



DATE: 1997-10-24

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2
Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS) - ISO/IEC 10646
Secretariat: ANSI

DOC TYPE: Meeting Minutes

TITLE: Unconfirmed Meeting Minutes, WG 2 Meeting # 33,
Heraklion, Crete, Greece, 30 June – 4 July 1997

SOURCE: V.S. Umamaheswaran, Recording Secretary; Mike Ksar, Convener

PROJECT: JTC 1.02.18 – ISO/IEC 10646

STATUS: SC 2/WG 2 participants are requested to review the attached unconfirmed minutes, act on appropriate noted action items, and to send any comments or corrections to the convener as soon as possible but no later than 1998-01-31.

ACTION ID: ACT

DUE DATE: 1998-01-31

DISTRIBUTION: SC 2/WG 2 members and Liaison organizations

MEDIUM: Paper

NO. OF PAGES: 66

Mike Ksar
Convener – ISO/IEC/JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2
Hewlett-Packard Company
1501 Page Mill Rd., M/S 5 U – L
Palo Alto, CA 94304
U. S. A.

Phone: +1 415 857 8817
Fax (PC): +1 415 852 8500
Alt. Fax: +1 415 857 4882
e-mail: mike_ksar@hp.com

ISO
International Organization for Standardization
Organisation Internationale de Normalisation

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2
Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set (UCS)

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1603
Date: 1997-10-24

<p>Title: Unconfirmed Minutes of WG 2 Meeting # 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 1997-06-30/07-04</p> <p>Source: V.S. UMaaheswaran, Meeting Secretary, Mike Ksar, Convener</p> <p>Action: WG 2 members and Liaison organizations</p> <p>Distribution: ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 members and Liaisons</p>

1. Opening and roll call

Input Documents:

1601 WG 2 Distribution List; Mike Ksar; 1997-06-xx (pre-meeting version)
1517 2nd Call and Tentative Agenda for WG 2 Meeting 33 in Greece; Ksar; 1997-03-20

1.1 Opening

Mr. Mike Ksar convened the meeting at 09:23h and introduced Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis, representing the host organization, ELOT, the Hellenic Organization for Standardization.

Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis welcomed the delegates to Crete. Some of his statements were:

"Crete island has many peculiarities. This island unites two continents - it is part of an arc that connects Greece to the middle-east. This island has more than 4000 years of history. We have representatives from all the continents of the world. Let us hope that this meeting unites all the continents of the world. An exact replica of the Phaistos 'disk' was distributed to attendees of the previous meeting of SC 2/WG 2 held in Athens -- one can visit the site on this island where the Phaistos disk was found. Mr. Zakis - composer of Zakis - is from this island.

"Several events are organized by the Hotel Candia Maris - you are welcome to participate. On the weekend there is a trip to Phaistos and Knossos. A visit to caves of Matalan is also included. Welcome from Crete and all the Cretans. A very warm welcome to Crete. Wish you all a successful meeting. Thanks for letting us have a chance to host this meeting. There are a number of Gods on this island - Zeus is the biggest of them all. Friday night is the Greek Night - delegates should confirm their participation."

Then he went on to expand on the administrative support provided by ELOT, and other meeting facilities and logistics.

Mr. Mike Ksar: We have quite a few new participants at the meeting. This meeting will have probably have the maximum number of countries and delegates -- expected 25 member bodies + Liaison organizations; perhaps 1 observer from Georgia. Documents received after the deadline in April 1997 - will be made available later during the meeting. ELOT and staff were making copies of all documents till about 01:30h (about 10,000 pages were copied). Some of these documents are already on the agenda, some are for discussion at this meeting (not yet in the agenda), and some are for information only. Delegates are also reminded that national bodies are to notify the WG 2 secretariat, SC 2 secretariat and the convener, before attending future WG meetings.

1.2 Roll Call

Input Document:

1601 WG 2 Distribution List; Mike Ksar; 1997-06-xx (pre-meeting version)

Mr. Mike Ksar requested the attending delegates to introduce themselves, and mark up the distribution list (pre-meeting version of document N1601) with any changes, checking the information for themselves and on others from their countries. The following Fifty (50) delegates representing Twenty Three (23) member bodies, Ten (10) liaison organizations, and one (1) observer attended the meeting. Sri Lanka and Armenia were attending the WG 2 meeting for the first time.

NAME	COUNTRY / LIAISON ORGANIZATION	AFFILIATION
Vahram Mekhitarian	Armenia	Information Technologies, SARM
Peter Jonas	Austria; ISO TC 173	Austrian Standards Institute
Erich Schmid	Austria	School for the Blind, Vienna
Alain LaBonté	Canada; GSE; SC 18/WG9	Treasury Board Secretariat, Government of Québec
V.S. UMAmaheswaran	Canada; Meeting Secretary	IBM Canada
Mao Yong Gang	China	Chinese Electronics Standardization Institute
Shama Layi	China	Southwest Minority Nationality College
Fu Yong He	China	State Language Commission
Zhang Zhoucai	China, IRG Rapporteur	CCID
Keld Jørn Simonsen	Denmark; CEN/TC 304; IETF	Danish UNIX-system User Group
Khaled Sherif	Egypt	IBM Egypt
Erkki Kolehmainen	Finland	Finnish Data Communication Association
Oliver Corf	Germany	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
Panagiotis Dellios	Greece; ITU-T SG8	Hellenic Telecommunications Organization
Evangelos Melagrakis	Greece; TC 46/SC2	ELOT
Þorvardur Kári Ólafsson	Iceland	Icelandic Council for Standardization (STRÍ)
Þorgeir Sigurðsson	Iceland	Icelandic Council for Standardization (STRÍ)
Michael Everson	Ireland	Everson Gunn Teoranta
Stefan Fuchs	Israel	Bezeq
Tatsuo Kobayashi	Japan	Justsystem Corp.
Shun Ishizaki	Japan	Keio University
Kohji Shibano	Japan; Acting SC 2 Chair	Tokyo International University
Toshiko Kimura	Japan; SC 2 Secretariat	IPSJ/ITSCJ
Takayuki K. Sato	Japan; SC 22/WG 20	IPSJ/ITSCJ
Joon-Suk Lee	Korea	The National Academy of the Korean Language
Jonh In Lee	Korea	Ministry of Culture and Sports
Young-Ho Mun	Korea	Ministry of Culture and Sports
Kyongsok Kim	Korea	Pusan National University
Johan van Wingen	Netherlands; SC 22	Independent
Trond Trosterud	Norway	Universitetet i Tromsø
Richard Youatt	Observer	Independent; Advisor to SARM, Armenia
Alexandrina Stasescu	Romania	Romanian Standards Institution
S.T. Nandasara	Sri Lanka	University of Colombo
J. B. Disanayaka	Sri Lanka	University of Colombo
Wera Lungström	Sweden	Statskontoret
Karl Ivar Larsson	Sweden	Consultant
Monica Ståhl	Sweden	IBM Sweden
Wolfe Arfvidson	Sweden	Statskontoret
Mehmet Sarigül	Turkey	Turkish Standards Institution
Bruce Paterson	UK; Editor	Independent
John Clews	UK; TC 46/SC 2	SESAME Computer Projects
Asmus Freytag	The Unicode Consortium	Asmus Inc.
Glenn Adams	The Unicode Consortium	Spyglass Inc.
Edwin Hart	USA	SHARE Inc.
Michael Kung	USA	Oracle Corp.
Arnold Winkler	USA	Unisys Corp.
Michel Suignard	USA	Microsoft Corp.
Mike Ksar	USA; Convener	Hewlett-Packard Company
Ngô Trung Viet	Vietnam	Steering Committee of National Program on IT
Tran Luu Chuong	Vietnam	Steering Committee of National Program on IT

Messrs. Umamaheswaran, Bruce Paterson, Michel Suignard, and Mike Ksar were identified to participate in drafting the meeting resolutions.

Of the above delegates, Messrs. Larsson, Arfvidsson, Paterson, Hart, Ólafsson and Sigurðsson, Ms. Ståhl and Ms. Lungström -- arrived on Thursday. Messrs. Fuchs, Sherif and Ishizaki, and Ms. Kimura -- arrived on Friday.

2. Approval of the agenda

Input Document:

1517 2nd Call and Tentative Agenda for WG 2 Meeting 33 in Greece; Ksar; 1997-03-20

Document N1597 from Mr. Johan van Wingen and document N1525 from Mr. Hugh McGregor Ross on Tibetan extensions will be withdrawn due to some improper and untrue statements in these documents. It was noted that documents N1579 and N1592 were the same and have been erroneously given different numbers. Also, document N1569 is to be replaced by documents N1561, N1562 and N1563.

The preliminary agenda in document N1517 was reviewed. New documents were posted to agenda items on Byzantine, Sinhala, principles and procedures, and others during the course of the meeting. New agenda items on Archaic scripts, New scripts, Euro, General Variation Mark, JTC 1 Electronic Distribution of documents, and JTC 1 ad hoc on re-engineering, were added to the agenda. The following table of contents of this meeting minutes reflects the agenda items as the meeting progressed.

Agenda Item	Page No.
1. Opening and roll call	1
1.1 Opening	1
1.2 Roll Call	2
2. Approval of the agenda	3
3. Approval of minutes of meeting 32, Singapore	5
4. Review action items from previous meeting	5
5. JTC 1 and ITTF matters	10
5.1 Transfer to new SC2 Secretariat	10
5.2 Table of replies on DAM 5, 6, 7 and 8	10
5.3 Disposition of Comments - DAM 5, 6 & 7	10
5.3.1 DAM 5 - Korean Hangul	11
5.3.2 DAM 6 - Tibetan	12
5.3.3 DAM 7 - 33 additional characters	12
5.4 Next Edition of 10646	12
5.5 JTC 1 Electronic Distribution of Documents	14
5.6 JTC 1 Ad Hoc on Re-Engineering	18
6. SC 2 matters	18
6.1 DAM 9 – Unique Identifiers – Final Text/Disposition of Comments	18
6.2 PDAM 10 – Ethiopic – Ballot Resolution	19
6.3 PDAM 11 – Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics – Ballot Resolution	19
6.4 PDAM 12 – Cherokee – Ballot Resolution	20
6.5 DTR 15285 -Character/Glyph Model – Ballot Resolution	21
7. Non-repertoire issues:	22
7.1 Editorial corrigenda - standing document	22
7.2 Revised definition of “collections”	22
7.3 Draft PDAM text for emptying of buckets	24
7.4 Naming of characters – Norway	25
7.5 Roadmap to plane 1 - Everson	26
7.6 Principles and Procedures	27
8. Repertoire issues	27
8.1 Repertoire Additions – Cumulative List No. 5	27
8.2 Revisit Roadmap guideline document - BMP	27
8.3 Byzantine Musical Symbols	28
8.4 Braille – proposed PDAM text	29
8.5 Runic – proposed PDAM text	30
8.6 Ogham – proposed PDAM text	31
8.7 Sinhala script	32
8.8 Yi Script – proposed code table / names	33

Agenda Item	Page No.
8.9 Indic Scripts – private use zone	35
8.10 Thai and Lao Scripts – private use zone	35
8.11 African including Yoruba – private use zone	35
8.12 Romanian & Latvian – private use zone	35
8.13 Burmese	35
8.14 Khmer	36
8.15 Tibetan Extensions	36
8.16 Thaana	36
8.17 Korean Bangeom and Gugyeol characters	36
8.17.1 Bangeom	36
8.17.2 Gugyeol	36
8.18 Mongolian – feedback on ad hoc report N1515	37
8.19 Reminder about 4 Medieval English Latin characters	38
8.20 Bengali Coded Character Set	38
8.21 Hebrew Repertoire	38
8.22 Cham Script	39
8.23 Armenian – feedback on document N1446	40
8.24 Other Scripts	40
8.24.1 Archaic	40
8.24.2 New Non Archaic	42
8.24.3 EURO sign	42
8.24.4 General Variation Mark	43
8.24.5 Romanian	44
8.24.6 Additional Arabic Characters	46
8.24.7 Cyrillic Sami	47
8.24.8 Latin Characters Required By Latinized Taiwanese Languages	47
8.24.9 Proposal to add 2 Latin characters for Finnish Romani	48
9. IRG status and reports	48
9.1 Internal/Horizontal Supplementation – PDAM text	48
9.2 Kang Xi Radicals, Hangzhou numerals – PDAM	48
9.3 Ideographic Radical Supplement	48
9.4 CJK Unified Ideograph Vertical Extension A	49
9.5 IRG New Project Proposals	49
9.6 IRG Administrative	50
10. Defect reports status	50
11. Liaison reports	50
11.1 The Unicode Consortium	50
11.2 ITU-T SG8	50
11.3 Application for liaison membership-UNU	50
11.4 IETF	50
11.5 SC 22	52
11.6 SC 18/WG 9	52
11.7 TC 46/ SC 2	52
12. Other business	53
12.1 Web Site Review	53
12.2 Registration of 10646 subsets and 7350	53
12.3 Future meetings	54
13. Closing - Approval of Resolutions	55
14. Adjournment	56
15. Cumulative list of action items	57
15.1 Outstanding action items from previous WG 2 meetings -- M25 to M28	57
15.2 Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 29, Tokyo, Japan	57
15.3 Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 30, Copenhagen, Denmark	57
15.4 Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 31, Québec City, Canada	57
15.5 Outstanding action items from meeting 32, Singapore	58
15.6 New action items from meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece	58

3. Approval of minutes of meeting 32, Singapore

Input Document:

1503 Minutes of Meeting # 32 – Singapore; Umamaheswaran & Ksar; 1997-04-01

Dr. Umamaheswaran presented the highlights from the previous meeting minutes. Some of the editorial errors were identified prior to the meeting. The minutes were approved with the following editorial corrections:

- a) Several places in the document - capitalization of 'consortium' in 'Unicode Consortium' is inconsistent. Change all occurrences of 'consortium' to 'Consortium'
- b) Section 8.1, Roadmap, Discussion item a, last line; at the end of the sentence, add "with existing characters" after the word "unified"
- c) Section 8.7, Input Document, 1474: correct '10646I' to '10646;'
- d) Section 9.1, last line under relevant resolution, correct 'on page 3229' to 'on page 32'
- e) Section 9.3, last line and under relevant resolution, correct 'on page 3229' to 'on page 32'
- f) Section 9.4 - Correct 'Ideograph' to 'Ideographic' in the title line
- g) Section 12.1, under relevant resolution, the wordings 'WG 2 and IRG' in the second line should have been 'WG 2 and hot link to the IRG web site'.

4. Review action items from previous meeting

Input Document:

1503 Minutes of Meeting # 32 – Singapore; Umamaheswaran & Ksar; 1997-04-01

Section 15 of document N1503 containing the cumulative list of action items was reviewed by Dr. Umamaheswaran. The following tables show the result of the review. Several action items were completed, some are still in progress and others were dropped. All action items that are in progress or outstanding have been carried forward for review at the next meeting - and included in section 15 (on page 57) of this document.

(15.1) Action items from previous WG 2 meetings -- M25 to M28

All the action items from meeting 25, Antalya, Turkey, meeting 26, San Francisco, CA, USA, meeting 27, Geneva, Switzerland, and meeting 28, Helsinki, Finland, have been either completed or dropped.

(15.2) Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 29, Tokyo, Japan

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 29 Resolutions document N1304 and Unconfirmed Meeting 29 minutes in document N1303 -and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1353).	Status
AI-29-10	China	
a	To take comments in document N1246 and comments from this meeting (M29) as feedback to the appropriate experts on Uyghur, Kazakh and Kirghiz. M30, M31, M32 In progress.	M33: In progress.

(15.3) Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 30, Copenhagen, Denmark

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 30 Resolutions document N1354 and Unconfirmed Meeting 30 minutes in document N1353 and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1453).	Status
AI-30-9	Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson)	
b	To prepare Proposal Summary Forms and proposals for Sinhala, Burmese and Khmer scripts, based on contribution N1321 and N1376 from Mr. Hugh Ross. M31: In progress; Mr. Everson has these on his web page - he is requested to submit them in hard copy form to the convener; M32: In progress.	M33: Completed; See documents N1523 - Burmese, N1524 - Khmer and N1473R, N1480, N1532, N1589 - Sinhala
AI-30-12	Ad Hoc Group on Principles and Procedures (Mr. Sven Thygesen - lead)	

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1603	Unconfirmed Minutes	1997-10-24
Meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 1997-06-30/07-04		Page 5 of 63

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 30 Resolutions document N1354 and Unconfirmed Meeting 30 minutes in document N1353 and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1453).	Status
a	To work with Mr. Hugh Ross and document the guidelines / criteria that were used in the creation of the first edition of the standard, for deciding when a pre-composed character was considered for inclusion directly versus when it would be left as Level 3 composition encoding. M31: Outstanding; M32: In progress.	M33: In progress
AI-30-16	Latvia, Ireland and Finland a to provide additional supporting documents to address the various concerns expressed on proposal for Livonian characters in document N1322 at this meeting to permit WG 2 to better evaluate the proposal. M31: Outstanding; M32: Outstanding.	M33: In progress
AI-30-18	Greece a To prepare a revised proposal on Byzantine Musical Symbols addressing the concerns expressed during the discussion at meeting 30, for consideration at meeting 31. M31: In progress; M32: In progress.	M33: Completed; See document N1582.

(15.4) Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 31, Québec City, Canada

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 31 Resolutions document N1454 and Unconfirmed Meeting 31 minutes in document N1453 and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1503).	Status
AI-31-2	Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar c to communicate to the Asian Classics Input Project (ACIP) that DAM6 is for ballot, and that ACIP should communicate through the appropriate NB to get their feedback in. M32: Outstanding.	M33: Dropped.
AI-31-3	Editor - Mr. Bruce Paterson To prepare the appropriate PDAM texts and entries in collections of characters for future coding, with assistance from other identified parties, in accordance with the following WG 2 resolutions: h RESOLUTION M31.9 (Internal Supplementation / Horizontal Supplementation): WG 2 accepts documents N1427, N1428, N1429 and N1434 on Internal Supplementation / Horizontal Supplementation from the IRG. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from IRG editor, and forward it to SC 2 secretariat for an SC 2 ballot. M32: In progress.	See below for each sub item. M33: In progress.
AI-31-4	IRG - Rapporteur, Mr. Zhang Zhoucai a The current ITTF practice is to use Arial or Helvetica style for the numbers and non ideographic characters. IRG convener is to work with Mr. Bruce Paterson to follow the style used by ITTF for the standard publications, in time for transmission of the PDAM text by the editor - target Singapore meeting. M32: In progress.	M33: Completed; See document N1591, the IRG report.
AI-31-5	All member bodies and liaison organizations e are invited to write contributions on 'Guidelines on what sort of information can be included in Annex P - Additional information on characters'. The accepted text of such contributions would be included in the Principles and Procedures document. M32: In progress.	M33: Completed; Some input in document N1514.
AI-31-10	Dr. Glenn Adams and Mr. Keld Simonsen a are invited to interact with the principal authors of RFCs in IETF on 10646. Some collection identifier such as the proposed 301 - once finalized in 10646 - could be registered with IANA registration authority also for use with Internet protocols. M32: In progress.	M33: Completed; See document N1605.
AI-31-12	Swedish national body - Mr. Olle Järnefors a to consider the discussion on the Runic script proposal at this meeting and feedback to WG 2. M32: In progress.	M33: In progress.
AI-31-14	Romanian national body - Ms. Alexandrina Statescu	

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 31 Resolutions document N1454 and Unconfirmed Meeting 31 minutes in document N1453 and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1503).	Status
a	to provide more information, with input from other interested parties, including consideration for the various points raised on the proposed characters - s,S,t, and T with Comma below, and in the Copenhagen meeting, for further consideration at the Singapore meeting M32: In progress.	M33: Completed; See document N1598 (see also document N1583).

(15.5) Action items from meeting 32, Singapore

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 32 Resolutions document N1504 and Unconfirmed Meeting 32 minutes in document N1503 with corrections noted in section 3 of this document.)	Status
AI-32-1 Meeting Secretary - Dr. V.S. UMaaheswaran		
a	to finalize the document N1503 containing the unconfirmed meeting minutes and send it to the convener as soon as possible.	M33: Completed; See document N1503.
b	to finalize the document N1504 containing the adopted meeting resolutions and send it to the convener as soon as possible.	M33: Completed; See document N1504.
AI-32-2 Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar		
a	to update the list of projects of WG 2 (based on N1394R), with assistance from Mr. Keld Simonsen.	M33: Completed; See document N1521.
b	to communicate to IEC TC 3 that WG 2 has taken action on their request for technical symbols, including our plan for publishing these in the future. The symbols are currently in the cumulative symbols collection in document N1416.	M33: Completed.
c	to send to the SC 2 secretariat for forwarding to the Sri Lanka Standards Institution, a cover letter inviting the Sri Lankan member body to participate at the next WG 2 meeting along with WG 2's response on their contribution on Sinhala in document N1480, with assistance from Dr. Glenn Adams in preparing the response.	M33: Completed.
d	to get information from ITTF as to which amendments would have been approved by the next 10646 revision date, as input into the discussion on planning of the next edition of 10646 at the next WG 2 meeting.	M33: Completed; See agenda item 5.4 of M33.
e	to include an agenda item on the topic of next edition of 10646 for the next WG 2 meeting.	M33: Completed; See agenda item 5.4 of M33.
f	per resolution M32.6 on Part 2 of 10646, to forward document N1484R on the proposed scope of ISO/IEC 10646-2 to the SC 2 secretariat, in response to resolution M6.4 of SC 2 Plenary meeting, August 1996 (document SC 2 N2749).	M33: Completed.
AI-32-3 Project Editor, Mr. Bruce Paterson		
a	to prepare text for a PDAM on clearing the collections of accepted characters for consideration at the next meeting.	M33: Completed; See document N1564.
b	to prepare the text for DAM 9 for ISO/IEC 10646-1 on Unique Identifiers and forward it, together with the disposition of comments, to SC 2 secretariat for a JTC 1 ballot, per resolution M32.1 on PDAM9 (Unique Identifiers): "With reference to document N1445R and N1471 on Unique Identifiers, WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1471, amended as follows: a. to move all references to the forms beginning with the letter T into a note. b. to note that the comments from Denmark have been accommodated, and, c. to note that the comment from the UK, and a similar comment (no. 3) from Ireland, have not been accepted."	M33: Completed; See documents N1526 and N1527.
c	with reference to resolution M32.17 (Indic Scripts) to add the resolution in document N1470 addressing the defect report on Indic scripts, to the cumulative list of editorial corrigenda in document N1468.	M33: Completed; See document N1529.

