

# Questions RE: Han variants mapping

**KIM, Kyongsok (Rep. of KOREA)**

- prepared on 2014.10.02.
- modified on 2015.01.06.

# 1. variants mapping

- want to make sure that (CJKT) people understand the intent of IP (Integration Panel) correctly.
- consider the following four Han characters:

4E00 一 1.0	一	一	一	一	一	一
	G0-523B	HB1-A440	T1-4421	J0-306C	K0-6C69	V1-4A21
58F9 壹 33.9	壹	壹	壹	壹	壹	壹
	G0-523C	HB1-B3FC	T1-5E62	J0-5465	K0-6C6C	V1-513C
5F0C 弍 56.1	弍	弍	弍	弍	弍	
	G5-375F	H-9361	T3-2164	J0-5021	K2-307D	
58F1 弐 33.4	弐		弐	弐	弐	
	GE-263C		T3-2543	J0-306D	K2-2B3C	

## 1.1 Imaginary Situation 1

1) LGR1 (CN?): Three chars (U58F9 壹, U5F0C 弌, U58F1 壹) are considered as variants of U4E00 一.

- notat. (U4E00 一  $\leq$  U58F9 壹, U5F0C 弌, U58F1 壹)

- only U4E00 一 can be used in TLD.

- the other three chars (U58F9 壹, U5F0C 弌, U58F1 壹) cannot be used in TLD

$\Rightarrow$  LGR1's Label Generation Rule

2) LGR2 (KR?): (U4E00 一), (U58F9 壹  $\leq$  U58F1 壹), (U5F0C 弌)

$\Rightarrow$  LGR2's Label Generation Rule.

3) LGR3 (JP?): (U4E00 一), (U58F9 壹), (U58F1 壹),  
(U5F0C 弌)

- All four chars are considered distinct and different  
=> LGR3's Label Generation Rule.

4) Q11: Can LGR1, LGR2, and LGR3 be accepted?

--> This question was split into two questions as shown on the next page.

- Is it possible that CJKT agree on a SINGLE variants mapping?

// this page was added on 2015.01.06.

4-2) Q11-1: Is it technically "impossible" to accept LGR1, LGR2, and LGR3?

- If the answer is yes, why?
- A written answer is highly preferred.

4-3) Q11-2: If it is technically "possible" to accept LGR1, LGR2, and LGR3 but IP (or ICANN?) does not want to accept LGR1, LGR2, and LGR3, why?

- A written answer is highly preferred.

## 5-1) Scenario 1a:

- LGR1, LGR2, and LGR3 are effective.
- Neither “—XX” nor any variants are registered as TLD yet.
  - If “—XX” (assuming that there are no variants for XX) are registered as TLD with LGR1 (CN? language/script?) specified in TLD app. form.
    - No other person can apply for “壹XX”, “弍XX”, or “ㄝXX” as TLD with LGR1, LGR2, or LGR3 (CN?, KR?, JP? language/ script?) specified in TLD app. form.

Q12: Is it correct understanding?

## 5-2) Scenario 1b:

- LGR1, LGR2, and LGR3 are effective.
- Neither “—XX” nor any variants are registered as TLD yet.
- Assume that “—XX” (assuming that there are no variants for XX) are registered as TLD with LGR2 (KR? language/script?) specified in TLD app. form.
  - > Later, person2 can apply for “壹XX” as TLD with LGR2 (KR? language/script?) specified in TLD app. form.
  - > Later, person3 can apply for “弌XX” as TLD with LGR2 (KR? language/script?) specified in TLD app. form.

Q13: Is it a possible scenario? If not, why?

### 5-3) Scenario 1c:

- LGR1, LGR2, and LGR3 are effective.
  - Neither “—XX” nor any variants are registered as TLD yet.
  - Assume that “壹XX” (assuming that there are no variants for XX) are registered as TLD with LGR2 (KR? language/script?) specified in TLD app. form.
- > Later, no person can apply for “—XX”, “弌XX”, or “壹XX” as TLD with LGR1 (CN? language/script?) specified in TLD app. form.

**Q14: Is it a possible scenario? If not, why?**



1.2 Can CJKT come up with a single variants mapping?

– How can CJKT compromise?

1.3 Each language/script LGR can have its own variants mapping?

– a better approach?

## 2. ICANN approval of KR LGR; a complete proposal ?

Q21: wonder if, only after KR LGR proposal is submitted to ICANN, KR LGR will be approved.

– Or can KR LGR be approved by ICANN first and then start making KR LGR?

Q22: also wonder if CN LGR proposal is more or less complete (draft though).

### 3. Status Update: Korean LGP (KLGK)

- 1) 2014.08.21. : KLGK domestic meeting.
  - report of LGP meetings at ICANN #50 in London.
  - a single variants mapping ? - a major issue.
  
- 2) 2014.08.26. : Han Chuan LEE and others attended
  - via Adobe connect.
  - confused at to whether CJKT must agree on a SINGLE variants mapping
  
- 3) 2014.09.03. : CJK people discussed via Adobe connect.
  - connection was not good enough to discuss.
  - CJK(T?) prepare variant mapping for certain chars.

4) lots of confusion RE: variants mapping

4.1) @ ICANN #50 in London:

- each LGR can have its own, possibly different, variants mapping (consider Situation 1 above).

4.2) @ 2014.08.26. meeting with Han Chuan LEE

- CJKT MUST have a SINGLE variants mapping (although disposition can be different.)
- (consider Situation 1 above)

4.3) Until this issue is clearly understood, it seems that Ko LGR cannot proceed at all.

5) a future plan in Oct. ~ Dec. 2014

- define KR's Han variants mapping

- get approval of KLGP from ICANN

#### 4. TLD app. form. uestion RE: JP' s position

– wonder if JP considers

正字 (authentic form) and 略字 (abbreviated form)  
as different and distinct characters,  
NOT as variants.

– example 1: U4E00 一, U58F9 壹, U5F0C 弍, U58F1 壹

– example 2:

## 5. Variants at char level vs. variants at TLD level

- at character level (KR):  
variants (一 4E00, 壹 58F9, 尙 58F1, 弍 5F0C)
- However, at TLD (or word) level (KR):  
大一, 大壹, 大尙, 大弍: variants? probably NOT...  
  
(大一), (大壹 <= 大尙 variant), (大弍)

\* \* \*