: In figure 2, planes 0F and 10 should be shown and marked as private use planes.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: The new clause 11 could be removed as a major clause – and propose two lower level sub-clauses Presentation forms and Compatibility characters.
- c) Dr. Ken Whistler: There is also another place - clause 21 – special characters. We can move the new proposed 11.1 and 11.2.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Proposal is to move them after existing section 21 – as separate clauses 22, 23 etc. The proposal to unify block names is in line with what we agreed to in London. The block names are informative.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: I will have problems with unifying Coptic under the Greek Block Name.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: I share Mr. Michael Everson's concern for now. If it is a contentious issue – then we have to be careful. Greece is not represented here.
- g) Mr. Michel Suignard: The collections already have the correct name. There may not be a problem.
- h) Mr. Bruce Paterson: We can have GREEK and COPTIC for the Block Name.
- i) Mr. Michael Everson: Current proposed draft for 2nd edition has 8 cols. plus 1 col. You are not planning to show 9 cols. are you.
- j) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I can be persuaded to do it. In ISO/IEC 10646-1 we cannot make wider columns through rows – a problem with Korean.

**Disposition:** Move the proposed clauses 11.1, 11.2 as separate clauses after clause 21. GREEK will be replaced with GREEK and COPTIC for the block name. This will be included in document N1796 – cumulative editorial corrigendum.

Accept the Editorial Corrigendum on Zones in document N1934 – modified with input at the meeting. Incorporate it into the cumulative list of editorial corrigenda in document N1796.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.15 (Editorial corrigendum on zones):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the Editorial Corrigendum on Zones in document N1934, with modifications based on discussion at meeting 36. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.

## 7.1.2 Hangul syllable name rules

**Input document:**

1942 Hangul syllable name rules, proposed for 10646 2nd Edition; Paterson; 1998-12-08

Mr. Bruce Paterson: The reason for document N1942 is – current Hangul Names list occupies 88 pages in the document. These names can be generated in an algorithmic way using the component names. In Amendment 5, there are errors in the names –due to the algorithm that was used generating the wrong names. There was a defect report from UK. There were also errors in the annotations. The proposed algorithm is deliberately human oriented.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: Professor Kim is expected to arrive later (to be able to get Korean national body input).
- b) Mr. Alain LaBonté: I would strongly support the method to generate the names than the list of names.
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I have an implementation of an algorithm which generates the names.
- d) Mr. Bruce Paterson: There is an algorithm in the Unicode book, it generates the names and the example shown is wrong.
- e) Dr. Ken Whistler: The error is being fixed.
- f) Mr. Michael Everson: I have difficulty with the notation. I am a little uncomfortable with it being decimal. ?? name ??
- g) Mr. Bruce Paterson: In the source document it was called PEAK. Korean input was that they do not need the algorithm themselves.

- h) Dr. Umamaheswaran: There is a UK defect report. This algorithm would replace all the published Hangul names with this proposed algorithm text as the replacement text.
- i) Mr. Bruce Paterson: We cannot include this as it is in the next edition without a technical corrigendum being processed.
- j) Dr. Asmus Freytag: It is appropriate to process it as a corrigendum. We can create tables up to 14 cols. per page. At the header we could provide the plane number, and starting row number. There will be no holes.
- k) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The ad hoc looking at the next edition of the publication should take a look at the sample pages and make the decision on it.
- l) Mr. Mike Ksar: Mr. Keith Brannon has informed that it is not critical as to how thick the document is. They are planning to publish it on a CD.

**Action item:** AFII is to produce sample pages with 14 columns for review and deciding the final format for Hangul, by the ad hoc editorial committee for the second edition.

**Disposition:**

Proceed with preparing a technical corrigendum text based on document N1942. Refer to also the UK defect report on Amd.6 – document N 1806.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.12 (Technical Corrigendum on Hangul names list):**

**Japan Abstained**

WG 2 accepts document N1942 as the basis for addressing defect report in document N1806 on Amendment 6 on Hangul Syllables. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to prepare a technical corrigendum based on document N1942 and discussion at meeting 36 in response to the defect report, and forward it to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, in time for ballot starting before 1999-06-01.

**7.1.3 Revision of Annex T for CJK Extension A**

**Input document:**

1943 Revision of 10646-1 Annex T for CJK Unified Ideographs Extension A (Draft); Paterson/Sato; 1998-01-08

Mr. Bruce Paterson: Document N1943 arises from disposition of comments on Amendment 17 - Ideograph Extension A. Annex T applies equally to CJK in the first edition and to Amd.17. The references for sources were not quite correct to cover Amd.17. This is being fixed.

The solution is to replace the existing list of sources in Annex T and replace with a reference to the source list in clause 26. There was another source list in Annex L. These source lists are all being consolidated into a reference to a single source list. In Annex L – see also the list of sources in clause 26.

**Discussion:**

- a) Ms. Emily Hsu: There is a source list in Annex T referring to 1986 version.
- b) Mr. Takayuki Sato: There is a source list for unification, and another for source-code separation. The list of standards used for source-code separation in clause T.1.6 is frozen in time. The list of source code used for unification for CJK, and CJK Extension A – will show the latest edition of standards.

**Disposition:**

Accept the proposed revisions for Annex T in document N1943 and include it in the consolidated editorial corrigendum document.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.16 (Editorial corrigendum on Annex T for CJK Extension A):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the proposed revisions for Annex T for CJK Extension A, in document N1943, modified by discussion at meeting 36. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.

**7.1.4 Editorial corrigenda - standing document**

**Input document:**

1796 S 10646-1 Second Edition, First draft text with editorial corrigenda; Paterson; 1998-06-01

Mr. Bruce Paterson: Document N1796 contains the cumulative editorial corrigenda on the first edition. Mr. Hugh Ross has given a few minor typographical errors – some of which arising from the first edition. It continues to be an action item on everyone to ensure that what is in document N1796 reflects the resolutions we have taken so far. See section 7.3.1– based on an Email from Mr. Keith Brannon – that it is not necessary to ballot the next edition. Part of the ITTF message is that he would like it to be reviewed by WG 2 and SC 2 and agreed to by a resolution at the plenary of SC 2. There is no reason for a ballot. (Mr. Takayuki Sato: there could be another visibility problem). Mr. Keith Brannon has agreed to what Mr. Bruce Paterson has proposed to ITTF. We could request that the next revision of document N1796 can include all the corrigenda including any from this meeting. The intent is to send out the clean copy for SC 2 review. Do you need another one with markups between now and the next circulation of the document?

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: The request is to create the document that is suitable for review by WG 2 members. There is also a request from the French translation group. There was some issues about translatability from Japan also.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The target is sometime in Summer.
- c) Mr. Alain LaBonté: I would like to review it from the French translatability of the document. Canada and France did the first attempt at translating did bring up some issues. Now that I know what it is – IDEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTOR CHARACTER -- we can do better translation of the name.

**Action item:**

All national bodies are to review the revised document N1796 from technical point of view to ensure that the amendments have all been incorporated -- extended deadline is end of April 1999 so that revised document can be produced by the editor for July 1999 distribution; and also from the TRANSLATABILITY aspects to different languages.

### **7.1.5 Working draft for proposed update to Annex N - 2<sup>nd</sup> edition**

**Input document:**

1893 Working Draft for proposed update to Annex N - 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition; Everson; 1998-10-19

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1893 contains a proposal for replacing the content of existing Annex N of the standard. Most of the scripts that have been for future work identified in part 1 have been completed. The proposal is to remove Annex N from the next edition.

**Discussion:**

- a) Dr. Ken Whistler: We are in favor of removing the Annex N. However, the list of scripts that is included in document N1893, should be included in another document – for example, the roadmap. The document has a list of scripts for BMP, for most of which some documentation exists. The list for the supplementary planes has some parenthetical description for each script. It would be useful to have this list included in the SC 2 program of work or charter.
- b) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Japan is in favor of removing Annex N. The proposal is to move it to another document.
- c) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The editor can do whatever is necessary to the standard – with the informative annexes. Would it be useful to take one of the introductory paragraphs – to create a note in the scope for the document to indicate that other scripts may be added to the standard as better information is made available on them. This is to indicate that the content of ISO/IEC 10646-1 is not frozen.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: The XML community has a complaint that the document is a moving target. We are making the next edition available on the web and will take away some of the concern.
- e) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The XML community has to recognize that the standard will change in content. The collection ids are the mechanism provided for them to use as a target. It would be nice to have the proposed note in the scope as a replacement of Annex N.
- f) Dr. Ken Whistler: We should not only provide the collection id mechanism, but also provide a stable reference such as edition 2.0 and version 3.0 of Unicode – as a stake in the ground. Their concern is that they cannot get a copy of the standard in their hand. The note in the scope is not to say the standard is changing constantly, but to give a warm feeling to say to user community that their scripts are not ignored.
- g) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I have the concern about the Visibility problem.

- h) Dr. Umamaheswaran: We should attach – as Dr. Ken Whistler has suggested – the list of future potential scripts into the WG 2 program of work, into SC 2 program of work and get it approved by JTC 1 – this should alleviate some of Mr. Takayuki Sato's concern on the visibility of SC 2 work.

**Disposition:**

Delete Annex N from the next edition. To generate another document to include the list in a program of work. A note capturing the intent of adding new scripts in the future will be added to the scope of ISO/IEC 10646-1 replacing Annex N.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.14 (Deletion of Annex N in the next edition):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 notes that all but two of the entries from the informative Annex N – "Scripts under consideration for future editions of ISO/IEC 10646", of part 1 have been processed. WG 2 resolves to delete Annex N from the next edition. WG 2 instructs its project editor to delete Annex N, and add a note capturing the intent of adding new scripts in the future, in the scope of the next edition of the standard, and to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.

## 7.1.6 A "fixed collection" for the BMP - 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1

**Input document:**

1983 A "fixed collection" for the BMP at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition of 10646-1; Paterson; 1999-01-11

Mr. Bruce Paterson: The proposal in document N1983 is to give a fixed target for people to refer to for communities such as XML – as Dr. Ken Whistler referenced in the previous discussion. The proposal is to give a fixed collection identifier corresponding to the second edition of the standard to be included in Annex A. The collection id proposed is 302.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: It would be a technical corrigendum, since it is normative.
- b) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Canada is in favor of the new collection id – fixed.
- c) Dr. Ken Whistler: Sounds like a good idea to me.
- d) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Go ahead.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: OK.

**Disposition:** Include the proposed fixed collection id 302 – to correspond to the repertoire of the 2nd edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 in a technical corrigendum.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.13 (Technical Corrigendum on Collection ID for BMP of 2nd edition):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the proposed fixed collection identifier in document N1983 (collection 302) for the fixed repertoire of BMP of the second edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1, and instructs its project editor to prepare a technical corrigendum to Annex A, for inclusion with the Technical Corrigendum in resolution on 'Hangul names list' above. (See section 7.1.2).

## 7.2 Repertoire issues

### 7.2.1 Non-IRG documents

#### 7.2.1.1 Criteria for Encoding Symbols

**Input document:**

1982 Towards criteria for encoding symbols; Unicode, Freytag; 1998-02-26

Dr. Asmus Freytag: The interesting aspect of coding symbols is that it does not fit neatly into a comprehensive list of classification such as for alphabets. So we need some criteria to decide / evaluate proposed symbols to be accepted for encoding in the standard or not. The request is to include the criteria proposed in document N1982 in the principles and procedures document of WG 2. The document describes how symbols could be classified, and what criteria could be used.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: The document as a whole is probably a bit much to include in the principles and procedures. There has been no flood of symbols requests today.



- b) Dr. Ken Whistler: There is a set of Mathematical Symbols – a notational system – that is in the works, despite what you say that there is no deluge.
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: The mathematical symbols is a script in its own right. Would you be prepared to produce a text suitable for inclusion as an Annex to the principles and procedures document ?
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: It is not clear to both the user community and to ourselves as to which symbols we should go actively after, and which are random ad hoc ones that we come across and we take a liking to etc. From the Unicode consortium, the UTC needed such a document to overcome a reluctance to touch any symbol for encoding. It was presumed that a symbols is simply a picture and is not encodable due to some defect or another. The proposed paper gives guidelines on how to distinguish those that are legitimate and those that are not. There is nothing wrong in having a criterion for symbols in their own right. I have nothing against the whole document being incorporated as an annex to the principles and procedures –except for editing the language etc.
- e) Mr. Mike Ksar: How much of this document can be included in the Principles and Procedures is questionable. The principles and procedures is becoming bigger. We need some flexibility given to the ad hoc to incorporate this document into the document.
- f) Dr. Asmus Freytag: There is a need for understanding the nature of the symbols – so an explanatory text is still needed.
- g) Dr. Umamaheswaran: There may be a need to do some editing towards providing a check list.
- h) Mr. Takayuki Sato: There is some work in Japan on JIS symbols. I would like it to be reviewed by the national body.
- i) Mr. Mike Ksar: If we include it in the principles and procedures document, the national bodies will still have an opportunity to review it.
- j) Dr. Ken Whistler: It is structurally several pieces. It contains the background information. There is also a checklist –that should be strongly pointed out from the instructions to fill the proposal form. I am in favor of putting these in the principles and procedures document. On the one hand – it looks like an extension to the road map, and on the other one as an aid to submitters for looking at proposals for symbols. There is some mix of how WG 2 prioritizes the list.
- k) Dr. Asmus Freytag: There are several areas where there are symbols that no one has taken time to look at symbols that have not been incorporated. It is time that we step up to look for high priority symbols that are candidates for inclusion in the standard. Some user groups are establishing parallel efforts to ISO/IEC 10646-1 – for example, CAD community – instead of coming up with requests for inclusion in the standard. Japan is looking at symbols for JIS, for example.

**Disposition:**

WG 2 adopts the proposal in document N1982 in principle and instructs the ad hoc to incorporate the material from this document into the principles and procedures document.

**Action item:**

National bodies and liaison organizations to take note of document N1982 and advise potential contributors on symbols that are candidates for plain text processing and potential candidates for inclusion in ISO/IEC 10646-1.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.20 (Criteria for encoding symbols):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the Criteria for Encoding Symbols proposed in document N1982 in principle and instructs the ad hoc group on Principles and Procedures to incorporate the material from this document into the WG 2 standing document on Principles and Procedures, document N2002.

**7.2.1.2 Request for addition of Triangular Overlay Character**

**Input document:**

1941 Request for addition of Triangular Overlay Character; Unicode - McGowan; 1998-12-07

Document N1941 contains a request for a single character – the 'Triangular Overlay Character'. The proposed character has been accepted for inclusion by UTC in the Unicode standard in the future. The document N1941 does not say when to include the proposed character in the standard.

**Discussion:**

- a) Dr. Ken Whistler: The USA position is to include in a future edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1. All similar characters are called CLOSING. Overlay is something to put on top of another character. COMBINING ENCLOSING UPWARD POINTING TRIANGLE is the new name, changed from COMBINING UPWARD POINTING TRIANGLE OVERLAY; at the next location U+20E4.

**Disposition:**

U+20E4 - COMBINING ENCLOSING UPWARD POINTING TRIANGLE -- is accepted for inclusion in the standard in the future with the shape as proposed by Ireland in document N1975. Goes into bucket M36 for processing in post-second edition of 10646-1.

**Relevant Resolution:**

See section 0 for the relevant resolution.

**7.2.1.3 Addition of the Drachma Currency Sign****Input document:**

1946 Addition of the Drachma Currency Sign; ELOT, Greece; 1999-01-20

Document N1946 contains a proposal to encode the Greek Drachma currency sign. The glyph that is in the document is approximate. The correct shape is available with AFII in the font to be used for the next edition. Refer also to document N1975 – the proposed location is U+20AF with the name DRACHMA SIGN.

WG2 decided earlier (see section 0 item A) to add this character to Amendment 30 – to respond to Irish Technical comment to PDAM 30.

**Disposition:** Include as part of PDAM 30 resolution.

See section 0 for relevant resolution.

**7.2.1.4 Repertoire additions - Cumulative List # 8****Input document:**

1936 Repertoire additions for ISO/IEC 10646-1 - Cumulative List No.8; Paterson; 1998-12-01

Mr. Bruce Paterson: Document N1936 replaces document N1791. It shows all the additions we have agreed to in London. There is ONE error – we should have picked this up in London, we did not:

Code position for GENERAL VARIATION MARK – FFFB – should not be there. It is replaced by IDEOGRAPHIC VARIATION INDICATOR at 303E. This line should be deleted.

(NOTE: update the roadmap document also). Apart from the above delegates, national bodies and liaisons are requested to review this document and feedback to the editor.

**Action item:** All National bodies and liaison organizations are to review and feedback on document N1936 to the editor. The ad hoc group responsible for the roadmap document should take note of including IDEOGRAPHIC VARIATION INDICATOR at 303E and remove GENERAL VARIATION MARK from FFFB.

**7.2.1.5 Armenia's feedback on Armenian in ISO/IEC 10646-1****Input documents:**

1981 Armenia's feedback on Armenian script i10646-1; Armenia; 1998-12-16

1984 USA Response to N1981 – Armenian; US/Suignard; 1999-03-09

Mr. Mike Ksar: The agreement we had with the Armenian guest was not apparently conveyed to some people in Armenia – and they were not aware of it. The character was incorporated into Amd.18. There is some miscommunication within Armenia.

Mr. Michel Suignard: The USA contribution document N1984 responds to Armenian concerns – it seems that Armenian reviewers were looking at only one of the pages out of ISO/IEC 10646-1 – and the characters in question were not in that block. USA contribution addresses each point from Armenia – for example, the punctuation characters have been unified with other characters. Most of the Armenian characters were already added in the standard. One could possibly make a case for future inclusion of the ETERNITY SIGN (10/1 in AST 34.002-97 (looks like an inverse propeller) in the standard.

There is certainly more rationale required for inclusion of capital and small versions of SYMBOLS. The Armenian national body is requested not to code characters that are not needed. Armenian authorities need to know that ISO/IEC 10646-1 does support 2022 controls (part of C0 and C1 set support) etc. The USA contribution keeps the door open for communication with Armenian national body.

**Disposition:** Convener (delegated to Mr. Michel Suignard) is to forward document N1984 for review by SC 2 towards forwarding to the Armenian national body in response to their letter dated 1998-11-16 to the SC 2 secretariat.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.21 (Feedback to Armenia):**

**Ireland Abstained**

WG 2 accepts document N1984 and requests SC 2 to consider it and forward it to the Armenian NB in response to their letter dated 1998-11-16 (in document N1981 – SC 2 N3222).

## 7.2.2 IRG-specific documents

### 7.2.2.1 Editorial corrigenda on CJK compatibility

**Input document:**

1935 Editorial corrigenda on CJK compatibility ideographs, and other items; Paterson; 1998-11-30

Mr. Mike Ksar: Referring to document N1935 – at the Redmond meeting there were two characters that were removed from Extension A since these were in the compatibility area. We took a decision in Annex P to give an equivalent of 5 column format. The material provided is with assistance from Mr. Michel Suignard.

Dr. Ken Whistler: The asterisk is missing in the names for 1F and 23.

**Disposition:**

Accept the proposed annotation for Annex P for the CJK compatibility ideographs and include in the Editorial Corrigendum. Also for Bangjeom (Old Hangul) tone marks -- accept it (subject to no objection from Korean national body) and include in the next editorial corrigendum.

**Relevant resolutions:**

**M36.17 (Editorial corrigendum on CJK compatibility characters):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the proposed annotations in Annex P for the two CJK compatibility ideographs in document N1935. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.

**M36.18 (Editorial corrigendum on Banjgeom characters):**

**Japan abstained**

WG 2 accepts the proposed annotations in Annex P for the Bangjeom characters in document N1935. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.

### 7.2.2.2 IRG Resolutions – Meeting # 12

**Input documents:**

1992 IRG #12 – Resolutions (IRG N620); IRG; 1998-12-11

1993 Format for Extension B (IRG N615R); IRG

1994 Super CJK Version 5.0; IRG; 1999-02-07

1995 Report on CJK Unified Ideographs Extension B (IRG N624); IRG; 1999-02-07

Document N1992 contains the IRG meeting 12 resolutions.

The resolutions dealing with the next edition of part 1 are discussed below.

- M12.2 – related to radical names. Dealt with by resolutions to Amd.15 Kang Xi radicals (see section 6.1.1).
  - M12.3 – related to the request to circulate the camera ready copy of CJK part of part 1 to the national bodies for review.
- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: Mr. Bruce Paterson is preparing the text, AFII (Dr. Asmus Freytag) is preparing the non-ideographic part. What is the schedule for the CRC of CJK part? The next meeting is in May 99. We would like to get a date by which the CRC will be ready. The national body review will take some time.

- b) Mr. Takayuki Sato: CJK Extension A is in the final ballot stage. As soon as the Amendment is finished it will be included in the CRC for part 1. The time schedule is not yet known. Mr. Zhang Zhoucai will incorporate them. IRG will possibly accept the final CRC in May 99.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: I want to ensure that the IRG national bodies review the final CRC and agree that everything is OK.
- d) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Our schedule for the next edition is to have everything ready by WG 2 meeting in September.
- e) Mr. Bruce Paterson: At some point I have to give the page numbers to start printing the CRC. The ballot closes early May. The CRC should probably be ready by July 99.

**Action item:** IRG editor is to work with the project editor to synchronize the page numbering for the CJK tables (Clause 26 tables) to get the Camera Ready Copy ready by end of July 1999.

- M12.5 – Future IRG Meeting Schedule
  - Meeting 13 – 17-21 May 99 in Hong Kong
  - Meeting 14 – Dec 1999 in Singapore
  - Meeting 15 – May 2000 in Taiwan.

**Disposition:**

Approve the above IRG meeting schedule.  
(See relevant resolution in section 12.2.)

(Revisit the other IRG resolution – related to part 2).

### 7.3 Approval process, contents, format, schedule & responsibilities

#### 7.3.1 Approval process - input from ITTF

**Input document:**

1961 Input from ITTF (Mr. Keith Brannon) on approval process for publication of the next edition of 10646-1; Keith Brannon, ITTF; 1999-02-16

This topic was discussed under section 6.4. Document N1961 contains an email correspondence from ITTF (Mr. Keith Brannon) to the editor Mr. Bruce Paterson.

