ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N2237

Date: 2017-07-06

Source:	Jaemin Chung
Title:	Duplicate character in Extension F
Status:	Individual contribution
Action required:	To be considered by the IRG
Pages:	1

U+247EC (Extension B) and U+2DE17 (Extension F) are duplicates.

This needs to be documented somewhere.

(End of document)

Title: **Response to IRGN2237**

Date: 2017/07/08

Source: Henry Chan

Status: Individual Contribution

Action Required: Consideration by IRG

Pages: 1

Issue

According to IRGN2088 Extension F.2 V 4, the following attributes are recorded:

猤 04514	94.0 犬 9 3			猤 KA-KC06493		font not changed, evidence accepted, irg43.

The same attributes are also recorded for Extension F.2 V3.

The glyph has not changed since IRGN2018 Extension F.2 V1:

猤 04514	94.0 犬 9 3			猤 KA-KC06493		

Therefore, I believe the glyph in the code chart for U+2DE17 is in error, and hence not duplicate of U+247EC:

2DE17 犬 94.9 猤 KC-06493

247EC 犬 94.9 猤 UCS2003 猤 GKX-0716.02 猤 T6-4B3E

Suggested Action Item

- Correct the glyph in U+2DE17 to follow the shape as approved by IRG according to the evidence provided in IRG #43.

Addendum

This difference in shape should be considered a normalization difference by IRG, and hence unified in the future (WS2017 and above).

> # Korea JTC1/SC2, Committee on Coded Character Sets

Authors: SHIN Sanghyun; KIM Kyongsok

Date: 2018.05.21.

Subject: KR Response1 to IRG N2237 Duplicate Characters in Ext.F

1. IRGN2237 DuplicateCharactersinExt.F, Jaemin CHUNG

 - U+247EC (Extension B) and U+2DE17 (Extension F) are duplicates.

2. KR Evidence for KC-06493

3. Discussion Records for KC06493 in V2, V3, and V4 of Ext. F.2

(See Response to IRG N2237 by Henry Chan)

1) the glyph in IRG N2018 Extension F.2 V2

猠 04514	94.0 犬 9				猠 KA-KC06493		

2) the glyph and discussion Record in IRG N2044 Extension F.2 V3

猠 04514	94.0 犬 9		3		猠 KA-KC06493		font not changed, evidence accepted, irg43.

3) the glyph and discussion Record in IRG N2088 Extension F.2 V4

猠 04514	94.0 犬 9		3		猠 KA-KC06493		font not changed, evidence accepted, irg43.

4) the glyph in IRG N2156 Code Table

2DE17 犬 94.9	猠 KC-06493

4. Conclusion

1) In Ext F proposal, KR initially proposed 猠, which is a normalized glyph for 猠 in the evidence.

   - see KR Norml. Rules #53-1 and 53-3

2) During review process, it was pointed out that the proposed glyph 猠 is not the same as the glyph 猠 in evidence.   As a result, the glyph was modified as 猠.   However, it was not noticed that the glyph 猠 was already encoded as U+247EC (Extension B).

3) Now, it is pointed out that U+2DE17 (Ext.F) and U+247EC (Ext.B) are duplicates.

4) KR suggests that the glyph of U+2DE17 be modified as 猠, the initially proposed glyph.

* * *