

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

8 October 2018

Attendees:

1. Ajay Data
2. Alireza Saleh
3. Dennis Tan Tanaka
4. Dessalegn Yehuala
5. Edmon Chung
6. Mirjana Tasic

ICANN org staff:

1. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
2. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

1. Gaurav Vedi

Summary of Notes

The SG started discussing Recommendation 6 onwards in the draft [document](#).

1. **Recommendation 6.** This recommendation says that RZ-LGR puts an upper limit on the repertoire. The SG discussed in the context of this recommendations it would be useful to include how the RZ-LGR repertoire is determined by the GP. Also, in case of revision the GP needs to request these code points to IP based on the MSR (or also request addition of code points in MSR if the code points supported by IDNA2008).

The reason of differentiating IDNA2008, MSR and RZ-LGR levels is because there may be different responses. If a code point is outside IDNA2008, it cannot be incorporated. In case the code point being requested to be added in the RZ-LGR is in IDNA2008 but not in MSR, a different route of reconsideration may exist.

The SG also raised if there is something here which warrants a recommendation or does this just require an explanation of the process, if an applicant finds that a code point is missing and wants to raise an appeal.

This item pertains to those scripts which are included in the RZ-LGR but lacking some code points or rules. In this context, there are two kinds of excluded code points: those already considered by a GP and explicitly excluded vs. those which were not considered by the GP as they were included in the IDNA2008 (and MSR) at a date later than the RZ-LGR proposal for the script, due to later addition of these code points in Unicode.

SG suggested making a recommendation that in case the requested code point is beyond IETF standards (IDNA2008), then no policy should be able to override it. If included in IETF standards, relevant policy may suggest next steps based. SG suggested the following:

- IDNA2008 – the code point is out, and the application containing it is rejected

- Not in RZ-LGR – applicant should talk to GP for possible inclusion in the LGR proposal – in this case, the downstream policy should only consider suspending the application (pending the code point analysis by the GP) or rejecting the application.
- In RZ-LGR – the application should proceed

It was suggested that the bar on reconsideration request for code points in the RZ-LGR should be higher for those code points which have already been considered by the GP and rejected vs. those not yet considered by a GP. In the former case, the GP may not want to reformulate because it has already considered the code point. The applicant should be pointed to the supporting document of the LGR proposal for this purpose. In cases of code points discussed and rejected by a GP, a more detailed documentation may be needed by the applicant for making the case to the GP.

2. **Recommendation 7.** The SG decided to come back to this recommendation on single character TLDs.
3. **Existing ccTLD and gTLDs.** The RZ-LGR should be used to calculate the variant labels of the existing TLDs, which should be reserved from applications.

What would be the impact RZ-LGR now, or later when it changes? What to do if variant labels generated by the introduction or change in RZ-LGR create a collision within the existing TLD base.

Two separate items were identified: supporting existing TLD base in the RZ-LGR repertoire, and dealing with collisions due to the variants of this TLD base as defined by the RZ-LGR.

It was suggested that a condition should be imposed on the RZ-LGR proposals to support all the existing TLDs, asking all GPs to check against this condition. This will remove the requirement of grandfathering any TLDs. Existing TLDs may not be subject to revocation based on RZ-LGR, though the SG members considered if there may be any cases which could be revoked. RZ-LGR design to address such considerations. The GP should be asked to do this analysis and make a clear justification in case it is not supporting an existing TLD, as the proposal causes instability in the root zone. This should undergo a public comment.

The SG also discussed and concluded that the GPs must also look at possible collisions the relevant LGR proposal may cause due to the definition of variant code point between the existing TLDs. The GP must note these in their proposal in case these cannot be avoided in the design of the LGR proposal and also suggest possible mitigation in such cases, so that the community can consider and share its feedback during the public comment.

SG raised how this will be managed for the GPs which have already finished their work and their work is part of the RZ-LGR? It was suggested that any possible issues can be reviewed and reported back to SG.

Next meeting on 15 October 2018.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
<i>1</i>	<i>Update recommendations as discussed</i>	DT
<i>2</i>	<i>Review recommendations</i>	ALL