Mr. Bruce Paterson: All of the technical material that goes into second edition of part 1 would be finished balloting by end of September 1999 or already have been published. ITTF will not print those amendments that have not already been printed, they will consolidate these in the second edition of the standard. The text of second edition will be made available in WG 2 mailing at the end of June 1999. ITTF will regard this as a minor revision of the standard – since all the technical material would have gone through ballot process. Material shown in document N1961 in Italics was submitted to the convener and forwarded to ITTF.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I do not see any problem with this in theory. We are still facing a VISIBILITY problem – so I think we should request the SC 2 chair to report to JTC 1 plenary that the new edition will be coming without undergoing a separate ballot.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The SC 2 business plan – market relevance, the sales plan etc. – should mention this. The business plan, however, is NOT on the SC 2 agenda. We can make a suggestion that the next review of the Business Plan should get the positive message about the next edition.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: The intent of WG 2 is to send ONLY the TEXTUAL PART of the Next Edition of the Standard for a review by SC 2. The CODE CHARTS is considered as a consolidation of all the material that has already been balloted, and are not intended to be sent for SC 2 review. The cover letter accompanying the draft text will include statement of the status of the different amendment and corrigenda.

**Disposition:** Convener to bring up the topic of next edition and forward document N1961 to SC 2. Ensure that the cover letter includes the intent of sending only the Textual portion.

**Relevant resolution:****M36.24 (Approval process for second edition of 10646-1):****Unanimous**

WG 2 instructs its convener to forward document N1961, for adoption by SC 2 as the approval process for the second edition of 10646-1. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the consolidated text of the second edition of 10646-1 (update of document N1796), and forward it by 1999-05-31, along with document N1998 (sample of code charts for second edition), to the SC 2 secretariat for NB review and comment by 1999-08-31.

**7.3.2 Second edition - contents: text & charts****Input documents:**

1924 Progress Report - Printing the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of 10646; AFII; 1998-11-02  
1991 AFII Progress Report on the printing of next edition; AFII; 1999-03-02  
1998 Code Charts for 10646-1 except Unified Ideographs – sample charts; AFII; 99-02-17

Documents N1924 and N1991 are progress reports from AFII.

Dr. Asmus Freytag showed samples of the various charts ONLINE. Printed copies of the charts were made available at the meeting for the delegates to review and comment. Fonts are mixed and matched even within one table. In some cases at each cell level, one could specify the size of the characters from the font. The size adjustment is done with outline font technology – that was done with previous AFII Bit-Map Fonts for edition 1. The fonts are given to AFII from different manufacturers for the explicit purpose of printing the ISO/IEC 10646-1 and Unicode 3.0 Camera Ready Copies. When a character reaches the square cell boundary, the character is shifted to fit within the cell. We are also correcting some incorrect glyphs – all input in terms of Glyphs must be received by middle of APRIL 1999.

The Name Table is generated from the same data base of names used by Unicode 3.0 and ISO/IEC 10646-1 2nd edition. The tool used by AFII can generate the Unicode names list and charts as well as the ISO/IEC 10646-1 names list and charts. Where there was another name in Unicode 1.0 this is shown in UPPERCASE in the Unicode names list. Other information is also added in the Unicode Names List.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: In Unicode .3.0, the Unicode Consortium wants to create the unified Han charts, and these will look differently from the ISO/IEC 10646-1 's 5-column version. The effect of this is that there is a division of labor between Unicode 3.0 and ISO/IEC 10646-1. The annotations and cross reference for names lists is maintained by UTC. The IRG maintains the list of Han – five columns. Unicode sticks to the same rule as not changing the names and code positions – the properties themselves are not yet stable enough to be fixed.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The only other thing that is holding us back from preparing the Camera Ready Copy is the PAGE NUMBERING.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: I hope we can find a clever way of arriving at the final page numbers. This has to be coordinated with the text portion of the standard.
- d) Dr. Ken Whistler: The usual way of dealing with the multiple part publication is to give a separate section for the charts and let the numbering part of it be finished independently.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I can do either sequential numbering or Number-Number. I am not set up for Letter – Number page numbering.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: The editor has to follow the ITTF / ISO Style Rules. You have to synchronize the page numbering with the editor – the TEXTUAL PART, the non-Han code charts and the Han-charts from IRG. The Han and non-Han are in different clauses.
- g) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The first edition was done 1 through 799. I have to assume that the editor had asked and got an answer for it. Who can we ask – Mr. Keith Brannon?
- h) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I would be comfortable to state that it would be acceptable to the WG 2 members to let the editors to work within the acceptable rules of ISO.
- i) Mr. Mike Ksar: Since AFII is going out of business by 31 Aug 1999, if we have to make changes after that date – the responsibilities of AFII will be moving to Unicode Consortium after that date, I would like to ensure that the Unicode Consortium can accommodate any possible future need for making the changes prior to the publication. We would like to ensure that AFII produces the CRC before it goes out of business – 31 August 1999. There are some ballots that will be closing after that date and just in case there is some delay. I would like to receive some confirmation from the Unicode consortium that they are taking on the responsibility from AFII after AFII discontinues its operation.
- j) Dr. Asmus Freytag: This is not officially discussed at this point in time. The step that is missing is a request from WG 2. Without that the Unicode Consortium has not discussed officially whether it

is taking over the responsibility from AFII. Input to AFII must come up to four weeks before the date of 31 August 99.

- k) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The liaison reports from AFII and Unicode Consortium have yet to be tabled. I would like these reports to indicate to WG 2 as to what will happen when – to indicate if AFII goes out of business how will they transfer the responsibilities. Similarly from Unicode liaison report, whether the transfer of responsibility will happen or not.
- l) Dr. Ken Whistler: We cannot simply make a phone call to Unicode Consortium – it is similar to stating that a phone call be made to WG 2.
- m) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The hand over from AFII to Unicode may happen sometime prior to August 31 1999.
- n) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The Unicode Consortium could inform WG 2 as to what they have decided on this issue at the next meeting – possibly earlier.

**Disposition:** request the Unicode Consortium to act as the backup to AFII to complete the printing of ISO/IEC 10646-1 Second edition.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.25 (Request to Unicode consortium to be back up for AFII):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 requests the Unicode Consortium to act as the backup to AFII, if necessary, for preparing the camera ready copy of the non-Unified CJK glyph charts and list of names of the second edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 on schedule.

### **7.3.3 Format: what you see is what you get**

See discussion under section 7.3.2 above.

### **7.3.4 Schedule: synchronization with Unicode 3.0**

See discussion under section 11.1 later.

### **7.3.5 Responsibilities: review for confirmation at WG 2 September 1999 meeting**

See discussion under section 7.3.2 above.

## **8 10646 part 2**

### **8.1 2nd working draft**

**Input document:**

2012 WD of ISO/IEC 10646-2; Michel Suignard, Project Editor; 1999-03-10

Mr. Michel Suignard: I have incorporated the comments I have received from various national bodies. The Deseret script was agreed upon earlier. The code allocation was not done earlier – it is indicated. We still need to have a discussion on the roadmap. The term "non-graphic characters" is not used anymore. GSSP – General Scripts and Symbols supplementary plane; UISP – Unified Ideographic Supplementary plane and GPP – General Purpose Plane (Plane 14). The code positions in collection identifiers – for example will have five hex digits. Where necessary, a distinction between planes 1, 2 and 14 will be made. For plane 14 tag characters, we may need an annex describing the special nature of the tag characters. This is a Working Draft for review – and we will need more input to make it a Committee Draft.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Takayuki Sato: What do you want to do with this document?
- b) Mr. Michel Suignard: May 99 was CD ballot from the schedule point of view.
- c) Dr. Umamaheswaran: We would need to postpone the POW of this part by at least one meeting.
- d) Dr. Ken Whistler: Extension B – text is not ready yet. It is a significant part of Part 2.
- e) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I agree that it is the right thing to do.
- f) Ms. Emily Hsu: I agree to delay till we get the Extension B.
- g) Mr. Mike Ksar: We need to inform SC 2 about the change of the POW – the schedule is moved by 6 months. There are 5 dates – each of these dates have to be delayed by 6 months. We could agree on the CD contents at the September 1999 In the SC 2 program of work – we had May 1999 for FCD. Had DIS – May 2000 and IS in Dec 2000. The new dates will be CD Nov 99 – 3 month ballot; FCD – May 2000; FDIS – May 2001 and IS – Dec 2001.

- h) Mr. Michel Suignard: At some point there will be a part 1 amendment for linking part 2 to part 1. This work is to be done by editor of part 2. This link amendment to part 1 will be necessary to get part 2 synchronized with part 1. It is an essential part of the project on part 2.
- i) Mr. Bruce Paterson: It could be an editorial corrigendum. We have to see the text to determine if it is a technical corrigendum.
- j) Mr. Michel Suignard: I am only the editor – I will need input on this.
- k) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Clause 7 – Some comment on unification rule – text could be reworded to point to Annex T of Part 1.
- l) Mr. Michael Everson: General Scripts – suggest change to Secondary multilingual Plane.
- m) Mr. Bruce Paterson: I support the view of Mr. Michael Everson. If one is going to have acronyms – we should put in all GSSSP.
- n) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I do not see the need for acronyms.
- o) Mr. Michel Suignard: There is a lot of confusion between Plane 0 and Plane 1 etc.
- p) Mr. Mike Ksar: We can use plane 0, plane 1 etc. in our discussion. We should pick the acronyms to reflect the names of the scripts etc.
- q) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We could use Secondary Multi-lingual Plane for Scripts and Symbols – SMP – for plane 1, Supplementary plane for CJK Unified Ideographs – SIP – for plane 2, General purpose plane (GPP) – for plane 14; and include it in the text that has to go into part 1: Also, an editorial note to Annex A on collection identifiers – number ranges for use by Part 2 – should be created.
- r) Mr. Bruce Paterson: I see there are no combining characters in part 2. I do not see how musical symbols without combining marks can be used.
- s) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The rendering engine has to take care of the combinations in the same manner as the conjoining jamo symbols – it is up to the rendering engine to put these together in a meaningful manner.
- t) Mr. Mike Ksar: The code charts need to be improved and more readable. The glyphs of Byzantine Musical Symbols look too similar – we may need to be able to use a different size to be able to distinguish between them. I would like to thank the work of Mr. Michel Suignard on the hard work to prepare this draft. All of us need to review and feed back to Mr. Michel Suignard.

**Disposition:**

Move Tags and Tag characters from the definitions section to informative annex on Tag Characters. Highlight the changed dates for part 2 – while adopting the resolution. Accept the document N2012R. The new dates will be CD Nov 99 – 3 month ballot; FCD – May 2000; FDIS – May 2001 and IS – Dec 2001.

**Action item:** National bodies and liaisons to review the working draft for Part 2 – and feedback to the editor (Mr. Michel Suignard) by June 1999. This will give a chance to IRG to discuss it at their May 1999 meeting.

**Relevant resolutions:**

**M36.26 (2nd WD - 10646 Part 2):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts document N2012R as the second working draft of ISO/IEC 10646-2, including the following allocation / reallocation of code positions:

- Etruscan script is moved from 10200 ...1022F to 10300 ...1032F
- Gothic script is moved from 10230 ... 1024F to 10330 ... 1034F
- Deseret script is allocated to the range 10400 ... 1044F

and instructs its project editor to send the document to the SC 2 secretariat for circulating for NB comment by 1999-06-15.

**M36.27 (Request for Authorization of CD registration of 10646 Part 2):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 resolves to request SC 2 to authorize WG 2 to decide when to forward the WD for CD registration of ISO/IEC 10646-2. WG 2 further requests SC 2 to approve the following revised schedule: : CD -- November 99; FCD – May 2000; FDIS – May 2001 and IS – December 2001

## 8.2 Plane 1

### 8.2.1 Plane 1 roadmap

#### Input document:

1955 Plane 1 Roadmap; Everson; 1999-01-25

Document N1955 softcopy has been updated from the hard copy. It does not reflect the content of Part 2. They should be synchronized before consideration by WG 2. The roadmap should reflect the continuing research on new scripts.

