

REVIEW REPORT, Second Level LGR for Language: ___Latvian__

Date: 7 September 2016

Reviewer: Nicholas Ostler

Linguistic Review

Each LGR was reviewed by me as expert reviewer addressing linguistic issues relevant to the specification of label generation rules for IDNs in the given language. Among other considerations, this review answered the following questions:

1. Does the set of code points and label generation rules satisfactorily characterize the repertoire required for use of this language and script to define second-level labels? YES
Specifically can all of the following be answered in the negative:
 - a. Does the set of code points omit any required characters? NO
 - b. Does the set of code points omit any desirable characters? NO
 - c. Does the set of code points include any unnecessary characters? NO
 - d. Does the set of code points include any undesired characters? NO

 - e. Does the LGR omit any required variant rules? NO
 - f. Does the LGR omit any desirable variant rules? NO
 - g. Does the LGR include any unnecessary variant rules? NO
 - h. Does the LGR include any undesired variant rules? NO

 - i. Does the LGR omit any required WLE rules? NO
 - j. Does the LGR omit any desirable WLE rules? NO
 - k. Does the LGR include any unnecessary WLE rules? NO
 - l. Does the LGR include any undesired WLE rules? NO
2. Are the authorities cited by the LGR among the best available in relation to the relevant issues? YES
3. Could use of other authorities have led to better choices in the set of CPs and rules? NO
4. Has adequate provision been made for labels (e.g. for familiar but alien names or loan words) which exceed the bounds of repertoire of code points essential for the language? YES
5. Will extended code points (and variant or WLE rules) have undesired consequences for the repertoire as a whole? NO
6. Does the XML file accurately characterize the desired set of code points and rules for the language and script, and so match the descriptive document? YES