IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 08 December, 2016

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

> WG members:
> 1. Dennis Tanaka
> 2. Mats Dufberg
>
> Staff:
> 3. 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 20161208* was discussed.

1. **Authoritative sources for homoglyphs.** The WG considered the references provided and noted that if the WG is going to make a recommendation regarding homoglyphs and variants, it should have authoritative sources to refer to, to ensure that the recommendation is actionable. Also, that the reference from Unicode or IETF should be preferred. The WG also noted that Confusables.txt is a too extensible analysis, and intentional.txt list is conservative so though it is likely to get a solution near to intentional.txt but further analysis is needed. These lists should be filtered to exclude all code points Disallowed by IDNA2008. It was also noted that glyph is a representation and is font dependent, so definition of homoglyph set may change over time. Thus, this work will address the problem but cannot address it completely, due to the fuzzy nature of this work.

2. **Harmonizing of LGRs:** The WG discussed the revised recommendation and provided more feedback for further review. First, we need to define homoglyphs, be very clear what the scope is and add a reference to an authoritative source in order for registry operators to implement it. For example, the scope definition should be clear that similar cases within a script, e.g. Latin script case O and 0 are out of scope. Also the text is extensive, so it should be broken down into a clear and concise recommendation and explanatory material should be moved to a different section, e.g. an appendix, if needed. For example, the reference to root zone work is not actionable (as the root zone work is not complete). Registry operators should not be asked to find their own sources, otherwise this would cause confusion and unenforceable.

   As the guideline is also suggesting harmonizing variants within script, it would be challenging to find outside sources, and root zone may be the only authoritative source as a starting point.

   The WG group agreed that first the authoritative source(s) should be identified and then this recommendation should be revisited for revision based on the discussion.

3. **Bearing of harmonization on existing registrations.** The WG agreed that the new recommendation did address the requirement and was reasonably worded. The WG noted that the recommendation should more explicitly include a suggestion to notify the registrants who

have a potential issue with their registration so that they can consider the risks involved in continue to hold the registration. Just posting the policy may not forewarn the registrants appropriately of the implications. It was noted that this was done previously when previous guidelines are published asking the move from IDNA 2003 to IDNA 2008. However, this may be cumbersome for the registrars. Also, it should be discussed if this should be time bound. It was also discussed whether a publically accessible policy is a requirement for registries, where this new issue may be added? Guidance should also be provided on the text to be sent out to registrants, if that is what is finalized.

4. **Automatically activating variants.** Discussion was deferred till the recommendation is reviewed.

5. **Next meeting(s).** The WG agreed to meet on 15 December and may also consider meeting on 22 Dec., based on WG decision.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Filter the confusables.txt and intentional.txt to derive a list which does not include code points disallowed in IDNA 2008 for further analysis by the WG*	SH
2	*Update the recommendation on harmonization based on the current discussion*	MD
3	*Update the recommendation on impact of harmonization on existing registrations based on the current discussion*	KF
4	*Review the current discussion on harmonization and continue this discussion further*	ALL
	Re-write the recommendation on automatic activation based on the current input for further discussion	EC