

Neo-Brahmi Generation Panel:

Analysis of comments for Oriya LGR Proposal

Revision: June 30, 2019

Neo-Brahmi Generation Panel (NBGP) published the Oriya script LGR Proposal for the Root Zone for [public comment](#) on 8 August 2018. This document is an additional document of the public comment [report](#), collecting all comments and NBGP analyses as well as the concluded responses.

There are 10 (ten) comments received during the public comment period. There are also additional comments, after the closing of public comment, supporting the same points. Comments are categorized into two main issues:

1. The usage of Nukta.

There are multiple views from the Oriya community on the usage of Nukta. The Oriya LGR proposal version 2.9 (public comment version) allows Nukta to follow eight code points: ୦B21, ୦B22, ୦B15, ୦B16, ୦B17, ୦B1A, ୦B1C, and ୦B2B. Based on the comments and multiple discussions with the script users, the NBGP agrees to allow Nukta to follow only ୦B21 and ୦B22 as it is the general usage in Oriya.

2. The consideration of 0B35 (୦).

The Oriya LGR proposal version 2.9 (public comment version) includes code point 0B35. Based on the comments, 0B35 (୦) is coming under special purpose characters hence should not be included in the Oriya Script LGR.

Additional comments and details of these analyses can be found at the NBGP wiki page¹.

The NBGP's comment analyses are as follow:

¹ <https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Neo-Brahmi+GP>

No.	1	From	GANESH CHANDRA SINGH
Subject	Comment for Oriya domain name		
Comment	<p>It is nice to know that Internet Domain Names will be soon supported in Oriya (Odia) Language. The same Oriya (Odia) script has been used for Oriya language as well as many other tribal languages of Odisha such as Munda, Kui, Ho, Juanga, Oram, Kishan, Gond, Koya etc,</p> <p>As such the provision by ICANN to use Nukta (dot) for various consonants such as ବ, ଖ, ଙ, ଚ, ଣ, ଡ, ଢ etc. will enable to precisely express all those languages which use Oriya script.</p>		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP acknowledges the comment.		
NBGP Response	No action required as per this comment, however, the final proposal only allow Nukta to follow only ଡ 0B21 and ଢ 0B22.		

No.	2	From	Nistha ranjan Dash
Subject	Comment (Oriya)		
Comment	<p>Our Oriya alphabet owes its origin to Brahmi script and thus has both bilabial plosive 'Ba' (ବ) and nonplosive dentolabial 'Va' (ଭ). I am really happy to know that ICANN has included both these. As such scholars of all sectors can find it useful. The later addition of Wa/ଞ has also been included. Oriya is written as it is spoken and hence to avoid confusion a perfect Oriya script requires all these letters. It's a great work that no persons will be disappointed while asking for a domain name of their choice.</p>		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP acknowledges the comment.		
NBGP Response	No action required as per this comment, however, the final proposal exclude 0B35 (ଞ).		

No.	3	From	Amresh Mishra
Subject	Comments for Kannada, Oriya and Telugu Scripts' Root Zone Label Generation Rules		
Comment	Availability of domain in Oriya was long awaited and finally met herewith. In this spectacular work, I could find all the essential Oriya letters and their allophones to write all types Oriya texts viz. traditional, social, spiritual, scientific etc. So this Oriya orthography is complete and has wide applicability. Thanks, ICANN team for this praiseworthy work.		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP acknowledges Amresh comment.		
NBGP Response	No action required.		

