

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 25 August, 2016

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Edmon Chung
2. Dennis Tanaka
3. Jian Zhang
4. Kal Feher
5. Mats Dufberg

Staff:

6. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

The WG members continued the discussion on the document and the recommendations to be proposed for public comment.

- 1. Revised new recommendation re: reference second level LGRs, Section 2.4.** Updated recommendation in IDN Guidelines document 4.0 20160825 was discussed. The intention was to merge it with current recommendation 9. However, the latter is high level so it was not merged. It was discussed that the reference to PDT and RSEP make it very specific for gTLDs. The WG discussed that this should be written in a way that it is relevant for all TLDs, including gTLDs and ccTLDs. Though ccTLDs are not bound, they do express commitment to the IDN guidelines through the Fast Track application process. This can be replaced by justification in the context of security and stability considerations. The security and stability is defined in RSEP documents, which could be referred.

The recommendation should be clear if this should be a “must” or a “may”. Also, if a registry decides not to follow the reference LGR, the recommendation should be clear why and to whom the justification should be provided. The goal is that the guidelines are encouraging consistency of LGRs because they help in implementation and User Acceptance. As a WG this is the direction, though the WG does not want this to be binding so that registries can deviate if they want to.

The WG also discussed that the consistency should be emphasized and deviations should be de-emphasized, as to not encourage the registries to deviate.

The WG also agreed to add a separate recommendation that registries should collaborate to keep these reference LGRs updated – or be explicitly called out in the current recommendation 9. The WG to develop a revised text for discussion in the next meeting.

- 2. Current recommendation 6, section 2.9.** WG decided that members should review the text for finalizing the recommendation. Members discussed that it may be unproductive for the registries to convert the IDN tables into LGRs just for publishing as internally they may be using

more direct rules directly programmed into the system instead of the XML format. Other members suggested that LGR defines the data very formally, including the rules, which is not easily possible using a textual description in IDN tables. For example, text format tables cannot be compared. XML LGRs can be compared more precisely. One solution would be to give a transition time for publishing IDN tables in the LGR format. ICANN provides a tool to convert IDN tables to LGR format, though the rules may need to be manually done in this case. The member narrated that PDT experience shows that the textual variation in rules is significant so the XML format will be really beneficial. The WG agreed to update the recommendation in this context

3. **IDN Variants, Section 2.5.** The WG members agreed to take this up in the next meeting.
4. **ICANN 57 meeting.** The WG decided that it will aim to finish the draft guidelines in next three meetings and try to publish them for public comment for discussion during ICANN 57. The WG noted that there are a total of five meetings left before that time. In case there is no agreement on certain issues, multiple versions may be put out for community input.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Add a recommendation to encourage registries to collaborate to develop and update the reference second level LGRs</i>	MD
2	<i>Edit last part of the Revised new recommendation re: LGRs to remove reference to PDT and RSEP to make it more generally applicable to all TLDs and add pointer to justification in the context of security and stability considerations (also define security and stability).</i>	DT
3	<i>Review text of current recommendation 6 in Section 2.9 for finalization. Any suggestions for edits should be shared on the list.</i>	ALL
4	<i>Revise the text in Recommendation 7 in Section 2.3 to use the LGR format, while considering the issues in such transition from the IDN Tables.</i>	EC