IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 6 July, 2017

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

> WG members:
> 1. Edmon Chung
> 2. Mats Dufberg
> 3. Satish Babu
> 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 RySG9.** The working group agreed with RySG's recommendation that TLD registry must publish variant activation policy publicly, to be included as either 13(c) or a standalone recommendation.

2. **Comment RySG10.** The WG noted there are three different items being asked by RySG in this comment.

   For the first part of the comment, it was agreed that the new term "registry side approach" should not be used and should be explained. It was suggested to break the first paragraph into two parts: 13 (a) Only IDN Variant Labels with a disposition of "allocatable" may be included in the DNS. IDN Variant Labels must only be delegated into the DNS ("activated") as requested by the registrant (or corresponding registrar). 13 (b) The registry may have automatic activation of variant labels if it is explicitly expressed in the IDN policy for a particular language/script.

   Following second part of the comment, the second paragraph it was discussed whether it be made into 13(c), in case automatic activation is done. However, it was suggested that the second paragraph should be included as a condition to 13(b), adding "the registry must carefully take into consideration the security and stability impacts". It was pointed out that automatic activation also puts an operational challenge, which may need to be captured, so that this may be taken up the registries conservatively and carefully. It was concluded that the second paragraph should be reviewed again in this context.

   The last part of the comment regarding use of "must" was parked until the WG comes back and rewrites the second paragraph as part of 13 (b).

3. **Comment RySG11.** The WG agreed that the clarification should be done. The intent was to do it for a particular TLD. It was suggested to change it to: "Registries must ensure that all applicable same-script IDN tables with a variant policy for a TLD have uniform variant rules that properly account for symmetry and transitivity properties of all variant sets."

4. **Comment RySG12.** The WG noted that RySG agreed with the WG for 2.7 and 2.8.

5. **Comment RySG13.** The WG accepted the comment and made the change from "word" to "label".

6. **Next Steps.** It was identified that the WG needs to develop a response to the comments and also update the guidelines. It was suggested to do the guidelines first. Staff to develop a response based on the discussion to be reviewed by the WG for finalization. Staff to also annotate the document with discussion and share with the WG for its revision by the WG.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Annotate the Guidelines document with discussion on comments received by the WG for further discussion.*	SH
2	*Develop an initial tentative response to the comments for review of the WG in parallel with the discussion.*	SH