IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 13 Jan. 2016

<u>Meeting Attendees</u>

WG members (in alphabetical order):

1. Edmon Chung
2. Dennis Tan Tanaka
3. Mats Dufberg
4. Ram Mohan
5. Wael Nasr

Staff:

6. Sarmad Hussain

<u>Regrets</u>

1. Chris Dillon
2. Christian Dawson
3. Kal Feher

<u>Meeting Notes</u>

1. **TMCH - continued.** Because of variants, TMCH, when it checks for a domain name for a trademark string, it needs to realize that it should check against the variants. If somebody is trying to register a trademark name, the process needs to take into consideration the variants. In the current implementation it is not handled by TMCH. The group agreed that the TMCH is not directly relevant to IDN Implementation Guidelines. However, the advice of the group should be more general, that all the systems and peripheral services ICANN procures, including TMCH, should be aware of and coherent with IDN policies. Further, there should be some harmonization of variants by TMCH compared with the variants defined by the registries, including capturing the difference across these registries.

2. **Similarity and confusability of labels.** The previous version of the Guidelines suggested that the homographic issues be considered. It is recommended that within-script and cross-script similarity should be lumped into a single more general recommendation. It is in important issue to discuss further and include in the recommendations.

3. **Upper and lower case mapping.** Should upper case be considered relevant for string similarity? Though it is not relevant in the context of IDNA2008, applications do map upper case domain names to lower case during resolution in many cases so it can still be indirectly relevant.

4. **Script mixing.** Multiple scripts within a label should be avoided. Otherwise, if there is one script per label, offering multiple scripts at second levels should be generally OK. It is important to point out the risks which accrue due to the process. Enforceability at ICANN and registries

should be taken into account when determining such rules. More analysis may be needed for providing a specific requirement.

5. **Face to face meeting at ICANN 55.** Tentatively a face to face meeting of the group will be scheduled either on Tuesday evening or Wednesday morning during the ICANN 55 meeting.

The next WG call will be on Wednesday 27 January 2016.

Appendix A: Issues list discussed

1. Transition and Terminology
   a. Any (residual) issues/items from IDNA2003 to IDNA2008 transition?
   b. Glossary of terms around LGRs and variants from the IDN TLD project and other work
2. Language table format and managing consistency of end-user experience
   a. IDN Table format in XML, based on new LGR specifications being developed
   b. Role of reference second level tables in managing consistency and differences across TLDs for a predictable end-user experience
   c. Relationship between language tables and script tables? Other categories (some languages but not entire script)?
   d. Managing consistence across levels; relationship of Root Zone LGR and the second level IDN tables?
3. Variants
   a. Variant states (number and nomenclature) and state-change mechanisms (e.g. blocked, allocatable, allocated, reserved, etc.)
   b. Primary vs. secondary variants in Chinese language (other scripts or languages?)
   c. Policy for activating variants
      i. Automatic or registrant requested allocation
         1. Automatic activation of variant labels at second level for Chinese language domain names
      ii. Minimum and Maximum number of allocated variants/Ceiling value?
      iii. Choosing which variants may be activated
   d. Variants at second level must(?) be allocated to the same registrant?
   e. Implication of second level variants on TMCH
4. Similarity/Confusability of labels
   a. Homographic issues within script
      i. General homographic issues within a script
      ii. Scope of confusability: upper to lower case mapping
   b. Cross-script homoglyphs management to prevent phishing possibilities– cox.com, where "cox" can be in Latin or Greek or Cyrillic
      i. Script mixing within a second level label
      ii. Script mixing across levels
      iii. Scope of confusability: upper to lower case mapping
      iv. Is ASCII a special case for mixing?
5. Registration data
   a. Registration data for IDNs
   b. Registration data of variants – information regarding variant sets and variant label disposition(s)