

Subject: BMP CJK characters  
From: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>  
Date: Sat, 7 Aug 2010 23:55:20 -0700  
To: Bear Tseng <beartsn@gmail.com>, 'chen-zhuang' <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com" <geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com" <rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk" <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimgs@pnu.kr" <gimgs@pnu.kr>, "satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com" <satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "cchau@safp.gov.mo" <cchau@safp.gov.mo>, "selena@cmex.org.tw" <selena@cmex.org.tw>, "jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>, "vietnt@itnet.gov.vn" <vietnt@itnet.gov.vn>, 'csluqin' <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>  
CC: "michel.suignard@gmail.com" <michel.suignard@gmail.com>

Dear all,

According to last IRG resolution, please find in <http://www.unicode.org/~suignard/fdis10646-CJKBMP.pdf> the chart for the BMP CJK characters (Unified) as planned for the FDIS (2nd edition of 10646).

I have verified that the changes corresponding to the G, T, J, K, and V sources that I received late July are implemented as requested. The plan is to use those charts for the FDIS ballot (header and footer will be updated as appropriate for ISO format).

Let me know asap any issues.

Note that I will have limited internet connectivity for the next 10 days.

Best regards,

Michel

Subject: Re: re: BMP CJK characters  
From: K KIM <gimsg0@gmail.com>  
Date: Thu, 12 Aug 2010 13:26:33 +0900  
To: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>  
CC: Satoshi YAMAMOTO <yama.motch@gmail.com>, beartsn@gmail.com, geumnanghwa@gmail.com, rkfyan@gmail.com, peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk, gimsg@pnu.kr, cchau@safp.gov.mo, selenacmex.org.tw, jenkins@apple.com, michel@suignard.com, csuqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk, michel.suignard@gmail.com, satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com, ntviet@gmail.com, cuongnomna@gmail.com

My comments are shown below:

2010/8/12 chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>

Dear Yamamoto san,

Personally, I support TCA to keep their glyphs for reflecting the original shapes in TCA-CNS standards. Moreover, these glyphs can be unified to their counterparts in UCS 2003. Unfortunately, they were not fixed in Nagaoka.

I am somewhat confused. What is meant by "not fixed"?

I understand that changing glyphs at this stage is some kind of BREAKING RULES,

I guess that we need to adhere to the decision at Nagaoka meeting.

Of course, there could be exceptions in which case IRG editors can probably discuss via e-mail (or some other way) and, if everybody agrees, we can probably decide to change decisions at Nagaoka meeting. I think this is a proper procedure.

This is my personal opinion. I would like to hear your opinions.

Thanks.

KIM, K.

Subject: Re: RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: Satoshi YAMAMOTO <yama.motch@gmail.com>  
Date: Sat, 21 Aug 2010 10:48:54 +0900  
To: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>  
CC: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>, K KIM  
<gimsgs0@gmail.com>, "beartsn@gmail.com"  
<beartsn@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com"  
<geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com"  
<rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk"  
<peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimsgs@pnu.kr" <gimsgs@pnu.kr>,  
"cchau@saftp.gov.mo" <cchau@saftp.gov.mo>,  
"selenacmex.org.tw" <selenacmex.org.tw>,  
"jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>,  
"csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk" <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>,  
"michel.suignard@gmail.com" <michel.suignard@gmail.com>,  
"satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com"  
<satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com"  
<ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com"  
<cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Chen,

On the view point of procedure, we should not make any  
change  
on the conclusions, however, I can compromise "do not  
change  
these three TCA glyphs" because this do not cause  
inconsistency  
of the standard. For me, it's OK with TCA's font.

> > I also sent to this group the Vietnam glyph change doc  
on August 12th.  
> > Please confirm that the V changes are correctly  
implemented in the chart (I  
> > did my own check).

I also checked this report and found all V issues on IRG  
N1700 are  
covered and glyphs in the new code chart (Michel  
distributed on 8th Aug.)  
are modified correctly.

Thanks.

-- YAMAMOTO Satoshi mailto:satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com,  
gmail: yama.motch@gmail.com Product Planning Dept.,  
Hitachi, Ltd., Software Division

Subject: RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>  
Date: Sat, 21 Aug 2010 13:40:47 -0700  
To: Satoshi YAMAMOTO <yama.motch@gmail.com>, chen-zhuang  
<chenzh-zhuang@163.com>  
CC: K KIM <gimgs0@gmail.com>, "beartsn@gmail.com"  
<beartsn@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com"  
<geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com"  
<rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk"  
<peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimgs@pnu.kr" <gimgs@pnu.kr>,  
"cchau@safp.gov.mo" <cchau@safp.gov.mo>,  
"selenacmex.org.tw" <selenacmex.org.tw>,  
"jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>,  
"csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk" <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>,  
"michel.suignard@gmail.com" <michel.suignard@gmail.com>,  
"satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com"  
<satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com"  
<ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com"  
<cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Sorry to bother you again, but we have another issue with  
5FF9.

