Japan proposes WG2 to open the discussion on the issues described in this document.

**Issue-1:** Definition of the COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH in contrast with the UNIFIED IDEOGRAPH in somewhere ISO/IEC 10646 is necessary:

The more people believes the CJK UNIFICATION, the more difficulty to understand an existence of the COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH, for non native user of the CJK IDEOGRAPHS in particular. Therefore it might be better to include an explanation of both IDEOGRAPHS within the ISO/IEC 10646.

One sample of the explanation is definitions in N2196. But, it may not be necessary to be so. It may be other ways to explain.

Definitions in N2196 are: (for reference)
Definition-1: CJK COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH  
CJK ideograph that has to be unified with existing 
CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPH in principle. However, different code position is assigned for the CJK 
COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH to guarantee “round trip conversion” between UCS and existing 
national standard(s) or industrial practices.

Definition-2: CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPH  
CJK ideograph that is independent ideograph from any other 
CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPH per the unification rule of the UCS. The unification is done by the 
unification rule defined in the ISO/IEC 10646.

By the way, Japan strongly request WG2 to confirm the N2196 as a guidance rule of the 
COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH.

Issue-2: Existing CJK COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH.

Since both WG2 N2142 and N2196 are requesting “compatibility information” for the COMPATIBILITY 
IDEOGRAPHS. However, existing CJK COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH (F900-FA2D) do not have 
such an information.

There might be better to amend ISO/IEC 10646-1 by the compatibility information for those CJK 
COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH.

Issue-3: Is annex P right place to amend the compatibility ideograph?

The compatibility information has two key components. One is the source standard and another is 
“corresponding CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPH (or it’s extension).

The source standard information is just a couple of lines of text for a group of the COMPATIBILITY 
IDEOGRAPH, thus annex P might be a good place to fill in. Besides, the correspondence data might 
make the annex P too large (and not practice to use).

It is better to consider locating the corresponding data onto separated place. Some of ideas are:

- To create new annex for this data or
- Add parenthesized data to the character name

Issue-4: Mapping information.

To avoid the mapping data inconsistency problem. It is better that the mapping data should be defined 
within the source standard. ISO/IEC 10646 does have only a data of the name of the source standard 
for the COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH. The mapping data is only necessary for the users of the source 
standard. The other users are not expected to use the COMPATIBILITY IDEOGRAPH in principle.