

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

### **Notes from the meeting on 5 October 2017**

#### Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

##### WG members:

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

##### Staff:

5. Sarmad Hussain
6. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana

#### Meeting Notes

The WG continued the discussion on the IDN Implementation Guidelines 4.0 draft 2.5. The meeting was extended to 3 hours to finalize the Guidelines.

1. **Guideline 15.** The WG had extensive discussion on three possible positions:
  - a. **Remove the guideline.** As there is no authoritative source which registries can refer to, this guideline might not be actionable or measurable. In addition, the issue of similarity and confusability of labels applies not only for IDNs but for all domain names. Implementing this guideline can increase the burden for registries operator while the issue would have not been resolved.

The legal interpretation of 'are encouraged' for the contractual parties could be different and leads to ambiguity.

- b. **Keep the guideline with the current text.** Despite of the lack of reference information, it is better to have this guideline to point out the complexity and the requirement than to merely leave it out. Additionally, there are several efforts to make the authoritative reference data available by communities, e.g. RZ-LGR Generational Panels, Unicode consortium and IETF, and at the end, the data will be available.

The current text, 'are encouraged', is not mandatory. It only requests the registries to consider policies and it should be reasonably workable.

- c. **Keep the guideline with the scope limited to homoglyphs.** To address the options above, this third option was explored. As the range of similarity and confusability issue is too wide, limiting the scope to homoglyphs could be benefit the analysis. It would reduce the size of issue to the range which registries could manage by its policies.

In parallel, script-based communities through Generation Panels are working on homoglyphs on the script-level so they cover all the relevant cases. If registries develop an IDN table they can look at relevant portion of RZ-LGR to identify the homoglyphs.

The WG agreed on the position (c) and finalized the revised guideline: “TLD registries are encouraged to consider policies to minimize confusion of IDN labels with other labels within the same script, specifically arising due to homoglyphic characters. Also see Additional Note IV.”

2. **Guideline 16-18.** It was noted that these guidelines are inherited from the previous version. They were accepted and implemented by the communities. No further changes were suggested for these guidelines.
3. **Guideline 19.** This is a new guideline triggered by the RySG feedback from public comment that the guidelines should recommend publishing the information related to allocatable or activated variant labels. As there were multiple guidelines asking to publish information, the WG had suggested to group these together in a single guideline and list what information should be included. The WG discussed and agreed to the following edit:
  - a. Include IDN table in the list
  - b. Add ‘if applicable’ to (b) and move it at the end of each item
  - c. For (b) and (c), change the word ‘rules’ to ‘policies’

The terminology of ‘should’ was discussed. The WG noted that the meaning of ‘should, must’ from RFC 2119 is not used in this Guidelines. It was agreed to keep using the word ‘should’ with the intention that it indicates a case where there is a requirement but which can be waived with a good reason.

4. **Additional Notes.** The WG agreed on Additional Notes section.
5. **Appendix A: Member of IDN Guideline WG.** The WG confirmed the list of members.
6. **Appendix B: Glossary of Relevant Terms.** The WG noted that in general the definition the existing documents which already agreed by the community.

It was agreed to the following edit:

- a. Add “IDNA2003 has been superseded by IDAN2008” to IDNA2003.
- b. Add “in this document used in the context of Unicode standard” to Code Point.

After the first pass was completed, the members proceeded with the second pass on the document. The following is the second pass discussion summary.

7. **Introduction.** There was a feedback from public comment asking if the scope of the guideline covers other data in the TLD zone file. The WG agreed to add a paragraph in a new section 1.2 on Scope to clarify that the scope of this document is limited to only the owner-name of the DNS records. Excluded from scope are any glue records and right-hand or target names. The paragraph was suggested and agreed for inclusion.
8. **Guideline 3.** This guideline focused on the pre-existing domain names in gTLDs, as the new registered domain names are required to conform with IDNA2008. For the pre-existing domain name which does not conform with IDNA2008, the registry operator could choose the policy to sunset the domain name or maintain it. The intent of the guideline is that whichever way is decided for proceeding forward, the registry

must publish the information. The WG agreed to edit the text to clearly reflect this intention by removing the last two sentences.

9. **Guideline 5.** The WG agreed to remove this guideline as it repeats Guideline 3.
10. **Guideline 7.** The WG agreed to revise the text to be applicable for IDN tables in LGR format and in text format. The WG would consult with the expert for the text and circulate among the WG members to finalize via mailing list. For 7(a) the WG would reach out to RySG for the feedback on the appropriate 'X' number of months.
11. **Guideline 12, 13.** The WG agreed with the use of "is" in the first two sentences and on the suggested changes, and change the word 'must conforms' to 'conforms'.
12. The staff will prepare the revised a clean version along with a cleaner redline version to reflect the recent changes and circulate to members for final review. The staff will also prepare presentations for ICANN 60 based on the finalized guidelines. These presentations would also be discussed and finalized in the next meeting.

#### Action Items

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1	<i>Update the Guidelines document and email the clean and updated redline versions</i>	SH
2	<i>Based on the updated Guidelines, share the presentations for ICANN 60</i>	SH