

TO: UTC

L2/13-028

FROM: Deborah Anderson, Rick McGowan, Ken Whistler, and Roozbeh Pournader

SUBJECT: Recommendations to UTC on Script Proposals

DATE: 25 January 2013

In an effort to speed up processing of scripts in the UTC, we have reviewed the following script/character encoding proposals and provide recommendations. In general, we grouped them into one of the following categories:

- noncontroversial, and the UTC should proceed with approval
- unacceptable, and the UTC should go on record as not wanting to progress the proposal
- problematical, and the UTC needs to discuss on specifically identified points
- noted, and the UTC take no action.

1. [L2/12-044](#) Four historic Latin letters for Sakha (Yakut) – Yevlampiev, Pentzlin, et al. 2012-05-04

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, and found that the four proposed letters are not currently representable by characters in Unicode.

Note: While the script is described as initially monocal, the authors may wish to do further research whether upper case forms did exist (cf. Russian Wikipedia article under “Yakut alphabet”, where it mentions that the script was “initially” monocal).

Recommendation: We judge the proposal to be noncontroversial, and recommend the UTC approve the following four characters:

U+AB60 LATIN SMALL LETTER SAKHA IOTIFIED A

U+AB61 LATIN SMALL LETTER IOTIFIED E

U+AB62 LATIN SMALL LETTER OPEN OE

U+AB63 LATIN SMALL LETTER UO

2. [L2/12-045](#) Revised proposal to encode Latin letters used in the Former Soviet Union (replaces L2/11-360) – Yevlampiev, Pentzlin, et al. 2012-01-30

Discussion: We reviewed this lengthy proposal. Although the dead orthographies of the Former Soviet Union (FSU) are characterized by the borrowing of letters from different scripts, the authors base their proposal on the premise that the script for these orthographies is Latin and hence request numerous Latin duplicates of already encoded Cyrillic characters. The authors “consider...script mixing being a bad thing” (section 2.4), citing IDN spoofing concerns and

irritation to the common user. In our opinion, the proposal needs to be re-structured, identifying which characters are not capable of being represented with Cyrillic characters. The UTC might want to take a position on the practice of mixing of scripts for dead orthographies, particularly in cases, such as those of the FSU, where typography is especially poor and the potential users and scholars have moved on to other orthographies.

Recommendation: We deem this proposal problematical, and recommend the UTC review it and send the authors comments.

3. [L2/12-066](#) Proposal for encoding the Uygur script in the SMP – Osman 2012-02-05

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. While we feel the script is important and should be encoded, the proposal as it stands is not yet mature. For example, no names of characters are provided, the “Contents” on page 1 only partially refers to this document, and the correct name of the script and number of requested characters should be entered onto the Proposal Summary Form. Also, the question of whether the script is vertical or horizontal needs to be discussed.

Recommendation: We consider this proposal to be problematical, and recommend the UTC review it and send feedback to the author (and D. Anderson, who has offered to help Osman on the proposal).

4. [L2/12-094](#) Proposal to encode a United States Flag symbol – Vasquez 2012-02-14

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. The U.S. flag can already be represented using Regional Indicator Symbols.

Recommendation: We consider this proposal unacceptable, and the UTC should go on record as not wanting it to progress. (The UTC may wish to relay the request for flag characters to the Editorial Committee, as fodder for a future FAQ.)

5. [L2/12-116](#) Proposal to encode a symbol Capitalized Commercial At – Pentzlin 2012-04-17

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. While we do not believe it is the job of the UTC to define orthographies, we recommend the users represent the circled letters with the currently encoded U+24B6 CIRCLED LATIN CAPITAL LETTER A and U+24D0 CIRCLED LATIN SMALL LETTER A, adjusting fonts as needed to get the desired glyph shapes. This approach has the advantage of maintaining a casing relationship between the two characters, which is not shared between the proposed CAPITALIZED COMMERCIAL AT and U+0040 COMMERCIAL AT. The two characters we recommend, U+24B6 and U+24D0, have the “So” property, which is the same as the proposed CAPITALIZED COMMERCIAL AT, and while our approach won’t satisfy all the

requirements of a modern-day user community, it does offer an off-the-shelf solution that won't require users to rely on the PUA.