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 32 Resolutions document N1504 and Unconfirmed Meeting 32 minutes in document N1503 with corrections noted in section 3 of this document.)	Status
	<p>d to take the necessary steps per the following resolution M32.18 on Collection Identifier:</p> <p>WG 2 accepts the document N1512 as a defect report. WG 2 instructs its editor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. to prepare all necessary editorial corrigenda to the text of 10646-1 in accordance with the principles in document N1512 b. to revise the definition of collection identifier 301 (BMP up to amendment 7) in document N1466 as a 'fixed collection' in accordance with the above principles c. to draft the definition of a new 'fixed' collection identifier 299 (BMP prior to any amendments) to identify the repertoire of ISO/IEC 10646-1 edition 1 and submit the text for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting. <p>e per resolution M32.3, to add to the cumulative list of editorial corrigenda in document N1468, the editorial corrigenda proposed in document N1469, arising from the French translation of ISO/IEC 10646-1.</p> <p>f to add it to the cumulative list of characters in document N1467 for future inclusion in ISO/IEC 10646-1, per the following resolution (M32.16):</p> <p>WG 2 accepts the request for the Ideographic Variation Mark and associated graphic symbol in document N1491, and assigns it as follows: FFFB GENERAL VARIATION MARK and instructs the editor</p> <p>g per resolution M32.4, to redraft the entries in the cumulative list of editorial corrigenda in document N1468 for Table 56, Row 33, as entries for Annex P, instead of showing corrections for the names in Table 56 - CJK Compatibility as requested by the Japanese national body. (This resolution modifies resolution M24. DFR-1 from WG 2 meeting 24.)</p>	<p>M33: Completed; See document N1556.</p> <p>M33: Completed; See document N1529.</p> <p>M33: Completed; See documents N1528 and N1564.</p> <p>M33: Completed; See document N1529.</p>
AI-32-4	<p>Co-editors of TR 15285 (Messrs. Edwin Hart, Alan Griffiee)</p> <p>a to prepare the text for PDTR 15285 and forward it to SC 2 secretariat for an SC 2 ballot, per the following resolution (M32.2):</p> <p>WG 2 accepts the response to comments in document N1477, and the revised text of the Working Draft on ISO/IEC PDTR 15285 in document N1478. WG 2 further instructs the co-editors (Messrs. Hart and Griffiee) to prepare the text for PDTR 15285 ...</p>	<p>M33: Completed; See documents N1586 and N1587.</p>
AI-32-5	<p>Chinese member body (Mr. Mao Gang)</p> <p>a to prepare text for a PDAM on Yi Syllabary per resolution M32.7 on Yi Syllabary, below:</p> <p>WG 2 accepts the set of 1165 characters of the Yi Syllabary, their names (with LETTER changed to SYLLABLE), and their shapes proposed in document N1481, allocates them provisionally to code positions in the range xA000 to xA48F, and invites the Chinese national body to prepare text for a PDAM for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting.</p> <p>b to prepare text for a PDAM on Yi Syllabary per resolution M32.7 on Yi Radicals, below:</p> <p>WG 2 accepts the 39 characters of the Yi radicals set, their names (with LETTR changed to RADICAL, and the suffix 'b' removed from each name, and change the character names to uppercase), and their shapes proposed in document N1482, allocates them provisionally to code positions in the range xA490 to xA4BF, and invites the Chinese national body to prepare text for a PDAM for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting.</p>	<p>M33: Completed; See document N1608.</p> <p>M33: Completed; See document N1611.</p>
AI-32-6	<p>US member body (Messrs. Michel Suignard, John Jenkins)</p> <p>a is invited to prepare PDAM text on Braille symbols for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.12 below:</p> <p>WG 2 accepts the 256 Braille symbols proposed in document N1409R, and provisionally allocates them to code positions In the range 2800 to 28FF. ...</p> <p>b Dr. John Jenkins, is invited to prepare the draft text on the Deseret script (in document N1498) in a form suitable for inclusion in the future ISO/IEC 10646-Part 2.</p>	<p>M33: Completed; See document N1541 (prepared by Mr. Michael Everson, Ireland).</p> <p>M33: In progress.</p>
AI-32-7	The Unicode Consortium	
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1603		1997-10-24 Page 8 of 63
	Unconfirmed Minutes Meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 1997-06-30/07-04	

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 32 Resolutions document N1504 and Unconfirmed Meeting 32 minutes in document N1503 with corrections noted in section 3 of this document.)	Status
	<p>a Dr. Glenn Adams is invited to prepare a response (giving due consideration for contributions from Messrs. Ross and Everson on the Sinhalese script) to document N1480 on the Sinhalese script from the Sri Lankan member body and send it to the convener.</p> <p>b Dr. Asmus Freytag and the Editor Mr. Bruce Paterson to get together to understand the errata process for the Unicode standard, towards assisting in the synchronization between the 10646 corrigenda and the corresponding errata for the Unicode standard.</p>	<p>M33: See document N1584.</p> <p>M33: See document N1514.</p>
AI-32-8	<p>Danish member body (Mr. Keld Simonsen)</p> <p>a coordinating with the convener, Mr. Mike Ksar, to update the list of projects of WG 2 (based on N1394R).</p>	M33: See document N1521
AI-32-9	<p>UK member body (Mr. Bruce Paterson)</p> <p>a to investigate possibility of BSI getting an official position from Nigerian authorities - in support of the Yoruba proposal from Mr. Hugh McGregor Ross.</p>	M33: In progress.
AI-32-10	<p>Ad hoc group on principles and procedures (lead - Mr. Sven Thygesen, assist of a US member body representative)</p> <p>a to update the Principles and Procedures document and forward it to the convener, incorporating the principles in the roadmap document N1499, taking into consideration comments in document N1505 (from Mr. John Clews).</p>	M33: In progress.
AI-32-11	<p>Korean member body (Professor Kyongsok Kim)</p> <p>a is invited to submit a proposal summary form to cover requests for Bangjeom and Gugyeol characters (original requests in documents N935 and N936) with a possible updates to these documents and submit to WG 2 for consideration at meeting 33.</p>	M33: Completed; See documents N1599 and N1606.
AI-32-12	<p>IRG (Mr. Zhang Zhoucai, Rapporteur)</p> <p>a with assistance of the Taiwanese Computer Association to prepare PDAM text on Kang Xi radicals for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.10 below: WG 2 accepts the request for the set of 214 Kang Xi radical characters in document N1182. WG 2 allocates them provisionally to code positions in the range 2F00 to 2FDF. WG 2 further invites the IRG to prepare the text for a PDAM assigning character names, their shapes in accordance with document N1182, and the block name 'KANG XI RADICALS', ...</p> <p>b with assistance of the Taiwanese Computer Association to prepare PDAM text on Hangzhou numerals for inclusion as a separate item in the PDAM for resolution M32.10 (see action item a above), for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.11 below: WG 2 accepts the request for 3 Hangzhou numerals in document N1182. WG 2 provisionally allocates code positions and names in the CJK Symbols and Punctuation block, as follows: 3038 - HANGZHOU NUMERAL TEN 3039 - HANGZHOU NUMERAL TWENTY 303A - HANGZHOU NUMERAL THIRTY</p> <p>c to prepare text on Ideographic Radical Supplement for inclusion as a separate item in the PDAM per resolution M32.10 (see action item a above), for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.15 below: WG 2 accepts the 31 Ideographic Radicals proposed in document N1492, and provisionally allocates them to code positions in the range 2FE0 to 2FFF. WG 2 further invites the IRG to assign a character name and a single graphic symbol to each. ...</p> <p>d the IRG editor is to prepare PDAM text on CJK Unified Ideograph Extension A Version 1.1, for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.14 below: WG 2 provisionally allocates the set of 6585 characters of CJK Unified Ideograph Extension A Version 1.1 in documents N1423 and N1424 to code positions in the range 3400 to 4DBF, ...</p>	<p>M33: In progress.</p> <p>M33: In progress.</p> <p>M33: In progress.</p> <p>M33: In progress.</p>
AI-32-13	All member bodies and liaison organizations	

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 32 Resolutions document N1504 and Unconfirmed Meeting 32 minutes in document N1503 with corrections noted in section 3 of this document.)	Status
	<p>a with reference to PDAMs sent for SC 2 ballot -- PDAM 10 on Ethiopic script, PDAM 11 on Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics script and PDAM 12 on Cherokee script -- to review the PDAM documents and include all their comments in the ballot response.</p> <p>b to review the cumulative editorial corrections in document N1468, along with the draft marked up text of 10646-1 in document N1396, for any errors, omissions etc. and inform the editor, Mr. Bruce Paterson.</p> <p>c are invited to review and feedback to Mr. Zhang Zhoucai, the IRG Rapporteur, on the proposal for 12 Ideographic Structure characters by the end of April 1997 (in time for the next IRG meeting). Documents N1489, N1490, N1491, N1493 and N1494 - to be read together. (Document N1494 contains a request for 12 Ideographic Structure Characters; Document N1490 contains the answers to all the questions that have been raised at previous meetings.)</p> <p>d per resolution M32.9 on the Mongolian script, are invited to review and comment on document N1515, prior to the next WG 2 meeting.</p> <p>e to take note of the following future meetings of IRG and WG 2:</p> <p>a) IRG meeting number 9 in Nanjing, China, 5--9 May 1997</p> <p>b) IRG meeting number 10 in Vietnam, December 1997.</p> <p>c) Meeting WG 2-33: 30 June to 4 July 1997, in Cyprus (could change to Greece, backup USA West Coast)</p> <p>d) Meeting WG 2-34: 16--20 March 1998 (US West Coast, backup UK)</p> <p>e) Meeting WG 2-35: 21--25 September 1998 (UK, backup Vietnam)</p> <p>f) Meeting WG 2-36: March 1999 (China)</p>	<p>M33: Completed.</p> <p>M33: Completed.</p> <p>M33: Completed.</p> <p>M33: In progress.</p> <p>M33: Completed.</p>
AI-32-14	<p>Mr. John Clews, Convener of TC 46/SC 2</p> <p>a is invited to update the TC 46/SC 2 to WG 2 liaison report document N1511 to address the comments during the meeting and provide a revised document N1511R to the convener Mr. Mike Ksar.</p>	<p>M33: Completed</p>

5. JTC 1 and ITTF matters

5.1 Transfer to new SC2 Secretariat

Input Document:

1522 Transfer of SC2 Secretariat; JISC; 1997-01-13

SC 2 secretariat has been transferred to Japan. Professor Kohji Shibano has been appointed the acting chair of SC 2, expected to be endorsed by the SC 2 plenary.

5.2 Table of replies on DAM 5, 6, 7 and 8

Input Documents:

1537 Table of Replies and Feedback on Amendment 5 – Hangul; JTC1 Secretariat; 1997-01-29
1538 Table of Replies and Feedback on Amendment 6 – Tibetan; JTC1 Secretariat; 1997-01-29
1539 Table of Replies and Feedback on Amendment 7 – Hebrew etc.; JTC1 Secretariat; 1997-01-29
1540 Table of Replies and Feedback on Amendment 8 – Han Unification Rules; JTC1 Secretariat; 1997-01-29

The above documents were tabled for information to WG 2. The editor Mr. Bruce Paterson had prepared disposition of comments and proposed final texts for the above amendments. The discussion on these documents are minuted under the following agenda items.

5.3 Disposition of Comments - DAM 5, 6 & 7

Documents N1561, N1562 and N1563, contain the disposition of comments on DAM 5, 6 and 7 - JTC 1 ballots. Note documents N1561, N1562 and N1563 are all combined in document N1569. Please ignore document N1569.

5.3.1 DAM 5 - Korean Hangul

Input Documents:

1537 Table of Replies and Feedback on Amendment 5 – Hangul; JTC1 Secretariat; 1997-01-29
1561 Draft Disposition of Comments on DAM 5 – Hangul; SC2 N 2788 – WG2 N1537; Paterson; 1997-05-27
1570 Almost Final Text (pages 2-5 and 182 only) of DAM 5 – Hangul; Paterson; 1997-06-23

Mr. Bruce Paterson presented documents N1561 containing the disposition of comments, Document N1570 contains the almost final text. The final code tables are to be prepared by Korea before the Amendment can be published.

Negative ballot from Netherlands - was based on whether an earlier edition of the standard can be referenced. This reference has been deleted. Netherlands has changed its negative vote to positive. If Korea is unable to produce the final code tables within a reasonable amount of time, the US national body and other volunteers are willing to produce the code table under four weeks.

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kyongsok Kim: The final code tables for Korean is still in progress. It is being prepared by some private organizations. Mr. Bruce Paterson asked for some editorial guidelines of ITTF to be followed. We received the final printing guidelines for ITTF only a few months ago.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: We need camera ready copy for printing the final AM text. The Korean national body had volunteered to get this job done. It is not acceptable that the final publication be held back because of some printing problems. We approved this work item about two years ago. It is unacceptable that we have not been able to print this document yet. The honouring of the commitments by different national bodies applies to each of the Amendment being processed by WG 2, not just for DAM 5.
- c) Mr. Michel Suignard: This amendment has been accepted and implemented by the industry.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The Unicode Consortium is willing to assist WG 2 since we have already printed this.
- e) Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: If one member of WG 2 does not step up to its responsibility, the work of the whole committee suffers.
- f) Professor Kohji Shibano: ITTF / JTC 1 asks for exact target dates for the publications. WG2 should set target dates for publications and ensure that these dates are met.
- g) Professor Kyongsok Kim: In document N1570 - collection "71 HANGUL EXTENDED" should be "71 HANGUL SYLLABLES", on page 2. Korea will provide a written committed date by end of day.
- h) Mr. Michel Suignard: How do we synchronize the corrigenda and the amendments?. Are the corrigenda also published? For example, document N1556 - is a proposed corrigendum.
- i) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The Amendments are published in the order in which they are issued. At the same time the Corrigendum Text - shows the standing corrections to the standard. As to document N1556 - it has not yet gone through the process. When the corrigendum gets accepted, there may be a problem of synchronization.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1561, and the final text in document N1570 (with one correction).

Action Item:

Korea will supply the final code tables to the editor in time for the target date of September 1997 for the final publication of Amendment 5.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.1 (DAM 5 - Korean Hangul):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1561, and the final text in N1570 with the following correction:
collection "71 HANGUL EXTENDED"
should be "71 HANGUL SYLLABLES", on page 2,
and instructs its editor to forward them by September 1997 to SC2 secretariat for further processing.

5.3.2 DAM 6 - Tibetan

Input Documents:

1538 Table of Replies and Feedback on Amendment 6 – Tibetan; JTC1 Secretariat; 1997-01-29
1562 Draft Disposition of Comments on DAM 6 – Tibetan; SC2 N 2789 – WG2 N1538; Paterson; 1997-05-27
1571 Almost Final Text – DAM 6 – Tibetan; Paterson; 1997-06-23

The delegates are asked to inform the editor of any problems with the disposition of comments in document N1562 or the proposed final text for Amendment text in document N1571, as soon as possible. The content of the amendment text is unchanged from what was received from the ad hoc on Tibetan.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments and the proposed final text.

Relevant Resolution:

<i>M33.2 (DAM-6 Tibetan):</i>	Unanimous
WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1562, and the final text in N1571, and instructs its editor to forward them to SC2 secretariat in July 1997 for further processing.	

5.3.3 DAM 7 - 33 additional characters

Input Documents:

1539 Table of Replies and Feedback on Amendment 7 – Hebrew etc.; JTC1 Secretariat; 1997-01-29
1563 Draft Disposition of Comments on DAM 7 – 33 Additional Characters; SC2 N 2790 – WG2 N1539; Paterson; 1997-05-27
1572 Almost Final Text – DAM 7 – 33 additional characters; Paterson; 1997-06-23

The editor has prepared disposition of comments in document N1563 and the proposed final text in document N1572. The editor has also included Annex P (per corrigendum no. 1). Delegates to this meeting are requested to review the inclusion of Corrigendum no. 1 in the proposed final text in document N1572.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The Unicode Consortium sees no strong requirement to have the Annex P information in place. The information is not a MUST to have. We will check with Unicode 2.0. The proposed additional annotations were not available to us during the V2.0 publication. In the interests of maintaining synchronization we prefer not to include this. If we do not violate any rules - then we prefer to omit it.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: Israel national body knows they made an error and we have accepted the changes in principle. I will check our Copenhagen resolution and see if there has been any omission on WG 2's part.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the editor's proposed disposition of comments and the proposed final text including the Annex P information.

Relevant Resolution:

<i>M33.3 (DAM-7 - Additional 33 characters):</i>	Unanimous
WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1563, and the final text in N1572 including the additional information on Hebrew character names in Annex P, and instructs its editor to forward them to SC2 secretariat in July 1997 for further processing.	

5.4 Next Edition of 10646

Mr. Mike Ksar: I had met with ITTF. They are not quite happy with the number of amendments that WG 2 is processing. They are not sure as to what recommendations WG 2 will come up with. The following are some items for consideration by WG 2.

One of the related items is the FIVE YEAR review of the standard. JTC 1 has been notified. 10646-1:1993 and several parts of 8859-xx are on the periodic review notification -- one of the action items on WG 2 is to make recommendation as to publish a new edition or re-confirm with amendments.

There are two ways to republish. WG 2 makes the recommendation. Whether it will be a printed copy, or we would like to have a CD-ROM publication etc. is important. If we update the hard copy including all the additions and amendments consolidated - it will be approximately 1000 pages. The alternative is to continue publishing amendments -- already up to 18 - ITTF is not happy with this proliferation. It is up to ITTF to decide how to publish the next edition -- option of having 10646 on CD-ROM etc.

Publishing in multiple parts also has some disadvantages. Each part must have a conformance statement, scope statement -- several duplicated parts replicated. One of the possibilities is for the first part to be the textual content of current standard. The other parts could be organized by Groups, Scripts etc. Each of the part must have a separate scope, links to the previous parts, and has to be balloted separately. If one part is not accepted (fails a ballot) the linkages get broken.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: I think it is important the new edition contains all the amendments. I will be concerned about CD-ROM-only publication - due to non-availability of the necessary technology. Some arrangements have to be made to bring the cost of printing / publishing this document down. The Unicode Consortium could bring the costs down to about 100 USD whereas the ITTF price is 500 USD. The whole standard has to be in one volume - otherwise they will be considered as different parts.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: ITTF is expecting a recommendation from SC 2/WG 2. If it is not on a CD-ROM, the document has to be in multiple parts.
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The Unicode Consortium has the experience in publishing Volume 2.0. We have several additional textual topics. We also have CD-ROM supplementary information. We use a publishing house to get all this done and keep the costs down. We may be able leverage the fact that The Unicode Consortium publication and WG 2 standards are in synchronization. We should explore possibility of coming to some agreement with the Unicode Consortium so that we can have a Normative Reference to the code charts that are published by the Unicode standard. If we can come up with agreement with ITTF being able to reference an industry standard there are some benefits to be gained -- and be able to keep the costs of publications / purchase price down. The code charts and the names are the same. The Unicode Consortium has demonstrated that the document can be published on better quality paper, faster and at a lower cost. We should explore if we can synchronize the ITTF and the Unicode Consortium publication needs. If we solve the question of the code charts using an imaginative approach -- the resulting textual, conformance statements etc. could all be contained in a single document instead of having to publish in multiple parts. This would be preferable. If we have to have parts, the preference should be on plane boundaries.
- d) Professor Kohji Shibano: At the SC 2 plenary - we have to discuss the review of 10646 and its corrigenda. ITTF has already considerations for Electronic Publishing. Existing SC 2 standards are being planned to be scanned into electronic means.
- e) Mr. Alain LaBonté: The French version has been synchronized up to Amendment 5. Canada and France would like to get the French version of the standard synchronized with the next English version -- including all the consolidated amendments. If the Unicode Consortium is volunteering the publication - would they be willing to assist with the French version also? In addition to the names of the characters, the titles of the symbol charts also are in English.
- f) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Only the charts containing the symbols are directly usable. At present the Unicode Consortium does not have the French translations of names. It is not within the scope of the Unicode Consortium as to the translated version of 10646 textual part; if the on-line versions of the French translated names can be made available on the common site it could be referenced.
- g) Mr. Trond Trosterud: Norway's preference is to have paper. The purpose of 10646 is to support all the languages / users of the scripts -- both currently being well served by computers but also by others. These people may not have the means to use CD-ROM.

- h) Mr. Keld Simonsen: I would suggest that we go for a revision of the standard. I have seen some other ISO standards being published as two volumes -- 9945-2 (POSIX) approximately 1200 pages. Publishers such as Addison Wesley - got the rights for ITTF publication of a specific standard -- and were able to produce at a much lower cost. This option is also available.
- i) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: CD-ROM will become a common device on most PCs in the future. It would be probably penalizing those with CD-ROM by making the document available only in paper form.
- j) Dr. Glenn Adams: The number of pages one can produce depends on the quality of printing -- tradeoff between size and legibility. On line versions of each character in the form of .GIF files etc. could also be made available -- and these could be placed on the CD-ROM versions.
- k) Mr. Johan van Wingen: Referencing a different document as a normative text would not be possible from an ISO standard. One could reuse the same publisher as the Unicode to reduce the cost. The preference would be to keep the number of parts to a minimum. If national bodies are going to make these national standards, they may choose to publish only parts that are relevant to them. A single part publication may not be beneficial.
- l) Mr. Mike Ksar: One of the recommendations is that a revision of 10646 be undertaken. We may not be able to decide on up to which amendment to include.
- m) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: There will be a JTC 1 process to reconfirm the revision of 10646. We need not decide up to which amendment at this time.
- n) Mr. S.T. Nandasara: If the publications are on CD-ROM - what would be the format? It is up to ITTF.
- o) Mr. Keld Simonsen: We can recommend to ITTF the format. At this point in time we do not have to tell SC 2 or ITTF - as to at which amendment do we draw the line.

Disposition:

WG 2 recommends to SC 2 that a revision of 10646 be undertaken, in response to the question of reconfirmation of 10646.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.4 (5 year review of 10646):

Unanimous

With reference to the Question from ITTF on the Five Year Review of ISO/IEC 10646-1:1993, WG 2 recommends to SC 2 that a revision of 10646-1:1993 consolidating all corrigenda and amendments approved by 1999-03-31, be undertaken rather than a reconfirmation.

5.5 JTC 1 Electronic Distribution of Documents

Input Documents:

JTC 1/SC 2/N 2931 JTC 1 Policy on Electronic Document Distribution Using the World Wide Web; JTC 1 ad hoc on Implementing IT; 1997-07-17; (same as JTC 1 N4761 of 1997-06-26).

??? JTC 1 / N4576 - Tips and techniques for JTC 1 web pages

Output Document:

1615 Guide for WG 2 document distribution and posting to the SC 2/WG 2 web site; Simonsen, Ksar; 1997-07-03

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kohji Shibano: JTC 1 is encouraging the use of the Internet technology for distribution of documents. In SC 2, because of the current Internet technology status in many countries, we have problems and we will not be able to fully utilize it. Each NB will be asked about their position at the SC 2 plenary.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: The nature of SC 2 business is such that it is not technically feasible yet to be able to use the Internet technology - since we are still talking about characters not yet in supported technologies. Even though current browser technologies can browse GIF files, the accessibility in several countries is a concern. We may have to continue with the paper distribution for some more time.
- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: It may not be an absolute requirement for SC 2 work - however, we may be able to provide GIF files for distribution.

- d) Mr. Keld Simonsen: The new proposals cannot be expected to be in any products implementing the standards yet. GIF files, JPEG files etc. should be the mode of distribution of SC 2 documents. We have distributed, for example, Canadian and other contributions using GIF files -- that can be viewed using browsers of today. We should fully capitalize on existing technology. JTC 1 discussion has accepted HTML as one of the preferred formats for document distribution. JTC 1 secretariat is asking each NB whether the web is being used for distribution of the documents. The model we are doing in WG 2 for example is being followed by JTC 1 also. The JTC 1 IT implementation related documents are available on line from the home page of JTC 1 ad hoc group -- available from url: <http://www.dkuug.dk/jtc1/impit/>.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We had a discussion on formats, the tools etc. What is missing is the process. With paper based distribution, one could go to the stack of paper and pick up the information needed for example for a meeting. Having it on a web site, one may not be able to access these from a meeting site. There is difference between making some documents available (for example web site) versus being distributed. The burden of assembling the necessary information is now being pushed on to individuals. The convener is currently providing the service (useful to ALL members) of compiling the list of contributions and the documents and being sent to the members. The web technology does not provide the equivalent service. The web can be used for archiving and for searching for an existing (previously distributed) document etc. However, it is not a substitute for equivalent of the current distribution of documents - unless someone takes on the responsibility of producing a CD-ROM or equivalent prior to the meeting and appropriate technology is available to everyone attending the meetings.
- f) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: The flow of information between JTC 1 and NBs will be dealt with at the JTC 1 level. Each SC does not have to be concerned with that. Concerning distribution of documents, other organizations maintain a collection of all documents at a common site and is made available for someone to go search and locate etc. This central location for making all documents available is a valuable service.
- g) Mr. Mike Ksar: One thing to keep in mind is that if the original document is NOT provided to the convener in an electronic form, the convener will not be able to scan and convert it to electronic form. The convener also has to maintain control over these documents - the source once given to the convener should not be modified by the originator without the control being maintained. An electronic version should be sent to the convener -- and only these documents can be posted to the web site. Whether we use push / pull technology is another topic of discussion.
- h) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Technology itself is not a big issue. Our concern is that we are dealing with more and more minority characters or with scripts used in geographies where the technologies are not prevalent. It is hard to expect everyone in the world have the same set of tools -- the discussion is about the "implementation of technology" and not the technology itself. We should maintain paper distribution for some more time to come.
- i) Mr. Johan van Wingen: Many NBs do not have the ability to convert electronic versions to paper copy. This has brought new bottlenecks in for example national SC 18s and SC 29s etc.
- j) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: TC 46/SC 2 have similar problems as SC 2. We deal with lots of fonts - we deal with transliteration of characters prepared by SC 2. The secretariat has taken the responsibility to convert the documents to electronic form. Rarely we get electronic versions of the contributions. We have difficulties in converting to electronic form. Use of the web site is also low enough that it is not considered a viable alternative to current paper distribution. JTC 1 has put out policy statements regarding the use of IT. These are very restrictive - need password protection etc. for e-mail discussion, document distribution etc. These aspects make it more difficult to administer. Unless ISO steps up to providing better tools, technologies, copyright policies etc. we will not be able to make it happen. FDISs, DISs etc. have been for example prohibited from wide electronic distribution.
- k) Mr. Keld Simonsen: JTC 1 is going with a policy of web distribution - by 1 September 1997, for all of its SCs including SC 2. We should, as far as possible, operate according

to the JTC 1 policies. If JTC 1 can do it, we should be able to do it also. Almost all WG documents - are defined by JTC 1, as having no need to be protected by passwords and can be distributed freely.

