IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 19 May, 2016

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Dennis Tanaka
2. Mats Dufberg
3. Wael Nasr

Staff:

4. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

Based on the discussion in the previous meeting, some revisions to recommendations from the current version 3.0 were proposed on the email list. The WG members discussed these suggested revisions.

1. **Review of Introduction section.** It was explained that the proposed revision makes the Introduction section generic and to-the-point, stating that the guidelines are being revised in the context of the recent expansion of the domain name space after the new gTLD program. The applicability of these guidelines to registrars, in addition to the registries, was discussed and it was agreed to list registrars as the stakeholders. Further it was suggested that the reference should be made to TLD registries in general, as these are relevant to both gTLDs and ccTLDs (though to a varying degree of applicability). The following revised text was suggested: “The IDN Guidelines are written for TLD registries and registrars, however the IDN Guidelines are also intended as a support document for other registries establishing IDN policies.”

2. **Review of recommendations in Section 2.1: Transition.** The proposed revision to the current recommendation 1 referring only to IDNA 2008 was agreed to be included. However, it was suggested that the registrations which do not conform to IDNA2008 but to IDNA2003 should be allowed to renew, even if the new registrations are restricted to IDNA 2008. However, such customers should be alerted that the domain names may not work. Thus the current recommendations 2 and 7 referring to existing registrations and their transitional matters should be retained. Similarly to allow for transitional cases of registration, the current recommendation 8 should also be retained.

3. **Additional recommendation.** The proposed revision against current recommendation 2 seems to be a new suggestion and not a revision to the existing recommendation. Thus, this recommendation should be discussed next time, when the proposing member is present.

**Action Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Staff to update the draft Guidelines document based on the discussion and circulate</strong></td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>