Recommendation: We deem this proposal problematical, but recommend the UTC discuss the suggestion of using U+24B6 and U+24D0 as an alternative to the proposed CAPITALIZED COMMERCIAL AT (and, for its lowercase equivalent, U+0040 COMMERCIAL AT).

6. [L2/12-228](#) Revised proposal for encoding the Afáka script in the SMP – Everson 2012-07-23

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. We deem the proposal as not ready for encoding, particularly in light of section 8, "Expansion of the repertoire", which calls into question the stability of the script's character repertoire.

Recommendation: We consider the proposal unacceptable as it stands, and recommend the UTC respond to the proposal author accordingly.

7. [L2/12-276](#) Preliminary Proposal to encode Bodoni Ornament symbols – Pentzlin 2012-07-12

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal for 121 characters. The proposal does not make a strong case for encoding these ornaments as characters. Hundreds of similar sets exist and were in widespread use until the mid-20th century, and more are being created all the time, e.g. on "free font" sites all over the world. None of the Bodoni Ornament symbols needs to be encoded as characters for data-interchange usage.

Recommendation: We deem the proposal unacceptable, and recommend the UTC take no action but respond to the author.

8. [L2/12-302](#) Revised proposal to incorporate the symbols of ISO/IEC 9995-7:2009 (WG2 N4317) – SC35 via Karl Pentzlin 2012-10-08

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, and note that the USNB/Unicode Consortium already has responded with comments on an earlier version of this proposal ([L2/11-078](#)). The comments sent in 2011 are still applicable: the proposal does not demonstrate textual use of the proposed symbols.

Recommendation: We consider this proposal problematical, and recommend the UTC respond to the authors by forwarding on the earlier set of comments, noting that no action will be taken until the earlier suggestions have been taken on board.

9. [L2/12-303](#) Proposal to add four arrows to get a consistent mapping from ISO/IEC 9995-7 symbols to Unicode (WG2 N4318) – Pentzlin 2012-10-08

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which requests encoding 4 triangle-headed arrow characters from ISO/IEC 9995-7, and deleting annotations to 4 existing arrow characters for cursor actions (“fast cursor left”, “fast cursor up”, etc.). The upshot of the proposal is to direct users to not use the current arrows for “fast cursor” actions, but use the new ISO/IEC 9995-7 characters, which have slightly different glyph shapes.

Recommendation: We deem the proposal problematical, and recommend the UTC discuss it.

10. [L2/12-311](#) Proposal to encode the Mwangwego script – Everson 2012-07-24

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. While the script probably deserves encoding, it still has problems (such as the most appropriate encoding model), and is not yet ready for approval.

Recommendation: We consider the proposal problematical, and recommend the UTC discuss it.

11. [L2/12-317](#) Proposal to encode square with speckles fill – Park 2012-09-27

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. We note that CP 949 maps A2C6 to U+2592 (<http://www.unicode.org/Public/MAPPINGS/VENDORS/MICSFT/WINDOWS/CP949.TXT>):

0xA2C6	0x2592	#MEDIUM SHADE
0xA2C7	0x25A4	#SQUARE WITH HORIZONTAL FILL
0xA2C8	0x25A5	#SQUARE WITH VERTICAL FILL
0xA2C9	0x25A8	#SQUARE WITH UPPER RIGHT TO LOWER LEFT FILL
0xA2CA	0x25A7	#SQUARE WITH UPPER LEFT TO LOWER RIGHT FILL

Adding the proposed new character would cause serious problems for data mapped to CP 949.

We note that the same request was made in 2010 by the Republic of Korea in their comments on ISO/IEC 10646 3rd edition in 2010 (pp. 11-12, [L2/10-385](#)), where the character was named “SQUARE WITH DOTS,” After discussion in WG2, the request was withdrawn by the ROK.

Recommendation: We deem this proposal unacceptable, and recommend the UTC go on record as not wanting it to progress.

