

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

27 August 2018

### Attendees:

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

### ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarnmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

### Regrets:

### Summary of Notes

The SG also agreed to start a new google doc for the recommendations so that everybody can put their suggestions online. The SG continued to discuss the scope questions to derive the recommendations.

- 2) The SG started by discussing the second item in the scope.
  - a) The SG discussed that it would keep the focus on the security and stability aspect and not the policy consideration – based on the input from [SSAC 052 report](#). The SG was apprised on recommendation 1 item 6 on pg. 9. It was noted that when the report was issued, the RZ-LGR was still in initial stages. Now that we have a maturer RZ-LGR data, it would be useful to review this recommendation and comment further on it. SG members agreed to review recommendation 1 section 6 on pg. 9 for further discussion.
- 3) The item deals with gTLDs and ccTLDs, breaking down into current and future TLDs. For already delegated TLDs, it can be recommended that these labels are validated, and their variants calculated, so that these variant labels are not registerable. It was raised how to define variant label is? It was stated that the variant labels are those defined by the GP in the RZ-LGR. The variant labels and their disposition is calculated as per the details defined in the RZ-LGR Procedure.

It was noted that 3.a.i assumes that existing TLDs should be valid as per the RZ-LGR. A question is whether RZ-LGR must support all existing TLDs – or should there be grand-fathering?

Also, per 3.a.i.1, some variant labels were identified by the applicant. How should those variant labels be processed? Should these be ignored, especially if those variant labels are not generated using RZ-LGR?

Further per 3.a.i.2, suppose we have variant labels for current TLDs, how do we process these – should a reserved list be created, or how else to address them?

It was suggested that the current TLDs should be run through the RZ-LGR to determine their variants. Self-identified variant labels should not be used. The RZ-LGR calculation would override the previous calculation. The SG was shown the examples of variant labels suggested by the applicants in the Fast Track process, as displayed on the relevant webpage. It was shared that an explicit recommendation from the SG on how to address these would be useful. This will help address this record even if these self-identified variant labels do not have a formal status as per the ccTLD and gTLD processes.

*Possible recommendation: Existing gTLDs and ccTLDs should be valid through RZ-LGR.*

*Possible recommendation: Variant labels of existing gTLDs and ccTLDs must be identified. Such variant labels should not be allocated to a different applicant, following the IDN variant TLD management process*

- 4) SG had already discussed equal application to ccTLDs and gTLDs. SG agreed that there is no difference as far as technical use for RZ-LGR is concerned. So it should be applied equally to both kinds of TLDs, for validation and determination of variant labels.

*Possible recommendation: RZ-LGR calculations should be applied equally for validation and variant labels of gTLDs and ccTLDs.*

*Possible recommendation: Based on the calculations of RZ-LGR, the follow-up additional constraints can be different between gTLD and ccTLD, as per the policies and processes for gTLDs and ccTLDs respectively.*

- 5) The SG noted that RZ-LGR will be used for determining variant labels for reserved labels, which should also be incorporated in the list of reserved labels.

*Possible recommendation: RZ-LGR will be used for determining variant labels for reserved labels, which should also be incorporated in the list of reserved labels.*

SG was asked if there will be additional terminology to differentiate the labels reserved from application because these are (i) reserved, and (ii) reserved from application by other applicant because these are variants of existing TLDs. SG agreed to disambiguate these definitions.

There will not be a meeting next week due to holiday in the US. The SG will meet in two weeks. All members are requested to review the current recommendations.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	Start a Google Document for recommendations	DT
2	Review Recommendation 1 item 6 on pg. 9 of <a href="#">SSAC 052 report</a> for further discussion on scope item 2.a.	ALL
3	Develop a recommendation on how to deal with self-identified variant labels for ccTLDs and gTLDs	ALL
4	Review the existing recommendations and analysis	ALL

Possible Recommendations

- Existing gTLDs and ccTLDs should be valid through RZ-LGR.

- *Variant labels of existing gTLDs and ccTLDs must be identified using RZ-LGR. Such variant labels should not be allocated to a different applicant, following the IDN variant TLD management process*
- *RZ-LGR calculations should be applied equally for validation and variant labels of gTLDs and ccTLDs.*
- *Based on the calculations of RZ-LGR, the follow-up additional constraints can be different between gTLD and ccTLD, as per the policies and processes for gTLDs and ccTLDs respectively.*
- *RZ-LGR will be used for determining variant labels for reserved labels, which should also be incorporated in the list of reserved labels.*