TO: UTC
FROM: **Deborah Anderson, Ken Whistler, Roozbeh Pournader, Lisa Moore, and Liang Hai**
SUBJECT: **Recommendations to UTC #153 October 2017 on Script Proposals**
DATE: **22 October 2017**

The Script Ad Hoc group met on 6 October 2017 in order to review proposals. The following represents feedback on proposals that were posted in the Unicode document registry at the time the group met.

GENERAL
1.   Script names
Document: L2/17-293 About script names in the code charts – Eduardo Marin Silva

Comments: We reviewed this document, which requested alternative script names be added to the top of the names list for 4 scripts.

Some of the proposed alternative names appear to be acceptable (i.e., a note about the proper spelling of N'Ko and the alternative name for Bopomofo), but others have a long history and are better handled in the text of the core specification. It was noted that script (and character) names are formally constrained by limitations as spelled out in §4.8 of the core spec, so accents or punctuation marks are not allowed.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC remand this document to the Editorial Committee.

EUROPE
2.   Latin
a.   Cornish characters
Documents: L2/17-357 Proposal to add one punctuation character for Medieval Cornish – Michael Everson
L2/17-358 Proposal to add one combining character for Medieval Cornish – Michael Everson

Comments: We reviewed earlier drafts of these proposals, which were available when the script ad hoc met. The proposals are both based on L2/17-342.

a.   One punctuation character: DOUBLE OBLIQUE HYPHEN WITH FALLING DOTS (L2/17-357)
This proposal is for one character that is attested in medieval Cornish manuscripts. It is used to separate verses. Evidence from manuscripts is provided.

The following points were raised during discussion:
  • How have other scholars represent this mark in typeset text?
  • Contact experts to see if there is a need to interchange this symbol in text.

b.   One combining character: COMBINING OVERCURL (L2/17-358)
This document proposes a combining overcurl that appears in Medieval Cornish handwriting. This mark may be used as a swash with no meaning, or it may be an an abbreviation.

The following are comments raised during discussion of this proposal:
- Because it is not clear that the mission of an international character encoding standard is to provide character-by-character representation of manuscripts, consider other possible approaches to representing this mark (such as markup, fonts, etc.).
- Demonstrate the requirement for this mark to be interchanged across different systems.
- If this mark is deemed eligible for representation in plaintext:
  - Discuss whether the mark could be a ligature of a base and an inverted breve.
  - Because a combining mark could be difficult for font vendors to implement, list the pre-composed forms that would need to be encoded, as one option.

Recommendations: For the punctuation character, we recommend the UTC withhold approval of the character, which is in ballot, until the questions are addressed. For the combining character, we recommend the UTC review the proposal, and send the author comments, including those above.

b. Tironian et
Document: L2/17-359 Proposal to add six Latin Tironian letters - Michael Everson
Other documents: L2/17-300 Proposal to add five Latin Tironian letters (WG2 N4841) - Michael Everson
L2/17-326 Feedback on encoding proposals L2/17-236 and L2/17-300 - Eduardo Marin Silva

Comments: We reviewed a draft of this proposal, which is a revision of L2/17-300. (Note: L2/17-300 was reviewed by the script ad hoc in L2/17-367.   The script ad hoc did not review the feedback in L2/17-326.)

Two issues were raised in the discussion:
1. Casing
This document proposes three casing pairs for Latin letter Tironian ET, which was used to represent Latin or French *et*, Old English *ond*, and Irish *agus*, all meaning 'and'. The proposal states that Medieval English manuscripts treat Tironian ET as a letter. Figure 1 shows it being cased when sentence initial.

The character U+204A TIRONIAN SIGN ET was encoded in Unicode 3.0 (1999) in the General Punctuation block with gc=Po. This proposal offers two different options to represent the casing pairs for Latin ET. Under the first option, three pairs of characters are proposed for encoding in Latin Extended-D. An alternative is offered as "Option 2", which changes the property for U+204A TIRONIAN SIGN ET from Po to Ll, and proposes LATIN CAPITAL LETTER TIRONIAN ET, alongside the two other casing pairs – one with hook and the other with hook and stroke – for a total of 5 new characters.

Because the TIRONIAN SIGN ET character is not used in modern texts, and no evidence was given to *require* a case pairing (such as need for automatic capitalization), no change should be made to the property of U+204A, in our opinion.

