ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM TO ACCOMPANY SUBMISSIONS FOR
ADDITIONS TO THE REPERTOIRE OF ISO/IEC 10646

A. Administrative

1. Title: **Aktieselskab**

2. Requester's name: Andreas Stötzner
3. Requester type: expert, independent signographic researcher

4. Submission date: 9. November 2004
5. Requester's reference: 1/2004
6. This is a complete proposal.

B. Technical – General

1. Choose one of the following:
      a. /
      b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block:
      Name of the existing block: "Letterlike symbols"
2. Number of characters in proposal: one
3. Proposed category (select one from below – see section 2.2 of P&P document):
      A-<u>Contemporary</u> B.1-Specialized (small collection)
      B.2-Specialized (large collection) C-Major extinct
      D-Attested extinct E-Minor extinct
      F-Archaic Hieroglyphic or Ideographic
      G-Obscure or questionable usage symbols
4. Proposed Level of Implementation (1, 2 or 3)
      (see Annex K in P&P document): 1
Is a rationale provided for the choice? YES.
      If Yes, reference: see proposal.
5. Is a repertoire including character names provided? YES.
      a. If YES, are the names in accordance with the   character naming
      guidelines in Annex L of P&P document? YES.
      b. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form
      suitable for review? YES.
6. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered <u>preference</u>:
True Type, or <u>PostScript format</u>) for publishing the standard?
      Andreas Stötzner
      If available now, identify source(s) for the font (include address,
      e-mail, ftp-site, etc.) and indicate the tools used:
      Font available on request.
7. References:
      a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries,
      descriptive texts etc.) provided? YES.
b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers,
      magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached? YES.

8. Special encoding issues:
Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing
(if applicable) such as input, presentation, sorting, searching,
indexing, transliteration etc. (if yes please enclose information)?
> NO.

9. Additional Information:
Submitters are invited to provide any additional information about Properties
of the proposed Character(s) or Script that will assist in correct
understanding of and correct linguistic processing of the proposed
character(s) or script. Examples of such properties are: Casing information,
Numeric information, Currency information, Display behaviour information such
as line breaks, widths etc., Combining behaviour, Spacing behaviour,
Directional behaviour, Default Collation behaviour, relevance in Mark Up
contexts, Compatibility equivalence and other Unicode normalization related
information.
> The character will be a symbol (property So),
> not have a compatibility decomposition, and is without case-pairing.

C. Technical - Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before?
> NO.

2. Has contact been made to members of the user community?
> No personal contact yet to norwegian or danish users.
> The relevance of general typographic usage is obvious from the samples given.

3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters
> mainly Danish and Norwegian public; typesetters in general.

4. The context of use for the proposed characters
(type of use; common or rare)
> Common usage in business or commercial matters.

5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?
> YES. Reference: See examples attached.

6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document
must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?
> YES.

7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range
> /

8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form
of an existing character or character sequence?
> NO.

9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character
sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?
> Only the MODIFIER CAPITAL LETTER A (U+1D2C) would apply;
> yet a matching character S is missed.

10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar
(inappearance or function) to an existing character?
> U+2101 may be regarded only a minor glyph variant by appearance, yet this
> character must not be mistaken as a sign for AKTIESELSKAB
> since this character mostly appears in capitals.

11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences?

NO.

Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided?

/

12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?

NO.

13. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility character(s)?

NO.

****