LU, Qin [COMP]

From:	Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, 21 March, 2018 4:26 PM
To:	LU, Qin [COMP]; Ken Lunde
Cc:	irgeditors@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk
Subject:	RE: [irgeditors] IRGN2269 Consolidated Comments on WS2015v5.0

<<
Sorry for my absence due to family emergency. Yes, after IRG's #50 meeting in May, IRG will have recommendation on the issues related to Ext. G. If there are too many problems to be fixed, we will not go to DAM2, but if the problems can be fixed without much stability issue, we may still recommend to proceed as DAM2 is in July. IRG editors will have technical review on our consolidated comments. If we can received the disposition comments from Michel, we will also review them offline until IRG#50.
>>
Dear Lu Qin,
I hope your family is doing well.

Concerning message above, I have no intend to dispose any pdam2.2 comments concerning Ext G, I think it is better for IRG 50 to deal with these comments and additional feedback received by then.
I would like to see the content exposed in pdam2.2 used as a reference point, so the review should result in the following items:
- characters to be deleted (because of unification or further study)
- characters to be moved (because their radical stroke value has changed)
- characters that acquire additional RS values (it is possible to have multiple if it makes sense)
- characters that need to have their glyph changes (with combination of possible move, different RS value)
- characters to be added (typically part of the original WS2015 but were left behind for whatever reason)

If characters are added or glyph changes, I will need fonts for those. And I will need data files for all those changes. Another issue I have is that we are in some sort of moving target, because the official target is IRN 2269 (WS2015 v5.0) which may or not be identical to the set in pdam2.2 based on the data and fonts I got from the IRG members. At the end WS 2015 v5.0 is not that relevant, the real reference point is what is in pdam2.2 with the accompanying data file.
At the same time, I see that most of not all IRG members are done against WS2015 v5.0. This may miss discrepancies between what in WS2015 v5.0 and the pdam2.2 content.

On the other end, if you want to create a WS2015 v6.0 that is the basis for a new ballot (independently of what was in pdam2.2), it may be possible, but then I would need new resources for everything (fonts and data). That scenario is way riskier for converging.

Finally, I am planning to add in the next iteration of the CJKSrc.txt file new fields for TotalStrokes and the IDS sequence to capture more information currently available in the WS2015 set. IRG may want to think about what should be preserved in Unihan and/or ISO data files.

Best regards,

Michel
-----Original Message-----
From: LU, Qin [COMP] <qin.lu@polyu.edu.hk>
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 6:28 PM
To: Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com>; Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com>
Cc: irgeditors@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk
Subject: RE: [irgeditors] IRGN2269 Consolidated Comments on WS2015v5.0

Dear IRG editors and Michel,

Sorry for my absence due to family emergency. Yes, after IRG's #50 meeting in May, IRG will have recommendation on the issues related to Ext. G. If there are too many problems to be fixed, we will not go to DAM2, but if the problems can be fixed without much stability issue, we may still recommend to proceed as DAM2 is in July. IRG editors will have technical review on our consolidated comments. If we can received the disposition comments from Michel, we will also review them offline until IRG#50.

Best regards,

Lu Qin

-----Original Message-----
From: irgeditors-request@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk [mailto:irgeditors-request@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk] On Behalf Of Ken Lunde
Sent: Tuesday, 20 March 2018 12:44 AM
To: Suignard Michel <michel@suignard.com>
Cc: irgeditors@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk
Subject: Re: [irgeditors] IRGN2269 Consolidated Comments on WS2015v5.0

Michel,

Dr. Lu, as the IRG Rapporteur, is the best person to reply to your questions below.

On the US/Unicode side, John is planning to attend IRG #50 in May, and I am planning to attend IRG #51 in October.

Regards...

-- Ken

> On Mar 18, 2018, at 2:18 PM, Michel Suignard <michel@suignard.com> wrote:
>
> I also need some clarity on the planning for WS2015. For now, I am planning to pull Ext G (WS2015) from pdam 2.3 following recommendations of several NBs. Furthermore, it is really up to IRG to react to the pdam2.2 ballot comments concerning Ext G and any other feedbacks from IRG members. Given the expected churn in ext G I don't think it is reasonable to expect to see Ext G being integrated back into Amendment 2 for the enquiry phase (DAM2) starting in July (DAM ballots are not a good vehicle for detailed technical comments). But we don't have to decide that now.
>
> From a code chart production point of view, I cannot attend IRG #50 (I will be in New York until Saturday May 19th, which would mean I would miss some time of the IRG meeting if I travelled immediately afterward, and I am not sure I want to travel back to back. I still hope to get the material (spreadsheet, fonts, datafile) before or at the WG2 meeting in June.
>
> My other questions has to do about whether you expect further feedback on WS2015 after IRG 50 that would make my presence for finalization of WS2015 in IRG 51 (Vietnam October 2018) useful? I don't expect complicated feedback after IRG50, but you never know. It also depends on the magnitude of changes made on the current set.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Michel
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: irgeditors-request@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk
> <irgeditors-request@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk> On Behalf Of Ken Lunde
> Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 6:41 AM

