
COPENHAGEN – IDN - Cyrillic Generation Panel Meeting
Monday, March 13, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sorry for the delay. We are waiting for Dušan who's here to start the meeting.

Thank you all very much for joining the session today on Cyrillic Generation Panel update. We will start the session now, so over to Dušan who's the Chair of the panel and he'll take us through the session.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Thank you, Sarmad. I'm Dušan Stojičević, I'm chairing this Generation Panel and I have prepared one presentation, so we can see where are we now with our work.

So, first, quick overview what I will tell you during the presentation. First, we will start with introduction and background, then with methodology of the work that we have done. Also, results, issues that we have found in MSR-2, next steps and IP feedback and we will continue with discussion afterwards. So, let's go into introduction.

I will try to be quick, so we are here and our work was on this Cyrillic script. You have there ISO Code, you have there – what's

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

happening? What we were doing, we were doing Cyrillic script under MSR-2. So, this is the important part of this slide.

Next, there's a little bit of a history. Let's say that Cyrillic script is based on early Cyrillic from first Bulgarian Empire in 9th century, so we are using this for almost 12 centuries. And we have a lot of languages that are using this script in Eastern part of Europe and also North and Central Asia. Basis of alphabets in languages, especially in Slavic languages, also the basis is found in non-Slavic languages influenced by Russian.

So, we can conclude that right now, we have around 250 millions of people using Cyrillic script as the official script and half of them are from Russia.

Also, I need to mention that with Bulgaria entering into European Union, Cyrillic script became the third official script of the European Union in addition to the Latin and Greek scripts.

More on history, if you want, we can skip this part but you can see some of historical effects here. What is the main point of this slide is the least individual languages and groups using Cyrillic script, so you can see that we have Indo-Europeans, Sino-Tibetan, Mongolian, Turkic, Caucasian, Chukchi and Kamchatka, Tungus, Ural and some of them are individual and you can see those languages.

So, to summarize where we are using Cyrillic script, it's better to be shown as a picture. So you can see which part of the world is using and you can see also where is Cyrillic script is official but equally used with some other script. This is light green on the map. So, this is from what I see let's say Bosnia and Herzegovina. You have there, for example, Latin and Cyrillic script equally used.

So, we can split the world into Southeastern part of Europe – Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Herzegovina – using Cyrillic scrip. Eastern Europe – Belorussia/Belarus, Ukraine, Russia. Central Asia – Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Mongolia.

Well, now we are going into the methodology. We were working on inside Cyrillic Generation Panel. According to the proposal that we gave one year ago, we were doing initially language-based repertoire compiled. So, we, too, let's say in a different way, we subtracted the MSR-2 into only Cyrillic, which we want to work on based on second-level IDN tables used by different ccTLD and we were using also .su. This stands for Soviet Union ccTLD, which contains a lot of languages currently spoken in Russia.

So, after that, we had a face-to-face meeting in Istanbul late last year. Main work was done there in Istanbul. Then, we continued

to use mailing list to shape and finalize the documents. Also, we consulted Integration Panel several times on several occasion and the crucial query for us was the inclusion of this code point in MSR for Ukrainian and Belarusian. This stands for apostrophe sign.

So, what we have done during the work, we decided which Inclusion and exclusion principles we were using. So inclusion principle, only one was this one that we decided, any code point which is a letter in established contemporary use in a language.

Bu we had a lot of exclusion principles. So, any – on this slide, you have four. On the next slide, you have additional three. These four are main exclusion principles. Any code point disallowed by IDNA protocol. Any code point representing a security or stability issue, which cannot be resolved at any other stage of the analysis. For example, stage of determining code points, variants or whole label rules.

Third one was any code point not listed in the MSR or listed in the MSR and deprecated or not recommended for use in Unicode Standards.

Fourth, any code point representing technical signs only or that does not meet the inclusion criterion.

So, additional three was about the general – was different kind of. It was, let's say, part of the real world. The Generation Panel, for example, 50s, the real picture of what I'm saying, the new Generation Panel lacked sufficient information on the usage. So, probably some code points we cannot establish connection how much is used in several – in languages.

