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

9 July 2018

Attendees:

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

ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarnmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

Summary of Notes

The SG started discussing the public comment scope document available at
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VCpLpl9nkHq7D7Pf0gyJm7zSllVC9pLvsu_7YdJ473Y/edit.

Principles. The SG reviewed and agreed with the principles.

Scope of Work. The SG discussed that there is PDP on subsequent round of gTLDs and this work will be useful for the PDP working group. The SG started discussing the items in the scope, with the discussion against each item summarized below.

1. RZ-LGR be used for validating labels and determining variant labels and their disposition. Also, how should the labels be reviewed for those scripts not integrated in the RZ-LGR? And finally, the limitations on the repertoire based on RZ-LGR.

    RZ-LGR users were discussed. It was suggested to add TLD application evaluation panels and end-users who may want to review variant labels for raising objections.

    For part e., it was discussed that though RZ-LGR was intended for IDN TLDs, ASCII applications should also be reviewed using RZ-LGR to discover their cross-script variant labels.

2. The question on single characters should be kept, to see if SG needs to reiterate SSAC's advisory on it.
3. RZ-LGR needs to be used for both ccTLD and gTLDs for current TLDs and future applications.
4. RZ-LGR should be applied equally for both gTLDs and ccTLDs from a technical validation standpoint.
5. RZ-LGR should also be applied for all reserved labels including ASCII label, and not just IDN labels. Possible such labels could be "example", "corp", "mail" etc. Two-letter ASCII labels are also reserved. So that the variants of such labels can also be reserved.
6. Policy should say how to deal with applied for labels not supported by RZ-LGR.

7. It is an important question on how the change in RZ-LGR should be managed.
8. IANA currently does not have a framework to deal with variant labels. So work will be needed in this area.
9. Who creates and maintains the RZ-LGR (e.g. ICANN through GPs and IP), what is the authoritative source for RZ-LGR (e.g. IANA), and who would implement it? Whoever is implementing it should verify that their implementation is correct.
10. The question on states for labels and their transitions has been discussed by the SG as a relevant question to answer.
11. This question based on SSAC concern on permutational explosion based on variants at multiple levels, and should be addressed.
12. Who and when can somebody object to the RZ-LGR proposal. The SG discussed the public comment process which a RZ-LGR process undergoes under GP and IP, querying if the community can still challenge the proposal after the public comment process?
13. See the discussion in item 12.
14. The SG discussed that it should be investigated what remaining work should be conducted in DNS Stability Review after RZ-LGR is applied. It was suggested that DNS stability panel may also be consulted for feedback on this question.

SG to review the questions in the scope document and share feedback. Next week the SG will aim to finalize the scope. Finally, the public comment announcement should also be drafted. Time of next call may be changed.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Review the scope of work, with the aim to finalize it in the next call*	ALL
2	*Draft public comment announcement*	SH