- l) Mr. Michael Everson: I have been making HTML versions of all my WG 2 contributions. I send the hard copy to the convener. The technology itself is there and it can be done. The difficulty is -- how can documents such as N1521 (which has 121 GIF-s in it) be sent to the convener? Should it be sent in zipped form etc. The only concern I have is the logistics of operations as to posting on the web site.
- m) Mr. Mike Ksar: I prefer to have the control in the hands of the convener. The document should be sent to the convener. It should be posted to the web site of WG 2. The links to private web sites should not be in WG 2 contributions.
- n) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: I suggest we should be able to start using the web based distribution in the same time frame as JTC 1.
- o) Mr. Keld Simonsen: We need some guidelines for WG 2 electronic submissions.
- p) Mr. Michel Suignard: The HTML documents sent to the convener should be self-contained. There should not be external links for resources such as GIF-s. Links used for 'extra information' is fine -- but not for the essence of the document.
- q) Mr. Mike Ksar: Possible resolution - encourage contributions be given on diskettes or electronic means to the convener for placing on the WG 2 web site. The convener will continue to print and distribute the documents. The web site will be used for archiving all available electronic versions of the documents.

Ad Hoc Group on Electronic Document Distribution:

An ad hoc group on Electronic Document Distribution met during the meeting and prepared the document N1645. This document was presented by Mr. Keld Simonsen.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: Platform independent forms such as HTML may be preferable than other forms to get from the WG 2 web site. Paper copies will be sent anyway. We had links to Euro site for example as hot links. Should such hot links be converted to only URLs.? If I send the convener a paper with url link to my site would the convener delete that link? For example, can I include my e-mail address?
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: The convener has the right to remove links to private sites. Links to public sites may be left in as hot. Even on paper documents one should have the ISO JTC 1 cover sheet (like the ones being used now by SC 2) with all the requested information in it. E-mail addresses are OK as long as they are in plain text.
- c) Mr. Michel Suignard: HTML is suitable for some types of documents. I seek some precision on which version since HTML is a dynamic target. The same goes for the version numbers to be added to other word processing packages listed. MHTML - is another one which is becoming popular -- (MIME HTML) - is one way of encapsulating the multiple files. If a font is required for some documents -- if it does not exist on the convener's system or on the web site. A lower version of HTML may not be the right choice due to poor formatting.
- d) Mr. Keld Simonsen: This document - N1615 - is building on the JTC 1 document, which does prescribe the version numbers etc. more precisely. There is a hot link to the JTC 1 site for reference indicated in document N1615.
- e) Mr. Mike Ksar: The aim of the document N1615 is to assist the convener as much as the WG 2 members. There is no priority or preference in this listed formats. If I cannot retrieve it or print it I will not be able to do anything with it.
- f) Dr. Umamaheswaran: There is concern about the copyright item. Are we giving it up? In the current paper model the copyrighted documents are given with a paragraph which gives permission for copying and distribution for standardization activities.
- g) Mr. Keld Simonsen: JTC 1 feels that once it is on the web, it should be free to be used anywhere.
- h) Mr. Michel Suignard: The issue may be complicated in the sense for example Fonts etc.
- i) Mr. Mike Ksar: There are no JTC 1 guidelines for the equivalent electronic form.

- j) Dr. Glenn Adams: Paper document model allows requesting and inputting document numbers while preparing the document -- with prior seeking for a document number from the convener. The PDF versions have their advantages - especially for including special fonts. There is a need to be able to add document number in the PDF document.
- k) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The alternative of separating the front cover sheet as plain text and the attachment as a PDF file also exists.
- l) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: I would like to see a structure of the site - to be able to download meeting documents for example prior to meeting. I am also concerned about password protection etc. on documents. If we have documents that contain GIF-s for example code tables, should it contain GIF for individual characters or for the whole code table?
- m) Mr. Mike Ksar: I have no problem at looking at other systems. I do not have an answer for GIF files.
- n) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Adding to the last item - Dr. Joe Becker had at one point started a synopsis of all for all WG 2 proposal documents. Such documents could be accessed better by hot links. It is constrained to the server's resources. As a liaison organization, the Unicode web site should not be categorically excluded. The primary motivation for being cautious on the links - comes from the documents being completely self contained. I share the concern. On the other hand that if one wants to compile a bibliography of documents, it should not be a burden to the creator of such documents. There should be some criterion in that if the referenced document is only a reference and not a part of the contents of the proposal, links would be useful. To deal with this in a categorical manner seems to be being overcautious. There are situations in paper model -- such as references to dictionaries, or other research text books etc. where it may not be readily accessible by the user. Similar situations should be recognized also when we are putting guidelines about hot links.
- o) Mr. Michael Everson: I would like to be able to hot link to WG 2 sites -- can I do it? Will you as convener take a PDF document if it contains a lot of fonts? I would like to get accesses to documents under the category of protected also.
- p) Mr. Mike Ksar: There is a problem of unofficial versions of the various WG 2 documents. Once a document is released to WG 2 - it should be under the control of WG 2. Links to NBs or LOs - sites are quite acceptable. If a document has reference to sites that others cannot get access to - we will have some problems. You can do hot links now - but to the open WG 2 site and not the protected site. I have no objections to adding some a guidelines regarding hotlinks.
- q) Mr. Keld Simonsen: There should be a set of documents in the password protected area per JTC 1 procedure. Not all working documents are classified as OPEN. One could make this also PROTECTED.
- r) Professor Kyongsok Kim: Paragraph 1.2 - seem to indicate that electronic form alone is possible. Both paper copy and electronic form is required in the same paragraph -- some clarification is needed.
- s) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: The ISO council -- even today -- permits distribution of only the Working Drafts etc. in the open and to working groups only. ISO claims Copyright on CDs, DISs etc. Some NBs do sell these in their countries.
- t) Mr. Trond Trosterud: Regarding some of the word processing software listed here - not everyone can use these. If you post it as RTF file from .DOC format etc. then we can retrieve it.
- u) Mr. Michel Suignard: We can make it easier by requesting the submitters to create RTF fomatted file.
- v) Mr. Keld Simonsen: Resolution 9 of ISO TMB - that permits project related material including CDs for world wide distribution. It is on the web page. For the restricted use web site as administrator I can give you user id: sc2wg2 and password TO BE PROVIDED LATER.
- w) Ms. Alexandrina Statescu: Do not forget that Romania does not have web access at this time. Per document SC 2 N2816 - any SC or NB that cannot meet the above guidelines have to send the petition to JTC 1 and indicate how they can step up.

- x) Mr. Mike Ksar: Both electronic and paper forms are required. This document N1615 is for our internal use as a guideline. The submitter may optionally convert the source into RTF format, HTML form etc. I do not intend to convert to RTF format. I will continue to send the paper copy as now.

Disposition:

Accept the guidelines in updated document N1615 - to be produced by Mr. Keld Simonsen addressing concerns raised in the above discussion - for use within WG 2. Attendees are advised to discard all copies of draft N1615 that was distributed prior to the above discussion.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.5 (Electronic documents within WG 2):

Unanimous

WG 2 confirms that it will continue to use paper copies for document distribution. However, it encourages its members to additionally provide the convener with electronic copies for possible postings to the WG 2 web site. WG 2 adopts the set of guidelines in document N1615 for this purpose.

5.6 JTC 1 Ad Hoc on Re-Engineering

Mr. Mike Ksar: There are two documents from JTC 1. One on Technical Directions and the other one on Ad Hoc on Re-engineering. Both relate to work in WG 2. One of the proposals was to combine SC 2 and SC 29. As a result of feedback on the technical directions work, SC 2 will remain an entity by itself, till the conclusion of discussion in a workshop of SC 2, SC 18 and SC 22/WG 20 - by March 1998. The workshop should make recommendations to the next ad hoc meeting on re-engineering to be held in Japan in 1999. We could try and arrange for a workshop at the end of March 98, soon after our next meeting -- if we cannot get the appropriate parties together, we will not be able to meet the JTC 1 deadline. It is an action item on the WG 2 convener and SC 2 chair -- to ensure that the workshop happens. The ad hoc is to address I18N, DSSSL and SC 2. It includes the user interface from Keyboards also.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Alain LaBonté: France had proposed the workshop and Canada had supported it, to host the meeting in France or Canada.
- b) Mr. Johan van Wingen: This is not just a matter for WG 2. We should discuss this matter with others off line and draft a SC 2 position / response.

Action Item:

Mr. Mike Ksar - to get together with SC 2 chair.

6. SC 2 matters

6.1 DAM 9 – Unique Identifiers – Final Text/Disposition of Comments

Input Documents:

- 1526 Final Text of Amendment 9 – Identifiers for Characters; Paterson; 1997-02-21
- 1527 Disposition of Comments Report on Amendment 9 – Identifiers for Characters; Paterson; 1997-02-21
- 1546 Liaison Statement from SC 22 to SC 2/WG 2 on DAM 9; Johan van Wingen; 1997-03-18

DAM 9 - is under ballot in JTC 1 - closes in July 1997.

Comments:

- a) Mr. Johan van Wingen: The liaison statement from SC 22 has not been addressed. Talking to the editor, he had indeed addressed it. I would like to see that a statement be added to the disposition of comments that SC 22 comments were addressed in the DAM text.
- b) Mr. Keld Simonsen: Denmark had addressed several items of the liaison statement. Not sure if a ballot resolution should address Liaison Statements.
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Document N1526 Page 4 - Clause 6.2 Coding of characters -- The new wording of paragraph 1 - is not correct; I can take it off line with Mr. Bruce Paterson.

6.2 PDAM 10 – Ethiopic – Ballot Resolution

Input Documents:

1485	PDAM 10 – Ethiopic; Adams/Paterson; 1996-12-01
1594	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies, Amendment 10 – Ethiopic; SC 2 Secretariat; 1997-06-17
1614	Proposed resolution of Japanese comments on PDAM 10; Unicode; 1997-07-01

Document N1594 contains the summary of voting / table of replies on PDAM 10 on Ethiopic - both the registration and on the PDAM text in SC 2 N 2805. Ethiopic experts are requested to address the different comments in document N1594 and work with the editor on the disposition of comments.

Dr. Glenn Adams prepared document N1614 containing proposed disposition of comments and described its contents.

- a) Negative ballot from Japan - indicated there are missing characters. It is known that the set presented in the PDAM was considered to be a stable set. There have been several proposals for extensions. At this point in time they were not considered stable enough for Ethiopic computing. Document N1614 has specifically addressed the problem identified by Japan and suggested resolutions to the problem.
- b) Greece, in their ballot response, had questioned the inclusion of Ethiopic in the BMP. Ethiopic is a Category A script and therefore is a candidate for BMP.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Takayuki Sato: The missing characters and presentation forms are not issues. A single character's source will be identified - Dr. Glenn Adams has volunteered to find the source. With this explanation, Japan's technical comments have all been addressed adequately, and this will change their negative ballot to positive.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the proposed disposition of comments in document N1614.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.6 (FPDAM-10 - Ethiopic script):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts the disposition of ballot comments in document N1614, and instructs its editor, with the assistance of the Unicode Consortium (Dr. Glenn Adams), to prepare the final disposition of comments and text for DAM-10 on Ethiopic script and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing by October 1997, with the target date of April 1998 for the AM-10 text.

6.3 PDAM 11 – Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics – Ballot Resolution

Input Documents:

1472	PDAM 11 - Unified Canadian Aboriginal Syllabics; Bruce Paterson; 1996-11-20
1595	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies, Amendment 11 – Canadian Syllabics; SC 2 Secretariat; 1997-06-17

Document N1595 - shows approval of PDAM 11, with TWO technical Disapprovals - Netherlands and Ireland. Netherlands voted negative based on 'No market relevance' in Netherlands.

Ireland: Two glyphs need correction and align the collection names in the Block and in the Annex.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: Moving the block to fill the empty position 000. There are some early implementations with the empty position 000.
- b) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Canada's ballot comments have not been included in the table of replies document. Our comments have been captured in Ireland's comments. Canada had also requested for consistency in block names between the table and the annex content. As to the 00 position being blank, Canada's position is that there are current implementations leaving position 00 unused in the block and it is our preference not to move all the characters up by one. We had similar question and comment at the last meeting.
- c) Dr. Asmus Freytag: US - had commented that the code position 00 should not be left blank. US position - could not be accommodated. We could live with the empty position if the Canadian national body can live with it. We should adopt a position that an empty

position at 00 in a block should be avoided unless there is a valid reason for doing so -- such as alignment with an existing code; and is clearly articulated in the initial proposal made to WG 2.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts: Aligning the block name - UNIFIED CANADIAN ABORIGINAL SYLLABICS. and correcting the shapes identified - Ireland / Canada (not in document N1595) - at code positions 14FF and 1512. Disposition of comments document is to be prepared reflecting the above. Accept the proposal to require justification for leaving position 00 in a block empty in future proposals.

Relevant Resolutions:

M33.7 (FPDAM-11 - Canadian Syllabics script): Netherlands Abstained

WG 2 instructs its editor, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), to prepare the disposition of comments on the ballot of PDAM-11, prepare the text for DAM-11, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, by October 1997, with the target date of April 1998 for the AM-11 text taking into account the following agreements:

M33.12 (Empty 00 position in a block): Unanimous

WG 2 emphasizes that proposals for code allocations should not leave position 00 unassigned in each block unless there are compelling documented reasons for doing so. WG 2 further instructs the ad hoc group on principles and procedures to update the standing document on Principles and Procedures accordingly.

6.4 PDAM 12 – Cherokee – Ballot Resolution

Input Documents:

1476 Draft PDAM 12 - Cherokee; Paterson; 1996-12-09
1596 Summary of Voting/Table of Replies, Amendment 12 – Cherokee; SC 2 Secretariat; 1997-06-17

The PDAM has been approved with one negative and two comments.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Netherlands is requested to reconsider their statement of 'No market relevance' when applied to several of the minority scripts. If someone applies the term 'market relevance' in the narrow sense no characters will ever get into 10646. We do have the principles and guidelines, the rationale etc. To assist national body members who review the SC 2 documents but do not attend WG 2 meetings, possibly the proposal summary form can be attached to the PDAM as an informative annex to the document.
- b) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: We are not able to get to the precise criterion as to how a character is determined to be in BMP or elsewhere. We were aware of the procedures - but the national body experts were not able to clearly understand the criteria - especially if a script is totally unknown to the experts in a country.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: We do have our procedures and guidelines document in place. The proposal summary forms, unfortunately, are NOT attached to PDAM etc. National bodies are requested to contact the convener to get additional information on any particular PDAM to help them in reaching informed decisions on any ballot.
- d) Mr. Michel Suignard: It is disturbing to see comments like -- if a character is not in a particular order it will not be accepted. The US proposes to move the proposed code positions up by one, to remove the empty position at 00 in the block.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: It is disturbing that if nationalities or country standards are not attached to a script - people seem to be unwilling to accept in WG 2. As to the names, the user community has been using these names and it may be preferable in this case to respect the user community.
- f) Mr. Michel Everson: Ireland agrees to withdraw our objection to the positions of characters.

Disposition:

The negative from Netherlands cannot be resolved. WG 2 could not accommodate the request for change of name to SYLLABLE from LETTER. WG 2 accepts to move up the proposed code positions by one removing the empty position at position 13A0 - per US comment. The disposition of comments document is to be prepared.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.8 (FPDAM-12 - Cherokee script):

Netherlands Abstained

WG 2 instructs its editor, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), to prepare the disposition of comments on the ballot of PDAM-12, prepare the text for DAM-12, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, by October 1997, with the target date of April 1998 for the AM-12 text. taking into account the following agreement:
Move up the proposed code positions by one removing the empty position at position 13A0.

6.5 DTR 15285 -Character/Glyph Model – Ballot Resolution

Input Documents:

1477 Proposed disposition of comments on Character Glyph Model TR; Hart & Griffee; 1997-01-10
1478 Updated Character Glyph Model Draft TR; Hart & Griffee; 1997-01-10
1586 Proposed text for DTR 15285 – Character Glyph Model; Hart/Griffee; 1997-06-23
1587 Recommended disposition of comments on DTR 15285 – Character Glyph Model; Hart/Griffee; 1997-06-23

Mr. Edwin Hart: Mr. Alan Griffee sends his regrets. Section B.4 has been added to the revised PDTR in document N1586, in response to comments from Netherlands and Japan.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Keld Simonsen: Looks like comments from Denmark has been lost somewhere. In Singapore we had a conclusion.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: Comment from Denmark - were discussed in Singapore and we agreed to include the additional requirements in a future technical report.
- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: The information added from Mr. Peter Lofting - what was the basis for adding it to the DTR. Could you briefly explain this section. It is an elaboration of section 4.
- d) Mr. Edwin Hart: The text was added -- the editors felt that the text would address the concerns implied in some the comments received. The section B.4 describes three main criteria for how a character gets selected for inclusion in a coded character set standard.
- e) Mr. Takayuki Sato: Three of the comments of Japan were not accepted. B.4 - it meets 50 percent of our concerns. As to the response to point 5, we request the comments included in document N1587 be included as an Annex to the DTR.
- f) Mr. Michael Everson and Dr. Asmus Freytag: We would like to find better example to include in the DTR.
- g) Professor Kyongsok Kim: I have some comments on the revised text.
 - i) Section 4, second line - remove the word 'which with one exception'.
 - ii) End of the same paragraph: Change the word 'Character Coding Standards' to 'Standards for Coded Character Sets'.
 - iii) Page 3 - Are we assigning 'code' or 'code position' -- change to position assignments.
 - iv) Page 5, Figure 2 - delete 'character code' inside the box.
- h) Mr. Keld Simonsen: What should we do with CGM comments from Denmark. Denmark is invited to propose an NP for a new TR.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts disposition of comments. Accepts to accommodate the Editorial corrections arising out of the above discussion. Agrees to forward updated PDTR to SC 2 secretariat for further processing.

Action Item:

Denmark is invited to propose an NP for a new TR.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.9 (PDTR 15285 - Character Glyph Model):

China Abstained

WG 2 instructs its editors to prepare the disposition of comments on the ballot of PDTR 15285, prepare the text for DTR 15285, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing, taking into account the comments received on the proposed disposition of comments in document N1586 and the proposed DTR text in document N1587 at WG 2 meeting 33, in July 1997, with the target date of May 1998 for the final TR text.

7. Non-repertoire issues:

7.1 Editorial corrigenda - standing document

Input Document:

1529 Editorial Corrigenda – 3rd Cumulative List – Issue 2 (replaces N1384); Paterson; 1997-02-14

Mr. Bruce Paterson: Document N1529 is an update of the previous version of the Editorial Corrigenda. One entry - regarding 'Hebrew point Mete' in the annotation for 05C3 from source document N1346 - is missing (by oversight).

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Glenn Adams: Regarding 15.1 - on N1470-1: M32.17. There are two potential problems with the text we have agreed to earlier (in document N1470):
 - i) Indic script requires Levels 2 or 3. Why are we placing a restrictive text for Level 1 -- about 'unique representation rule'. I would suggest that we drop the restriction to Level 1.
 - ii) There is an implication in the wording to indicate that somehow a 'composite sequence represents a character', the standard clearly states otherwise. I would take an action item on myself to provide alternate appropriate wording.
- b) Mr. Bruce Paterson: The two Items identified above will pose a change to the agreement in Singapore.
- c) Professor Kyongsok Kim: Item 3344 - on page 3 - is the name of character Square Mayakru correct? No, it should be Mayakuru.

Action Items:

Dr. Glenn Adams / Mr. Bruce Paterson - to fix the wordings per above discussion. All NBs and LOs to comment and feedback on document N1529.

7.2 Revised definition of “collections”

Input Document:

1556 Revised definition of “collections” in ISO/IEC 10646; Paterson; 1997-05-01

Mr. Bruce Paterson: Document N1556 gives the introduction to the problem. The problem has been with us as to - "does the definition of collection change if we add a character within a range covered by the collection identifier"? In Singapore we had a discussion on it. We recognized that we have a need to identify two kinds of collections -- one which is fixed for all time and the other one which may not be fixed.

Document N1556 - has definition of Collection and Dense Collection. Annex A - has been presented with items which have a clause A.1 and an * against each existing collection which is known to be 'dense' (or full). Additional collections 71 and 72 have been added to reflect accepted amendments. New collection 301 (typo in document N1556 -- marked as 310) as a DENSE collection indicating all BMP code positions including Amendment 7. Section A.4 consists of the list of cells corresponding to 3.1. BMP of the first edition -- as it was -- is 299; it is also in the collection ids list and is identified also in A.4.

Another problem identified was regarding the Block Names under clause 19 - and their ordering. We decided to move that information to Annex A. These have been moved to A.2 - ordered according to the block names. A.3 - gives an index of names of scripts - gathered from the Block Names - and shows the collection number in which the name of the script appears.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: This reflects the desire of WG 2 at the Singapore meeting. I would like to thank Mr. Bruce Paterson for developing this based on original contribution from the US.
- b) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The whole annex A is Normative. Would there be a way to indicate sections of this as informative?.
- c) Mr. Bruce Paterson: This may not be a controversial - some clauses may be marked as Informative using a Note - if needed.

