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There are many requests for variants of Unicode emoji. This document provides a concrete proposal for a mechanism that could be used for such customization, using the TAG characters. It is based on the discussions in the last UTC meeting (see also L2/16-009). This approach allows us to handle certain kinds of needs without requiring a large number of new encoded characters, and without needed the long lead time for Unicode releases. The mechanism has been designed to be extensible for the future.

The end target for the proposal is a new Proposed Draft UTS #52 Unicode Emoji Mechanisms that would include syntax, additional emoji properties, and the discussion below.

While this mechanism is not required to be synchronized with Unicode 9.0, it would be useful to have it released shortly afterwards. We would want to allow time for people to assess any implementation issues.
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Semantics

The Unicode emoji customization mechanism is used to request an alternate rendering of a particular emoji character. It is only used where the base emoji character is in some way generic, and the customization would be considered a variant of that base character. For example, it could be used to indicate that the MAN emoji should be shown with red hair, but not that the MAN emoji be shown as a cup of tea.

Note: one by-product of the direction of this work is that the Emoji SC and UTC should focus primarily on “generic” emoji characters, rather than very specific versions.

Overall Syntax

The customization syntax uses the 95 invisible TAG characters:
These correspond to ASCII characters, and may be referenced by an abbreviated name of the form Tag-<single-ascii-character>, such as Tag-U for U+E0055 TAG LATIN CAPITAL LETTER U. In examples, where clear, they can also be represented simply by the corresponding ASCII letters. The tag-term can be represented by ✦. The regex characters ?, *, + have their normal meaning.

In addition, there are the following special terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tag-base</td>
<td>[:emoji=yes:]</td>
<td>any single emoji character (w/o Regional_Indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag-term</td>
<td>U+E007F CANCEL TAG</td>
<td>terminating Tag (see Review Note).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag-keyChar</td>
<td>Tag-A..Tag-Z</td>
<td>Tag characters corresponding to uppercase letters: [A-Z]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tag-valChar</td>
<td>U+E0020..U+E007E</td>
<td>Tag characters that are neither tag-term nor tag-keyChar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ED-10a. emoji tag sequence**

A sequence consisting of an emoji character followed by one or more non-terminating TAG characters, followed by a terminating TAG character.

```plaintext
emoji-tag-sequence ::= tag-base-item tag-key-value-pair+ tag-term
tag-base-item ::= tag_base | tag_base_variation_sequence
tag-key-value-pair ::= tag-key tag-value
tag-key ::= tag-keyChar+
tag-value ::= tag-valueChar+
```

Add new definition in UTR51:

10b. A `tag_base_variation_sequence` is an emoji variation sequence that starts with a `tag_base`.

Add emoji-tag-sequence to the following definitions in UTR51:

**ED-13. emoji modifier sequence, and**
**ED-15. emoji core sequence.**

**Further Constraints:**

- The entire sequence, including the tag-base and tag-term is limited to 16 characters.
- Within the tag sequence, the tag-key-value-pairs must be sorted in ascending code-point order of the tag-key.
- Within the tag sequence, no two tag-key-value-pairs can have the same tag-key.
- No key can start with Z except a private use key.
- If a private use key occurs, it can be the only key.
- Further structure of the tag-value is determined by the tag-key.
  - The tag-value could have a single semantic or some more complicated structure.
  - For example, the tag-key could require sorted order among characters of the tag-value.

Thus—in ASCII terms—each key is a tag sequence that consist of one or A..Z characters. So “A” is a key, as is “AB” or “ZZ”. The value is any sequence of one or more characters from <space> to “}”. A setting could be,
for example “Fusca”. The interpretation of each tag-key-value-pair depends on the tag-base, tag-key, and tag-value.

Example: <tag-base>ABxAy<tag-term> is invalid, as is <tag-base>AxAy<tag-term>.

Review Note: the length (currently 16) is up for discussion, but everyone is agreed that we need a fixed limit.

Review Note: the committee considered whether to have the tag-term or not. For font lookup, people didn't want to have to backup when a non-TAG character is seen. To mark the end, it would be sufficient to forbid sequences that are prefixes of other valid sequences. The easiest way to ensure that is to always have a terminator. In some cases, it may not be necessary, but it makes validity checking much easier.

This defines the well-formed emoji tag sequences. However, the only currently valid sequences are those defined in the following sections. All others are reserved for future use. Only certain tag-keys are valid for a given tag-base, and only certain tag-values are valid for the given tag-key. The tag-value may also have internal syntax.

With respect to emoji modifiers and ZWJ sequences, an emoji tag sequence behaves as a single emoji character; an emoji modifier that affects the customized emoji should follow the complete sequence representing the customized emoji, and in a sequence such as <Char ZWJ Char TAG+> the TAG sequence applies only to the second character in the sequence.