12. [L2/12-341](#) Buginese issues – Glass 2012-10-29

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which requests property changes and poses two questions.

a. The property changes requested are:

- change the General Category property for U+1A1B BUGINESE VOWEL SIGN AE from Mc to Mn (due to an apparent error)
- change the Canonical_Combining_Class from “0” to “230”

- change the Bidi_Class from “L” to “NSM”

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review the property changes. To us, the requests for changes to the General Category and bidi properties of U+1A1B BUGINESE VOWEL SIGN AE seem acceptable, but the CCC cannot be changed due to stability policies

b. The author asks whether the character recommended in Chapter 11 for Buginese reduplication should be changed. The current text in TUS states that reduplication can be represented by U+0662 ARABIC-INDIC DIGIT TWO, whose bidi property is “AN”. The question is whether U+A9CF JAVANESE PANGRANGKEP, whose bidi property is “L”, might be more appropriate. If so, the script property for U+A9CF should be changed to Common and the block intro be updated.

Recommendation: The change to U+A9CF JAVANESE PANGRANGKEP seems acceptable to us, but we recommend the UTC discuss this, and, if approved, update the script property and block introduction for Buginese accordingly.

c. The proposal for Buginese (L2/03-191) originally included a virama, but was not approved for encoding. However, the current Buginese block introduction (Chapter 11) mentions a virama. The author requests the block introduction be clarified concerning the virama.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC remand this request to the Editorial Committee, and suggest the UTC might note that a proposal for an explicit Buginese virama could be entertained, though it would need to explain how its inclusion would not cause problems for currently encoded Buginese data.

13. [L2/12-359](#) Proposal to Encode Bowl of Hygieia – stas624-uni@yahoo.com 2012-11-02

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal, which asks for the encoding of one map symbol, BOWL OF HYGIEIA. The proposed location, U+1F54F, is available.

Recommendation: We find the proposal noncontroversial and recommend the character be approved.

14. Hungarian [L2/12-331](#) Revised proposal for encoding the Rovas Script – Rumi, et al. 2012-10-29.

Additional documents:

[L2/12-332](#) Additional information about the name of the Rovas script – Tamás Rumi, et al.

[L2/12-337](#) About the consensus of the Rovas encoding - Response to N4373 – Tamás Rumi, et al.

Discussion: We reviewed the revised proposal ([L2/12-331](#)) and other two documents ([L2/12-332](#) and [L2/12-337](#)). These documents are not responsive to the current DAM2 ballot (<http://std.dkuug.dk/jtc1/sc2/wg2/docs/n4386-A.pdf>).

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC note the documents, but take no action.

South Asian

15. [L2/12-323](#) Siddham section marks – Pandey

Additional docs:

[L2/12-274](#) Recommendation against encoding ornamental punctuation marks for Siddham – Sharma

[L2/12-367](#) Feedback on Siddham proposal (WG2 N4361) – Suzuki

[L2/12-369](#) Comments on Feedback on Siddham proposal (WG2 N4369) – Eidsun, et al.

[L2/12-372](#) Additional Information on Siddham Section Marks (WG2 N4378) – Anderson

Discussion: We reviewed the proposal and ancillary documents. We note that additional information should be forthcoming from the Shingon representative on the names and usage of the Siddham section marks.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC note the documents, but take no action at this time.

16. [L2/12-039](#) Proposal to add two letters to the Grantha repertoire – Everson 2012-02-02

Additional docs:

[L2/12-054](#) Letter regarding Grantha encoding – Maravanpulavu Sachithanathan

[L2/12-059](#) Feedback on Grantha document N4198 L2/12-039 – Sharma 2012-02-02

[L2/12-149](#) Re Grantham – N. D. Logasundaram

[L2/12-151](#) Brief Comments on UTC register documents (May 2012) on Grantha script encoding – Ganesan

[L2/12-348](#) Comments on Proposal L2/12-039, "Proposal to add two letters to the Grantha repertoire" – S. Palaniappan

[L2/12-353](#) Letters LLLA and NNNA in Grantha block - Reference documents from experts and users – Ganesan

[L2/12-382](#) Letter re Grantha encoding – Santhalingam Chockaiah

Discussion: We reviewed the proposal L2/12-039 and ancillary documents. Document L2/12-353 recommends encoding GRANTHA NNNA and LLLA (as does L2/12-054, from a publisher who is transliterating Tamil texts into Grantha), while L2/12-348 counsels against encoding them (and L2/12-382 agrees). Document L2/12-059 finds the evidence for NNNA flawed and requests further examples of LLLA.

