

## Latin Generation Panel (GP) Meeting Notes from meeting on 17 May 2018

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Bill Jouris
2. Dennis T. Tanaka
3. Jean Paul Nkurunziza
4. Mats Dufberg
5. Mirjana Tasić

Staff:

6. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
7. Sarmad Hussain

The following communicated their inability to attend:

1. Ahmed Bakht Masood
2. Hazem Hezzah
3. Michael Bauland

### Meeting Notes

The GP discussed the first version of the Latin Script LGR proposal, at [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ROPzdGUWdfMmoM1mzxbVHgi3ulrATSE5FwV\\_fNaZJk/edit#heading=h.gjdgxs](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ROPzdGUWdfMmoM1mzxbVHgi3ulrATSE5FwV_fNaZJk/edit#heading=h.gjdgxs). This version covers only the LGR overview and the code point repertoire. The GP discussed and agreed on the following items:

1. The structure regards to the excluded code point required a revision (Section 5.4.3). The referring MSR should be MSR-3. The text for the proposed of candidate code points to be included in MSR-3 should reflect that fact that it was done. The MSR-3 detailed discussion could be found in section 5.7.5 of the following document <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/msr-3-overview-28mar18-en.pdf> .
2. At the end of section 2, the discussion around lowercase and uppercase should be addressed due to two factors. First, generally ASCII uppercase and lowercase is allowed in domain names which is also Latin. Some distinction needs to be made e.g. the context of ASCII versus IDNs and why uppercase is not allow in IDN. The other factor is the relevance of uppercase and the definition of variants which it come into question if the uppercase should be consider for variants or not. This is directly impact on what variants are. The GP agreed to elaborate more on these two contexts. The chair requested for a volunteers to draft the text for this section.
3. the fact that currently users could type a domain name in uppercase which lead to the lowercase domain name, therefore the GP should analyse whether any set of code points which look alike in their uppercase should be defined as variant set. The chair called for volunteer to draft the text for this.
4. On page 6, The GP agreed to lay out the numbers of all processed code points. Starting from MSR-2 code points, sequence of code points, the six candidate code points for MSR-3, and the three code points which were included in the MSR-3. Both versions of the MSR, MSR-2 and MSR-3, would be added as references.

5. The GP agreed to the text for 5.2 Principles for developing Repertoire.
6. The GP will provide two versions of the code point repertoire tables. First version is the table, listed in section 5 for general audience, it would be ordered by Glyph family. Second version is the table which is ordered by UNICODE code point, listed in appendix for technical community audience.
7. The GP agreed that after incorporating all points above, the LGR proposal could be submitted to the IP as a first version.
8. Variant WG chair requested for additional volunteer to work on variant analysis sheet. The GP suggested to send the request via the Latin GP mailing list.

#### Action Items

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1	<i>Revise the text for the discussion point 1,2, 3 and 5 then finalize the first version of the Latin Script LGR and submit to the IP</i>	MJ
2	<i>Call for volunteers for analysing the variant via the Latin GP mailing list</i>	DT