

**Subject:** Re: [irgeditors] Draft for the handling of modern self-created characters  
**From:** irgeditors@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk  
**Date:** 10/5/2022, 4:32 AM  
**To:** West <andrewcwest@gmail.com>  
**CC:** irgeditors@ml.comp.polyu.edu.hk

Andrew,

I have the following feedback on your feedback:

1. The title (Rules to Restrict the Encoding of Modern "Self-created Characters") is unnecessarily prohibitive. A more neutral title such as "Rules for Handling the Encoding of Modern "Self-created Characters"" would be better.

I agree that using "for handling" instead "to restrict" is better.

2. The term "self-created characters" is problematic, as discussed in Eiso Chan's feedback document, and needs to be clearly defined. Consider avoiding the term "self-created characters".

Would "coined" or "invented" be better? The former may be most accurate, but the latter is more broadly understood.

3. The scope of the term "modern" is unclear, and needs to be defined.

It may not be necessary.

4. IRG has managed for almost 30 years without rules for self-created characters, and I am not convinced that such rules need to be added to the PnP now. I believe that the most important factor when evaluating characters for encoding is whether or not there is satisfactory evidence of textual usage in printed matter, and the genesis of the characters should not be an important consideration. In my opinion, adding these rules to the IRG PnP would be unnecessarily restrictive. Rephrasing these as "guidelines" may be acceptable, but I could not support adding "rules" such as these to the IRG PnP.

I also agree that "guidelines" would be better, because such ideographs tend to be treated on a case-by-case basis, because their circumstances tend to be unique.

All of the above suggests the following revised title, along with corresponding changes throughout the document itself:

"Guidelines for Handling the Encoding of Invented Characters"

Regards...

-- Ken