

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
UCS

WG2N4508

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N1967

Date: 2013-11-04

Source:	China
Title:	Proposal on 3 China's UNCs
Meeting:	IRG#41, Tokyo
Status :	
Actions required	To be considered by IRG
Distribution:	IRG
Medium :	Electronic
Page:	5
Appendix:	Attributes (in an excel file)

The *General Purpose Normalized Hanzi List* (通用规范汉字表) was released by the 国务院 of China on June 5, 2013. The List contains 8105 Hanzi characters classified to 3 levels.

- Level One: 3,500 characters, for elementary education and culture popularization.
- Level Two: 3,000 characters, lower using frequency (than Level One).
- Level Three: 1,605 characters, names of persons and places, characters used in sciences and technologies (which are not involved in Level One and Two).

<http://politics.people.com.cn/n/2013/0819/c1001-22620090.html>
(96MB)

By checking against the latest UCS and CJK_F (1 and 2), we found 3 characters not encoded. There are 2 characters in CJK_F, 1 character never proposed. China requests to IRG to process them as Urgently Needed Characters.

埠

1.

- Level Three in the List, Serial Number 6774.
- Never proposed before.

- G source: G_GFZ108
- Pronunciation: gàng. Meanings: hill, used for place name; long and narrow highland. See page 108 of *General Normalized Hanzi Dictionary*, by Wang Ning, published by Business Press, 2013. (王宁《通用规范汉字字典》，商务印书馆 2013 年版)

埠 gàng 三级 9 画 ①山冈。多用于地名：浮亭～（在浙江）| 牯牛～（山名，在安徽）。②狭长的高地；土岗子。多用于地名：大～（在福建）| 吊～（在福建）。

Page 108 of *General Normalized Hanzi Dictionary* 《通用规范汉字字典》

石达

2.

- Level Three in the List, Serial Number 7146.
- CJK_F Serial Number 05113.
- G source: G_GFC022. GFC means Modern Chinese Standard Dictionary, as it is in CJK_F. (李行健主编《现代汉语规范词典》第二版)
- Pronunciation: dā. Meanings: place name, ~石 (in Guangdong Province). See page 61 of *General Normalized Hanzi Dictionary*, by Wang Ning, published by Business Press, 2013. (王宁《通用规范汉字字典》，商务印书馆 2013 年版)
- Pronunciation: tǎ. Meanings: place name, ~石 (in Zhejiang Province). See page 355 of *General Normalized Hanzi Dictionary*, by Wang Ning, published by Business Press, 2013. (王宁《通用规范汉字字典》，商务印书馆 2013 年版)
- Pronunciation: dá. Meanings: cobblestone; water gate. See page 236 of *Modern Chinese Standard Dictionary*, by Li Xingjian, published

by Foreign Language Teaching And Research Press, Beijing, 2010.
(李行健主编《现代汉语规范词典》第二版。北京，外语教学与研究出版社。2010年5月。ISBN: 978-7-5600-9518-9)

碇 (碇) dá <文> ① 碇 卵石。○ ② 碇 水
闸 ▷ 造闸 ~ 以储湖水。

Page 236 of *Modern Chinese Standard Dictionary* 《现代汉语规范词典》

镨

3.

- Level Three in the List, Serial Number 7373.
- CJK_F Serial Number 07656.
- G source: G_GFC059. GFC means *Modern Chinese Standard Dictionary*, as it is in CJK_F. (李行健主编《现代汉语规范词典》第二版)
- Pronunciation: mài. Meanings: metal element. Mt. See page 243 of *General Normalized Hanzi Dictionary*, by Wang Ning, published by Business Press, 2013. (王宁《通用规范汉字字典》，商务印书馆 2013 年版)
- Pronunciation: mài. Meanings: metal element. Mt (meitnerium). See page 914 of *Modern Chinese Dictionary*, Ed. 5, published by Business Press, 2005. (《现代汉语词典》第 5 版，商务印书馆，2005 年版)
- Pronunciation: mài. Meanings: metal element. Mt. See page 883 of *Modern Chinese Standard Dictionary*, by Li Xingjian, published by Foreign Language Teaching And Research Press, Beijing, 2010. (李行健主编《现代汉语规范词典》第二版。北京，外语教学与研究出版社。2010年5月。ISBN: 978-7-5600-9518-9)

镨 (鏷) mài 碇 金属元素，符号 Mt。具有
较强的放射性，由人工核反应获得。

Page 883 of *Modern Chinese Standard Dictionary* 《现代汉语规范词典》

**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 Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) from <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg31/IRGN1562.pdf>
for guidelines and details before filling in this form.

Please ensure you are using the latest Form from <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/SubmissionForm.pdf>.

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

A. Administrative

1. IRG Project Code:	
2. Title:	China's Urgently Needed CJK Characters (UNC) proposed to IRG41
3. Requester's region/country name:	China
4. Requester type (National Body/Individual contribution):	Member Body
5. Submission date:	2013-10
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs)	Unified
If Compatibility, does 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)	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:	3
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs: (128x128 "bmp" files or TrueType font file)	128x128 bmp
If 'bmp' files, their file names are the same as their Source IDs?	Yes
If TrueType font, all proposed glyphs are put into BMP PUA area?	
If TrueType font, data for Source IDs vs. character codes are provided?	
3. Source IDs:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper Source ID (country/region code and less than 9 alphanumeric characters)?	Yes
4. Evidence:	
a. Do all the proposed ideographs have the 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 did the requester understand the unification policy?	Yes
2. Has the requester read the “Unifiable Calligraphic Variations” (contact IRG technical editor through the Rapporteur for the latest one) and did the requester understand the unifiable variation examples?	Yes
3. Has the requester read this P&P document and did 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 any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the unified or compatibility ideographs of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which version of ISO/IEC 10646 did requester check? (e.g. 10646:2003)	Yes 10646: 2012
5. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the ideographs in Amendments of current ISO/IEC 10646? (As of 2009, Amendment 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8 have CJK ideographs.) If yes, which amendments did requester check?	Yes
6. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the ideographs in the current IRG working sets or proposed amendments of ISO/IEC 10646? (As of 2009, PDAM 6 and PDAM 8 have CJK ideographs.) If yes, which draft amendments did requester check?	Yes
7. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with 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 document did requester check?	Yes CJK_F1 and F2
8. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs is not unifiable with the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (Check Annex E of this document).	Yes
9. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs has similar ideograph(s) with the ideographs in the current standardized or working set mentioned above?	Yes
10. Has the requester checked that any of the proposed ideographs has variant ideograph(s) with the ideographs in the current standardized or working set mentioned above?	Yes
Attribute Data Checklist	
11. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data such as the KangXi radical code, stroke count and first stroke?	Yes
12. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in 简化字總表) in the proposed ideographs? If YES, does your proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in attribute data?	Yes Yes
13. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in attribute data?	Yes
14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in 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