Please refer to first part of section 1 of document IRG  
N1700 in <http://app=srv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg34/IRGN1700CJKEditorialReport.doc> .

The result of the G glyph change is a disambiguation of  
5FF9 in favor of the  
e T source glyph but with three side effects:  
- the source reference for 2F89F is no longer correct  
(mentioned in N1700)  
- it makes 225D6 a perfect duplicate of the 'new' 5FF9'  
(this was not menti= oned in N1700 which is unfortunate)  
- there is no encoding of the non cognate variant which was  
represented by =  
the former G source glyph for 5FF9

Because there is a large body of existing data created with  
the 'old' G gly= ph variant (most PRC fonts have it that way for a very long  
time), this can= be considered as a breaking technical change not suitable

for a FDIS. It seems more appropriate to do the following:

- disambiguate 5FF9 in favor of the G glyph variant (ie change the T glyph = instead of the G glyph, in fact the T glyph disappear from 5FF9 unless we move the reference from 2F89F)
- this means that 225D6 is kept distinct and non cognate from 5FF9,
- it is also means that the mapping for 2F89F stays correct
- we would have to change some source references for 5FF9 and 225D6

>From a FDIS production point of view I could do that with the fonts I have.=

I would just undo the G glyph change for 5FF9 and use an override to change the T glyph.

>From a source point of view it would mean:

U+5FF9

G Source GKX-0378.29 new (but was part of UniHan)  
(T source removed, unless we move the T source from 2F89F)

225D6

G Source G3-5137 <-- moved from 5FF9

T Source T3-2623 <-- moved from 5FF9

2F89F

T source removed if we move it to 5FF9

This disrupts the mapping but maintain better the technical integrity of the standard.

For reference the HanziDian references for these characters are:

5FF9: 42275.080

225D6: 42277.020

If this is too much to swallow without a long email discussion and possibly=

a face to face discussion, the minimum change is to undo

the glyph change =  
for the G source for 5FF9.

Please advise.

Michel

Subject: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>  
Date: Sun, 22 Aug 2010 08:40:18 +0800 (CST)  
To: "Michel Suignard" <michel@suignard.com>  
CC: "Satoshi YAMAMOTO" <yama.motch@gmail.com>, "K KIM" <gimgs0@gmail.com>, "beartsn@gmail.com" <beartsn@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com" <geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com" <rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk" <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimgs@pnu.kr" <gimgs@pnu.kr>, "cchau@safp.gov.mo" <cchau@safp.gov.mo>, "selena@cmex.org.tw" <selena@cmex.org.tw>, "jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>, "csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk" <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, "michel.suignard@gmail.com" <michel.suignard@gmail.com>, "satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com" <satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com" <ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com" <cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Michel,

Thanks for your suggestion. It sounds practical, let me discuss this with my friends in companies.

But, why not change glyphs of both 05FF9 and 225D6, and change sources of 225D6?

05FF9: HYD42277.020, Keep current G and T source. (Agreed at IRG#34)

225D6: HYD42275.080, Change G source, add T source which was required by TCA at IRG#34. (Rejected at IRG#34)

IRG editorial meeting rejected this, but I want to hear the reason again. Thank you.

Chen Zhuang

Subject: RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>  
Date: Sat, 21 Aug 2010 18:16:35 -0700  
To: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>  
CC: Satoshi YAMAMOTO <yama.motch@gmail.com>, K KIM  
<gimsgs0@gmail.com>, "beartsn@gmail.com"  
<beartsn@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com"  
<geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com"  
<rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk"  
<peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimsgs@pnu.kr" <gimsgs@pnu.kr>,  
"cchau@safp.gov.mo" <cchau@safp.gov.mo>,  
"selenacmex.org.tw" <selenacmex.org.tw>,  
"jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>,  
"csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk" <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>,  
"michel.suignard@gmail.com" <michel.suignard@gmail.com>,  
"satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com"  
<satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com"  
<ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com"  
<cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Chen Zhuang

Changing glyphs is at this point more disruptive than changing the source mapping. More and more people are using the UCS natively. My plan was leaving 225D6 as it is and only touching the T glyph in 5FF9.

