

**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2
Coded Character Set
Secretariat: Japan (JISC)**

Doc. Type: Disposition of comments

Title: Disposition of comments on SC2 N 3761 (PDAM text for Amendment 2 to ISO/IEC 10646:2003)

Source: Michel Suignard (project editor)

Project: JTC1 02.10646.00.01

Status: For review by WG2

Date: 2005-01-27

Distribution: WG2

Reference: SC2 N3761, N3779, WG2 N2097, N2765, N2829, N2869-2871

Medium: Paper, PDF file

Comments were received from Canada, China, Germany, Ireland, Japan and USA. The following document is the disposition of those comments. The disposition is organized per country.

As a result of the dispositions, China, Ireland, and Japan reversed their vote from negative to positive. Only two negative votes remained (Canada and Germany).

Note – A positive vote without comment was also recorded from Iran but was received too late to be mentioned on N3779.

Note – The full content of the ballot comments (minus some character glyphs) have been included in this document to facilitate the reading. The dispositions are inserted in between these comments and are marked in **Underlined Bold Serif text**, *with explanatory text in italicized serif*.

Canada: Negative:

Technical Comments concerning NKO

Comment 1a) The English Block name contains an apostrophe while the character names do not. I believe the English names may not contain an apostrophe (I don't know why though), this is not true of the French names, to ensure coherence between Letter and Block names in the English version, the script should be called Nko in English (N'ko in French).

Accepted in principle

Also requested by Japan and the US in comment T.1.

The consensus was to use NKO for character names, block name and collection. In the occurrence where the Block name is represented in mixed casing, such as the chart pages, the name will 'NKO'. It should be noted that related to that issue of block name guidelines, the US had requested that block name follows the same guideline as for characters in its contribution WG2 N2919.

Comment 1b) Canada also requests that – to make it clear in the standard – that a paragraph / clause explaining the naming rules for Block Names be added. The naming rules should be identical to the rules for naming of characters except for allowing Upper and Lower case letters in the block names. This would also exclude the Apostrophe in the Block Name.

Accepted in principle

See above

Comment 2) The explanations provided in Markham by the proposer (from Ireland) to explain the inclusion of the following characters ("they are used in historical documents to show the evolution of the script") is not wholly convincing:

07E8 NKO LETTER OLD JA

07E9 NKO LETTER OLD CHA

07EA NKO LETTER OLD RA

It is quite easy to find books on the history of Latin, Greek or let's say the Phoenician script, which will show old and new forms of the same characters. Hence, Canada does not understand why these characters are not treated as historical glyph variants. Except in treatise dealing with the history of the script, I believe these old forms are not used simultaneously with the new ones. These characters are just historical glyph variants of characters that are otherwise provided for in the proposal. Encoding such would be akin to encoding various historical forms of Latin letters such as Uncial or Fraktur, which is clearly not desirable. Canada is asking for their removal.

Not accepted

There is evidence from the user community (ref WG2 N2914) that these characters are used in the same context as the other N'Ko characters. The fact that there are also engraved in keyboard along with other characters is a strong sign in favor of maintaining their encoding.

Arguments in favor of the current proposal were made in WG2 N2898 and answered by Canada in WG2 N2911. The following text reflects the current Canadian position at disposition time:

Unfortunately, Canada continues to oppose the current encoding of N'ko, since its concerns outlined in its ballot comments (cf. <http://std.dkuug.dk/jtc1/sc2/def/02n3771.pdf>) and in <http://std.dkuug.dk/jtc1/sc2/wg2/docs/n2911.pdf> have not been addressed. More specifically, Canada remains unconvinced that the old variants forms (the proposed U+07E8, U+07E9, and U+07EA) should be separately encoded, even though a virtual keyboard contains keys for them. Keyboards are no ground to encode characters. Canada suggested the use of variant selectors, if such a keyboard was to be retained.

However, Canada wishes N'ko to be encoded and we have thus suggested ways to improve the current proposal and to bring evidence that would sway our vote.

Canada will, for instance, look favourably at the encoding of the old variants if an N'ko dictionary having main entries (the "keywords") mixing old and new forms could be found. Other proofs – technical requirements – of the need of a plain text distinction between the old and new forms would obviously also be satisfactory.

