**Talking Points for Joint Meeting of Armenian/Cyrillic/Greek/Latin GPs with IP at ICANN66**

1. The Latin mappings for y including Cyrillic in-script variant.
2. Any mappings that would lead to ASCII variants (and why that is a non-starter).
3. Any mappings that might lead to in-script variants in Greek.
4. The suggested mapping for beta and sharp s.
5. Notes on cross-script variant process

## Item 1: Cross-script variants causing in-script variant for Cyrillic

The following variant set proposed for the Latin LGR would cause an in-script variant for Cyrillic which would require review by the Cyrillic GP.

y U+0079 LATIN SMALL LETTER Y

ɣ U+0263 LATIN SMALL LETTER GAMMA

γ U+03B3 GREEK SMALL LETTER GAMMA

у U+0443 CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER U

ү U+04AF CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER STRAIGHT U

ỵ U+1EF5 LATIN SMALL LETTER Y WITH DOT BELOW

## Items 2-3: Cross-Script variants causing in-script variants for ASCII

The following variant set proposed for the Greek LGR contains one letter U+1E7F not found in the Latin LGR proposal, which should be removed. It would also pick up transitive mappings, if integrated (bold red). One of them would introduce a variant between ASCII letters V and Y. That is not permissible (because it affects ASCII-only labels, which are outside the IDN process).

v U+0076 LATIN SMALL LETER V

**y U+0079 LATIN SMALL LETTER Y**

ɣ U+0263 LATIN SMALL LETTER GAMMA

**γ U+03B3 GREEK SMALL LETTER GAMMA**

**ν U+03BD GREEK SMALL LETTER NU**

**у U+0443 CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER U**

ү U+04AF CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER STRAIGHT U

ұ U+04B1 GREEK SMALL LETTER

ṿ U+1E7F LATIN SMALL LETTER V WITH DOT BELOW **(not in Latin LGR)**

The same set contains a proposed in-script variant for Greek. (In the proposal text they map separately to U+04AF, but transitivity requires that they also map to each other)

## Item 4: Mappings for Latin Sharp S

The following variant set maps “ss” to “ß” as well as to Greek beta.

ss U+0073 U+0073 LATIN LETTER SMALL S + LATIN LETTER SMALL S

ß U+00DF LATIN SMALL LETTER SHARP S

β U+03B2 GREEK SMALL LETTER BETA

The Greek LGR proposal does not contain a cross-script mapping for beta. Normally, for assigning any cross-script variant, it may be sufficient if it is clearly seen as a variant by the users of one script, in which case the conservative approach may be to allow it.

However, this case is interesting because the in-script variant in Latin is a “semantic” one: transitivity would introduce a mapping between β U+03B2 and ss U+0073 U+0073.

It is clear that the transitive mapping would be surprising to Greek users. But it may well be motivated, because users of the “ss” variant may not natively use “ß”. While they would generally know of the equivalents, they may be more likely to accept “β” as a substitute. The situation is made more complex, by the fact that *ß* is a typical *italic* form of “ß”. This may motivate the variant mapping from the perspective of Latin users, even if it isn’t as obvious a variant for Greek users.

Required handling of overlapped variants would introduce U+0455 U+0455 (Cyrillic ѕ) as well as any in-script variants of ‘s’, such as U+015F (ş)

## Item 5: Cross-script variant process

There are limits to what can be defined as variants. Generally, there has to be some equivalence relation, because symmetry and transitivity must apply to variant definitions. In some cases, the perspective from users of different may need to be reconciled; in other cases, the conservative approach supports assigning a variant, even if only one script can make a strong case. Here are some discussion points:

1. The integration process applies the superset of all cross-script variants
2. The integration process extends this superset to be symmetric and transitive
3. Users of two different scripts may not see the same pair as variants; in that case, the more conservative route is to allow the variant.
4. Some variants may be seen to adversely impact another script; in that case, the variant should be allowed only if there is a solid case for it in the proposing script.
5. Some cross-script variants would lead to in-script variants in another LGR. This case generally requires a chance for the other GP to decide whether such “imposed” in-script variants should be treated as allocatable or blocked (inside the script). (See also 3).
6. A cross-script variant might result in a variant among ASCII code points (whether directly or via transitivity); such variants cannot be approved (because ASCII-only TLDs are outside the IDN TLD process).