

Regarding Proposed Additions to UAX #45

John H. Jenkins
12 September 2019

Document L2/19-308 requests the addition of nearly one hundred ideographs to UAX #45. This proposal is from an official organization in China. As such, it is inappropriate for the UTC to submit these characters to the IRG. Instead, they should go through the Chinese NB. It is strongly recommended that the UTC reject the proposal.

This proposal, however, highlights a problem with UAX #45, which includes the paragraph:

This document serves two purposes. First, it provides a formal reference to UTC-source ideographs, so that they may be referred to in other documents by their UTC-source identifiers. Second, it provides a public record of all ideographs which have been submitted to the Unicode Technical Committee for consideration. As such, it provides data on the nature, content, and disposition of these submissions.

This paragraph, as it stands, would require adding the characters from L2/19-308 to UAX #45, together with an appropriate status. Unfortunately, none of our available status values reflect the actual disposition of this submission, meaning a new status value would have to be added.

The overhead of adding characters to UAX #45 is not insignificant. The characters need to be checked against the 3210 characters already included, evidence vetted and recorded, fonts updated, and data files regenerated. For this particular proposal, that would be a great deal of work with no real value: the technical merits of its contents are not in question.

It is therefore recommended that the paragraph from UAX #45 quoted above be altered to read:

This document provides a formal reference to UTC-source ideographs, so that they may be referred to in other documents by their UTC-source identifiers. In many instances, it also provides a public record of ideographs which were submitted to the Unicode Technical Committee for consideration.

This would allow the omission of characters from documents such as L2/19-308, which are rejected for administrative, and not technical, reasons.