Comment 3) Some of the proposed nko combining marks have identical shape and canonical combining class to already encoded marks (07EB, 07ED, 07EE,...) - these combining marks would look and behave in the same way as already encoded combining characters. During the discussion in Markham, it was answered that these characters have a different origin from the common and generic combining marks (which may combine with any other base character) and may sometimes adopt different shapes. But this may also be true of umlauts or

accents across languages: they don't always adopt the same shape (an umlaut may be represented inside the letter or an e above the letter).

<http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Umlaut>

<http://www.peter-doerling.de/Lese/Sutterlin0.htm>

Canada finds the justification in document N2765 pretty poor. The statement about directionality issues is totally bogus. As for font-binding issues, they seem out of scope in a character-encoding standard. In Latin script, a simple acute accent can range from almost vertical (in Polish for example) to almost flat and will of course be set at a different height depending on the base. The usual fontlevel solution is to use ligatures, which allow all the desirable variability and would seem to be able to do so also for Nko.

Not accepted

The exact list of problematic combining marks was not provided. The values 07EB, 07ED and 07EE are mentioned but with a following ellipsis. The majority view is that, given the various shapes used by these combining marks, it would be unwise to unify the N'Ko combining marks with the generic ones. The point mentioned above for umlaut or other common accents may easily be accommodated in text rendering by using glyph anchor points. The N'Ko combining marks would be extremely challenging to render using a unified model.

The following text reflects the current Canadian position at disposition time:

It has also been asserted that generic diacritics could not be used for any N'ko diacritics because of the excessive departure in shape from the usual shapes of the generic characters. We accept that this could be a reason not to use the generic marks, which are, however, the first choice. We have yet seen no evidence of excessive departure for U+07EB, U+07ED, U+07EE, U+07F2 and U+07F3 (for which U+0304, U+0307, U+0302, U+0323 and U+0308 respectively should be used); in fact all alphabets we have seen use very similar shapes to the corresponding generic signs that we suggest be used. The issue could be solved if either the five diacritics mentioned above were removed from the proposal or if a list of variant shapes showing sufficient departure (with non-negligible frequency) from the generic diacritics were provided. Canada will evidently reconsider its opposition for diacritics whose shape vary obviously too much and too often from the corresponding generic shape.

Based on these dispositions, the vote from Canada stays negative

China: Negative

Technical comments:

Phags-pa:

Few agreements were achieved in WG2N2829 (Consensus on the encoding of the Phags-pa script in the PDAM code chart, Markham, Canada, 2004). It's true that names of A862 and A863 are reflected in the PDAM2, but more questions raised in WG2N2829 need further discussion by interested parties. China requests that her comments be fully reflected in next round of ballot on the bases of her comments being fully discussed by interested parties.

Technical details:

Comment 1. Two vowel letters OE and UE and four consonant letters expressing initial consonants of “审, 影, 匣, 非” in Chinese language should be at least added to the list of nominal characters.

Partially accepted.

An ad hoc meeting was held at the WG2 meeting 46 in Xiamen, China to dispose the comments from China. The summary of all changes required by these dispositions is provided after Comment 6. The following text reflects the consensus reached by the ad hoc group for each of the comment (1 to 6): The four consonant letters requested by China will be added. The two vowel letters will not be added, as they can be represented using sequences of other existing characters.

Comment 2. A series of variants of letters should be added.

Partially accepted.

Contributions from China in N2869, N2870 and N2871 enumerated many variation-selector sequences. Six of these are accepted for addition to Clause 20.4, as required to represent reversed connecting forms of letters. Other variation-selector sequences will not be added.

Comment 3. If information processing is taken into consideration, a syllable delimiter, a joiner and its variant are needed.

Not accepted.

The joiner and its variant have been determined not to be necessary to represent the needed connecting forms. Syllable delimitation can be represented using the existing space characters (breaking or non-breaking) already encoded in the UCS.

Comment 4. Khubilai Khan font should be used.

Accepted in principle.

China has agreed to provide an appropriate font of the Khubilai Khan style provided it is made available prior to the close of Meeting 46.

Comment 5. Three variant selectors are needed.

Partially accepted.

The ad hoc determined that only one variation selector is required, and can use one of the variation-selector characters already encoded in the UCS.

Comment 6. Inputting rules for single variant presentation forms should be specified.

Partially accepted.

The ad hoc reaffirmed the principle that Phags-pa contextually-determined positional variants can be represented in isolation using zero width joiner and zero width non-joiner. The ad hoc determined that variation-selector sequences should be explicitly listed in Clause 20.4. The ad hoc determined that separate listing of free-variant forms was not required. The ad hoc determined that other entries in the Reference Table in N2870 do not need to be listed as the text elements can be represented as sequences of other existing characters.

