

**Notes on the feedback document L2/12-148 regarding Early Russian Currency Symbols (L2/11-273 = WG2 N4208) by Ralph Cleminson and David Birnbaum (dated 2012-04-24)**

*Karl Pentzlin – 2012-05-06*

We (the authors of L2/11-273 = WG2 N4208) thank the authors of the feedback document for reviewing our proposal.

However, we disagree in some points on their conclusions.

It is correct that a character like the "d" used for the historic British penny need not to be encoded separately, as the underlying letter is to be used directly if it is already encoded and its glyphic appearance is basically unchanged.

But this is not the case for the Muscovy signs which are combining subscripts, to be applied onto the last digit of the currency amount.

For one of the currency units, the алтын, the currency sign is a combining superscript а, for which we consequently have proposed to use the already encoded U+2DF6 COMBINING CYRILLIC LETTER A.

For the денга however, abbreviated by the two-letter sequence де (which in turn may show a ligated form by glyphic variance), there exists no appropriate already encoded character. Thus, we proposed the COMBINING MUSCOVY DENGA SIGN, choosing a ligated form as representative glyph.

The hint by Ralph Cleminson that the same abbreviation is used in dates (denoting день "day") is valuable, and we will check this. If it used as a combining subscript in the same way, the character has to be named like COMBINING CYRILLIC LETTERS DE IE and to be placed into a Cyrillic Extended block.

Similarly, our proposed IMPERIAL KOPECK SIGN is not simply a letter sequence ко, as it is consequently shown subscripted (and shows glyph variation by ligating and single/double underlining).

Requesting its representation simply by the letter sequence "ко" is like requesting the trade mark sign ™ by the letter sequence "TM", instead of encoding a U+2122 TRADE MARK SIGN.

**We will prepare a new version of our proposal to be presented at a future UTC**, addressing these concerns in detail and giving a reworked discussion on the proposed ruble signs.

**Therefore, we kindly request the UTC #131 of May 2012 to take no decision on the characters proposed in L2/11-273 now.**