ICANN IDN Variant TLD Program Meeting Minutes

Conference Call for Project 2.1:
A Way to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules (LGR) for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels

Tuesday,   27 November 2012

Meeting Chair: Dennis Jennings
Discussion Leader: Andrew Sullivan
Meeting Minutes: Dennis Chang
Meeting Location: Teleconference/Adobeconnect

Participants:
Akshat Joshi, Andrew Sullivan, Asmus Freytag, Chris Dillon, Daniel Kalchev, Dennis Chang, Dennis Jennings, Dennis Tan, Dmitry Kohmanyuk, Francisco Arias, Joseph Yee, Michael Everson, Mirjana Tasic, LinLin Zhou, Nadya Morozova, Neha Gupta, Nicoleta Munteanu, Syed Iftikhar H. Shah, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Vaggelis Segredakis, Yoshiro Yoneya, Zhang Zhoucai (Joe)

Regrets:
Alireza Saleh, Sarmad Hussain, Raymond Doctor, Zhang Zhoucai (Joe)

Minutes:
1. Mailing list discussions raised several issues and will be discussed
2. Latest draft of report was sent out last Friday (23 November 2012)
3. Andrew believes that all comments to date have been addressed and incorporated as appropriate
4. Text links to examples were not included due to Criticisms received that they represented a very small and limited sample
5. There were many discussions on Conservatism principle but no text in the report has changed as a result
6. The suggestion for adding an appeal mechanism was not incorporated
    a. ALAC comment included as well this suggestion
    b. Implementation of such mechanism could take 5 years to set up
    c. Generation Panel could always go back to and try again with Integration Panel
7. Panel dispute resolution suggestions
    a. Generation panel members who objected could always object during public comment if they feel their voice was not heard
    b. It was by design that Generation Panel do not require unanimous agreement to go forward to Integration Panel, only a rough agreement
    c. This would allow progress and not have one Generation Panel member stop the progress

8. Removed "by decree" language per suggestion
9. Whole label rules: go with structural rule first and leave others out
10. Concerns with examples. Need very specific edits to be helpful.
11. As suggested we will use "Variant Sequence" term.
12. We need to avoid talking too specifically to avoid problems for Generation and Integration Panels
13. Limitation of allocatable label in case where large number is possible
    a. If we have 5 variants active, 625 possible labels at 3rd level. 39525 at 4th level. Enormously large numbers.
    b. Also, we cannot control what happens down the stream
    c. Will add this discussion on the next update
    d. If we block, there will be surprises by users
    e. Arbitrary block by design is unpredictable and will cause surprises
    f. If we were to do this, we will need some sensible rule such as
        i. If more than a certain number of variants, then block
14. Need alternative concrete text to apply changes at this stage of the project. Please provide text changes so we can quickly evaluate for incorporation.
15. For practical purposes, end of this week is the deadline
    a. Close of business this Thursday is the last date for comments for incorporation prior to the Final Public Comment posting.
16. Appendix G. is intended for board members for quick rundown of what happens. Large number of board members is not expected to read the whole report because it is so large. Andrew requests suggestions on making this clearer.
17. Please note that the Names of panels have changed from our first draft
    a. Primary panel is now Generation Panel
    b. Secondary panel is now Integration Panel
18. If Generation Panel and Integration Panel do not agree, there is no change to the root.
19. Integration Panel has the responsibility to establish maximum repertoire
20. Integration Panel should not have the power to decide whether some scripts are dead
21. ALAC submission.
    a. Appeals mechanism. ALAC makes this suggestion in principle. If the group feels this is the best case, then we could make this argument.
22. Text that suggests using partial repertoires for Cyrillic and Greek and mixed script with Latin should be reviewed as strong objection is voiced
23. Section 3.4.2 page 26. Is there possibility for IDNA 2008 protocol update in future?
    a. No one implemented 2008 except Opera
    b. IDNA 2008 was intended for forward compatible
    c. We could use language such as "IDNA 2008 or its successor"
    d. If IDNA 2008 is rewritten then this procedure needs to be redone
24. If two panels are in conflict, how will they go forward to formal discussion?

      a. This being informal technical discussion , we expect they would resolve issues prior to formal submission.

      b. This is not a political discussion.

25. Reminder: Submit your comments by Thursday, 29 November 2012; please provide suggested text with your comments.