The Generation Panel could only use for such languages that had an EGIDS rating higher than five, six or above, as per the Guidelines. This was from Integration Panel. This is the criteria that we must meet as Cyrillic Generation Panel.

Then, seventh was the Generation Panel had data on the use of code points but where Integration Panel explicitly expressed disagreement on the validity and relevance of such data in separate communications.

So, basically, this includes the code point of apostrophe, which we know that is used in Ukraine and Belarus. But in discussion with Integration Panel, we could not find the solution for this code point because it's not in MSR and I said we were working under MSR-2.

So, we are going to Final Results. Final results of our work are shown here. So, we have 84 code points recommended for inclusion, 8 code points recommended for exclusion. And you can see those for exclusion on the slide. Each exclusion as you

see is explained. It was explained by the rule that we were using for exclusion.

So, next in our result of the work was variants. We needed to find variants in Cyrillic script and there is no variants in Cyrillic script. But some code points are visually confusable. So, we prepared a table of confusable code points, so ICANN and the other organizations can use as needed, and we provided the whole table in our final proposal document.

Cross-script variants, as a Generation Panel, we decided to limit these to homoglyphs. So, everything else which is not homoglyphs will be in tables of confusions. So, what we included here was the homoglyphs only in the lower case because the Integration Panel was asking only about lower case. We discussed that because in upper case, we have different homoglyphs. As the Integration Panel was telling us, we decide to keep the results only in the lower case.

Cyrillic Generation Panel found cross-script variants with Armenian, Greek, and Latin script. A lot of them are in Latin. We didn't find with Georgian, which was also under our part of the work.

Cyrillic – so, cross-script variants with the Armenian script, I'm now giving you the results by scripts. So, variants that we have found in Armenian scripts are Cyrillic glyph O, letter O. So, we

also looked at Armenian Generation Panel final results and final documents, and they indicated three variants with Cyrillic script. We excluded two because those are similarities under – they are not homoglyphs, they are similar but not homoglyphs and that’s why we have only one.

So, the criteria or let’s say the decision of Generation Panel to stick homoglyph is different than decision that was made in Armenian Generation Panel, that’s why we have differences.

Next is with Greek script, we have three homoglyphic variants and a lot of them with Latin script. We had some issues that we have found in MSR-2 and I will pointing it this sign apostrophe and we were contacting Integration Panel and trying to get response from them, we get response about this letter.

Also, we know that in Montenegro, we have two new chars, two new code points in national scripts – Latin and Cyrillic. But they are not yet in Unicode, so we cannot work on that. So it’s a possible future work for Generation Panel.

We were discussing Old Church Cyrillic script. And, basically, after several discussions on the list of the list live discussion, well, it should not be used for root zone because it’s not in second level of use. That’s why we didn’t had this variant of Cyrillic under our discussion more under our work.

So, as I was saying, using upper case and lower case in Unicode code points in Cyrillic, we have a problem also in the upper space and we need to address somehow that because Integration Panel was pointing that we are using only lower case in root zone. So, we think that we need to address this issue more.

So, something about Generation Panel. The formation of Generation Panel, you can see in the balloons what are the major dates of Cyrillic Generation Panel. Formation three years ago. Proposal – first proposal for the Generation Panel was two years ago. Then, work was finished late last year in November.

Proposal – documents for final documents are prepared in February. On those final documents, we got feedback from the Integration Panel and we will have definitely few next steps.

Well, I just want to say here that it looks like that we were formed three years ago and yes, we had the problems during the work, especially during the formation. But the work has been done according to the dates in initial document in initial working plan.

So, what are the next steps? Next steps, I have prepared and I categorize it. There are three phases, let's say, of next steps.

First, short phase and also planned for this session is to finalize proposal based on the IP feedback, finalize XML and test data files and issue the final documents for public comment.

After that, after public comment phase, we need to finalize definitely LGR proposal to include community which inclusion of community feedback.