For further details, read China-Mongolia joint proposal WG2Nxxxx please [N2869: Proposal to encode the Phags-pa script and N2871: Some problems on the Encoding of Phags-pa Script].

Further disposition and consequences for PDAM2

As a result of these suggested dispositions, the ad hoc does not recommend that any characters be removed from PDAM2. Furthermore, in accordance with these dispositions and other suggestions resulting from the consensus agreement of the ad hoc committee, it is recommended that the contents of PDAM2 be changed as follows:

- *Character name change: U+A85A PHAGS-PA LETTER -A should be renamed PHAGS-PA LETTER SMALL A.*
- *Four characters are to be added, with names as follows:*
 - *PHAGS-PA LETTER ALTERNATE YA*
 - *PHAGS-PA LETTER VOICELESS SHA*
 - *PHAGS-PA LETTER VOICED HA*
 - *PHAGS-PA LETTER ASPIRATED FA*
- *The ad hoc agreed that the code table should in principle be re-ordered in accordance with the recommendations of the Chinese NB as specified in N2870, with modifications to reflect the decision not to encode some of the characters listed in N2870, and to include characters in PDAM2. The revised ordering of characters is as specified in the draft revised code charts for amendment 2 in N2924.*

In addition to the above changes to the code table, make the following changes to Amendment 2:

- *In the specification of new tables, change the specification for the Phags-pa range from A840—A873 to A840—A877.*
- *In the specification for collection 307 UNICODE 5.0, change the final cell for row A8 from 73 to 77.*
- *Add the four new Phag-pa letters to the New names list.*
- *Add the following variation-selector-sequence entries as appropriate to existing or new tables in Clause 20.4 Variation Sequences:*

- < A856 PHAGS-PA LETTER SMALL A, FE00 > = phags-pa letter reversed shaping small a
- < A85C PHAGS-PA LETTER HA, FE00 > = phags-pa letter reversed shaping ha
- < A85E PHAGS-PA LETTER I, FE00 > = phags-pa letter reversed shaping i
- < A85F PHAGS-PA LETTER U, FE00 > = phags-pa letter reversed shaping u
- < A860 PHAGS-PA LETTER E, FE00 > = phags-pa letter reversed shaping e
- < A868 PHAGS-PA LETTER SUBJOINED YA, FE00 > = phags-pa letter reversed shaping subjoined ya

Note: these variation-selector sequences do not select absolute glyph forms; rather, they select a form that is reversed from the normal form predicted by the preceding letter.

As a result of this disposition China changes its vote to YES

Germany: Negative

Technical Comments:

Remove the Phoenician block

Reason:

Encoding Phoenician is redundant, and needlessly proliferates Canaanite diacritics. It is in stark contrast to both the Unicode/ISO 10646 script unification model and the character/glyph model.

We are convinced that the script used in writing Phoenician, Old Hebrew, Old Aramaic, Moabite, and Ammonite is one and the same script. The problem is if we encode all of Hebrew and Aramaic with one Unicode block, the Hebrew block, and then introduce a Phoenician block, it will become quite impossible to draw well-defined lines. Will we also encode Elephantine letters, the Mesha stele, the Dead Sea scrolls in Phoenician, but Rabbinic and Modern Hebrew in Hebrew? The Phoenician block needlessly complicates text processing and goes against current practice where all these scripts are unified in one encoding, in either (a misnamed) Hebrew encoding or in Roman transliteration.

The German vote of disapproval and the proposal to remove the Phoenician block from ISO/IEC 10646/PDAM 2 is based on expertise obtained from the University of Tübingen. See also document SC2/WG2 N2097.

Not accepted

It should be noted that WG2 N2097 is vastly anterior to the recent discussion concerning the Phoenician script and by no mean can be categorized as supporting the position expressed above. Excerpt:

*“It can be sensible to generate, for a limited field of application, **standardized** character forms that can be used in print. This is the case, e.g. for the Ugaritic cuneiform, the Old Persian cuneiform, for **Phoenician** and for the Old South Arabian alphabet.”*

Removing the Phoenician block from the proposed amendment would invalidate many positive national body votes, so the request from Germany could not be accommodated.

Based on these dispositions, the vote from Germany stays negative

Ireland: Negative

Technical comments

T.1. Hebrew Characters. With reference to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N2840 “Proposal to add HEBREW POINT HOLAM HASER FOR VAV to the BMP of the UCS”, Ireland requests the addition of HEBREW POINT HOLAM HASER FOR VAV at position U+05BA, which would entail moving HEBREW POINT QAMATS QATAN (under ballot in FPDAM-1) to position U+05C7.

