

Neo-Brahmi Generation Panel:

Analysis of comments for Kannada script LGR Proposal for the Root Zone

Revision: June 30, 2019

Neo-Brahmi Generation Panel (NBGP) published the Kannada script LGR Proposal for the Root Zone for [public comment](#) on 8 August 2018. This document is an additional document of the public comment [report](#), collecting all comments and NBGP analyses as well as the concluded responses. There are 4 (four) comment analyses as follow:

No.	1	From	Shantinath Shirahatti
Subject	(none)		
Comment	Lets make Kannada domain		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP acknowledges Shantinath's comment.		
NBGP Response	No action required.		

No.	2	From	Vikas Hegde
Subject	Proposals for Kannada Script's Root Zone Label Generation Rules		
Comment	The current proposal is good and satisfactory. As of now, ZWNJ and ZWJ have not been accepted in domain names. This may need to be revised in future as requirement arise. As stated in the proposal, MS Word spell check philosophy can be applied for this.		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP acknowledges Vikas' comment. The comment regarding ZWNJ and ZWJ in aligned with what mentioned in the proposal.		
NBGP Response	No action required.		

No.	3	From	Asmus Freytag, Integration Panel
Subject	Integration Panel Comment on the Kannada and Telugu LGR Proposals		
Comment	<p>For Public Comment on the Kannada and Telugu LGR Proposals</p> <p>In reviewing the Sinhala LGR proposal, the IP noted that the Sinhala GP considers the Kannada and Telugu letters distinct enough so as to not contain any candidates for cross-script variants.</p> <p>The IP notes that the Kannada and Telugu LGR proposals contain a proposed cross-script relation for the letter RA as well as some dependent letters between the respective scripts and Sinhala. The IP is a bit skeptical as to whether the letter RA / RAYANNA case rises to the level of a variant and would like to encourage the NeoB GP to review the matter.</p> <p>In doing so, the GP is encouraged to engage in dialog with the Sinhala GP and to come to a mutual understanding.</p> <p>If the review by the GP concludes that the Kannada/Telugu RA and Sinhala RAYANNA are distinct after all, the fix would be to remove that variant (as well as all variants for dependent characters). If the review comes to the opposite conclusion, the IP would expect some added discussion in the LGR proposal text that better documents why it is important that this particular variant should be included.</p>		
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP has discussed this issue with Sinhala GP and concluded that there is no cross-script variants between Sinhala and Kannada scripts.		
NBGP Response	Edit section 6.2.5 to list only Visarga-Visargaya and Anusvara-Anusvaraya as confusable code points.		

No.	4	From	Liang Hai
Subject	A quick review of the Kannada proposal		
Comment	2, Latin transliteration of the native script name: kannada (Also, please use a consistent transliteration scheme in the document.)		
NBGP Analysis	The document uses the spelling “Kannada” throughout the document is intended. As the accent markers may not be present on most of the user’s keyboards, that could have posed problems in terms of searching, hence, exact latin transliteration was not used.		
NBGP Response	No action required.		

Comment	3.4.7, “For 3.4.7.4 there could be cases involving ...”: The discussed cases and §3.4.7.4 are not relevant.
NBGP Analysis	NBGP reviewed the text and concludes the the discussed cases are relevant.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	3.4.7, “... hence this is explicitly prohibited by the NBGP”: Not necessary. Just think about writing a note in a limited space then inter-word spaces are extremely narrow — do users have to modify words’ spelling to avoid vowel letters following a consonant with halant?
NBGP Analysis	It was agreed by the NBGP to prohibit V-follow-H due to the lack of hyphen or ZWNJ at the top level, the H and V could create a joint form which is confusing to the end users.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	5.3: What does “Does not belong to Kannada” even mean? U+0CBC KANNADA SIGN NUKTA is a Kannada grapheme, just not commonly used. U+0CD5 KANNADA LENGTH MARK and U+0CD6 KANNADA AI LENGTH MARK are technically used part of vowel sign character’s canonical decompositions, just not used independently and IDNA2008 requires NFC.
NBGP Analysis	To the NBGP Author views,0CD5 and 0CD6 are in the Kannada UNICODE code chart for technical reason.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	6.1, “There are no variants within the Kannada script.”: Preconditions are WLE and the limited character set.
NBGP Analysis	The Variants discussion cannot be seen in isolation from presence of WLE rules, at least in the context of this document. Thus, the instance mentioned i.e. vowel aa vs <vowel letter a, vowel sign aa> cannot be formed given the WLE recommendation. The text beginning with the section 6 however can be modified to clearly state the conformance to the WLE rules.

NBGP Response	Add the text in section 6.1, “when the formation of a label is governed by the Whole Label Evaluation rules in section 7.”
Comment	7: A comprehensible pattern for other reviewers to refer to: `C[M][B X] V[B X] CH` (consonant clusters analyzed as a consonant preceded by one or more `CH` occurrences).
NBGP Analysis	The rules given in Section 7 have been specifically made simple to be “comprehensible” even to a non-technical user.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	7, Rule 5: Unnecessary restriction.
NBGP Analysis	The NBGP had discussed about Rule 5 and concluded it is needed to be restricted.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	Appendix II: This is important discussion about required usage of ZWJ and ZWNJ. Should be included in the main text instead of in appendix. Also the rationale/excusing of the lack of ZWJ/ZWNJ is weak and ridiculous.
NBGP Analysis	The comment is generic and non-specific remark for RZ-LGR.
NBGP Response	No action required.
Comment	The proposal should discuss the inconsistent encoding and rendering of <ra, virama, ra> /rra/. The preferred rendering form should be glyph sequence <<ra base, ra vattu>>, but in most implementations <ra, virama, ra> yields <<ra base, reph>> thus requires a ZWJ, as in <ra, virama, zwj, ra> (legacy logic) or <ra, zwj, virama, ra> (Unicode recommendation), to trigger the preferred form.
NBGP Analysis	The comment is generic and non-specific remark for RZ-LGR.
NBGP Response	No action required.