#### Discussion:

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: The current document shows a number of scripts changed based on discovery of more information on some of the scripts. We have not had the discussion with editor of part 2. The roadmap for part 2 is different from the part 1 roadmap.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Does the change you have introduced increase or decrease the script cross-over of a 128 or 1024 position boundary? Has what you have moved a length of only one row? While the roadmap shows positions allocated to scripts. WG 2 should have the right to reallocate the scripts.
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: The shift is by entire rows. What is now 03 used to be 02.
- d) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Is the allocation of code positions fixed as indicated in the road map?
- e) Mr. Mike Ksar: The code positions indicated in the road map – is only potential locations. The old rules that we applied to the roadmap to BMP must apply to the plane 1 roadmap as well.
- f) Dr. Asmus Freytag: There will be proposals coming in for considerations and it may be OK to shuffle things around. In the past when a proposal has come in, the candidate location was completely open. We are moving towards a situation with tentative locations in the roadmap. In a way it is a small but significant shift. The 'general consensus' part of it is not binding on WG 2. The tentative code position allocation has to be clearly understood. There may be a consensus within the ad hoc.
- g) Mr. Bruce Paterson: What are the boundary rules – half rows and four-rows? Where is it documented and have you observed it in the roadmap?
- h) Mr. Michael Everson: The four row boundary has not been observed, the half row boundary rule has not always been observed.
- i) Dr. Umamaheswaran: If we are going to make this into a standing document then WG 2 has to adopt this document and instruct the ad hoc to incorporate into Principles and Procedures document.
- j) Mr. Mike Ksar: There will be modified text – delete the word 'general consensus'. It will be an expert contribution as far as the status is concerned. The text that goes into the road map standing document has to clearly reflect the status of the proposed code position allocations. Action on this document is for Review and Confirmation by WG 2.
- k) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Are we going to allocate some regions in these planes, to be able to guarantee (in some way) for example, the LTR vs. RTL property? It is important to be able to preselect location of RTL characters to have the BIDI algorithm handle future characters gracefully. The idea is to be able to manage the script properties – starting each of these boundaries at the 4-row boundaries. Same should apply to large scripts.
- l) Dr. Ken Whistler: Suggested reallocation of some of the scripts to different zones based on LTR vs. RTL.
- m) Mr. Michael Everson: There are also the Asian ideographic scripts. I have no idea why the Byzantyne etc. were later down.
- n) Dr. Ken Whistler: The original idea was to start a range for symbols – again at a 4-row boundary.
- o) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Is there any idea of PUA?
- p) Mr. Mike Ksar: There are two private use planes – there will not be any PUA in planes 1 and 2.
- q) Mr. Michael Everson: There is an entry for Gindai script – we need some input from Japan.
- r) Mr. Takayuki Sato: The question of this script has never come from Japan. I have recommended for a while the removal of Gindai. It is a sensitive item.
- s) Dr. Ken Whistler: Etruscan and Gothic to move from 2 to 3. RTL to start at 08. Deseret – needs consideration. Keep pushing down till Brahmi – 08 to 0D – RTL.



Messrs. Ken Whistler and Michael Everson to rework the document, and decide the code positions for Deseret.

**Disposition:**

Change the allocation for Etruscan from 10200 ... 10022F to 10300 ... 1032F

Change the allocation for Gothic from 10230 ... 1024F to 10330 ... 1034F

Part 2 will reflect the above reassignments. Editor to fix the working draft.

Messrs. Ken Whistler and Michael Everson have given the starting code points for Deseret script to Mr. Michel Suignard.

**Action Item:**

Mr. Michael Everson to update the plane 1 road map – incorporate the feedback from the WG. NBs to review the revised document and feedback to Michael Everson.

## 8.2.2 Encoding Deseret script

**Input document:**

1891 Encoding the Deseret script in plane 1; Everson; 1998-10-16

The code positions were assigned for Deseret script by the ad hoc on roadmap for plane 2 to be 10400 to 1044F.

## 8.2.3 Egyptian Hieroglyphs

**Input document:**

1944 Encoding Egyptian Hieroglyphs in Plane 1; Everson; 1999-01-09

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1944 replaces documents N1636 and N1637. The only feedback I have received is that some people in Germany want to continue to review this document. I will continue to research on this. There are basic hieroglyphics – rows 40—42. There were some extended ones rows 44—56. There is some research from Institute for Egyptology Research – generating some more marked rows 57—63 in the roadmap document.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Bruce Paterson: If you look at document N1944, the proposal summary form for Egyptian Hieroglyphics – the name of each character is a catalog number from source of catalog of six references. The catalog has to be identified with a specific source. The same occurs in document N1959 – where the name is simply a catalog number – without identifying which is the source for the catalog number. The source happens to be the manual de codage. For cuneiform there are a number of non-identical catalogs. There should be a requirement – that when the names are not self describing - the source and identity must be identified in the document. It is similar to clause 26? for part 1. Document N1959 identifies the sources in the proposal form – and it must be carried forward into the standard. When the names are catalog references the source catalog must be uniquely identified. An entry in part 2 must be made to cross reference the names to the specific catalog.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: In addition, there may be other references identifying the sources of scripts. It would be like a bibliography.

## 8.2.4 New script proposals

**Input documents:**

1947 Revised Proposal for encoding the Old Permic Script in Plane 1; Everson; 1999-01-22

1948 Proposal to encode the Osmanya script in Plane 1 of the UCS; Everson; 1999-01-25

1959 Proposal to encode the Indus script in Plane 1; Everson; 1999-01-29

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1947 – is resubmitted – I believe it is mature. As far as the other documents are concerned, no action needs to be taken at this meeting.

**Action item:**

National bodies and liaisons are requested to review and feedback to the author on the above documents N1947, 1948 and N1949,

**8.3 Plane 2 - IRG****Input documents:**

1992 IRG #12 – Resolutions (IRG N620); IRG; 1998-12-11  
1993 Format for Extension B (IRG N615R); IRG  
1994 Super CJK Version 5.0; IRG; 1999-02-07

*Refer to document N1992 – IRG Resolution – M12.1 – Format for printing of part 2 CJKV charts.*

Document N1993 contains the answer on the question from WG2 to IRG on the printing format of the CJKV charts in plane 2. IRG would like to have three columns with source information – without nationality identified. If we have only one agreeable glyph, we will need only one column. If there are glyph disagreements, then we need more columns. The first column will be from Kang Xi dictionary. The second will be New Stroke Style if any. If some country needs another one, it will go into another column. Other glyphs if any will go to annex P. In most instances these are enough. The SUPER CJK – hard copy that was made available at the meeting – is printed using this format. Most of them have only two columns, and a rare case of three columns and Annex P entry will be even rarer. The Super CJK document is still a working document towards unification.

Implication: part 2 – should have an Annex P equivalent in it, i.e. annotation of character names. Document N1994 contains samples.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: IRG was given the choice of the format just like what we did for the BMP. Does anyone have any concern?
- b) Mr. Hideki Hiura: There was no agreement on how many columns in IRG, even though WG 2 had given its opinion.
- c) Mr. Takayuki Sato: The single column was NOT agreed to and is not possible. The three column was selected – there is a possibility of National Taiwan standard for glyphs will have their variant. The Chinese simplified glyphs may have a different shape.
- d) Ms. Emily Hsu: The glyph 0 should be the traditional shape from Kang Xi dictionary – used in Taiwan. Glyph 1 is used in China. Glyph 2 is for other variants in other countries such as Singapore.
- e) Mr. Michel Suignard: This multiple column is going to lead to an unmanageable document – the number of pages is going to be too large and may not be distributable. Having more than one column – is not easy to deal with for implementations.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: Has IRG thought about using only one shape and putting the other characters in a TR ? IRG should consider the manageability and usefulness from the implementers' point of view.
- g) Mr. Takayuki Sato: No. There is too much disagreement in the IRG. If miracle happens? The thought of putting three columns in a technical report will not be acceptable to IRG members.
- h) Dr. Ken Whistler: From the glyph analytic point of view, these glyphs are the same. The difference between the style based glyph and the Kang Xi does not seem to be justified. We had great difficulty in getting a grip on the current BMP – with its multiple column glyphs. We need a facility to be able to quickly look up in a table the character glyph to know what the character may look like. In addition there will be a resource a font house will need with culturally-specific glyph information to incorporate in their fonts. The large size is one issue – fewer people will be able to use it. The online version will be large and becomes difficult to access, download etc. Let us say this entire document is online. The access due to the size of the document via Internet for example would take a long time. Implementers are looking for tables to mapping from / to source standards – probably in the form of text files. The information provided for example in the Super CJK sample, will go into the mapping tables. In addition we need some ease of reference to what the character is for any code points – a large enough glyph so that the details are not lost. The information of about the font specifics are not needed in the standard itself.

- i) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The Unicode consortium is planning to provide only one glyph – to make the document more useable. The size matters -- 100 MB on a server – in paper it could be 1000s of pages.
- j) Mr. Mike Ksar: The feedback from ITTF is that the preference is to go in the future to CD ROM versions. WG 2 expressed our preference for a single column format earlier. IRG has come back with multiple column format. IRG should take the feedback and see what they can do.
- k) Mr. Michel Suignard: Obviously having a single column would help converging the documents into a smaller volume. It can simplify a lot the editing process. Now it is more or less cut and paste of pieces.
- l) Dr. Umamaheswaran: What I hear is that IRG cannot agree on a single column glyph to be selected. It does not seem to be possible to agree on which set to pick.
- m) Mr. Hideki Hiura: Japan and USA preference was for a single column. Other members of IRG will have problems.
- n) Dr. Ken Whistler: If we look at the Super CJK draft, we can do the following:
- Keep the single glyphs as the ones shown
  - For the two glyphs entries:
    - those shown on the left sometimes have constructed bit maps. For these select the nicer font (almost always the right side glyph)
    - those that have both clean fonts, select ONE of them – would be the right side one for consistency in style with previous choice
  - 99.9 percent of the entries could be single column by using the above methodology of selecting a single glyph. Where there is need for more, use the Annex P technique, again selecting one glyph following the above guidelines.
- o) Mr. Mike Ksar: the other possibility is to come up with 90 percent of the proposed ideographs to have a single glyph. WG 2 wants to communicate to IRG the comment from WG 2.
- p) Mr. Michael Everson: We could communicate the suggestion from Dr. Ken Whistler – we could instruct the IRG to come with some specific to do.
- q) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I would like to take back to IRG a summary of the problem faced by the multi-column. We may be able to state that Easy Identification of character is the main requirement and not the size. As far as IRG is concerned, the role is to provide the hardcopy of CRC to WG 2. Beyond that IRG does not have any mission. I want WG 2 to give specific instruction to IRG so that we can execute the instruction. The requirement of electronic copy as a deliverable from IRG is new. Do you think IRG can have only one meeting in May and come up with what you are seeking in single column? The chances of failure of this is very high – you should be forewarned. There is only one meeting in May 99 for IRG. Remember there is only one IRG meeting before next WG 2 meeting.
- r) Mr. Mike Ksar: At the May meeting the IRG can take a look at the problem and can let us know any impact on WG 2 as soon as possible. WG 2 could continue to work on an agreed upon content of a 3 column meeting – as a working paper. But the final version of the standard can have a single column with additional work from IRG. Without slipping the schedule the CD ballot could be based on three column format and agree on the single column format for the DIS etc.
- s) Dr. Ken Whistler: If we have to be on schedule, the three column format will reflect the unification part of it and will be in the CD ballot. However, some of the national bodies will come back with strong comments and we may be risking failure of the CD ballot. Keith Brannon (ITTF) will get his machine readable form – a collection of pdf files. However, the cross referencing of sources of each unified ideograph character, in a machine readable form would be useful.
- t) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We are saying that let us continue the current phase with the current format – however, the final expected version is the single column format. In the past such information (cross referencing of sources) has been made available only to participants in IRG etc. No other ISO standards have distributed machine readable plain text files, database information etc. This will be a new request to IRG.
- u) Mr. Mike Ksar: It is expected that during the CD ballot that the strong preference will be a single column format, and we will need to take action at that time.
- v) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I also learn of a new requirement – cross referencing of source character code points to each one of the Extension B characters. The second message is WG 2's **STRONG PREFERENCE** for a **SINGLE COLUMN** format to the IRG.