Based on the analysis presented by S. Palaniappan (L2/12-348), the current proposal does not provide sufficient evidence for encoding the two letters in the Grantha block, since they are considered to be Tamil, and appear in macaronic (mixed language) text.

Recommendation: We consider the current proposal problematical and recommend the UTC review it.

17. [L2/12-231](#) Tamil fractions and symbols – Sharma 2012-07-17

Additional docs:

[L2/12-243](#) Comment on L2/12-231: Tamil symbols and fractions – Ganesan 2012-07-23

[L2/12-384](#) Comments on Tamil fractions and Tamil credit sign – Ganesan 2012-11-06

Discussion: We reviewed these documents. In general, the character repertoire looks acceptable and appears well documented. Below we provide comments on specific characters.

In §5.1 of L2/12-231, the Tamil fractions and symbols proposal, we disagree with the author that 5 of the proposed characters, FRACTION ONE TWENTIETH, FRACTION ONE QUARTER, SIGN KURUNI, SIGN TUUNI, and SIGN KALAM, should be separately encoded because they have a different General Category from existing Tamil letter characters. (Note that the Greek block does not separately encode its alphabetic letters that are used as numbers, just because of different General Category values.) Instead, we recommend the 5 encoded characters, TAMIL LETTER PA, TAMIL LETTER VA, TAMIL LETTER NGA, TAMIL LETTER TA, and TAMIL LETTER LLA, be annotated reflecting the additional functions. Similarly, we recommend U+11FD6 TAMIL SIGN UZHAKKU be removed and unified with U+11FD1 TAMIL FRACTION THREE QUARTERS (with an appropriate annotation added). We recommend the holes in the Tamil Supplement block be closed up (after the removal of the characters listed above).

The inclusion of a TAMIL TRADITIONAL NUMBER SIGN and TRADITIONAL DEBIT SIGN, with rationale as presented in §5.2.1 and §5.2.2, seems reasonable. The location of these 2 characters on the BMP, alongside TAMIL NUMBER SIGN and TAMIL CREDIT SIGN, also seems reasonable.

In §5.3, the glyph corrections for TAMIL DEBIT SIGN and TAMIL CREDIT SIGN seem acceptable to us.

TAMIL RINGGIT SIGN, proposed for inclusion on the BMP at U+0BFB, is identified as quite rare (p. 15, §4.7). Sri Lanka has questioned this character in an informal communication. Because of uncertainty as to its status, we suggest RINGGIT SIGN be removed from the list of proposed characters. However, the proposed four clerical symbols, CURRENT SIGN, AND ODD SIGN, SPENT SIGN, and TOTAL SIGN, located at the end of the current Tamil block on the BMP would be acceptable.

The proposed collation of these symbols, discussed in §9.4, is fine but because the symbols are rare and appear in a non-decimal system, there should be no expectation that the default ordering for these symbols would work this way in UCA.

Document L2/12-243 (and L2/12-384) raised questions about the orthography for two annotations. On page 58, the annotations read “poga” (for U+0BFE TAMIL SPENT SIGN) and “aaga” (for U+0BFF TAMIL TOTAL SIGN), but on page 6, the Tamil words are “pōka” and “āka”. Can the author clarify?

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC have the author provide an abbreviated proposal, consisting of updated code chart and names list, with the following changes:

- Remove the following 6 characters, since the disunification of identical forms based on General Category is not sufficient, and close up the holes accordingly:
 - U+11FC8 TAMIL FRACTION ONE TWENTIETH
 - U+11FCF TAMIL FRACTION ONE QUARTER
 - U+11FD6 TAMIL SIGN UZHAKKU
 - U+11FDA TAMIL SIGN KURUNI
 - U+11FDD TAMIL SIGN TUUNI
 - U+11FDE TAMIL SIGN KALAM
- Remove RINGGIT from the list of proposed characters, and include it on a list of characters requiring more study. We suggest TRADITIONAL NUMBER SIGN be moved in its place, at U+ 0BFB, so as to be closer to TAMIL CREDIT SIGN.
- Add annotations (noting numerical or measure usage) to the following:
 - U+0BAA TAMIL LETTER PA
 - U+0BB5 TAMIL LETTER VA
 - U+0B99 TAMIL LETTER NGA
 - U+0BA4 TAMIL LETTER TA
 - U+0BB3 TAMIL LETTER LLA
 - U+11FD1 TAMIL FRACTION THREE QUARTERS
- Include glyph changes for TAMIL DEBIT SIGN and TAMIL CREDIT SIGN.

