At the outset we would like to thank the Integration panel for the detailed review of the document. Due not of each of their comments and proposals has been undertaken and suitable changes have been made to the document to accommodate their suggestions and comments. These are provided below:

1. The background information refers to many scripts including Thai, Lao, Tibetan, Burmese and others, for which separate generation panels are being formed. For clarity, it is suggested that Neo-Brahmi Generation Panel explicitly states the complete set scripts it intends to cover now and in the future. It is suggested to add a new table to section three with a tabular list of these scripts (with 4-letter ISO 15924 script codes) that will form the scope of the panel and to the extent that the work will have to be staged, a clear indication when each script will be worked on (The official list of ISO 15924 script codes can be found here:http://unicode.org/iso15924/).

ACTION TAKEN: More clarity provided in the shape of a preamble and also within the body of the document. Section 4 has been modified to conver the Target scripts and languages. A table has been provided with a tabular list of the scripts along with ISO 15924 codes for scripts and ISO 639-3 codes for languages.

2. It is suggested that the focus of the background information should be to cover issues that are (more or less) directly relevant to the task of developing an LGR for the Root Zone for each of the target scripts. This might reasonably include a discussion of the degree to which these scripts are related, and especially whether that relation makes it mandatory to consider them jointly during integration into the LGR.

ACTION TAKEN: Handled within the body of the document.

3. The proposal notes that "In the first phase, the Neo-Brāhmī group restricts itself to six South Asian Scripts … These six scripts are Bengali, Devanagari, Gujarati, Gurmukhi, Tamil and Telugu. The phase two will involve scripts Kannada, Malayalam and Oriya." Details should clarify this phasing, especially whether the LGR will be developed for the six scripts and submitted before work is started on the three scripts in the second phase or the phases will be sequenced and LGR for all the nine scripts will be developed and submitted together?

COMMENT: At the initial stage when the proposal was drafted, expertise for all those scripts was available which were present in the Root. Hence the GP took an approach of phasing. However, with more members volunteering for scripts other that those present in the Root, the GP has decided to move ahead with the whole set. The GP will remain open to fill in the necessary expertise if needed. This has been mentioned in Section 4.

4. For any scripts that are deferred to a phase past the first submitted LGR proposal, kindly explain why it is safe to defer consideration of the script in questions and an explicit statement as to why the script is not so tightly related to non-deferred scripts as to risk possible incompatibilities when they are not considered together. In particular, there is the question of whether there are any possible consistency issues that could be introduced by not treating these scripts simultaneously, for example, there is no possibility of cross-script homoglyphs or similar issues that would require coordination between the LGRs for these two groups of scripts. In other words, the division may be fine, but it should be clearly stated why the GP is confident that this will not cause any issues for developing the LGRs or their integration.

Please see comment to point 3 above.

5. For Tamil script interaction with experts from Sri Lanka and Singapore is desired. Therefore, representative from these countries should be considered for inclusion in the Generation Panel. It is noted that both Singapore and Sri Lanka have applied for IDN ccTLD in Tamil script.

COMMENT: We had tried to contact experts for Tamil from Singapore and Sri Lanka as well as for Bengali from Bangladesh. In fact the Tamil Expert from Singapore was contacted during his visit to India at the World Tamil Conference. There was no response. We however would be open for inclusions in the Generation Panel even after formation. We even floated a call for participation on the ICANN website, as well as during a special session organized at APR-IGF – 2014.

6. Similarly, the Generation Panel is encouraged to reach out to and include experts from Bangladesh, both for Bengali language and for other languages written using Bengali script in Bangladesh. It is noted that Bangladesh has applied for IDN ccTLD in Bengali script.

Please refer to Comment on 5 above.

7. How does the Generation Panel plan to reach out to the language communities not represented in the Panel to determine their requirements for the scripts they use, if these communities otherwise fulfill the Panel's criteria of inclusion in the analysis?

COMMENT: Some of the experts on the Panel are polyglots. However, the GP will remain open to take experts on-board even after formation. The GP will, from time to time participate in various related forums, as it has already done in the past, and issue a call for participation.

Further (mostly editorial) suggestions

The following comments are largely editorial. They are brought to the attention of the drafters of the proposal in an effort to make it easier for readers to follow.