**Disposition:**

- a. The strong preference expressed by WG 2 from the point of view of usability of the standard is to have a single column format for the Extension B format. If the single column format cannot be achieved the CD of part 2 will contain the agreed upon unification in the current 3-column format, with the work on coming up with a single-column format continuing in the IRG.
- b. The new publication format preference from ITTF is for electronic publication.
- c. Additional requirement is for capturing the cross reference information already gathered in the Super CJK exercise in a plain text format – without any glyphs.

*Resolution M12.4 – schedule for Extension B – from the IRG editor group*

The Super CJK 5.0 has been produced and was made available at the WG 2 meeting – document N1994.

The schedule will be synchronized with that of part 2.

**Relevant resolution:****M36.28 (IRG-Extension B – printing format):****Japan Negative**

With reference to IRG resolution M12.1 in document N1992, and document N1993 containing the format description, WG 2 requests the IRG to note the following:

In the interests of better usability, and smaller size of the standard using higher density of information per page, WG 2 expresses its strong preference that the Extension B code charts in ISO/IEC 10646-2 be printed with a single ideograph glyph per code position, and removing the information on source characters from the code charts.

WG 2 also requests IRG to prepare a soft copy text file containing cross references between Extension B characters and the source standard characters (code positions) to assist with cross mapping between various source standards and 10646.

## **9 ISO/IEC 10646 - Amendments beyond 2nd edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1**

### **9.1 General policy - future of WG 2 program of work - what, when and how?**

An email received from Mr. Bruce Paterson was summarized by Mr. Mike Ksar.

In item 9 we need a "general policy" topic for discussion, so we can discuss:

- Does anyone want to put effort into work beyond 2nd Edition?

We may need to ballot a new work item on it to find out.

- Timetable; including when can we quit entirely ?

- do we plan another steady trickle of small amendments as before?

ITTF doesn't like it, nor does the editor. It makes ISO/IEC 10646-1 virtually a registry, so why not recognize that ? (=UK preference).

UK prefers that WG 2 should consider the future additions to ISO/IEC 10646-1 be via a registration mechanism of some sorts, and handled by a maintenance agency.

(See ad hoc report on WG 2 charter, in response to similar comments from Japanese national body to JTC 1).

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: The rate at which we produce the amendments for part 1 will be slowing down in the future.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We will have the same pressure as we faced before for the BMP, in that as soon as a script is accepted, they would like to see it published. For Plane 1 the pressure will not be the same.
- c) Dr. Umamaheswaran: We could minimize the number of amendments by stating that in general we could bundle a number of these scripts into one amendment. We need to be able to decide that case by case.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: There will be some pressure on some of the scripts that are in the pipeline – and will be encoded in the BMP.

**Relevant resolution:****M36.29 (Policy on 10646-1 beyond 2nd edition):****Unanimous**

As a general policy, WG 2 resolves that the objective will be to minimize the number of amendments to Part 1, without sacrificing the timeliness to meet the end user requirements.

## 9.2 BMP roadmap

**Input document:**

1949 BMP Roadmap; Everson; 1999-01-25

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1949 contains an update of previous road map document. Some moving around has been done to respect the 128 character boundaries. The major change was – proposals for BannaDai and DeHong Dai. Looks like we have four of these Tai scripts – and it turns out that we need only Three. We were able to reduce the size of one of these. A draft for Lepcha script is available – its size has been adjusted. An exploratory draft for Newari script is also available.

Some of the feedback from discussion in section 8.2.1 on document N1955 is applicable to this document as well.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: distinguish between proposals that exists and those that are not.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: In light of this document which is in more user friendly way, should I cease to document stuff in the registry of code positions available etc. (document N1936)? It has a summary of character allocations.
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: In D7 – one empty row short – D7AF instead of D7FF; FA2F instead of FAFF.

**Action items:**

National bodies are to review and feedback to Author. Mr. Michael Everson will update the document for review at the next meeting. Dr. Umamaheswaran to include in the Procedures document – agreed upon parts of the BMP and Plane1 roadmaps.

## 9.3 New miscellaneous bucket

A new bucket has been opened Bucket M36 – with one character added during this meeting. See section 0 for the relevant resolution.

## 9.4 BMP – proposed additions

### 9.4.1 Buginese, Glogolitic, Phoenician, Phillippine scripts

**Input documents:**

1930 Revised proposal for encoding the Buginese script; Everson; 1998-11-10  
1931 Revised proposal for encoding the Glagolitic script; Everson; 1998-11-10  
1932 Revised proposal for encoding the Phoenician script; Everson; 1998-11-10  
1933 Revised proposal for encoding the Phillippine scripts; Everson; 1998-11-10

The above four proposals are considered to be extremely mature. There have been consultations with the UTC experts on these. The above documents are updates to previous submissions.

**Discussion:**

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The relevant coding experts in our committees have agreed on that there are no design alternatives to pursue. To what extent the user community are comfortable with these? I would like to know if there is a user community using these scripts in some place and we are doing somewhere else etc. This is related to market relevance. Biblical Hebrew implementations were doing their own things for example – implementers and scholarly communities should be involved.
- b) Dr. Ken Whistler: The ISO process does not prevent such things happening. For most of the above scripts there are no national bodies owning the above scripts. If we look at the Syriac proposal, it is an example where a set of Endorsements is attached to the Proposal Summary Form.

- c) Mr. Takayuki Sato: I had met with the Philippines standards people – they had no means of developing their own proposals. They have been asked to review the proposals – bureau of product standards Philippines, along with national computer center.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: I have talked to one of the Philippines designers. The repertoires are simple and well defined. The source for Philippines script is one expert Hector Sanchez. I have not contacted the Philippines national body. In another instance – the Glagolytic font was from a Slovenian source and there is another source is the TC 146 standard. I do not want to be responsible to be chasing endorsing statements. The script has been endorsed by the UTC. We already have a letter for Klingon.
- e) Mr. Mike Ksar: Are there users outside the three experts that can rely on the proposals – not only from coding experts point of view or other users of these scripts? Are there any other national bodies etc. to be additionally consulted. We would like to see some endorsement from the intended user community for these. Mr. Takayuki Sato has offered to get the review from the Philippines national body sources.
- f) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I would like to see the reviewers from Philippines that they do encourage us to continue with us going ahead with the proposal. It is like to getting some endorsement for our work. The UTC collectively will be part of gathering such endorsements from different sources.

**Action item:**

WG 2 will seek to get endorsement letters form the user communities. National bodies requested to identify user communities.

**9.4.2 OI Cemet', Sorang Sompeng, Varang Kshiti scripts**

**Input documents:**

- 1956 Proposal to encode the OI Cemet' script iBMP; Everson; 1999-01-29
- 1957 Proposal to encode the Sorang Sompeng script ithe BMP; Everson; 1999-01-29
- 1958 Proposal to encode the Varang Kshiti script ithe BMP; Everson; 1999-01-29

These proposals are submitted to the WG 2 for the first time. National bodies are to review and feedback to the author.

**Action item:** National bodies to review and feedback.

**9.4.3 Optimizing Georgian representation in the BMP**

**Input document:**

- 1962 Optimizing Georgian representation in the BMP of the UCS; Everson; 1999-02-11

This proposal has been presented before. Needs review by national bodies.

**Action item:** National bodies to review and feedback.

**9.4.4 Cham script**

**Input documents:**

- 1960 Response to Ngo Trung Viet on feedback from Cham experts; Everson; 1999-02-01
- 1997 Response to Everson on Cham; Vietnam; 1999-03-09

Mr. Michael Everson: I had discussion with Vietnamese experts on these two documents. The proposal is close to being mature. Will possibly get endorsement from Vietnam national body.

**10 Defect reports**

**10.1 Defect report index No 5 for10646-1**

**Input document:**

- 1978 Defect Report Index No. 5 for 10646-1; Paterson; 1999-02-09

Mr. Bruce Paterson: Document N1978 contains the defect report index. It is prepared in accordance with JTC 1 directives, and is to be prepared before each plenary of the SC. It records the status of the defect reports and the dispositions for each and the actions taken. C = Corrigendum Agreed Formally by WG 2 should be added. M33: etc. next to the status column legend is not connected to the Status letters. It gives the dates for each of the meeting cited. The status is as of February 1999. It has to be updated to

include later defect report dispositions. The As will become Cs in the next version of this document. Amd.5 defect report – the N will become a C.

A revised document N1978R was prepared by the editor before the end of the meeting. for submission next week to the SC 2 plenary.

**Relevant resolution:**

**M36.30 (Defect report index no. 5):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts document N1978R as the revised defect report index no. 5 summarizing the dispositions of all the defect report dispositions to ISO/IEC 10646-1: 1993 to date.

## 11 Liaison reports

### 11.1 The Unicode Consortium

**Input document:**

2010 Synchronization between The Unicode Standard and ISO/IEC 10646-1 – Liaison Report; The Unicode Consortium; 1999-03-09

Dr. Asmus Freytag presented the Liaison report in document N2010. It details the synchronization aspect between V3.0 of Unicode and ISO/IEC 10646-1 second edition. There is some pressure on Unicode 3.0 publication.

**Discussion:**

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: I would like to see that we provide text to the editor to include Unicode 3.0 as a normative reference to the next edition of the standard.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: A normative reference – is only there when it says that to implement ISO/IEC 10646-1 we will have to conform to Unicode 3.0? UK will vehemently oppose this – it is not the case. At this point, Annex L has only a list of sources of characters.
- c) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Moreover, we will have to process this as a technical corrigendum – because it is normative. As an informative reference there will not be a problem.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Unicode consortium will be perfectly happy if it is an informative reference.

**Action item:** Messrs. Bruce Paterson, Asmus Freytag, and Michael Everson – to look at how a reference to Unicode 3.0 (and its ISBN) can be accommodated in the next edition.

### 11.2 CEN/TC304

**Input document:**

2014 Cooperation report on CEN/TC304 related work; Keld Simonsen; 1999-03-06

Document N2014 was distributed for information to WG2 members. There was no discussion.

### 11.3 AFII

**Input document:**

1991 AFII Progress Report on the printing of next edition; AFII; 1999-03-02

2015 Liaison Report from AFII (also SC 2 N3271); AFII; 1999-03-10

A status of the printing of second edition is given in documents N1991 and N2015. See also discussion under section 7.3.2 on page 43.

### 11.4 JTC 1/SC 22/ WG 20

Dr. Ken Whistler reported on SC 22 WG 20 activities. WG 2 met in October 1998 in Tel Aviv. Dealt with ballot resolutions for 14651 FCD ordering standard-- issued 2nd FCD ballot closing April 8, 1999. Dealt with ballot resolution for FCD 14652 on cultural conventions – issued 2nd FCD closing 26 April 99. Concurrent NP and Ballot on Amendment to TR 10176 (Guidelines on i18n of programming languages) related to identifiers was prepared – ballot closing on March 8, 1999. Registration of cultural elements – ENV 12005 was fast-tracked to IS 15897 – with editing to conform to ISO format and start the registration. Denmark is the registration authority. Other work items – I18N API WD 15435 is in progress. No CD issued yet. next meeting is May 3—7, 1999, Malvern, PA, USA.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Takayuki Sato: Who is the editor for the API project?

Dr. Ken Whistler: For cultural elements and cultural element registration and the API project – the editor is Keld Simonsen.

**12 Other business****12.1 Web site review**

The WG 2 site is operational. Feedback from national bodies is solicited to improve the site.

**Action item:**

Convener to check with Danish Standards to ensure the dkuug.dk web site will continue to be supported for WG 2 standards / activities.

**12.2 Future meetings**

Mr. Mike Ksar: I had conversations with Keld and Melagrakis. To avoid conflicts with other meetings, I suggest to hold our next meeting M37 the week of 13 September 1999. Suggestion is to hold it for Monday 13th to Thursday 16th AM. WG 3 can meet Thursday 16th PM and Friday, 17th. Danish Standards will be contacted to verify these dates are OK. The host will be dkuug.

Meeting M38, the next meeting – will be in September 2000, to synchronize with SC 2. March 2000 date is being postponed – there will not be enough work within WG 2 to review, the editing committee will be busy working on the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1. Possibly the week of 11th of September 2000. SC 2 meeting is either Denmark / Greece.

IRG may finish their work on Extension B – current plan is by September 1999. Waiting for one full year to progress by WG 2 may be too long for IRG work.

Dr. Asmus Freytag: Once the collection required for example the Hong Kong collection is solidified – it is not justified to delay the progress if it can be avoided.

Mr. Michel Suignard: There is a lot of pressure on the vendors to do something about Extension B. It will be nice to have some sort of endorsement from WG 2 at the earliest.

Mr. Mike Ksar: We need to synchronize with SC 2.

Dr. Ken Whistler: The reality is that an important repertoire is coming along and is going to put pressure on WG 2 to do something about it. Part 2 – needs to make a progress – and the reason for progressing it is because of Extension B – not any of the other scripts.

Meeting M38 could be tentatively scheduled for 20–23 March 2000 – with China as the host -- to possibly deal with Extension B and progress Part 2.

Mr. Mike Ksar: I received a message on Friday from Keld Simonsen stating that for Meeting M37, our Host is Danish Standards, and the meeting is held at the DKUUG; they will be inviting WG 2 and WG 3. Sept 13, 1999 as the start date is confirmed.

**Relevant resolution****M36.33 (Future meetings):****Unanimous**

WG 2 confirms the following future meeting schedule:

- Meeting 37: 13--16 September 1999 -- Copenhagen, Denmark
- Meeting 38: TENTATIVELY in March 2000 --China, USA as fallback
- Meeting 39 September 2000, Greece (USA as fall back) (along with SC 2 meeting)

WG 2 accepts and confirms the following IRG future meeting schedule:

- IRG 13: May 1999, Hong Kong
- IRG 14: Dec 1999 in Singapore
- IRG 15: May 2000 in Taiwan



### 12.3 WG 2 report to SC 2

**Input document:**

1940 WG 2 Report to SC 2 plenary 9 - Fukuoka, Japan; Ksar; 1998-12-11

Mr. Mike Ksar: Document N1940 was sent out in the mailing in January. It has been updated to reflect changes from this meeting -- M36. Dates for some of the amendments have been revised – Amd.14, 16, 28—31, to change the FCD dates to 4/99, 10/99 and 2/00. Part 2 dates have been revised to what was agreed to during the meeting. Correct DCOR-3 ballot to 99-06. Editor's name will be added to vacant slots. This document is intended to be part of SC 2 program of work.

The convener will finalize document N1940 incorporating decisions from meeting M36, will create document N1940R.

### 12.4 Principles and procedures document

**Input document:**

2002 Updated N1502 – Principles and Procedures; Uma; 99-03-08

Mr. Mike Ksar: I would like to give the editor of N2002 – the choice of being able to move things around etc. so that it is an updated and useful document.

Dr. Asmus Freytag: I would like to have the document opened up to be able to incorporate changes required also from the view of UTC.

**Action item:**

Dr. Umamaheswaran will distribute the latest draft of document N2002 – for use by everyone. This was done before the end of the meeting.

### 12.5 Status of WG 2 proposals – standing document

**Input document:**

1952 S Summary of WG 2 Work Items and status of contributions, replaces N1509 S; Everson; 1999-02-20

Mr. Mike Everson: Document N1952 replaces the standing document N1502 – containing the spread sheet of the status of WG 2 proposals. It has been converted to HTML spread sheet form and has incorporated all the changes that were proposed and their status. I would like to know – how to make it a smaller document. Page 9 – most of these documents have come from N874 and earlier. Need to know what to do with the Stopped etc.

We could group these into three parts – part 1 containing all that will be published in Edition 2. Another part containing all the STOPPED items. And the third part could be the living documents to keep track of.

Need assistance from the IRG experts to look at the proposals on the IRG topics – Mr. Takayuki Sato san can help.

**Action Item:** Mr. Takayuki Sato to assist Mr. Everson in updating the status of proposals arising out of IRG.

### 12.6 Request for publishing TR15258 on the web

**Input document:**

2008 Request for ISO to publish TR 15285 on the www; Edwin Hart and Asmus Freytag; 1999-03-09

Document N2008 contains a request to WG 2 to ask that TR 15258 be published on the web so that other standards can point to it on the web. WG2 accepted and endorsed this request.

**RESOLUTION M36.31 (TR 15285 on www):**

**Unanimous**

WG 2 accepts the request in document N2008 for publishing TR 15285 – Operational model for characters and glyphs, on the world wide web, and requests SC 2 to endorse it and forward the request to JTC 1.

## 12.7 Collections for European subrepertoires

Input document:

2013 Multilingual European Subset Repertoires; Erkki Kolehmainen; 1999-03-07

A letter from Erkki Kolehmainen was distributed. It indicates that the MES-1 through MES-3 were not yet ready. No action need to be taken by WG 2 at this meeting, since the repertoire is not yet stable.

## 13 Closing

### 13.1 Approval of resolutions of meeting 36

Output document:

2004 Resolutions of Meeting M36, Fukuoka, Japan, March 9—15, 1999; 1999-03-15.

Draft resolutions prepared by the editing committee – Messrs. Mike Ksar, Bruce Paterson, Michel Suignard, Takayuki Sato, and Umamaheswaran, were discussed and approved with some modifications. Output document N2004 contains the final approved resolutions.

Resolution M36.23 – on approval process for 2nd ed. of part 1. Professor Shibano will inform JTC 1 of the Part 1 second edition as the key deliverable as part of the Business Plan of SC 2.

Resolution M36.25

Mr. Takayuki Sato: The WD of part 2 – will contain all but Plane 2. Plane 2 will not be ready in June. In Sept we will do final review.

Ms. Toshiko Kimura: CD Registration ballot has to happen before the CD / simultaneously.

Mr. Michel Suignard: Will something be ready from plane 2 for inclusion in June distribution.

Mr. Mike Ksar: We will split the document into two – one on the June comment document. The other one is to request to delegate to WG 2 the registration of CD before the next plenary.

Mr. Takayuki Sato: Resolution on IRG printing – Japan will object in principle to ask IRG to change from 3 columns.

Professor Shibano: ISO has some criteria etc. to meet before web publication. It will be discussed in SC 2.

Mr. Takayuki Sato: SC 2 meeting in Fukuoka was moved from Turkey to Japan. We should possibly have Turkey on the list for future SC 2 meetings. Also, in the count of names, the name 'Observer' should be changed to 'Guest' in the attendance list and in the resolutions document, so as not to confuse between P-member and O-member status.

### 13.2 Adjournment

Meeting closed at 15:15h.

## 14 Cumulative list of action items

*Note: WG 2 experts, national bodies and liaison organizations are encouraged to verify the action items against the final list given below – and inform the convener Mr. Mike Ksar, and the recording secretary, Dr. V.S. Umamaheswaran of completions with the relevant document numbers and of any corrections.*

### 14.1 Action items from previous WG 2 meetings -- Meetings no. 25 to 32

All the action items from meeting 25 in Antalya, Turkey, meeting 26 in San Francisco, CA, USA, meeting 27 in Geneva, Switzerland, meeting 28 in Helsinki, Finland, meeting 29 in Tokyo, Japan, meeting 30 in Copenhagen, Denmark, meeting 31 in Québec City, Canada, and meeting 32 in Singapore, have been either completed or dropped.

## 14.2 Outstanding action items from meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions in document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 – with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N1703.)	Status
<b>AI-33-8</b>	<b>Korean national body (Professor Kyongsok Kim)</b>	
<b>b</b>	is invited to submit a proposal summary form to cover requests for Gugyeol characters (original requests in document N936) with possible updates to these documents and submit to WG 2 for consideration at meeting 34. M34, M35 and M36: In progress.	<b>M37:</b>

## 14.3 Outstanding action items from meeting 34, Redmond, WA, USA

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 34 Resolutions in document N1704R and Unconfirmed Meeting 34 minutes in document N1703 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N1903.)	Status
<b>AI-34-2</b>	<b>Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar</b>	
<b>f</b>	to send document N1670 as a liaison document to IETF from SC 2/WG 2. WG 2 is concerned because the initial MLSF proposal is in conflict with UTF-8. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-34-4</b>	<b>Editor of 10646-2: Mr. Michel Suignard</b>	
	to take note of the following and incorporate the needed text in the draft of 10646-2:	
<b>a</b>	RESOLUTION M34.1 (DTR 15285 Character Glyph Model): ... WG 2 further instructs its project editors for ISO/IEC 10646 Part 1 and Part 2 to add TR 15285 as a reference to the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 and to the WD of ISO/IEC 10646-2. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>b</b>	RESOLUTION M34.14 (Characters for inclusion in WD of Part 2): WG 2 accepts the following: Plane 14 Characters for Language Tags according to document N1670. ETRUSCAN script in the range Plane 1 0200 to 022F, in accordance with document N1580. GOTHIC script in the range Plane 1 0230 to 024F, in accordance with document N1581, with the last three characters in that document deleted from the repertoire. WESTERN MUSICAL SYMBOLS in the range Plane 1 D100 to D1FF, starting at D103, in accordance with document N1693. and instructs its project editor to include the above accepted characters in the working draft of 10646-2. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>c</b>	to update the working draft in document 1717 - accommodating the various comments during meeting 34, and to draft some text for inclusion in Part 1 referring to the architectural statements that need to be included in Part 1. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>d</b>	RESOLUTION M34.18 (Collection Identifiers in Parts 1 and 2): WG 2 accepts the recommendations of the ad hoc on collection identifiers in document N1726, and instructs the ad hoc on Principles and Procedures to include these in the Principles and Procedures document (N1502R). WG 2 further instructs its project editors to take note of these recommendations for adoption in Parts 1 and Part 2. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-34-10</b>	<b>The Unicode Consortium (Dr. Asmus Freytag, and some US experts)</b>	
<b>bc</b>	is requested to work with the American Mathematical Society, examine the proposal in document N1716 - Math Symbols, refine the proposals and draft (jointly with the US national body) an updated document for consideration at the next meeting. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-34-13</b>	<b>Irish national body (Mr. Michael Everson)</b>	
<b>h</b>	is invited to create a "Defect Report" on changing the block name IPA Extension to IPA Latin Extension. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-34-14</b>	<b>US national body (Dr. Ken Whistler and other experts)</b>	
<b>c</b>	is requested to work with the American mathematical society, examine the proposal in document N1716 - Math Symbols, refine the proposals and draft (jointly with the Unicode Consortium) an updated document for consideration at the next meeting. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>

