Using the list of delegated IDN TLDs, the Integration Panel performed collision checks (all valid labels are added in order as encountered, any later label with the same index variant is a collision) and **found one collision**.

Conflict:

label ভারত (09AD 09BE 09B0 09A4) <==>

label ভাৰত (09AD 09BE 09F0 09A4):

Index Variant = ভারত (09AD 09BE 09B0 09A4).

The labels in question differ between code points 09B0 and 09F0, which are **blocked** variants in the Bangla LGR.

Variant Set 4 — 2 Members

Source Glyph		Target Glyph			Type	Ref	Comment
09B0	র	09F0	ৰ	↔	blocked		Bengali variant

These labels spell "India" in Bangla and Assamese and are both currently delegated, but would not be both allocatable under the RZ-LGR, due to the code points being defined as blocked variants. Because both labels refer to the same word, they could be considered semantic variants of each other.

The IP would like to bring this to the attention of the community. There is no requirement for the RZ-LGR to cover every previously delegated IDN TLDs. However, the GP may decide based on the following considerations to make a change or to better explain the rationale for the existing design

Defining variants addresses both security and usability issues. When two variant labels refer to different and unrelated words in each community, then the presumption would be that they would be of interest to unrelated entities and making them variants intends to address any security issue by setting up a first-come-first-serve resolution in favor of one, but not the other.

Whenever the variants are not unrelated, but instead represent the same term, this can create a usability issue. Normally, with a ***blocked*** disposition, a label can only exist in the spelling used by one community, and members of the other community might be unable to access the label altogether. To be able to address such usability issues, variants can be made ***allocatable***, which would allow the same resource to be made available equally for each community.

The fact that the country name has been delegated in both forms might be seen as an indication of a usability issue that is not addressed in the design of the LGR. Simply grandfathering the name of the

country might not be enough, if, as is common, that name or its derivatives may show up as part of other labels.

This issue apparently applies to a single pair of code points (listed above). No matter how this is resolved, we encourage the GP to evaluate the underlying usability issue and discuss in the LGR proposal what actions should or should not be taken and the reasons for that decision.

In case this leads to making the code point pair allocatable variants, additional steps would need to be taken to reduce the possibility of large numbers of allocatable variants via combinatorial explosion; for example, by adding a "no-mix" whole label rule (and action) to prevent labels containing a mixture of these two code points in the same label. (See the Arabic LGR for examples).