

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 01 December, 2016

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

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

Staff:

4. 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 20161128* was discussed.

- 1. Harmonizing of LGRs:** The WG shared that “harmonization” was unclear term but the scope was cleared over email. The WG discussed if the recommendation should be further clarified. Also WG asked if there is a list of cross-script homoglyphs published, which should be referred to, instead of people making their own minds. It was suggested that root zone LGR work may have such data, but that work is not yet published and also that it may contain a smaller subset of code points compared to the second level LGR. The WG suggested to look for other sources as well.

It was discussed that cross-LGR impacts on security may be undertaken through the RSEP process. This guideline is suggested as a “must” as it impacts the user end security. The WG discussed this can be done by removing a code point, or adding variant rules, etc. However, the guideline be focused the desired outcome and allow registries to implement their own solutions to get there.

The recommendation should be divided into three parts, explaining what harmonization is, point out cross-script homoglyphs and intra-script variants from different LGRs.

- 2. Bearing of harmonization on existing registrations.** WG discussed to have a general grandfathering advice which is applicable here but also for other existing registrations being invalidated by the updated guidelines. However, as this condition is a security issue, a mechanism should be devised to phase such cases out, instead of keeping them in the system indefinitely. However, we should not enumerate different solutions.
- 3. Automatically activating variants.** The WG considered the recommendation submitted by EC, which allows for automatically delegating variants. The WG discussed that the recommendation should be made clearer. Generally labels are registered on the request of the registrant, however, the Chinese community has suggested automatic activation. The WG members suggested that the argument to support either case is not currently clearly made and the WG is free to decide based on various considerations. In the revisions, the reference to RFC 3743

should be removed. Also that recommendation is currently written to address all scripts, though the case has been generally applicable to Chinese. The recommendation should be revised for further consideration and discussion.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Find out if there are existing lists of homoglyphs which can be referenced</i>	SH
2	<i>Divide new recommendation on harmonization of LGRs into three recommendations, explaining harmonization, address cross-script homoglyphic variants, and address within-script variants caused by two different LGRs</i>	MD
3	<i>Write a new recommendation on how to address existing registrations which are not harmonized, giving flexibility to registries</i>	KF
4	<i>Re-write the recommendation on automatic activation based on the current input for further discussion</i>	EC