Then, we have long-term phase. As I was saying, Cyrillic is live script. We have new letters coming in. So, we need to address new code points included in the MSR in the future and if needed, in the root zone LGR. So, this is optional long-term phase.

You can see the members of Cyrillic Generation Panel, all of them. And, I especially highlighted the ones that were in Istanbul doing the major part of the work, so they're in bold script, bolded.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Well, you recalled [inaudible] was helping us in –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah, okay. I do. Italics, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Underlines, okay. So –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yes. I hope that members of Cyrillic script got the final response – not final but the response from Integration Panel. And I hope that we can use this time to address this feedback that we get from Integration Panel to try to fulfill this short phase today.

So, in order to do that, I prepared additional slides for – let’s say Integration Panel feedback. If you want, you have all of that in document but we can follow this slide. It was prepared based on their documents.

So, before we continue, do you have any questions, comments, rotten tomatoes? Do you agree that we continue to use this time to work on feedback from Integration Panel?

Okay. Silence – complete silence, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What happened to your presentation when you have some lines cut in half?

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: My presentation is good but what is happening with displaying my presentation is not my fault.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe Russian hackers, you know.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Well. So, let's continue with this. I will take silence as yes. So, first, we will proceed with some points – general points, let's say, on procedure. What Integration Panel thinks? Maybe – well, maybe Sarmad can help a little bit with –

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So, we have IP members here. So you can have a direct communication with them if you'd like.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Okay.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: We have Asmus and Mark who are from the Integration Panel.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Thank you, Sarmad.

So, this part – who is moving the presentation? So, this part is about procedure of submitting documents if I correctly... This is about what we need to create. This is about XML file and test files. So, maybe we can skip this to the last part of the discussion and we can go into the code points that we have got as, let's say, questionable code points. This is also about submitting.

So, this is the question on style of submission. This is the question, which – or an issue or, let's say, proposal from the Integration Panel that in the Section of 5.4, code points excluded refers to rules. Exclusion principles in Section 5.2, yes, the answer is yes. Should consistently referred to as principles or exclusion principles.

So, when we were working on that, we decided to have those exclusion principles and everything – what we excluded from the final list was done in Section 5.2, so exclusion principles are there. So, what is the real question here?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Yeah. I think Integration Panel is suggesting some editing where in the table it says Rule 6 rather than Principle 6. Whereas in the earlier part of the document, we've said the Principle 1 through 6 rather than Rules 1, 2, 3 to 6.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Thank you, Sarmad. Okay, this is easy one, so we will change according to the proposal.

I'm not prepared for this, so I'm asking for help and also from the members of Integration Panel. In Point 6 Section 5.2, exclusion is a language has EGIDS rating higher than 5. Yes. Yes, you can.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, again, I think it's just, again, editorial suggestion.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Where in Point 6 of Section 5.2, basically, the Generation Panel is saying that they are going to look at different languages, which are 0 through 5 and then eventually later on in the proposal it suggest, it's written that those, which are 0 through 4 will be included. Number 5 were initially included because the borderline, so additional analysis needs to be done.

But when the statement comes in in Section 5.2, that is not very clear. So I think what they are suggesting is that when you are at that part of the proposal when the proposal is suggesting to include 0 through 5, it should be clarified that 5 is borderline and each of the languages will be separately addressed, so that it then becomes consistent with the statement later in the proposal, which is that everything from 0 through 4 is included.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: This is let's say another editorial remark, which we I think can solve easily. Can I ask some of the member – some of – one member of the group to open? Do you have document or I need to open to take immediately the notes and to finalize directly?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] we just need to say exactly which languages they accepted, right? And maybe we already have this information

but, for example, remember we have [inaudible] included, right? Or we just maybe don't have a list, so that features an [inaudible] to the map, right, or [inaudible] in this section?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, [inaudible] recording of the section.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Like we just say maybe list the languages. Would they get [inaudible], as well, right? Is it common then we will show which ones are Rating 5 and then for this, maybe we'll have to include a [common feature]. This language is Rating 5 because we think it's appropriate because it's – used it in [inaudible], right, because that's the only reason we have used these.

