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

4 June 2018

Attendees:

1. Dennis Tan Tanaka
2. Edmon Chung
3. Gaurav Vedi
4. Wang Wei

ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarnmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

A. Ajay Data
B. Alireza Saleh
C. Dessalegn Yehuala
D. Mirjana Tasic

Summary of Notes

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

Principles. The SG noted that the principles are generally stable and hoped that they will hold over time. There had been discussion on whether the first principle may be part of the second principle, but the SG agreed on keeping it explicit.

1. **Use of RZ-LGR.**
    B. The SG members were requested to review the text in this section and share they feedback.

    C. Some reference documents have been documented. The SG should review and edit. The SG said that the scope will be revisited to discuss and make recommendations.

    D. This and additional point E and F will be removed, as these aspects are not relevant for the SG and should be taken up by the respective generation panels.

    G. SG noted that there are two cases each, current and future applications, for gTLDs and ccTLDs.

    H. SG agreed that RZ-LGR should be applied equally. The application of RZ-LGR is a technical and objective input/output process and remains the same for gTLDs and ccTLDs. Any difference may occur downstream when additional policy is applied to the output to further constrain the results, based on the category of the TLD.

I. The SG agreed with the change indicating that the reserved labels are those for the top-level and not the second-level and noted the additional RFCs and other link provided, which list such labels. The RZ-LGR would create variant labels for the reserved labels.

Question was raised on whether an invalid label could be reserved? Also, what would happen to labels in scripts not supported by RZ-LGR?

The SG discussed the possibility of reserving similar looking label which is invalid, as it may become valid at a later stage. SG agreed to think this point through and to develop any examples to explain the case.

SG discussed that "reserved" should be defined. A definition is that those labels which are technically allowed to be part of root zone but not allowed for some other reason. Another definition could be those which are identified through a process like string similarity but are not valid by RZ-LGR calculation. So they should be "remembered" so that these could be reserved when RZ-LGR is updated in a way that such labels become valid.

J. SG reviewed that the RZ-LGR may not contain all scripts. So the question is when to use the RZ-LGR, given that when it is implemented, its calculations will be final. SG to consider on how to deal with remaining cases not covered.

SG discussed if a separate process could be used for scripts not supported.

K. SG reviewed how the community would deal with changes in RZ-LGR calculations. SG agreed that all the possibilities should be enumerated, and agreed drawing matrix to capture these cases.

L. The IANA processes and whois records were discussed. Staff was asked to identify the process for IANA. SG noted that whois records are more complicated to maintain than the DNS entry. It is not clear if IANA is supposed to update its whois system, to show relationship of variant labels. On the question, SG clarified that the scope of this item is limited to the delegation process at IANA and not the other processes. This item will be fine-tuned.

2. Variants.

A. It was not clear what this item intended. It would be reviewed later.

B. SG noted that the dispositions are allocatable and blocked.

C. SG discussed a comment on technical bundling related to deployment of variants. It was raised that there are two points – first if allocation and activation of allocatable can minimized – second, how activated variant labels are implemented. Implementation should be discussed in a separate point, if needed.

D. It was noted that this point overlaps with Item 1.K above and the two should be merged.

E. This point will also be merged with the change of status matrix discussion in 1.K.

3. Appeal Process.
    A. SG considered the appeal process. It was pointed out that there are possibly three points of view: applicant, community member or trademark holder wanting to raise an objection, generation panel. Each role can potentially request to redefine a variant set. It was further clarified that the appeal process could include changing members of a variant set: (i) intention to include a non-variant label in a variant set, or (ii) intention to take a variant label and excluding it from the variant set.

    It was also raised that how the appealing process will be handled if the appeal is successful. Will it only address the particular label or the whole RZ-LGR? SSAC has provided some suggestions on how to proceed in SAC060, e.g. by reconvening the appropriate generation panel to review.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	Think through any cases where invalid labels may also need to be reserved, in case these become valid in the future, and develop any examples to explain the case (Item 1.i.)	EC
2	Create a matrix capturing all the states changes possible and recommendations for each of the cases (allocatable, allocated, blocked, reserved, etc.)	DT
3	Get more details on the IANA delegation process	SH
4	The item on IANA process and whois records will be fine-tuned	DT
5	Merge the related topics 2.D, 2.E. and 1.K	DT
6	Add SSAC's recommendation for 3.A/B	DT
7	Review and provide feedback on the whole document	ALL