The Old Hanzi Expert Group ad hoc meeting was held at Tokyo from February 20th to 23rd, 2012. The meetings were held at Kikai Shinko Kaikan, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

This report is organized as follows:

1. WG2#59 meeting report
2. Discussion on the items assigned by IRG N1827
3. Discussion on IRG N1786
4. Discussion on WG2 N4236
5. Other items
6. Open Issues
7. Appreciation

1. **WG2#59 meeting report**

Chen Zhuang reported the resolution of WG2#59 (2012-02-10/13), M59.19. Old Hanzi expert group accepts it unanimously.
2. Discussion on the items assigned by IRG N1827

Old Hanzi expert group discussed the feedbacks to the items listed in IRG N1827.

**IRG N1827 1.a (reference list review):**

The bibliography list is reviewed and completed (the result is found in Appendix).

**IRG N1827 1.b (indexing method for Oracle Bone glyph without corresponding SW and UCS characters):**

Japan proposed to classify the glyphs into 2 groups.

Group A: the Oracle Bone glyphs without corresponding SW character but with corresponding SW radical.

Group B: the Oracle Bone glyphs without corresponding SW character and without corresponding SW radical.

Old Hanzi expert group agreed to use some referential material(s) to index group B unanimously. Xin Jiaguwenbian (新甲骨文編, 刘釗/洪鵬等编篡, 福建人民出版社, 2009, ISBN 9787211058532) would be a candidate of the material(s). To index group A, China and TCA recommended to consider a method using the number of strokes out of radical, of corresponding modern character, as a candidate of the indexing method. Japan proposed to choose one dictionary to index group A and group B. At present, Japan is not sure which dictionary is the best for this method, but Xin Jiaguwenbian would be a candidate. China and TCA commented Japan proposal is difficult for “new” Oracle Bone glyphs that cannot be found in existing dictionaries. Japan commented to the candidate indexing method given by China and TCA that the rule how to choose modern character is not fixed yet and using it for indexing is unstable. The decision of the indexing method for group A glyphs is postponed.

**IRG N1827 1.c (coverage of the code points for “UCS character” column):**

China and TCA proposed to use CJK Unified Ideographs including the extension A, B,
C, D. Japan requested to fix the version of SW, to stabilize the modern character corresponding to Shuowen character. China and TCA proposed to use the version by 陳昌治 (so-called “一篆一行本”), and Old Hanzi expert group accepted it unanimously.

**IRG N1827 1.d** (completion of the definitions for the entries required in the submission):

The definition of “Epoch/Period” is given, and “Site/Area” column is decided to be removed.

**IRG N1827 2.a** (review IRG N1771):

China proposed to make no names for Oracle Bone characters, but an option might be the convention used by CJK Unified Ideographs that the names are determined by their code positions. Also some difficulties were pointed by China and TCA experts: a) single character may have multiple meaning, b) some characters are not deciphered and no meaning is known, c) meaning of a character may be differently deciphered by different scholars. Japan replied that the meaning-based names are not essential.

Also China commented Japanese proposal does not cover all items in current database, because some items are dropped by the clause 3 in IRG N1771. Japan commented the clause 3 was introduced to make a stable definition of the character, so it is related with the definitions of the character and glyph for Oracle Bone script.

The discussion on the character and glyph definitions could not be finished in this meeting, thus China and TCA will submit their feedbacks before IRG#38, with written document.

**IRG N1827 2.b** (clarification of requirement):

Old Hanzi expert group could not understand the question by IRG. The Rapporteur gave further explanation, as follows:

The purpose of this collection is to have it coded so that some applications/research can make use of them for their work. From user’s view points, you must have some
application related requirement so that the coding would fit your requirement such as, based on what you want them coded (say, glyphs, images, or the abstract glyphs you have come up with for coding). How you want the character to be ordered so that you can index/search them easily.

I understand that in working out the collection you have some attributes, some of them are for internal use (to get the collection in place). Some may be essential in developing the coding model (so not internal to getting the collection) which you need to distinguish and let coding people know. In other words, coding method is related to how you want your characters (glyph, glyph representatives) to be used.

Your group (or later individual contributions) need to tell IRG/WG2 this first. Otherwise, a coding model cannot be developed or may face the possibility of not being useful for any Oracle Bone development/research work.

TCA and China think this question is same with 1.b, therefore, the answer is the same with that to IRG N1827 1.b. Japan has a concern that the questions in 1.b and 2.b are different.

Japanese feedback is already submitted as IRG N1842. Japan considers the interoperability between existing dictionaries, databases, corpuses is important requirement, so IRG N1771 was designed by using existing Chinese dictionary, Yinxu Jiagu Keci Leizuan (殷墟甲骨刻辭類纂, 姚孝遂主編, 中華書局, ISBN 9787101004779, 1989), that used by several fonts and databases. Thus, Japan emphasized the importance of the mapping table between the ID in Oracle Bone database and the index number of the heading glyph in the conventional dictionary, like, Jia Gu Wen Bian (甲骨文編, 中国社会科学院考古研究所編, 科学出版社, ISBN 7101005233, 1965). Japan thinks the mapping table described in above is necessary for encoding. China and TCA agrees that the mapping table is important for users but not necessary for encoding. China and TCA consider that it is not the business of Old Hanzi expert group. Current Oracle Bone database has no information to automate the production of a mapping table, because Old Hanzi P&R had no explicit instruction to submit the information to make a
mapping table. China, TCA and Japan agreed that the mapping table cannot be made from current Oracle Bone database. Japan national body requested to note that the mapping table is necessary for encoding. TCA member body requested to note that the contributed mapping table will be welcomed.

3. Discussion on IRG N1786

China commented that TCA and China are collaborating for the font production, so China finds no problem in the font design policy.

4. Discussion on WG2 N4236

This document was submitted just before WG2#59, so China and TCA experts did not have enough time to review it. Japan explained the first question in WG2 N4236: the request of the clarification with other projects: China Character Repertoire, and other databases (e.g. CHANT). The Old Hanzi expert group is aware of their activity, however currently there is no official relationship to the group.

5. Other items

Old Hanzi expert group received the consolidated comment IRG N1835.

6. Open Issues

The comment disposition for IRG N1835
The mutual check of the comments in IRG N1787 Part 2 (the 2nd round checking)
The Old Hanzi expert group requests to close these 2 issues in IRG#38.

7. Appreciation

Old Hanzi expert group would like to express its sincere appreciation to the meeting host for the Tokyo ad Hoc meeting, Information Technology Standards Commission of Japan (ITSCJ). Old Hanzi expert group would also like to thank Ms. Toshiko Kimura for her excellent work on meeting logistics, arrangement, and hospitality.

Members attended the meeting are:
Li Guoying, Wei Lin-Mei (Selena), Zhou Xiaowen, Chen Zhuang, Dai Hong, Tatsuo Kobayashi, Masahiro Sekiguchi, Atsushi Suzuki, Toshiya Suzuki and Takao Hirase.
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