And also, yeah, because I think we have not had included all the languages because we didn't have experts from some of the languages or... So maybe that should be just the table or even list of languages, maybe one per paragraph or something.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If I may help there [inaudible]. So, the one thing we're looking for in a proposal is it's going to be archived and it's going to be hopefully looked at by people 5, 10 years from now trying to figure out what this is based on. And [though] we'll have any

memory of what happen, so we need to make sure we write down some stuff that seems obvious now.

So, one of the things that needs to be written down is somewhere we need to be able to know all the languages that you've actually looked at, the inputs to your process. And then, somewhere else we need to have a list of all the ones that are included and particularly, as you mentioned, the idea of having a short sentence for each of those that were borderline, that were 5 because they need a specific decision to be included. And that what the facts were that that decision was based on. Not just saying it was language X, it was 5 and we decided to include it but it was language X, it has 5. But we know of this, this, this, this fact and therefore, we decided to include it. That's the statement we're looking for.

It doesn't have to be very long. It just has to be very precise.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ:

I mean, the fact was that we had had SU table. I mean, in practice, right, we had considered some languages, which we had included. And then, we had considered some languages, which we have not included. So then, we should say included these, not included these, so we have to explain Rating 6? No. If the Rating 6 is not included, we just don't even have to mention it or which you have to mention it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] you have [inaudible]. You can mention it in summary. You can say, “These are all the ones we looked at. We excluded all the ones of level 6 because we think those are ranked correctly and level 6 that’s ranked correctly doesn’t have to be considered.” And then, you say for the 5, “We did this analysis and these ones are included because X, Y, Z and these ones are not included because they are no experts, no knowledge, we don’t think it’s big.” So then we can see what you thought. That’s what we want to do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, maybe you can for Section 6, languages included and list them, and then you say, “Let me just consider it and not include it, reject it.” And then, the [circuit that go to] languages we did not consider it, well, they’re not mentioned because we didn’t never consider it. Like for example, we have not Mongolian person panel, right, for example, and we don’t mention Mongolian and we may say that we know that Mongolian existed and we had not even used it for consideration because that means also has to be mentioned then.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mongolian is an interesting case. It's not an obscure language, not at all, right? And, I think you need to address the fact that you didn't have the Mongolian expert and the question could be – you may know a little bit about Mongolian from public sources. You may decide that Mongolian is unlikely to have led to the inclusion of a particular code point, in which case you can mention that and then you don't have to discuss it further. But to keep silent just means that in public comment, somebody will say, "Oh, what about Mongolian?"

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: We included Mongolian letters but we didn't have experts, so –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, [inaudible] we did the letters.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: We did the letters.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. I mentioned like for example, we may not – okay, we did not have a personal [inaudible]. These are good letters. These are an all good letters. Mongolian alphabet recently changed. They have one more letter like with Macedonian. But we didn't have such person. I mean, for example, I did Tatar table, right. I don't know Tatars but I went to public sources like we keep it and say, "These are Tatar characters." And I crosschecked Tatar characters around the [Emassar] and stuff and that was like my work but I'm not Tatar expert. And, somebody could have done such work from Mongolian but we didn't do it because I guess nobody was Mongolian enough.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: I think it's clear what we are going to do with this.

Let's go to the next. So, we are going into the actual work. So, this is about... You need – yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: So, this is about small letter E with diaeresis. We didn't provide no reference, without reference. Let me just –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: This one 04ED is in exclusion table, so it's excluded by the rule or Principle 6.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, are you saying just to add [inaudible]?

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: So, all of these is just to include [inaudible] link.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Basically.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Next.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The second – this second.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Second one, oh, sorry. Small letter zhe with breve.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So zhe, wait, is that comment related to this?