No.	4	From	Thin Zar Phyto, Myanmar GP																								
Subject	Finalized Information for NBGP LGRs																										
Comment	<p>Dear NBGP members,</p> <p>Myanmar GP would like to congratulate on the complete work of Oriya LGR proposal.</p> <p>We are currently developing the Myanmar Script LGR proposal. In the Oriya and Myanmar cross-script variant analysis, Myanmar GP defines the following code points as variants</p> <p>Variant code Points</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No.</th> <th>Glyph</th> <th>Code Point</th> <th>Myanmar Character Name</th> <th>Glyph</th> <th>Code Point</th> <th>Oriya Character Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>◌</td> <td>U+101D</td> <td>MYANMAR LETTER WA</td> <td>◌</td> <td>U+0B20</td> <td>ORIYA LETTER TTHA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>◌◌</td> <td>U+1031</td> <td>MYANMAR VOWEL SIGN E</td> <td>◌</td> <td>U+0B47</td> <td>ORIYA VOWEL SIGN E</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>We'd like to draw your attention to these sets. They might need to be included in Oriya variant rules.</p> <p>We'd like to thank you for your good work. And we hope to have further collaboration with the NBGP regarding the LGR proposals</p>						No.	Glyph	Code Point	Myanmar Character Name	Glyph	Code Point	Oriya Character Name	1	◌	U+101D	MYANMAR LETTER WA	◌	U+0B20	ORIYA LETTER TTHA	2	◌◌	U+1031	MYANMAR VOWEL SIGN E	◌	U+0B47	ORIYA VOWEL SIGN E
No.	Glyph	Code Point	Myanmar Character Name	Glyph	Code Point	Oriya Character Name																					
1	◌	U+101D	MYANMAR LETTER WA	◌	U+0B20	ORIYA LETTER TTHA																					
2	◌◌	U+1031	MYANMAR VOWEL SIGN E	◌	U+0B47	ORIYA VOWEL SIGN E																					

NBGP Analysis	The NBGP acknowledges the comment and agrees to include two Myanmar-Oriya cross-script variant set.
NBGP Response	Updated the proposal and add <i>appendix D: NBGP Cross-script Variant Inclusion Policy</i> .

No.	5	From	Liang Hai
Subject	A quick review of the Odia proposal		
Comment	2, “oḍiā”: Not an accurate transliteration as it doesn’t distinguish ଓଡ଼ିଆ and ଓଡ଼ିଆ.		
NBGP Analysis	<p>The above ‘oḍiā’ transliteration has been extensively used in many articles (see reference 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). We had thus followed it.</p> <p>The document uses the spelling “Oriya(Odia)” throughout the document except in the said location where exact ISO 15919 is intended. As the accent markers may not be present on most of the user’s keyboards, that could have posed problems in terms of searching, hence, exact latin transliteration was not used elsewhere.</p> <p>Reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - https://trove.nla.gov.au/work/32072148?q&versionId=38952581 - https://search.library.wisc.edu/catalog/999675412802121 - http://www.worldcat.org/title/odia-upanyasa-sahitya-paricaya/oclc/30912921 - http://www.worldcat.org/title/odia-padya-mahakabyara-kramabikasa/oclc/20062769 		
NBGP Response	Edit section 2 to use ISO 15919 system and transliterate as ‘oṛiā’		
Comment	3, “known in Unicode as Oriya”: It’s known also as “Oriya” everywhere.		
NBGP Analysis	<p>Previously the spelling was Oriya; was changed to ‘Odia’ after recommendation of govt in September, 2011 and subsequent amendment by constitution. To avoid the confusion, in our whole oriya LGR proposal, ‘Odia’ is written along with ‘Oriya’ within parenthesis.</p> <p>Reference:</p> <p>https://www.corporate-cases.com/2018/04/orissa-to-odisha-oriya-to-odia-name-change.html</p>		

	The Orissa (Alteration of Name) Bill and the Constitution (113th) Amendment Bill were unanimously passed by the 301 members present in the lok sabha house. https://www.hindustantimes.com/delhi-news/constitution-amended-orissa-is-odisha-oriya-is-odia/story-ueHHnEL8pOLbup8JuT1UOP.html
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	3, “Oriya script seems to be a variant of Devanāgarī ... mahājani (trader's) script.”: Seriously? Is this copied from the Gujarati proposal? Odia doesn’t seem to be a variant of Devanagari to anyone who knows the existence of the Bangla script.
NBGP Analysis	The word ‘variant’ was used to indicate that both Oriya script and Devanagari script are of Brahmic origin and diverged at certain point in due course of evolution. But if according to you confusion still persists about the word ‘variant’, it can be dropped. The terms Mahajani(trader's) etc are not copied from Gujarati but based on the well known maritime history of Orissa. The origin and history of any script and language are variously theorized, interpreted by various authors. This creates controversy which has no relevance in our current LGR proposal, thus it’s better to omit such historical words and phrases.
NBGP Response	Section 3, The word variant and topics related to historical aspects have been removed from the LGR document.
Comment	3.1, “The diagram below shows the major stages in the evolution of Oriya attesting its late divergence from Devanāgarī.”: Are the authors trying to ignore/deny Odia’s relationship with Bangla?
NBGP Analysis	The given diagram clearly depicts Oriya and Bengali together. We have never ignored/denied Oriya’s relationship with Bengali and the allegation is false. TLD proposal is about our domain generation and has nothing to do with its relation with Bengali. So, this part has not been discussed in the proposal. . On one hand you are asking us to write Oriya and not Odia, but you yourself spell Bangla instead of Bengali and Odia instead of Oriya.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	3.4: Why the IPA of 𑂔 is missing? The whole set of IPA transcriptions is apparently inaccurate as it doesn’t reflect even some of the Odia language’s typical features (eg, the rounded schwa). Actually the proposal doesn’t need IPA transcriptions for every letter because it’s text encoding

