

Doc Type: Ideographic Rapporteur Group Document
Title: Request to clarify some unclear evidences issues
Source: Wang Xieyang (王谢杨)
Status: Individual Contribution
Action: For consideration by IRG
Date: 2020-03-09

Considering unclear evidence comment is used frequently in IRG online working system, to exclude subjective factors in the process of identifying unclear evidences, I request IRG to standardize the process and define the types of “unclear evidence” in IRG PnP. Here are my suggestions.

1. The types of unclear evidence

According to previous IRG Working Sets, we can define three kinds of unclear evidences as follow:

- 1) Evidences which provides only the glyph. This means there is no pronunciation, no meaning and no reasonable explanation attached. For example, [the evidence of 𠄎又工 \(IRG WS2017, GXM-00083\)](#).
- 2) Evidences which provides shape, pronunciation or meaning that doesn't match. For example, [the evidence of 𠄎山仓 \(IRG WS2017, GDM-00188\)](#).
- 3) Evidences which provides hazy or broken glyph indicates that it may not be a unifiable glyph of the submitted glyph. For example, [the evidence of 𠄎车宜 \(IRG WS2017, UK-10911\)](#).

2. The process of identifying unclear evidences

According to the current IRG PnP, the first two kinds of unclear evidences can be handled properly. **The third kind, however, is not well handled nor defined, which can cause the incorrectness of IRG judgment.** For example, the unclear evidence comment of [𠄎角小](#) says “The glyph is broken and incomplete for deciding that it is composed of 角 and 小” but doesn't say what it could be. To my point of view, there is no other reasonable glyphs can be listed according to the evidence. Thus I suggest:

When an unclear evidence comment is firstly raised, the expert should list at least one reasonable glyph that is not unifiable with submitted glyph according to the latest evidence. For example, the left pair is reasonable while the right pair is not.

Fig.1

Fig.2

If the reasonable glyph can't be listed, the unclear evidence comment should be invalid and should not be discussed.

Once the comment confirmed after discussing, the submitted character should be pending for new evidences or withdrawn.

3. The resubmission of influenced characters

Since it's possible that new acceptable evidences are found after the development process, IRG should clarify the resubmission procedure of these characters.

To make a balance between encoding more useful characters and not overworking IRG experts, I suggest that IRG allow the resubmission until the submission of the next IRG Working Set ends.

It's unusual to find acceptable evidences for D-set characters, hence adding them to next Working Set as additional characters is better.

(End of Doc)