

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 13 July, 2017

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

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

Staff:

5. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

The WG started discussing the document revision based on the discussions on community feedback received.

- 1. Introduction - Scope of the Guidelines.** The scope of the guidelines was discussed, in the context of the discussion conversation with Patrik (from SSAC). There was no specific response. There was an additional verbal discussion with Jim Galvin, who suggested that SSAC's recent advisory on Emoji's may indicate that the integrity of the entire zone served by the TLD should be of concern for the registries and should be part of what IDNGWG should recommend. IDNGWG members discussed that this is quite complex, as the TLD is not authoritative for the content. The WG members thought that SSAC should come up with some language for this purpose – as they would be able to articulate it better.

The WG raised that there are two steps: first the WG needs to determine if this is in scope, and then look at the recommendation if it is in scope. It was suggested that if the WG considers everything which starts with “xn—“ in the zone file as IDNs, then the larger discussion is in scope. In this case, it was raised if WG should only limit to second level or may also look at other levels? WG members consider the scope as the immediate zone served by the TLD.

WG agreed that the scope should be limited to the registered domains. Registry agreement language could be borrowed in this context. NS objects would then be out of scope, though WG could still consider it if there is a strong counter argument. It was discussed whether the same restrictions on names could be applied to other TLDs and other levels of zones.

WG summarized that generally glue records within the zone are in scope, and for registered domains rules the recommendations should apply. If these are out of zone then the recommendations may not apply. However, members still thought this may be trying to control too much and guidelines should be more focused on the registered name.

It was concluded to invite SSAC member for a consultation before finalizing the discussion. In case the scope is expanded, WG should also engage with the RySG.

2. **Normative Language.** It was agreed to remove the reference to RFC 2119. It was discussed that “must” and “may” are generally clear, but “should” could be confusing. The words should be used as intended for English, except the definition for “should” be added from RFC2119. “Should” is not taken as an optional choice, but requires a good reason not to follow. This is stronger than “recommended”. Each instance of “should” be revisited in the guidelines and address it on case to case basis.

Section 1.1 is to be deleted and a comment be put in with the definition of “should” from the RFC, to be reviewed for inclusion after the document has been reviewed for the uses of this word.

3. **Comment on 2.1 - 1.** “and its successors” to be replaced with “or any RFC that replaces or updates the listed RFCs.” Relevant RFC terminology should also be looked into.
4. **Comment 2.1 - 2.** Move the later part of the text: “The registrant of a ... registry initiative.” to recommendation 5, to be consolidated with no. 5 later.
5. **Comment 2.1-4.** Review the use of “both” to make sure these are simultaneously used.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Set up a meeting with SSAC on whether scope of IDN Guidelines should include other data beyond the registered domain names</i>	SH
2	<i>In Recommendation 4, suggest alternate to “both” to make clearer</i>	MD