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: No. It's related to the table that we –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, the [inaudible] it says included as optional code point. This is about [4CD]? Because you mentioned Ukrainian and this is mentioned that the language is no in Cyrillic or I mean this third paragraph, what characters this is about? When it says that included an optional code point, which code point?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, yeah. So, if I may explain this. If you look at the complete information in the entire proposal, you find something it looks slightly inconsistent because at some point, it says no information is available. In another place, it gives information. It says it's not written since 1996. So, these two statements seemed to contradict each other and you should... If you're

really basing your decision on the fact that it's not written, then you should use the principle that applies to it not being written.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But if the link which is not written, then [inaudible] Ukrainian and these two paragraphs –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. Let's not get into why the IP comments are not really well written because they aren't. We know that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] the third paragraph. It says included as code point, which code point it means?

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Wait. So, what we are talking here [inaudible] is what [inaudible] was sending to us, this is about a language, which is not using Cyrillic at all. And we excluded firstly by the rule of five. This is what they are quoting in their answer and this is a lack of sufficient information. So, either it's not used or –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You are speaking about the Gagauz.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah, Gagauz, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The Gagauz letter, well, Gagauz is a small nation living in Moldova. They use the Cyrillic script for their alphabet until 1996. After that, they stopped using the Cyrillic script. So, the symbol we found was used only for Gagauz language, was excluded from our proposal, though it was in [Emassar].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Then, it should say Gagauz, not D language because it says zhe language. It should say the Gagauz language. That will be clear. Then that we see that language is in our table as level 6 and that's it or whatever, level 5 but it's level 5 old Cyrillic, yeah.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: It's level 5.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. But it should not say the language but the Gagauz language, I mean, to make it clear.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Gagauz script. In your table, it says Gagauz language. What we are saying is if you are sure it's not used, it's not a Principle 5 case, it's some other principle.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Some other, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So you need to put the right number for the principle. That's what we're saying.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Alexander.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Excuse me, but we hope also for like the large community Gagauz people in Odessa region, they probably use also Cyrillic, not only Latin. We have large Gagauz people community in Odessa region in Ukraine also, not only in Moldova.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, great. So then what? We should check if they use that letter in that area versus people who speak that language in Moldova?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I hope they speak Ukrainian.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. I mean, they may speak both. They may speak whatever.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or they use Ukrainian Cyrillic script.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, here is another one. In developing the reference LGR for the second level and researching available sources of list of alphabets for Ukrainian and extended characters used with Ukrainian text because of people using other characters that live in Ukraine, we found that some services were listing that character as an extended character.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ukrainian doesn't have extended characters.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, not the [inaudible] language but the Ukraine is a country was using –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There is no Ukraine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Ukraine. And, so that's what we found. We found sources that were documenting this. We decided to put that into the extended set for that. Some of the comments that were written were from IP members who know that and want to know what's the story. Is it actually used by somebody in Ukraine? Is it not used in Ukraine? If you don't know, say you don't know. That's fine. But that's where that comment came.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, there's some people take Ukrainian alphabet at this character and use it. I don't know. No information. School alphabet in Ukrainian and academic alphabet are the same. They have only one set of characters including apostrophe. They don't have second class characters. It's like you say the extended American language use [inaudible] because some people speak Spanish and the [inaudible] that be – I mean, just an example. I don't use the same alphabet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If the real example would be in English, the extended letters would be the I with two dots because some people write naïve with the two dots. It's done but it's not taught in schools. So, you

can't just go by the elementary school alphabet. You have to...
For some –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. But even if you go to any academic place, nobody will officially list the kind of things that people also use but the AE is occasionally used, the OE is quite occasionally used, the O with two dots is quite often used and the I with two dots is also very well used in English, as well as the E with accent.

So you have for all these languages, always in auxiliary set and if you go to sources like the CLDR database (Common Locale Data Repository), they will give you for Ukrainian that character in its auxiliary set.

Now, I have no idea what information that is based on but it's published that way and it is this thing that people can go and raise bugs against if it's wrong information to have it changed. And, it's used by various software companies to do the internationalization support.

