

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION
ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2/IRG**

Universal Coded Character Set (UCS)
--

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2/IRG N2116
2015-11-2**

Title:	SAT's Working Set 2015 for the extension G in the CJK unified Ideographs
Source:	SAT Daizōkyō Text Database Committee (Prof. Masahiro Shimoda)
Action:	To be considered by IRG
Distribution:	IRG Member Bodies and Ideographic Experts

SAT would like to propose 2,045 ideographs for the extension G in the CJK unified ideographs. The ideographs were mostly collected from Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo and its witnesses, such as woodcut printings and manuscripts.

Appendix 1: Attributes

Appendix 2: Bitmap files

Appendix 3: Evidence file

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2/IRG
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS
FOR ADDITIONS OF CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646**

Please fill in all the sections below.
Please read the Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg41/IRGN1975PnPv6.doc>
for guidelines and details before filling in this form.
Please ensure that you are using the latest Form from
http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg41/IRGN1975_PnP_BlankDataFile.xls

See also <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irgwds.html> for the latest *Unifiable Component Variations*

A. Administrative

1. IRG Project Code:	Working Set 2015
2. Title:	SAT's submission for Working Set 2015
3. Requester's region/country name:	SAT
4. Requester type (National Body/Individual contribution):	Expert
5. Submission date:	2015-11-02 (2015-11-05 revised)
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs):	Unified
If Compatibility, does the requester have the intention to register them as IVS (See UTS #37) with the IRG's approval? (Registration fee will not be charged if authorized by the IRG.)	
7. Request Type (Normal Request or Urgently Needed)	Normal Request
8. Choose one of the following:	
This is a complete proposal:	Yes
(or) More information will be provided later	

B. Technical – General

1. Number of ideographs in the proposal:	2005
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 "bmp" files or TrueType font file)	BMP
If 'bmp' files, are their file names the same as their source references?	Yes
If TrueType font, are all proposed glyphs put into BMP PUA area?	
If TrueType font, are data for source references vs. character codes provided?	
3. Source references:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper source reference (member body abbreviation followed by no more than 9 alphanumeric characters)?	Yes
4. Evidence:	
a. Do all the proposed ideographs have a separate evidence document which contains at least one scanned image of printed materials (preferably dictionaries)?	Yes
b. Do all the printed materials used for evidence provide enough information to track them by a third party (ISBN numbers, etc.)?	Yes
5. Attribute Data Format: (Excel file or CSV)	Excel

C. Technical - Checklist

Understandings of the Unification Checklist	
1. Has the requester read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and does the requester understand the unification policy?	Yes
2. Has the requester read the “Unifiable Component Variations” (contact IRG technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the latest one) and does the requester understand the unifiable variation examples?	Yes
3. Has the requester read this P&P document and does the requester understand the 5% Rule?	Yes
Character-Glyph Duplication Checklist (http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm contains all the published ones and those under ballot)	
4. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the unified or compatibility ideographs of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? If the checking has been done against an earlier version of ISO/IEC 10646, please specify the version? (e.g. 10646:2011)	Yes
5. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the amendments, if any, of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which amendments has the requester checked?	Yes
6. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the proposed amendments, if any, of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which draft amendments has the requester checked?	Yes Ext. F1/F2
7. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the current working M-set and D-set of the IRG? (Contact IRG chief editor and technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the newest list) If yes, which documents has the requester checked?	Yes IRG N2044 (ExtF2 v3)
8. Has the requester checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (Check Annex E of this document)	Yes
9. Has the requester checked whether the proposed ideographs have any similar ideographs in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	Yes
10. Has the requester checked whether the proposed ideographs have any variant ideographs in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	Yes
Attribute Data Checklist	
11. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the KangXi radical code and stroke count?	Yes
12. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in 簡化字總表) among the proposed ideographs? If YES, does the proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in the attribute data?	No
13. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in the attribute data?	Yes
14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in the attribute data? If NO, how many proposed ideographs do not have the IDS?	Yes
15. If the answer to question 9 or 10 is yes, do the attribute data include any information on similar/variant ideographs for the proposed ideographs?	No

