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

20 August 2018

Attendees:

1. Dennis Tan Tanaka
2. Dessalegn Yehuala
3. Edmon Chung
4. Gaurav Vedi
5. Mirjana Tasic

ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarnmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

Summary of Notes

The SG noted that they work will now start to develop the recommendations based on the scope of work. The analysis will start with the recommendations which the SG considers certainly in scope of their work, while the decision on the rest can be delayed till the public comments are received.

1) The SG started by discussing the first item in the scope.

   a) The SG agreed with the definition of the "use" including (i) syntax validation, and (ii) variant label calculation. SG also noted that in addition to the normative definition in the XML format, any additional comments noted in the RZ-LGR proposals should also be brought up for consideration in the relevant further procedures. However, in such cases, these comments may put additional constraints on the normative XML definition of the RZ-LGR but may not override the normative definition, e.g. by making the XML definition less conservative. It was also suggested to develop a repository for these non-informative comments. It should be discussed who should develop this repository. It was suggested to note this for further discussion.

   b) The SG discussed how to address the scripts not supported by the RZ-LGR. For the supported scripts, the users must agree to the results. In case of scripts not supported, it was raised that the RZ-LGR Procedure may also say something in this context and was agreed to identify and share that information.

   c) The SG agreed that RZ-LGR defines the upper limit for the code point repertoire. It was noted that there are two aspects to this limit. First, that GP has put a limit within the constraints of the relevant MSR (MSR-3 based on Unicode 6.3 at this time). However, even if the MSR is eventually extended to include later version of the Unicode, the upper limit would not change until the GP revises the LGR proposal to include any additional code points from the later versions of the MSR included from later versions of the Unicode. It was raised was that in such cases, should the label be rejected or suspended until the RZ-LGR is updated. In such cases, the suspension should be bound in time by the relevant policy to make sure that it is deterministic. This will prevent any cases where an application does not

get resolved, for example, if a GP does not re-form itself. This may be a different policy for ccTLDs and gTLDs. The SG should point out that this needs to be addressed, and not address the it here.

d) The SG reviewed the users of the RZ-LGR. It was suggested that the other users could also be divided into two sub-groups, those who are involved in the application process and those involved in their technical implementation and universal acceptance. The application process is determined by GNSO and ccNSO.

e) The SG agreed to recommend using RZ-LGR for determining variant labels for ASCII labels.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Start developing a preliminary document on Recommendations*	SH
2	*Consult RZ-LGR Procedure to determine if it suggests a course of action for using RZ-LGR in the context of scripts not integrated in it*	SH