IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 5 January, 2017

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

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

      Staff:
4. Sarmad Hussain

<u>Meeting Notes</u>

The WG members continued the discussion on the document and the recommendations to be proposed for public comment. Updated document *IDN Guidelines 4.0 20160105* was discussed.

1. **Harmonization of IDN tables for a zone.** The WG discussed the revised text proposed and comments received against it. The recommendation has three parts. The first part is exactly the same as recommendation 5 from version 3.0. The second part looks at within script variants and the last part looks at cross-script whole-label homoglyphs.

   There was a general discussion on using "will" and whether "must" or "should" be used.

   The WG revisited the decision to drop the last sentence of recommendation 5 version 3.0. As this last sentence is in the context of the first sentence of the recommendation, which focuses on a single label where multiple scripts are co-mingled, the WG decided it provides a unique case not covered by other recommendations on harmonization. The WG agreed to keep the text with some edits to clarify the last sentence, e.g. to change text to say "…visually confusable characters from different scripts will not be allowed in a single label unless such confusability is addressed by explicit rules". The WG will keep but revise the last sentence of the recommendation.

   The second part of recommendation on harmonization was also discussed by the WG. It was pointed out that variants are dependent on and inherent to the script itself. If a registry supports a script which has variants, it should support the corresponding variants as well. The current text seemed to suggest that registry could decide either way. The WG also noted that there are two part of this recommendation. First, if two different IDN language tables for the same script have their own set of variant rules, these rules must be harmonized when both tables are supported. Second, even if an IDN language table is implemented and does not have variant rules, the variants may still need to be introduced if another IDN table is added for a different language using the same script (e.g. Persian added after Arabic language is being supported).   Finally, the exception clause in this recommendation should be revised to clearly refer to the second sentence, i.e. the symmetry and transitivity.

2. **Next meeting.** The WG members agreed to keep a weekly schedule, starting again on 12 January, 2017.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Update the recommendation on harmonization of LGRs/IDN tables for the registries as per the discussion*	DT
2	*Pending from 20161222 - Re-write the recommendation on automatic activation based on the current input for further discussion*	EC
3	*Pending from 20161222 - Recommendation on grandfathering current registrations should be updated per the current discussion*	KF