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

21 May 2018

Attendees:

1. Ajay Data
2. Dennis Tan Tanaka
3. Mirjana Tasic
4. Wang Wei

ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarnmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

A. Dessalegn Yehuala
B. 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 continued discussing the scope document on the use of RZ-LGR.

C. SG members shared an overview of SAC 052, that the report cautions against single character TLDs as such TLDs increase the chance of user confusion. This relates to string similarity review, in addition to RZ-LGR work. SG raised a question about the "o.com" domain and that the discussion around this single letter domain at second level may be relevant, noting that normally single character domain labels have generally not been allowed. Single character domain names are reserved for the second level per the contract for .com with Verisign, but this may not be the case for other new gTLDs. In the past, even the ccTLDs had not allowed single character domains, but now they are increasingly becoming available. Sometimes auction is also used for this purpose, shared another member of the SG. Members suggested that such domain name should not be used due to user confusion issues. However, final decision was not made.

   It was shared that SAC089 suggests that user confusion is related to the security. Also, that the RZ-LGR can technically validate a single character label provided to it as in input. However, it is then policy which decides how to proceed. The explanation around the single character will be updated in the document for all to review and comment further.

D. It was shared that there is no restriction on two characters for the IDN TLDs, where even today new IDN gTLDs with two characters exist. SG agreed to remove this items from the scope document.

There was discussion on the use of “character” vs. “letter”, as the former is used to refer to code points in Chinese language. However, the latter is used to refer to property value for the code point in the Unicode standard.

E. Regards to script mixing, top level domains restrict such cases except the known examples for Chinese, Japanese and Korean. Any additional cases must be proposed by relevant Generation Panels and reviewed by Integration Panel. Therefore, SG agreed to remove this question.

F. SG agreed it would be same as item E above.

G. SG noted that the Application Guidebook for new gTLDs and Fast Track for IDN ccTLDs should be used. It was suggested that this be further divided into four cases:

    a. Existing IDN gTLDs
    b. Future IDN gTLDs
    c. Existing IDN ccTLDs
    d. Future IDN ccTLDs

    For existing cases, only variant labels may be determined as the applied-for labels are already validated. However, for future applications RZ-LGR may also validate the label before determining its variant labels.

    Also in relation to previous application for gTLDs and ccTLDs, the applicants had identified variant labels through the application process. ICANN had noted that these labels are noted but are not processed. It may be useful to point out by the SG that variant calculations done by the RZ-LGR will override those arbitrary variant labels identified by the applicants.

    It was asked if RZ-LGR is run against current TLDs when it is updated for the stability of the root zone. ICANN staff shared that this is the case and each RZ-LGR update is tested to ensure it does not impact the stability of the root zone.

H. SG suggested tagging geo names is dependent on policy and not technical part of the RZ-LGR calculation. Recommendation 4 from SAC060 document from SSAC was pointed out in this context. But it was discussed that Recommendation 1 would be even more relevant, as it suggests that as root is the single zone where ccTLDs and gTLDs labels are added, and therefore the RZ-LGR be applied equally.

I. SG noted that calculating variants of reserved words as calculated by RZ-LGR should also be reserved. This would be a straight forward ask. Further the any candidate labels should also be validated by RZ-LGR before they are reserved.

J. SG pointed out an example that suppose there are 100 scripts, and RZ-LGR covers just 10. In such a case, what do we do for evaluating the labels in scripts not supported by the RZ-LGR? SG had discussed such application should not be rejected. One mechanism would be to perhaps default to MSR for review? Of course, the issue is if MSR is used, there are no variant code points and WLE rules defined and it is not clear if all the code points in MSR will be eventually shortlisted in the RZ-LGR by the relevant GP.

If any alternate mechanism is used, then from a technical point of view of RZ-LGR as a gating factor, this is equivalent to saying that there is a mechanism which can by-pass the RZ-LGR's "invalid" decision. That could render the RZ-LGR useless. So the question should possibly be turned around to ask: When are we ready to apply RZ-LGR? This question is raised because there will always be scripts not covered by RZ-LGR even if all the 28 scripts in current MSR are integrated.

The meeting for the next week will not be held due to public holiday in the USA. All were requested to read the scope document and add their further input.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Update the explanation for single character TLDs in the scope document based on the discussion in the SG and in SAC052*	DT
2	*Remove item D from the scope, regarding the discussion on two-character TLDs*	DT
3	*Remove items E and F from the scope, as script mixing is relevant for the discussion between GP and IP but not relevant for SG*	DT
4	*For item G, four cases to be added for discussion and, in addition, the SG should also discuss how to address the variant labels already arbitrarily identified by the applicant for ccTLDs and gTLDs*	DT
5	*Reformulate the question in item J to discuss when can RZ-LGR be applied?*	DT
6	*Review the updated scope document and add comments and feedback*	ALL