Where the emoji tag sequence is not supported by an implementation, the tag characters are invisible and occupy no space. If the implementation is aware of the tag mechanism, but does not support a particular sequence, then the fallback character should be displayed with a question mark superimposed, such as the following:

![Question Mark](image)

That way, the recipient is notified that there is something odd about the character; that it isn’t exactly what the sender intended. The above appearance is not normative: the goal is have a superimposed question mark, but there could be alternate appearances so that the base character is not obscured.

**Flags**

These customizations allow for additional emoji characters for images of a flag associated with particular regions, such as emoji depictions of the flag of Scotland or California. They are limited to Unicode subdivisions (which generally correspond to ISO 3166-2 subdivisions), and valid 3-digit UN codes. Like the Regional_Indicator characters, they do not represent a specific image. One way to think of them is that they represent “a flag” for a region, not “the flag” for a region.

**Syntax**

**Tag-Base:** U+1F3F3 WAVING WHITE FLAG  
**Tag-Key:** Tag-V  
**Tag-Value:** (Tag-0..Tag-9, Tag-a..Tag-z)+

**Further Constraints:**
1. The Tag-Value must be a specification of either a valid Unicode subdivision_attribute or a valid 3-digit unicode_region_subtag, as per CLDR.
2. They are only lowercase letters and number TAGs: [0-9 a-z].
3. Like the current regional indicators, these can request an image for whatever is currently the flag of the specified subregion. They are not intended to provide a mechanism for versioned representations of any particular flag image.

Example: <U+1F3F3>Vgbsct<tag-term> requests a flag for the subdivision “gbsct”, which represents Scotland. Note that there is no hyphen, and it is all lowercase, unlike the format for ISO subdivisions (“GB-SCT”).

This mechanism cannot currently be used for arbitrary flags. It cannot, for example, be used for a rainbow flag, the flag of a particular football club, or a pirate flag.

Review Note: Tag-Key ‘V’ is mnemonic for Vexilology, but we could change that if we wanted.

Attributes

The attributes are used to request the display of an emoji character to have a particular attribute. There are currently 3 supported types of attributes:

- Hair color (eg, black, blond, brown, red, gray, bald)
- Gender (eg, make a runner be male vs female)
- Direction (for faces with direction, hand gestures, vehicles, pistol, etc.)

Syntax

Tag-Base: Gender_Base | Hair_Base | Direction_Base
Tag-Key: Tag-U
Tag-Value: (Gender_Attribute | Hair_Attribute | Direction_Base)+

The Tag-Base and tag-key-value-pair values are listed below. A Tag-Base character can be in any of the listed classes. Each class has a set of valid attributes. Additional classes and attributes may be added in future versions.

The Tag-Value characters are arbitrary, but are chosen to be mnemonic. These are not visible to end-users, but are useful for internal debugging.

Review Note: This particular model for U is chosen for compactness, rather than having a model with a distinct tag key for each set of related attributes. For example, one can have 🏃 Ugmr ✧ instead of the slightly longer 🏃 DrGmHg ✧ (where Direction, Gender, and Hair are separate Tag-Keys).

Further Constraints:

- The Tag-Value characters must be in code point order, without duplicates.
- The Tag-Value must not contain two characters that are valid for the same class: for example, it cannot contain two Gender_Attribute characters.

Additional emoji properties would be added to Annex A: Emoji Properties and Data Files in support of these, with a new data file (eg, emoji-attributes.txt) using the standard format, eg:
There is an attached text file that lists these. If this proposal is accepted, then the list should be presented for public review and refinement before release. Any Unicode 9.0 emoji candidates that are withdrawn in the 2016Q2 UTC meeting would be removed, of course.

Review Note: We could use different tag-keys for the different attributes, eg “G” for gender, “H” for hair, “D” for direction; or “UG”, “UH”, “UD”. That would be conceptually simpler, but longer.

The Tag-Values are deliberately limited to avoid font-size problems.

**Gender_Base**

This is an initial-draft list of characters that are commonly shown with a particular gender.

---

Committee Note: We will delete from the following list: Snowmen, Princess, Dancer, Father Christmas, Bride, Bunny Ears, Baby, Angel Baby

Unicode itself doesn’t normally specify the gender for emoji characters: it is RUNNER, not MAN RUNNING; POLICE OFFICER not POLICEMAN. The exceptions are where there is corresponding character of the other gender (MAN vs WOMAN), or where the character was encoded for compatibility with the original Japanese emoji or some other source. Those compatibility characters include items like the list below (possibly excluding the snowmen).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unicode</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U+1F603</td>
<td>SNOWMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F6C4</td>
<td>SNOWMAN WITHOUT SNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F470</td>
<td>BRIDE WITH VEIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F46F</td>
<td>WOMAN WITH BUNNY EARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F472</td>
<td>MAN WITH GUA PI MAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F473</td>
<td>MAN WITH TURBAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F482</td>
<td>GUARDSMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F385</td>
<td>FATHER CHRISTMAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9.0 candidates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unicode</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U+1F57A</td>
<td>MAN DANCING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F934</td>
<td>PRINCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F935</td>
<td>MAN IN TUXEDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U+1F936</td>
<td>MOTHER CHRISTMAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, for realism vendors typically pick a particular gender to display, even for the neutral characters. The Gender attributes allow vendors to display both gendered forms.
Review Note: For the 9.0 sports figures, we could drop those where we have consensus to only show neutral images. We need to look at whether JUGGLING might be a person, also.