	being discussed. Lossless transliterations are much more useful. The whole Table 1 can be removed.
NBGP Analysis	You have rightly pointed out the missing ‘ଐ’ . Schwa (ə/ୠ) has been described as the first vowel. In Oriya it is always unrounded. Thus description of rounded schwa is irrelevant in Oriya. IPA transcription is required so that the non-Oriyas can also comprehend the phonemic and allophonic nature of a particular character.
NBGP Response	The missing IPA of ‘ଐ’ has been included but rounded schwa does exist in oriya so need not be mentioned.
Comment	3.6: Authors are not using accurate transliterations.
NBGP Analysis	The transliterations had been done throughout the document where exact latin transliteration is intended. As the accent markers may not be present on most of the user’s keyboards, that could have posed problems in terms of searching.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	3.7, “Half form of consonants (pre-base form)”: Pre-base forms don’t seem relevant to Odia discussions.
NBGP Analysis	In Oriya, consonant clusters are written in many ways : 1) in most cases the second component is in half form (without the rounded top) or reduced form and put under the first component e.g. ଢ, ଢ, ଢ, 2) Sometimes the reverse case happens and the first component (esp. when it is ଢ) is reduced and is put below the second as in ଢ, ଢ, ଢ ଢ 3) Pre-base forms are also seen in ଢ ଢ, but due to cursive writing the prebase components seem to be like new glyphs. Pre-base forms do occur in certain cases in Oriya orthography. But other forms are also there which will be addressed.
NBGP Response	In section 3.7, add other forms in addition to the pre-base form.
Comment	3.8, “... to show that words having these consonants with a nukta are to be pronounced in the Perso-Arabic style.”: Inaccurate. At least the usage of nukta on dda and ddha is not related to Perso-Arabic words.

NBGP Analysis	The NBGP takes comment into consideration. Please see 1. above.
NBGP Response	Update the proposal to allow Nukta to follow only ୱ 0B21 and ୱ 0B22.
Comment	3.10, “/ãala/”: Either use a phonetic transcription (then the first syllable’s vowel is probably not /a/ and the consonant is not /l/), or use transliteration: aṁlā. It’s not helpful and is only confusing if an inaccurate transcription/transliteration is provide. Drop it or correct it.
NBGP Analysis	3.10 and 3.11 repeat the transliteration comment.
NBGP Response	Update Oriya words to use ISO 15919 system where needed.
Comment	3.12, Table 3: Clean up the duplicated dotted circles. Why is vocalic rr excluded but vocalic l adn vocalic ll are included? Be consistent with the discussions in later sections.
NBGP Analysis	Few dotted circles are duplicated and will be cleaned. Just below the given table 3, we have clearly mentioned that “ୱ” U+0B0C, “ୱ” U+0B61, “ୱ”U+0B62 and “ୱ”U+0B63are hardly in use in modern days. Thus these may be excluded.
NBGP Response	Clean duplicated dotted circles in Table 3.
Comment	5.2 and 5.2.1: Doesn’t U+0B35 ORIYA LETTER VA fall into “4.1.2.4 No Rare and Obsolete Characters”? Why is U+0B57 ORIYA AU LENGTH MARK excluded but U+0B56 ORIYA AI LENGTH MARK is included?
NBGP Analysis	There are lithographic as well as manuscript evidences of use of ‘Va’ character in Oriya for centuries since ancient times to mid 20th century. Then came the era of letterpress, whereby the technical difficulties could not maintain the distinction between ‘Ba’ ୱ and ‘Va’ “ୱ” (U+0B35) in printed books leading to the substitution of ‘Va’ by ‘Ba’. Oriya ‘Va’ is not vanished as it is prevalent and well marked in spoken Oriya in different parts of Orissa. In the current age of computers clearly differentiable ‘Va’ is available with Oriya Unicode.

