

LU, Qin [COMP]

From: Satoshi Yamamoto <yama.motch@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, 14 July 2018 4:12 AM
To: csluqin@comp.polyu.edu.hk; chen-zhuang
Cc: Michel Suignard
Subject: Questionable updates on revised CJK G code table regarding IRG#50 editorial report

Dear Dr. Lu and Chen Zhuang, cc: WG2 Project editor

As mentioned by Japanese attendees at the last WG2 meeting, I quickly checked updates in WG2 N4982 (updated draft code table for Amd2 issued just before meeting) following IRG N2269 (Editorial report of WS2015 IRG#50), and found so many problems.

I report them in this message and hope it will help brushing up the code table. However please understand this is not a complete review due to the time constraint and the current draft is not matured yet. I'd like to suggest re-consider the schedule of CJK G progression.

2. Radicals

#00593 u+3021E SC=8

#00748 u+30297 Ambiguous record. Should be deleted if no concensus.

#03538 u+30C19 Ambiguous record.

#03852 u+30D31 Ambiguous record. 肉 or 言 ?

Below are not yet corrected as noted in the report.

#00018

#00036

#00260

#00267

#00287

#00412

#00415

#00418

#00428

#00850

#00918

#00975

#01063

#01132

#01176

#01621

#01516

#01517

#01632

#01695
#01745
#01795
#01904
#01915
#02002
#02110
#02132
#02289
#02351
#02355
#02681
#02711
#02823
#03132

Inconsistent descriptions between "comment" and "note" which make it impossible to understand what is the conclusion.

#00434
#03582
#04187
#02087
#02038
#02039
#02393
#02437
#02849
#02997
#03009
#03334

4. Fontdesigns & normalizations

#00340 u+3010B SC=13
#00623 u+30C01 Ambiguous record. Is it acceptable to change glyph ? If so, SC does not match to the glyphs.
#00980 u+300D3 Right part is wrong.
#01023 u+3038A not yet corrected.
#01174 u+3041C Wrong SC
#01408 u+30504 Wrong SC
#02708 u+30940 This glyph is modified because of "PRC conventions". Same thing on u+30941(GZ-1982203) ?
#02868 u+309F4 Wrong SC
#03008 u+30A35 Wrong SC
#03140 u+30A9F It is questionable on "PRC conventions" to change 日 to 月
#03359 u+30B5F Glyph is not modified. Is it OK ? I wonder if there is no suggestion to modify the shape of 「及」 to match the evidence.
#03825 u+30D11 I wonder why the shape of 「見」 was simplified in WS2015 ver5.0. Is the current status correct ?
#04021 u+30DCA I guess 「喪→喪」 is a big change and it should not be "PRC conventions".Wrong SC as well.
#04111 u+30E21 It should not be PRC conventions on this change. Wrong SC.
#04135 u+30E37 This change is beyond unifiable range and not a "normalization". Wrong SC as well.

7. Editorial Errors

7.1

#02972 u+3040B Radical is not changed to 爻

#03555 u+30C28 UK-01950 is not deleted.

7.2

#00731 u+3027E Ambiguous record (About PDAM2.2 only) UK source is not added.

#00854 u+302F6 Ambiguous record (About PDAM2.2 only) UK source is not added.

7.4

#03461 u+30BD2 Source information is not modified as described in the record.

#04015 u+30DC5 Source information is not modified as described in the record.

#04032 u+30DD6 Source information is not modified as described in the record.

[General concerns]

Discussion record should be carefully reviewed before registration of it to make the conclusions be clear. This document is not just a memo but a part of Editorial report (Official document). Chinese words such as 點 or 提 should be translated to English word.

At this time, China accepts so many "PRC conventions" or "normalization" comment to modify glyphs. It looks very strange to me and I'd like to suggest IRG re-consider the handling about "conventions" and "normalization" issue on glyph design.

I strongly request to setup the review period to end after "report is issued", "updated glyphs are submitted" and "code table is updated". There are so many errors every time in general.

--

山本知 (やまもと さとし)

gmail: yama.motch@gmail.com