IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from the meeting on 8 February 2018

<u>Meeting Attendees</u> (in alphabetical order)

WG members:
1. Edmon Chung
2. Dennis Tanaka
3. Mats Dufberg
4. Satish Babu

ICANN Org:
5. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
6. Sarmad Hussain

<u>Meeting Notes</u>

The WG members noted that the following documents to review:
i.   Feedback from second Public Comment
ii.   Feedback from the Board IDN WG
iii.   SSAC Response
iv.   Summary of discussion from the public session at ICANN 60

The WG continued the discussion on community feedback received on the IDN Implementation Guidelines following the second public comment.

1. **RYSG-1.** The WG continued exploring options on how to address the comment, noting that it had included the definitions from RSEP initially but taken these out after the first public comment. It was concluded that restate the answer from the last time, noting that the definitions were included but taken out previously, but do not change the recommendation. Also point out that Registry agreement itself does not have the definition and we are following the same convention.

2. **RYSG-2.** The WG considered using "same registration". The group noted that the guidelines have been avoiding implementation details and same registration or calling for nameservers would be implementation level. Further definition of registrant should not be added for these reasons. It was noted that variant labels are delegated to the same nameservers in new gTLD registry agreements. But the WG discussed that different nameservers may also be needed if variant labels are needed to serve different communities. The WG agreed that there should not be any changes and respond that the requested information pertains to implementation details which guidelines are not generally covering.

3. **RYSG-3.** The IDNGWG noted the response and also noted that there is no further discussion or response needed by IDNGWG.

4. **RYSG-4.** IDNGWG summarized that RYSG suggests that LGR format should not be mandatory for IDN tables. The WG noted that an X months delay was added in the previous version to accommodate a similar comment by RYSG in the first public comment. The WG agreed to respond that it considers the format has significant benefits to be implemented for future IDN tables, and has considered the RYSG

comment and therefore added the X months delay, which they may need to implement the LGR format. Also, legacy IDN tables are not required to be updated.

The guidelines 5 and 6 should be clarified that this is applicable per the TLD and any other ambiguities.