	<p>Thus the Va which was in written manuscripts for centuries disappeared from books for few decades only and now back in the age of computers. Thus it is not an obsolete character.</p> <p>Oriya script is not only used for writing Oriya language but also for writing tribal languages of 62 tribes constituting more than 22 percent of total population. In their language also ‘Va’ is conspicuous. So we can not regard it as obsolete in Orissa.</p> <p>There are numerous tatsama and English words assimilated into Oriya vocabulary where ‘Va’ is essential. So it is not obsolete.</p>
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	<p>6.1, “... there are no characters/character sequences which can be created by using the Oriya characters permitted as per the [MSR] and look identical.”: **FALSE**. Odia has a seriously problem of confusables because of multiple ways of encoding the signs of ba and ya. Many fonts (eg, Nirmala UI) allow both <virama, U+0B2F ya> and <virama, U+0B5F yya> to form the post-base form of ya; and allow all of <virama, U+0B2C ba>, <virama, U+0B35 va>, and <virama, U+0B71 wa> to form the blow-base forms of ba. To the very least, this is the problem the proposal should’ve captured, and the NBGP failed. And these variants probably need to be proposed as “allocatable”. Also, Odia does have other natural (not because of technical issues like the problem aforementioned) ambiguities that need to be addressed (note many of them are stylistic and depend on what font is used to render text), see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Odia_alphabet#Ambiguities</p>
NBGP Analysis	<p>In Oriya no two characters, character sequences and their clusters are exactly alike and hence it is not at all confusing for Oriya people to read or write. However the beginners might find it difficult to learn. In certain consonant clusters, a part of the glyph may look alike but pronunciation differs which however can easily be differentiated from other part of the glyph; hence, it does not lead to confusion. The differences found in different fonts and UIs are only technical errors, but such errors are not found with Unicode which is followed by NBGP. Ambiguities are found in all scripts of all languages, but the users are comfortable with it, we cannot change the script.</p>
NBGP Response	No action required.

Comment	7: For other reviewers' reference: `C[N][M][B D X] V[B D X] C[N]H`
NBGP Analysis	The descriptive text is meant to be a simplified version of the same, simplicity being one of the foundational principles of the LGR procedure.
NBGP Response	No action required.

No.	6	From	Panigrahi
Subject	In response to Liang Hai's comment on Oriya		
Comment	Largely agree with Liang. Additionally, it feels like a majority portion of the content is lifted from Wikipedia without correcting anything based on verification. Liang has already flagged the Gujarati part. It is weird to see that researchers are referring to Wikipedia rather than referring to primary and secondary sources. Wikipedia itself refers to tertiary and above sources and at times contains factual inconsistencies.		
NBGP Analysis	We agree with you that Wikipedia is not a standard reference		
NBGP Response	Wherever Wikipedia is cited as a reference, will be replaced.		
Comment	3.4: It is important to note that "𑄚" (U+0B35) is a burrowed character from Sanskrit that was inserted in the Unicode chart. Apart from any alleged publications that might have been created by the authors, the character has not seen the day of light in any authentic source (e.g. news publication by noted publication houses, text books, other published books from noted publishers, etc.). What is the point in pushing the agenda of a few people that is not largely accepted by the community.		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP takes comment into consideration. Please see 2. above.		
NBGP Response	Update the proposal to exclude 0B35 (𑄚).		

