

Root Zone Label Generation Rules Study Group Meeting

5 April 2018

Attendees:

1. Ajay Data
2. Alireza Saleh
3. Dennis Tan Tanaka
4. Edmon Chung
5. Gaurav Vedi
6. Mirjana Tasic
7. Wang Wei

ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

Summarized Notes

Review of scope of work.

The members continued to discuss the scope of the study group (SG). It was noted that a couple of additional points have been added in the draft scope on the wiki page by ICANN staff for the SG to review.

The SG reiterated the scope of its work, which includes the technical recommendations for the use of RZ-LGR for consideration of the future policy development process. The SG is focused on technical issues and not policy matters. SG members discussed if trademark issues may be relevant. SG noted that trademark may relate to policy discussion however SG could discuss this further.

The SG reviewed the items listed in the scope. For the validation of TLDs using RZ-LGR, the SG should look at how RZ-LGR may be used in the context of applied-for gTLD string review (based on Applicant Guidebook, for example) and in the context of ccTLD string review (based on IDN ccTLD Fast Track process). For determination of variant TLDs and their disposition using RZ-LGR, SG should look at any issues around it? For example, number of allocated variant labels, transition between dispositions of labels and whether variant set can be changed.

SG was clarified that for reserved labels, currently a particular label is reserved. However, RZ-LGR will introduce variant labels for such reserved labels and the SG needs to consider if these should also be reserved.

SG also reviewed additional items suggested in scope and listed at the wiki page. SG raised if this is the complete list or are there other items which should be included?

SG suggested to change the “application” to “utilization” or some other word to remove confusion with the application process of TLDs.

SG members also raised that trademark could still be relevant as application of a label could create variant labels which could infringe on somebody else’s trademark. SG suggested to document the

use case for this from a technical point of view. SG agreed to move forward with the suggested points and add any additional points if raised in the future. Regarding the scope of work, SG was reminded that the LGR procedure should be reviewed as a baseline.

SG members questioned how this study group may determine its limits, so that it does not go into policy matters. The SG members were explained that, for example looking at constraining the number of allocatable labels, the SG may look at the permutational issues caused by many allocatable TLD variant labels and variant labels at the second level to see the implementation challenges and then make recommendations to mitigate issues, which can then be considered by those developing policy on this as the next step.

SG agreed to expand these points to a more granular level for more clarity.

SG members asked why in case of variant labels, the suggestion is only to reduce allocatable variant labels and not to increase them. Further, why is this constraint needed? SG was explained that increasing allocatable labels was not an option as the LGR Procedure does not allow making blocked labels allocatable, but there is no constraint on adding additional criteria on reducing allocatable labels for activation. Also, the motivation behind the suggested item in the scope comes from the advice provided from the SSAC and the Integration panel (IP). For example, the IP noted that for boundary cases, a label may still create too many allocatable variant labels, even if generally RZ-LGR is designed to keep them at a minimal level. In such cases, additional constraints may be needed. Integrated Issues Report (preceding the LGR Procedure) identified usability, need and security and stability as potential criteria for limiting variant labels, for example.

SG raised an associated question on when can an allocated TLD label, not activated/delegated initially, be activated/delegate later? SG was explained that this could be a question for ccNSO and GNSO to address, as this was a policy or application procedure detail, e.g. whether such TLD applications could be made during active rounds or on rolling basis, etc. From a technical point of view, there may not be any issues in such a process at any time. SG raised it may be good to add this to the list of items in the scope that if there is a technical issue with activating/delegating a label after the primary label has been delegated.

Administrative matters. The SG discussed requirements for the quorum, e.g., 50% of the members, or some specific number. It was suggested not to set a quorum and let the chair make the decision based on the item being discussed during the specific meeting and email discussions.

The SG members also suggested to use a better tool for the meeting for more effective remote participation.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Add a requirement on whether RZ-LGR needs to be consulted in the objection and dispute processes for TLD applications</i>	DT and SH
2	<i>Expand the scope of WG to more granular points for more clarity</i>	DT and SH
3	<i>Add additional item on determining any technical challenges on activating/delegating an additional allocatable variant label withheld initially, after the primary label and some of its allocatable variant labels are already delegated</i>	DT and SH