Accepted

Also requested by US comment T3. Supplementary information available in WG2 N2844.

T.2a. Kannada Characters. With reference to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N2860 “Proposal to add six characters for Kannada to the BMP of the UCS”, Ireland requests the addition of the characters

KANNADA DANDA at position U+0CE4,
KANNADA DOUBLE DANDA at position U+0CE5,

Withdrawn

Original comment from Ireland split in two sections to differentiate between the withdrawn part and the rest which was accepted (see below).

T.2b. Kannada Characters. With reference to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N2860 “Proposal to add six characters for Kannada to the BMP of the UCS”, Ireland requests the addition of the characters KANNADA VOWEL SIGN VOCALIC L at position U+0CE2, KANNADA VOWEL SIGN VOCALIC LL at position U+0CE3, KANNADA SIGN JIHVAMULIYA at position U+0CF1, and KANNADA SIGN UPADHMANIYA at position U+0CF2.

Accepted

T.3. Invisible letter. With reference to ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N2822 “Proposal to add INVISIBLE LETTER to the UCS”, Ireland requests the addition of the character INVISIBLE LETTER at position U+2427.

Withdrawn

T.4. 0238 LATIN SMALL LETTER TH WITH STRIKETHROUGH: Ireland would support the removal of this character from the PDAM pending further study of it and similar phonetic ligatures. We do not, however, insist on this point. At the very least it ought to be moved to 1D7A with other phonetic characters.

Withdrawn

Editorial comments

E.1 Title. Change “Phags-Pa” to “Phags-pa” in the title of the Amendment.

Accepted

E.2 Page 8 - Row 09: Phoenician. We would like clarification: is this “Row 09” or is it “Row 109”?

Noted

By definition a Row is defined within a plane and cannot exceed 255 (decimal) and is always expressed in hexadecimal notation (00-FF). Row 09: Phoenician is the Row 9 within Plane 01 (SMP) and can never be expressed as Row 109. The notation has been used in this form for all documents addressing ISO/IEC 10646 supplementary planes.

E.3 Page 10 - Row 20: Cuneiform. The glyphs at U+12031 and U+12050 should be reduced to fit into their boxes. In addition, we would like clarification: is this “Row 20” or is it “Row 120”?

Noted

See above for Row value.

E.4 Page 12 - Rows 20-21: Cuneiform. We would like clarification: is this “Rows 20-21” or is it “Rows 120-121”?

Noted

See above for Row value.

E.5 Page 14 - Rows 21-22: Cuneiform. We would like clarification: is this “Rows 21-22” or is it “Rows 121-122”?

Noted

See above for Row value.

E.6 Page 16 - Row 22: Cuneiform. The glyph at U+1221D should be reduced to fit into its box. In addition, we would like clarification: is this “Row 22” or is it “Row 122”?

Noted

See above for Row value.

E.7 Page 18 - Rows 22-23: Cuneiform. We would like clarification: is this “Rows 22-23” or is it “Rows 122-123”?

Noted

See above for Row value.

E.8 Page 20 - Row 23: Cuneiform. We would like clarification: is this “Row 23” or is it “Row 123”?

Noted

See above for Row value.

E.9 Page 22 - Row 20: Cuneiform. The characters at U+12407, U+1241D, U+12427, U+12428, U+12429, U+1242A, U+1242B, U+1242E, and U+12431 should be reduced to fit into their boxes. In addition, we would like clarification: is this “Row 24” or is it “Row 124”?

Noted

See above for Row value.

As a result of this disposition Ireland changes its vote to YES

Japan, Negative

Technical Comments

(Collection and block names for N'Ko script)

In updates to "Page 1349, Annex A.1", change

128 N'KO 07C0-07FF to

128 NKO 07C0-07FF

In updates to "Page 1351, annex A.1", change

N'Ko 128 to

NKo 128

In updates to "Page 1352, Annex A.2.1", change

N'KO 07C0-07FF to

NKO 07C0-07FF

Rationale:

Current draft uses APOSTROPHE in the middle of collection name and block name for N'Ko script.

APOSTROPHE is new to UCS collection/block names. Unlike character names, we have no guidelines for collection/block names, but introduction of a new punctuation character in such names break some existing practices. For example, XML Schema specification (developed by W3C) has a notion of character class, used in its regular expression syntax, to explicitly restrict allowed character repertoire in some context. One of the methods to specify a character class is the use of a block name, called "block escape", and the current syntax doesn't allow APOSTROPHE.