 Because the evidence was strong for the uppercase form of ET, we recommend one new character be added, TIRONIAN SIGN CAPITAL ET, and located in the Supplemental Punctuation block at U+2E4F, with properties as given for U+204A TIRONIAN SIGN ET (Po;0;ON;;;;;N;;;;;).

2. Forms with hook/hook with stroke
The shape of ET changed through time from 7 into a form with a hook, and a form with hook and stroke. Neither of these variations is found in Ireland, according to the proposal.

The examples show all the proposed forms, as well as variants (such as figures 26 and 31, with glyphs having additional curves). Figure 8 distinguishes in print the current glyph 7 from "a rather elaborate form" of ET, namely an ET WITH HOOK. Figure 14 also differentiates an ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE from an ET WITH HOOK, reflecting the shapes found in the original manuscript (figure 13). Still, a stronger case to carry this differentiation of the forms ET WITH HOOK and ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE in plaintext needs to be made. In our view, the case pairs LATIN CAPITAL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK and LATIN LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE are variants, based on the evidence provided.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC discuss the proposal and consider adding TIRONIAN SIGN CAPITAL ET at U+2E4F with properties as for U+204A.

3. Vithkuqi
Document: L2/17-316 Preliminary proposal for encoding the Vithkuqi script (WG2 N4854) – Michael Everson

Comments: We reviewed this preliminary proposal for Vithkuqi, an historic script used to write Albanian in the 19th century. The script has drawn modern interest after the Kosovan artist Edon Muhaxheri created an art exhibit with the script's letters and designed a new font, aimed at preserving the alphabet and promoting its use. The artist apparently made a few errors by relying on Faulmann's faulty analysis in *Das Buch der Schrift*.

Modern Albanian has phonemes not represented by the historic alphabet, so additions are put forward in this preliminary proposal, using the historic letters with diacritics. The proposal also points out that a few questions remain regarding the original repertoire, such as for the letters B and H.

Since the historic letters are attested in print (with the exception of the issues on B and H), they could proceed in the approval process, and modern additions can be added later, when the modern use and user preferences are determined. One question to consider: would use of combining characters be preferable to precomposed letters?

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC review this proposal, and forward comments to the proposal author.

4. Armenian
Document: L2/17-315 Evidence of diaeresis in Armenian - Yury Golev and Deborah Anderson

Comments: We reviewed this document which provides evidence of diaeresis appearing over the Armenian letters AYB, lowercase OH, and lowercase VO in Armenian dialect materials. The document requested a note be added to the core spec, CLDR include the combinations its exemplars, and font vendors incorporate the appropriate glyphs in their fonts.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC remand this document to the Editorial Committee, and suggest the authors submit a note to CLDR. Further, users should be encouraged to contact their font vendors and request the combination be included in fonts.

MIDDLE EAST
6. Elymaic

Document: L2/17-226 Proposal to encode the Elymaic script in Unicode - Anshuman Pandey

Comments: We reviewed this proposal, which is a revision of L2/17-055 Preliminary proposal to encode the Elymaic script.

The following were comments made during discussion:

- Add text clarifying that the proposed script is based on the inscriptions, but the script found on the coinage – or some of the coinage – may be a separate script. This text should go into the core specification, once the script is published.
- The discussion on KAPH, AYIN and RESH in §4.1 addresses the concerns raised in the last script ad hoc (L2/17-255).

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC review this proposal and approve it for encoding, after the change suggested above (under the first bullet) is incorporated.

7. Arabic
a. Hamza
Document: L2/17-252 Proposal to encode some Hamza Quranic marks – Azzeddine Lazrek

Comments: We reviewed this proposal which proposes 20 new Arabic characters, 18 of which are combining. The proposal author's analysis is, in our view, theoretically plausible, but is not one based on the Standard, and hence would not be consistent with the current model.

The following are comments on proposed characters:

- Character #1 ARABIC HIGH WASLA

The examples show this combining character only over *alef*.

The proposal mentions "Moreover, we could need to use Wasla alone, to explain its use for example." This indeed happens, and is used in pedagogical text. We do not recommend encoding a separate combining mark due to destabilization of encoding, but a spacing mark for wasla, similar to the characters in the U+FBB2..U+FBC1 range could be encoded.

Note that a visually similar character placed over other characters was earlier proposed by Mussa Abudena (figure 1 in L2/16-056), but that is a *waqf* sign, which is graphically much larger. The script ad hoc had earlier recommended this character for encoding in L2/16-342. After discussion with Arabic experts, the suggested name put forward was ARABIC SMALL HIGH WORD SAH (with an annotation "sign of waqf").

