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

**Notes from Meeting on 15 June, 2017**

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:
1. Kal Feher
2. Mats Dufberg
3. Dennis Tanaka
Staff:
4. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

The WG members continued to discuss the public comments received, based on the PC summary circulated to the WG members.

1. **Comment RySG6.1 – 6.4.** Starting with RySG 6.1, WG members said that LGR format significantly contributes to interoperability and that is the main motivation for RFC 7940. So there may be a misunderstanding on what this RFC delivers by RySG. It was noted that there was discussion within RySG members that the LGR format may have additional burden without clear benefit. It was also raised that as RFC 7940 is intended by the WG as a publishing format, it may be interpreted that it does not contribute to interoperability, because this need not be implemented. However, the WG noted that the interoperability should be looked in a broad sense beyond registries and registrars, e.g. also including application developers, who may find it easier to implement the LGR as it has well defined format. As another example, it is useful for moving a TLD between RSPs. It was noted that the earlier formats cannot formally capture all the information including repertoire, variant code points, variant types, dispositions and label-level evaluation rules. Thus, this format is needed. It was questioned if it may be useful to more explicitly point out that it is applicable to the new LGRs.

   The WG reviewed that RySG is saying that this does not address the risk of cybersquatting and consumer confusion. However, it was raised that in case of complex rules there is a higher possibility of different registries implementing them differently even using the same IDN table, which can cause consumer confusion. Thus, having a clearer format helps address the problem.

   The WG also considered RySG comments 6.2-6.4 in the context. It was noted that some of these are implementation level comments by RySG – e.g. transition time and tool requirements. These may not be relevant for the guidelines.

   The WG members pointed out that even though the LGR is a publishing format, it is generated from the system, so code development is needed even for that purpose. And as this is done systematically, so even if system is updated for one new IDN table, internally this system change is applicable to all the existing IDN tables which are already incorporated. Therefore, it was suggested that a transition period of six months – one year may be suggested to ease the process. It was discussed whether it should be limited to new TLDs being delegated or

applicable to all TLDs.  It may be useful to reach out to the RySG to get their opinion on the transition.

It was agreed that the WG did consider that the requirement for RFC 7940 is useful, so the guideline remains unchanged.  However, to address RySG feedback, implementation notes be added, allowing for a transition time and strategy for implementation, e.g. on staggered roll-out for new/old TLDS vs. single deadline sometime in the future.

It was noted that 6.3 is not relevant for WG.

In summary, it was agreed that the recommendation will remain unchanged, but may add a transition period.  RySG will be contacted to determine the appropriate transition period, and if RySG sees any value in separating the new IDN tables from those are already implemented.  In that case, the new IDN tables need not be separated in the recommendation by the WG.

2. **Next Meeting.**  There will not be a meeting on 22 June 2017.  The next meeting will be on 29 June 2017.


Action Items

| S. No. | Action Items | Owner |
|--------|-------------|-------|
| 1 | *IDNGWG to reach out to RySG on the transition time and strategy for Recommendation 7.* | MD, EC |