Again, if this is too controversial I am willing to go to the minimal fix which is to undo the G glyph change for 5FF9, and delay the full fix for the next edition (3rd edition which is now on CD ballot).

Note also the FDIS ballot is not technical (yes/no with only editorial comments), so we need to be careful on what we do here.

Best regards,

Michel

Subject: Re:RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>  
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2010 10:57:10 +0800 (CST)  
To: "Michel Suignard" <michel@suignard.com>  
CC: "Satoshi YAMAMOTO" <yama.motch@gmail.com>, "K KIM"  
<gimgs0@gmail.com>, "beartsn@gmail.com"  
<beartsn@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com"  
<geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com"  
<rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk"  
<peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimgs@pnu.kr" <gimgs@pnu.kr>,  
"cchau@safp.gov.mo" <cchau@safp.gov.mo>,  
"selenacmex.org.tw" <selenacmex.org.tw>,  
"jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>,  
"csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk" <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>,  
"michel.suignard@gmail.com" <michel.suignard@gmail.com>,  
"satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com"  
<satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com"  
<ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com"  
<cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Michel,

Thanks for your explanation.

Basically, I accept your suggestion. I believe that 05FF9 and 225D6 are seldom used because no one in Chinese mainland reported them to us though CJK mainblock and Ext. B characters have been used for over 10 years. But, they are to be used in the "Chinese Characters Repertoire" which was mentioned in our activity report at IRG#34. So, if the two glyphs are confirmed in UCS new edition, I hope no more change in future.

Let's wait for TCA's reply.

Regards,

Chen Zhuang

Subject: RE: RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: "Bear Tseng" <beartsn@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2010 11:26:59 +0800  
To: "'chen-zhuang'" <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, "'Michel Suignard'" <michel@suignard.com>  
CC: "'Satoshi YAMAMOTO'" <yama.motch@gmail.com>, "'K KIM'" <gimsg0@gmail.com>, <geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, <rkfyan@gmail.com>, <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, <gimsg@pnu.kr>, <cchau@saftp.gov.mo>, <selena@cmex.org.tw>, <jenkins@apple.com>, <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, <michel.suignard@gmail.com>, <satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, <ntviet@gmail.com>, <cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Michel and Chen Zhuang,

For the code point U+5FF9, the font and the mapping of the T-source ideograph are both correct. We don't need to change/modify either of them. But TCA requests to disunify U+225D6 from U+5FF9, that we had discussed.

Best regards,

Bear

"Doing everything always does nothing" Bear said.  
<http://idv.sinica.edu.tw/bear/>  
<http://blog.udn.com/beartsn>

Subject: RE: RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>  
Date: Sun, 22 Aug 2010 21:45:52 -0700  
To: Bear Tseng <beartsn@gmail.com>  
CC: 'Satoshi YAMAMOTO' <yama.motch@gmail.com>, 'K KIM'  
<gimgs0@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com"  
<geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com"  
<rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk"  
<peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimgs@pnu.kr" <gimgs@pnu.kr>,  
"cchau@saftp.gov.mo" <cchau@saftp.gov.mo>,  
"selena@cmex.org.tw" <selena@cmex.org.tw>,  
"jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>, 'chen-zhuang'  
<chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, "csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk"  
<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, "michel.suignard@gmail.com"  
<michel.suignard@gmail.com>,  
"satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com"  
<satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com"  
<ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com"  
<cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Bear,

You may want to read in more detail my proposal. As in ISO/IEC 10646:2003, the situation is really not that bad. 225D6 (single column) and 5FF9 (G column) are clearly non cognate and 2F89F maps correctly to the G column of 5FF9. The only odd part is the T glyph for 5FF9 which is in fact identical to 225D6.

Changing the G glyph in 5FF9 to look like 225D6 (as requested in IRG 34) makes in fact the situation much worse. You have now two duplicates and an incorrect compatibility mapping. And you have to re-encode another unified character corresponding to the old G glyph for 5FF9, and even possibly another CJK compat to map to that new character.

Saying that the T source and glyph are correct does not solve the issue that they don't look like the current G glyph which is de facto the recognized identity of the character (look at the UniHan database). Furthermore the mapping for 2F89F is clearly related to the current (as in 2003) G glyph in 5FF9.

I cannot force you to accept my arguments, but at minimum I have to reverse the glyph change for the G source for 5FF9 because it introduces a technical regression which is not acceptable at FDIS level. That leaves the T representations in an odd situation which could be solved by my proposal (see my previous 2 messages).

