Source:	TCA
Title:	Proposal on 1 TCA's UNC Character
Meeting:	IRG#53 (by circulation)
Status:	Member's submission
Actions required:	To be considered by IRG
Distribution:	IRG
Medium:	Electronic
Page:	3
Appendix:	4

1. Introduction

This is a revised document of IRGN2433 based on the feedback given by Ken Lunde (21 July 2020). We have confirmed with the Dept. of Household Registration, M.O.I.(內政部戶政司) that these two characters are used in Taiwanese names: "瑛" (the upper-right component ⁺⁺ is three strokes, CNS 13-7A2D) and "瑛" (the upper-right component ⁺⁺ is four strokes, CNS 12-662B). After discussing with M.O.I., we decided to process 12-662B character as UNC.

In IRGN2430, Macao request IRG/WG2 for vertical extension of 6 characters as UNC submission. Among them, the 12-662B glyph of CNS 11643 is similar to MC-00136. IRG experts all accepted to encode MC-00136 and consequently, TCA would like to process 12-662B character as UNC and horizontally extending with MC-00136 as the same code.

2. Proposed UNC Character

In the CNS 11643, the font of 12-662B shown as "瑛", similar with MC-00136. The source of the character belong to a name.

T-source	PUA	Glyphs	MC-source	Radical Form	Strokes	Total Stroke	IDS	FS	T/S
TC-662B	U+E000	瑺	MC-00136	玉 96.0	10	14	⿰王荣	2	1

3. Evidence

Fig. 1 CNS 11643 https://www.cns11643.gov.tw/wordView.jsp?ID=812587

This TCA UNC character submission consists of the following documents:

IRGN2344Ra: This document
IRGN2344Rb: Proposal summary form to accompany submissions
IRGN2344Rappendix 1:   An Excel spreadsheet with character attribute
IRGN2344Rappendix2:   A zip archive of glyph' bitmap
IRGN2344Rappendix 3:   Evidences of the character
IRGN2344Rappendix 4:   A font file containing TC-662B glyph

(End of document)

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS
FOR ADDITION OF CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646
Submitters are reminded to:
1.Fill in all the sections below.
2. Read the Principles and Procedures Document （P & P） available at http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg45/ IRGN2092PnPv8.pdf
for guidelines and details before filling in this form.
3. Use the latest Form from
http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg45/IRGN2092PnP_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:**	IRGN2433
2. **Title:**	TCA's Proposal on 1 TCA's UNC to IRG
3. Submitter's Region/Country Name:	TCA
4. Submitter Type （National Body/Individual Contribution）:	Member body
5. Submission Date:	2020-7-28
6. Requested Ideograph Type （Unified or Compatibility Ideographs）	Unified Ideographs
If Compatibility, does the submitter have the intention to register them as IVS （See UTS #37） with the IRG's approval? （Registration fee will not be charged if auth by the IRG.）	No
7. Proposal Type （Normal Proposal or Urgently Needed）	Urgently Needed
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:	1
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: （128x128 Bitmap files or TrueType font file）	Both
If Bitmap files, are their file names the same as their source references?	Yes
If TrueType font file, are all the proposed glyphs put into BMP PUA area?	Yes
If TrueType font file, are data for source references vs. character codes provided?	Yes
3. Source references:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper source reference （member bod international consortium 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 least one scanned image of printed materials （preferably dictionaries）?　　　Yes

    b. Do all the printed materials used for evidence provide enough information to track th by a third party　（ISBN numbers, etc.）?　　　Yes

5. Attribute Data Format:　（Excel file or CSV text）　　　*Excel*

C. Technical - Checklist

Understanding of the Unification Principles

1. Has the submitter read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and does the submitter understand the unification principles?	*Yes*
2. Has the submitter read the "Unifiable Component Variations" （contact the IRG technical editor through the IRG Rapporteur for the latest version） and does the submitter understand the unifiable variation examples?	*Yes*
3. Has the submitter read the IRG PnP document and does the submitter understand the 5% Rule?	*Yes*

Character-Glyph Duplication （http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm contains all the published ones and those under ballot）

4. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the unified or compatibility ideographs of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646?	*Yes*
If the checking has been done against an earlier version of ISO/IEC 10646, please specify the version? （e.g. 10646:2012）	ISO/IEC 10646:2014（E）
5. Has the submitter 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?	*Yes*
If yes, which amendment（s） has the submitter checked?	
6. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the ideographs in the proposed amendments, if any, of ISO/IEC 10646?	*Yes*
If yes, which draft amendment（s） has the submitter checked?	
7. Has the submitter 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）	*Yes*
If yes, which document（s） has the submitter checked?	WS2015, WS2017
8. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are *not unifiable* with any of the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? （See Annex E of the IRG PnP document）.	*Yes*
9. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any *similar ideographs* in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	*Yes*
10. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any *variant ideograph* in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	*Yes*

Attribute Data

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?	*Yes*
If yes, does the proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in the attribute data?	*Yes*

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?   *Yes*

   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?   *Yes*

16. Do all the proposed ideographs contains the total stroke count（kTotalStrokes）?   *Yes*