

Korea JTC1/SC2, Committee on Character Codes

Authors: SHIN Sanghyun; CHO Sungduk; PYO Seungju; HEO Chul; CHOI Jinwook;
KIM Kyongsok

Date: 2018.03.16.

Status: National Body Position, Rep. of KOREA

Subject: A list of IRGN docs for Working Set 2017 revised submission

This is revised ROK submission for Working Set 2017. ROK deleted 121 chars from 686 Hanja chars in the original submission in IRGN2229, and proposes 565 Hanja chars (including 10 Hanja chars whose glyphs are modified) as candidates for the IRG Working Set 2017. The following is revised list of IRGN docs.

- 0) IRGN2229R_10_k2351_20_KR_WS2017_list_docs_20180316.pdf: This document
- 1) IRGN2229R_11_k2351_21_KR_WS2017_sub_form_20180316.xls: submission form
- the number of Hanja chars submitted: 565 chars.
- 2) IRGN2229R_12_k2351_22_KR_WS2017_sub_sumry_form_20180316.doc: sub. summary
form
- 3) IRGN2229R_13_k2351_23_KR_WS2017_BMP_20180316.zip: bitmap image files
- zip file size: about 481 KB; 565 .BMP files
(uncompressed: about 28MB)
- 4) IRGN2229R_15_k2351_25_KR_WS2017_evidence_JPG_20180316.zip: evidence files
- zip file size: about 445MB; 565 .jpg files
(uncompressed: about 364MB)

* * *

Doc. #: IRGN2229R

Subject: KR Submission Summary form

to accompany KR's Working Set 2017 Submission Form (IRGN2229R)

Date: 2018.03.16.

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 2017
2. Title:	KR's submission for Working Set 2017
3. Requester's region/country name:	KR (Republic of KOREA)
4. Requester type (National Body/Individual contribution):	National Body
5. Submission date:	2018-03-16
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs)	Unified
If Compatibility, does the requester have the intention to register them as IVS (See UT# #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:	565
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 bod abbreviation followed by no more than 9 alphanumeric characters)?	Yes
4. Evidence:	

IRG N1887_12 (=K2177_12) Submission Summary form

accompanying ROK's Extension F submission (IRG N1887 = K2177_11)

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 WS2015
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 or technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the newest list) If yes, which documents has the requester checked?	Yes IRG N2269 (WS2015 v5)
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 ideograph in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	Yes
10. Has the requester checked whether the proposed ideographs have any variant ideograph 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?	No
14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in the attribute data?	Yes

IRG N1887_12 (=K2177_12) Submission Summary form

accompanying ROK's Extension F submission (IRG N1887 = K2177_11)

If NO, how many proposed ideographs do not have the IDS?

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