Response of IP on Tamil LGR Proposal of 2018-08-09

DATE: 2018-08-15

# Overview

In its response [2018-08-09] to the feedback of IP on Tamil LGR proposal dated 2018-05-30, NBGP appear to have accepted and responded to all IP requests.

# Conclusion

There is an issue in the way the VISARGA is handled that may need a redesign and change in presentation; in addition, there are more minor editorial issues.

Because of the suggested possible change in WLE rules, the IP feels the need to review an updated proposal before making any final recommendation on whether this is ready to go to public comment.

**NBGP:** Afterhaving due discussion with community, GP has accepted the findings of the IP and modified the WLE accordingly.

# Comments on main document (.docx)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** | **NBGP** |
| 1 | In section 3.3.4 the presentation of VISARGA makes reference to some information that is not defined. It is also apparently not complete, as it does not mention the use of VISARGA to modify the sound of following consonants (for foreign sounds) | Please review and fix | 3.3.4. has been Modified  Added Appendix C as a reference. |
| 2 | In section 5.5.4 there is no accounting for the use of VISARGA at the start of a consonant sequence (as when VISARGA is used to modify a consonant to represent foreign sounds) | Please review and fix | resolved by 3.3.2 |
| 3 | Because of the issues 1 and 2, the IP may have given incorrect or incomplete feedback on the design of WLE rules for VISARGA.  As currently defined the rules prevent a VX sequence unless it is a VXC1. That was probably not intended.  Also, as rule 4 currently only allows XC1 sequences, rule 3 is actually redundant (the sequence XX is clearly not of the form XC1).  In reviewing this, the IP has come to the view that the constraints on VISARGA are primarily orthographical (spelling rules) and perhaps not really structural in the way this is understood in the LGR.  For example a label XXX, while not a legal word in Tamil, presents no issues in terms of confusability or the ability of users to recognize or enter it. Perhaps, then, the best approach might be to treat VISARGA like consonants or vowels as a letter that is not dependent on any other and can occur freely.  This also has the effect that it is not necessary for the set C1 to be fixed for all time.  Also, in the absence of spaces, it isn’t clear whether a syllable ending in X couldn’t be followed by another word starting with X (i.e. starting with a foreign sound). This would make WLE rule 3 appear too restrictive.  Labels are not required to be words in any given language; the typical restrictions on placement and sequence for NeoB scripts are focused on preventing mainly the combining marks from occurring in unexpected places, or to disallow sequences that otherwise are problematic in rendering (or in duplicating other code points or sequences). None of those issues seems to be in play here.  Even if not restricted in the LGR, the set C1 should be defined in the explanation of the usage of VISARGA in sections 3.3.4 and/or 5.5.4 | Please consider removing all context rules for VISARGA.  (Alternatively, the rules would have to be redesigned) | Removed context rules for Visarga |
| 4 | Minor editorial issues are commented on in a marked up version of the proposal document which is attached here | Please review and make further changes as needed | Incorporated. |
| 5 | One of the tables had inconsistent formatting, This has been cleaned in the attached version. |  | Incorporated. |

# Comments on Test Labels

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
|  | No new comments | - |
|  |  |  |