Accepted in principle

See disposition of Canadian comment 1a).

As a result of this disposition Japan changes its vote to YES

USA: Yes with comments:

Technical comments:

(wherever the US mentioned a WG2 document TBD, the ballot text has been amended to show the actual WG2 document number that was posted after this comment was created)

T.1 N'KO script

The N'KO script should be renamed NKO (removing the apostrophe) to be consistent with de facto block name naming convention. This also aligns the block name with the character names used within the block.

Accepted

See disposition of Canadian comment 1a).

T.2 Seventeen Planes restriction

To improve the synchronization between the Unicode Standard and ISO/IEC 10646 and to make UTF-16 and UCS-4 equivalent in repertoire representation, the U.S. is asking to make all code positions in plane 11 (hexadecimal notation) and above permanently reserved, by doing the following changes:

- Remove the note part of Figure 1 (page 6) and the 2nd note part of Figure 2 (page 7)
- Make the 2nd note in Clause 7 (General requirements for the UCS) normative. It becomes requirement ‘b.’, pushing the following requirements to ‘c.’ and ‘d.’
- Replace the text in sub-clause 9.2 (Other Planes reserved for future standardization) by the following:
*Planes 11 to FF in Group 00 and all planes in any other groups (i.e. Planes 00 to FF in Groups 01 to 7F) are permanently reserved.
Code positions in these planes do not have a mapping to the UTF-16 form (see Annex C).*
- Replace ‘character’ by ‘code position’ in annex D (UCS Transformation Format 8 (UTF-8)) when the UCS range description goes beyond plane 10.

Withdrawn

The comment is withdrawn in the context of the current PDAM2 ballot disposition. This issue is covered by a separate document WG2 N2920 discussed separately.

T.3 Hebrew script

The US is in favor of adding the following Hebrew character as proposed by document WG2 N2840.

05BA HEBREW POINT HOLAM HASER FOR VAV

This is related to US comment 10646:2003 FPDAM1 T.11 requesting the move of the currently proposed Qamats Qatan from 05BA to 05C7.

Accepted

See disposition of Irish comment T1.

T.4 Mathematical characters

a) The US is in favor of adding the following Mathematical character as proposed by document [WG2 N2842] with modified code positions to take into account characters proposed in the FPDam1:

Miscellaneous Technical:

23DC	⎵	TOP PARENTHESIS
23DD	⎴	BOTTOM PARENTHESIS
23DE	⎶	TOP CURLY BRACKET
23DF	⎵	BOTTOM CURLY BRACKET
23E0	⎷	TOP TORTOISE SHELL BRACKET

Accepted

These four characters will be annotated with “(mathematical use)”

b) The US is in favor of adding the following Mathematical character as proposed by document [WG2 N2874]:

Combining Diacritical Marks for Symbols:

20EC	COMBINING RIGHTWARDS HARPOON WITH BARB DOWNWARDS
20ED	COMBINING LEFTWARDS HARPOON WITH BARB DOWNWARDS
20EE	COMBINING LEFT ARROW BELOW
20EF	COMBINING RIGHT ARROW BELOW

Miscellaneous Technical:

23E1	ELECTRICAL INTERSECTION
23E2	WHITE TRAPEZIUM
23E3	BENZENE RING WITH CIRCLE
23E4	STRAIGHTNESS
23E5	FLATNESS
23E6	AC CURRENT

Miscellaneous Symbols:

26B2	NEUTER
------	--------

Miscellaneous Mathematical Symbols-A

27C7 OR WITH DOT INSIDE
27C8 REVERSE SOLIDUS PRECEDING SUBSET
27C9 SUPERSET PRECEDING SOLIDUS

Miscellaneous Symbols and Arrows:

2B14 SQUARE WITH UPPER RIGHT DIAGONAL HALF BLACK
2B15 SQUARE WITH LOWER LEFT DIAGONAL HALF BLACK
2B16 DIAMOND WITH LEFT HALF BLACK
2B17 DIAMOND WITH RIGHT HALF BLACK
2B18 DIAMOND WITH TOP HALF BLACK
2B19 DIAMOND WITH BOTTOM HALF BLACK
2B20 WHITE PENTAGON
2B21 WHITE HEXAGON
2B22 BLACK HEXAGON
2B23 HORIZONTAL BLACK HEXAGON

Mathematical Alphanumeric Symbols:

1D7CA MATHEMATICAL BOLD CAPITAL DIGAMMA
1D7CB MATHEMATICAL BOLD SMALL DIGAMMA

Accepted

The characters 20EC, 20ED, 20EE, and 20EF are combining characters and will be added into Annex B.1.