So, that means that this code point is claimed by some people to be used in some context. Not enough information to know but

we know that it's claimed to be used so we're asking you, do you have any information or do you just basically say two things, the Gagauz language that in Moldova doesn't use it anymore and any other Gagauz uses we don't know anything. If you write it down that way, we're perfectly happy.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ:

This is the way that we were writing this as I recollect because now, we didn't exclude it with any other rule because we didn't know how much is used in Ukraine although we have a lot of Ukraine members.

So, Rule 5 is definitely the answer here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So, one problem here is that you find this in a comment from the IP in one place. Is that we're saying the summary in the table that you have is very nice but it is really short in lens itself to some – but it's like telegraph, it's like a telegram stuff. It says Rule 5 this. If you had a sentence below the table that says, "We looked at this. It's complicated because there's different user communities, and for most of them, we don't know but for this one we do know." That sentence would just clarify everything and it's done.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: For this one, we can use additional sentence to clarify why it's Rule 5.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] more like nobody ever of Ukrainian experts toward this letter to be part of Ukrainian. I mean, look and again, your [inaudible] example is good but Ukrainian doesn't have such users. It's like if I take the Belarus language, you'll say, "Some people use Russian words and write with the Belarus context using letters that are not present in Belarus alphabet." Yes, but this are not Belarus.

I mean, we are not going by country. We go by language, right? Language – for example, Ukraine, we have three other spoken languages. We should be, I don't know, parts of other nations, right? They are not Ukrainian. The alphabet is different. There may be Serbian people living in Ukraine. Maybe they write Serbian letters in Ukrainian text, okay, fine. That's not extended Ukrainian. I mean, that would be just different.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: But there is usage and we need to explain and I agree with this comment. So, we can go further if it's clear about this one.

So, next one is Palochka. Expect it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] again.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Oh.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: This one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, in this particular case, the comment basically is some of our members know that this letter is used in a number of languages and it doesn't mean that we disagree with the Generation Panel. This needs maybe not one sentence but two sentences explaining a little bit of the thinking behind that letter. We assume there was a lot of thinking behind that letter.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yes, definitely. This was a discussion on our meeting in the Istanbul. So, okay, we can also provide further explanation on this letter if it's okay.

So next, small letter Palochka.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The same.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: The same.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]. It is the same slide.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: In Istanbul.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Okay. So, this is small letter P, which is [inaudible]. Code point from MSR-2 neither included nor listed or as excluded.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's that one, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's [inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Maybe.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a [inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There is too much reference [inaudible]. I will explain it to you later.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But the whole point is this is the one Cyrillic code point from the MSR-2 that you don't cover in the document.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: These are [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was omitted by accident or –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Probably something happened. Is it –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is it supposed to be included you think or was it supposed to be excluded you think?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a [inaudible] in my opinion. [Inaudible] expert. But it will makes it very funny to include it because anything [inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: It's always a pleasure working with you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] the letter [inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: We will address this. We definitely missed this one, so we will include it and we will explain.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I mean, [inaudible] included, it should be included. I think we discussed it and if we don't –

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: We missed this one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I remember we are discussing we are planning to use it in the table as an included character.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah, as included, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's just in an odd location in the code space. That you probably – you went through all the 04 and you forgot the 05.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No other –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, another –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The other page where you would –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: We will address this. We will correct this.

So next. So, for second one, this is from Bulgaria. Yuliya, I think we discussed this on the meeting.

YULIYA MORENETS: Second one is Bulgarian.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah. And, it's available for extended use but like we were talking about previous extended use, it's not – maybe, Yuliya, you can explain what is the usage of this letter in Bulgaria.

