

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
UCS

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/IRGN2635_TCA Feedback

Date: 2023-10-13

Doc. Type:	Member body contribution
Title:	TCA's Feedback to IRGN2635
Source:	TCA
Status:	Input to IRG meeting 61
Action:	For consideration by JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG
Distribution:	IRG Members and Ideographic Experts
No. of pages:	2
Appendixes	None
Medium:	Electronic

[IRGN2635](#) mentions T-source, so TCA reads it seriously. This document has done a initial analysis on CJK Extension I, and the issues found are divided into 3 topics to explain, TCA would like to put forward some ideas here:

- **Part 1- Characters from WS2021:** The characters mentioned in this section are not coded in Ext-I. As evidenced by [WG2N5238](#) (proposed by China), this issue does not exist.
- **Part 2- Newly introduced half-duplicated characters:** Two similarities with other encoded glyphs were mentioned: U+2ED9D 𪚑⁺⁺义, U+2EDE0 𪚒_一圣, which should be unified according to the UCV rule. TCA proposed that this part could be further discussed by the IRG. See below for details.
- **Part 3- Other possible horizontal extensions:** It is mentioned in the document that 104 T-source characters can be extended horizontally. Thanks to the proposer's suggestion, TCA has considered applying for horizontal extension.

Regarding Part 2, how to solve this situation that Ext-I has not follow the rule of unification(UCV) completely? TCA has two concerns:

1. The first question is, Ext-I is already coded separately, how to deal with the part that creates the same glyphs but with different code points? Please see the following two examples.
2. The second question is, names and place names have a special legal status and

the requirement for the government usage, and it is not possible to follow the rule of unification completely. If they do not follow the principle of unification, the above mentioned issues will appear again. In this case, what should be done with the unified glyphs?

The above two issues should be discussed seriously by the experts from WG2, IRG, and UTC, as they will affect the submission of new working sets and the review principles. TCA suggests IVS or other solutions, in the hope that we can solve the problems.

● 2 examples :

1. U+2EC7B vs U+5F84

Ext-I code/Glyph		Other encoded code /Glyph			Note
2EC7B	2EC7B 𢦏 60.5 GIDC23-140	5F84	5F84 𢦏 60.5 G0-3E36	径 径 径 T3-2875 J0-3742 K2-314A	UCV #87 圣圣

From this set of example, we can find that the glyph of U+2EC7B are exactly the same as the glyphs of T, J and K of U+5F84.

2. U+2ED9D vs U+8286

Ext-I code/Glyph		Other encoded code /Glyph			Note
2ED9D	2ED9D 艸 140.3 艾 GIDC23-430	8286	8286 艸 140.3 艾 G3-6837	艾 T3-2728	UCV#127 义叉

In this group, the glyph for U+2ED9D is the same as the glyph for T-source (T3-2728) in U+8286. If it is T-source moved to U+2ED9D, TCA does not agree with it because it is a commonly used character and "艾" is a basic character(正字) and "艾" is a variant of "艾".

(End of document)