

LU, Qin [COMP]

From: irgeditors-request@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk on behalf of Ken Lunde
<lunde@adobe.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 21 March 2018 9:07 PM
To: LU, Qin [COMP]
Cc: irgeditors
Subject: [irgeditors] UTC's response to IRG Working Set 2015 Version 5.0 Consolidated Comments

Responses to UTC-submitted Characters in IRG Working Set 2015 Version 5.0 (aka IRG N2269) Consolidated Comments

Section 1:

General Comment: Many of the suggested unifications would be appropriate if this were IRG Working Set 2017, which is subject to newly-introduced unification rules, but this is IRG Working Set 2015 with unchanged unification rules.

02213/UTC-01266 (𠄎火𠄎刀田): (SAT) Unification with U+2DD36 (𠄎火𠄎𠄎田; Extension F); Disagree: The components that differ—刀 and 𠄎—are not unifiable, at least in the context of IRG Working Set 2015, and perhaps more importantly, they are non-cognate as SAT's evidence for U+2DD36 (一字佛頂輪王經 [Number 0951 菩提流志譯] in Volume 19, page 259) indicates that it has the same meaning as U+7092 炒 (fry, sauté, roast, boil, cook), and the UTC-submitted character is used in a personal name, and therefore its meaning may never be known and must be assumed to be non-cognate.

03883/UTC-01057 (𠄎𠄎 千): (J) Possible unification with U+8BA6 讠 or U+2C8D9 (; 𠄎𠄎 于; Extension E); Disagree: 𠄎𠄎 千 is the Second Stage Simplification of U+8B19 謙 (qiān), which is non-cognate with both U+8BA6 讠 (jié) and U+2C8D9 (xū). Because they are non-cognate and have different glyph shapes, they are therefore not unifiable according to IRG's Principles & Procedures.

Section 2:

General Comment: Please seriously consider what the UK wrote -- more than once -- in its feedback when considering what radical to specify: "Use the most obvious radical so it is convenient for users to find the character." In other words, even if there is a technically correct radical, if there is a much more obvious one, shape-wise, that enables the character to be found more easily within an ocean of characters, please specify it instead. Keep in mind that we're not building an ideograph dictionary whose radical assignments needs to be technically correct, but rather repertoires for a coded character set that need to be usable by over a billion people. Even authoritative dictionaries can get the radical wrong, such as U+6B6F 齒 (Japan's simplified form of U+9F52 齒), whose specified radical is Radical #77 止, because Morohashi (aka 大漢和辭典) mistakenly classified it under that particular radical. The IRG's Principles & Procedures should make this point clearer, as the current wording about radical selection is arguably vague.

Section 3:

00128/UTC-01202 (𠄎𠄎水): (SAT) This was an unintentional error, and the ISO 10646 Chief Editor is now in possession of the fixed font

02028/UTC-01241 (𠄎𠄎 𠄎尸永): (SAT) Clearer evidence supplied in Version 2.0 response:
<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg47/IRGN2155-utc-review.pdf>

02137/UTC-01256 (𠄎; 𠄎門𠄎土): (SAT) Clearer evidence supplied in Version 2.0 response:
<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155-utc-review.pdf>

02145/UTC-01257 (𠄎凵爻): (SAT) Clearer evidence supplied in Version 2.0 response:
<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155-utc-review.pdf>

02190/UTC-01263 (𠄎彡火): (SAT) Clearer evidence supplied in Version 2.0 response:
<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155-utc-review.pdf>

02212/UTC-01265 (𠄎尾火): (SAT) Clearer evidence supplied in Version 2.0 response:
<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155-utc-review.pdf>

02262/UTC-01272 (𠄎炊囙): (SAT) This character and 02284/UTC-01276 (𠄎𠄎囙) were thoroughly discussed during IRG #49

02277/UTC-01275 (𠄎楊火): (SAT) Clearer evidence supplied in Version 2.0 response:
<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155-utc-review.pdf>

02284/UTC-01276 (𠄎𠄎囙): (SAT) This character and 02262/UTC-01272 (𠄎炊囙) were thoroughly discussed during IRG #49

02299/UTC-01279 (𠄎𠄎并馬火): (SAT) Clearer evidence supplied in Version 2.0 response:
<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155-utc-review.pdf>

Section 4:

00128/UTC-01202 (𠄎𠄎水): (J & Henry) See the duplicate comment in Section 3

02126/UTC-01254 (𠄎沙莫): (Henry) This character was submitted by the UTC, so it does not need to adhere to PRC regional conventions

03644/UTC-01287 (𠄎𠄎𠄎): (Henry) This character was submitted by the UTC, so it does not need to adhere to PRC regional conventions

04077/UTC-01062 (𠄎𠄎 刀): (Henry) No change is necessary

05285/UTC-01146 (𠄎𠄎𠄎): (Henry) This character was submitted by the UTC, so it does not need to adhere to PRC regional conventions

Section 5:

The UTC does not object to the four suggested SC/TS changes

Section 6:

The UTC does not object to the 14 suggested IDS changes

Section 7.1:

03555/UK-01950 (𠄎𠄎𠄎): (J) Although not a UTC-submitted character, this character was discussed at extreme length during IRG #49 (not IRG #50, which has not yet taken place), and the end result *was* a consensus to disunify, and it is unfortunate that the discussion record didn't capture this correctly. In addition, please see the following document that Ming Fan and Eiso Chan prepared and submitted as an IRG Working Set 2015 Version 4.0

(aka IRG N2223) comment for this particular character that further suggests that disunification is the correct action to take:

<http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg49/IRGN2223EisoMingCommentOnUTC01950.pdf>

Section 7.2:

The Extension G code charts cannot display more than one U-Source (UTC-, UK-, USAT-, UCI-) character, and when there are multiple ones, which can happen only when there is a USAT- one, USAT- wins.

That is all.