This is an attempt to restate the UTC #79 resolution of 2/3/99 concerning Eyelash RA in terms of the Devanagari script rules presented in the Unicode Standard 2.0, p. 6-33 ff.

It is the UTC's belief that ISCII in essence uses the alternative RA, U+0931 RRA, to implement Eyelash RA. The UTC would like to emulate the ISCII model in the simplest way. The proposal is to add the one rule:

\[ \text{RRA}_h \alpha \text{Eyelash RA} \]

No other change is made. The following are consequences of this addition. The behavior of RRA becomes as follows, based on Unicode 2.0 p. 6-37 (Consonant Forms / see Figure 6-16) & p. 6-36 (Explicit Virama):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RRA}_n + \text{VIRAMA}_n + C_l & \quad \text{RRA}_h + C_l \text{ -- now Eyelash RA} \\
\text{RRA}_n + \text{VIRAMA}_n + \text{ZWJ} & \quad \text{RRA}_h \text{ -- consistent} \\
\text{RRA}_n + \text{VIRAMA}_n + X & \quad \text{RRA}_d \text{ -- where } X = \text{anything else, including ZWNJ or nil}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that Unicode already specifies a canonical equivalence:

\[ \text{RRA}_n \alpha \text{RA}_n + \text{NUKTA}_n \]

therefore that substitution may be made in the rules above, modeling (the UTC believes) the ISCII behavior.

The proposed overloading of RRA, which is originally defined as a transcription for a Dravidian "r" sound, may cause a problem in case transcribed text encounters the first consequence listed above, namely:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RRA}_n + \text{VIRAMA}_n + C_l & \quad \text{RRA}_h + C_l \text{ -- now Eyelash RA} \\
\end{align*}
\]

in a case where RRA\(_d\) + C\(_l\) would be the appropriate appearance instead of RRA\(_h\) + C\(_l\). In such a case, a ZWNJ inserted by hand would fix the appearance:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RRA}_n + \text{VIRAMA}_n + \text{ZWJ} + C_l & \quad \text{RRA}_d + C_l
\end{align*}
\]

Presumably machine-transcribed text is less common than ordinary typed-in text, and may need to undergo hand-editing in any case.