Response of IP on Oriya LGR Proposal of 2018-05-29

DATE: 2018-06-25

# Overview

Although the previous version of the Oriya proposal was said to be “an early draft”, the NBGP have responded actively to all suggestions of the IP, so that the proposal appears substantially complete.

The GP for Oriya was not able to provide an authoritative BNF model of the Oriya akshara, but has provided a minimal set of WLE for significant classes of CP.

# Conclusion

The proposal appears substantially complete.

# Comments on main document (.docx)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |  |
| 1 | In section 6.2 (Table 6) a single cross-script variant is proposed with a code point in Malayalam.  The similar glyph to which they are rendered is a circle.  Since Oriya and Malayalam are not similar scripts, and there are no other potential cross-script confusables, this does not appear sufficient to motivate a cross-script variant, even on security grounds.  A CP rendered as a circular glyph is in fact present in most of the scripts of the world and the IP’s general view is that, by itself, such circle homoglyphs aren’t a sufficient issue to warrant a variant definition.  The situation changes for graphically similar scripts that share a more diverse set of variants. | Consider removing this lone variant. | Under Discussion Among NBGP to make final decision |
| 2 | In section 3.3 ‘According to Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Odia\_languagethe Oriya (Odia) diaspora’ | Add a space between ‘language’ and ‘the’ | Done |
| 3 | In section 3.5, IAST is not defined | Please explain acronym | Added it in the Proposal. International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration (I.A.S.T.) is a transliteration scheme that allows the lossless romanization of Indic scripts as employed by Sanskrit and related Indic languages. IAST makes it possible for the reader to read the Indic text unambiguously, exactly as if it were in the original Indic script. Example: କ 0B15 (ka), ଖ 0B16 (kha) etc |
| 4 | In section 4.1, the term ‘ambit’ is not a common term. | Suggest replace by ‘scope’. | Ambit is Replaced with Scope |
| 5 | In section 7 definition of C1 ‘ଡ0B21, ଢ0B22, କ 0B15, ଖ 0B16, ଗ 0B17, ଚ 0B1A, ଜ 0B1C, ଫ 0B2B}’ | Please order C1 in increasing order | Arranged in increasing order |
| 6 | Section 7: Use of modals (“must”, “may”) in specifying separate WLE cases. | For each character mentioned, there MUST be a context made up of a number (>1) of distinct alternatives. Therefore each of these alternatives MAY (not MUST) be the context for that character. | Agreed with this suggesion |
| 7 | Some other details are adjusted in the text for the Proposal .docx attached. | As attached. |  |

# Comments on LGR specification (.xml)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
| 1 | Comments for class names  Named classes should have a “comment” attribute with a reminder of their content. | Please see suggested comments |
| 2 | Reference to Unicode 1.0.1, numbering of references.  For the integrated LGR, the Unicode version references are mechanically re-generated from the Unicode Character Database. That database only reliably goes back to Unicode 1.1, therefore, we do not distinguish between Unicode 1.0, 1.0.1 and 1.1.  The numbering should match that used in MSR-3, with 1.1 having [0]  Also, note use of “comment” attribute for references in the XML. | Change version numbering to match MSR-3 and coming LGR-3  (Review XML and also see whether document needs to change to match XML). |
| 3 | There are a number of minor details where Oriya GP are following some editorial conventions that play poorly with our toolset (for example, enclosing the URL in a reference in parens).  It would be best if those could be fixed now, as much as is feasible, or IP will have to do more extensive editorial prep before we can merge the LGRs. | The IP has attached an edited version of the XML that addresses most of these issues and recommends the GP to review this and base any further work on the XML on it.  (As many suggested fixes as feasible were added to the attached XML file – please review, adopt or make further changes). |

# Comments on Test Labels

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |