

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

### **Notes from Meeting on 14 July, 2016**

#### Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Dennis Tanaka
2. Edmon Chung
3. Jian Zhang
4. Kal Feher
5. Mats Dufberg
6. Wael Nasr

Staff:

7. Sarmad Hussain

#### Meeting Notes

The WG members continued the discussion on the document and the recommendations to be proposed for public comment.

- 1. RFC Publication for Label Generation Rules.** As a follow up from previous meeting, staff informed the WG that the RFC has gone through the editorial process and is in the publication queue and will be published soon. Staff will circulate the information and update the document when the RFC is published.
- 2. Update to previous Recommendation 6, Section 2.4.** In the previous meeting, while discussing current recommendation 6, it was suggested that the wording: *“The registry should also encourage its registrars ...”* should be made more specific. Revised text was suggested to add *“by including a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement”* to the recommendation. However, WG discussed that this may be too specific and too focused towards gTLDs. Also, the WG members suggested not to address matters related to contractual terms. Further, only relevant information should be provided to the registrant in a simple way (e.g. using a link), as there may be much more and complex information available, to avoid distracting the user from registering a domain name. WG members agreed that this information should not be part of the flow of the registration process. It was decided that WG member will update the wording of the text of the recommendation.
- 3. Previous Recommendation 9, Section 2.4.** The WG members said that this recommendation does not contain a reference to IDNs, so may not be relevant. However it was suggested to keep the recommendation and refer it to the reference second level LGRs being published by ICANN, and ask community to work on improving and updating them over time in the spirit of to adopt them. The registries should be advised that having common LGRs is generally a good practice. However, a member also suggested that this should not be imposed and registries may be allowed to vary from it, to address dialectical variation, difference between gTLD and

ccTLDs contexts, etc. So in addition to consistency, there are other goals as well. WG members will update the recommendation to include these points. However, the recommendation should be general enough to also include continued collaboration in other IDN related matters, as they come up. It was suggested that this recommendation be broken into multiple recommendations.

4. **IDN Variants, Section 2.5.** The WG members agreed to take this up in the next meeting. The final column in the table includes notes from the discussions in the previous meetings.

Action Items

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Owner</b>
1	<i>Staff to share when RFC on LGRs is published and update document appropriately</i>	SH
2	<i>Suggest updated text for current Recommendation 6 in section 2.4</i>	KF
3	<i>Break Recommendation 9 in section 2.4 into multiple recommendations covering the various ideas discussed, including Reference 2<sup>nd</sup> Level LGRs, more general IDN policy and collaboration in other aspects of IDNs in the future</i>	SH - EC
4	<i>Review the table with text on IDN Variants and come with suggestion for recommendation(s) for next meeting</i>	ALL