

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from the meeting on 1 March 2018

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Dennis Tanaka
2. Kal Feher
3. Mats Dufberg

ICANN Org:

4. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
5. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

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. BIWG Comments on Guideline 7.** IDNGWG reviewed that the expectation from this guideline is not to have a standing consortium but should be organized on need basis. It was noted that even if the “consortium” and “fora” may not imply the “ad hoc” meaning, it may still be good to keep the collaborative mechanism open and not specify a certain model – as this may be different for different communities. Response to EURID2 comment was also reviewed in this context.

The WG discussed whether to keep the guideline, remove it or cut it down to ask for “collaboration” instead of “consortium”. The outcomes of this guideline may not be measurable and it is not clear how such collaboration should be done. However, it was noted by the members that the guideline would help interoperability and usability through collaboration. Moreover, this is a requirement which reminds the TLD operators of a collective responsibility to contribute beyond individual requirements.

The WG discussed that to incorporate the feedback the guideline should be rephrased, perhaps to focus on goals rather than methods, and raise the advice in a way that it is a suggestion rather than being obligatory. Also, the method may differ across scripts and languages. It was pointed out that it is under the heading of consistency of IDN tables and practices. The WG appreciated that there has been collaboration in the community for root zone LGR and second level LGRs.

The WG agreed that staff should reach out to EURID and invite them to the IDNGWG meeting to discuss how they may want to follow up on their comment.

- 2. BIWG Comments on Guideline 6 and 10.** The WG noted that before the LGR format there was no easy way to check for consistency between two IDN tables. The WG was informed that the gap in publication on IDN tables is being investigated by

ICANN form an operational perspective. The WG said if this concerns out-of-date tables, it may be good to have a single copy of the IDN table – e.g. by putting a link to the IDN tables rather than duplicating it on registry website.

The members shared feedback from the community that there is reluctance to use LGR format as it is unwieldy and hard to communicate to other stakeholders like registrars. So registries may be submitting LGRs only for IANA repository and will publish a different version on their own website. This may result in more inconsistency related issues. However, an HTML version of the XML is being made available through ICANN's online tool which can be used for creating a more user-friendly view, though the HTML is not part of the formal definition of RFC 7940. It was argued that even the regular IDN table format is not necessarily simple, and need experience in comprehending them.

Consistency is about both publishing same IDN tables and having the same content. The WG finalized that managing consistency of IDN tables in IANA repository is an operational matter and out of WG's scope.

Further, suggesting registries to link to IANA repository could be optional but should not restrict them to just use those. Issues were identified in making such links and was decided that it was not feasible at this time.

WG also noted that this is a manual process and sometimes take many days.

The WG concluded not to make any changes in these guidelines.

Action Items

| S. No. | Action Items | Owner |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| 1 | <i>Rephrase Guideline 7 to focus on goals rather than methods, and write the advice in a way that it is a suggestion rather than being obligatory.</i> | KF |
| 2 | <i>Invite EURID to IDNGWG session at ICANN61</i> | SH |