**Gender.Attribute**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tag-valChar</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag-m</td>
<td>Male appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-f</td>
<td>Female appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-n</td>
<td>Gender-neutral: neither male nor female appearance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These attributes are to mark appearance, and not gender identification. Neutral doesn’t mean the default (untagged) presentation, which could be any of these three; it means a specifically a gender-neutral presentation.

**Examples:**
- Male Runner: <U+1F3C3>Um<tag-term>
- Female Runner: <U+1F3C3>Uf<tag-term>

**Hair.Base**

This is an initial-draft list of characters that are commonly shown with some visible hair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tag-valChar</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag-k</td>
<td>Black-haired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-s</td>
<td>Blond(e) [also Sandy-haired]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-b</td>
<td>Brown [Brunet(te)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-g</td>
<td>Redhead [Ginger]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-y</td>
<td>Gray-haired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-d</td>
<td>Bald (no hair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Note: With single letters for hair, it is difficult to be mnemonic, but that doesn't matter to end-users anyway. But other suggestions are welcome.

There are hundreds of possible distinctions among hair color, but because emoji are presented with a “cartoon” style it suffices to have just a few broad choices. This list is taken from the US Online Passport.
form (BLACK, BLONDE, BROWN, RED, GRAY), with the addition of Bald (no hair). This also matches the UN Grounds Pass application, and is similar to hair color options on other forms, such as driver’s licences.

Example:

Red-haired Female Runner: <U+1F3C3>Ugm<tag-term>

Note that the characters “gm” must be in sorted order.

**Direction_Base**

These are characters typically presented with a direction that may be semantically significant in sequences of emoji, in that they would point in the direction of an action. Unfortunately, for historical reasons the “default” direction is fairly arbitrary; you see some emoji pointing left △ and others pointing right ▶.

So, for example, when someone is commenting on a crime movie, for “the detective shot the policeman” it would be more natural to see:

... 🕵️‍♂️ 🕵️‍♂️ ...

Rather than to see the following, could be taken as the detective committing suicide:

... 🕵️‍♂️ 🕵️‍♂️ ...

A initial-draft set of Direction_Base characters is listed below.

Committee Note: We will add the following characters: 👮‍♂️ ⚫️ ♨️ ⏰ ⎨ ⎐ ⎐

Note: There are many possible characters that could usefully have direction applied to them. However, we should start out with just small number of base characters, and expand as necessary.

A major difference for the Direction attribute is that the images simply need to be mirrored, thus making essentially no difference in the size of the font (if the technology permits).

**Direction_Attribute**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tag-valChar</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag-r</td>
<td>Point-Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-l</td>
<td>Point-Left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tag directions are to have a mirrored effect in a bidi context. All emoji characters are Bidi_Class=Other_Neutral (except for the enclosed alphanumerics).

Example:
Private Use

Private Use tag sequences are for closed interchange within a given system. As with private use codes in general, the tag sequence may have no meaning or a different meaning outside that system, so it is not suitable for general interchange. Any key starting with Tag-Z qualifies, and any tag-value.

Syntax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag-Base:</th>
<th>emoji-character (any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag-Key:</td>
<td>Tag-Z tag-keyChar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-Value</td>
<td>tag-value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementations should consider the use of any of the thousands of private use Unicode characters instead. However, the advantages of Private Use emoji customizations include:

- there is a fallback to display of the base emoji character, instead of showing a black box;
- a customized emoji sequence has defined properties that depend on the base emoji character, while for private use Unicode characters the generic properties assigned by the Unicode Standard may not be appropriate for the way the character is being used (thus possibly requiring an override of standard Unicode properties — which may not be feasible).

Implementation Notes

For subdivision flags, as discussed earlier, there is no requirement or expectation that all of them — or even any large subset of them — be supported. It is expected that only a relatively small number would be initially supported broadly. (Side note: see the informative TED talk on flag design: The Worst-Designed Thing You’ve Never Noticed.)

The hair color, gender, and emoji-modifiers could be mixed, resulting in a combinatorial explosion of glyphs in fonts. It is anticipated that only certain combinations would be supported generally. One implementation approach to dealing with the combinatorial explosion is the “Mx Potato Head” approach, whereby glyph pieces are assembled for a particular image. For example, there might be some different color hair images that would be appropriate for overlaying on a BOY emoji. These could then be used on each of the BOY images with different skin-tones.

It might be useful to maintain a list of which vendors support which of these tag sequences, something like we already do with the Full Emoji Data chart and other sequence charts.

Review Note: We considered various other models:

- Additional modifier characters would be possible, but there is a long lead time for defining them, whereas additional settings or values could be added relatively quickly: months not years.
- Variation selectors could be used, except that the number is constrained and they are defined as limited to only one per base.