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

29 October 2018

Attendees:

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

ICANN org staff:

1. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

Summary of Notes

The SG discussed inclusion of Harsha Wijayawardhana and agreed to invite him to join as a member of the study group.

The SG reviewed the revised Recommendation 2 in the draft document.

1. **Recommendation 2.** The SG reviewed that there are two possible options. One was to develop a conservative method to evaluate a string vs. second was not review such a string at all and put it on hold until the GP has finalized the relevant LGR proposal. In case of the first option, the decision must be even more conservative than what a Generation Panel would possibly propose. The SG discussed updated proposed text.

   It was suggested that to add a general reference to RFC 6912 as guiding principles for the string review panel, which include some of the same principles from the LGR Procedure. Also, there should be at least a specific comment each for repertoire, variants and WLE rules to constrain them. These should follow the overall principle being suggested that the criteria of the panel must be more conservative than the subsequent generation panel.

   For sub-recommendation (i) on repertoire, it was suggested that the string must be limited only to characters from a single language which is EGIDS levels 1-4 and is primarily written in the script applied for. This would make the condition stricter than a GP's analysis, which may also consider some EGIDS level 5 languages.

   For sub-recommendation (ii) on variants, it was suggested that the potential variant labels should be identified from the perspective of analysis from a string similarity perspective but not declared formally as variant labels to prevent fixing possible variant sets. This allows GP to do this analysis without the string approval process predetermining such sets. Very liberal string similarity criteria must be used on the potential string evaluation during the similarity review.

   It was also suggested that the evaluation should be limited to the string review and minimize impact on the script so as not to take away the independence of the eventual GP to create a solution for that script.

For sub-recommendation (iii) and (iv) on WLE rules, it was asked if the general recommendation on restricting combining marks may fit as it pertains to a LGR and not specifically to a string being evaluated. Rewording of the recommendation was proposed to say that if a combining mark is used in a string, it must be non-optional and must be in a context which is well-understood and non-controversial. Combining marks may still be required for scripts like Tibetan, e.g. to specify vowels. In such cases, the context should be non-questionable.

For sub-recommendation (v) on script mixing, the group agreed to keep the recommendation strictly disallowing script mixing in a label.

The group reviewed the second option, which suggests putting such a string on hold for which the IP has not integrated the LGR procedure by the GP. The study group agreed that this option is the more conservative approach but option one is the more practical approach.

The group discussed that option two may be better because in many scripts there are many arbitrary restrictions which are not predictable algorithmically based on Unicode code point properties. The particular script community knows such restrictions, e.g. as identified in the LGR proposals by NBGP or Myanmar GP, but cannot be determined otherwise. So option one presents a tangible risk that approval of a string may compromise the eventual work of a particular generation panel.

The study group agreed that both options could be presented, with the group saying that option two is better (more conservative) but option one is more practical but may create a precedence which can potentially override a GP's decision. One way to mitigate the risk due to option one is to require that such strings must be evaluated by a panel which includes at least two experts of the script in addition to the other panel members if they do not have script-specific expertise. The group agreed to suggest option two as the recommended approach, though option one can be listed as a second alternative.

Next meeting is planned on 5 November 2018. No meeting will be held on 12 November. Subsequent meeting will be held on 19 November.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	Add Harsha Wijayawardhana to the mailing list and to the study group	SH
2	Review recommendations and provide feedback	ALL