Overall
Comment: The General Information section is confusingly stated, if intended (as it seems), as a background to Brahmi derived Scripts used in India, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka

ACTION TAKEN: Considerable pruning of the document as well as a preamble which clearly defines the scope of the Panel and specifies that a large part of Sections 2, 3 and partly 4 serve an informative purpose.

p. 3, l. 5
Burmese, Thai, Lao, Khmer and other Central Asian scripts

Suggested: e.g. Burmese, Thai, Lao, Khmer (in South-east Asia), and others in Central Asia (including Tibetan)
ACTION TAKEN: ACCEPTED AND SUITABLY MODIFIED
p. 3, l.7
rich matricial script

Suggested: a script that was the mother of many others
ACTION TAKEN: ACCEPTED AND SUITABLY MODIFIED

p. 3, l. 18
Consonants at times modified by the "vowel-killer" termed as the Halanta, admit a set of modifiers such as the Vowel Sign.

Suggested: Consonants (which written simply imply a following vowel such as schwa or a) are at times modified by a combining mark functioning as "vowel-killer" (termed Halanta), truncating the following vowel. They also admit a set of modifiers which serve as Vowel Signs; and both

vocalized consonants and simple vowel signs also accept further combining marks, which signify Nasalization of vowels.
ACTION TAKEN: ACCEPTED AND SUITABLY MODIFIED

p. 4, 1. 10
shows the evolution of the retroflex nasal

Suggested: shows the major stages in evolution of this family of scripts, illustrated with different forms of the retroflex nasal (It would also be better to label the nodes of the tree, and perhaps include intermediate forms of the illustrating character, although the IP understands if editing the diagram isn't feasible.)
ACTION TAKEN: ACCEPTED AND SUITABLY MODIFIED. EDITING THE DIAGRAM WAS NEITHER FEASIBLE NOR CORRECT SINCE IT IS COPYRIGHT OF THE AUTHORS.

Section 2.1
Comment: The individual script-descriptions seem to have been written independently of one another, and consequently there is a lot of repetition of "written from left to right" and "derived from Brahmi" and "like all Brahmi scripts". Generally shared features should be mentioned once at the outset of the whole section, and then the script-descriptions should stick to what makes each one different.
ACTION TAKEN: THE SECTION HAS BEEN EDITED AND REPETITIONS REMOVED.

General information on the scripts can be found in many sources, such as Wikipedia and the Unicode Standard. Of interest here are those aspects that specifically affect the development of the LGR.

fn 2
Comment: the web address quoted is obsolete: replace with linguistics.berkeley.edu/~pandey
ACTION TAKEN: ACCEPTED AND SUITABLY MODIFIED

Sections 2.2 and 2.3
Comment: There is no technical (or even historic) content in section 2.2; and the information in 2.3 though clearly fuller than that, seems incomplete, even as a basic sketch of each of the scripts mentioned. The attached diagram gives more information about the graphic transformations of one letter, but does not well illuminate the description that precedes it.
ACTION TAKEN: THESE WERE PURPOSELY NOT DEVELOPED SINCE THEY DO NOT FULL WITHIN THE AMBIT OF THE PANEL. HOWEVER A CLARIFICATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED.

p. 9, 3.1 (tables)
Comment: Oriya and Odia represent the same script. Unicode uses Oriya as a formal identifier (and ISO 15924 uses Orya), so when Odia is mentioned, it would be nice to explicitly link that spelling to Oriya not only in the running text (as has been done in several places) but also In the formal table, and, as recommend above, to also provide in that table the four letter abbreviation from ISO 15924.
ACTION TAKEN: ACCEPTED AND SUITABLY MODIFIED: A DETAILED FOOTNOTE PROVIDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTION TO THE CHANGE OF NAME PROVIDED WITH THE PROVISO THAT WHEREVER THE TERM HAS BEEN USED IN OLDER DOCUMENTS, IT HAS BEEN RETAINED AS SUCH.

p.11, section 3.2
"Neo-Brahmi based language"

Suggested: language that is written with a Neo-Brahmi script.
ACTION TAKEN: ACCEPTED AND SUITABLY MODIFIED