- d) Mr. Michel Suignard: The normativeness may be controversial in some cases. Not all scripts are necessarily contained within the blocks etc. Some way of indicating this as non-normative would be needed.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: The editor has certainly done a good job of collecting this information. This list may be correct in what it states - that the terms are used in block names. However, people use the terms without the provisions described in this annex. For example the term IPA may not appear as keyword in the index -- however, it could be wrongly interpreted that IPA is missing Latin characters etc.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: If we change some text in A.3, to indicate that these are keywords that are derived from Block Names and to indicate in a note that names listed in here may cover more than one script. We can cover the exceptions in a note.
- g) Mr. Michael Everson: A note may suffice.
- h) Dr. Asmus Freytag: It looks like people seem to be having in their views that the need is really to answer 'which blocks do I actually use for a given script' rather than 'which block name has a script name in it, as an index of terms. One way is to give instructions of how to do it. Other way is to restrict to terms only. Saying that this is only terms is I believe missing the point that people are looking at it as an aid to a greater purpose.
- i) Mr. Bruce Paterson: Notes proposed by our convener to clarify these via notes may be adequate. TC 46 had requested us to somehow cross relate the scripts to blocks in the BMP - this annex will satisfy their need also.
- j) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: I am confused about the value of the information in this annex. One cannot really have complete information -- for example, 'where are all the characters required by a given script?'. I am not sure if we may be inadvertently leading people to believe that the script may be found only in the blocks. Once we open it up, the follow on question would be why don't you also provide a breakdown based on Languages?
- k) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I agree with the concerns expressed by Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis. If we have to add a note - adding a note that characters may come from some other place also may suffice. IPA block - is a major exception. I would have a less of an objection if exceptions are highlighted -- my preference is still to remove this information completely, comparing the potential confusion created by this versus the information provided.
- l) Mr. Bruce Paterson: To ease the IPA problem, we could easily change to 'IPA extensions' to alleviate the concern of Mr. Michael Everson.
- m) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Is there a way to create an index in ISO standards? Not at present.
- n) Mr. Mike Ksar: I would suggest to create the entire content of A.3 as a Note with clarifications and make it as an informative section. Material in A.3 could be a note to A.1.
- o) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: I would assume that our work group will not be dragged into extension of this note into further breakdown etc. of the terms.
- p) Mr. Bruce Paterson: This is a borderline case between Corrigendum and an Amendment. Which is the right procedure to follow?.
- q) Professor Kohji Shibano: We are planning to have a corrigendum - why don't we plan to include in the next edition of the standard.
- r) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Our discussion is predicated on the basis of proceeding right away. We could have done this as a part of a PDAM we had done earlier. It would be more appropriate to treat this as a Technical Corrigendum. Change 'amended' to 'corrected' in the cover letter.
- s) Mr. Mike Ksar: I share that view and I would suggest processing it as a Technical Corrigendum.

Disposition:

WG 2 agrees to process the changes as a Technical Corrigendum. Editorial changes resulting from above discussion include: Use of the term Keyword; change IPA to IPA Extensions Add a note to state that the names may include more than one script. And make the entire material A.3 to a note to A.1, and make it an informative section.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.10 (DCOR - Collection Identifiers):

Unanimous

WG 2 instructs its editor to prepare a draft technical corrigendum (DCOR) to ISO/IEC 10646-1:1993, and forward it to SC 2 secretariat by October 1997 for further processing, with the target date of May 1998 for the final COR text, based on document N1556 taking into account comments received at WG 2 meeting 33.

7.3 Draft PDAM text for emptying of buckets

Input Document:

1564 Draft PDAM 14 of various additional characters that were in the holding bucket – symbols, etc.; Paterson; 1997-05-27

Mr. Mike Ksar: Document N1564 is in response not to delay processing of characters that we have already accepted. We have several symbols in this document brought together from various sources. As to the symbol names, the names have been aligned with several similar symbols we have in the current edition to bring some consistency into the naming of new symbols with others. For the keyboard symbols the shape is described in the name and the function is added in parenthesis.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Umamaheswaran: We had a request from SC 18/WG 9 yesterday for another symbol. I think WG 2 will be accepting to add one more symbol to the keyboard symbols collection. I suggest we split the keyboard symbols into a separate PDAM.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We understand what the editor is doing with the naming of the symbols. We may need to have an additional review on the names - for example: 2616 - 'Information Symbol'. This is widely used in Europe, but not so in some other countries. I would welcome the opportunity to split the PDAM into two -- to allow us to discuss the other open questions.
- c) Mr. Michel Suignard: Some of the symbols that are in the keyboard set, one could also use in a broader context. Same character may be useable in other contexts. The names of the symbols should be reviewed to make it acceptable in a broader context.
- d) Mr. Bruce Paterson: How would you split the code table now -- we have already agreed on code position allocations in Geneva. If we follow the suggestion of splitting the PDAMs, we will be going out with two PDAMs with holes in one versus the other. Also, remember that we are imposing additional burden on national bodies when we are processing these as small PDAMs. Let us not try to split this up.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We understand the points raised by the editor. We will not suggest moving the code positions from what we have agreed to.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: Editor has spent a lot of time in creating the charts - had to do a lot of cut and paste. Any unnecessary work on the editor should be done only when absolutely required. ITTF has also told us that too many PDAMs is not good for the ISO processing / administration.
- g) Mr. Takayuki Sato: We also had a discussion on the General Variation Mark. We agreed to process it separately. We would also like to have a description of the use of Object Replacement Character.
- h) Mr. Michael Everson: I would be prepared to create the camera ready copy and make the fonts available if we decide to proceed as separate PDAMs.
- i) Mr. Michel Suignard: We are still learning about the bucket processing. This is one of the rare cases - the request was to split into two. On the tools side we are getting better and can assist the editor in creation of the camera ready copy etc.
- j) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: The request to split the keyboard symbols separately may not be putting additional burden on the NBs since these have to be considered by keyboard experts.
- k) Mr. Michael Everson: We are not proposing POSTPONING the keyboard symbols. Some NBs seem to be having problems with some of the symbols. We would propose processing the Keyboard symbols for PDAM processing and the non-controversial ones as FPDAM.

- l) Dr. Asmus Freytag: From the Unicode Consortium perspective - the Object Replacement Character is in wide use and would like to move forward with it. We can provide additional information on use of the Object Replacement Character.
- m) Mr. Bruce Paterson: Where should such a paragraph on information / extra definition should go? Annex D - is on Alternate Format Characters. We could add an extension to deal with such extra definitions.
- n) Mr. Alain LaBonté: I am glad that better fonts could be used to create the Glyphs for Keyboard symbols. The symbols used in the PDAM are not the ones we supplied to WG 2.
- o) Mr. Arnold Winkler: Would this be a PDAM 18? No 19 and 20. We will need another ballot for work item also.
- p) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: We are coding mathematical symbols -- which are presentation variants of several of the existing Greek Alphabet. Why are we coding more and more shapes of Greek characters?
- q) Mr. Mike Ksar: The only reason they are included here is because they are in external standards. An ad hoc could get together to create the textual part for Annex D. We would separate the General Variation Mark into another PDAM. We would separate the keyboard symbols into another PDAM which would including the additional DECIMAL SEPARATOR from document N1548, resolving any differences in the Glyphs to be used in the Standard. We would process an FPDAM containing the rest of the symbols.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts to process -

One FPDAM containing:

2380 - 238C (Technical Symbols); 2614 - 2619 (Miscellaneous Dingbats); 25F0 - 25F7 (Blocks); 21EB - 21F2 (Arrows); 2425 (Control ??)

and, another One PDAM containing:

Keyboard Symbols

For discussion and disposition regarding the General Variation Mark, see section 8.24.4 on page 43.

Relevant Resolutions:

M33.26 (FPDAM on Symbols and Other collections):

Unanimous

WG 2 instructs its editor to prepare a sub division proposal, registration proposal and FPDAM text and forward them to SC 2 secretariat for simultaneous processing, containing the set of characters in document N1626 (extracted from document N1564), and the characters accepted in resolutions M33.21 (see section 8.19 on page 38), M33.22 (see section 8.23 on page 40), M33.23 (see section 8.24.3 on page 42), M33.24 (see section 8.24.5 on page 44) and M33.25 (see section 8.24.6 on page 46).

RESOLUTION M33.27 (PDAM on Keyboard symbols):

Unanimous

WG 2 instructs its editor to prepare a work item proposal, registration proposal and PDAM text and forward them to SC 2 secretariat for simultaneous processing, containing the set of keyboard symbols in document N1625 (extracted from document N1564) and the character accepted in resolution M33.20 (see section 11.6 on page 52).

7.4 Naming of characters – Norway

Input Document:

1518 Naming of Characters ISO/IEC 10646-1; Norway; 1996-12-10

Mr. Trond Trosterud: I had informed TC 37 regarding the divergence between ISO/IEC 14567 and ISO 12199 -- two standards on sort, both referencing ISO/IEC 10646. Mr. Havard Hjulstad has prepared the response -- titled Naming of Characters ISO/IEC 10646-1.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: To accommodate naming related clarifications where necessary, 10646 has Annex P to add annotations. Name changes for existing characters is NOT allowed in 10646.
- b) Mr. Michel Suignard: Annex P should be used also in a sparing manner - as an exception. Things like CAPITAL versus UPPERCASE are just preferences.

- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: Last paragraph refers to a few letters that are not in 10646. If there is a requirement for new characters these should be submitted using proposal summary form -- for example 'dashes'.
- d) Mr. Johan van Wingen: This document causes confusion. If the ordering standard is not meant for electronic sorting - then this paper is irrelevant. If it is meant for electronic sorting, ISO/IEC 14651 should be used. For ordering even superscript and subscript characters are being distinguished. Norwegian delegates should be left to sort out the problems first.
- e) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: In paragraph 4, there is some confusion as to what is meant. Marks used for transliteration purposes and constructed characters -- a warning that these characters should not be included in standards such as Sorting. TC 46/SC 2 is carefully investigating whether some of the characters needed for Transliteration are really needed in the coded character standards.
- f) Mr. Trond Trosterud: The background for this paper was TC 37/SC2/WG 3 - to contact all other committees etc. This document has not been discussed in Norway itself. ISO 12199 claims that it is NOT for electronic sorting and doing almost all that an electronic sorting should do. This document should be taken as an information document.

Disposition:

SC 2 WG 2 cannot do anything about this paper. Norway may request TC 37/SC2/WG3 to stop the work on ISO/IEC 12199.

7.5 Roadmap to plane 1 - Everson

Input Documents:

1520 Roadmap to the BMP of ISO 10646; Everson, Ireland; 1997-03-01
 1558 Roadmap to Plane 1 of ISO 10646; Everson; 1997-03-01

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1520 contains a graphical representation in HTML the same information as in document N1499 for the BMP. Perhaps this document will be useful to be added as part of the standing document on roadmap guidelines. Document N1558 is for information of the committee reflecting the several of the scripts proposed for Plane 1 and are being worked on currently. I would like to know if a graphical representation of the Roadmap document would be useful.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Glenn Adams: The title of the document may lead to potential confusion that this document subsumes the previous Road Map document -- you may want to change the title to reflect that this is an aid. There are also some differences in the order between documents N1499 and N1520. These need to be corrected -- changes have been made giving the impression that this is a new road map. Notes about colours -- looks OK on screen but not on paper.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I would like to emphasize that we have an agreed upon Road Map in this committee, and we should not be entertaining changes. I would like to know if there are substantial differences.
- c) Mr. Michel Suignard: We should not confuse the issue that we seem to be coming up with a new road map. These should not be confused as if they are conflicting document.
- d) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The title of the document can be changed to 'a graphical view of road map' -- and then it could be included In the principles and procedures document.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The graphical and textual version of the road map should be in synchronization.
- f) Mr. Mike Ksar: The graphical representation of the road map is a good idea. This representation should be brought in synchronization with the accepted text for BMP roadmap. Then it can be included in the principles and procedures document. We will do this for Plane 0 only at this meeting. We will postpone the decision for Plane 1.

Action Items:

Mr. Michael Everson is invited to update his graphical view of the road map document ensuring that it is in synchronism with the road map text in the principles and procedures document and assist Mr. Sven Thygesen in incorporating it into the guidelines in principles and procedures, currently document N1502.

7.6 Principles and Procedures

Input Document:

1583 UTC # 72 resolutions; Unicode; 1997-06-30

Dr. Asmus Freytag / Dr. Glenn Adams: Referring to document N1583, item Motion 72.18 - Block Assignment Rules. So far we have followed the rule of starting at block boundaries of 128 code positions each. There are some cases, for example the IPA extensions, where the script may be large and will cross the 128 block boundaries. Also, a core part may be in one area and the extension is preferable to be in the same as the core part. If any one is interested in the compression algorithm - technical report (wherein such block assignment rule becomes advantageous) it can be made available on request.

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kyongsok Kim: I have difficulty in the statement 'high frequency characters' should be within the first 128 and others outside? If we have 140 characters, high frequency seems to be given preference than their natural order in the script.
- b) Dr. Glenn Adams: We can modify the statement to clarify that the high frequency criterion is to be used if neither natural ordering nor any other criterion is preferred for a script.
- c) Mr. Keld Simonsen: Will there be a conflict with the proposed graphic contribution to road map? No.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the proposal for Block Assignment Guideline with changes. The ad hoc on principles and procedures is to reflect this in the procedures document.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.11 (Block Assignment Guideline):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts the request to add Block Assignment Guideline (see document N1583 - item 72.18) with the qualification that the high frequency occurrence criterion be used when no other overriding criterion exists. WG 2 further instructs the ad hoc group on principles and procedures to update the standing document on Principles and Procedures accordingly.

8. Repertoire issues

8.1 Repertoire Additions – Cumulative List No. 5

Input Document:

1528 Repertoire Additions – Cumulative List No. 5 (replaces N1385); Paterson; 1997-02-12

Mr. Bruce Paterson: explained the content of document N1528. At the end of this meeting this list needs to be updated. It contains the new collection numbers assigned as they are being assigned.

Action Item:

NBs and LOs are to review and feedback.

8.2 Revisit Roadmap guideline document - BMP

Input Documents:

1499 BMP and Supplementary Planes Allocation Roadmap; U.S.; 1996-12-27

1520 Roadmap to the BMP of ISO 10646; Everson, Ireland; 1997-03-01

(See discussion under item section 7.5 on page 26.)

8.3 Byzantine Musical Symbols

Input Document:

1208	List of Greek (Byzantine) musical notation system for inclusion in 10646; ELOT; 1995-03-30
1375	Revised Proposal - Repertoire of Greek Byzantine Musical Notation System; ELOT; 1996-04-16
1582	3rd revision for proposal of repertoire of Greek Byzantine Music Notation System; ELOT; 1997-06-11

Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: The document N1582 contains the third revision of the Byzantine Musical Symbols proposal. The repertoire is stable now. The national committee of Greece consists of members from both industry and public domain. The national character sets committee could not decide where to code the repertoire. We will leave it to WG 2. Documents N1208 and N1375 contain all the background information. Document N1582 contains only the English translation of the draft ELOT 1373 standard. Some minor changes to the names have been made. Double allocation -- upper and lower -- has been removed. The glyphs have not yet been fine tuned -- awaiting decision to include this set in 10646.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: ELOT has been responding to the various comments and feedback from WG 2. This proposal should be considered by WG 2.
- b) Mr. Michel Suignard: It would be easier / faster to accept if the repertoire is put into plane 1. Has the repertoire changed? Is there any way to capture the U, M and L concept in 10646.
- c) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: We have accommodated the comments received in Copenhagen. There were notes about specific characters that could go into lower, middle or upper stripe. We have removed the potential multiple appearance of a character in the code table. The rule as to where the stripe appears -- whether it is a habit / custom -- was not really a rule. It was decided that the position was fixed for characters. Other than that the repertoire has not been changed.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: A question of clarification - we are not sure if the characters are combining or not. What would be implementation level you would see? While we do not have objection in principle, for inclusion in plane 1, I would be careful about the thoroughness -- especially because of the size of the repertoire. For example in section 5.3.2, there are mentions of combining symbols. One could use the name above, below etc. in the name.
- e) Dr. Glenn Adams: Are the names per Annex K conventions? If a dotted circles are added where would one place the character? If there is no dual position possibility, a dotted circle and relative positioning would suffice. Would these characters be Level 2 or Level 3?
- f) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: The circles on combining characters are to be added to the glyphs. Every character in U or L position is combining. The U M and L information was given for characters. Where the characters are potentially confusing, specific positioning is described. When they are fixed, the relative position with the dotted circles will clarify. There are NO characters that can go Both BELOW or ABOVE some other character. Each one has its own a specific place. Initial proposal would be Level 2 or Level 3. We could live with Level 3.
- g) Mr. Michael Everson: 10646 by itself does not provide information such as U, M or L. I am not sure as to what kind of information needs to be added.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the repertoire of 246 Greek Byzantine Musical Symbols in document N1582 based on documents N1208 and N1375 with the following:

- a. to identify in the code table which of the characters are combining using dotted circles
- b. this collection will use implementation Level 3
- c. for encoding in Plane 1
- d. code positions to be finalized at a later date; suggested starting at position B000 in Plane 1.
Note: the starting code position was changed to D000 during the adoption of resolution M33.13, based on an ad hoc discussion among some experts.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.13 (Greek Byzantine Musical signs):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts the repertoire of 246 Greek Byzantine Musical signs proposed in document N1582 (based on documents N1208 and N1375) with the following changes:

- a. combining characters are to be shown in the code tables with dotted circles
- b. provisional code positions will be in plane 1 starting at D000.

This repertoire will be held in a collection of characters to be encoded in the future part 2 of ISO/IEC 10646.

8.4 Braille – proposed PDAM text

Input Documents:

1541 Proposed PDAM text for Braille; Everson; 1997-03-11

1612 Results of Braille ad hoc; Ireland, Austria, Japan, US, Unicode; 1997-07-01

An ad hoc committee on Braille:

An ad hoc committee met to resolve the differences between the SC 2 PDAM on Braille and DIS 11548 from TC 173.

Dr. Peters Jonas: See document N1612 - ad hoc group report for details. TC 173 defined DIS 11548-1 and -2, and SC 2 PDAM on Braille --were out of alignment. The ad hoc recommendation is to produce a modified PDAM text with changes to character names and arrangements to more closely align the SC 2 document with the DIS 11548. The glyph of each dot pattern will also include a white circle (for absent dot) or filled circle (for present dot). TC 173 intends to have a normative reference to the amendment from SC 2. An explanation of the numbering system can be found only in TC 173 text.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We accepted the name changes - because the name can communicate the character's bit pattern better to users of Braille. We had used a computer generated algorithm for generating the dot patterns, we were informed that the community is more familiar with 6 dots as the first set versus 8 dots and is more convenient to the user community. We are sticking with the principle that the code position only refers to the dot pattern. The relationship between the dot pattern and the different user communities will be done by TC 173 and is outside the scope of SC 2. The assignment of meaning to each dot pattern is in the domain of TC 173. This is not only the best proposal - but it is also the final one. Because we had the cooperation of the user -- I would suggest we go for a FPDAM ballot on this.
- b) Mr. Michael Everson: Should the PDAM text have a normative reference to the TC 173 standard?
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: Yes. We should include the document as a reference in the PDAM text. The total number of characters is still 256. We are lucky that this time we were able to get in touch with the user community (TC 173) -- publication of the PDAM has brought the attention of the user community.
- d) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: Would it be possible to have a PUNCHED CARD version of the code table -- i.e. in Braille?
- e) Mr. Erich Schmid: We have a copy of DIS 11548 in Braille. Document N1588 contains the repertoire of 11548. The PDAM text can also be produced in Braille when it is used in TC 173.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the changes to PDAM text proposed by the ad-hoc on Braille. WG 2 agrees to proceed with an FPDAM with new text. Mr. Michael Everson volunteered to assist the editor in preparing the FPDAM text.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.14 (FPDAM-16 - Braille patterns):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts 256 characters, their names and their shapes in the report of the ad hoc group on Braille patterns in document N1612, with code positions in the range 2800 to 28FF in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create FPDAM text, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), based on document N1624, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing by September 1997, with target date of May 1998 for DAM-16 text and October 1998 for the final AM-16 text.

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1603

Unconfirmed Minutes

1997-10-24

Meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 1997-06-30/07-04

Page 29 of 63

8.5 Runic – proposed PDAM text

Input Documents:

1330	Final Draft - Runic Characters in 10646; ITS, ISO Runes Project; 1996-03-07
1382	Runic Script - Proposed correction to character name; Sweden; 1996-04-25
1417	Runic Proposal Update; Sweden; 1996-07-17
1542	Proposed PDAM text for Runic; Everson; 1997-03-27

Output Document:

1620	Runic Proposal Update; Everson; 1997-07-03
------	--

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Glenn Adams: We should not be entertaining this text as a PDAM text. The repertoire is still being contested -- three characters need clarification. We have not agreed on the code position assignment.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: Rename the contribution to be 'additional contribution on Runic', even though the contribution can be in the form of a PDAM text to assist the editor.
- c) Ms. Wera Lundström: Some shape of characters in document N1542 are to be fixed. Mr. Michael Everson has agreed to change to what was in original contribution. Some of the characters should not be included. Sweden still feels that Annex P should contain information on Runic, and it would be useful to non-Runic users. In the interest of progressing the topic into the standards we probably may not insist on it. However we would like to have a discussion on the purpose and use of Annex P.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: Regarding Annex P, WG 2's position is not to open up Annex P for script-related information. I would suggest progressing the Repertoire, Coding etc. as a separate part, and discuss the Annex P naming related items as another part.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: At this point in time the names, shapes and code tables are stable enough to go ahead with it and the Annex P issues can be discussed separately.
- f) Dr. Glenn Adams: The Unicode Technical Committee had discussions and we are satisfied we can go without unifying three punctuation marks. As to Annex P related additional information, the Unicode Consortium is more than willing to include the relevant information and possibly more into the Unicode documentation.
- g) Ms. Wera Lundström: We appreciate your opinion, and we appreciate that the Unicode Consortium is willing to add information on Runic (such as that proposed for Annex P). I will have to take this back to Runic experts.
- h) Mr. Mike Ksar: We accept the repertoire, code table etc.
- i) Mr. Michael Everson: Three characters had different glyphs - original glyphs were agreed to by the Unicode Consortium representatives.
- j) Mr. Karl Ivar Larsson: Mr. Olle Järnefors is not working with Swedish standardization any more. Glyphs that are in document N1542 do not look like what were presented by the Runic interest group in document N1330. I do not know the answer to the question about the fonts.
- k) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Submitting documents with glyphs in one style is one thing - one cannot assume that the paper copy submitted can be used directly for publishing. If Sweden is willing to assist in preparation of the code tables for the final PDAM then it will be helpful. Will they be willing to assist?
- l) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Are there only three character glyphs in question or the entire set.
- m) Mr. Michael Everson: It is simple - if the font style used in the contribution is the problem we can use the style from Sweden.
- n) Mr. Mike Ksar: If Sweden can provide the fonts by August 15th we will use their fonts. Otherwise we will proceed with what we have (with Mr. Michael Everson).

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the repertoire in document N1542 on Runic script; assigns code positions 16A0 to 16FF to the script; restores character shapes of three characters to what they were in the original Swedish proposal in document N1330; the collection number will be assigned by the editor (will not be 80; 80 has been assigned already). Mr. Michael Everson has volunteered to produce a revised proposed PDAM text - this will be document N1620. (Note that the date for providing fonts by Sweden, was changed from 15 August 1997 to 15 October 1997, at Sweden's request, during the discussion on adopting the relevant resolution).

Relevant Resolution:

M33.15 (Runic script):

Turkey, Ireland, Netherlands abstained

WG 2 accepts the repertoire of 81 characters for Runic script, their shapes and their names proposed in document N1542 for encoding in the range 16A0 through 16FF in the BMP. The shapes are to be changed to look like those in document N1330, using fonts to be provided by Sweden by 15 October 1997. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create a new sub division proposal, registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from Sweden and Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing.

8.6 Ogham – proposed PDAM text

Input Documents:

1543 Proposed PDAM text for Ogham; Everson; 1997-03-27
1577 Results of National Enquiry on Ogham; Everson; 1997-05-30

Output Document:

1610 Ogham updated during meeting 33; Everson; 1997-07-02

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1577 contains the results of a National Enquiry in Ireland on Ogham. Three more characters were identified as required in addition to earlier proposal. Ireland is proposing adding these three characters to the accepted repertoire and for coding. Our request is to progress this script to its conclusion at the earliest.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Glenn Adams: Why should we have an unused position at column 00A0?
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: If document N1577 is an update of document N1543, a reference to the older document is warranted showing any differences between the old and the new document. It would be helpful to explain the layout on page 2.
- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: Document N1543 has the title PDAM text. It will be useful to mark the code positions as PROPOSED code positions, till WG 2 has made the allocations -- because many people look at WG 2 papers and implementations may wrongly assume that these code positions are accepted. Why LACUNA mark cannot be unified with Ellipsis? Why the term MARK has been used? I would like to see justification / answers for these two questions.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: Ireland has requested for additional 3 characters - WG 2 would like to examine this further.
- e) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The repertoire has not been stable since the last time. One could argue also that the names are also not stable. You should permit this committee to exercise a reasonable amount of caution in view of this instability. If you had this reviewed with other national bodies ahead of time - there will be smoother passage. The Unicode Technical Committee has not had discussions on this topic.
- f) Mr. Michel Suignard: In earlier proposal there were no proposed allocations.
- g) Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1502R has potential location identified. It has been discussed with other experts including some from Unicode.
- h) Mr. Mike Ksar: This document was sent in after the WG 2 deadline in April. This document has been tabled. There are members of WG 2 who have not seen this particular contribution till today. I must point out that there is still some uncertainty between proposals.
- i) Mr. Michael Everson: The name of one of the characters has been corrected to FERN. We could also make the comments re: correction of name spelling during the ballot commenting.

