

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 N 1880  
23 September 1998

<b>Title:</b>	Response and Clarification to N1864
<b>Source:</b>	Ad-hoc discussion by WG2 Members
<b>Author:</b>	Christopher J. Fynn, U.K.
<b>Status:</b>	Working Document
<b>Action:</b>	FYI
<b>References:</b>	WG2 N1756 / WG2 N1864
<b>Distribution:</b>	WG2 Members

This document, based on ad-hoc group discussion by WG2 members at London on 22, 23 Sept. 1998, responds to the concerns and corrections to WG2 N1575 raised by China in their document WG2 N1864.


## Response and Clarification to WG2 N1864 : "Comments on WG2 N1756 (Tibetan Extension)".

1. "The Tibetan experts of China insist on interchanging the glyphs of three characters positioned at AD, B1, and B2 and the other three glyphs of characters positioned at AD, B1 and B2 as what they were before."

The glyphs displayed in document WG2 N1756 for the characters at 0FAD [TIBETAN SUBJOINED LETTER WA], 0FB1 [TIBETAN SUBJOINED LETTER YA] and 0FB2 [TIBETAN SUBJOINED LETTER RA] are the normal glyph forms these subjoined consonant characters take in the (usual) Tibetan *dbu.chan* script.

The new characters 0FBA [TIBETAN SUBJOINED LETTER FIXED-FORM WA], 0FBB [TIBETAN SUBJOINED LETTER FIXED-FORM YA], 0FBC [TIBETAN SUBJOINED LETTER FIXED-FORM RA] are to be used only in those (exceptional) cases where a full form of the subjoined letter is required to be maintained. Short form (transformed or *wa.zur*, *ya.btags* and *ra.btags*) glyphs are obviously not suitable to represent these fixed-form subjoined characters. Furthermore if full-form glyphs were also used to represent 0FBA, 0FBB and 0FBB this would lead to confusion and be contrary to the usual graphic shapes which these characters are associated with.

Example:

 = 0F40 + 0FB2 (usual case)

 = 0F40 + 0FBC (exceptional case)

The consensus reached by the interested WG2 committee members with input from other Tibetan experts after extensive discussion of the Tibetan Block both at the main meeting of WG2 and in ad-hoc discussions, was that a normal-form / fixed-form model should be adopted for these Tibetan sub-joined characters. It was demonstrated that encoding specific "short form" subjoined *wa*, *ya* and *ra*, as was once proposed, is contrary to the lexical and grammatical behaviour of these characters. This can also be seen by looking at the different styles of the Tibetan script since the glyph forms these subjoined characters normally take depends on the style of the Tibetan script being used (the glyph transformation rules being different in e.g. the widely used *dbu.chan* and *dbu.med* forms of the Tibetan script). The encoding in WG2 N1576 deals with these problems in the most straight forward and unambiguous manner possible.







---

It is hoped that these clarifications and corrections satisfactorily meet the concerns and useful comments expressed by China in WG2 N1864 and that the current Tibetan proposal which is before WG2 can quickly move forward. The Chinese delegation asked for sufficient time to consult with their Tibetan experts and circulate any further comments received from them to WG2 members before WG2 N1576 is processed as an FPDAM

It is therefore the recommendation of the ad-hoc committee to accept the repertoire names and glyph representations in N1576, with the corrections noted in 4. and 5. above, for further processing by the editor as a PDAM.

---