<p>Comment</p>	<p>3.8 It's laughable and there is no logic whatsoever to explain why nukta is added “କ” (U+0B15), “ଖ” (U+0B16), “ଗ” (U+0B17), “ଢ” (U+0B1A), “ଢ” (U+0B1C), and “ଢ” (U+0B2B). There is no reference or any published resources to show the need or historical use of these. Simply put, the researchers should have gone beyond Wikipedia to find if the historical use actually exist as these characters not only mimic the efforts of those standardized the language and the script on the basis of which the Indian state of Odisha was formed in 1936. If a script would evolve, it would evolve based on a dialog between the experts and the larger community. Insertion of nukta to these characters are done in this document in a monolithic manner without any consensus, historical reference and to promote a new trend one of the researchers for Odia is promoting on social media. This should not be treated as allegation but a serious flag as these serious flaws will tarnish the hard work of ICANN.</p> <p>Nukta in “ଢ” (U+0B1A), however, is visible in the Karani script which is another historical variation/predecessor of the current Odia script but has to be treated as a different script. The reason for nukta in “ଢ” (U+0B1A) was for a different purpose and bringing it back for another purpose is gross manipulation.</p> <p>Strongly support Liang's point about "ଢ" and "ଢ" as those two characters are regarded as treasure troves of Odia script. The very name of the language "ଓଡ଼ିଆ" and the geographical place — the state of Odisha (ଓଡ଼ିଶା) contains these characters. "ଢ" and "ଢ" are supposed to be treated as characters rather than variations of "ଢ" and "ଢ" as the usage case for the former two are more than the latter.</p>
<p>NBGP Analysis</p>	<p>The NBGP takes comment into consideration. Please see 1. above.</p>
<p>NBGP Response</p>	<p>Update the proposal to allow Nukta to follow only ଢ 0B21 and ଢ 0B22.</p>

No.	7	From	O Foundation Members : Prateek Pattanaik Nasim Ali Shitikantha Dash Shreekant Kedia Sailesh Patnaik Jnanaranjan Sahu Chinmayee Mishra Mrutyunjaya Kar Subhashish Panigrahi
Subject	Comments on Odia proposal		
Comment	We largely agree with Liang. “Oriya script seems to be a variant of Devanāgarī” is a glaring mistake. It is not just an insult to a classical language and a script that existed more than 1500 years ago in eastern India around the time Sanskrit and Tamil flourished, but undermining the struggle that went into making Odisha the first state in India to be formed in 1936 in the basis of linguistic identity.		
NBGP Analysis	Please see the response to Liang’s comment		
NBGP Response	Please see the response to Liang’s comment		
Comment	Additionally, it feels like a majority portion of the content is copied from Wikipedia without verification from external sources. Liang has already flagged the Gujarati part. It is disheartening to see that researchers are referring to Wikipedia rather than referring to primary and secondary sources. Wikipedia itself refers to tertiary and above sources and at times contains factual inconsistencies.		
NBGP Analysis	Please see the response to Liang’s comment		
NBGP Response	Please see the response to Liang’s comment		
Comment	3.4 It is important to note that "𑂏" (U+0B35) is a non-existent character in the Odia alphabet. It was invented by a fringe group during sometime in the last few decades but never gained traction among the general public. It was later inserted in the Unicode chart for Odia based on unreliable sources but still remains an alien symbol for native speakers of the language. Documentary evidence corroborates with the historical non-existence of any such character in Odia such as Notable Dictionaries or Lexicons published over the last two centuries (including the most exhaustive and largest Odia dictionary “Purnachandra Bhashakosha”.) Odia literature has special literary genres known as Chautisa and Champu that were written from 7th century AD up to 19th century AD. These are poems where each stanza begins with a letter of the alphabet and continues sequentially. These also do not use this character making it of doubtful antiquity. Scholarly studies on Odia linguistics, literature and		