- Character #3 ARABIC SMALL DOT LEFT

This character is a good candidate for encoding, but not as a combining mark. (A combining mark or stand-alone character would appear identically when rendered.) The January 2017 script ad hoc (L2/17-037) had recommended this same character, but with the name ARABIC ROUNDED STOP WITH FILLED CENTRE and an annotation that the character will appear to the left of the stem of an *alef*.   However, the size and appearance of the dots should be discussed: characters #2-#4 are small dots, #5-#6 hollow rings, #10-#14 are big dots. How different are they from one another? How do they appear in different systems?

- Character #5 ○ ARABIC SMALL RING LEFT and Character #6 ○ ARABIC SMALL RING BELOW

Characters #5 and #6 may be legitimate, though #5 would need to be encoded as a stand-alone character instead of a combining mark. Higher resolution images are required in order to determine what the marks really are. For example, what is in Figure 10.b (see below) could be a below version of U+06DF.

What is the character in Figure 36.b (see below)? Is it #6?

- Character #7 ○ ARABIC SMALL STROKE ABOVE and Character #9 ○ ARABIC SMALL STROKE BELOW

These three characters, which are attached to the *alef*, should be proposed as precomposed characters, because in the current model they should be encoded as atomic units. The January 2017 script ad hoc report (L2/17-037) had recommended precomposed forms. The following were the names recommended by the ad hoc in L2/17-037:
    ALEF WITH ATTACHED FATHA (whose glyph has a stroke at the top)
    ALEF WTH ATTACHED KASRA (whose glyph has a stroke on the bottom)
However, the size of the stroke should be discussed: How are characters #7 and #9 different from #16 ARABIC BIG STROKE ABOVE and #17 ARABIC BIG STROKE BELOW? Are they clearly different characters with different semantics?

- Character #14 • ARABIC BIG DOT INLINE
Based on the examples provided, this looks like a good candidate encoding, and distinct enough from ARABIC ROUNDED STOP WITH FILLED CENTRE.

- Character #15 ○ ARABIC YEH ABOVE
This character may be a good candidate for encoding, but the figure provided (figure 27) is too low resolution to be able to read the signs clearly. Provide figures 27 a and b with a higher resolution.

- Character #20 ‑ ARABIC BIG STROKE INLINE
Explain why U+0640 ARABIC TATWEEL or U+06D4 ARABIC FULL STOP (used in Urdu) could not be used to represent the text in figure 33.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC review this document, and relay to the author that the following characters are eligible for encoding, but a revised proposal should be prepared, with references to the appropriate examples:

a. ARABIC SYMBOL WASLA ABOVE (at U+FBC2)
b. ARABIC BIG DOT INLINE (with the name and code point to be determined)
c. If the size of the stroke can be resolved (and code points to be determined)
    ALEF WITH ATTACHED FATHA (whose glyph has a stroke at the top)
    ALEF WITH MIDDLE STROKE
    ALEF WiTH ATTACHED KASRA (whose glyph has a stroke on the bottom)
d. If the size of the dot is resolved (and code point to be determined)
    ARABIC ROUNDED STOP WITH FILLED CENTRE

Other feedback from discussion and the comments above should also be forwarded to the author.

b. Wasla
Document: L2/17-327 Recommendations on additional Wasla proposition (L2/17-215) – Azzeddine Lazrek

Background documents:
L2/17-215 Proposal to Encode Additional Wasla Characters for the Holy Quran - Murodulla Begmatov
L2/17-255 Recommendations to UTC #152 July-August 2017 on Script Proposals – Anderson et al.

Comments: We reviewed this document, which provided feedback on L2/17-215, a proposal to add 6 *wasla* characters. The original *wasla* proposal was reviewed by the script ad hoc (L2/17-255) and discussed at the July/August 2017 UTC.

The feedback document L2/17-255 repeated the comments of the script ad hoc, namely that published examples are required in order to be eligible for encoding them. Beyond what the script ad hoc had recommended, the author further suggests that sequences could be used, including characters he proposes in L2/17-252.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC note this document.

SOUTH ASIA
8. Divehi (Dhives Akuru)
Document: L2/17-292 Proposal to encode Divehi - Anshuman Pandey

Comments: We reviewed this proposal, which built off two preliminary proposals, L2/09-191 and L2/10-213.