Michel

Subject: RE: RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: "Bear Tseng" <beartsn@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2010 15:09:15 +0800  
To: "'Michel Suignard'" <michel@suignard.com>  
CC: "'Satoshi YAMAMOTO'" <yama.motch@gmail.com>, "'K KIM'" <gimsgs0@gmail.com>, <geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, <rkfyan@gmail.com>, <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, <gimsgs@pnu.kr>, <cchau@safp.gov.mo>, <selena@cmex.org.tw>, <jenkins@apple.com>, "'chen-zhuang'" <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, <michel.suignard@gmail.com>, <satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, <ntviet@gmail.com>, <cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Michel,

The ideograph U+2F89F has only one source T5-2438, so it's clearly a T-character. Why do you say 2F89F maps correctly to the G column of 5FF9? In general, for the case that 2 or more characters are unifiable and came from the same source, then only one can appear in CJK Unified Ideographs area and the remainders have to appear in compatibility area. There is the reason why more than 500 T-source characters appear in CJK Compatibility Ideographs Supplement area. I had pointed out that the critical difference between the phonetic part of G-character and T-character of U+5FF9 is that the middle horizontal bar longer or shorter than the top horizontal bar and bottom horizontal bar.

For a Chinese person, the current G-character and T-character of U+5FF9 are different ideographs (i.e., different meaning and different pronunciation), the current G-character of U+5FF9 and the T-character of U+2F89F are same, and T-character of U+5FF9 and the character of U+225D6 are variants (i.e., same meaning and same pronunciation, but different shapes) even they have different top bars, one is horizontal and another is slashed.

That's my opinion. And then, how to solve the problem depends on you.

Best regards,

Bear

"Doing everything always does nothing" Bear said.

<http://idv.sinica.edu.tw/bear/>

<http://blog.udn.com/beartseng>

Subject: RE: RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>  
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2010 10:28:17 -0700  
To: Bear Tseng <beartsn@gmail.com>  
CC: 'Satoshi YAMAMOTO' <yama.motch@gmail.com>, 'K KIM'  
<gimgs0@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com"  
<geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com" <rkfyan@gmail.com>,  
"peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk" <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>,  
"gimgs@pnu.kr" <gimgs@pnu.kr>, "cchau@saftp.gov.mo"  
<cchau@saftp.gov.mo>, "selena@cmex.org.tw" <selena@cmex.org.tw>,  
"jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>, 'chen-zhuang' <chenzh-  
zhuang@163.com>, "csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk"  
<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, "michel.suignard@gmail.com"  
<michel.suignard@gmail.com>, "satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com"  
<satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com"  
<ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com"  
<cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Bear

<< The ideograph U+2F89F has only one source T5-2438, so it's clearly a T-character. Why do you say 2F89F maps correctly to the G column of 5FF9? In general, for the case that 2 or more characters are unifiable and came from the same source, then only one can appear in CJK Unified Ideographs area and the remainders have to appear in compatibility area. I had pointed out that the critical difference between the phonetic part of G-character and T-character of U+5FF9 is that the middle horizontal bar longer or shorter than the top horizontal bar and bottom horizontal bar.

>>

No disagreement in principle. By saying that 2f89F maps to the G column of 5ff9, I meant that they were the same cognate character. I am in fact suggesting to move the T5-2438 source from 2F89F to 5FF9, because I want to move the current T3-2623 from 5FF9 to 225D6. If you move the T5-2438 to 5FF9 along with its glyph (as now represented in 2F89F), all glyphs in 5FF9 become the same.

<<

For a Chinese person, the current G-character and T-character of U+5FF9 are different ideographs (i.e., different meaning and different pronunciation), the current G-character of U+5FF9 and the T-character of U+2F89F are same, and T-character of U+5FF9

and the character of U+225D6 are variants (i.e., same meaning and same pronunciation, but different shapes) even they have different top bars, one is horizontal and another is slashed.

>>

Again no disagreement here, we all agree that G and T character in 5FF9 (as in 10646:2003) are different characters. But unlike what IRG#34 proposed which was to disambiguate 5FF9 in favor of the T column which creates a lot of problem for other characters such as 225D6, 2F89F, and need for a new encoding; I am proposing to disambiguate 5FF9 in favor of the current G character, and move the T-character of 5FF9 to 225D6, as well as moving another T character from 2F89F to 5FF9.

<<

That's my opinion. And then, how to solve the problem depends on you.

