Dear Dr Sarmad Hussain,

Please find below, comments from the Devanagari and Gujarati LGR point of view towards the Sinhala GP proposal which I am trying to post onto the url at Proposal for Sinhala Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules - ICANN [icann.org]. Somehow, the "submit comments" facility is not responding properly. Here are the details on behalf of the NBGP, submitted as its Co-Chair:

Proposal for Sinhala Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules - ICANN

Devanagari - Sinhala

Devanagari Code Point	Sinhala Code Point	In Devanagari LGR Proposal	In Sinhala LGR proposal	Decision/Action
◌ः (U+0903)	◌ඃ (U+0D83)	Confusable	Confusable	The Devanagari LGR, in the appendix, has listed substantial number of Cross-script variants which are consonants, vowels and vowel signs. Among all of those, Sinhala Visarga character also is included. As it is the dependent vowel sign which in isolation cannot form any valid label, it is mentioned only for the sake of completeness as a confusable. Devanagari LGR team would like to place on record it's agreement with the Sinhala GP.

Gujarati - Sinhala

Gujarati Code Point	Sinhala Code Point	In Gujarati LGR Proposal	In Sinhala LGR proposal	Decision/Action
◌ः (U+0A83)	ඃ (U+0D83)	This is not mentioned	Confusable	The Gujarati LGR has not listed any cross-script variants as the team did not find any Consonants/Vowels which can be confused with the Consonants/Vowels of any other scripts. As the dependent signs cannot form any valid label, such signs were not listed as the GJ LGR confusables. The discrepancy between cross-script confusable analysis between Gujarati (0A83) and Sinhala (0D83) Visarga character is seen because of that. As the pair is not found the normative Sinhala LGR, it is assumed that it is listed only for the sake of reference and as a confusable. GJ LGR team would like to place on record that this being part of the confusables only, the discrepancy is a non-issue and hopes that the Sinhala GP is in consonance with the same.

In addition, we may be able to submit the comments of the Kannada and the Telugu teams to strongly argue for inclusion of the normative variant pairs mentioned in their respective LGRs to be included in the Sinhala normative variant pairs. As the Kannada and Telugu mentions those code points as normative variants and the Sinhala LGR does not, this is a breaking discrepancy and needs to be addressed.

Regards,

Prof Udaya Narayana Singh
Co-Chair, NBGP
Dean, Faculty of Arts & Humanities &
Chair-Professor, ACLiS
Amity University Haryana
Pachgaon-Manesar, Dt Gurgaon
PIN 122413
Cell 9434050218; 9830132234
Official ID: unsingh@ggn.amity.edu
Web-site: www.udayanarayana.com