Latin Generation Panel (GP) Meeting
Notes from the meeting on 24 October 2019

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

    GP members:
1. Amadou Ly
2. Bill Jouris
3. Dennis Tan
4. Hazem Hezzah
5. Mats Dufburg
6. Meikal Mumin
7. Mirjana Tasić

    Staff:
8. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana

<u>Meeting Notes</u>

1. **ICANN 66 sessions.** The information of session which Latin GP will present was shared.

Date	Time	Room	Session
Mon, 4 Nov.	1215 - 1315	518	IDN: Latin GP meeting with Integration Panel
Tue, 5 Nov	1030 - 1200	523B	IDN: Armenian Cyrillic Greek Latin GP Meeting
Wed, 6 Nov.	15:15 - 16:45	514A	IDN Program Updates

    The full schedule including UA sessions will be shared with the GP soon.

2. **Allocation of in-script variant analysis tasks.**
Meikal shared that the task allocation was done in [Trello](#) and the proposal version 6 was created as a new [Google document](#). For each task in Trello board, a sub-section in appendix D of the proposal was provided.

    The assigned members were invited to document analysis directly to the corresponding sub-sections. It was discussed that this task should be competed by December 2019.

    It was raised that some sets show obvious distinguishable cases. The GP discussed and agreed that it is useful to also document the analysis for such case.

    It was mentioned that the size of the Google document is very large and will take a lot of time to format the final version. However, breaking into many smaller documents will need the oversight effort. Therefore the GP agreed to continue using the single file.

3. **In-script variants analysis**
Two documents were shared on the mailing list and they were discussed during the meeting: the [Google document](#) of the list of candidates of in-script variant set by Meikal, and the Excel file of the list of candidates of in-script variant set with the marking table by Bill.

    The GP agreed to conduct the analysis by using the excel file, as it has been used in the earlier analysis, to keep the methodology consistent. Bill will complete the template, taking into account Meikal document, and share on the mailing list for member to put the ratings.

It was raised that members can use the Wordmark.it screen-captures in Appendix D of the proposal as input for rating consideration. However, it was also raised that in many cases Workmark.it pictures show substituted fonts which make the pair more distinguishable than it should be. This is also the rationales why the GP selected only three common fonts for cross-script analysis. There was no particular conclusion on this discussion.

It was discussed that the different grouping of variant analysis sets could lead to different results. Therefore the explanation why the GP select each group should be provided; e.g. there were a set for "Caron vs. Horn Above" and "Caron vs. Breve" but not all three "Caron, Horn Above Breve".

4. **Next meeting**: 14 November 2019 at 16:00 UTC.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Conduct the analysis as assigned and document the results in the corresponding sub-section in the proposal version6*	ALL
2	*Finalize the excel file for in-script variant rating and share the GP members*	BJ
3	*Add explanation of in-script variant grouping for each sub-section of Appendix D*	MM