

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2/IRG
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS
FOR ADDITION OF CJK UNIFIED IDEOGRAPHS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646**

Submitters are reminded to:
1. Fill in all the sections below.
2. Read the Principles and Procedures Document (P & P) available at <https://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg56/IRGN2424Confirmed.pdf>
for guidelines and details before filling in this form.
3. Use the latest Form from <https://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg56/IRGN2424SubmissionForm.xlsx>
See also <http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irgwds.html> for the latest *Unifiable Component Variations*.

Administrative

1. IRG Project Code:	e.g. IRG Collection 2021
2. Title:	Vietnam Summary Form
3. Submitter's Region/Country Name:	Vietnam
4. Submitter Type (National Body/Individual Contribution):	National Body
5. Submission Date:	7 May 2021
6. Requested Ideograph Type (Unified or Compatibility Ideographs)	Unified
If Compatibility, the submitter is strongly encouraged to instead register them as IVS in a new or an existing IVD collection(See UTS #37) with the IRG's approval (Registration fee will not be charged if authorized by the IRG.).	
7. Proposal Type (Normal Proposal or Urgently Needed)	Normal
8. Choose one of the following:	
This is a complete proposal.	Yes
(or) More information will be provided later.	

B. Technical – General

1. Number of ideographs in the proposal:	1002
2. Glyph format of the proposed ideographs is in TrueType?	Yes
Are all the proposed glyphs put into BMP PUA area?	Yes
Are data for source references vs. character codes provided?	Yes
3. Source references:	
Do all the proposed ideographs have a unique, proper source reference (member body/international consortium abbreviation followed by no more than 9 alphanumeric characters)?	Yes
4. Evidence:	
a. Do all the proposed ideographs have a separate evidence document which contains at least one scanned image of printed materials (preferably dictionaries)?	Yes
b. Do all the printed materials used for evidence provide enough information to track them by a third party (ISBN numbers, etc.)?	Yes
5. Attribute Data Format: (Excel file or CSV text)	Excel

C. Technical - Checklist

Understanding of the Unification Principles	
1. Has the submitter read ISO/IEC 10646 Annex S and does the submitter understand the unification principles?	Yes
2. Has the submitter read the “Unifiable Component Variations” (contact the IRG technical editor through the IRG Convenor for the latest version) and does the submitter understand the unifiable variation examples?	Yes
3. Has the submitter read the IRG PnP document and does the submitter understand the 5% Rule?	Yes
Character-Glyph Duplication (http://www.itscj.ipsj.or.jp/sc2/open/pow.htm contains all the published ones and those under ballot)	
4. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the unified or compatibility ideographs of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? If the checking has been done against an earlier version of ISO/IEC 10646, please specify the version. (e.g. 10646:2012)	Yes
5. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the amendments, if any, of the latest version of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which amendment(s) has the submitter checked?	Yes
6. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the proposed amendments, if any, of ISO/IEC 10646? If yes, which draft amendment(s) has the submitter checked?	Yes
7. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the ideographs in the current working M-set and D-set of the IRG? (Contact IRG chief editor and technical editor through the IRG Convenor for the newest list) If yes, which document(s) has the submitter checked?	Yes
8. Has the submitter checked that the proposed ideographs are not unifiable with any of the over-unified or mis-unified ideographs in ISO/IEC 10646? (See Annex E of the IRG PnP document)	Yes
9. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any similar ideographs in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	Yes
10. Has the submitter checked whether the proposed ideographs have any variant ideographs in the current standardized or working sets mentioned above?	Yes
Attribute Data	
11. Do all the proposed ideographs have attribute data including the Kangxi radical code, stroke count, and first stroke(primary)?	Yes
12. Do the proposed ideographs contain secondary radical code and their stroke count and first stroke are also provided?	
13. Are there any simplified ideographs (ideographs that are based on the policy described in 簡化字總表) among the proposed ideographs? If yes, does the proposal include proper simplified/traditional indication flag for each proposed ideograph in the attribute data?	
14. Do all the proposed ideographs have the document page number of evidence documents in the attribute data?	Yes
15. Do all the proposed ideographs have the proper Ideographic Description Sequence (IDS) in the attribute data? If no, how many proposed ideographs do not have the IDS?	Yes
16. If the answer to question 9 or 10 is yes, do the attribute data include any information on similar/variant ideographs for the proposed ideographs?	Yes
17. Do all the proposed ideographs contain the total stroke count (kTotalStrokes)?	



