General Response

In the editorial meeting of Ext. F (F1 and postponed) in IRG#42, the rapporteur suggested to unify the similar-shape non-cognate pairs in Japanese submissions as: the different item numbers in a dictionary is no more than a source code separation, therefore it is not sufficient rationale to encode them separately, because the source code separation rule is no longer extended to cover new source (including dictionaries).

This point sounds new viewpoint for Japanese delegates: if a dictionary places same character (same heading glyph and same meaning description) at multiple positions in it, the request to encode them as different character is “source separation” attitude. But we supplied the different meaning. If different meaning in the dictionary is insufficient to separate, please clarify what should be supplied. For example:

- the description text how the glyph designs are different
- the document using both characters keeping their subtle difference
- the evidence showing that the subtle glyphic differences are samely kept and interchanged in the multiple documents, or typefaces.

Without such criteria, everything could be unified in future extensions.

Also Japan wants to have an alternative option how to interchange the separately coded data in our government database of personal names. Some experts may have the objection to use IVS because IVS is primarily a technology to distinguish the shape difference. The proposal of the compatibility ideographs is still acceptable? When Japan discussed the possibility to propose a large set (> 1000) of compatibility ideographs for Hanyo-Denshi, the main response was that the compatibility ideographs are for the legacy systems and the future extensions are no more welcomed.

Additional Response to 3 Submissions

In Japanese Ext. F submission, there is a few pairs of the similar-shaped but non-cognate characters which the unification may cause a serious confusion in the
consistency of the ideograph unification.
Also Japan checked Yasuoka’s submission IRG N2007, and found that Yasuoka also suggests to disunify the characters in the radical moon and meat.

03368/JMJ-003782

According to the description in the evidence, the left component of the proposed character is the moon (月) not the meat (肉). There are many existing disunifications of the pairs with 月-radical vs 肉-radical (like 脠(U+813C) vs 腮(U+23377), 腫(U+8192) vs 腺(U+267FE), 腋(U+3B3B) vs 腕(U+4420)). Therefore Japan requests again the separately encoding of JMJ-003782 in radical moon.

03389/JMJ-003833

Although Morohashi omitted, the original source (字彙) wrote as the left component is “舟”. As we do not know any existing unification between ship and meat (ship:moon unification would be popular, like “服”), Japan requests to encode JMJ-003833 at the separated codepoint from U+440B.
According to the source, the left component is a broken form of “艹”. Japan thinks the radical meat does not include the character whose radical is not semantic meat (although the radical moon could include the character whose radical is not semantic moon). Thus Japan wants to encode JMJ-003791 separately. If there were a similar character in the moon radical, it would be the considerable option to unify.