

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 2 February, 2017

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Satish Babu
2. Mats Dufberg
3. Kal Feher
4. Dennis Tanaka
5. Jian Zhang

Staff:

6. 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 20170202* was discussed.

- 1. Grandfathering labels that do not conform to the guidelines.** The WG was updated that RFC 7940 was reviewed to see the usage of “domain name”, “domain” and “label”. There is no explicit statement in the RFC on the difference but the RFC uses “label” where a string is being referred to for evaluation or a result of a process, while “domain name” is generally used for registered names or objects are referred to. A written distinction of these terms is also not found in the other documents being used in the industry, and in some cases these two are confusable. However, the same convention as the RFC is followed in the revised version of this recommendation: registered objects as “domain names” and processed or derived strings as “labels”. It was also noted that the rest of the document is not rigorously using this scheme and thus may need to be reviewed by the WG.

The WG discussed using “domain name” in all cases as the distinction may indicate an implementation specific difference as well, which can vary across registries. However, it was noted that the intention is not to specify any specific implementation but in some cases one may need to refer to labels which are not added to the zone file and in those cases the term “label” may be needed.

The WG went through the revised recommendation 13. It request registries to articulate the plans for such domain names and labels. The WG agreed with the terminology distinction and considered taking this as a model for the rest of the document as well. The two terms “domain name” and “label” should be added to the glossary of the guidelines. “Domain name” and “domain” are synonymous and interchangeable.

Finally, it was also suggested to consider breaking up the recommendation into smaller sections as the current recommendation may be too long.

2. **Harmonization of variant rules across same-script IDN tables.** It was explained that this is a new recommendation addressing variant rules across two IDN language table using the same script, and when a new IDN language table is added for the script.

It was raised that for introduction of new variant rules some reference may be needed. So a registry may not know which rules to add. The WG suggested that this recommendation at least points to the need to do it. Further, root zone LGR work can be used as the reference (to the extent it covers the repertoire) as it presents a community based script level variant analysis. The WG agreed to add a reference to root zone LGR as an advisory or in some other way.

The WG also agreed to change the “will” to “must” to be consistent with RFC 2119. And call it out explicitly for the registries for any feedback on the terminology.

3. **Presentation at ICANN 58.** The WG agreed to hold a session at ICANN 58 to present its latest set of recommendation to gather community feedback. It was noted that in previous such session at ICANN 57 very good feedback was received. Also, as the guidelines are not yet in their final form, a draft clean version of the document should be circulated for discussion and presentation. The timelines will be discussed in the next meeting.
4. **Next meeting.** The next meeting of the WG will be on 9 February, 2017.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Update recommendation on Harmonization of variant rules by (i) changing “will” to “must”, etc. according to RFC 2119, and (ii) updating it to note how registries could use the existing work by ICANN community to implement these guidelines, by referring to root zone LGR and other relevant work.</i>	DT