>>

Again, my solution totally respects your opinion. It is just a more elegant solution and less disruptive one than the one proposed at the last IRG #34, and I can also add that it would be supported by the Unicode Consortium (wearing my other hat here). I still need some level of acceptance from you.

Best regards,

Michel

Subject: RE: RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: "Bear Tseng" <beartsn@gmail.com>  
Date: Tue, 24 Aug 2010 08:53:22 +0800  
To: "'Michel Suignard'" <michel@suignard.com>  
CC: "'Satoshi YAMAMOTO'" <yama.motch@gmail.com>, "'K KIM'" <gimgs0@gmail.com>, <geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, <rkfyan@gmail.com>, <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, <gimgs@pnu.kr>, <cchau@safp.gov.mo>, <selena@cmex.org.tw>, <jenkins@apple.com>, "'chen-zhuang'" <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, <michel.suignard@gmail.com>, <satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, <ntviet@gmail.com>, <cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Michel,

I checked the G-character and T-character of U+5FF9 in the document fdis10646-CJKBMP2010-08-09.pdf last night, and found that they were modified to be the same character having a longer middle horizontal bar (as T3-2623). It made a contrary case with your solution.

Best regards,

Bear

"Doing everything always does nothing" Bear said.  
<http://idv.sinica.edu.tw/bear/>  
<http://blog.udn.com/beartsn>

Subject: Re:RE: RE: Re:RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: chen-zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>  
Date: Tue, 24 Aug 2010 08:59:14 +0800 (CST)  
To: "Michel Suignard" <michel@suignard.com>  
CC: "Bear Tseng" <beartsn@gmail.com>, "'Satoshi YAMAMOTO'"  
<yama.motch@gmail.com>, "'K KIM'" <gimsgs0@gmail.com>,  
"geumnanghwa@gmail.com" <geumnanghwa@gmail.com>,  
"rkfyan@gmail.com" <rkfyan@gmail.com>,  
"peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk" <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>,  
"gimsgs@pnu.kr" <gimsgs@pnu.kr>, "cchau@safp.gov.mo"  
<cchau@safp.gov.mo>, "selena@cmex.org.tw"  
<selena@cmex.org.tw>, "jenkins@apple.com"  
<jenkins@apple.com>, "csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk"  
<csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, "michel.suignard@gmail.com"  
<michel.suignard@gmail.com>,  
"satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com"  
<satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com"  
<ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com"  
<cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Michel,

Let me explain what I understand to Bear in Chinese. Both of us were confused because UCS CD and FDIS are showing different glyphs at 5FF9 and 225D6, and your new solution is not shown yet. Thanks for your understanding.

Chen Zhuang

Subject: RE: BMP CJK characters (and more)  
From: Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>  
Date: Mon, 23 Aug 2010 20:30:34 -0700  
To: Bear Tseng <beartsn@gmail.com>  
CC: 'Satoshi YAMAMOTO' <yama.motch@gmail.com>, 'K KIM' <gimsgs0@gmail.com>, "geumnanghwa@gmail.com" <geumnanghwa@gmail.com>, "rkfyan@gmail.com" <rkfyan@gmail.com>, "peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk" <peter\_wh\_cheng@csb.gov.hk>, "gimsgs@pnu.kr" <gimsgs@pnu.kr>, "cchau@saftp.gov.mo" <cchau@saftp.gov.mo>, "selena@cmex.org.tw" <selena@cmex.org.tw>, "jenkins@apple.com" <jenkins@apple.com>, 'chen-zhuang' <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>, "csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk" <csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk>, "michel.suignard@gmail.com" <michel.suignard@gmail.com>, "satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com" <satoshi.yamamoto.yd@hitachi.com>, "ntviet@gmail.com" <ntviet@gmail.com>, "cuongnomna@gmail.com" <cuongnomna@gmail.com>

Dear Bear,

Of course it does because that document is the implementation of the IRG #34 decision and I was instructed by IRG and WG2 to proceed that way. Now we have the final review before issuing the real FDIS document (due in September) and further feedback is now taking place. My solution would change the representation of 5FF9 (and the sources for 5FF9, 225D6, and 2F89F) in the "final" FDIS document. I know exactly what to do but don't want through another cycle of review before the FDIS is sent to SC2 for JTC1 balloting. I am willing to show the FDIS charts to this group before I sent them to SC2, but then I will only fix severe showstoppers if any.

I will take Chen Zhuang's offer to talk to you in Chinese. Finally, as we all know nothing is ever cast in stone in 10646, so we always have another chance to fix things, but I want to make sure we have overall agreement that my proposed solution is a step in the right direction.

Michel.