IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 9 February, 2017

Meeting Attendees(in alphabetical order)

WG members:
1. Satish Babu
2. Edmon Chung
3. Dennis Tanaka

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 20170209* was discussed.

1. **Harmonization of variant rules across same-script IDN tables.** The WG was reminded that "must" and "shall" mean the same per RFC 2119. The WG reviewed the changes suggested and agreed with the revised wording. However, it was discussed that the "shall" may also be changed to "must" to address any ambiguity.

2. **Cross-script homoglyph labels.** It was shared that there are very few cases of homoglyph related security issues for IDNs so a "may" is used. It was reviewed that each of the four parts in this section are mutually exclusive. Further, as this recommendation deals with homoglyphs, the end user may not be able to tell such label apart, and thus a stronger recommendation may be considered than "may". However, it was discussed that these are very few cases where a label can be spoofed using a different script. However, it is not very clear how homoglyphs may be defined. Further, making such requirements (which are corner cases and not well defined) make it operationally harder for registries to implement IDNs. Thus, a "may" may still be appropriate. Further, as in the case of ASCII, other (dispute) procedures are in place to mitigate such confusability as well. The WG decided to come back to this in the next call to get opinion of other members as well on whether to use "may" or a stronger recommendation.

3. **Limitations of IDN tables and policies.** The recommendation was discussed by the WG. It was suggested that the first part of the paragraph which specifies a guideline may be separated from the second part of the paragraph which presents a further explanation.

4. **Tentative Section 2.8 and 2.9.** It was reviewed that these two items were raised during ICANN 55. The WG still needs to decide if anything needs to be recommended for these sections. For 2.9, the WG noted that there could be a high level statement; otherwise it may be out of scope. For 2.8, WG could state that the data should be able to be represented in standard form, but that would also be a high level statement. As high-level statements are not very actionable, the WG may not provide any recommendations for these topics.

5. **ICANN 58 meeting.** There are three meetings before the Copenhagen meeting. To have a draft ready for ICANN 58, the substantive discussion should close in next meeting and then next two meetings be used for finalizing the wording. However, the release should be informal, and the formal Public Comment should be done immediately after the meeting. The WG agreed to two sessions – a 75 minute detailed session of the WG with the community and a short presentation during the IDN Program Update session. These are being planned for Sunday and Wednesday respectively.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Update recommendation on automatic activation of labels in Section 2.6.*	EC
2	*Split the paragraph on Limitations of IDN tables and policies into two paragraphs, as discussed*	EC