Latin LGR

Potential Issues

Repertoire

* Only 212 of 455 living languages using the Latin Script were included
  + The threshold for how many speakers were required was arbitrary
  + Most excluded languages are from sub-Saharan Africa
* No review from, for example, At Large AFRALO regarding who was not included

Variants

* High threshold for designating variants
  + Super-majority of experts required
  + Doing side by side comparison of code points they *knew* were different
* Lack of consistency
  + The same pair of diacritic marks might sometimes result in a variant, and sometimes not, depending on which letter they were modifying
* No review by non-expert users
  + Who, typically, are not aware of a majority of the possible diacritics, and so might not notice differences from the ones they are aware of.

Possible issue

Underlining

* Most users have never encountered, let alone being familiar with, below-the-line diacritics which are not connected to the overlying letter. That is, Dot Below, Macron Below, etc. (As opposed to diacritics like the cedilla, which is connected to the letter being modified.) So why would they look for one?
* Some browsers (for example Chrome, Firefox) put blank pixels around below-the-line diacritics, making them somewhat visible (if you think to look). But others (for example Internet Explorer) do not.
* Some word-processing software likewise put blank pixels around below-the-line diacritics. But other widely used ones (PowerPoint, Word, Excel) do not.
* However the Latin GP decided (Section 6.4.1) that those blank pixels were sufficiently noticeable, and sufficiently common, that those diacritics being obscured by underlining was not a problem sufficient to create variants.\*\*

\*\* Note that the software used for ICANN’s Comment process is among those which do NOT provide the blank pixels. Hmmm….