Root Zone Label Generation Rules Study Group (RZ-LGR-SG) Meeting

14 May 2018

Attendees:

1. Ajay Data
2. Dennis Tan Tanaka
3. Edmon Chung
4. Mirjana Tasic

ICANN org staff:

1. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

1. Dessalegn Yehuala
2. Gaurav Vedi

Summary of Notes

The SG started discussing the scope document being developed, and available at
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VCpLpl9nkHq7D7Pf0gyJm7zSllVC9pLvsu_7YdJ473Y/edit.

1. Use of RZ-LGR. The SG started with discussing the first item in the scope on the use of RZ-LGR.

   A. The question in 1.A. is raised for the subsequent group using SG's recommendations. SG summarized that the use of RZ-LGR can be viewed by a process where:

> a label is input into a tool which uses the RZ-LGR and the tool outputs if the label is valid or invalid; and if the label is valid, the tool also computes all its variant labels along with their dispositions (allocatable or blocked).

   SG suggested documenting this for clarifying the use for RZ-LGR. SG also considered identifying who are the users. For example, not only TLD applicants, but also other users, such as ICANN staff, IANA, etc. Other users could also include application providers, like browser manufacturers and those providing internationalized email mailboxes. It was discussed that mailbox names may be more liberal in their formation so RZ-LGR may be too restrictive.

   The SG agreed that to focus the current work, the scope should be limited to TLD application, TLD allocation and TLD delegation processes. The SG should note any additional uses in a separate bucket and see if these need to be discussed at a later stage.

   It was also raised that the RZ-LGR cannot be used partially – it can either be used completely or not used. So what would happen if a script is not integrated – how will the label in that script be evaluated?

   B. SG agreed that RZ-LGR is needed to validate TLDs. SG to expand on why?

It was also raised that the SG should discuss how to address a case for evaluating a label for which the relevant script(s) have not been integrated in the RZ-LGR. The SG noted that 86% of the IDN applications in the previous gTLD round would not be covered by the RZ-LGR-2 version available at this time. If such a situation persists, then it may not be reasonable to impose RZ-LGR. It was discussed that one would need to look at it from both coverage and technical points of view.

SG discussed that TLD applications should be allowed beyond the coverage of RZ-LGR. Those labels not covered by RZ-LGR may not be processed and put on hold, and possibly taken through a separate process. So that the applicant does not have to wait for the next round. However, other members raised that bypassing RZ-LGR may not be effective. Also, RZ-LGR should be considered as a single IDN Table for the Root Zone. From that perspective, for whatever reason, if a label contains a character which is out of repertoire, its status will be calculated as invalid by RZ-LGR. How could one distinguish that some invalid labels are actually invalid, whereas for others the state could be changed to put them on hold. This could "break" the RZ-LGR.

C. and D. The group discussed if TLD label with one or two characters be allowed. There was no limitation on two characters – though it was not clear if this could be done for Latin script. SSAC's SAC052 report put a limit on the use of single characters. However, in the PDP for the subsequent round of gTLDs, its Work Track 4 (WT4) is considering allowing single character TLDs.

The SG raised if it should be in its scope to deal with single character IDNs? SG could review the SSAC's recommendations and possibly add implementation details on the advisory, for example. SG agreed to look at SAC052 report and discuss further.

SG members will update the scope document based on the discussions, and all members should continue to review it.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Update the Scope document based on the discussion*	DT
2	*Read SSAC's SAC052 report in the context of single character TLDs for further discussion*	ALL
3	*Review and comment on the scope document*	ALL