IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 13 October, 2016

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

    WG members:
    1. Dennis Tanaka
    2. Edmon Chung
    3. Jian Zhang
    4. Kal Feher
    5. Mats Dufberg

    Staff:
    6. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

The WG members continued the discussion on the document and the recommendations to be proposed for public comment. Updated document IDN Guidelines 4.0 20161012 was discussed.

1. Interactions at ICANN 57. The WG discussed the interactions at ICANN 57 and decided that WG would continue to discuss the content of the guidelines during the three meetings leading to ICANN 57 and based on the latest status, informally circulate the guidelines document to the community for review and feedback. The WG will continue a working session at ICANN 57 and interact with the community. The WG will release the document for a formal public comment after the group has finalized the guidelines, soon after ICANN 57. The WG also agreed to give a 10 minute update during the IDN Program Update session at ICANN 57.

2. Introduction of the Guidelines document. A WG member pointed out that the introduction section of the clean document needs to be revisited and elaborated in a way that the reader can understand the intent of the document. It was agreed that a revised version be developed to address these points for further discussion and finalization. Further the names of the WG members should be moved to the end of the document. It was suggested that these be moved in an appendix in the final version and may be moved in appendix even in the interim version.

3. IDN Variants. The WG started with the first item, which considered the allocation of variants to the same registrant. Based on discussion, the groups agreed that this be the requirement with a “must”. Based on this the rest of the “allocation” section questions are addressed.

4. Terminology for Variants. The group identified “allocation”, “activation”, “blocked”, “variants” as potential candidates for definition. It was suggested that use the term “IDN Variants” to be more specific, based on what is derived from the relevant LGR. It was further suggested to differentiate between “IDN Variant code points” and “IDN Variant labels”.

5. Other variants. It was also discussed whether cross-script variants (e.g. between Cyrillic and Latin) and cross-language variants (e.g. between Arabic language and Persian) be in scope. The group had an initial discussion on these, but was not concluded.
## Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Update the Introduction section to include more context for the reader for the document to be more self-explanatory.</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draft a new requirement which requires all variants to be allocated to the same registrant, with a “must”</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Update the terminology list to include the terms identified, and add relevant definitions from existing documents</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>