Response of IP to Malayalam Draft LGR of 2018-08-07

DATE: 2018-08-15

# Overview

This document provides IP response to the Malayalam LGR proposal dated 2018-08-07

The draft reviewed is the second draft of a Malayalam LGR proposal received by the IP and it follows additional discussion in a teleconference to address issues with variants. Overall, there have been substantial improvements, but there are a number of major and minor issues that ***require resolution***.

The IP expects to review an updated draft of the proposal before making a final recommendation on whether it is ready for public comment.

All of the previously raised issues appear to have been accommodated and are therefore not mentioned here again.

# General Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** | **PK** |
|  |  |  |  |
| §3 Background on script .. | 1. . We previously asked “how does "CHILLU" relate to "CHILLAKSHARAM" and "SAMVRUTHOKARAM"?” This particular section we find difficult to follow. If any of these terms have English translations (or glosses) that would improve the explanation. | Please consider these suggestions and make appropriate edits. | Added “Chillu letters (Chillaksharam) and Samvruthokarams” section at page 9 |
| 0D33 0D33  Section 6.1, Section 7 and Appendix C | In Section 6.1. the proposal states:  “Therefore, NBGP decides not to define Set 2 as variants, and handle this case by using the whole label evaluation rules. The rule will allow a consonant ള (0D33) to be followed by a second 0D33, only if an H precedes it.”  The wording of this sentence is prone to misreading: it is unclear whether the “it” at the end of the sentence refers to the first or second 0D33 is not clear and would make a difference. As written it could be read as intending to allow the sequence 0D4D 0D33 0D33 where the first 0D33 is indeed preceded by a 0D4D and followed by an 0D33.  However, it could also be read as allowing the sequence 0D33 0D4D 0D33 where the second 0D33 is preceded by 0D4D.  In section 7 the proposal contains this unambiguous rule:  “Rule 7: The ള (0D33) cannot immediately follow ള (0D33)”  The effect of this rule is that ***any*** combination of 0D33 0D33 in a label is disallowed.  However, Appendix C states on page 26:  “This has been restricted by a WLE rule 7. It allows the combination “ള്ളള” (0D33 0D4D 0D33 0D33) which is present in words like “ഉള്ളളവ്” (meaning: inner dimension viz. volume), and blocks the combination “ളള്ള” (0D33 0D33 0D4D 0D33) which is rarely found in usage.”  This latter statement is incorrect, as the 0D33 0D33 in the combination “ള്ളള” (0D33 0D4D **0D33 0D33**) would also be invalid under WLE Rule 7.  There are two possibilities:  1) The statement on p. 26 in Appendix C is incorrect. In that case, it should be corrected.  2) The statement on p. 26 in Appendix C does describe the actual intent of the GP. In that case, the WLE rule 7 would need to be modified (and the statement on p. 20 in Section 5.x would need to be extended).  If needed, a sequence 0D4D 0D33 0D33 could be added to the repertoire. Adding such a sequence would have the effect of allowing the case “ള്ളള” (0D33 **0D4D 0D33 0D33**) while continue to disallow **0D33 0D33** everywhere else, including in “ളള്ള” (**0D33 0D33** 0D4D 0D33) | Please reaffirm the exact intent of the restriction on 0D33 and make any edits in explanatory texts or LGR specifications as needed. | Added a sequence 0D33 0D4D 0D33.  The intention is to allow “ള്ളള” (0D33 0D4D 0D33 0D33) but block blocks the combination “ളള്ള” (0D33 0D33 0D4D 0D33) |
| References | 1. Some of the punctuation and other conventions in listing references are still a bit different from the majority of LGR proposals – some tweaks have been suggested. | Please make edits as suggested | Accepted suggestions. |

# Whole Label Evaluation Rules

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** | **PK** |
| §7 | 1. The use of WLE to handle the case of 0D33 0D33 appears promising, however, some statements in Appendix C seem to indicate a different understanding of the intended restriction. 2. To match the modified restriction as expressed in Appendix C,an exception would need to be added. This is best done not by modifying the rule 7, but, e.g. by defining sequence 0D33 0D4D 0D33 so that it can be followed by 0D33. 3. Doing this would not require any change to the rules as stated, but would require a change to section 5 and the XML data (addition of the section). | See separate discussion | Accept the attached XML. |

# XML file specific

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** | **PK** |
| XML: <description> | 1. In the first paragraph of “Overview” the wrong name was given for the name of the proposal. 2. In “Repertoire” The Unicode (gc) is not listed 3. In “repertoire” need to mention that there is a sequence that has been added (U+0D28 …) for variant purposes. 4. If a 0D33 0D4d 0D33 sequence added as may result from a separate discussion, it would need to be mentioned here (in “Repertoire”). 5. in “Variants” there is no mention of in-script variants. Something like “there are two sequences in Malayalam that are defined as in-script variants, see Section … in [proposal]” | Please review and make additional changes as needed  (Not all of the items here are already covered in the attached XML) | a) Accepted the change.  b) No action. GC never listed in other LGRs.  c) Added the sequence.  d) Added the sequence.  e) Added the in-script variant description. |
| XML: <data> | If 0D7B has a not-when rule "follows-B-X-or-H" that looks behind, shouldn't 0D7B 0D31 have the same rule too? Otherwise any sequence 0D7B 0D31 would be allowed to follow B , X or H.  As the sequence has been defined to allow a variant and not for the purpose of creating an exception to the WLE rule, the XML should be fixed to:   <char cp="0D7B" not-when="follows-B-X-or-H" tag="Chillu" ref="106" comment="MALAYALAM LETTER CHILLU N" />          <char cp="0D7B 0D31" **not-when="follows-B-X-or-H"** ref="106" >              <var cp="0D28 0D4D 0D31" type="blocked" />          </char>  Because there is reason for sequence 0D28 0D4D 0D31 other than when it can be a variant for 0D7B 0D31 the IP believes, it should also have the not-when rule applied to it.  Note that because 0D28 exists by itself in the repertoire where it does not have a context rule, this does not prevent labels from containing 0D28 0D4D 0D31 after a B-X-or-H, but in those cases, that sequence is not a variant. | Please review and correct if appropriate (this correction has been made in the accompanying draft XML file) | Accepted the suggested change. |
| **Detailed editing** | Copy of XML included with suggested changes. | Please compare to the version submitted for feedback and note suggested changes, review and use as basis for further edits. | Accepted changes. |

# Test files

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** | **PK** |
| Test file | 1. The test file results generally match the Pass/Fail indications in the test label file – except for the WLE rule about leading Chillu, where Pass/Fail seems to be designated in the opposite sense (Fail should mean that the label is invalid). | Please provide test file according to specification. | The test file updated. |