	grammar as well primary sources such as stone inscriptions and palm leaf manuscripts. Odia language primers and textbooks including those published by Governmental agencies (eg: Dept of Language, Literature and Culture Govt of Odisha, The Odisha State Museum). Popular print or electronic media including newspapers, journals and television.
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP takes comment into consideration. Please see 2. above.
NBGP Response	Update the proposal to exclude 0B35 (୩).
Comment	<p>3.8 Another dubious claim with no explanation or logic whatsoever is the addition of nukta to “୩” (U+0B15), “୪” (U+0B16), “୫” (U+0B17), “୬” (U+0B1A), “୭” (U+0B1C), and “୮” (U+0B2B). There is no reference or any published resources to show the need or historical use of these. Simply put, the researchers should have gone beyond Wikipedia to find if the historical use actually exists as these characters ignore the efforts of those who standardized the language and the script on the basis of which the Indian state of Odisha was formed in 1936. If a script would evolve, it would evolve based on a dialogue between the experts and the larger community. Insertion of nukta to these characters are done in this document in an autocratic manner without any consensus, historical reference and to substantiate a new trend one of the researchers for Odia is promoting on social media. This should not be treated as an allegation but a cautionary flag as these serious flaws will tarnish the hard work of ICANN. Nukta in “୬” (U+0B1A), however, is visible in the Karani script which is another historical variation/predecessor of the current Odia script but has to be treated as a different script. The reason for nukta in “୬” (U+0B1A) was for a different purpose and bringing it back for another purpose is gross manipulation. We strongly support Liang's point about “୭” and “୮” as those two characters are regarded as treasure troves of Odia script. The very name of the language “ଓଡ଼ିଆ” and the geographical place — the state of Odisha (ଓଡ଼ିଶା) contains these characters. “୭” and “୮” are supposed to be treated as characters rather than variations of “୭” and “୮” as the use case for the former two are more than the latter. We are drafting this response immediately because it was our notice only today. We hope to formulate a complete response with necessary sources in the following week if an extension of the deadline can be accommodated. O Foundation (OFDN) www.theofdn.org OFDN is a nonprofit organization based in Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India that works in the intersection of marginalized societies, languages, and cultures.</p>

NBGP Analysis	The NBGP takes comment into consideration. Please see 1. above.
NBGP Response	Update the proposal to allow Nukta to follow only ୱ 0B21 and ୱ 0B22.

No.	8	From	Santosh Mohanty, CIIL
Subject	Comments on Oriya /Odia Language		
Comment	<p>Thanks for the new initiative.</p> <p>The Odia document has some problems in section 3.4 and 3.8 (IPA and Nukta Characters).</p> <p>Some of the references have taken from Wikipedia which should be verified from the authentic sources.</p>		
NBGP Analysis	Please see the response to Liang's comment		
NBGP Response	Please see the response to Liang's comment		

No.	9	From	anindita sahuo, Indian Institute of Technology Madras
Subject	Review of the Odia proposal		
Comment	<p>Example: Oriya script frequently uses “ୱ” (U+0B21), “ୱ” (U+0B22) as well as their respective allophones “ୱ” , and “ୱ” . In Oriya (Odia) script, these differ in use of nukta. Thus “ୱ” and “ୱ” as distinct letters are not allowed but their decomposed form i.e. “ୱ” , “ୱ” followed by Oriya (Odia) sign nukta (U+0B3C) can be used. Similarly, for allophones of other consonants like ୱ (U+0B15), ୱ (U+0B16), ୱ(U+0B17), ୱ(U+0B1A), ୱ(U+0B1C), ୱ(U+0B2B)nukta can be used.</p> <p>The above given para in the original proposal caught my attention because of the wrong information it provides. The retroflex sounds “ୱ” and “ୱ” are NOT the allophones of “ୱ” and “ୱ”. These are distinct consonants and “ୱ” and “ୱ” should not be considered as the decomposed form of “ୱ” and “ୱ” . Rather they (“ୱ” and “ୱ”) deserve a special</p>		

	<p>mention in the script because of their unique property and usage in the discourse.</p> <p>The other wrong information that this proposal provides is the use of "କ", "ଖ", "ଗ", "ଘ", "ଙ" and "ଢ" with a nukta. My understanding about this language says this is an absurd suggestion. The above consonants have been originally there in the script and they do not have any allophone. So the inclusion of the nukta-ed version these consonants does not serve any purpose; rather it will create confusion to the speakers of this language (economy of grammar is compromised).</p> <p>As far as my understanding is concerned, this proposal would make things clumsy and complex for the learners Instead of simplifying it.</p> <p>Therefore, I request the maintainers to keep a note of my response and do the necessary changes in the proposal.</p>
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP takes comment into consideration. Please see 1. above.
NBGP Response	Update the proposal to allow Nukta to follow only ଓ 0B21 and ଓ 0B22.

No.	10	From	J.P. Das
Subject	Odia Script		
Comment	<p>The suggestion regarding nukta/dot below letters should be rejected.</p> <p>I also think these should be discarded from even ଓ ଓ.</p>		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP takes comment into consideration. Please see 1. above.		
NBGP Response	Update the proposal to allow Nukta to follow only ଓ 0B21 and ଓ 0B22.		