Minutes from F2F meeting in Brussels, January 29th till 31st 2018

Following GP members were present :

Bill Jouris
Dennis Tan
Hazem Hezzah
Mats Dufberg
Michael Bauland
Mirjana Tasić
Sarmad Hussain

January 29th: Repertoire

First day main topic of discussion was finalization of Repertoire. GP members have resolved all problems found in Repertoire.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Building final Repertoire table*	MD, HH
2	*Update the reference numbers in the repertoire table*	SH

January 30th: In-script Variants

Main discussion these two days was about variants (in-script and cross-script). GP tried to define what could be the definition of variants for the Latin script Root Zone LGR.

One of the IP statements is, that only homoglyphs could be treated as variants.
On the evening of January, the 30th, Dennis Tan, Mats and Mirjana had discussed the in-script variant with IP members (Asmus, Marc and Michele) to try to clarify the issue.

GP members should keep in mind that similarity issue of TLD labels are treated by Similarity Review process. So only some usage of similar or identical glyphs with same meaning for the community that are not discovered up to now, should be specified as variant
Asmus gave an example in Turkish language, which probably could be treated as in script variant if GP finds enough evidence in real life to support it. Very important issue is that the evidence of variants in everyday life should be found and documented.

First example is:

015F	ş	LATIN SMALL LETTER S WITH CEDILLA

and

Commented [1]: This is my understanding of in-script variant. Please correct me if I am wrong

Commented [2]: In other words, for in-script variants the IP expects homoglyhps and/or characters that are used interchangeably by the script community.

0219	ș	LATIN SMALL LETTER S WITH COMMA BELOW

These two letters were used interchangeably in Turkish language in history. To prove that these letters are in-script variants GP has to find the evidence of it in everyday life, and to document it.

The other example of in-script variant could be any two small letters that map to the same uppercase letter

Second example: If two homoglyphs small letters do not map to the same uppercase letter they could not be treated as variants.

01DD	ə	LATIN SMALL LETTER TURNED E

and

0259	ə	LATIN SMALL LETTER SCHWA

They are not variants because their uppercase versions are "Ǝ" (018E) and "Ə" (01F8) respectively.

Third example: In Turkish language, again

0069	i	LATIN SMALL LETTER I

and

0131	ı	LATIN SMALL LETTER I DOTLESS

Both characters in uppercase are the same I (0049), I (0049).

Commented [3]: Are they variants?

Commented [4]: This is what the GP needs to resolve. I don't think we can take the decision lightly. We should discuss this case from different angles and arrive to a recommendation.

For in-script variants GP members agreed to send an invitation to all GP members with clear instructions how to look for in-script variants in their own community.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
3	*Search the Unicode database looking for similar cases like the dotless i (i.e. upper case mapping is locale dependent).*	MD
4	*Look at other ccTLD idn tables for rules about the Sharp S*	MB
5	*Preparation of instructions for GP members " How to look for in-script variants in the community"*	DTs
6	Letter to GP members asking all to look for in-script variants in their community	DT

January 31st : Cross-script Variants

GP has decided to look again , with a revised methodology, for cross script variants with Cyrillic, Armenian and Greek script. See methodology at

https://community.icann.org/display/croscomlgrprocedure/Latin+GP?preview=/52897663/79433450/Latin%20Variant%20Notes.pdf

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
7	*Preparation of working tables for new investigation of cross-script variant*	DT
8	*Work on cross script variants second revision*	DT, Variant Group members, All GP members to help

January 31st: Drafting the Final Report

GP members agreed to include in the final document in relevant chapters following information:
- # of languages processed per continent
- # of countries represented per continent
- # of characters
- language families
- Repertoire and Variant principles
- examples of characters

GP members proposed to move history of Latin script in appendix.

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
9	*Drafting the final report*	MT, all GP members

Commented [5]: Could someone help me to recall what we meant by this

Commented [6]: My recollection on this was someone suggested there should be examples of the Latin characters included in the repertoire. But examples outside the a-z range.