

Release Management Group Report to UTC #183

April 11, 2025

Peter Constable & UTC Release Management Group

The Release Management Group (“RMG”) is composed of UTC working group leaders and other volunteers working on the process for development of the Unicode 17.0 release and for evolving processes for future Unicode Standard releases.

Unicode 17.0 timeline

A timeline for the development and release of Unicode 16.0 was proposed in [L2/24-258](#) and confirmed by UTC #181 (cf. [181-C59](#)). The following is a summary of key dates:

- 2025-4-1: End of alpha
- 2025-4-24, UTC #183: Finalize beta content
- 2025-5-20: start of beta review
- 2025-7-1: end of beta
- 2025-7-24, UTC #184: Finalize 17.0 content
- 2025-9-9: Unicode 17.0 release

Unicode 17.0 beta review

The 17.0 beta review period will begin roughly four weeks after UTC #183, on May 20. The RMG together with the Charts WG, CJK, EDC and PAG have begun preparing for this milestone. The beta deliverables will consist of:

- A complete draft of core spec in the Web format;
- updated code charts;
- all data files;
- a PRI cover page; and
- a Unicode blog post.

RMG recommends the following UTC actions:

[183-C] Consensus: The UTC authorizes starting the beta review for Unicode 17.0.

[183-A] Action Item for Peter Constable, RMG: Coordinate the publication of the Unicode 17.0 beta review.

[183-A] Action Item for Ken Whistler, RMG: Prepare the Unicode 17.0 beta review landing page and linking text for a PRI page.

[183-A] Action Item for Michelle Perham, UTC: Post the PRI for the Unicode 17.0 beta review, to close July 2, 2025.

Preliminary repertoire for Unicode 18.0

By the end of the Q4 UTC meeting (UTC #185), UTC should have made preliminary decisions on the repertoire for Unicode 17.0. (A draft repertoire for the Unicode 18.0 alpha will be required no later than UTC #186.)

In the meantime, we also know that JTC 1/SC 2 has drafts in progress for the next edition for ISO/IEC 10646, with a synchronization plan for the new edition to have the same character repertoire as Unicode 18.0. Thus, the 10646 project editor needs to prepare committee drafts (CDs) for comments, and it will be best to plan the repertoire earlier rather than later.

With that in mind, RMG has reviewed the pipeline and come up with a preliminary proposal for character and script additions for Unicode 18.0. Key decision criteria for this list included:

- Prioritize characters based on how long they have been in *provisionally assigned* status.
- Prioritize characters in modern usage by language communities.
- Consider proposals for related characters that should progress together.

Based on these factors, our preliminary proposal includes the additions summarized below. All of the characters or scripts listed have provisional code point assignments from prior UTC meetings.

RMG is not asking for any UTC action at this time, but invites discussion. We may propose formal approvals for Unicode 18.0 at UTC #184 or UTC #185.

New scripts / blocks

Characters / scripts	Provisional code points	Count	Prior UTC actions
Archaic Cuneiform Numerals	12550..12686	323	181-C31
Jurchen	18E00..19191	914	180-C28
Jurchen radicals	191A0..191D2	51	180-C29

Additions to existing scripts/blocks:

Characters / scripts	Provisional code points	Count	Prior UTC actions
Arabic letters, marks	10EC9..10ECF, 10ED9..10EEE, 10EF0..10EF9	39	180-C22 , 180-C26
Armenian modifier letters	0558, 058B..058C	3	179-C46
Bengali sign	0984	1	180-C30
Cuneiform numerals	1246F, 12475..1247F	323	181-C31
Devanagari letter	11B0A	1	182-C5
Hebrew sign	05C8	1	182-C4
IPA/phonetic letters & diacritics	1ADE..1ADF, 1AEC..1AF0, 209D..209F, 107BB..107BF, 1DF1F..1DF24, 1DF2D..1DF3A, 1DF3B..1DF3D, 1DF3E..1DF3F, 1DF40..1DF56, 1DFD0, 1DFD1, 1DFD2..1DFD7, 1DFD8..1DFE8, 1DF39..1DFF2, 1DFF3..1DFF4, 1DFF5..1DFF9, 1DFFA..1DFFF	113	179-C55 , 179-C59 , 179-C60 , 180-C32 , 180-C33 , 180-C34 , 180-C35 , 180-C36 , 180-C37 , 181-C33 , 181-C34 , 181-C35 , 181-C36 , 181-C45
Kana digraphs	1B123..1B125, 1B126	4	180-C6 , 182-C31
Latin letters	2E60..2E63, A7DD, A7E2, AB6C..AB6D, 1DF57..1DF59, 1DF5A..1DF66, 1DF67, 1DF68..1DF81, 1DFCD..1DFCF	54	181-C8 , 181-C10 , 182-C6 , 182-C7 , 182-C8 , 182-C9 , 183-C8
Mongolian letter	1879	1	178-C30
Music symbols	1D127..1D128, 1D1EB..1D1F6, 1D1F7..1D1FE, 1D1FF, 1D250..1D255, 1D256..1D25A, 1D25B..1D25F, 1D260, 1D261, 1D262..1D27F	71	178-C31 , 178-C36 , 178-C37 , 180-C38 , 180-C39 , 180-C40 , 181-C38 , 181-C39 , 182-C10 , 182-C11

Symbols (other)	1F1AE, 1F7DA	2	181-C40
-----------------	--------------	---	-------------------------

Acknowledgements

RMG reminds UTC working group leaders that the RMG issue-tracking repo has a standing issue for tracking acknowledgements for Unicode 17.0. The various working group leaders have access to this. RMG reminds the leadership for each working group to capture in that one place contributions that merit acknowledgement, and recommend that this be done throughout the development cycle, rather than having to do a historical review later in the cycle.

UTC and WG processes for proposed updates

In [RMG's report to UTC #180](#), it was noted that some working groups had questions about when it is necessary for UTC to authorize proposed updates for technical reports, particularly for cases in which there will be proposed changes to data files but not to the text of a UAX. In providing recommendations for how that scenario should be handled, RMG also made the following recommendation for cases when the text of technical reports will change:

- *UTC should always record a decision authorizing a proposed update whenever there will be substantive changes to the text of a UAX or a synchronized UTS (10, 39, 46, 51). Authorization of a PRI for that proposed update should be considered implicit and not require a separate UTC action.*
- *When only a data file associated with a UAX or synchronized UTS is to be changed, it should not be necessary to authorize a proposed update of the UAX/UTS, but the fact that the data file has changes (and, optionally, more details) should be called out in the release notes or PRI cover page for the alpha and beta releases.*

That was in July 2024. Six months later, at UTC #182, there were challenges in handling decisions to authorize proposed updates to UAXes, mainly because UTC didn't have a process to keep track, for each UAX, whether a proposed update had already been authorized or not.

In subsequent discussion within the RMG, issues related to processes for substantive textual changes have been considered more deeply than they were last year, with two factors in focus:

- UTC processes must ensure careful oversight in maintenance of our technical documents—the Unicode Technical Group Procedures require this.
- As UTC relies primarily on volunteer contributors, we want efficient processes that avoid overhead where possible.

To that end, RMG has discussed a new recommendation that differs from the first of the recommendations to UTC #180 quoted above. Some of the RMG participants have prepared a separate document, [L2/25-118](#), with a proposal for a UTC decision on process; this has been reviewed by all of RMG, which endorses that proposal.