

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

26 November 2018

Attendees:

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

ICANN org staff:

1. Sarmad Hussain
2. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana

Regrets:

Summary of Notes

The SG reviewed the revised recommendations in the draft [document](#).

1. **Recommendation 3.** The SG was informed that this recommendation has been updated based on the input in the previous meeting. The SG reviewed the question it had asked to raise for public comment. In the context of the discussion, the SG was pointed to Recommendation 2 of SSAC's [SAC060](#) document. The SG's Recommendation 3 is a way to address SSAC's concern in Recommendation 2 and thus provides the motivation for this recommendation by the SG. SG considered whether this is a circular argument, however, it was noted that the current policy framework does not tie RZ-LGR with the application process and the details being suggested by the SG will help policy makers make that connection. This recommendation, though circular, also suggests to the policy makers that the only way to update RZ-LGR is to send it back to Generation Panels (GP), else RZ-LGR will be invalidated.
2. **Recommendation 6 and 7.** To be deleted because these are captured by earlier recommendations.
3. **Recommendation 8.** The SG discussed if it is useful to include any recommendation on single character TLD labels, as the GNSO's PDP on subsequent gTLD round is already including a reference to SSAC's SAC052. However, the SG agreed to keep the recommendation as this document is also designed for ccNSO. SG agreed that the wording of this recommendation can be fine-tuned, as needed based on further feedback from the SG members.
4. **Recommendation for existing TLDs.** SG agreed to include the recommendation to say that existing TLDs must be validated by the RZ-LGR. In case any TLD is not validated, it could be grandfathered, for stability reasons. SG discussed that it should be the relevant script GP's responsibility to check if existing TLDs in that script are validated by their proposal. In case the proposal does not support any existing TLD, the GP must document the reasons, which should be reviewed by the community during the public comment process. SG was informed that Integration Panel (IP) also undertakes this test against the TLDs. However, the SG agreed that it is useful if the GP does this analysis and finalizes its proposal knowing any implications on the

existing TLD base. ICANN org can provide the support and help with the analysis if the GP needs. The LGR tool can also perform this analysis.

5. **Recommendation for variant TLDs.** This requirement is addressed by Recommendation 2. However, if a collision occurs between variant labels of the existing TLDs based on RZ-LGR proposal, the relevant GP should be aware of it and should provide appropriate remediation. This solution should be presented in the proposal during the public comment process. Such a scenario may occur with in-script and cross-script variant labels.
6. **Recommendation for self-identified variant labels of existing TLDs.** The SG was informed that how self-identified variant labels are addressed may need to be reviewed separately for the gTLD and ccTLD cases, as there is differing language in Applicant Guidebook and IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. The following language is used in these documents.

For gTLDs in AGB <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb> (pg. 1-35 section 1.3.3):

Each application contains one applied-for gTLD string. The applicant may also declare any variant strings for the TLD in its application. However, no variant gTLD strings will be delegated through the New gTLD Program until variant management solutions are developed and implemented.9Declaring variant strings is informative only and will not imply any right or claim to the declared variant strings.

For IDN ccTLD Fast Track process: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTLD-implementation-plan-05nov13-en.pdf> (Section 3.4, pg. 9)

Variant TLDs desired by the requester for delegation must be indicated by the requester. Desired variant TLDs will be allocated to the requester (if successfully evaluated). This does not mean that the variant TLD will be delegated in the DNS root zone. It will be allocated to the requester in order to be reserved to the entitled manager for potential future delegation in the DNS root zone. A list of non-desired variants will be generated based on the received IDN Tables. Non-desired variants will be placed on a blocked list by ICANN. Subsequent application or request for non-desired variants will be denied.

7. **Recommendation on allocation of variant labels of existing TLDs based on variant TLD management mechanisms.** The SG discussed that these mechanisms are still under development by the community, so the SG may not be able to comment in this context.
8. **Recommendation on equal application of RZ-LGR to ccTLDs and gTLDs.** SG agreed that the RZ-LGR should be the technical gatekeeper, being applied cohesively across the gTLDs and ccTLDs, even if their respective policies downstream may vary. The downstream discussion and policy is up to the ccNSO and GNSO to discuss and is out of scope of the SG's work. Thus SG should only suggest equal application but not talk about additional constraints and NSOs may put in. This point could be included in a sub-bullet, if needed. Also, it is useful to call out both gTLD and ccTLD explicitly for equal application, and not use just TLD, to be clear.

Next call on 3 December.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
--------	--------------	-------

1	<i>Update Recommendation 3 to point to SSAC's SAC060 and tie this recommendation as a means to address SSAC's Recommendation 2.</i>	DT
2	<i>Review AGB and IDN ccTLD Fast Track language to decide how to process the self-identified variant labels.</i>	ALL
3	<i>Develop and update recommendations based on the discussion.</i>	DT
4	<i>Review the updated recommendations.</i>	ALL