We recommend the UTC remand the proposed annotations in §9.2 to the Editorial Committee, alerting the author that editorial suggestions for the names list will undergo editorial review once character encoding issues are worked out.

We further suggest the updated document then be circulated to the Government of India, the Government of Tamil Nadu, INFITT, and Sri Lanka for their feedback.

18. [L2/12-224](#) Annotation for SHARADA OM – Sharma 2012-07-10

Related document:

[L2/12-019](#) Recommendation against use of 111C4 SHARADA OM for now – Sharma

Discussion: We reviewed this document, which provides text for an annotation to U+111C4 SHARADA OM. (The annotation supports the comments on L2/12-019. The topic was discussed earlier in L2/11-308.)

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC note this doc and send it on to Editorial Committee as feedback.

19. [L2/12-106](#) Editorial updates to various Indic scripts – Sharma 2012-03-15

19.1 Generic Indic

Discussion: We reviewed this section, which proposes text changes in Chapter 9 on how to represent LETTER RA before LETTER VOCALIC R/RR/L/LL as a generic Indic encoding principle.

Recommendation: We consider this topic problematical and recommend it be discussed in the UTC.

19.2 TAMIL DEBIT SIGN and TAMIL CREDIT SIGN glyphs

Additional docs:

[L2/12-150](#) Tamil credit sign (U+0BF7) glyph shape from Printed Books

[L2/12-384](#) Comments on Tamil fractions and Tamil credit sign – Ganesan

Discussion: We reviewed §2 of L2/12-106 (which is also discussed in **17** [L2/12-231](#) Tamil fractions and symbols, above) and ancillary documents.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC approve the two glyph corrections (TAMIL DEBIT SIGN and TAMIL CREDIT SIGN).

19.3 Malayalam

Discussion: We reviewed §3 of L2/12-106, which recommends changing the section of the Malayalam block introduction on DOT REPH.

Recommendation: We consider this topic problematical and recommend it be discussed in the UTC.

19.4 Oriya

Discussion: We reviewed §4 of L2/12-106 on the representation of Oriya OM.

Recommendation: We consider this topic problematical and recommend it be discussed in the UTC.

20. [L2/12-016](#) **Proposal to encode 0C5A TELUGU LETTER RRRA (WG2 N4215) – Sharma 2012-01-23**

Discussion: In view of the following comments from Prof. Peri Bhaskararao, it appears the encoding of TELUGU LETTER RRRA is still an open question, and there is no consensus this should be done.

I had a brief discussion with Prof. Uma Maheshwar Rao about this proposal. This proposal for encoding a character for RRRA for Telugu requires careful examination. Prima facie this proposed entity seems to be a glyph variant of RRA U+0C31 occurring as an allograph. George Starostin's opinion quoted by the proposers need to be examined in comparison with established opinion about Old Telugu phonology.

Feedback from the Government of Andhra Pradesh would also be advisable. (Note: D. Anderson sent a note on 15 January 2013 requesting feedback from the representatives from the Government of Andhra Pradesh to the Unicode Consortium on this topic.)

Recommendation: We deem this proposal problematical, as opposing expert opinions still need to be sorted through. We recommend the UTC take no action at this time.

Preliminary/Introductory proposals (non-South Asian)

21. [L2/12-139](#) **Preliminary proposal for encoding the Garay script – Everson 2012-05-01**

Discussion: We reviewed this preliminary proposal, which is for a script used by a small community. We have no further comments, except to note that it might make sense to move the script to the beginning of the U+1E900 row on the Roadmap. (The beginning of the row U+1E900 was earlier set aside for Mende numbers, but this space has since been freed up because of the decision on encoding Mende numbers, as reflected in L2/12-335.)

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC review this proposal and send comments to the author.

