

Latin Generation Panel (GP) Meeting Notes from the meeting on 4 July 2019

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

GP members:

1. Bill Jouris
2. Meikal Mumin
3. Micheal Boulard
4. Mirjana Tasić

Staff:

5. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
6. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

1. URL Underlining analysis was completed. Bill will capture the result into the report.
2. The GP discussed the integrated analysis in Appendix D Merger. Meikal setup an oversight mechanism using Trello tool (<https://trello.com/c/BoKkXTzF/1-in-script-variants-analysis>) for keeping track what is missing in Appendix D. There are 14 items more which should be analyzed, beside some other items which are not finished by GP members from previous assignment. All assigned and not completed items has in the title of item the code(1 to 7) which marks to whom the item was assigned. The assignment of new 14 new items is proposed as follows:

No	Item	GP member
1.	Shape: Ring above vs Hook Above	1 (<i>Hazzem</i>)
2.	Shape: Ring above vs Dot Above	2 (<i>Michael</i>)
3.	Shape: Caron vs Horn above	3 (<i>Dennis</i>)
4.	Stacking: Circumflex (above) and dot below	4 (<i>Bill</i>)
5.	Stacking: Breve above and dot below	5 (<i>Meikal</i>)
6.	Stacking: Grave and dot below	6 (<i>Mats</i>)
7.	Stacking: Acute and dot below	7 (<i>Mirjana</i>)
8.	Stacking: Horn and Acute above	1 (<i>Hazzem</i>)
9.	Stacking: Horn and Tilde above	3 (<i>Dennis</i>)
10.	Stacking: Horn and Dot below	4 (<i>Bill</i>)
11.	Stacking: Acute vs non acute	5 (<i>Meikal</i>)
12.	IDNA Compatibility: i vs dotless i (overlaps with base character analysis)	6 (<i>Mats</i>)
13.	IDNA Compatibility: Sharp s vs sequence ss	2 (<i>Michael</i>)
14.	Visual analysis : turned e vs schwa	7 (<i>Mirjana</i>)

Finished analysis could be inserted in [Appendix D merger \[docs.google.com\]](#), or sent to the list in an e-mail.

3. Seven members of the GP will get accounts with wordmark.it. Pitinan will inform GP when accounts will be ready for use.
4. GP decided to use rest of the time in the call to look at Michaels contribution in the report about sharp s vs ss and his consultations with German, Austrian and Swiss ccTLD. This part of the report is cleaned of some remarks, but it should be discussed again with other GP members which were not present on this call.
5. Visual Analysis of in-script variants was also added to the agenda. Meikal said that in this topic all homoglyphs in the script should be analyzed. Up to now he has proposed only one

“turned e vs schwa”

It was proposed that all members of the panel should pass through the defined Repertoire and propose any other code points for Visual analysis.

6. The next meeting will be held on 11 July 2019 16:00UTC.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Draft the underlining analysis in the report, based on the analysis conclusion.</i>	BJ
2	<i>Prepare the Wordmark.it account for seven members as per request.</i>	PK
3	<i>Review the repertoire for the visual analysis for in-script variant and share the findings to the GP.</i>	ALL