**Report V5 TBD suggestions by IP - tasks description and execution**

Every member will produce own copy of this document. The name of the file produced by individual member should consist of MemeberInitials- ICANN-LGP-Proposal-V5-IP-Annotated-04.

(EXAMPLE: MT-ICANN-LGP-Proposal-V5-IP-Annotated-04)

When TBD is done my proposal is to mark it with green

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| no | Section | Description | Implementer |
| 1 | 3.1 | TBD: this is unclear. If this is in a numbered attachement, please state. Attachments may be in separated files, in which case, the attachment section in this document contains a description of the file that forms the attachment.] |  |
| 2 | 5.3 Code points included | TBD: we previously made some comments that appear not to have been addressed:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1. Please document in Section 5.3 that à (A GRAVE) and ù (U GRAVE) are used in French; and also in any other place where language is associated with a specific code point. | No change has been made in description of 00E0 and 00F9. | | MT |
|  | 5.3 Code points included  Row 129 | [TBD: Even if it is a personal communication it sholuld be a numbered reference] | Pitinan |
| 3 | 5.4 Code points excuded  Row 129 | TBD: arguably, the letters d and l with caron (for which the caron is typically rendered in a way that looks like an apostrophe might be added to this list | MT |
| 4 | 5.4.1Other Excluded Letters | [TBD: this use of “unspecified” is pejorative, please delete.]  [TBD: “marked” how? Suggest different phrasing.]  TBD: as the suggested edits show, this can be formulated more neutrally; as originally worded the text implies a discretion by the IP that does not, in fact, exist.]  TBD: as the suggested edits show, this can be formulated more neutrally; as originally worded the text implies a discretion by the IP that does not, in fact, exist.] | Help with language |
| 5 | 6.Variants | TBD: Under separate cover, the IP has communicated a review of the set of proposed variants (limited to those variants listed in the XML document for the LGR proposal. This review is ***not repeated here***. Instead the IP requests the GP to review the submitted variant review in light of the discussions at ICANN66 and make the necessary changes. Please be sure that the variants listed XML matche the variants listed in this document.] | To be analyzed and processed. Who will lead? |
| 6 | 6.1.1Distinguishing Visual From Non-Visual Variants | TBD: would not be better to talk about visual “equivalence” here? Because mere similarity is ruled out as a criterion in the procedure.] | MM |
| 7 | 6.1.3.1 Shape of basic character | NOTE: the word “shaping” has a technical meaning best avoided here. “Shape”, “letter shape” or “glyph shape”, as appropriate, would suffice to express the intent.] | MM |
| 8 | 6.3.3 Greek script | [TBD: please summarize this discussion, focusing on the conclusion and relegate the details to Appendix D]  TBD: best to keep this item very focused and to relegate the longer discussion and all the links to appendix D]  [TBD: this discussion needs to be replaced by a focused summary and the details relegated to Appendix D] | ? |
| 9 | 6.3.4 Generic Glyphs | [TBD – the table above is empty – is there something missing?] | MM |
| 10 | 6.4 Methodology for developing in script Variants | [TBD: the “:” implies that there is a list or table that is supposed to be here. Or replace by a “.”] | MM |
| 11 | 6.7.1 URL underlining | [TBD: “majority vote” may not always be in keeping with the principles laid down in the procedure. For repertoire items, it is quite explicitly stated that anything that is “in doubt” should rather be excluded. For variant candidates, the issue is more complex. Normally, adding a blocked variant has the effect of reducing the set of simultaneously available labels, therefore even though something is “added”, the result can be a more “conservative” specification. However, the variant mechanism relies on equivalence relationships: there has to be robust sense of “sameness” underlying the variant definition. If that robust sense is absent, we call code points “confusables” instead. As indicated in our separate review, we think that some proposed variant pairs fall short of that standard. Whether that is due to to the adopted voting process can’t be established and even if it could, it might not help the process: however, after considering our review, we hope the GP can arrive at a variant set which makes the correct cut between “variants” on one side and “confusables” on the other.]  [TBD: the problem with presenting variants pairwise (as in the following table) is that it hides the transitive mappings for sets of cardinality > 2. Perhaps the dividers between the sets could be emphasized and a note provided that points out that the full set includes all symmetric and transitive mappings in each set.] | BJ |