- j) Mr. Michel Suignard: Update document N1543 with what is in document N1547 - and we may be done.
- k) Mr. Keld Simonsen: When we go to a PDAM stage - we need a technically stable document.

Ad hoc group on Ogham script:

An ad hoc group - with Messrs. Michael Everson, Glenn Adams, Keld Simonsen and Erkki Kolehmainen volunteering to participate -- discussed outstanding concerns / questions.

Mr. Michael Everson: Ireland agrees to use modern names for the characters, to the unification of Ellipsis; and removal of blank at x00. Some other reshuffling of code positions were also agreed to. A revised contribution will be presented (document N1610).

Disposition:

WG 2 agrees to accept the ad-hoc group's consensus: agreed to addition of two characters to the previously agreed upon Ogham repertoire; with revised spelling for character names; with code positions 1680 to 169F in the BMP. WG 2 agreed to progress the script as a new FPDAM with document N1610 as proposed text. Mr. Michael Everson volunteered to assist the editor in preparing the FPDAM text.

Action item:

Request SC 2 to approve the sub-division and registration for an FPDAM.

Relevant Resolution:

<i>M33.16 (Ogham script):</i>	Netherlands abstained
WG 2 accepts the repertoire of 29 characters for Ogham script, their shapes and their names proposed in document N1610 for encoding in the range 1680 through 169F in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create a sub division proposal, registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing	

8.7 Sinhala script

Input Documents:

- 1473 Proposal for encoding the Sinhalese script in 10646; Michel Everson; 1996-10-26
- 1480 Request to add Sinhalese to 10646 based on recent Sinhalese Standard (SLS 1134-1996); Sri Lanka Standards Institution; 1996-11-15
- 1532 Comment on Sri Lanka Proposal for Sinhala Script; Hugh McG Ross, U.K.; 1997-03-07
- 1584 Feedback on Sinhala Script Proposals (N1480, N1473R, etc.); Glenn Adams; 1997-06-30
- 1585 Towards Standard Sinhala Character Code; J. B. Disanayaka; 1997-06-25
- 1589 Mapping of Sinhala from 10646 to SLS 1134; Everson; 1997-06-13

Output Document:

- 1613 Results of Sinhala ad hoc; Sri Lanka, U.S. Ireland, Unicode; 1997-07-01

An ad hoc group on Sinhala script:

An ad hoc group met on Sinhala on Monday and Tuesday PM. Document N1613 - contains the ad hoc group meeting report.

Mr. J.B. Disanayaka thanked the participants of the ad hoc meeting in helping arriving at a final proposal. Document N1613 contains the code table, and the character names.

Dr. Glenn Adams: The repertoire is stable. There may be other characters added in the future - pending further study. The proposed layout maintains identical layout to the current Sri Lankan standard - and is compatible with that. We have by convention used blocks of 128 for scripts and the remaining positions in the code table are left vacant. The character name (position not used) should be changed to what is in the current standard for similar unused positions. The collection number should be assigned in the PDAM text -- by the editor.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: Have we a collection number? Why are there holes in the standard?
- b) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: I see control characters such as those mentioned in the encoding principles are in 10646. I am concerned by the presence of control characters in areas traditionally reserved for graphic characters.
- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: 'Alternate format characters' is the term that we have been using in the standard. We have not included several control characters from the Sri Lankan standard

- in 10646. We have other characters such as Virama which act as control characters in the standard.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: The point raised by Greece is valid. The expectation should be set that the control characters are NOT candidates for inclusion in the standard. The intent is NOT to include these in the standard. We should re-use the alternate format characters.
 - e) Mr. Michael Everson: Ireland's concern were sufficiency for supporting the Pali scriptures. The other aspect was the order of characters - the current ordering in Sri Lankan standard was important to them. At least my points have been heard and understood.
 - f) Mr. Johan van Wingen: I would like to know how many NBs will be supportive of this new sub division? A show of hands indicated six national bodies in support.
 - g) Mr. Mike Ksar: The point raised by Mr. Johan van Wingen is important -- support from as many national bodies be sought on every script -- even though it may not be interested in the script.
 - h) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: Five P members have to - agree to the work item and agree to participate in the work item. I would like to emphasize that it is important for NBs to consider participation question also positively - otherwise the work item can be disapproved. If a work item fails it can still be processed further by having NB consensus at a meeting.
 - i) Professor Kohji Shibano: JTC 1 procedures are slightly different from ISO procedures in this regard.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the output from the ad hoc on Sinhala script; accepts the repertoire, character glyphs, and names (with changes); with code positions in the range 0D80 to 0DFF; and to process it as FPDAM. Dr. Glenn Adams (the Unicode Consortium) volunteered to assist.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.17 (Sinhala script):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts 80 characters, their shapes, and their names in the report of the ad hoc group on Sinhala script in document N1613, and assigns them to code positions in the range 0D80 to 0DFF in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create a new sub division item proposal, registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from the Unicode Consortium (Dr. Glenn Adams), based on document N1613, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing.

8.8 Yi Script – proposed code table / names

Input Documents:

- 1531 Yi Coding Table and Name List – 1st Printing Pass; Mao Yong Gang; 1997-03-19
- 1608 Yi Script high quality code tables and names; China; 1997-06-20
- 1611 Yi Radical high quality text for PDAM; China; 1997-06-20

Mr. Mao Yong Gang: Document N1531 was prepared by China as PDAM text per Singapore resolution. Feedback was received from Mr. Hugh Ross. Document N1608 contains the high quality printed text for PDAM on Yi script. We have incorporated feedback -- revised the names based on input from Ireland and the Unicode Consortium. Document N1609 has the Yi Radical set.

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kohji Shibano: SC 2 ballot on Yi script - sub division of work has been approved. Can we meet the target date of September 97? If we process it as a FPDAM, no comments on technical matters is permitted. Is this document ready for PDAM or FPDAM?
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: WG 2 will take a decision on whether the document is ready for processing as a PDAM or FPDAM? JTC 1 procedures - permit a PDAM and a FPDAM ballot. Three month period for PDAM and four month for FPDAM.
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: Would like to take a look in detail at the latest draft PDAM. Would prefer PDAM.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The group here is facing a different number of Radicals that what we have seen in Singapore. Going out as a FPDAM is probably not in order. Contributions such as a SINGLE CHARACTER etc. would be candidate as FPDAM - not for large

- scripts which probably need further study. The Unicode Consortium - would like to study the Yi proposal more carefully.
- e) Mr. Mao Yong Gang: We have NOT changed the repertoire of characters. The names are also not changed. The code table had some errors and have been fixed. The Yi Script has NOT changed. We just incorporated the input from Ireland and the Unicode Consortium on naming convention. Document N1531 had a character missing from what we had agreed to in Singapore.
 - f) Mr. Michael Everson: It seems clear that Yi script can go ahead as a FPDAM. We would study the Radicals part of it.
 - g) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We can verify that document N1608 has 1165 characters. As to document N1609 - we need to allow for review during the next stage of processing. I would prefer the Radicals not go for FPDAM - it can go for PDAM. The repertoire of Radicals is subject to review -- there is still some question as to whether some unification has been done or not?
 - h) Mr. Mike Ksar: Let us split the question into two:
 - i) Yi-Script - is it ready go for FPDAM?
 - a) Ireland, Unicode - only PDAM.
 - ii) Radicals - are they mature enough for processing as PDAM?
 - a) Ireland - YES. The Unicode Consortium. We are willing to go ahead with some reservation that we can propose changes to Radicals set.
 - i) Dr. Umamaheswaran: If there is some doubt on the repertoire of Radical set, WG 2 should perhaps not go ahead with the set as even a PDAM. There is a risk that the repertoire can change and we should be careful in moving ahead if there is some uncertainty.
 - j) Mr. Mao Yong Gang: We have had discussions with other experts on the topic of Radical set. We are confident that it is stable enough that we go ahead.
 - k) Mr. Mike Ksar: We should be aware that if there are some technical comments received during the PDAM processing - there will be additional delays.
 - l) Dr. Glenn Adams: Need some clarification - as to change in procedure between previous Ethiopic and the new ones under discussion. I have as much confidence in Yi proposals as we had in Ethiopic and Canadian Syllabics etc.
 - m) Professor Kohji Shibano: We can have technical comments at FPDAM stage. The only constraint is that at the DIS stage - NO TECHNICAL COMMENTS are ALLOWED. We can have as many FPDAMs as we need.
 - n) Mr. Mike Ksar: The difference between old and new - we had 3 month CD and 6 month DIS ballot. -- new: 3 month proposed CD, 4 month proposed final CD and 6 month DIS stage. If we had technical comments we need editing meetings. An ad hoc on Yi can advise us as to whether we are ready to go ahead with this as a PDAM or FPDAM or not. SC 2 N2815 - is the new JTC 1 procedures document.

Ad hoc on Yi-script and Radicals:

An ad hoc group on Yi script and Yi Radicals met and recommended to combine the Yi-script and Yi-radicals into a single PDAM and process it at this time as a PDAM and not FPDAM.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts to combine the Yi-script and Yi radicals proposal into a combined PDAM text and proceed with further processing. Mr. Michael Everson and Mr. Mao Yong Gang volunteered to assist the editor in the preparation of the PDAM text.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.18 (Yi script and Yi radicals):	Unanimous
WG 2 accepts:	
1165 characters, their shapes and names in document N1608 for the Yi script, and their assignment to code positions in the range A000 to A48C in the BMP,	
and	
57 characters (Note: 18 more than in resolution M32.8), their shapes and names in document N1611 for the Yi radicals, and their assignment to code positions in the range A490 to A4C8 in the BMP.	
WG 2 further instructs its editor to create PDAM text, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson) and China (Mr. Mao Yong Gang), based on documents N1608 and N1611, and forward these to SC 2 secretariat for further processing.	

8.9 Indic Scripts – private use zone

Input Document:

1533 Simplification of Use of Indic Scripts; Hugh McG Ross, U.K.; 1997-03-14

This document was not discussed. See discussion and relevant resolution M33.19 (Policy on PU zone) under section 8.12 on page 35.

8.10 Thai and Lao Scripts – private use zone

Input Document:

1534 Entity Coding of Thai and Lao Scripts; Hugh McG Ross, U.K.; 1997-03-03

This document was not discussed. See discussion and relevant resolution M33.19 (Policy on PU zone) under section 8.12 on page 35.

8.11 African including Yoruba – private use zone

Input Document:

1535 Simple Use of ISO 10646 for African Languages; Hugh McG Ross, U.K.; 1997-02-25

This document was not discussed. See discussion and relevant resolution M33.19 (Policy on PU zone) under section 8.12 on page 35.

8.12 Romanian & Latvian – private use zone

Input Documents:

1507 Comment on Romanian issues concerning characters S & T with Cedilla/Comma; Michel Suignard, U.S.; 1996-12-06

1536 Simple Way to Write Romanian & Latvian Correctly; Hugh McG Ross, U.K.; 1997-03-03

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: These contributions are all proposals for adding code positions in PU zone. Suggest that these should not be discussed by WG 2.
- b) Mr. Johan van Wingen: I support the suggestion by the convener.
- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: There are some valuable background information in these documents and could be used for discussion on related other documents.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We should probably take a resolution to reconfirm / reiterate that PU zone is outside the encoding.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: These documents are for information probably - Mr. Ross did not expect this to be treated by WG 2.

Disposition:

WG 2 agreed to reiterate that WG 2 will not entertain any proposal for including characters in PU zones. PU zones are reserved for PU only.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.19 (Policy on PU zone):

Unanimous

WG 2 emphasizes that no technical contributions regarding usage of Private Use zones in the standard will be entertained by WG 2.

8.13 Burmese

Input Document:

1523 Proposal for encoding the Burmese script in ISO 10646; Hugh Ross, UK; 1997-01-22

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1523 is tabled for feedback from interested parties.

Action Item:

All NBs and LOs to review and feedback.

8.14 Khmer

Input Document:

1524 Proposal for encoding the Khmer script; Everson, Ireland; 1997-01-22

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1524 is tabled for feedback from interested parties.

Action Item:

All NBs and LOs to review and feedback.

8.15 Tibetan Extensions

Input Document:

1525 Withdrawn; ; 1997-07-01

Discussion:

Dr. Glenn Adams: Document N1525 - has also proposal for use of PU zones. This should be treated the same as the other contributions on PU. There are also insinuations about not having enough consultations with Tibetan experts etc.

Mr. Michael Everson: I do not subscribe to the PU zone use.

Disposition:

See discussion and relevant resolution M33.19 (Policy on PU zone) under section 8.12 on page 35. This document will not be kept as part of the WG 2 list of documents. It will be struck because of insinuating paragraphs which have no place in technical contributions.

Action Item:

All NBs, LOs and expert contributors are requested to take note that insinuations and innuendoes of personal nature will not be acceptable in technical contributions made to WG 2.

8.16 Thaana

Input Document:

1519 Proposal for encoding the Thaana script; Everson, Ireland; 1997-03-01

Mr. Michael Everson: Document N1519 is tabled for feedback from interested parties.

Action Item:

All NBs and LOs to review and feedback.

8.17 Korean Bangjeom and Gugyeol characters

Input Documents:

935 Adding two Bangjeom chars (Old Hangul tone marks) to UCS-2; Kyongsok Kim Korea; 1993-10-29

936 A draft proposal on adding Gugyeol characters to UCS-2; Kyongsok Kim Korea; 1993-10-29

1599 Proposal Summary form for two Bangjeom characters (Old Hangul tone marks); Korea; 1997-06-30

1606 Korean proposal on Gugyeol, reference N 936; Korea; 1997-06-30

8.17.1 Bangjeom

Professor Kyongsok Kim: Document N1599 contains the proposal summary form; document N935 (attached) has the relevant background information. There are two alternatives -- leave the existing ones and change their properties to be non-combining characters. If it cannot be done add two new non-combining characters.

Action Item:

All NBs and LOs to review and feedback.

8.17.2 Gugyeol

Document N1606 - is in response to an action item on Professor Kyongsok Kim. At the time of writing N1606 (??), the Korean NB had decided to get some more information to finalize our proposal.

Action Item:

Korea is invited to make a proposal when they have decided on Gugyeol characters. Do not carry forward to next meeting till we hear from Korea.

8.18 Mongolian – feedback on ad hoc report N1515**Input Documents:**

1515 Report of ad hoc on Mongolian encoding proposal; United Nations University, China and Unicode ; 1997-01-23
1583 UTC # 72 resolutions; Unicode; 1997-06-30
1607 Mongolian proposal review; China; 1997-06-20

Output Document:

1622 Feedback and issues in Mongolian document N1515; Oliver Corf; 1997-07-03

Mr. Mao Yong Gang: Document N1607 - This is a report on the proposal document N1515 - we have received some feedback on the document There was a brief discussion at the TC 46 meeting in London. Germany, Mongolia, Ireland, UNU and China were there. There are different opinions on the subject.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Oliver Corf: There are several technical problems that have been identified in this report. An ad hoc experts meeting is needed to deal with the problems.
- b) Dr. Glenn Adams: I would like to see if a document summarizing the problems encountered from Germany. Document N1583 proposes some points to be considered by the work group. (Subsequently Mr. Oliver Corf prepared document N1622.)
- c) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: TC 46/SC2 had a lengthy Mongolian discussion in London. Based on that I am not sure we should proceed with this subject at this time.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I would like to request people engaged in TC 46/SC2 consider keeping the Unicode Technical Committee experts advised on the status of discussions on Mongolian and other scripts. We did not have the benefit of inputs from several related discussion on other scripts.
- e) Mr. Mao Yong Gang: China convened a meeting per resolution M32.9 - and discussed document N1515. China will be organizing a conference on Mongolian in Mongolia. China will report to the next WG 2 meeting on a the status of Mongolian.
- f) Mr. Oliver Corf: Document N1622 summarizes the current status of different proposals and the technical issues that need addressing. The problems associated with Mongolian Space, Variant Selectors and with Repertoire issues are outlined in the document. The issue of how many and where to place the so called 'variant selectors' should be decided by WG 2 and not just by Ad Hoc on Mongolian. The Mongolian ad hoc can meet in August 1997 in Ulaanbator and present the Mongolian character set proposal.
- g) Mr. Mike Ksar: Some experts who are not aware of the August meeting may find it difficult to attend the Ulaanbator meeting. Meeting notices are required much earlier than the meeting dates. The results of this meeting may be presented to WG 2 but may be subject to more discussion due to some experts not being able to participate. Even though document N1515 was presented to us, it has still some issues that need to be addressed by the ad hoc group.
- h) Mr. Mao Yong Gang: We did not plan to have the meeting in August.
- i) Mr. Oliver Corf: Even discussing whether things like variant selectors belong in the Mongolian set or not cannot be discussed by the Mongolian ad hoc group alone. We have heard different opinions on these.
- j) Dr. Glenn Adams: Who is expressing different opinions on the variant selectors? Our comments are in document N1583.
- k) Mr. Oliver Corf: Mr. Michael Everson's opinions..
- l) Mr. Mike Ksar: I would advise Mr. Michael Everson to be involved in this group actively.

Disposition:

Await further input from China based on Mongolian ad hoc work group and results of the next ad hoc meeting schedule on Mongolian in August 1997 in Ulaanbator.

8.19 Reminder about 4 Medieval English Latin characters

Input Documents:

1547 Reminder about 4 medieval English Latin Characters; Everson; 1997-04-14
1549 On the derivation of YOGH and EZH; Everson; 1997-04-20

Mr. Michael Everson: Presented document N1547. Document N1549 is additional information.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Document N1583 - Unicode Consortium accepts the YOGH characters in 10646.
- b) Mr. Johan van Wingen: Netherlands is against including historic characters in the standard.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the proposal: character shapes as shown in document N1547; code positions for Yogh - 021C (Capital) and 021D (Small); Hwair Capital and Wynn Capital - at code positions 01F6 and 01F7. Small Hwair and Wynn are already in the standard. To be included in the next PDAM. Mr. Michael Everson volunteered to assist the editor in preparation of the PDAM text.

Relevant Resolution:

<i>M33.21 (Medieval English characters):</i>	Netherlands Negative.
WG 2 accepts the four additional characters for Medieval English, the shapes and their names proposed in document N1547 for encoding in the BMP as follows:	
01F6	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER HWAIR
01F7	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER WYNN
021C	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER YOGH
021D	LATIN SMALL LETTER YOGH
See resolution M33.26 (under section 7.3 on page 24) for further processing.	

8.20 Bengali Coded Character Set

Input Document:

1555 Incorporation of Bengali Coded Character set in the revision of ISO/IEC 10646-1; Bangladesh Standards and Testing Institution; 1997-03-19

Bangladesh has sent the contribution to SC 2 through ISO. The convener has responded to the submitter with initial comments.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: I studied the proposal - and there are number of presentation forms of conjuncts. We could send them a copy of what we have in the standard today. Request them to compare and come back to WG 2 to see if they have additional requirements.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: I did receive an e-mail from Bangladesh - but the contents are not complete enough for us to proceed with it.

Action Item:

Convener will request through SC 2 to ISO to advise Bangladesh to acquire a copy of 10646. Also arrange for a copy of the Unicode V 2.0 book to be sent to them.

8.21 Hebrew Repertoire

Input Documents:

1346 Entries for new Annex P of 10646-1; Standardization Institution of Israel SII; 1996-04-01
1557 Name for the (Hebrew) character coded FB1D; SII; 1997-05-11

Document N1557 requests a change in the name for a character that has been accepted for inclusion in the standard.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Asmus Freytag: In principle changing names is a nuisance and committee should think hard about changes. It is unfortunate that this character is close to the other Hebrew characters. It is unfortunate that Israeli delegate is not here to give us more justification for their request.
- b) Dr. Glenn Adams: The character is in document N1564 - the Unicode Consortium does not believe that this character is exclusively used for Yiddish only.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: Can we address this problem using Annex P.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: I have had talked to other experts on this subject also - it is used in Hebrew. It should not be changed to imply that it is used only in Yiddish. Annex P may be used.
- e) Dr. Umamaheswaran: If there is evidence that this character used in more than Yiddish then it should not be restricted in the name.

Disposition:

Israel's request is NOT accepted, based on feedback from WG 2 experts that the character in question is not exclusively for Yiddish.

8.22 Cham Script**Input Documents:**

1559 Proposal for encoding the Cham script; Everson; 1997-05-01
1578 Cham encoding discussion; Everson; 1997-04-06

Mr. Michael Everson: In Geneva, Vietnam proposed Cham. There were several questions at that meeting. There were communications between Vietnam and myself. Mr. Ngô Trung Viet had sent Cham dictionary to Mr. Michael Everson. Document N1559 contains the proposal summary form. It has been sent to Vietnam. Messrs. Hugh Ross and Michael Everson had discussed this with the Vietnamese. Document N1578 has information on encoding related aspects of this script. I would like to invite experts to take a look at this document.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: There is no action to take at this meeting. This is a revised proposal to WG 2. First location being left as a blank - should be removed. Blanks in the coding space are there. We need to involve the Vietnamese national body in this -- we should be able to resolve any differences between the experts group on the subject and Vietnamese national body needs.
- b) Dr. Glenn Adams: We had asked Vietnamese if they will be presenting a contribution. At present there is a small community in Cambodia also - besides the largest being in Vietnam. I would like to see the national body a chance to present their position. They do not seem to be considering the harmonization with other Brahmic script as a priority or a desirable thing. I met with Vietnamese NB in February 1994 with Director General on Cham Script. They are also doing considerable amount of research being done there. We need not be in a hurry on this one. Would it be useful to ask Vietnam to see if they want to take the lead on Cham or will they will be willing to cooperate with Mr. Michael Everson.
- c) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: In the code tables in document N1578 - an explanation is needed about the last paragraph in page 2 about gray boxed areas.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: The holes in the table is because of aligning these with the other Indic scripts. The gray area is just for information. Not for use in 10646. I agree that there is no need to rush on this proposal at this time.
- e) Mr. Ngô Trung Viet: We are willing to work Mr. Michael Everson and progress the contributions.

Action Item:

Additional contributions from various interested parties including Vietnam is invited -- to arrive at a more mature proposal. NBs, LOs, and other experts are invited to feedback on the contributions.

8.23 Armenian – feedback on document N1446

Input Documents:

- 1395 Armenian Repertoire Proposal Summary Form; Armenian Engineers and Scientists of America, Inc. - Richard Youatt; 1996-06-04
1446 U.S. Position on Armenian (N1395); U.S.; 1996-08-09
1560 Response on US feedback on Armenian; Richard Youatt; 1997-05-16

Output Document:

- 1616 Armenian ad hoc report; Suignard; 1997-07-03

Ad hoc group on Armenian script:

An ad hoc group met on Tuesday PM, and prepared the report in document N1616. Mr. Michel Suignard introduced the document. There were several issues. First one was Punctuation marks - can they be merged or not with existing. Some had to be separated. Only one - ARMENIAN DASH - was kept. It has a slightly different behaviour so that it cannot be unified. Its shape is also different from hyphen. For the letters - Ou - need not be coded as a single character. EF ligature - capital form was not encoded - decided to remove it. Some character which is on the border line case of combining or non combining, some go from full width to zero width, etc. -- instead of insisting on Level 3, it was decided to leave them as they are than asking for complexity. Leaving the rest to rendering. The net of the ad hoc was to add a single new character.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Vahram Mekhitarian / Mr. Richard Youatt Armenia: Armenia national body would like to study the results of ad hoc. Decision to add a single character may be OK. The decision NOT to add more characters is a problem.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: Decision NOT to add characters is probably not as serious -- since we can always add characters in the future.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: We have the repertoire. It looks like we are adding a new character. Are we ready to move ahead with adding a new character at this meeting or we await Armenia's feedback.
- d) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: I have some concern on not taking a decision on this character at this meeting. There are other ISO standards awaiting a decision to add a character to the repertoire or not.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the ad hoc group recommendation to add ARMENIAN HYPHEN; detail character shape is in document N1616; code position 058A; Mr. Michel Suignard volunteered to assist in preparing the appropriate PDAM text.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.22 (Armenian Hyphen):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts one additional character for Armenian - its name, its shape and its code position in the BMP, in accordance with the report of the ad hoc group on Armenian in document N1616, as follows:

058A ARMENIAN HYPHEN

See resolution M33.26 (under section 7.3 on page 24) for further processing.