22. [L2/12-125](#) **Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Kawi Script – Pandey 2012-04-25**

Additional doc:

[L2/12-167](#) **Encoding Model for Kawi Script – Ganesan 2012-05-03**

Discussion: We reviewed this proposal. We recommend further research be done to confirm 5 columns are needed, and not 4 (or even 3?). Because the copper plates show no aspirated consonants, it seems reasonable to not allocate space for them now, instead encoding only

those characters that are known. (If evidence of aspirated consonants does appear later, a block of extensions could be added.) It would also be advisable to try to get input from scholars in Indonesia, if possible. The author should also take into consideration the comments expressed in L2/12-167.

Recommendation: We bring this proposal to the UTC's attention, noting that we have provided some feedback, and recommend others with comments send them to the proposal author.

23. [L2/12-229](#) Preliminary proposal for encoding the Bagam script – Everson 2012-07-23

Discussion: We reviewed this preliminary script proposal, which is based on one manuscript. The proposal makes no case for encoding the script: the script is not fully understood, is not currently in use, and does not appear to have a scholarly community actively working on interpreting the script and its elements. However, if scholarly interest develops and scholars begin publishing research on the script, the proposal would have grounds to proceed.

Recommendation: We bring this preliminary proposal to the UTC's attention, noting that we have provided some feedback, and recommend others with comments send them to the proposal author.

South Asian

24. [L2/12-214](#) Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Rohingya Script – Pandey 2012-06-25

Discussion: We reviewed this preliminary proposal for a script which appears to be well understood, is well attested and in current use. (The Rohingya language can also be written in the Arabic, Latin and the Myanmar scripts.) We note that the proposal includes a TATWEEL, although Manichaean, Mandaic and Syriac use U+0640 ARABIC TATWEEL. The author should expect a question from the UTC as to why a script-specific TATWEEL character is necessary, or if U+0640 ARABIC TATWEEL would suffice.

Recommendation: We call attention this proposal to UTC, and recommend members forward their comments to the author.

25. [L2/12-217](#) Introducing the Coorgi-Cox Alphabet – Pandey 2012-06-25

Discussion: We reviewed this introductory document for a constructed script.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC note this preliminary proposal.

26. [L2/12-235](#) Revised Preliminary Proposal to Encode the Gondi Script – Pandey 2012-07-24

Discussion: We reviewed this revised preliminary proposal for a new script for the Gondi language, which is also written in Devanagari and Telugu. We found no particular issue with the analysis, and await the final proposal.

Recommendation: We recommend the UTC note this proposal, and send comments to the proposal author.

27. [L2/12-363](#) Preliminary Proposal to add the Leke Script in the SMP (WG2 N4344) – Fickle/Hosken 2012-11-02

Discussion: We reviewed the very preliminary proposal, which represents a good start. The document includes a chart with 6 columns, but only 4 columns are currently on the Roadmap. The justification for the additional columns seems to be “to accommodate Pali extension letters,” but more substantive evidence is required to support the extra two columns. We noted that page 5 of the document is blank, and should be removed. In the Unicode Properties section (page 6) “2A LEKE LETTER UNKNOWN” is listed, but nothing appears in 2A in the code chart (page 3) or names list (page 4). In the Bibliography, the link for Peter Huston’s webpage contains an extra character (“]”), so the link doesn’t work. Several other links in the Bibliography don’t work as well. The author for “Iayami, Yoko” should be Hayami, Yoko.

Recommendation: We bring this proposal to the UTC’s attention, noting that we have provided some feedback, and recommend others with comments send them to the proposal author.

28. [L2/13-002](#) Preliminary proposal for encoding the Nandinagari script (WG2 N4389) – Pandey 2013-01-13

Discussion: We reviewed this preliminary proposal, which is for another Brahmi-based script. We note that the script is not on the current version of the Roadmap. The overall analysis of the script looks fine, though the author should close up the holes in the dependent vowels section, unless there is good reason to leave the two spots open. (In this way, it would be possible to fit the script into 5 columns instead of 6.) Are the holes in the independent vowels needed?

Recommendation: We bring this proposal to the UTC’s attention, noting that we have provided some feedback, and recommend others with comments send them to the proposal author.