| 12 | 6.7.2 IDNA 2003 Compatibility | [TBD: make each case a sub-sub-sub section, e.g. 6.2.7.1 etc.]  [TBD: while 00DF is implicated in the transition from IDNA 2003, there is independent rationale for the proposed variant treatment. It might be better to focus on that aspect and mention IDNA2003 only in passing.]  TBD: missing here are the additional variants needed because of overlapping variants (“ss” and ‘s’) as well as the final design of whichever methodology the GP chose to minimize allocatable variant labels.] | DT |
| 13 | 7 WLE and contextual rules | TBD: if the scheme to reduce allocatable variant labels that involves definitions of <action> elements is adopted, those should be summarized here. Suggest: 7.1 for context rules and 7.2 for “Dispositions based on variant type”.] | ? |
| 14 | 9.1 Reference used in develioping Repertoire | TBD: please change the numbering for reference “[0]”: when we create a production version of this LGR, each code point will be assigned a reference between [0] and (currently) [14], identifying the version (major and minor) of the Unicode Standard that the code point was first encoded in. [0] is reserved to Unicode Standard 1.1. To avoid conflct, please use the same methodology for citing the Unicode Standard in the table of repertoire. For details, see MSR]  [TBD: earlier comments not accommodated:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | (3) reference 167 (Pulaar sound inventory) is unused; reference 149 (Fula, with alternate Spelling pulaar) is listed for U+01B4, but the language mentioned for ref 149 is not cited for U+01B4. These and similar issues may affect the table in section 5.3 of the main document as well and should be reviewed. | This reference is still present. Other implications of our advice are hard to check. | | Pitinan |
| 15 | Appendix A | TBD- need the date and link for MSR-4. | MT |
| 16 | Appendix B | [TBD: the use of both “processed” and “used” seems redundant. | Help with language |
| 17 | Appendix C | The data in this table is the same as in Table 3 in Section 5.3, except for the ordering of entries. [TBD: it seems useful to be explicit here. In the final version adjust the column width to avoid wrapping words like “Glyph” – also, it might be useful to make this appendix a separate document.]  Raw 13:  [TBD: even if it is a personal communicatin, it should be a numbered reference] | Numbered reference Pitinan |
| 18 | D.1 | Shape of base characters  [TBD: “Shaping” has a different meaning for characters]  [TBD: this is not limited to Swedish, but common to italic fonts. The “Calibri” font, for example, also has that shape in its italic variant. TBD: please make that statement more general.]  [TBD: this “conclusion” does not agree with the formal specificaiton. The variant relation is not carried out in the XML (and perhaps not in all tables in this document? Not in Table 14 in Section 6.5) Make sure that ***either*** this statement is withdrawn ***or*** the variant definition is actually added.] | Help with language |
| 19 | D.1.9 Latin Small Letter T vs. Latin Small Letter L With Stroke | TBD: the analysis is missing the comparison against d (or l) plus apostrophe. | ? |
| 20 | D.5.1 Latin SMALL LETTER SHARP S (ß) 00DF | TBD: “freedom of expression” is too vague a concept and appears unlikely to fully capture the linguistic reality considered by the GP. Please review the suggested alternative wording, which tries to capture what may have been intended instead. Please make any additiponal changes to ensure that the text reflects the GP’s analysis.]  [TBD: we suggest adding some discussion of the need to reduce allocatable variants (see text provided). Please review to make sure this captures the GP’s position on allocatable variatnts.]  [NOTE; this solution may have been adopted because the use of an alternative using variants may not have been considered.]  [TBD: it might be worthwhile to mention the need for defensive registrations in the absence of a variant definition.]  [TBD: describe the additional variants needed because of overlap between the variant definitions for “ss” and “s”. Describe the additional methods needed to prevent more than two allocatable labels (variant subtyping) – see separate document. The IP will gladly provide assistance with formulating the proper LGR syntax, if requested.] | DT |
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