Below are comments raised during discussion:
- We recommend the name of the script be changed; the proposed name, "Divehi", would cause confusion, as the modern language is called "Dhivehi"/ "Divehi" (and "Maldivian"). Possible names could be "Dhives Akuru" or "Old Divehi".
- On page 7, one major variant of LETTER O appears to be the sequence <LETTER E, VOWEL SIGN AA> and a variant of LETTER AU is the sequence <LETTER E, VOWEL SIGN O>. It would be better to treat these variants as an orthographic difference (similar to type 2 vowel letters) and encode them graphically, instead of phonemically.
- In §4.3, it is not clear that the major variants listed for the CONSONANT CA should be unified with CONSONANT CA, or might need to be separately encoded. What is the source of the

alternate variants for CA? Similarly, provide more information for the variant for CONSONANT NNA.

- Also in §4.3, why is the first variant of YA 𑚈 unified with YA, instead of YYA?
- We recommend seeking input from implementers on §5.5 (2) (page 18), namely, how the kinzi-like sequence, proposed here to be encoded as NGA + VIRAMA for the attached case and a separate character for the detached case, should be encoded. Also, do implementers feel that the suffix that is presently proposed to be encoded as VIRAMA + THA in §5.6 Gemination (page 18), should be encoded as a separate combining mark instead?
- In section on Unicode Character Data (page 24), correct the decompositions for U+11B34, U+11B35, and U+11B36.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC review this proposal, and forward any comments, including those above, to the proposal author.

9. Vedic
Document: L2/17-319 Reconsidering the glyph change of Vedic signs Jihvamuliya and Upadhmaniya – Srinidhi and Sridatta
Background document: L2/17-095 Request to change the glyphs of Vedic signs Jihvamuliya and Upadhmaniya – Srinidhi and Sridatta

Comments: We reviewed this proposal, which modified an earlier request (L2/17-095) to change the glyph for U+1CF6 VEDIC SIGN UPADHMANIYA. The authors also provide some additional information in answer to questions posed in the script ad hoc report L2/17-255 (p. 13).

Glyphs

The authors are requesting the glyph for U+1CF6 VEDIC SIGN UPADHMANIYA be changed to 𑳀 (which varies from that in the earlier document, L2/17-095). The glyph for U+1CF5 VEDIC SIGN JIHVAMULIYA should still be an "X" shape, but it should be enclosed in a dotted box. The evidence provided supports the new glyph for *upadhmaniya*.

Encoding model
The proposed model recommends stacking when *upadhmaniya* or *jihvamuliya* is followed by a consonant (see top row example, below). When a ZWNJ is placed between the *upadhmaniya* or *jihvamuliya* and the following consonant, the two characters appear side by side (see bottom row example, below).

The discussion on the encoding model raised a following questions:
- In the examples of explicit forms (bottom row of examples above), what happens if a left-side vowel sign is on the on the left of the *ka/kha/pa/pha* character? Would it go to the left of the first or second consonant? Provide an example, and discuss in a revised version of this proposal.
- Depending on the answer to the previous question, ZWNJ may or may not be the appropriate mechanism to use to render the non-stacked versions of the *upadhmaniya* and *jihvamuliya.*

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC take the following actions:
- modify the earlier action item on the glyph erratum (152-C8), instead refer to Section 5 of L2/17-319 for the glyphs
- add Bengali to the set of scripts in the ScriptExtensions property for U+1CF5 and U+1CF6
- assign the Indic_Syllabic_Category for U+1CF5 and U+1CF6 to be Consonant_With_Stacker.
- remand to the Editorial Committee this document, once revised with information requested above. The topics for the core specification are: text on the rendering and behavior of *upadhmaniya* and *jihvamuliya* in Bengali, and text stating that U+1CF5 and U+1CF6 behave as other consonants in consonant clusters, they can occur with more than 2 consonants (i.e., *hkra* and *hpra*), and they can also occur with vowels signs in clusters.

10. Devanagari
Document: L2/17-309 Special rendering of Rya in Devanagari – Srinidhi and Sridatta

Comments: We reviewed this document, which was a response to the script ad hoc recommendations L2/17-255, requesting evidence for the special rendering of *rya* in North Indian languages.

