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

2 July 2018

Attendees:

1. Ajay Data
2. Dennis Tan Tanaka
3. Mirjana Tasic

ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarnmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

Summary of Notes

1. **Timeline.** The meeting started with a discussion the timeline for the work. The original workplan for the SG was as follows:

   a. May – scope of work
   b. August – preliminary recommendations and public comment release
   c. December- finalization

   It was suggested that the scope may be gathered into a baseline document for releasing for a public comment period. The SG agreed to generate a clean document to contain issues, explanations and preliminary recommendations.

   It was emphasized that the text should be clarified so that the community understands the context (the motivation of this SG, the process adopted, the problem the SG is addressing, the solution being proposed, and how it will contribute to subsequent work) and what is needed from the community in the feedback.

   The group agreed to prepare an issues list and review it in the call next week. After finalizing the issues, the SG could consider adding analysis and preliminary recommendations where possible and finalize the document by 16 July, for discussion and release for public comment.

2. **Recap of discussion with PTI at ICANN62.** The SG was informed that the meeting with PTI was to understand the IANA processes as they related to RZ delegation and the associated registry operators. The members were informed that a summary of the discussion will be circulated soon. However, two items were highlighted in the SG meeting: first how IANA has to prepare itself when variant TLDs are realized, and second who is going to the manager of RZ-LGR and where will it be stored. For the second point, it was shared that currently ICANN is the manager of the RZ-LGR using the GP-IP framework and IANA could potentially be its repository in the future.

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

3. **Single character labels.** Single character labels were discussed. It was suggested that it is a policy related question, like the geo-names, etc. A single character would pass the RZ-LGR. It was questioned if the SG may suggest some technical considerations for the subsequent policy work. However, the SG noted that such considerations are already available in RFCs, technical reports and applicant guidebook for gTLDs.

    It was noted that the scope could be looked at from two perspectives, the input or contents of the RZ-LGR, and the output labels and their dispositions created by the RZ-LGR. The SG may consider this view to determine its scope of work. While discussing how single character TLDs can be distinguished from other topics like the geo-names, latter also a policy question, it was noted that a distinction can be made on technical issues vs. non-technical issues to be discussed by the community at large. The SG members thought single character TLDs may also be more of a policy issue and may not be technically relevant for this SG.

    The SG noted that it could be borderline due to security and stability reasons, and concluded to keep it included at this time.

4. **Test cases for RZ-LGR.** The SG members were informed that the discussion with PTI brought out the need for test cases to ensure that the implementations of RZ-LGR are consistent. Integration Panel is already asking that Generation Panels provide such test cases for regression testing. These are published. The question is to just take these test cases supplied by the GPs and release them as references? Or ask IP to review and finalize the test cases, taking GP input and adding their own cases? The reason to ask IP is because they are technical implementers whereas GPs are just linguistic data producers. The test labels allow for test repertoire, variants and label evaluation rules. It was questioned if what is supplied by the GP is sufficient? The SG generally agreed to ask the IP for reviewing and releasing the reference test cases as they had a implementation and a broader view.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Prepare the rationale, issue list and possible recommendations for public comment*	DT, SH
2	*Send a doodle poll to review the time for SG meeting, to make is earlier for the benefit for those joining from Asia*	SH