ICANN IDN Variant TLD Program
A Way to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules (LGR) for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels

Meeting Chair: Dennis Jennings
Discussion Leader: Andrew Sullivan
Meeting Notes: Naela Sarras
Meeting Location: Toronto, Canada

DAY 1: Friday, 12 October 2012

Participants:
In Toronto: Alexei Sozonov, Joseph Yee, Chris Dillon, Andrew Sullivan, Dennis Jennings, Asmus Freytag, Michael Everson, Yoav Keren, Neha Gupta, Akshat Joshi, Syed Iftikhar Shah, Zhang Zhoucai (Joe), Alireza Saleh, Daniel Kalchev, Dmitry Kohmanyuk, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Nadya Morozova, Edmon Chung, Panagiotis Papaspiliopoulos, Yoshiro Yoneya, Mirjana Tasic, Vladimir Shadrunov, Francisco Arias, Nicoleta Munteanu.

Remote participants: Sarmad Hussain, Raymond Doctor, Vaggelis Segredakis, Naela Sarras, Dennis Tan, Linlin Zhou, Dennis Chang, Kim Davies.

Brainstorming Session:

Issues raised:

1. Public comment process
   1.1 Who
   1.2 How
   1.3 Can we cancel a public comment period?

2. Tags
   2.1 What to do if there is disagreement between panels regarding tags?
   2.2 Which tags?
   2.3 Name
   2.4 Rule based

3. Advisors
   3.1 Nomination by primary panel
   3.2 Maximize use?

4. Interaction between panels
   4.1 Separation of panel responsibilities and perspectives
   4.2 Review panel
   4.3 Formalizing communication between panels

5. Secondary Panel
   5.1 Prepares the playing field
   5.2 Paid or not paid
   5.3 Need for appeal to Secondary panel decisions
   5.4 Observers
   5.5 How do we ensure enough expertise on the secondary panel?
   5.6 Dealing with multiple scripts
   5.7 How do we ensure and what type of diversity we need in the secondary panel?

6. Primary Panel
   6.1 Format of primary panel proposals
   6.2 What is the minimum number of experts in the primary panel?
   6.3 How do we ensure and what type of diversity we need in the primary panel?
   6.4 Who decides when a primary panel has considered enough languages to move ahead with a proposal for a script?
   6.5 Who decides the scope of a primary panel?
   6.6 Who and how do we decide who can participate in a primary panel?
   6.7 Difficulty of recruiting the needed expertise
   6.8 Time to create
   6.9 Who decides on the repertoire?

7. 2012 new gTLD round
   7.1 What about existing applications
   7.2 Do they bypass the LGR?

8. String confusability review
   8.1 Mention confusability review (out of scope of this process)
   8.2 Do we need to ban panelist to be in both the code point variant panels and the confusability panels (should there be those)?

9. Initial exclusion of scripts based on lack of use
   9.1 Cannot exclude permanently

10. Broad outreach
    10.1   Outreach given the potential limitations of the public comment process

11. Timeframe
    11.1   Standing secondary panel for a long time
    11.2   Cost
    11.3   When will we have the 1st version of the root LGR?

12. Sequencing issues
    12.1   1st mover advantage

13. Whole-label rules/restrictions

13.1   Dependent on language

13.2   A priori selection

14. All variants for a code point
    14.1   Same or different?
    14.2   Disposition

15. Allocation rules
    15.1   For language tag
    15.2   More restrictive than script tag rules

16. Need to test each new version of the LGR before adopting it given that it is meant to be used for automated processing

17. Reflect "Inclusion principle" more effectively

18. Check that the label fits a repertoire

19. Requesting/grandfathering of variants of existing ASCII TLDs

20. Transitive variant rules (Chinese)

21. Label disposition from code point disposition rules

<<Lunch Break>>

Issues in Relation to the Primary Panel:

1. Format of Primary Panel proposals: Project 1 (the LGR Tool, lead by Kim Davies) of the Variant TLDs Program is intended to create such a tool. Does the team think that is a sufficient tool? Use existing tools and add any explanatory materials.

   Composition of the panels:

2. What is the minimum number of experts in the primary panel? General questions about composition.
3. How do we ensure, and what type of diversity, do we need in the primary panel?

