

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set  
UCS

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/IRGN2474\_TCA Feedback

Date: 2021-9-10

Doc. Type:	Member body contribution
Title:	TCA's Feedback to IRGN2474 Feedback
Source:	TCA
Status:	Input to IRG meeting 57
Action:	For consideration by JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG
Distribution:	IRG Members and Ideographic Experts
No. of pages:	1
Appendixes	None

[IRGN2474 Feedback](#) suggests that PnP needs to add new rules, TCA very seriously look at the description of the rules in the document is not fully understood. Take the paragraph "Non-cognate rule" as an example, "Characters that are related in historical derivation may also be disunified as long the difference in glyph shape is sufficient for reflecting different semantics." This sentence refers to a variant of the character, which is also a proper character(正字), right? Also, it is suggested that the wording could be similar to the original PnP style to make it easier to read.

The PnP is the basis of the IRG's work. For the TCA, the IRG's review requires the assistance of textual experts, but many of the terms used in the PnP are not common to textual science, so to avoid misunderstandings or lack of understanding of the rule descriptions, it is suggested that the IRG could provide a cross-reference between Chinese and English to avoid interpretation errors and to make future work smoother.

*(End of document)*