

Follow up to L2/17-188 (On the name and display of tally marks)**Eduardo Marin Silva****16/08/2017**

In the document: Proposal to change the name of the accepted tally marks and add named character sequences for them <http://www.unicode.org/L2/L2017/17188-tally-mark-name-change.pdf> I argued that the names TALLY MARK ONE and TALLY MARK FIVE were too general terms to correctly identify them within other systems of tally marks. I did not receive a rebuttal of why changing the name to FENCE TALLY MARK ONE and FENCE TALLY MARK FIVE was undesirable, even if we are to assume that there is very little chance of confusion with the current names, it stands to reason that nothing is lost when making the name change and something is gained. Maybe the response will be that it is too late to change the names, in which case I have no say.

It was also argued that evidence of tally marks in vertical text needed to be provided before assigning the property `vo=R`, but I think this is not necessary since it can be argued that it is undesirable for them not to rotate. One can imagine TALLY MARK FIVE occupying a single cell but the number four which is of lower value, occupying four times as much space. It is feasible higher level protocols could force the four characters to occupy the same cell, but that wouldn't change the fact that the fallback would be unacceptable. This is analogous to asking for evidence of "VERTICAL LINE" in vertical text, when it is obvious that it is desirable for it to rotate.

I am not in a rush to change the property `vo`, since that can be changed after encoding, but the name issue must be addressed as soon as possible, since that cannot change. Consider the fact that what south-Americans call tally marks, are completely different to the most common ones, so they must be differentiated with different names. Such names could mention the geographic zone: SOUTH AMERICAN TALLY MARK ONE, but that runs the risk of making the system seem to be better used in that zone, when in reality they could be used anywhere regardless of language. So a name describing their shape is more desirable: BOX TALLY MARK ONE (with a possible note describing its use in South America). If you follow that logic it shouldn't be different for the already accepted tally marks.

An informative note in the code chart must be added to clarify that repetitions of TALLY MARK ONE should be used to express the number two, three and four, so that way there is no ambiguity.