The authors provide ample attestation that in a number of North Indian languages (Braj Bhasha, Awadhi, Rajasthani, Gujarati, etc.) the sequence <RA, VIRAMA, YA> renders a ligature of *ya* and *ra*, instead of *repha.* This situation is similar to Bengali, where the sequence <RA, VIRAMA, YA> may be rendered as *ya-phalaa* or *repha.*

To prevent the *repha* from being rendered, the authors recommend use of ZWJ after the *ra*, but before the *virama*. In Marathi, where the *eyelash ra* appears in certain contexts, ZWJ is placed after the *virama* but before the *ya* to render the ligature.

In our opinion, the recommended sequence is consistent with the current specification.

Recommendations: We request the UTC review this doc to verify it conforms to the specification and, if so, remand the document to the Editorial Committee for text to be included in Chapter 12.

EAST ASIAN
11. Miao
Document: L2/17-345 Additions to the Miao Script – Adrian Cheuk

Comments: We reviewed this proposal, which proposes 16 characters used today by 4 language groups in 3 provinces of China. The Miao script is dynamic; the proposal author orally reported that there are two other language communities using the script, but no data is yet available on the usage of the script by those communities. This document was seen first at the September 2017 WG2 and was added to PDAM 2.2.

Four characters (U+1F6F46, U+16F47, U+16F86, and U+16F87) have not yet formally appeared in print publications, but the proposal includes examples of the characters in charts and provides letters from the community attesting their use.

The document proposes the addition of 16 new characters, 6 consonants, 9 vowel signs, and one nukta. The nukta, a combining mark that appears on the lower-left of the base character, is used only with two consonants, and marks contrast in the place of articulation. The addition of a combining nukta mark

that appears on the left side of a base letter would change the syllabic model for Miao, which already represents nasalization with a spacing letter that appears to the left side of another letter. Such a change to add left-side reordering of a new combining mark may be an ill-advised addition of complexity to the model.

We suggest the author investigate the different options:
a. Encode 2 new atomic letters which simply appear with the nukta diacritic preformed (MIAO LETTER RNA and MIAO LETTER RDA), with no separate encoding of a combining nukta mark.

b. Treat the nukta similarly to the existing U+16F50 MIAO NASALIZATION LETTER (gc=Lo), i.e. as a separate Miao Retroflexion Letter that occurs on the left side of the letter it phonologically modifies.

c. [as in the current proposal] Add a combining nukta that must be re-ordered for display on the left side of a base letter.

Of these options, our recommendation is to encode 2 new characters, as it will not create issues for the properties, won't make the model too complex, and should make rendering simpler.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC discuss this, and decide whether to add a ballot comment to PDAM 2.2 on the nukta. Our recommendation is to encode two preformed characters MIAO LETTER RNA, MIAO LETTER RDA, and revise the proposal accordingly, without the request for a combining nukta character.

NUMBER SYSTEMS, SYMBOLS, and PUNCTUATION
12. Ottoman Siyaq
Document: L2/17-348 Proposal to encode Ottoman Siyaq Numbers – Anshuman Pandey

Comments: We reviewed this proposal , which has addressed the concerns raised in the script ad hoc recommendations from July-August 2017 (L2/17-255).

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC review this proposal and accept the 61 Ottoman Siyaq Numbers.

13. Tally Marks
Document: L2/17-297 Follow up to L2/17-188 (On the name and display of tally marks) – Eduardo Marin Silva

Comments: We reviewed this document which re-iterated the request for a name change of U+1D377 TALLY MARK ONE and U+1D378 TALLY MARK FIVE to FENCE TALLY MARK ONE and FENCE TALLY MARK FIVE, which was earlier recommended by the author in L2/17-188. The rationale was that the current names are too general.

There was no consensus in the ad hoc to change the names.

(There was also a comment regarding the vertical orientation property, but that can be addressed at a later point.)

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC discuss this document. Note, these tally marks are in the DAM1 ballot, so if there is any consensus to change names for them, that would require an explicit comment on that ballot.

14. Moon symbols
Document: L2/17-304 The problem with the MOON SYMBOLs – Kent Karlsson

Comments: We reviewed this document, which requested the use of Variation Sequences to be able to depict the moon as viewed from the southern hemisphere. The document does not provide any examples in print that make a case for encoding the characters. It was also noted that the use of VS to represent this "southern view" is not an appropriate use of VSes.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC note this document.

15 FULL STOP
Document: L2/17-324 Two distinct code points: DECIMAL SEPARATOR and FULL STOP - Dario Schiavon

Comments: We briefly reviewed this proposal which asked for a name change to U+002E FULL STOP (to "FULL STOP-SEPARATOR") and two new code points, one for FULL STOP and one for DECIMAL SEPARATOR. Names cannot be changed, once the characters are encoded.