#### 14.4 Outstanding action items from meeting 35, London, UK

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 35 Resolutions in document N1904R and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N1903 - with the corrections noted in section 3 of document N2003.)	Status
<b>AI-35-2</b>	<b>Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar</b>	
<b>d</b>	to contact ITTF regarding the possible holding back of the publication of FDAM-17 on CJK Extension A, in view of the 2nd edition coming along soon. M36 – in progress – new deadline middle of April 1999. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>h</b>	to check with Korea if the explanatory note to Clause 24.1 regarding two Bangjeom characters proposed in document N1738 meet their requirements. M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>i</b>	to check with Korea for their position on the proposal to replace the Korean Hangeul long names in Amendment 5 with an equivalent algorithm which generates these names (see defect report in document N1806). M35 and M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-4</b>	<b>Editor of 10646-2: Mr. Michel Suignard</b>	
	to take note of the following and incorporate the needed text in the draft of 10646-2:	
<b>c</b>	IRG to review the schedule for CJK Extension B with editor of Part 2 -- should be synchronized with Part 2 plan in SC 2 Program of work. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-5</b>	<b>IRG (Mr. Zhang Zhoucai, Rapporteur)</b>	
<b>c</b>	IRG to review the schedule for CJK Extension B with editor of Part 2 -- should be synchronized with Part 2 plan in SC 2 Program of work. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-12</b>	<b>Japanese national body (Mr. Takayuki Sato) – transferred from UK</b>	
<b>a</b>	Mr. John Clews is to do some research to get the contact names, mailing address, fax etc. in the Maldivian Ministry of Education and get the information to the convener. M36 – transferred to Mr. Takayuki Sato.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-10</b>	<b>UK national body (Mr. John Clews, Mr. Hugh Ross)</b>	
<b>b</b>	Mr. Hugh Ross is encouraged to approach IEC to ask them to include similar mapping information (as in his contribution document N1818 on mapping of Electrotechnical symbols) in relevant IEC standards. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-11</b>	<b>Irish national body (Mr. Michael Everson)</b>	
<b>a</b>	Mr. Michael Everson is invited to take the comments at this meeting (M35) and prepare a revised contribution on Old Hungarian in document N1758. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-12</b>	<b>Japanese national body (Mr. Takayuki Sato)</b>	
<b>c</b>	to provide more information on the usage of and the need for "ng" and the need of "ng" in document N1859, taking into account the comments made at this meeting. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>d</b>	to provide more information on the Peso currency sign proposed in document N1858. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>e</b>	to provide additional information on Old Mongolian (document N1855) and its relationship to the Mongolian script proposal in the BMP. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-13</b>	<b>The Unicode Consortium (Dr. Asmus Freytag)</b>	
<b>a</b>	to provide more information on use of the three proposed symbols -- SQUARE FOOT, SQUARE INCH, and PROPERTY LINE in document N1887. M36 – in progress.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-35-16</b>	<b>All national bodies and liaison organizations</b>	
<b>j</b>	to review the scripts that they have contributed in the different amendments 10 through 27 to the standard and provide to WG 2 the source references for the scripts and individual characters for inclusion in Annex L. M36 – no feedback.	<b>M37:</b>

#### 14.5 New action items from meeting 36, Fukuoka, Japan

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 36 Resolutions in document N2004 and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N2003 – this document you are reading.)	Status
<b>AI-36-1</b>	<b>Meeting Secretary - Dr. V.S. UMaaheswaran</b>	

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 36 Resolutions in document N2004 and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N2003 – this document you are reading.)	Status
a	to finalize the document N2003 containing the unconfirmed meeting minutes and send it to the convener as soon as possible.	<b>M37:</b>
b	to finalize the document N2004 containing the adopted meeting resolutions and send it to the convener as soon as possible.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-2 Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar</b>		
a	per resolution M36.21, to forward document N1984 to SC 2 for forwarding to the Armenian NB in response to their letter dated 1998-11-16 (in document N1981 – SC2 N3222) (was delegated to Mr. Michel Suignard during the meeting).	<b>M37:</b>
b	to forward document N2009 on WG2 charter to SC2 for consideration and adoption towards improving the SC2 process. WG2 further requests SC 2 to forward it to JTC 1 as an attachment to the SC2 business plan. (as part of response to Resolution 19 of JTC1 resolutions document JTC 1 N5748).	<b>M37:</b>
c	to forward document N2017 – response to Japanese NB concerns – to SC2 as input into SC2 response to JTC 1 Resolution 19 regarding Japanese National Body's concerns on SC2 activities in JTC1 resolutions document N5748.	<b>M37:</b>
d	per resolution M36.24, to forward document N1961, for adoption by SC2 as the approval process for the second edition of 10646-1.	<b>M37:</b>
e	per resolution M36.25, communicate to the Unicode Consortium, the WG 2 request to the Unicode Consortium to act as the backup to AFII, if necessary, for preparing the camera ready copy of the non-Unified CJK glyph charts and list of names of the second edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 on schedule.	<b>M37:</b>
f	per resolution M36.27, to request SC2 to authorize WG 2 to decide when to forward the WD for CD registration of ISO/IEC 10646-2.	<b>M37:</b>
g	per resolution M36.31, to request SC 2 to endorse document N2008 to publish TR 15285 on www, and forward the request to JTC 1.	<b>M37:</b>
h	to get the front page of FDAM-17 and a few sample Han code tables from CJK Extension A for WG 2 distribution; it has been sent for JTC 1 ballot as an SC2 document SC2 N3220.	<b>M37:</b>
i	to check and confirm with Danish Standards that the dkuug.dk web site will continue to be supported for WG 2 standards / activities.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-3 Editor of 10646-1 Mr. Bruce Paterson and contributing editor Mr. Michael Everson</b>		
	to prepare the appropriate AM, DAM or PDAM texts, sub-division proposals, collection of editorial text for the next edition, corrigendum text, or entries in collections of characters for future coding, with assistance from other identified parties, in accordance with the following:	
a	<p><b>M36.1 (FPDAM-14 on Yi syllables and Yi radicals):</b>  WG 2 accepts the ad hoc report in document N1945R on ballot comments on FPDAM-14. WG2 further instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments and the final text of FDAM-14, based on document N1945R and discussion at meeting 36, with assistance from China and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with revised target dates --- FDAM 99-05 and AM 99-08  Note that the disposition of comments includes, as shown in document N1945R:  - Deletion of the 7 character positions – A49F, A4B3, A4B7, A4BD, A4C1, A4C2, A4C3.  - Rearrangement of character code positions in the range from A490 to A4CF.  <b>Fonts:</b> Mr. Michael Everson to send the relevant fonts to AFII for inclusion of Yi syllables and Yi radicals in the second edition of 10646-1.</p>	<b>M37:</b>
b	<p><b>M36.2 (FPDAM-22 on Keyboard symbols):</b>  WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.22, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-22, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.  <b>Glyph:</b> Messrs. Michael Everson and Asmus Freytag are to arrive at the correct glyph for the DECIMAL SEPARATOR character for inclusion in FPDAM22, and in the next edition of 10646-1.</p>	<b>M37:</b>
c	<p><b>M36.3 (FPDAM-24 on Thaana script):</b>  WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.24, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-24, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.</p>	<b>M37:</b>

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 36 Resolutions in document N2004 and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N2003 – this document you are reading.)	Status
d	<p><b>M36.4 (FPDAM-25 on Khmer script):</b> WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.25, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-25, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.</p> <p><b>Khmer script:</b> The contributing editor, Mr. Michael Everson, is to send the font used for the preparation of FDAM-25 by 1999-03-31 to Dr. Asmus Freytag, AFII, towards the preparation of the code tables in the next edition of the standard.</p>	M37:
e	<p><b>M36.5 (FPDAM-26 on Myanmar script):</b> WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N2016 for FPDAM.26, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-26, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.</p> <p><b>Myanmar script:</b> the contributing editor, Mr. Michael Everson, is to provide the updated glyphs in the font by 1999-03-31 to Asmus Freytag, AFII, for inclusion in the next edition document.</p>	M37:
f	<p><b>M36.6 (FPDAM-27 on Syriac script):</b> WG 2 notes the ballot responses in document N1986 on FPDAM-27, which contained no comments, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FDAM-27, with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with unchanged target dates.</p>	M37:
g	<p><b>M36.7 (PDAM-15 on Kang Xi and CJK radicals):</b> WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments on PDAM-15 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-15 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.</p>	M37:
h	<p><b>M36.8 (PDAM-28 on Ideographic description characters):</b> WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-28 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-28 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.</p>	M37:
i	<p><b>M36.9 (PDAM-29 on Mongolian script):</b> WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-29 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-29 with assistance from China, Mongolia and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.</p>	M37:
j	<p><b>M36.10 (PDAM-30 on Additional Latin and other characters):</b> WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-30 ballot in document N1965R, and the proposed clarification text for Annex D regarding Interlinear Annotation Characters in document N2007, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-30 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.</p> <p>Note the disposition of comments includes -- deletion of SOFT SPACE at 204F; addition from document N1975 of 048C CYRILLIC CAPITAL LETTER SEMISOFT SIGN and 048D CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER SEMISOFT SIGN; and, addition from document N1975 and N1946 of 20AF DRACHMA SIGN</p>	M37:
j	<p><b>M36.11 (PDAM-31 on Tibetan extensions):</b> WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-31 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-31 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.</p>	M37:
k	<p><b>M36.12 (Technical Corrigendum on Hangul names list):</b> WG 2 accepts document N1942 as the basis for addressing defect report in document N1806 on Amendment 6 on Hangul Syllables. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to prepare a technical corrigendum based on document N1942 and discussion at meeting 36 in response to the defect report, and forward it to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, in time for ballot starting before 1999-06-01.</p>	M37:



Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 36 Resolutions in document N2004 and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N2003 – this document you are reading.)	Status
l	<b>M36.13 (Technical Corrigendum on Collection ID for BMP of 2nd edition):</b> WG 2 accepts the proposed fixed collection identifier in document N1983 (collection 302) for the fixed repertoire of BMP of the second edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1, and instructs its project editor to prepare a technical corrigendum to Annex A, for inclusion with the Technical Corrigendum in resolution on 'Hangul names list' above.	M37:
m	<b>M36.14 (Deletion of Annex N in the next edition):</b> WG 2 notes that all but two of the entries from the informative Annex N – "Scripts under consideration for future editions of ISO/IEC 10646", of part 1 have been processed. WG 2 resolves to delete Annex N from the next edition. WG 2 instructs its project editor to delete Annex N, and add a note capturing the intent of adding new scripts in the future, in the scope of the next edition of the standard, and to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.	M37:
n	<b>M36.15 (Editorial corrigendum on zones):</b> WG 2 accepts the Editorial Corrigendum on Zones in document N1934, with modifications based on discussion at meeting 36. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.	M37:
o	<b>M36.16 (Editorial corrigendum on Annex T for CJK Extension A):</b> WG 2 accepts the proposed revisions for Annex T for CJK Extension A, in document N1943, modified by discussion at meeting 36. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.	M37:
p	<b>M36.17 (Editorial corrigendum on CJK compatibility characters):</b> WG 2 accepts the proposed annotations in Annex P for the two CJK compatibility ideographs in document N1935. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.	M37:
q	<b>M36.18 (Editorial corrigendum on Banjgeom characters):</b> WG 2 accepts the proposed annotations in Annex P for the Banjgeom characters in document N1935. WG 2 further instructs its project editor to process the above as an editorial consolidation of the text for the next edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.	M37:
r	<b>M36.19 (New character bucket M36):</b> With reference to document N1941, WG 2 accepts the proposed Triangular Overlay character, with the new name COMBINING ENCLOSING UPWARD POINTING TRIANGLE, with its proposed shape, and allocates it the code position 20E4 in the BMP. WG2 instructs its project editor to create a new list of characters accepted for processing beyond the 2nd edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1.	M37:
s	to work with the IRG editor to synchronize the page numbering for the CJK tables (Clause 26 tables) to get the Camera Ready Copy ready by end of July 1999.	M37:
t	to work with the Unicode liaison (Dr. Asmus Freytag) on the best way to reference the Unicode Standard in the next edition of 10646-1.	
u	<b>M36.24 (Approval process for second edition of 10646-1):</b> WG 2 instructs its convener to forward document N1961, for adoption by SC 2 as the approval process for the second edition of 10646-1. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the consolidated text of the second edition of 10646-1 (update of document N1796), and forward it by 1999-05-31, along with document N1998 (sample of code charts for second edition), to the SC 2 secretariat for NB review and comment by 1999-08-31.	M37:
AI-36-4	<b>Editor of 10646-2: Mr. Michel Suignard</b> to take note of the following and incorporate the needed text in the draft of 10646-2:	
a	<b>M36.26 (2nd WD - 10646 Part 2):</b> WG 2 accepts document N2012R as the second working draft of ISO/IEC 10646-2, including the following allocation / reallocation of code positions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Etruscan script is moved from 10200..1022F to 10300 ...1032F</li> <li>- Gothic script is moved from 10230 ... 1024F to 10330 ... 1034F</li> <li>- Deseret script is allocated to the range 10400 ... 1044F</li> </ul> and instructs its project editor to send the document to the SC2 secretariat for circulating for NB comment by 1999-06-15.	M37:
b	per resolution M36.27, to request SC 2 to approve the following revised schedule: CD -- November 99; FCD – May 2000; FDIS – May 2001 and IS – December 2001.	M37:
AI-36-5	<b>IRG (Mr. Zhang Zhoucai, Rapporteur)</b>	

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 36 Resolutions in document N2004 and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N2003 – this document you are reading.)	Status
a	to assist the project editor in the preparation of final text of FPDAM-15 according to resolution <b>M36.7 (PDAM-15 on Kang Xi and CJK radicals)</b> : WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments on PDAM-15 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-15 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.	<b>M37:</b>
b	to assist the project editor in the preparation of final text of FPDAM-15 according to resolution <b>M36.8 (PDAM-28 on Ideographic description characters)</b> : WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-28 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-28 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.	<b>M37:</b>
c	<b>M36.28 (IRG-Extension B – printing format)</b> : With reference to IRG resolution M12.1 in document N1992, and document N1993 containing the format description, WG 2 requests the IRG to note the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the interests of better usability, and smaller size of the standard using higher density of information per page, WG2 expresses its strong preference that the Extension B code charts in ISO/IEC 10646-2 be printed with a single ideograph glyph per code position, and removing the information on source characters from the code charts.</li> <li>• WG2 also requests IRG to prepare a soft copy text file containing cross references between Extension B characters and the source standard characters (code positions) to assist with cross mapping between various source standards and 10646.</li> </ul>	<b>M37:</b>
d	IRG editor is to work with the project editor to synchronize the page numbering for the CJK tables (Clause 26 tables) to get the Camera Ready Copy ready by end of July 1999.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-17 AFII (Dr. Asmus Freytag)</b>		
a	<b>Glyph:</b> Messrs. Michael Everson and Asmus Freytag are to arrive at the correct glyph for the DECIMAL SEPARATOR character for inclusion in FPDAM22, and in the next edition of 10646-1.	<b>M37:</b>
b	AFII is to produce sample pages with 14 columns for review and deciding the final format for Hangul glyph charts, by the ad hoc editorial committee for the second edition.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-6 Ad hoc group on principles and procedures (lead - Dr. V.S. UMAmaheswaran)</b>		
a	<b>M36.20 (Criteria for encoding symbols)</b> : WG 2 accepts the Criteria for Encoding Symbols proposed in document N1982 in principle and instructs the ad hoc group on Principles and Procedures to incorporate the material from this document into the WG 2 standing document on Principles and Procedures, document N2002.	<b>M37:</b>
b	to take note of including IDEOGRAPHIC VARIATION INDICATOR at 303E and remove GENERAL VARIATION MARK from FFFB in the roadmap related work.	<b>M37:</b>
c	to incorporate agreed upon parts of roadmap documents N1949 BMP and N1955 Plane 1 into the principles and procedures document.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-7 Chinese national body</b>		
a	to assist the project editor in the preparation of final text of FPDAM-15 according to resolution <b>M36.1 (FPDAM-14 on Yi syllables and Yi radicals)</b> : WG 2 accepts the ad hoc report in document N1945R on ballot comments on FPDAM-14. WG2 further instructs its project editor to prepare the final disposition of comments and the final text of FDAM-14, based on document N1945R and discussion at meeting 36, with assistance from China and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with revised target dates --- FDAM 99-05 and AM 99-08 Note that the disposition of comments includes, as shown in document N1945R: - Deletion of the 7 character positions – A49F, A4B3, A4B7, A4BD, A4C1, A4C2, A4C3. - Rearrangement of character code positions in the range from A490 to A4CF.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-8 TCA (Ms. Emily Hsu)</b>		
a	to assist the project editor in the preparation of final text of FPDAM-15 according to resolution <b>M36.7 (PDAM-15 on Kang Xi and CJK radicals)</b> : WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments on PDAM-15 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-15 with assistance from the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-9 Mongolian national body (Ms. Myatav Erdenchimeg)</b>		



Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 36 Resolutions in document N2004 and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N2003 – this document you are reading.)	Status
a	to assist the project editor in the preparation of final text of FPDAM-15 according to resolution <b>M36.9 (PDAM-29 on Mongolian script)</b> : WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments PDAM-29 ballot in document N1965R, and instructs its project editor to prepare the final text of FPDAM-29 with assistance from China, Mongolia and the contributing editor, and forward these documents to SC 2 secretariat for further processing with the revised target dates: FPDAM – 99-04, FDAM – 99-10, and AM – 00-02.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-10 Irish national body (Mr. Michael Everson)</b>		
a	to update the plane 1 road map in document N1955 incorporating the feedback from meeting 36 and circulate for national body comments in WG 2.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-11 Japanese national body (Mr. Takayuki Sato)</b>		
a	Japan is encouraged to contact the Maldivian sources regarding FPDAM-24 – Thaana script. Any feedback Japan gets from Maldives can be reviewed after the next edition of 10646-1 is published. (Also see AI-35-12a transferred from the UK).	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-12 The Unicode Consortium (Dr. Asmus Freytag)</b>		
a	to work with the project editor and contributing editor of part 1 on the best way to reference the Unicode Standard in the next edition of 10646-1.	<b>M37:</b>
b	to take note of and act on the resolution <b>M36.25 (Request to Unicode consortium to be back up for AFII)</b> : WG 2 request to the Unicode Consortium to act as the backup to AFII, if necessary, for preparing the camera ready copy of the non-Unified CJK glyph charts and list of names of the second edition of ISO/IEC 10646-1 on schedule.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-13 The U.S. national body (Dr. Ken Whistler)</b>		
a	Dr. Ken Whistler is to provide sources arising from Kang Xi and CJK Radicals (FPDAM-15)– to the project editor to include in the Annex T corrigendum text.	<b>M37:</b>
<b>AI-36-14 All national bodies and liaison organizations</b>		
a	to take note of document N1982 on criteria for encoding symbols, and advise potential contributors about these criteria on symbols that are candidates for plain text processing and are potential candidates for inclusion in 10646.	<b>M37:</b>
b	to review and feedback on N1936 – cumulative list #8 of repertoire additions to 10646-1 to the project editor.	<b>M37:</b>
c	to review and feedback on the 2nd WD of 10646-2 – document N2012R, by 1999-06-15.	<b>M37:</b>
d	to take note of resolution <b>M36.29 (Policy on 10646-1 beyond 2nd edition)</b> : As a general policy, WG2 resolves that the objective will be to minimize the number of amendments to Part 1, without sacrificing the timeliness to meet the end user requirements.	<b>M37:</b>
e	to review and feedback on the updated plane 1 road map (revised N1955) to be prepared by Mr. Michael Everson, and on the plane 0 roadmap in document document N1949.	<b>M37:</b>
f	to review and feedback on the revised document N1796 from technical point of view as well as translatability to different languages, to ensure that the amendments have all been incorporated -- extended deadline is end of April 1999 so that revised document can be produced by the editor for July 1999 distribution.	<b>M37:</b>
g	to take note of resolution <b>M36.30 (Defect report index no. 5)</b> : WG 2 accepts document N1978R as the revised defect report index no. 5 summarizing the dispositions of all the defect report dispositions to ISO/IEC 10646-1: 1993 to date.	<b>M37:</b>
h	to review and feedback on the following documents for the BMP – revised proposals N1930 – Buginese, N1931 – Glagolitic, N1932 – Phoenician, N1933 – Phillipine; new proposals N1956 – O Cemet', N1957 – Sorang Sompeng, N1958 – Varang Kshiti, and N1962 on Optimizing Georgian.	<b>M37:</b>
i	to review and feedback on the following documents for Plane 1: N1947 – Old Permic, N1948 – Osmanya, N1959 – Indus and N1944 – Egyptian Hieroglyphs.	<b>M37:</b>
j	to assist WG2 in identifying user communities for all scripts (especially new ones) towards getting their endorsements of maturity and usability of proposals prior to inclusion of the proposals in the standard.	<b>M37:</b>

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 36 Resolutions in document N2004 and Unconfirmed Meeting 35 minutes in document N2003 – this document you are reading.)	Status
k	<p>to take note of resolution <b>M36.33 (Future meetings):</b>            WG 2 confirms the following future meeting schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting 37: 13--16 September 1999 -- Copenhagen, Denmark</li> <li>• Meeting 38: TENTATIVELY in March 2000 –China, USA as fallback</li> <li>• Meeting 39 September 2000, Greece (USA as fall back) (along with SC 2 meeting)</li> </ul> <p>WG 2 accepts and confirms the following IRG future meeting schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IRG 13: May 1999, Hong Kong</li> <li>• IRG 14: Dec 1999 in Singapore</li> <li>• IRG 15: May 2000 in Taiwan</li> </ul>	<b>M37:</b>

===== END OF MINUTES OF MEETING 36 =====