

## IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

### Notes from Meeting on 18 May, 2017

#### Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Dennis Tanaka
2. Edmon Chung
3. Kal Feher
4. Mats Dufberg
5. Satish Babu

Staff:

6. Sarmad Hussain

#### Meeting Notes

The WG members started discussion on the public comments received, based on the PC summary circulated to the WG members.

- 1. Comments: CL1 and CL2.** The WG did not find a direct link to “labels inside a zone” to the recommendations and so deduced that this is a paraphrased comment and not referring to a particular recommendation. The WG also discussed the recommendations are generally referring to the label registered by the registrant. A WG member also noted that the IDN Guidelines have been around for years and this kind of confusion has not been reported. The group discussed whether it should discuss what a gTLD do if it receives a name server which is not IDNA 2008 compliant? WG agreed that this is generally out of scope, and a statement could be added to this effect in the guidelines, as an added explanation in the introduction section (in a sub-section, e.g. as scope), i.e. the guidelines refer to labels delegated and not labels delegated to. This could be reviewed at a later stage. In the meantime, WG to reach out to SSAC (Patrik Falstrom) to get its feedback.
- 2. Comments: O-X1 - O-X3.** It was discussed that the confusables.txt is not a conservative analysis so its implementation could be very disruptive. The WG’s approach has been very conservative and so TR39 may present an over-reach. Also, confusables go beyond IDNs. Also, there is no authoritative source to implement such a recommendation, so that was one of the reasons WG had not required it but only suggested it. However, it was also shared that the public opinion be taken into consideration. It was discussed if the recommendation should be updated to say “must consider” but it was raised that such a wording can be misinterpreted in the future. The WG agreed to continue the discussion in next meeting.

#### Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>As a start, add a “scope” sub-section in the guidelines to say that labels not directly registered are out of scope to address the comment from NIC Chile</i>	
2	<i>Consult with Patrik (SSAC) to get feedback to finalize the response to NIC Chile</i>	EC, MD and SH