Recommendations: We recommend the UTC go on record as not accepting this proposal. We also recommend that the UTC document that decision with a notice of non-approval

****

The following documents were not discussed at the script ad hoc. A number of those documents listed below were seen at the WG2 meeting may be discussed during the UTC meeting. Those not taken up at the UTC will be put on the agenda for the next script ad hoc meeting.

EUROPE
Latin
Thorn with Diagonal Stroke
L2/17-236 Proposal to add LATIN LETTER THORN WITH DIAGONAL STROKE (WG2 N4836) – Andrew West and Michael Everson
Feedback: L2/17-326 Feedback on encoding proposals L2/17-236 and L2/17-300 - Eduardo Marin Silva

AFRICA
Garay
L2/17-322 Report on the Garay script 2017 (WG2 N4875) - Charles Riley

Bété
L2/17-323 Report on the Bété script 2017 (WG2 N4876) – Charles Riley

SOUTH ASIA
Malayalam
L2/17-340 Request to Annotate North Indian Quarter Signs for Malayalam Usage – Cibu Johny

Khojki
L2/17-307 Proposal to encode two characters in Khojki – Srinidhi and Sridatta

Sharada
L2/17-214 Proposal to encode the Prishthamatra for Sharada – Srinidhi and Sridatta

Nandinagari
L2/17-213 Proposal to encode the Prishthamatra for Nandinagari – Srinidhi and Sridatta

Newa
L2/17-369 Proposal to encode JIHVAMULIYA and UPADHMANIYA for Newa

SOUTHEAST ASIA
Tai Le
L2/17-338 Preproposal to encode Tai Le Digits - Yihua Wang, Weining Xi

EAST ASIA
Ersu
L2/17-341 Preliminary Proposal on Encoding Ersu Hieroglyphs - Zhao Liming, Wang Yihua
[Cf. comments in L2/17-367 on SW Chinese Minority Hieroglyphs]

Naxi Dongba
L2/17-337 Results of the ad-hoc meeting on Naxi Dongba in Hohhot (WG2 N4895)
Background docs
L2/17-339=N 4898 Revised chart of Naxi Dongba characters (WG2 N4898)
L2/17-330 Naxi Geba characters from Fang Guoyu's dictionary (WG2 N4886) - Michael Everson
L2/17-331 Naxi Geba characters from Li Lincan's dictionary (WG2 N4887) – Michael Everson
L2/17-320 Naxi Dongba characters from Fang Guoyu's dictionary (WG2 N4877) - Everson, West
L2/17-321 Naxi Dongba characters from Li Lincan's dictionary (WG2 N4878) – Everson, West

Shuowen Seal
L2/17-371 Seal Script Naming Considerations (WG2 N4909)
L2/17-318 Shuowen Seal Ad Hoc Meeting Resolutions (WG2 N4853) – Richard Cook
Background docs
L2/17-317 Shuowen Seal Encoding Design Issues++ (WG2 N4852) – Richard Cook
L2/17-250 Shuowen Seal Encoding Design Issues (WG2 N4834) – Richard Cook

Shuishu
L2/17-336 Results of the ad-hoc meeting on Shuishu in Hohhot (WG2 N4894) – Michael Everson

Tangut
L2/17-360 Tangut Character Additions and Glyph Corrections (replaces L2/17-314 and L2/17-313, which were discussed by script ad hoc in L2/17-367) - Andrew West et a.

CJK
L2/17-306 Enclosed CJK Letters and Months – Bobo Alcazar

L2/17-294 Proposal to add standardized variation sequence for U+FF10 FULLWIDTH DIGIT ZERO – Ken Lunde

L2/17-056 Proposal to add standardized variation sequences - Ken Lunde

NOTATIONAL SYSTEMS, NUMBER SYSTEMS, SYMBOLS, and PUNCTUATION
SignWriting
L2/17-282 Design Options for Sutton SignWriting Auxiliary - Stephen Slevinski
L2/17-220 Design Options for Sutton SignWriting with examples and fonts - Stephen Slevinski

Flute and Lute Notation
Feedback: N4899 Feedbacks on N4848 (Chinese lute notations = L2/17-311) and N4849 (Chinese flute notations = L2/17-312) - Chinese Char Repertoire Project
(Both the lute and flute notation proposals were discussed by the script ad hoc in September in L2/17-367)