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[Summary]
Japan cannot understand the efficiency of the proposal in IRG N1788 (WG2 N4084) which suggests using IVD for recording result of IRG editorial discussion about unification. The reasons are summarizes as:

- IRG already has recording systems for the editorial discussions such as editorial group reports and IWDS.
- Japan sees that IVD doesn't have a mechanism recording meta-data. This may require changing of UTS#37 and this is a potential risk of confusing practical registry work.

[Detail]
For a long time, IRG continues making effort to record discussions at the editorial meeting as editorial group reports and IWDS. For the general components to be unified or non-unified, they are arranged into lists of UCV (Unifiable Component Variants) and NUCV (Non-Unifiable Component Variants). These documents are always referred at the IRG editorial work.

IRG N1788 looks to replace these with Unicode IVD (Ideographic Variation Database). However, Japan has some questions on this proposal.

- Basically IVD registers glyph instances only. It looks difficult to learn some "Components" can be unified /non-unified. IVD does not have information that which characters has the similar components as a part.
- IVD doesn't have a mechanism to recording meta-data other than glyph name or collection name. To record other meta-data, UTS#37 should be revised and this may effects to the already registered glyphs.
- What is the meta-data, by the way? There is no explanation about them in IRG N1788. Japan expects that "submitted meta-data" includes radical, number of strokes, evidences, and source information. Such information are less helpful to discuss unification on shapes.
- Once registered in IVD cannot be changed later. On the other hand IRG discussion sometimes changes the decision of unification later.

IVD is opened to public for achieving information interchange with IVS, besides information about unification/non-unification is local to the IRG editorial work. This is IRG's internal work and doesn't make sense to most such people in the world.
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