

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

9 September 2018

Attendees:

1. Ajay Data
2. Dennis Tan Tanaka
3. Dessalegn Yehuala
4. Edmon Chung
5. Gaurav Vedi
6. Wang Wei

ICANN org staff:

1. Sarmad Hussain

Regrets:

1. Mirjana Tasic

Summary of Notes

The SG reviewed the recommendations 1-5 in the draft [document](#). The WG asked staff to fill in the background information in the Executive Summary.

1. **Principles.** The SG discussed the principle suggested by Dusan, in which it was suggested that the work by GP should not be challenged. The SG agreed that that is assumed in its work. It may be included explicitly.
2. **Normative Language.** The SG discussed and agreed to include the normative language and it can be revisited after the public comment.
3. **Definitions.** The SG discussed that this section would include any definitions needed to understand the recommendations.
4. **Recommendation 1.** The text was adjusted to change “should” to a “must”. The SG agreed with the updated recommendation that RZ-LGR be applied to all applicable TLD labels, including IDN and ASCII labels. It was raised if IDN labels should be replaced with Unicode labels and ASCII labels. The SG agreed to tweak the language during the review as needed. Further, the second sentence may be updated to include check for validity in addition to determining the variants.
5. **Recommendation 2.** The SG discussed how to deal with the scripts not integrated in the RZ-LGR. Should it be discussed by subsequent policy work? A suggestion was shared that for the delegation to the root, the script should be integrated in RZ-LGR. As many gTLDs and ccTLDs are already processed, it may be a safe solution. There may be an exception for the ASCII/Latin to be included if it has not be integrated by that time. One could apply for a TLD, but for technical measure the recommendation should ask for only supporting integrated scripts and not processing other applications for delegation. The RZ-LGR be considered as black-box and SG should make the recommendation accordingly, independently of which scripts are integrated. The SG would discuss this further.
6. **Recommendation 3.** SG agreed with the recommendation. Regarding the scripts not integrated in the RZ-LGR, the SG would discuss next week after some further language has been proposed, as per the discussion for Recommendation 2.

- 7. Recommendation 4.** SG agreed with the gist of the recommendation but noted that the recommendation wording is confusing and should be simplified. It was agreed that ICANN org should develop and maintain this list, but in consultation with the relevant GP and IP.
- 8. Recommendation 5.** The recommendation is related to earlier discussion in Recommendation 2 on scripts not integrated in RZ-LGR, so would need to be re-arranged and discussed in that context. Further, for the cases in which the script is integrated but the code points are not included in the repertoire, the solution should be discussed along with the recommendation dealing with the objection process. It was discussed if “string” should be used instead of “TLD application”, however, it was agreed that “TLD application” is clearer in showing the intention. However, there should be a distinction between if a code point is in the MSR vs. it is in the Unicode standard. In the first case the application may be suspended but in the latter case the application should be rejected. This needs further thought and discussion by the SG.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Fill in background details in Executive Summary section of the Draft Recommendations document</i>	SH
2	<i>Review the language of the recommendations and suggest any edits inline</i>	ALL
3	<i>Based on the discussion, suggest language for how to handle TLD applications for those scripts not integrated in RZ-LGR for further review</i>	DT