

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N2133 UTC Comments

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set International Organization for Standardization

Doc Type: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG

Title: UTC Responses to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2133 CJK2015v1.1

Source: John H. Jenkins (井作恆)

Status: Member Body Contribution

Action: None

Date: 2016-05-21

Please note that in all cases, the UTC will defer to the judgment of the IRG. Dr. Lunde and I are both available as needed to answer any further queries.

Part 1, table 1, Unifications and Duplications

SN1 00003 UTC-00969: Unification with USAT05803 is acceptable

SN1 02151 UTC-01258: Not unifiable with U+2C27A

SN1 02476 UTC-01084: Unification with U+2DE61 is acceptable

SN1 03133 UTC-01086: Unification with U+2E196 is acceptable

SN1 03601 and SN1 03624: UTC-01176 and UTC-01177 are not unifiable

SN1 04411 and SN1 04416: UTC-01297 and UTC-01299 are not unifiable

SN1 04609 UTC-01124: Unification with U+2E93D is acceptable

SN1 04622 UTC-02194: Unification SN1 04621 G_Z2382304 is acceptable

Part 1, table 2, Attributes (Radical)

All the proposed radical changes for UTC submissions are acceptable

Part 1, table 3, Attributes (Stroke Counts)

SN1 00784 UTC-01221 Change of stroke count to 13 is not acceptable

SN1 04493 UTC-01120 Change of stroke count to 8 is acceptable

Part 2, Japanese comments on evidence

Section 1.4 (Derived simplified character without actual usage)

SN1 02866 UTC-01085 Disagree

Inasmuch as the *Xiàndài Hànyǔ Cídiǎn* 现代汉语词典 (2nd ed., 1983) is a widely-used modern dictionary, we consider the presence of a character in this source sufficient evidence of use.

Section 1.5 (Scanned dictionary image without further reference)

SN1 02261 UTC-1083 Disagree

Inasmuch as the *Xiàndài Hànyǔ Cídiǎn* 现代汉语词典 (2nd ed., 1983) is a widely-used modern dictionary, we consider the presence of a character in this source sufficient evidence of use.

Section 1.6 (Possibly characters used in proper nouns but the evidence is too fragmentary to be sure)

We don't understand the objection being raised. Even in those instances where the character is not explicitly marked as a proper noun, we feel that the evidence clearly indicates the use of the character within a standard Chinese dynastic history. Is this insufficient evidence of use? How are the precise semantics of the characters relevant?

Section 1.7 (Possibly an Old Hanzi transliteration character requiring further evidence for stability)

The source for our characters in this section is Bernhard Karlgren's *Grammata Serica Recensa* (1957). Given the nature of the source, and the fact that the characters here are handwritten and not provided with any further context, we accept that the evidence might be considered insufficient at this time. Removing them is acceptable.