IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from the meeting on 11 January 2018

<u>Meeting Attendees</u> (in alphabetical order)

WG members:
1. Dennis Tanaka
2. Edmon Chung
3. Kal Feher

ICANN Org:
4. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
5. Sarmad Hussain

<u>Meeting Notes</u>

The WG members noted that the following documents to review:
i.   Feedback from second Public Comment
ii.   Feedback from the Board IDN WG
iii.   SSAC Response
iv.   Summary of discussion from the public session at ICANN 60

The WG started the discussion on community feedback received on the IDN Implementation Guidelines following the second public comment.

1. **EURID1-2.** The WG discussed the comment in the context of feedback from BIWG. The members discussed that the guidelines should not ask for creation of such a forum. The second comment by EURID is more relevant to charter of such a group and should be considered at the time of its formation. In the context of BIWG comment, the WG discussed that a standing group may not be needed and the community would form such groups as needed.

   WG shared that this was not an obligation so if there was no consortium it should be considered a failure on part of the registries offering IDNs. The WG considered making the recommendation more specific, from its current general guideline, saying that it is intended as "as per need" basis.

   Finally, in response to the comments from EURID, it was noted that WG agree with the input that different stakeholders should be involved when such a collaboration is formed, and clarify that the guideline does not intend to create a standing forum, but on need basis. Suggest to Board that ICANN should stand ready to support such forum.

2. **DS1.** It may be noted that these are contractual commitments for gTLD registries and registrars and recommended for ccTLDs through the Fast Track process.

3. **DS2.** Based on IAB and RySG feedback in the previous public comment, the RFC 2119 terminology is not used but the use of "must" provides a similar sense in regular usage, which is intended. In case this refers to the registrar obligations then the comment would be out of the scope of the guidelines.

4. **DS3.** The WG members noted that changing to "must" would take away the exception being granted to existing IDN tables implemented. There is no benefit to move an established TLD with the published IDN tables to a new format. This causes additional labour for the registries.

5. **DS4.** WG noted that the check is only for the future IDN tables and not the currently implemented ones. RSEP for gTLDs and Fast Track for ccTLDs will incorporate this change. WG also reviewed RYSG4 which asks that registries should not be required to move to RFC7940 format. Also, NCSG2 suggests 4-6 months.

    The WG noted the inputs and deferred it till the WG discusses other RYSG comments.

6. **JG1.** WG noted that as this pertains to ASCII labels, it is not in the scope of the guidelines.

7. **JPRS1.** WG considered noting Japanese as an example, which could address JPRS concern. WG noted that Guidelines 15 and 16 allow for exceptions like Japanese, so do not understand why JPRS has concerns. WG was informed of the Google Registry response to the public comment on reference Japanese second level LGR released by ICANN. The WG suggested to continue to the discussion in the next meeting.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Draft responses to the comments being discussed for the WG to review*	*SH*