

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
 UCS

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N1969

Document Type:	Member body contribution
Source:	Japan
Title:	Request for the Note Field in the Review Comments
Actions required	For Discussion
Distribution:	IRG Members and Ideographic Experts

In the comment disposition to the Confirmed Consolidated comment to CJK Ext. F1 submissions, Japanese experts have found many strange comments. Some strange comments are requesting to unify the variants in NUCV list as “should not be unified”, or, the pair with the structural difference which Annex S mentions as “different”.

[illegible]

Example of a Comment Incompatible with NUCV

05166	<div>礁</div> <div>JMJ-058197</div>	U+7901	<div>7901</div> <div>石 112.12</div>	<div>礁</div> <div>G0-3D38</div>	<div>礁</div> <div>T1-7451</div>	<div>礁</div> <div>J0-3E4C</div>	<div>礁</div> <div>K0-7527</div>	Unification
-------	------------------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------

S.1.4.2 Different relative positions of components

The examples below illustrate rule b). Although the two ideographs in each pair have the same number of components, the relative positions of the components are different.

峰·峯, 荊·荆

Example of a Comment Incompatible with Annex S

Japanese experts could not understand why they are proposed. There might be several possibilities;

- A) The reviewers propose to update the rule (Annex S) or the convention (IWDS).
- B) The reviewers think the commented pair is out of the variants covered by the rule

or the convention, by some reason.







C) The reviewers had overlooked the rule or the convention.

The disposition to each possibilities are quite different (e.g. if the reviewer proposes the update of the rule, the impact of the rule changing should be discussed - if the reviewer had overlooked the existing separations, giving a NUCV number would be sufficient), and the different preparations are needed to form a consensus in IRG.




Because the unification rules and IWDS are large collection, Japanese experts have no intention to criticize the overlooking something in it. But without the correct understanding of the reviewers' intention, the appropriate disposition is impossible even if the total amount of the submission is in small.

In summary, Japanese experts suggests to utilize "NOTE" column more effectively, to clarify the background (and considerable objections, if possible). For example, "*change Annex S*", "*obsolete NUCV#xxx*", "*do not apply NUCV#xxx*", "*this is not subtle difference but frequent, so add this to UCV*", etc etc. If no note is given, the disposition of the comment could be sequentially discussed in the line "the glyphic difference could be classified as minor stroke change, or not".

It seems that the strange comment problem is not only in Japanese submission, but also in other members' submissions;

02775	 G_Z0071401	U+626F	626F 手 64.4						Unification
				G0-3336	T1-4AAA	J1-3F41	K2-344A	V0-367E	

Example of a Comment (to China submission) with Totally Different Shapes

00598	 00598 Z_SAT04838	U+3560	3560 又 29.10			Unification
				GHZ-64095.09	T3-3F78	

Example of a Comment (to SAT submission) with Incompatible with Annex S

(end of document)