8.24 Other Scripts

8.24.1 Archaic

Input Documents:

- 1575 Proposal to add Aegean Scripts – Phaistos Disk, Linear B and Cypriot; Unicode; 1997-06-10
1579 Proposal for encoding the Phoenician script; Everson; 1997-05-27
1580 Proposal for encoding the Etruscan script; Everson; 1997-05-27
1581 Proposal for encoding the Gothic script; Everson; 1997-05-27
1592 Duplicate of N1579

Mr. Michael Everson gave a brief outline on each; each document has more details.

Document N1575 - Aegian Scripts - Phaistos Disk, Linear B and Cypriot Syllabary

Cypriot Greek - is archaic; used to write Greek. Linear B - is being discussed on the e-mail list, and is used in Crete to write ancient Cretian scripts. Phaistos Disk - question has been raised whether this is a candidate for inclusion in the standard

Document N1579 - Phoenician

It is the original source for several of the scripts in the Mediterranean area. Latin, Greek, Arabic, Hebrew etc. and is a phonetic script. It is simple. The road map document has suggested the BMP for it.

Document N1580 - Etruscan

Etruscan is an archaic script - it can be written RTL and LTR. There are experts in ITALY on it.

Document N1581 - Gothic

Used to write - Old Germanic language - which is dead language now.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Glenn Adams: Cypriot, Linear B, etc. -- Considering our meeting location Crete, it would be nice to make some progress. The only reason for Phoenician script being suggested to be in the BMP in the roadmap document is that this script is RTL and there is room in the other RTL script blocks in the BMP.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: The above are on Archaic scripts. Have been brought to WG 2 first time. I am not sure if these scripts are mature enough.
- c) Dr. Umamaheswaran: I would like national bodies to keep in mind also the meaning of what it means 'to meet marketing needs for such Archaic scripts' in the context of JTC1 directives.
- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: Marketing needs directive of JTC 1 will still be governing our prioritization. We still must have some good reasons to add new characters / scripts in the standard.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: This is a Universal Character Set -- the answer is simple from Marketing Needs directive.
- f) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: Greece is interested in the whole area of Archaic scripts. I am not sure if the proposals are mature enough or not. I would like to know what kind of information or feedback is expected from NBs. It is interesting but difficult work. I would like to remind you that you are on the land which is the origin of several of these proposed archaic scripts. Greece will study the above contributions and provide feedback.
- g) Dr. Asmus Freytag: None of these documents were submitted prior to the deadline, and these are first submittals. Each national body may have to seek different kinds of expertise to deal with these Archaic scripts. Suggested sources may be locations such as Universities and other Linguistic research groups. I would suggest we create a collection of such scripts, and go forward with a work item or subdivision as a SINGLE collection. Expertise for these groups need not be in any particular geography or within a national body's zone of influence / contact. We have also to be clear that 10646 is not meant to be a museum of all possible scripts that existed. It should be viewed as a vehicle for implementing computerization of the archaic scripts. We should focus on how the current experts are utilizing the computers and on the issues they are facing in the coding world - the same way we deal with a modern script. We also have a lot of ancient scripts that do not have the complexity that some of the modern scripts have -- may be simpler to process these.
- h) Mr. Johan van Wingen: When a script matures to become a PDAM, as part of the new work item / registration at least five national bodies have to support the work. Otherwise the work cannot go forward. For several ancient scripts there are Learned Societies - we could locate these groups for their advice and not duplicate their work.

Disposition:

WG 2 will accumulate Archaic scripts in a separate collection. Scope of Work of Part 2 - has been sent to SC 2. We need some target dates in the WG 2 work plan for populating part 2.

Action Item:

NBs and LOs to feedback. NBs are invited to explore resources within each country on scripts that are of primarily scholarly interest in order to get meaningful feedback on such contributions to WG 2. National bodies may have to seek different kinds of expertise to deal with these Archaic scripts -- suggested sources may be locations such as Universities and other Linguistic research groups.

8.24.2 New Non Archaic**Input Documents:**

1574 Proposal to add Pollard Syllabary; Unicode; 1997-06-10
1576 Proposal to add Shavian; Unicode; 1997-05-21

Mr. Michael Everson - briefly described the scripts.

Document N1574 - Pollard

Pollard is a Phonetic script. It is not archaic. It is used in China.

Document N1576 - Shavian

Shavian is not archaic. It is a NOVEL script. George Bernard Shaw - willed some money to come up with a new orthography for English - this is a script that came out of this effort.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Glenn Adams: Document N1502 - the roadmap has these in there. When these proposals mature, we should review the allocation guidelines. Do you consider Shavian as a short hand? If so does this open the world to code the short hand scripts?
- b) Mr. Michael Everson: This is similar to some other short hand scripts. There is a recognition for short-hands in the road map document.

Action Item:

NBs and LOs are requested to review and feedback.

8.24.3 EURO sign**Input Documents:**

1566 Proposal for addition of new character: Euro Sign; Umamaheswaran et al; 1997-06-23

Dr. Umamaheswaran introduced document N1566. National bodies of Ireland and Slovenia also requested to be listed as part of the source for this proposal. The Unicode Technical Committee is fully aware of this contribution.

Document N1567 addresses the same subject matter as document N1566. The resolution for document N1566 addresses this document as well.

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kohji Shibano: There is a request from another TC (?) to SC 2.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: European Commission's DG3 feedback is that there are some presumptions etc. that seem to be flexing the facts too much -- this does not make me very comfortable. The EU or EMI have not decided firmly about the symbol. For some reason, they seem to be waiting for us to make a decision for them.
- c) Mr. Alain LaBonté: This proposal should be coordinated with an 8-bit code.
- d) Mr. Arnold Winkler: WG 2 does not have the responsibility to coordinate with the 8-bit codes. It can be done via SC 2 level. I spoke to Mr. Ken Thompson - technical person responsible for this symbol. The commission itself - as a user of IT - will request that the character will appear on keyboards, be able to print it etc. for the Commission's own work. I think we should move on this as fast as we can.
- e) Mr. Keld Simonsen: Naming is our business. Denmark supports this proposal - along with the proposed name, glyph and the code position. Procedurally there is no problem in moving directly with this proposal. It is clear that we will have a new symbol. There are clearly two separate currencies -- the ECU (with a code XEU) and the EURO (with EUR).
- f) Mr. Michael Everson: The CEN TC 304 has been communicating with both the commission and the members of CEN TC 304. It is clear that the commission does not

understand the standards world at all. Some members of the commission may be here to respond to some of our concern. One of the difficult things we had while we were preparing this contribution is that there was some confusion from different members of EU. It seems that we have to make the decision for them. I support the suggestion to go forward on this.

- g) Dr. Asmus Freytag: A big issue seems to be made on a straight forward proposal. In the Unicode Consortium, the vendors are faced with having to move forward fast. We should be following the JTC 1 directives of meeting the market needs as soon as possible.
- h) Mr. Michel Suignard: It takes a lot of work in being able to support this important character. There is a sense of urgency to get this character adopted very quickly.
- i) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: I have had chance to talk to two members of DG3. When I hear some of their views I will not take the view that we should not be moving forward. The symbol has been published well. There may not be a formal proposal.
- j) Mr. Panagiotis Dellios: The European Commission has a SOGIT - they do know about 10646. They would support the chair to wait or move forward. I also agree that there is an urgent need for standardizing the symbol. There is an urgent need to move fast.
- k) Dr. Umamaheswaran: I should point out that there are a number of national bodies from EU who are co-sponsors of this proposal.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the shape, name, proposed code position for the Euro Sign as proposed in document N1566, and to include it in the earliest next FPDAM.

Relevant Resolution:

<i>M33.23 (Euro sign):</i>	Unanimous
WG 2 accepts the character EURO SIGN, and its shape to be encoded in position 20AC in the BMP, in accordance with document N1566.	
See resolution M33.26 (under section 7.3 on page 24) for further processing.	

8.24.4 General Variation Mark

Input Documents:

- 1564 Draft PDAM 14 of various additional characters that were in the holding bucket – symbols, etc.; Paterson; 1997-05-27
- 1583 UTC # 72 resolutions; Unicode; 1997-06-30

Document N1564 has the proposed PDAM text prepared by the editor Mr. Bruce Paterson.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Glenn Adams: Document N1583 has been based on an earlier proposal summary form. It was before the addition of a question on special control character related properties. Document N1583 - addresses the problem - of concern to the Unicode Consortium. It is necessary to explain the control function semantics. Some explanation is needed on its use -- either the property has to be left to be outside the scope / for use by application, or its scope has to be spelled out within the standard. I propose that the semantic of this character be left to the applications using this character. This was confirmed in the discussion with other IRG members that the intent was to leave it to the applications than being specified in the standard.
- b) Mr. Michael Everson: Is it so complex that the semantics are not resolvable at this meeting?
- c) Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: We should propose concrete questions or proposals to take action on the comment in document N1583. Originally IRG had proposed this. It was generalized by WG 2. I would like action such as an ad hoc to resolve the problem. Also, would like to talk with the editor.
- d) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We are requesting that the character be not sent forward for publication yet pending clarification of its use and its semantics. The semantic is important to be understood properly for implementation. Also, there is no need to rush with this. Even if we arrive at a clarification of the semantic at this meeting in an ad hoc,

- the member bodies will still need to examine the solution before we can take a position. The proposal is not to reject this - but not to include this at this time in the PDAM.
- e) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Canada would suggest that the semantics be clarified. Otherwise, we will have problems in the implementation of the standard.
 - f) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: I agree with Canada's comments.
 - g) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The Singapore resolution on General Variation Mark is not rescinded. We can deal with this character, by NOT progressing it at this time, when drafting the resolutions related to document N1564..
 - h) Mr. Mike Ksar: Looks like this character is NOT yet ready to go forward - even though we took a decision to go forward at the Singapore meeting. The suggestion is not to include it in emptying the bucket till the semantics clarification is agreed upon. In the meantime IRG, the Unicode Consortium and other experts should meet and resolve the semantics question.

Disposition:

The GENERAL VARIATION MARK (on page 2) will be removed from the collection that will go forward for further processing, and left in the bucket for future processing, until its semantics and usage are clarified.

Action Item:

IRG, the Unicode Consortium and other experts should meet and resolve the semantics clarification question on the GENERAL VARIATION MARK.

Relevant Resolution:

<i>M33.28 (General Variation Mark):</i>	Unanimous
WG 2 resolves that the GENERAL VARIATION MARK in document N1564 will be further processed, once further clarification regarding its semantic and use is received from IRG.	

8.24.5 Romanian

Input Documents:

- 1361 Proposal for Addition of Latin Characters; Romanian Standards Institute; 1996-04-12
- 1440 Confirmation of request for 4 additional Latin characters used in Romania - reference document WG 2 N1361; Institutul Roman De Standardizare (IRS); 1996-07-09
- 1507 Comment on Romanian issues concerning characters S & T with Cedilla/Comma; Michel Suignard, U.S.; 1996-12-06
- 1598 On Changing Names in SC 2 standards & feedback on Romanian characters "s" and "t" with comma; J. van Wingen; 1997-06-25

Document N1598 - References previous documents -- N1361, N1440, and N1507.

Ms. Alexandrina Statescu: Romania has made previous proposals for changing the names. We have been told that we cannot change the names in 10646. We have therefore requested four new characters in 10646-1. Romania is left without any coverage by 8859 part. We are ISO members and our country requirements are not met. We need your help in solving our problem. In the context of 8859 we could never get agreement with Turkey even if Turkey is not using 8859-2.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Johan van Wingen: We should keep in mind the interoperability between 8859 parts and 10646. There is also 6937 to interoperate. This standard has been reconfirmed -- Romanian did not ballot. Now we have objections from Romania. Backward compatibility has to be checked as to the existing investment and based on Teletex standards. In terms of being able to distinguish printed versions -- it is not possible now. We are very much opposed to the separation of Comma below and Cedilla below. As stated in document N1598, if we do nothing the difference is only style and typeface -- and the problem goes away. If we accept the change we will introduce inconsistency with other SC 2 standards. The decision should be taken at SC 2 level. If we introduce this change -- it is an important change -- we should produce the balance between benefits and consequences.

- b) Dr. Glenn Adams: The Unicode Technical Committee (see document N1583) has recommended that we should accept the request from Romania for addition of four characters. The existing maps will not change. We do insist that the existing part of 8859-2 should not be changed.
- c) Professor Kohji Shibano: Does the evidence for simultaneous use exist in Romania? We have currently standards which are use of comma below only in Romania and cedilla below only in Turkey. There are also statements to the effect that the comma below and cedilla below are glyph variants. Would like to know why such incompatible changes are accepted?
- d) Dr. Glenn Adams: We will remove the statement 'these are unified' if necessary. The original mappings were based on the previous belief that these are unified. But more evidence has been found -- for example use of Turkish and Romanian simultaneous use - that it is perhaps wrong to unify these. Romania has provided sufficient evidence. We are not breaking the compatibility to 8859-2.
- e) Mr. Keld Simonsen: Evidence has been found in text associated with tables. Denmark will support the Romanian request for the characters and proposed code positions in 10646.
- f) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: We are complicating the issues. I am convinced that these four Romanian characters are distinct. We can certainly produce these using Level 3 in 10646. The request is to be able to use Level 1. WG 2 should encode these characters. It is also disturbing that 8859-xx parts are somehow being used against introducing these in 10646. As to 8859 parts, Romania is already proposing new parts. We should acknowledge the fact that these characters are distinct and required -- all other issues are in WG 3 and in other work groups.
- g) Mr. Trond Trosterud: I support these four characters in 10646. I am a little puzzled at the unification of characters used in the same language. If we extend the principle we may come up with nonsensical unification.
- h) Mr. Mehmet Sarigül: All the ISO standards are revisable standards. If there is a necessity to revise something we will do. The Comma and Cedilla below problem is not simple. It is important to spell people's names correctly with correct spelling. The Comma below is very important in Romanian. In Turkish we support S with Comma below. This is important for both countries. The national requirements should take priority over people outside the countries whose primary languages are affected.
- i) Mr. Michael Everson: To respond to Professor Kohji Shibano - documentation differentiating the comma below and cedilla below was not only in Geographical Atlases but also in lists of names. Also in transliterations. There has been a lot of E-mail discussion on this. It is certainly possible to use Level 3. We have been asked to find if we have a need for simultaneous use of Turkish and Romanian. I seem to detect consensus on this issue and we should move on.
- j) Mr. Mike Ksar: I would like to remind everyone that WG 2 does not deal with 8859 parts. We should focus only on the 10646 request. Interoperability between 8859-xx and 10646 will continue to exist. Implications on other areas such as keyboards are to be addressed by Romania and not in WG 2. We have had a lot of discussion in our previous meetings on the various points raised. We have been investigating this since the Copenhagen meeting. 10646 --has taken a position that we will not change code position allocations or names even though 10646 is revisable.
- k) Dr. Asmus Freytag: It is a sign how difficult this topic is based on the amount of time spent on this. The Unicode Consortium has also spent a lot of time, analyzed the evidence carefully -- we are usually very reluctant to add new fully formed accented characters in 10646 / Unicode. In document N1583 - because of evidences given to us -- that we are in support of the Romanian proposal. We are convinced that there are valid technical reasons for implementations, which supersede our principle of not adding fully formed accented characters - against a lot of opposition even within UTC. We have heard a number of arguments -- no new facts have been brought up at this time. We are convinced that Romania is fully aware of the consequences of adding these characters

not only inside Romania and internationally. I would suggest we should move towards closing the discussion.

- l) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The request was made to Romania to provide evidence that these characters are used simultaneously. We have evidence of these in the discussion. Canada will support these.
- m) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: I am fully in support of Romanian request. 10646 should be looking towards the future systems -- not be kept back, bound only by the backward compatibility issues with existing standards.
- n) Mr. Michel Suignard: US has the same position as expressed by Unicode. Further, I propose allocating positions 0218 to 021B for these characters.
- o) Mr. Oliver Corf: In Mongolian discussion - we had problems similar to these. When we try to replace one symbols versus another we can run into problems. We fully support the Romanian position - to avoid such problems.
- p) Mr. Mike Ksar: The consensus seems to be to accept the four characters proposed by Romania. Romania is fully aware of the risk of adding these characters to 10646 and the mapping problems to and from 8859-2.

Disposition:

WG 2 accept the four characters proposed by Romania, allocates code positions 0218 through 021B for S, s, T and t, all with Comma Below, respectively. These will be included in the earliest next FPDAM.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.24 (4 Latin characters):

Netherlands Negative.

WG 2 accepts the following four Latin characters (requested by Romania), their names and shapes to be encoded in the BMP as follows:

0218	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW
0219	LATIN SMALL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW
021A	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW
021B	LATIN SMALL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW

in accordance with document N1361.

See resolution M33.26 (under section 7.3 on page 24) for further processing.

8.24.6 Additional Arabic Characters

Input Document:

1573 Additional Arabic characters (chiefly from ISO 11822); US/Unicode; 1997-06-19

Mr. Michel Suignard: US requests that nine Arabic characters proposed are required -- since they exist in ISO 11822, and are used in living scripts in several countries.

Dr. Asmus Freytag: The amount of background information will increase till this issue is resolved.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Michael Everson: I have seen most of these contributions before and I have no problems going forward.
- b) Dr. Glenn Adams: The Unicode Consortium would like to emphasize that we should not entertain adding presentation forms for these characters in the standard.
- c) Mr. Mao Yong Gang: I do not have any comments at this point. I want to make sure there are no presentation characters in this standard. If some presentation forms are in the standard and others are missing it may cause problems for China if they are refused in the future.
- d) Mr. Johan van Wingen: We have an expert Mr. Milo in our NB, and would like to have an opinion from him before I can take a position on this.
- e) Dr. Glenn Adams: Mr. Milo was contacted.
- f) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Have other Arabic countries or experts from India (for use in Malayalam) been contacted?
- g) Mr. Mike Ksar: It has been well researched and experts have been contacted. For those NBs that have not been actively participating in WG 2, feedback may have to come after

we progress this as FPDAM.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts the proposed additional nine Arabic characters, their shapes and proposed code positions as in document N1573. The US NB and the Unicode Consortium have volunteered to assist the editor in preparing the FPDAM text and relevant information to include in the FPDAM registration document.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.25 (9 additional Arabic characters):

Unanimous

WG 2 accepts the 9 additional Arabic characters (chiefly from ISO 11822), their names and shapes and their proposed code positions in the BMP as proposed in document N1573.

See resolution M33.26 (under section 7.3 on page 24) for further processing.

8.24.7 Cyrillic Sami

Input Document:

1590 Repertoire proposal for 10 additional Cyrillic characters for Kildin Sami; Norway; 1997-06-30

Mr. Trond Trosterud introduced document N1590. Due to the history of people using Sami - disposed people using Sami - could not use some of their characters using the Cyrillic alphabet. 10 Cyrillic characters missing for Sami in the Cyrillic script are proposed to be added to 10646. Document N1590 has the relevant background information.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Johan van Wingen: When I prepared a document on Cyrillic earlier, there was no information on Sami. I have reservation on accepting these characters when these are used only by a small community. I am not sure we should go ahead with it.
- b) Mr. Michel Suignard: There is some valuable input in here. Looks like the script went through a lot of change. We need some more time to study this proposal in detail. Suggest that we deal with this and take decision at the next meeting, especially if there is no rush to go ahead with this.
- c) Mr. Trond Trosterud: I understand the need for time to study this proposal. I would like to get the feedback. This is not a new alphabet. This is a small addition to an existing script - missing characters are being proposed. In the background material there is a history of the use of minority languages. Mr. Johan van Wingen will get his answers in the contribution.

Action Item:

NBs and LOs to study the contribution and feedback.

8.24.8 Latin Characters Required By Latinized Taiwanese Languages

Input Document:

1593 Proposal to add Latin characters by Latinized Taiwanese languages; Everson; 1997-05-27

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: Looks like the support documents indicates some transliteration scheme.
- b) Mr. Michael Kung: I have seen this script used in Taiwan and there is no input from TCA on this. I would like to get more justification.
- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: We have suggestions for example in the past to solicit feedback from affected countries -- for example Nigeria for Yoruba . Would suggest that Mr. Michael Everson contact TCA and get their feedback / support.
- d) Mr. Michel Suignard: Can we meet all the requirements; can you support in Level 3?
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: The script is used as is - like Vietnamese is written using Latin alphabet. There is ONE missing combining character even for Level 3.
- f) Mr. Mao Yong Gang: I will take this back to China for feedback.

Action Item:

Mr. Michael Everson to bring this to attention of TCA. NBs and LOs to study the contribution and feedback.

8.24.9 Proposal to add 2 Latin characters for Finnish Romani

Input Document:

1619 Proposal to add 2 Latin characters; Finland; 1997-07-01

Document N1619 - has been tabled by Finland for review and feedback from NBs and LOs. For consideration at the next meeting.

Action Item:

NBs and LOs to review and feedback

9. IRG status and reports

Input Document:

1591 Resolutions of IRG Meeting # 9; IRG; 1997-05-09

Document N1591 covers the various sub items given below.

9.1 Internal/Horizontal Supplementation – PDAM text

Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: The PDAM text has been created in one year. IRG worked very hard to produce the high quality print of the code table, was reviewed by IRG and have the final version. The document is 400 pages replacing the existing CJK tables in 10646-1: 1993. The cover page, the PDAM number etc. are needed to produce the final version (information needed from the editor). Annex P - is in the final editing of co-editor. We are not sure if the Annex P should be merged with the PDAM text or not -- this document will arrive in Crete this week (awaiting John Jenkins' input).

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: The target date submitted to SC 2 - will we be able to meet this? We do not have a target date.
- b) Professor Kohji Shibano: JTC 1 wants to have the CD, DIS and Final pubs date as target dates for all new documents. IHS was approved in Québec.

9.2 Kang Xi Radicals, Hangzhou numerals – PDAM

Input Document:

1609 Kang Xi Radicals; IRG; 1997-06-27

Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: The names are ready. The code table is ready. The Hangul numerals will be ready in two weeks.

9.3 Ideographic Radical Supplement

Input Documents:

1544 Questions on the Han structure method described in N1490 (IRG N 436); Takayuki K. Sato – Japan; 1997-04-08

1545 Addition of new radicals; Japan – TKS; 1997-04-08

1617 Ideographic Radical Supplement; IRG; 1997-06-27

Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: Document N1617 is based on Singapore resolution. Japan and Korea have proposed more radicals. IRG considered (Resolution 9) this reasonable. Request for an additional row of 256 code positions in A zone. A new project with 'ideographic radicals' is proposed. The total estimate of radical set is 350. The request for an additional adjacent row to get the additional characters. Resolution 10 of IRG - the accepted 214 radicals (in Singapore) will remain as is. A supplemental set can be produced if approved by WG 2. IRG had taken a look at the JTC 1 re-engineering question and were under the impression that we had to ask for a new project for each activity.

