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Additions for Miscellaneous Pictographic Symbols

U+1F4xx OPEN MAILBOX WITH RAISED FLAG
U+1F4yy CLOSED MAILBOX WITH LOWERED FLAG

Properties:
1F4xx;OPEN MAILBOX WITH RAISED FLAG;So;0;ON;;;N;;;;;
1F4yy;CLOSED MAILBOX WITH LOWERED FLAG;So;0;ON;;;N;;;;;

The German comments for ISO/IEC 10646 PDAM8 contain the following comment T16:

U+1F4EB MAILBOX;
U+1F4EC MAILBOX WITH RAISED FLAG:
Germany requests a name change:
U+1F4EB OPEN MAILBOX WITH LOWERED FLAG
U+1F4EC CLOSED MAILBOX WITH RAISED FLAG

It cannot be excluded that the other combinations will be encoded in the future; e.g. the widespread Microsoft Wingdings font contains all four combinations.

Moreover, the FLAG in the name associates the US-style mailbox form for U+1F4EB.

In fact, Germany suggests including the whole set from the beginning on, by adding the following two characters:
U+1F4xx OPEN MAILBOX WITH RAISED FLAG
U+1F4yy CLOSED MAILBOX WITH LOWERED FLAG

As the addition of characters require a formal proposal rather than simply requesting them in a comment, this is done by this proposal.
### Proposal to encode two additional Mailbox Symbols complementing the Emoji set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Administrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Proposal to encode two additional Mailbox Symbols complementing the Emoji set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requester's name:</strong> German NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution):</strong> Member body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission date:</strong> 2009-09-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference:</strong> 2009-09-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Technical – General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of characters in proposal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category:</strong> Miscellaneous Pictographic Symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is a repertoire including character names provided?</strong> Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered preference: True Type, or PostScript format) for publishing the standard?</strong> Glyphs age contained in the widespread Microsoft Wingdings font</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special encoding issues:</strong> Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing (if applicable) such as input, presentation, sorting, searching, indexing, transliteration etc. (if yes please enclose information)? No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### C. Technical - Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before?  
   - **If YES explain**
     - **No**

2. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)?  
   - **If YES, with whom?** There is no specific user community; the characters are usable by anyone  
   - **If YES, available relevant documents:**  

3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included?  
   - **Reference:** see above

4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)  
   - **Reference:**  

5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?  
   - **If YES, where? Reference:** inclusion in a font like Microsoft Wingdings; similar characters contained in the Emoji set

6. After giving due considerations to the principles in the P&P document must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?  
   - **If YES, is a rationale provided?**
     - **No**

7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?  
   - **Yes**

8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence?  
   - **If YES, a rationale for its inclusion provided?**
     - **No**

9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?  
   - **If YES, a rationale for its inclusion provided?**
     - **No**

10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to an existing character?  
    - **If YES, a rationale for its inclusion provided?**
      - **No**

11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences?  
    - **If YES, a rationale for such use provided?**
      - **No**

12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?  
    - **If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary)**
      - **No**

13. Does the proposal contain any ideographic compatibility character(s)?  
    - **If YES, is the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic character(s) identified?**
      - **No**

---
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