

## REVIEW REPORT, Second Level LGR for Language: Latvian

Date: August 21, 2016

Reviewer: Wil Tan

### DNS Security and Stability Review

I have reviewed the LGR for stability and security issues that are pertinent to a single language label generation ruleset for IDNs on the second level. Among other considerations the review was guided by the following questions, along the respective results:

1. Does the repertoire allow undesirable script mixing? NO
2. Does the LGR include only PVALID, CONTEXTJ or CONTEXTO code points? YES
3. If the LGR contains CONTEXTJ/CONTEXTO code points, is sufficient justification given for their inclusion in the LGR? N/A
4. If the LGR includes combining marks:
  - a. Are they limited to specific code point sequences? N/A
  - b. If not, does the LGR use other means (rules, variant relations) to restrict undesirable sequences using these combining marks? N/A
5. If the LGR contains code points or variants that may present a security or stability concern, does it include rules to mitigate the risks? N/A
6. Are there any security or stability concerns with regards to variants in the LGR? N/A
  - a. Does the LGR omit any variant mappings that are necessary to mitigate security risks? NO
  - b. Does the LGR include any variant mappings that may cause security concerns (e.g. overly complex, over-produce allocatable variants, non-symmetrical or non-transitive?) N/A
7. Are there any security or stability concerns with regards to WLE rules in the LGR?
  - a. Does the LGR omit any WLE rules that are necessary to mitigate security risks? NO
  - b. Does the LGR define WLE rules that may cause security concerns? NO
8. Does the LGR satisfy, or otherwise discuss and adequately address any tension among, the principles laid out in Sections 3 and 4 of RFC 6912? YES