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kohji Shibano: Amendment 15 - Radicals and numerals - has been approved by SC 2. We may not need a new project approved to add more radicals. All JTC 1 officers are encouraged to read the JTC 1 directives. IRG rapporteur is encouraged to read them.

- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: Based on the scope of existing Amendment 15 project, we could add more radicals. There is no need to have an additional project.
- c) Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: I would like consensus that a new project is not needed.
- d) Mr. Michael Everson: If it will slow down the work - we will not need a new project.
- e) Mr. Takayuki Sato: At the time of creating this sub division, all reviewers were asked to comment whether more radicals can be added to in the future under the same project or not. We knew in Nanjing meeting (IRG-9) that we had more radicals to be added. So we were asked to comment during the sub-division of project approval that the project should not be restricted to the set of radicals that were proposed at that time -- see Note under resolution 9 in document N1591.

9.4 CJK Unified Ideograph Vertical Extension A

Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: At the end of last of week we received the high quality fonts. The current plan is to produce the code table by 15 September 1997. We do not have the fonts from Korea to get the job done. We have bit map fonts from Japan and Vietnam - we have to convert these to high quality fonts. 15 July is the deadline to send the fonts to IRG editor by the IRG member bodies.

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kyongsok Kim: My understanding was that we had submitted the fonts. Looks like there is some misunderstanding on the font requirement related to the revised Vertical Extension. If we have not started the work of collecting the fonts already, we may not be able to meet the deadline. I have to check into this matter.
- b) Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: We had received an older version of fonts which had errors. The newer version CJK fonts needs new fonts.
- c) Professor Kohji Shibano: IRG was asked to produce a CD within three years. We were delayed by a year. Would you be able to accelerate the process. JTC 1 wants us to meet the target dates that we give.
- d) Mr. Michael Kung: The project was delayed because there was a delay in getting the high quality fonts. The Korean delegate had acknowledged that there were some defects in the fonts supplied and had a work item to look into the matter.
- e) Mr. Mike Ksar: Due to difficulties such as we find in complex projects such as the CJK Vertical Extension A, we should be more careful in the future in setting more accurate target dates. Korea is requested to check into the Korean fonts required as soon as possible and ensure that fonts be supplied to the IRG editor. If we cannot meet the deadline we should be aware that JTC 1 may cancel the project.
- f) Document N1621 - from Professor Kyongsok Kim -- shows that Korea will supply he necessary fonts by 15 September 1997.

9.5 IRG New Project Proposals

Mr. Zhang Zhoucai: IRG Resolution 7 - requests WG 2 for a new project for 'Ideographic Structure Characters and Ideograph Component Supplements'. At present there is no such project. We also need another NP on populating Plane 2 - Ideograph Supplements - see Resolution 4 in document N1591.

Discussion:

- a) Professor Kohji Shibano: Do you have a new project proposal -- you will need to fill in one and submit to SC 2.
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: Should WG 2 approve this?
- c) Mr. Michael Everson: We should certainly go ahead.
- d) Dr. Umamaheswaran: Do we really need a sub-division of project at this time. Normally we do this only when we have some mature proposals.

Disposition:

WG 2 accepts IRG requests for NPs and instructs IRG to prepare the two New Work Item proposals - and submit to WG 2 -- not directly to SC 2.

Relevant Resolution:

RESOLUTION M33.29 (IRG - NPs):

Unanimous

In accordance with IRG #9 resolutions 4 and 7 in document N1591, WG 2 instructs IRG to prepare new sub division proposals for the following projects:

CJK Ideographs for Plane 2

Ideograph Structure Characters and Ideograph Component Supplement

and submit them to WG 2 for consideration at its next meeting.

9.6 IRG Administrative

Term of IRG Rapporteur:

IRG has agreed to extend the term of IRG Rapporteur till end of December 1997.

Request for nominations for new IRG Rapporteur has been sent out in IRG.

IRG Meeting No. 10

WG 2 is requested to approve IRG 10 in Ho-Chi Minh city in December 15-19, 1997.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.30 (IRG Administrative):

Unanimous

WG 2 approves the following resolutions from IRG #9:

#1. Extension of the term of Mr. Zhang Zhoucai as rapporteur till meeting IRG #10

#2. IRG Meeting 10 to be held in Ho-Chi Minh City, Vietnam, 1997-12-15--19.

10. Defect reports status

No outstanding defect reports.

11. Liaison reports

11.1 The Unicode Consortium

Input Documents:

1583 UTC # 72 resolutions; Unicode; 1997-06-30

1618 Unicode Liaison Report to SC 2; Unicode; 1997-07-02

Document N1583 contains the liaison report to WG 2. Items that were relevant to other agenda items from this liaison report were brought up during the relevant discussions. Document N1618 contains the liaison report from the Unicode Consortium to SC 2, and is for information only - to WG 2 members.

11.2 ITU-T SG8

No report.

11.3 Application for liaison membership-UNU

Input Document:

1530 Application for liaison Membership of WG 2 - United Nations University - International Institute for Software Technology; United Nations University; 1997-03-18

For information only - to WG 2 members.

11.4 IETF

Input Document:

1605 Liaison Report on IETF activities; Simonsen; 1997-06-30

Mr. Keld Simonsen: As part of action item placed on myself and Dr. Glenn Adams, a written report (to be submitted to SC 2) is in document N1605.

RFC 2070 on I18N of HTML - uses UCS-4 as the character entities in HTML. It is being used in several explorer products. Dr. Glenn Adams was one of the co-authors of this RFC. You can have an ASCII document and use the decimal number of the code position in 10646 as an Entity Reference. HTML as an application of SGML does not specify the encoding of the HTML document itself. It provides the references to characters that are needed as Numeric Character References. The Document Character set in previous version of HTML was with reference to 8859-1. Now the NCRs are with reference to 10646. One could use any one of the alternate forms of encoding of UCS as textual stream encoding also. There are a number of IETF documents that use 10646 or refer to it.

RFC 2120 - a report on character set usage on Internet Protocols. One of the recommendations was to be able to use 10646 as the base character set. I was one of the authors of this RFC. At the time of writing the report, about a year ago, I was not a liaison officer. We have established a contact with IETF, and the liaison is working. We could add the name of Mr. Harald Alvestrand as the contact in IETF to receive WG 2 documents.

Regarding IAB policy statement - recommending 10646 as the base character set for Internet protocols and as the preferred encoding. I have been participating in preparing this policy document. IETF is very interested in use of 10646.

There is conversation about including Language Tagging - in stream. One of the proposal is to use an extended UTF-8, another one is to use plane 14 and a third proposal is to use escape mechanism to perform this function. On the need for a general mechanism for Language -- this topic is not just within the work of WG 2 but there are several other standards working groups also involved.

IETF's officers are also concerned about the high cost of ISO standards and making the standards available on line. WG 2 can only make recommendations to ISO but we cannot make the decisions for them. WG 2 can make the CDs etc. available on the web site within the current rules of JTC 1 -- and advise IETF of the availability of these sites.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Mike Ksar: Are we expecting a contribution on tagging to WG 2 for processing by the next meeting?
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The e-mail traffic indicates that the user community requirement seems to be more than just character coding. There have been ad hoc meeting between the Unicode Consortium and IETF to narrow down the choices between the alternatives. Because of timing we could not get the proposal to WG 2. The current work item is to study the detail of plane 14 proposal. The idea is to have a protocol that is lightweight and is efficient for identifying language etc. WG 2 may have to provide in-stream infrastructure needed by a higher level protocol. Internet is working on one or more protocols which can use this language tagging infrastructure. Vendors supporting these protocols have clearly indicated that some of the proposals are going to make life difficult for their implementation - for example, modifying UTF-8 will cause problems for the UNIX community. I would like to forewarn WG 2 that there may be proposals to specifically speak to the needs of IETF and the infrastructure required from 10646 standard. An ad hoc group has been set up in the UTC -- contributions will be welcome by that ad hoc group. A proposal on the tagging topic will be put together for carrying forward to IETF Munich meeting and as soon as the Unicode Consortium has the proposal WG 2 will be informed. As to the cost of ISO standards, I would like to inform you that the Unicode Consortium has always shared the concern about costs of the standards, and we have provided both the hard copy and soft copy services for the standard -- information such as being able to look up sections of code charts etc. - on line.
- c) Dr. Glenn Adams: I would like to encourage Mr. Keld Simonsen to work with the ad hoc group (regarding language / other tagging items) towards arriving at a final consensus proposal before we come to WG 2.

- d) Mr. Mike Ksar: Dr. Glenn Adams / Mr. Keld Simonsen can invite IETF representative to attend the next WG 2 meeting. I would like to encourage continued cooperation between IETF and WG 2.

Action Items:

Dr. Glenn Adams / Mr. Keld Simonsen to invite IETF representative to attend the next WG 2 meeting. I would like to encourage continued cooperation between IETF and WG 2.
Recommendation to SC 2 to nominate Mr. Keld Simonsen as the official liaison officer from SC 2 to IETF.

11.5 SC 22

Input Document:

1546 Liaison Statement from SC 22 to SC 2/WG 2 on DAM 9; Johan van Wingen; 1997-03-18

Document N1546 is liaison report to SC 2 - for information only - nothing to report at this time.

11.6 SC 18/WG 9

Input Document:

1548 Liaison Statement from SC 18/WG 9 to SC 2/WG 2; Alain LaBonté; 1997-04-25

Mr. Alain LaBonté: Five symbols were added to 9995-7 amendment 1. Four of these are already accepted for encoding in 10646. The request is to add one more symbol to 10646.

Discussion:

- a) Dr. Umamaheswaran: The rationale for the new symbol - should this be covered by a new proposal summary form etc.
- b) Mr. Alain LaBonté: We have already proposal summary form with rationale and so on with the previously accepted characters.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: There are some concerns about the Symbols Bucket and their emptying (see discussion in section 7.3 on page 24).

Relevant Resolution:

M33.20 (Keyboard Decimal Separator symbol):

Unanimous

With reference to document N1548, WG 2 accepts the proposed symbol for 'decimal point marker' requested by SC 18/WG 9 for encoding in ISO/IEC 10646-1 with the provisional name BLACK NARROW UPPER LEFT TRIANGLE, at code position 2396 in the BMP, and with the shape as shown in document N1625.
See resolution M33.27 (under section 7.3 on page 24) for further processing.

11.7 TC 46/ SC 2

Input Document:

(Refer to written report to be provided to SC 2)

Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: TC 46/SC 2 works on 'Conversion of written languages'. This effort was joint work with SC 4 WG 4 - which was responsible for coding of bibliographic sets. This WG has been disbanded. Instead of designing new codes a resolution has been accepted to use 10646 as the base character set. Latin characters decorated with several diacritics --are not currently encoded in 10646. Unless we get solid requirements we will not submit this. A new WG has been created to study the overall use of diacritical marks in TC 46. During the revision of the existing standards, in scripts where they were characters for transliteration, several were NOT included in 10646. For example, the Persian transliteration standard - Persian experts indicated that some characters are not in. The contribution from these experts will be brought to the attention of WG 2. There are multiple ways of transliteration -- depending on the scheme different transliterations may happen. There will be a written report to SC 2 which may answer some of your questions.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Johan van Wingen: If the structure of TC 46 has been changed - Netherlands may not have been informed. I would like to get some idea as to the new structure. About Persian - we had a declaration from ASMO that they were not interested in Arabic script in other languages.

- b) Dr. Glenn Adams: Members of the Unicode Consortium are serving the transliteration market also. We will be interested in any new characters that may be required.
- c) Mr. Mike Ksar: A question related to TC 46 - to be discussed at SC 2 plenary as well. In SC 2 Québec meeting M6.14 - SC 2 N2749 -- "ISO TMB Resolution No. JTC 1 SC 2 requests ISO to invite transfer of TC 46 projects for completion and future maintenance, and transfer the current work items on coded character sets to JTC 1 SC 2.". JTC 1 had taken no action on this SC 2 resolution at its last plenary.
- d) Professor Kohji Shibano: JTC 1 chair and secretary are aware of this problem They will be addressing this question.
- e) Mr. Michael Everson: Convener of TC 46 SC 4 - does know about this request from SC 2.
- f) Mr. Johan van Wingen: Mr. Stefan Fuchs had requested TC 46 to withdraw a standard. The response was to await the next 5 year review period.

12. Other business

12.1 Web Site Review

Input Documents:

- 1502 Update of N1402 – Principles & Procedures of WG 2; Sven Thygesen; 1997-01-24
- 1509 Summary of WG 2 Work Items, including spreadsheet; Sven Thygesen; 1997-01-24

No discussion. See related topic of Electronic Document Distribution in section 5.5 on page 14.

12.2 Registration of 10646 subsets and 7350

Dr. Umamaheswaran: Annex A of 10646 has collection identifiers for registering subsets. There are some questions on the suitability of Annex A as the single vehicle for registering repertoires.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Keld Simonsen: Denmark thinks the collections do not permit arbitrary selections of characters to be registered as collections in 10646. There is a need for another registry.
- b) Dr. Asmus Freytag: The Unicode Consortium has recognized that the subsetting should not be in general used in context of 10646 / Unicode. Several vendors in the UTC have also been using the subsets. The implementation community have registered subsets -- and they have found that this can be entirely unbounded process. It is difficult to go to a registry and be able to identify which is important and which is not -- from just a registry. There is a strong distinction to be made - the collections have been 'standardized' by carefully filtering and agreeing on what is needed and useful with the combined expertise of various NBs and experts. The collections are certainly NOT frozen -- but it entails a scrutiny in WG 2. The message from the vendor community is not to add a registration on top of the current collection ids. The Unicode Consortium will take the same position to the SC 2 level.
- c) Mr. Johan van Wingen: This may be a duplicate of discussion on 7350 related items. My proposal is to postpone the discussion. There is a procurer's view -- be able to state what is precisely needed and nothing else. We have heard the vendor's view. The problem has to be viewed from both sides. If you are talking about 7350 we cannot discuss it in WG 2.
- d) Mr. Erkki Kolehmainen: I fail to understand why a procurer would like to restrict the characters. I believe a manageable registration mechanism is required - I agree with the Vendors' view. I believe there are too many mechanisms there. A cultural elements registry is being built in CEN for example. I do not quite understand the positions expressed.
- e) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: I do not wish to duplicate the discussion on 7350. I would like to add that there must be a way and a procedure is required to be able to introduce other collections in the standard.
- f) Dr. Umamaheswaran: My point of raising this topic - was to raise the concerns on suitability of Annex A -- to explore if there was deficiency etc.

- g) Mr. Michel Suignard: Document N1556 - is document on the Technical Corrigendum towards improving the collection ids. It is important to keep the collections to a minimum.
- h) Professor Kohji Shibano: Some people may think that other means such as 7350 is the means to register subsets of 10646. Also WG 3. We will have a discussion in SC 2 on this. If we are talking about 7350 it is a WG 3 matter.
- i) Mr. Mike Ksar: The mechanism to add collections to 10646 already exists -- if a NB wants to add a collection id today all it takes is to submit a contribution to WG 2. We already have a means to register any subset of 10646 in Annex of this document. it can be certainly improved to be able to register 10646 sub repertoires.

Disposition:

10646 has Annex A - can contain identifiers for sub repertoires as collections -- both specific collections with a fixed number of elements and collections that may grow when characters are added in empty code positions in ranges identified. WG 2 to make a recommendation to SC 2 via a resolution.

Relevant Resolution:

M33.31 (Sub-repertoire identification):

UK Negative

WG 2 strongly recommends to SC 2 that only Annex A on Collection Identifiers of ISO/IEC 10646-1 should be used to identify any sub-repertoire of 10646, and requests SC 2 to advise all concerned parties to forward such requests to include collections to WG 2.

12.3 Future meetings

Mr. Mike Ksar: Next meeting was proposed for 16--20 March in Seattle, hosting by US national body. If it will be possible to hold the SC 2 / SC 22 WG 20 and SC 18/WG 9 workshop in the same area - this will be an alternative. Japan wants to host the SC 2 plenary in Japan in April. Netherlands has an open invitation.

Discussion:

- a) Mr. Takayuki Sato: An SC 2 plenary meeting is required before the JTC 1 plenary in June 1998, to ensure that we can address all the issues from SC 2 to JTC 1. We also have to respond to the Cultural Adaptability Workshop. SC 2 has also to make some recommendations to JTC 1. Whatever happens we need four meetings - SC 2, WG 2, WG 3 and the Workshop. It would be preferable to hold these together in one location from travel point of view. Why not offer two alternatives to SC 2?
- b) Mr. Mike Ksar: As to the workshop it would probably have about five people from SC 2 side. It could be held in Seattle. Does SC 2 want to have the plenary in Seattle in March - this is an open question.
- c) Mr. Michel Suignard: What is the size of the planned workshop -- how many people will be invited? If we have to plan the workshop in Seattle, we need the information about the meeting far in advance to get the meeting arrangements done.
- d) Professor Kohji Shibano: The place for the SC 2 meeting is not decided -- Japan also has an invitation to SC 2 and its working groups. As to the Workshop, the plan was discussed at the JTC 1 meeting on re-engineering two weeks ago. Canada and France had proposed the workshop.
- e) Mr. Alain LaBonté: I do not know how big the group will be. France and Canada had volunteered the location. Would the US be able to accommodate WG 3 meeting along with WG 2 in Seattle?
- f) Professor Kohji Shibano: The workshop group may be pretty large -- since the keyboard, coded character sets and i18n are involved. Many small countries who are interested in cultural aspects will also be interested.
- g) Dr. Asmus Freytag: We are willing to explore the hosting effort of US - to host WG 3, and SC 2 as well. There is certainly benefits in hosting all the SC 2 groups at the same location and at the same time. As to the workshop, I suspect SC 2 has the largest number of NB participation. We may be looking at a minimum of 10 NBs -- 1 per NB? Perhaps 20 participants.
- h) Mr. Mao Yong Gang: WG 2 and WG 3, SC 2 --China has applied for permission to host a future meeting.

- i) Mr. Mike Ksar: The US location and dates are firm from WG 2 point of view. Would like to have 4.5 days for WG 2. We can encourage WG 3 to meet Friday PM and on Saturday. If SC 2 wants to meet also at the same location - we can have it the following week.

Disposition:

The meeting schedules are captured in the resolution below. WG 3 and SC 2 will be encouraged to colocate their meeting with WG 2.

Future hosts: Ireland, Israel, Vietnam, Netherlands, China

Relevant Resolution:

<i>M33.32 (Future meetings):</i>	Unanimous
WG 2 confirms the following future meeting schedule:	
Meeting 34: 16--20 March 1998, Seattle, WA, USA; Host: Microsoft Corp., USA.	
Meeting 35: 21--25 September 1998, UK - Host: BSI	
Meeting 36: 15--19 March 1999, Beijing, China	
Meeting 37: September 1999 -- Open for Invitation.	

13. Closing - Approval of Resolutions

Output Document:

1604 Resolutions of WG 2 Meeting # 33 – Crete; WG 2; 1997-07-04

Document 'draft N1604' was prepared by the resolutions-drafting committee consisting of Messrs. Bruce Paterson, Michel Suignard, Mike Ksar and Umamaheswaran. The following 23 national bodies, 10 (is erroneously 9 in final document N1604) liaison organizations and 1 observer, were represented when the following resolutions were discussed and adopted: Armenia, Austria, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Korea, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Turkey, UK, USA, and Vietnam; ISO TC 46/SC 2, the Unicode Consortium, CEN/TC 304, JTC 1/SC 18/WG9, ITU-SG8, GSE, ISO TC 173, GSE, SC 22/WG20, and SC22.

The following are comments raised during the discussion and adoption of draft resolutions.

- a) Added Egypt to list of member bodies present; fixed the number of Liaisons; fixed ITU to ITU-T SG8.
- b) M33.1 - correct editorial errors. Target dates are requested for each resolution. Further processing on DAMs is to send to ITTF for publication.
- c) M33.4 - five year review.
 - i) Professor Kohji Shibano: SC 2 will require all the dates for this project.
 - ii) Mr. Mike Ksar: We can take it as an action item on the editor.
 - iii) Mr. Arnold Winkler: Can we make a recommendation that ITTF make the next edition available in CD-ROM format.
 - iv) Mr. Mike Ksar: The resolution is based on discussion at the meeting.
 - v) Dr. Asmus Freytag: What was the rationale for the date of March 1999?
 - vi) Mr. Mike Ksar: This is based on drafting committee taking three factors into consideration -- DAMs that will be ready by March 98, plus the buffer needed to get the documents ready.
 - vii) Mr. Bruce Paterson: One of the reasons was to ensure that the Vertical Extension A will be able to go through all its stages of processing. The other PDAMs are relatively small in page count versus the Vertical Extension.
 - viii) Mr. Mike Ksar: We were estimating that JTC 1 ballot on Vertical Extension A - will not be finished by Jan 99.
 - ix) Mr. Alain LaBonté: The synchronization of the French translation - is currently at PDAM 4 level. The date of January 1999 looks too late for the corresponding synchronized French version.
 - x) Mr. Mike Ksar: ITTF will continue to process the Amendments etc.
 - xi) Dr. Asmus Freytag: I am satisfied with the response on the date. I would like to inform all NBs translating into other languages the Unicode Consortium will be glad to receive the information.

- d) M33.13 - Byzantine Music Symbols
 - i) Dr. Asmus Freytag: It was felt by an ad hoc group -- starting at D000 would be better. Would suggest 'provisionally accepts' in the first sentence.
 - ii) Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis: No objection to change to D000 from B000.
 - iii) Professor Kohji Shibano: We need some target dates for Part 2.
 - iv) Mr. Mike Ksar: We do not have an editor. At this point in time we do not have any dates.
 - v) Mr. Bruce Paterson: We do have currently a standing document - but it is only for part 1.
- e) M33.14 - Braille - output document N1624 -- was not available. Procedures related items were discussed.
- f) M33.15 - Runic: Sweden voiced their concern that they may not be able to meet the 15 August 97 date. They preferred 1 October 1997 would be a more realistic date. The draft resolution was changed to indicate 15 October 1997.
- g) M 33.18 - Yi: Why PDAM and not FPDAM? We had a discussion and the addition of 18 characters were discussed. This is the reason for going ahead as PDAM and not as FPDAM.
- h) M33.24 -- 4 Latin characters: Netherlands would like to strongly object to this subject. We would like to emphasize that our comments were not properly dealt with.
- i) M33.31 - Sub-repertoire identification - UK will vote against this resolution since it is against the policy of BSI.

Appreciations / Thanks etc.

Mr. Vahram Mekhitarian read out the following note of thanks:

"Dear Chairman and members of the meeting:
 I thank you for your welcome and assistance. Armenia has an ancient culture, but a young Republic, and every step of International Relations is important. On behalf of the Republic of Armenia, I wish to express my gratitude for the support shown by your countries. My participation as a guest has been invaluable, and I look forward to active involvement in future meetings. I wish to express my desire to cooperate with the working groups. At the next meeting the Republic of Armenia will be an official participant in WG 2 and will contribute fully in that capacity. This meeting reminds me of Noah's Ark and its eventual arrival on Mount Ararat. Once again I thank you, and say good bye until our next meeting.
 Vahram Mekhitarian, Armenia; vm@moon.yerphi.am"

Mr. J.B. Disanayaka of Sri Lanka expressed his thanks to WG 2 for helping progressing the Sinhalese script towards inclusion into the standard.

Mr. Mike Ksar as the convener, welcomed the new national bodies that participated and encouraged their continued future participation in WG 2.

Appreciation to the host - ELOT and their staff - is captured in the following resolution. There were 40 000 sheets of paper used for copying for WG 2 meeting only.

Relevant resolution:

<i>M33.33 (Appreciation to the host):</i>	by Acclamation
WG 2 thanks its host ELOT, the Hellenic Organization for Standardization, and their staff, especially Mr. Evangelos Melagrakis, for hosting the meeting, providing excellent secretarial and administrative support and for their outstanding hospitality.	

14. Adjournment

The convener adjourned the meeting at 12:50h on Friday.