4. Who decides when a primary panel has considered enough languages to move ahead with a proposal for a script?

   It is hard to make generic overarching rules on this. Procedure as draft calls for participants of goodwill. There is a restriction in the draft that all participants cannot work for the same employer. Want evidence of constituency behind the

work of the panel. For other groups, need a great deal of diversity. Section B.2.3.1 of document specifically addresses diversity. The description is general enough to address diversity issues. Perhaps add a pointer to who enforces such things, perhaps add something in the charter of the Secondary Panel saying the primary panel is properly constituted. However, the primary panel and secondary panel should be kept independent and if the secondary panel has rights to determine the constitution of the primary panel, it negates its independence.
Possibly use tools such as public comment and other internal ICANN tools to determine this independence.

A lot of demand is put on the secondary panel to be and to be seen as independent.

What happens in the case of dispute? What happens when two groups both bid for representing a language and if one group is focused only on one language and the other has a more generic approach and tries to harmonise all languages in one system. Who is to decide which group is representative: even more complex would a situation where two regions want representation.

The secondary panel's work is to ensure that all the principles and parameters are met in the work of the primary panel. Not just technical flaws but also procedural ones.

A discussion when there is dispute between two political entities that do not agree on the primary panel.

Two emerging issues from the discussion of these questions:

1. The need to ensure the separation of powers between the secondary panel and the auditing of the primary panel.
2. Protecting the root while also facilitating the process

5. Who decides the scope of the panel?
6. Who and how do we decide who can participate in the primary panel?
7. Difficulty of recruiting the needed expertise
8. Time to create
9. Who decides on the repertoire?

Issues in Relation to the Secondary Panel:

1. Preparing the playing field: general editorial enhancement to the document is needed here. This is a role for the secondary panel.

2. Paid or not paid. Prevent conflict of interest both presently and in the future (for a period of time). Draft as written is that only paid members belong to this panel whether it is through contractors or employees. For the reasons to "control" participants, these are paid positions. Editorial changes to the document to clarify this.

3. Need for appeals to Secondary panel decisions. Perhaps state that a party that does not agree with a secondary panel decision, they can appeal to the ICANN Board. The point is to use the existing ICANN mechanisms and not create new ones. This process may also be covered by the Ombudsman process.
One suggestion is to make a clarification in the document: Refusal is not forever, it is revisited when new facts come to light which lead to the primary panel resubmitting the proposal later with future evidence.

4. Another issue raised during discussion is rotation or term limits for how long to be on the panel. Update the text to say that there are no statutory limitations. The only limitation is not being on both primary and secondary panels.

5. Observers: what is the merit for observers if the panel is required to provide a rationale for each of their decisions? Reasons have to be published. Reluctance to make observers part of the deliberations of the secondary panel, but they are required to publish their rationale. Maybe add text to the document about transparency, how soon they are expected to publish their rationale, etc.

6. How do we ensure enough expertise on the secondary panel? A suggestion was made about having observers from other ICANN policy making bodies such as gNSO and ccNSO.

7. Dealing with multiple scripts: multiple scripts or multiple languages. If secondary panel adds a variant relationship that was not in the original proposal, the only possible disposition for that variant is blocked. This is not currently clear in the document.

8. How do we ensure and what type of diversity we need in the secondary panel?

Specific Examples:
Asmus gave examples on the whiteboard. Could not capture the examples given on the whiteboard at this time.
Participants were asked to get and raise concrete examples to share with the working group.

Edmon Chung kindly shared the following on the mailing list:

```
As mentioned in the discussion just now, here is a real life example which hopefully
can be used to explain the issue:
```

```
Simplified Chinese:
U+53D1 发        U+53D1 发

Traditional Chinese:
U+53D1 发        U+767C 發
U+53D1 发        U+9AEE 髮

Japanese Kanji:
U+767C 發        U+767C 發


So with the above (btw, the full set of variants are included below, I am using a
subset for the above example):

U+767C 發        ->      U+53D1 发        ->      U+9AEE 髮

PS:
Full set of IDN Variants based on the current CDNC tables:

Primary Codepoint      Preferred SC          Preferred TC              Other Variant
Characters
U+53D1 发       U+53D1 发    U+767C;U+9AEE 發;髮   U+5F42;U+9AEA    髪;髮
U+5F42 髲       U+53D1 发    U+767C       發       U+9AEA;U+9AEE;U+767A  髮;髮
U+767C 發       U+53D1 发    U+767C       發       U+5F42;U+9AEA;U+9AEE  髪;髮;髮
U+9AEA 髪       U+53D1 发    U+9AEE       髮       U+5F42;U+767C    髲;發
U+9AEE 髮       U+53D1 发    U+9AEE       髮       U+9AEA;U+5F42;U+767C 髮;髪;發
```

Closing:
Starting off in the morning on Saturday, 13 October at 8.30am Toronto time. Will resume
with discussion of concrete examples.