

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 24 November, 2016

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Edmon Chung
2. Jian Zhang
3. Mats Dufberg

Staff:

4. 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 20161124* was discussed.

1. Review of Comments from ICANN 57:

- a. The reference to “code point sequences” may complicate the text. Thus, the first place “code points” are mentioned, a footnote may be added rather than specifying “sequences” at each instance.
- b. The members agreed that it is useful to reuse definitions of terms from RFC 7940 consistently, to the extent needed and possible, and add additional label states which are beyond the scope of the LGR in RFC 7940.
- c. Regarding the explanation of LGR in the guidelines, the WG suggested that the Guidelines should be generic, and LGR is a more of an implementation mechanism. So it was suggested some explanation may be included as a glossary item. The reference to LGR can also be reviewed when final editing of the document is being done.
- d. Regarding relating Guidelines to Root Zone discussion, the WG discussed that the latter is not in the scope of the current WG, and that Root Zone is governed by its own processes. However, if there is possibility to add a reference during review of the document it can be done.
- e. Harmonizing the LGRs within the same zone should be addressed. This is needed for multiple LGRs which are contributing labels to the same zone, e.g. different subsets of a script for different languages, or LGRs for different scripts (Latin vs. Cyrillic). One option to address is to have a logically single LGR (with multiple LGR files) and thus any code point or set of code points added requires harmonization to address security and stability aspects. Other mechanism would be to keep LGRs logically separate but then require a follow up harmonization phase after changes in existing LGR or addition of a new LGR to ensure that security and stability is maintained. The second method allows for comparing and reusing second level LGRs across TLDs, which the first method will not allow for. WG members pointed out that this has been in the guidelines already and this needs to be further refined in the context of LGRs - where there are multiple LGRs for a zone, there needs to be harmonization where they share code point or share homographs. This should be a separate recommendation, to be added. The recommendation should point out when harmonization

is needed, and also what the harmonization should entail. Reference from Root Zone LGR experience can be brought it as well. This should be added to 2.7.

- 2. Next meeting cycle.** The group discussed and agreed to keep the weekly cycle for meetings to gather more pace. Share the information on the list and review if other members find it challenging.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Add footnote to refer to “code point sequences” and not add that in the text for readability</i>	SH
2	<i>Draft recommendation for harmonization of LGRs to be put in Section 2.7.</i>	SH
3	<i>Confirm with WG members if it is ok to move to a weekly schedule</i>	SH