15. Cumulative list of action items

Note: WG 2 experts, national bodies and liaison organizations are encouraged to verify the action items against the final list given below -- recording secretary, Dr. V.S. UMAhaheswaran.

15.1 Action items from previous WG 2 meetings -- M25 to M28

All the action items from meeting 25, Antalya, Turkey, meeting 26, San Francisco, CA, USA, meeting 27, Geneva, Switzerland, and meeting 28, Helsinki, Finland, have been either completed or dropped.

15.2 Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 29, Tokyo, Japan

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 29 Resolutions document N1304 and Unconfirmed Meeting 29 minutes in document N1303 -and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1353).	Status
AI-29-10	China	
a	To take comments in document N1246 and comments from this meeting (M29) as feedback to the appropriate experts on Uyghur, Kazakh and Kirghiz. M30, M31, M32 and M33 In progress.	M34:

15.3 Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 30, Copenhagen, Denmark

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 30 Resolutions document N1354 and Unconfirmed Meeting 30 minutes in document N1353 and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1453).	Status
AI-30-12	Ad Hoc Group on Principles and Procedures (Mr. Sven Thygesen - lead)	
a	To work with Mr. Hugh Ross and document the guidelines / criteria that were used in the creation of the first edition of the standard, for deciding when a pre-composed character was considered for inclusion directly versus when it would be left as Level 3 composition encoding. M31: Outstanding; M32 and M33: In progress.	M34:
AI-30-16	Latvia, Ireland and Finland	
a	to provide additional supporting documents to address the various concerns expressed on proposal for Livonian characters in document N1322 at this meeting to permit WG 2 to better evaluate the proposal. M31 and M32: Outstanding; M33: In progress.	M34:

15.4 Outstanding action items from WG 2 meeting 31, Québec City, Canada

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 31 Resolutions document N1454 and Unconfirmed Meeting 31 minutes in document N1453 and corrections to these minutes in section 3 of document N1503)	Status
AI-31-3	Editor - Mr. Bruce Paterson	
	To prepare the appropriate PDAM texts and entries in collections of characters for future coding, with assistance from other identified parties, in accordance with the following WG 2 resolutions:	
h	RESOLUTION M31.9 (Internal Supplementation / Horizontal Supplementation): WG 2 accepts documents N1427, N1428, N1429 and N1434 on Internal Supplementation / Horizontal Supplementation from the IRG. WG 2 further instructs its editor to prepare the PDAM text, with assistance from IRG editor, and forward it to SC 2 secretariat for an SC 2 ballot. M32 and M33: In progress.	M34:
AI-31-12	Swedish national body - Mr. Olle Järnefors	
a	to consider the discussion on the Runic script proposal at this meeting and feedback to WG 2. M32 and M33: In progress.	M34:

15.5 Outstanding action items from meeting 32, Singapore

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 32 Resolutions document N1504 and Unconfirmed Meeting 32 minutes in document N1503 -with the corrections noted in section 3 of this document).	Status
AI-32-6	US member body (Michel Suignard, John Jenkins) b Dr. John Jenkins, is invited to prepare the draft text on the Deseret script (in document N1498) in a form suitable for inclusion in the future ISO/IEC 10646-Part 2. M33: in progress.	M34:
AI-32-10	Ad hoc group on principles and procedures (lead - Mr. Sven Thygesen, assist of a US member body representative) a To update the Principles and Procedures document and forward it to the convener, incorporating the principles in the roadmap document N1499, taking into consideration comments in document N1505 (from Mr. John Clews) M33: in progress.	M34:
AI-32-12	IRG (Mr. Zhang Zhoucai, Rapporteur) a with assistance of the Taiwanese Computer Association to prepare PDAM text on Kang Xi radicals for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.10 below: WG 2 accepts the request for the set of 214 Kang Xi radical characters in document N1182. WG 2 allocates them provisionally to code positions in the range 2F00 to 2FDF. WG 2 further invites the IRG to prepare the text for a PDAM assigning character names, their shapes in accordance with document N1182, and the block name 'KANG XI RADICALS', .. M33: in progress. b with assistance of the Taiwanese Computer Association to prepare PDAM text on Hangzhou numerals for inclusion as a separate item in the PDAM for resolution M32.10 (see action item a above), for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.11 below: WG 2 accepts the request for 3 Hangzhou numerals in document N1182. WG 2 provisionally allocates code positions and names in the CJK Symbols and Punctuation block, as follows: 3038 - HANGZHOU NUMERAL TEN 3039 - HANGZHOU NUMERAL TWENTY 303A - HANGZHOU NUMERAL THIRTY M33: in progress. c to prepare text on Ideograph Radical Supplement for inclusion as a separate item in the PDAM per resolution M32.10 (see action item a above), for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.15 below: WG 2 accepts the 31 Ideographic Radicals proposed in document N1492, and provisionally allocates them to code positions in the range 2FE0 to 2FFF. WG 2 further invites the IRG to assign a character name and a single graphic symbol to each. .. M33: in progress. d the IRG editor is to prepare PDAM text on CJK Unified Ideograph Extension A Version 1.1, for consideration at the next WG 2 meeting, per resolution M32.14 below: WG 2 provisionally allocates the set of 6585 characters of CJK Unified Ideograph Extension A Version 1.1 in documents N1423 and N1424 to code positions in the range 3400 to 4DBF, .. M33: in progress.	M34: M34: M34: M34:
AI-32-13	All member bodies and liaison organizations d per resolution M32.9 on the Mongolian script, are invited to review and comment on document N1515, prior to the next WG 2 meeting. M33: in progress.	M34:

15.6 New action items from meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 -- this document you are reading)	Status
AI-33-1	Meeting Secretary - Dr. V.S. UMaaheswaran a to finalize the document N1603 containing the unconfirmed meeting minutes and send it to the convener as soon as possible. b to finalize the document N1604 containing the adopted meeting resolutions and send it to the	M34: M34:

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 -- this document you are reading)	Status
convener as soon as possible.		
AI-33-2	<p>Convener - Mr. Mike Ksar</p> <p>a to instruct the future of ISO/IEC 10646 Part 2, to take note of resolution M33.13 (Greek Byzantine Musical signs): WG 2 accepts the repertoire of 246 Greek Byzantine Musical signs proposed in document N1582 (based on documents N1208 and N1375) with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. combining characters are to be shown in the code tables with dotted circles b. provisional code positions will be in plane 1 starting at D000. <p>This repertoire will be held in a collection of characters to be encoded in the future part 2 of ISO/IEC 10646.</p> <p>b to get together with SC 2 chair on the topic of 'Cultural Adaptability Workshop' and its possible location and timing in conjunction with next WG 2 meeting.</p> <p>c to request through SC 2 to ISO to advise Bangladesh, with reference to their proposal on Bengali coded character set, to acquire a copy of 10646; also to arrange for a copy of the Unicode V 2.0 book to be sent to them.</p> <p>d to recommend that SC 2 nominate Mr. Keld Simonsen as the official liaison officer from SC 2 to IETF.</p>	<p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p>
AI-33-3	<p>Editor - Mr. Bruce Paterson</p> <p>to prepare the appropriate AM, DAM or PDAM texts, sub-division proposals, or entries in collections of characters for future coding, with assistance from other identified parties, in accordance with the following WG 2 resolutions:</p> <p>a M33.1 (DAM 5 - Korean Hangul): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1561, and the final text in N1570 with the following correction: collection "71 HANGUL EXTENDED" should be "71 HANGUL SYLLABLES", on page 2, and instructs its editor to forward them by September 1997 to SC2 secretariat for further processing. (Korean member body - Professor Kyongsok Kim- is to furnish the final charts in a ready for publish format.)</p> <p>b M33.2 (DAM-6 Tibetan): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1562, and the final text in N1571, and instructs its editor to forward them to SC2 secretariat in July 1997 for further processing.</p> <p>c M33.3 (DAM-7 - Additional 33 characters): WG 2 accepts the disposition of comments in document N1563, and the final text in N1572 including the additional information on Hebrew character names in Annex P, and instructs its editor to forward them to SC2 secretariat in July 1997 for further processing.</p> <p>d M33.6 (FPDAM-10 - Ethiopic script): WG 2 accepts the disposition of ballot comments in document N1614, and instructs its editor, with the assistance of the Unicode Consortium (Dr. Glenn Adams), to prepare the final disposition of comments and text for DAM-10 on Ethiopic script and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing by October 1997, with the target date of April 1998 for the AM-10 text.</p> <p>e M33.7 (FPDAM-11 - Canadian Syllabics script): WG 2 instructs its editor, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), to prepare the disposition of comments on the ballot of PDAM-11, prepare the text for DAM-11, and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing, by October 1997, with the target date of April 1998 for the AM-11 text taking into account the following agreements: Harmonize use of the name - UNIFIED CANADIAN ABORIGINAL SYLLABICS. Correct the shapes for code positions 14FF and 1512.</p> <p>f M33.8 (FPDAM-12 - Cherokee script): WG 2 instructs its editor, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), to prepare the disposition of comments on the ballot of PDAM-12, prepare the text for DAM-12, and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing, by October 1997, with the target date of April 1998 for the AM-12 text. taking into account the following agreement: Move up the proposed code positions by one removing the empty position at position 13A0.</p> <p>g M33.10 (DCOR - Collection Identifiers): WG 2 instructs its editor to prepare a draft technical corrigendum (DCOR) to ISO/IEC 10646-1:1993, and forward it to SC2 secretariat by October 1997 for further processing, with the</p>	<p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p>

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 -- this document you are reading)	Status
	<p>target date of May 1998 for the final COR text, based on document N1556 taking into account comments received at WG 2 meeting 33.</p> <p>h M33.14 (FPDAM-16 - Braille patterns): WG 2 accepts 256 characters, their names and their shapes in the report of the ad hoc group on Braille patterns in document N 1612, with code positions in the range 2800 to 28FF in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create FPDAM text, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), based on document N 1624, and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing by September 1997, with target date of May 1998 for DAM-16 text and October 1998 for the final AM-16 text.</p> <p>i M33.15 (Runic script): WG 2 accepts the repertoire of 81 characters for Runic script, their shapes and their names proposed in document N1542 for encoding in the range 16A0 through 16FF in the BMP. The shapes are to be changed to look like those in document N1330, using fonts to be provided by Sweden by 15 October 1997. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create a new sub division proposal, registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from Sweden and Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing.</p> <p>j M33.16 (Ogham script): WG 2 accepts the repertoire of 29 characters for Ogham script, their shapes and their names proposed in document N1610 for encoding in the range 1680 through 169F in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create a sub division proposal, registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson), and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing.</p> <p>k M33.17 (Sinhala script): WG 2 accepts 80 characters, their shapes, and their names in the report of the ad hoc group on Sinhala script in document N 1613, and assigns them to code positions in the range 0D80 to 0DFF in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create a new sub division item proposal, registration request and FPDAM text, with assistance from Unicode Consortium (Dr. Glenn Adams), based on document N 1613, and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing.</p> <p>l M33.18 (Yi script and Yi radicals): WG 2 accepts: 1165 characters, their shapes and names in document N 1608 for the Yi script, and their assignment to code positions in the range A000 to A48C in the BMP, and 57 characters (Note:18 more than in resolution M32.8), their shapes and names in document N 1611 for the Yi radicals, and their assignment to code positions in the range A490 to A4C8 in the BMP. WG 2 further instructs its editor to create PDAM text, with assistance from Ireland (Mr. Michael Everson) and China (Mr. Mao Yong Gang), based on documents N 1608 and N 1611, and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing.</p> <p>m M33.26 (FPDAM on Symbols and Other collections): WG 2 instructs its editor to prepare a sub division proposal, registration proposal and FPDAM text and forward them to SC 2 secretariat for simultaneous processing, containing the set of characters in document N 1626 (extracted from document N1564), and the characters accepted in resolutions M33.21, M33.22, M33.23, M33.24 and M33.25 listed below: (Note that the General Variation Mark is held back in the symbols collection at this time - see AI-33-5-a). M33.21 (Medieval English characters): WG 2 accepts the four additional characters for Medieval English, the shapes and their names proposed in document N1547 for encoding in the BMP as follows: 01F6 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER HWAIR 01F7 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER WYNN 021C LATIN CAPITAL LETTER YOGH 021D LATIN SMALL LETTER YOGH M33.22 (Armenian Hyphen): WG 2 accepts one additional character for Armenian - its name, its shape and its code position in the BMP, in accordance with the report of the ad hoc group on Armenian in document N 1616, as follows: 058A ARMENIAN HYPHEN M33.23 (Euro sign): WG 2 accepts the character EURO SIGN, and its shape to be encoded in position 20AC in the</p>	<p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p>
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1603	Unconfirmed Minutes Meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 1997-06-30/07-04	1997-10-24 Page 60 of 63

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 -- this document you are reading)	Status								
	<p>BMP, in accordance with document N 1566. M33.24 (4 Latin characters): WG 2 accepts the following four Latin characters (requested by Romania), their names and shapes to be encoded in the BMP as follows:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">0218</td> <td>LATIN CAPITAL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0219</td> <td>LATIN SMALL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>021A</td> <td>LATIN CAPITAL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>021B</td> <td>LATIN SMALL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW</td> </tr> </table> <p>in accordance with document N1361. M33.25 (9 additional Arabic characters): WG 2 accepts the 9 additional Arabic characters (chiefly from ISO 11822), their names and shapes and their proposed code positions in the BMP as proposed in document N 1573.</p> <p>n M33.27 (PDAM on Keyboard symbols): WG 2 instructs its editor to prepare a work item proposal, registration proposal and PDAM text and forward them to SC 2 secretariat for simultaneous processing, containing the set of keyboard symbols in document N 1625 (extracted from document N1564) and the character accepted in resolution M33.20 below. M33.20 (Keyboard Decimal Separator symbol): With reference to document N1548, WG 2 accepts the proposed symbol for 'decimal point marker' requested by SC 18/WG9 for encoding in ISO/IEC 10646-1 with the provisional name BLACK NARROW UPPER LEFT TRIANGLE, at code position 2396 in the BMP, and with the shape as shown in document N 1625.</p> <p>o to update document N1529, Editorial Corrigenda – 3rd Cumulative List – Issue 2 based on discussions at meeting 33, with assistance of the Unicode Consortium (Dr. Glenn Adams).</p>	0218	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW	0219	LATIN SMALL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW	021A	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW	021B	LATIN SMALL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW	<p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p>
0218	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW									
0219	LATIN SMALL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW									
021A	LATIN CAPITAL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW									
021B	LATIN SMALL LETTER T WITH COMMA BELOW									
	<p>AI-32-4 Co-editors of TR 15285 (Messrs. Edwin Hart, Alan Griffiee)</p> <p>a per resolution, M33.9 (PDTR 15285 - Character Glyph Model), to prepare the disposition of comments on the ballot of PDTR 15285, prepare the text for DTR 15285, and forward these to SC2 secretariat for further processing, taking into account the comments received on the proposed disposition of comments in document N1586 and the proposed DTR text in document N1587 at WG 2 meeting 33, in July 1997, with the target date of May 1998 for the final TR text.</p>	<p>M34:</p>								
	<p>AI-33-5 IRG (Mr. Zhang Zhoucai, Rapporteur)</p> <p>a to clarify the semantic of the GENERAL VARIATION MARK working with other interested experts, per resolution M33.28 (General Variation Mark): WG2 resolves that the GENERAL VARIATION MARK in document N 1564 will be further processed, once further clarification regarding its semantic and use is received from IRG.</p> <p>b to prepare the appropriate texts per resolution M33.29 (IRG - NPs): In accordance with IRG#9 resolutions 4 and 7 in document N 1591, WG 2 instructs IRG to prepare new sub division proposals for the following projects: CJK Ideographs for Plane 2 Ideograph Structure Characters and Ideograph Component Supplement and submit them to WG 2 for consideration at its next meeting.</p> <p>c to take note of the resolution M33.30 (IRG Administrative): Unanimous WG 2 approves the following resolutions from IRG#9: #6. Extension of the term of Mr. Zhang Zhoucai as rapporteur till meeting IRG#10 #7. IRG Meeting 10 to be held in Ho-Chi Minh City, Vietnam, 1997-12-15--19.</p>	<p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p>								
	<p>AI-33-6 Ad hoc group on principles and procedures (lead - Mr. Sven Thygesen) to update the standing document on Principle and Procedures per following:</p> <p>a M33.11 (Block Assignment Guideline): WG 2 accepts the request to add Block Assignment Guideline (see document N1583 - item 72.18) with the qualification that the high frequency occurrence criterion be used when no other overriding criterion exists. WG 2 further instructs the ad hoc group on principles and procedures to update the standing document on Principles and Procedures accordingly.</p> <p>b M33.12 (Empty 00 position in a block): WG 2 emphasizes that proposals for code allocations should not leave position 00 unassigned in each block unless there are compelling documented reasons for doing so. WG 2 further instructs the ad hoc group on principles and procedures to update the standing document on Principles and Procedures accordingly.</p> <p>c add the graphical view of the road map of the BMP in document N1520, after it is updated by Mr. Michael Everson ensuring that it is in synchronism with the road map text.</p>	<p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p> <p>M34:</p>								
<p>ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1603 Unconfirmed Minutes Meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 1997-06-30/07-04</p>		<p>1997-10-24 Page 61 of 63</p>								

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 -- this document you are reading)	Status
AI-33-7	Swedish member body (Mr. Karl Ivar Larsson) a to assist the editor Mr. Bruce Paterson in the preparation of the appropriate text per resolution M33.15 (Runic script) - see action item AI-33-3-i on the editor.	M34:
AI-33.8	Korean member body (Professor Kyongsok Kim) a to provide the editor the publication quality final code tables for Amendment No. 5, per resolution M33.1 (DAM 5 - Korean Hangul) - see action item AI-33-3-a on the editor. b is invited to submit a proposal summary form to cover requests for Gugyeol characters (original requests in documents N936) with a possible updates to these documents and submit to WG 2 for consideration at meeting 34.	M34: M34:
AI-33-9	Danish member body (Mr. Keld Simonsen) a Mr. Keld Simonsen is invited to propose a new work item proposal related to Character Glyph Mode, to address the Danish ballot response comments which were considered to be outside the scope of DTR 15285 on CGM. b Mr. Keld Simonsen, as the liaison officer to IETF, to invite IETF representative to attend the next WG 2 meeting.	M34: M34:
AI-32-10	The Unicode Consortium (Dr. Glenn Adams) a to assist the editor in preparation of the disposition of comments and DAM-10 text on Ethiopic script, per resolution M33.6 (FPDAM-10 - Ethiopic script) - see action item AI-33-3-d on the editor. b to assist the editor in the preparation of FPDAM text on Sinhala script, per resolution M33.17 (Sinhala script) - see action item AI-33-3-k on the editor. c to assist the editor in updating document N1529, Editorial Corrigenda – 3rd Cumulative List – Issue 2 based on discussions at meeting 33 - see action item AI-33-3-o on the editor.	M34: M34: M34:
AI-32-11	Chinese member body (Mr. Miao Yong Gang) a to assist the editor in the preparation of PDAM on Yi-script and Yi-radicals, per resolution M33.18 (Yi script and Yi radicals) - see action item AI-33-3-l on the editor. b to ensure that all interested parties on Mongolian script are informed well ahead of time of the ad hoc meeting schedule on Mongolian (planned for August 1997 in Ulaanbator).	M34: M34:
AI-32-12	Irish member body (Mr. Michael Everson) a to assist the editor in the preparation of the DAM-11 text on Canadian Syllabics script, per resolution M33.7 (FPDAM-11 - Canadian Syllabics script) - see action item AI-33-3-e on the editor. b to assist the editor with the preparation of DAM-12 text, per resolution M33.8 (FPDAM-12 - Cherokee script) - see action item AI-33-3-f on the editor. c to assist the editor in preparing the FPDAM text on Braille patterns, per resolution M33.14 (FPDAM-16 - Braille patterns) - see action item AI-33-3-h on the editor. d to assist the editor in the preparation of FPDAM text on Runic script, per resolution M33.15 (Runic script) - see action item AI-33-3-i on the editor. e to assist the editor in the preparation of FPDAM on Ogham script, per resolution M33.16 (Ogham script) - see action item AI-33-3-j on the editor. f to assist the editor in the preparation of PDAM on Yi-script and Yi-radicals, per resolution M33.18 (Yi script and Yi radicals) - see action item AI-33-3-l on the editor. g is invited to update his graphical view of the road map, document N1520, ensuring that it is in synchronism with the road map text in the principles and procedures document and assist Mr. Sven Thygesen in incorporating it into the guidelines in principles and procedures, currently document N1502. h to bring to attention of TCA for review and feedback on document N1593 - Proposal to add Latin characters by Latinized Taiwanese languages.	M34: M34: M34: M34: M34: M34: M34: M34:
AI-33-13	All member bodies and liaison organizations a to take note of resolution M33.5 (Electronic documents within WG 2); WG 2 confirms that it will continue to use paper copies for document distribution. However, it encourages its members to additionally provide the convener with electronic copies for possible postings to the WG 2 web site. WG 2 adopts the set of guidelines in document N 1615 for this purpose. b to take note of resolution M33.19 (Policy on PU zone): WG 2 emphasizes that no technical contributions regarding usage of Private Use zones in the standard will be entertained by WG 2. c to take note of the meeting dates in resolution M33.32 (Future meetings): WG 2 confirms the following future meeting schedule: IRG Meeting 10 to be held in Ho-Chi Minh City, Vietnam, 1997-12-15--19. Meeting 34: 16--20 March 1998, Seattle, WA, USA; Host: Microsoft Corp., USA.	M34: M34: M34:
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N1603	Unconfirmed Minutes Meeting 33, Heraklion, Crete, Greece; 1997-06-30/07-04	1997-10-24 Page 62 of 63

Item	Assigned to / action (Reference Meeting 33 Resolutions document N1604 and Unconfirmed Meeting 33 minutes in document N1603 -- this document you are reading)	Status
Meeting 35: 21--25 September 1998, UK - Host: BSI Meeting 36: 15--19 March 1999, Beijing, China Meeting 37: September 1999 -- Open for Invitation.		
	<p>d to review and feedback on document N1529, Editorial Corrigenda – 3rd Cumulative List – Issue 2. M34:</p> <p>e to review and feedback on document N1523 - Proposal for encoding the Burmese script. M34:</p> <p>f to review and feedback on document N1524 - Proposal for encoding the Khmer script. M34:</p> <p>g to review and feedback on document N1519 - Proposal for encoding the Thaana script. M34:</p> <p>h to review and feedback on documents N935, N936, and N1599 on adding two Bangjeom chars (Old Hangul tone marks). M34:</p> <p>l to take note that insinuations and innuendoes of personal nature will not be acceptable in technical contributions made to WG 2. M34:</p> <p>j to review and feedback on the contributions N1559 - Proposal for encoding the Cham script, and N1578 - Cham encoding discussion, towards arriving at a more mature proposal on the Cham script. M34:</p> <p>k to review and feedback on the proposals on Archaic Scripts -- N1575 on Aegean Scripts – Phaistos Disk, Linear B and Cypriot; N1579 - Phoenician script; N1580- - Etruscan script; and N1581 - Gothic script. M34:</p> <p>Member bodies are invited to explore resources within each country on archaic scripts that are of primarily scholarly interest to provide meaningful feedback on such contributions. Member bodies may have to seek different kinds of expertise to deal with these Archaic scripts -- suggested sources may be locations such as Universities and other Linguistic research groups.</p> <p>l to review and feedback on the proposals on newer non-traditional scripts: N1574 on Pollard Syllabary, and N1576 - Shavian. M34: (See suggestion to member bodies in item AI-33-13-k above).</p> <p>m to review and feedback on document N1590 - Repertoire proposal for 10 additional Cyrillic characters for Kildin Sami. M34:</p> <p>n to review and feedback on document N1593 - Proposal to add Latin characters by Latinized Taiwanese languages. M34:</p> <p>o to review and feedback on document N1619 - Proposal to add 2 Latin characters from Finland. M34:</p>	

END OF MEETING MINUTES