> To: chen zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com>
> Cc: irgeditors@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk
> Subject: Re: [irgeditors] IRGN2269 Consolidated Comments on WS2015v5.0
>
> Mr. Chen and others,
>
> My original suggestion is a bit more modest than what Andrew wrote as a response. I propose to merely postpone the current schedule that is specified in Recommendation IRG M49.11, and to come up with a new schedule for the same milestones during IRG #50 in May. Of course, if the majority of IRG NBs prefer to keep the current schedule for IRG Working Set 2017, then we keep its current schedule.
>
> My concern is based on the likelihood that some NBs may be unable to give IRG Working Set 2017 its full attention while focusing on what is—hopefully—the final review cycle for IRG Working Set 2015, which is arguably more important right now.
>
> Regards...
>
> -- Ken
>
>> On Mar 18, 2018, at 4:53 AM, chen zhuang <chenzh-zhuang@163.com> wrote:
>>
>> Dear colleagues,
>>
>> China would like to keep current schedule, push both WS2015 and WS2017 forward rather than to postpone any of them. There are lots characters used for person and place names, so we hope them encoded soon.
>>
>> Best regards,
>>
>> Chen Zhuang
>> 在 2018 年 03 月 16 00 时 51 分, "Lee Collins"<lcollins@mac.com>写道:
>> Vietnam would oppose this, since we have a large backlog of characters that have not been able to get into the pipeline for various reasons. Postponing only makes that worse. Instead, we should look into ways to streamline thie process.
>>
>> Lee
>>
>>> On Mar 15, 2018, at 6:48 AM, Andrew West <andrewcwest@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> Dear Dr Lu and Ken,
>>>
>>> I would very much support postponing WS2017 until after WS2015 has
>>> been settled. It is too much for me to work on both WS2015 and
>>> WS2017 at the same time, and it is not efficient for reviewers to
>>> try to review both sets simultaneously.
>>>
>>> I hope that the current WS2017 project can be cancelled, and a new
>>> WS2018 or WS2019 project started after WS2015 has been completely
>>> resolved, and then IRG member bodies can make new submissions for
>>> the new project. That way submitters can remove unifiable and
>>> already encoded characters that have already been identified, and
>>> add in a few urgently-required characters that have been recently identified (e.g.
>>> China, HK and Korea telegraph code characters).
>>>
>>> Andrew
>>>
>>>

>>> On 15 March 2018 at 13:31, Ken Lunde <lunde@adobe.com> wrote:
>>>> Dr. Lu,
>>>>
>>>> Is it possible to shelve IRG Working Set 2017 until the current working set has been settled? One reason is about the workload, but more importantly, because we're applying different unification rules for these two working sets, it will cause confusion among reviewers, and I would claim that it already has caused confusion. As a case in point, when I briefly examined the consolidated comments, the vast majority of unification suggestions would apply to IRG Working Set 2017, not to the current working set (2015).
>>>>
>>>> Regards...
>>>>
>>>> -- Ken
>>>>
>>>>> On Mar 14, 2018, at 11:06 PM, csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> Dear all IRG editors,
>>>>> Please do review this consolidated document for the next IRG meeting. Also, for member bodies who can cast comments as voting members in SC2, please make sure you give your comments with due consideration of this IRG consolidated comments.
>>>>>
>>>>> Best regads,
>>>>>
>>>>> Lu Qin
>>>>>
>>>>> From: irgeditors-request@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk
>>>>> [mailto:irgeditors-request@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk] On Behalf Of chen
>>>>> zhuang
>>>>> Sent: Thursday, 15 March 2018 11:17 AM
>>>>> To: irgeditors@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk
>>>>> Subject: [irgeditors] IRGN2269 Consolidated Comments on WS2015v5.0
>>>>>
>>>>> Dear colleagues,
>>>>>
>>>>> The consolidated comments are here:
>>>>> https://secure-web.cisco.com/131sNTbtS87oKfXCmpL5lgoytHzprl3bHybEt
>>>>> HxHhR8iffX0O8Bom5aw5X8DIT9rT6I0Z4nTtQpLMpLu0VMlGg0FXajEREHffUD5bFZ
>>>>> qSFx0mCbEaiBFUfhbGh28e63Kcw4kW9xnbX5aNb9jXq8HBLeNZRZJn9CaCTYzvaFqr
>>>>> LQYFiENi5-RpUvKAk5E6VPo-BTceIwN9faIccSy7Dl0U5xvzce7a0bsclWR_KMBo28
>>>>> gDiUHRYpAcPslvM4Fgwlm-2G-JDOO3wUOk0nhW4VSoni1mSamkqRRMfcwpLYjpBD_-
>>>>> kvrw-E_6dn_hbjpDLv5vfI7QHlEtxxDCtH2S597www/https%3A%2F%2Fna01.safe
>>>>> links.protection.outlook.com%2F%3Furl%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fp
>>>>> an.baidu.com%2Fs%2F1u_Sd9phPriHMJpHM4mp6mQ&data=02%7C01%7Clunde%40
>>>>> adobe.com%7C0bd7f3c6154045bdbb5a08d58d15d085%7Cfa7b1b5a7b34438794a
>>>>> ed2c178decee1%7C0%7C0%7C636570047228282891&sdata=AbkR2SUQgVLzeNc6q
>>>>> kKJSRtBQZ7mU%2B%2Bmuxj5daAmuso%3D&reserved=0
>>>>>
>>>>> After quick review of comments, I have suggestions for our discussions in the comming IRG meeting:
>>>>> 1. Tthe comments on postponed characters (commented by Eiso) are not consolidated because we decided in previous meetings that they would not be discussed after WS2015 v5.0. So, I suggest Eiso and other experts consider the possibility of proposing them to furture IRG WS.
>>>>> 2. I do not think the font issues are related to unifications/disunifications, so I suggest font submitters prepare updated fonts and explantions on unchanged fonts ASAP.
>>>>> 3. I will fix data of SC, TS, IDS T/S flags and editorial errors now, I think no need to discuss these one by one during meetings. Pleasse let me know if you have comments different to the consolidated ones. Thanks.
>>>>>
>>>>> Best regards,

>>>>>
>>>>> Chen Zhuang
>>>>
>

[http://mlm.polyu.edu.hk/PolyU_Email_Signature.jpg]