YULIYA MORENETS: The second one is used in Bulgarian to indicate ownership when you talk about female. So, it's a very rare cases but since Windows Vista is available in all keyboards for Bulgaria, it has a specific place on it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, we are totally fine with the location in the table, which is excluded. What we're saying is we're missing the explanation of why.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] sentence for each and we're totally [inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: So, definitely. Also, for Macedonian, this first one –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a similar case, yeah.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Similar case, definitely.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So maybe should we split, we say first Macedonian, second Bulgarian because now it is not clear and we think that both are in both languages, right? Looks like the 450 is only Macedonian, 45D is only Bulgarian. So then I guess it should be. But again, these are comments, right? These are not our text for we just mentioned that in our detail that we specifically say which letter is from which alphabet.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: [Inaudible] we understand what they want from us, so we will address. So, this is also under one good sentence to explain why we decided to exclude or include these characters.

So next, I think we finish this.

Zhe –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: It's the same I think.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's the same.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: It's the same letter that we have discussed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I think it's the same letter. There's multiple comments on the same letter came in.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Oh, okay. Next.

So, we are now about homoglyphs. So, yes, we know that Armenian –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And, just we want to know that you know.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yes, we know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, the whole point is –

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Another sentence.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. The whole point is that if you submit this LGR this way, the result will be that that Integration Panel has no choice but it has to apply the Armenian definition on top as part of the integration process. So the integration process always makes the union of everybody's LGR. So, if they define homoglyph relations and you do not, the result is a union. So, the homoglyph relation gets defined in the roots on the LGR. But if you are not –

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: We cannot change their work.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You can't change their work, that's – you had a chance while they were in public comment to say you're wrong, please remove but nobody did, so we have what we have.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: So, we cannot [inaudible] –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't think it's going to be a major problem. Good that you defined what you think is the truth, you write it down for reference and we all find it.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No action.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: No action here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No action. Just so you don't get upset when the union shows up later.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: It's perfect by [inaudible]. I don't know what other things.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But if it's a union, we cannot ban any letter from appearing, right? If we don't include it, other panel includes it, Integration Panel would combine and the union would [result] in letter being presented, so.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We don't have to include every letter if [inaudible] about because somebody who feels better about it will do it. You don't have to do the work, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's good.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: So, other homoglyphs, Section 6.2.4, Palochka, though not in repertoire. No, it's excluded if I –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. So you're doing it again. You're giving two signals. You exclude it in one place and you say this is a confusable at the same time. So, you either say you write a sentence to the table says the confusable tables include some excluded code points just to be complete or some other explanation to result [inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: No. We will erase the – this one as homoglyphs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Perfect. Yeah. That's another one.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Next is conclusion.

First one can be understand as congratulation for your work. And, second one is not congratulating me for providing of files needed. We understood the conclusion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] advisory.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: No. We need to change this. I think that's all and this second remark is also what I skipped as I think first two. To IP feedback, I think this –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: This one is more detailed about this. And, it will be done when we finish all code points that we have discussed today. So, I

don't think we have anything else to discuss. Anybody wants to add something, comments, questions.

Well, what is... [Dima] is looking at me with question about his head. So, what is needed? So, we discussed this and take this opportunity to discuss with Integration Panel and we are now clear what we need to change in the document, and I will try to change it during ICANN meeting and we can send to Integration Panel because those remarks that we have, they are not crucial and doesn't require more discussion. I think that several topics are already discussed by our Generation Panel, so we can only add few sentences to explain.

So, I will try to finish this document based on Integration Panel feedback and I will send to you to the list so you can check it, and also, I will wait for your comments and afterwards, I will send to Integration Panel as a final proposal with all additional files that you need in the Integration Panel.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Right. And also, either send some stuff to us and expect it to come back with suggestions or work with Sarmad when it comes to the XML has the data in it, as well as the annotations and the annotations we like to see in a particular way so that all the LGR look somewhat similar.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And, we don't have a really good descriptions. We have some examples. But we're happy to give feedback if you're willing to do a roundtrip a couple times to get it right.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We can work on that.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: We can work on that, okay. It's not a problem. So, I don't have anything else. If you don't have anything else then we are done.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: So, great. Thank you very much for attending. I think we will then close the session slightly earlier and the presentation and the recording of this session is going to be available online in case you want to follow-up. So, thank you all very much for attending and we'll close the session now. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]