T.5 Letterlike Symbols

The US is in favor of adding the following Letterlike symbol as proposed by document [WG2 N2889]:

214D A/S AKTIESELSKAB

Accepted

T.6 Latin characters

a) The US is in favor of adding the following Latin characters in the Latin Extended-B block as proposed by document WG2 [N2906]:

0242 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER B WITH STROKE
0243 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER U BAR
0244 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER TURNED V
0245 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER E WITH STROKE
0246 LATIN SMALL LETTER E WITH STROKE
0247 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER J WITH STROKE
0248 LATIN SMALL LETTER J WITH STROKE
0249 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER SMALL Q WITH HOOK TAIL
024A LATIN SMALL LETTER Q WITH HOOK TAIL
024B LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH STROKE
024C LATIN SMALL LETTER R WITH STROKE
024D LATIN CAPITAL LETTER Y WITH STROKE
024E LATIN SMALL LETTER Y WITH STROKE
024F LATIN SMALL LETTER V WITH CURL

This would make the Latin Extended-B collection fixed.

Accepted

b) The US is in favor of creating a new Latin Extended-C block and corresponding collection at the range 2C60-2C7F and insert the following characters as proposed by document [WG2 N2847]:

2C60 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER L WITH DOUBLE BAR
2C61 LATIN SMALL LETTER L WITH DOUBLE BAR
2C62 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER L WITH MIDDLE TILDE
2C63 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER P WITH STROKE
2C64 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER R WITH TAIL

Accepted

T.7 Combining Diacritical Marks Supplement

The US is in favor of adding the following Contour tone marks in the Combining Diacritical Marks Supplement block as proposed by document WG2 [N2906]:

1DC4 COMBINING MACRON-ACUTE
1DC5 COMBINING GRAVE-MACRON
1DC6 COMBINING MACRON-GRAVE
1DC7 COMBINING ACUTE-MACRON

1DC8 COMBINING GRAVE-ACUTE-GRAVE
1DC9 COMBINING ACUTE-GRAVE-ACUTE
1DCA COMBINING LATIN SMALL LETTER R BELOW

Accepted

T.8 Counting Rod Numerals

The US is in favor of creating a new Counting Rod Numerals block and corresponding collection at the range 1D360-1D37F as proposed by document WG2 N2816:

1D360 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT ONE
1D361 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT TWO
1D362 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT THREE
1D363 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT FOUR
1D364 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT FIVE
1D365 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT SIX
1D366 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT SEVEN
1D367 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT EIGHT
1D368 COUNTING ROD UNIT DIGIT NINE
1D369 COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT ONE
1D36A COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT TWO
1D36B COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT THREE
1D36C COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT FOUR
1D36D COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT FIVE
1D36E COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT SIX
1D36F COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT SEVEN
1D370 COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT EIGHT
1D371 COUNTING ROD TENS DIGIT NINE

Accepted

Note that the proposal WG2 N2816 contains an additional character at 13D72 which was not requested by the US and is therefore not part of the accepted list of characters above.

T.9 Modifier Tone Letters

The US is in favor of adding the following characters in the Modifier Tone Letters block as proposed by document L2/04-349 (WG2 N2883):

A717 MODIFIER LETTER DOT VERTICAL BAR
A718 MODIFIER LETTER DOT SLASH
A719 MODIFIER LETTER DOT HORIZONTAL BAR
A71A MODIFIER LETTER LOWER RIGHT CORNER ANGLE

Accepted

Note that these characters are not combining.

T.10 Phags-Pa

The US wants to reaffirm its support for the Phags-Pa as currently documented in PDAM2 and would not welcome significant modification without consensus of all of interested parties .

Noted

See disposition of Chinese comment.

Editorial Comments:

E.1 Annex R, Names of Hangul syllables

The information in the linked file (HangulSy.txt) and the tables R.1 to R.4 is redundant. Because the linked file is more complete, the U.S. is asking for the removal of the tables.

Accepted in principle

The table R.1 to R.4 will be preserved but moved to a separate PDF file linked to the main document similarly to the plain text file.
