

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set UCS

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N1464

Date: 2008-06-12

Source:	IRG PnP Drafting Group
Title:	Principles and Procedures Ad Hoc Group report of IRG#30, Busan
Status :	
Actions required	To be approved by IRG plenary
Distribution:	IRG#30
Medium :	Electronic
Appendix:	1

Editors from China, Japan, R.O.Korea, TCA, Hong Kong SAR, US/Unicode Consortium and Mr. Yeoh Sim Joo (editor of potential member body of Malaysia) and Mr. John Knightly (individual) met at IRG#30. The editors discussed issues on Principles and Procedures for IRG.

References:

- IRGN1436(IRG Principles and Procedures)
- WG2 Resolution: WG2 N3454
- WG2 Principles and Procedures document for UCS: WG2 N3452
- China: IRGN1227 (China evidences CJK C1)

The PnP Ad Hoc Group reviewed the draft paper IRGN1436, changed wordings and added contents to draft the IRG Principles and Procedures Version 1 (IRGN1465).

The editors' discussion focused on the general outline and framework of the document. Outstanding matters that required further discussion and textual amendments would be dealt with at a later stage.

The editors drew the following conclusions in regard of the IRG Principles and Procedures:

1. General Guiding Principles

The IRG resolves that for anything not explicitly written in the IRG Principles and Procedures, IRG will follow the Principles and Procedures of WG2 and higher level directives.

2. Characters in the Compatibility Zone
Members' request to WG2 for encoding characters in the compatibility zone should be reviewed by IRG for unification and subject to same checking procedures applicable to other CJK ideographs.
3. Enhancement to Annex S with new Submission
The editors agree that Annex S examples shall be continuously updated. In reviewing characters submission, the IRG shall consider whether or not a new submission is worth including in the Annex S as a new example for unification or non-unification.
4. Evidences as Required data to be submitted
Evidences to support the proposed glyph shape, usage and context with readings, meanings etc. of the proposed ideograph to convince it is actually being used and/or non-cognate with other similar ideographs.
5. Optional Data for Questionable characters
For questionable characters especially for those candidates with possible unification questions, member bodies are encouraged to supply more detail evidence of use from authoritative sources and additional information to other related characters, variants and characters similar in shape or meaning encoded in UCS for review.
6. Font Submission
Member bodies are encouraged to submit TrueType font for the glyph of the proposed ideographs in an early stage.
7. Use of IRG Document Number and Format for File Name
Editors should request IRG document number for every file to be submitted to IRG including comments for editorial work.
8. Review process of IRG working drafts
Depending on the amount of submission, project editor can split and assign the review work to members. Members are required to observe the review schedule and comments submitted by members after the review deadline will not be included.
9. IRG website
A search engine will be adopted at the IRG website to facilitate the searching of information of unification arguments and decisions for reference. Hyperlinks to WG2 websites will be provided for members' easy access.

10. Preparation for submission to WG2

The IRG shall make available TrueType fonts in accordance with the requirement stated in point 5 of A.1 – Submitter’s Responsibilities in Annex A, WG2N3452. The IRG should at least conduct one round review of the table generated with TrueType font before submission and member bodies are encouraged to review and comment on IRG submissions to WG2. The IRG Rapporteur will forward members’ comments to WG2.

11. Handling Defect Reports

The IRG will follow WG2 procedures on reporting of defect according to Annex I and J of WG2 P&P document.

12. Dealing with urgent requests

The IRG will consider give priority for processing submission with the status of “National” or “Regional” standards with consideration of work load incurred.

13. Change of Chief Drafter and Co-Chief Drafter of the Review Group

Dr LU shall head the group as the Chief Drafter.

The current membership includes:

John H Jenkins (Unicode)
Yasuhiro Anan (Japan)
John Knightley (UK)
Chen Zhuang (China)
Wang Xiaoming (China)
Retarkgo Yan (Hong Kong SAR)
Cheng Wai-hong, Peter (Hong Kong SAR)
Satoshi Yamamoto (Japan)
Kim Kyongsok (ROK)
Kang Mi-young (ROK)
Park Jong Woo (ROK)
Tseng, Shih-shyeng (TCA)
Wei, Lin-mei, Selina (TCA)
Ngo Trung Viet (Vietnam)
Lu Qin (Rapporteur)

14. The review schedule is as follows:

Round 1

2008-07-31	Members to provide feedback on IRG Principles and Procedures Version 1 draft (IRGN1465)
2008-08-31	Second Draft ready
Round 2	
2008-09-30	Members to provide feedback on second draft
2008-10-31	IRGN1465 final version ready for review by the IRG at IRG#31

Other issues discussed include:

- Simplified characters vs traditional characters (cf N953, N1227 and N1406). Inclusion in major and authoritative dictionaries and sources endorsed by IRG would be sufficient proof of the real use of a character, including a simplified one. Another form of acceptable evidence was extracts from printed literature. Government policies and publications concerning simplified characters were also good evidence for the purpose of IRG work.
- Provision and admissibility of evidence to support characters submitted. (NB Simplified vs traditional characters above.) Regarding questionable characters, written documents illustrating their usage and additional information on related characters should be provided by the submitters. Such further information and proof would be helpful to the making of informed decisions by member bodies.
- File format and presentation. All in electronic format in full compliance with the format set by the Rapporteur.

Appendix : Noted of discussion at the PnP Ad Hoc Group Meeting

IRG Meeting 30 at Busan, Republic of Korea

Notes of Discussion at the PnP Ad Hoc Group Meeting Held on 12 June 2008

(To be cross-checked with N1436 (in revision mode) and notes jotted down by Retarkgo Yan, who chaired the meeting.)

The Editorial Group Meeting started at 9:10 a.m.

PnP Ad Hoc Group reviewed the draft paper and new contents added and some wording changed. The focus of the discussion was on the general outline and framework of the document. Outstanding matters that required further discussion and textual amendments would be dealt with at a later stage.

Other issues discussed included the following:

- Request to WG2 that all characters in the compatibility zone should be reviewed by the IRG according to unification rules and procedures.

Lunch break from 12:10 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Meeting resumed at 1:40 p.m.

- Simplified characters vs traditional characters (cf N953, N1227 and N1406). Inclusion in major and authoritative dictionaries and sources endorsed by IRG would be sufficient proof of the real use of a character, including a simplified one. Another form of acceptable evidence was extracts from printed literature. Government policies and publications concerning simplified characters were also good evidence for the purpose of IRG work.
- Provision and admissibility of evidence to support characters submitted. (NB Simplified vs traditional characters above.) Regarding questionable characters, written documents illustrating their usage and additional information on related

characters should be provided by the submitters. Such further information and proof would be helpful to the making of informed decisions by member bodies.

- File format and presentation. All in electronic format in full compliance with the format set by the Rapporteur.
- Priorities of projects and submissions with regard to the nature, status and special circumstances of individual submissions. The characters enjoying higher priorities should be those already in electronic standards. With consensus among member bodies, relative priorities of concurrent sets, projects and extensions might be adjusted in a flexible manner.

Meeting ended at 3:15 p.m.