IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 08 September, 2016

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:
1. Edmon Chung
2. Dennis Tanaka
3. Jian Zhang
4. Mats Dufberg

Staff:
5. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

The WG members continued the discussion on the document and the recommendations to be proposed for public comment. Updated document *IDN Guidelines 4.0 20160908* was discussed.

1. **Review of recommendation 7 in Section 2.3.** The updated recommendation was discussed. It requires IDN tables to be published in RFC 7940 (LGR) format in the IANA Repository in the future, though the legacy IDN tables are encouraged to be converted to this format. The participants agreed to replace the "will" to a "must" as it conveys the same meaning but better in the context. Further, it was discussed whether there should be a time-span given for the legacy TLDs to switch to LGR format. The members did not agree that this would be easily possible to implement but suggested that the recommendation could be re-worded to be made slightly stronger as a second option.

2. **Revised new recommendation re: LGRs in Section 2.4.** The recommendation had been updated by removing reference to RSEP and PDT to make it general for all TLDs. The reference to security and stability is based on the definition from GNSO. These definitions would need to be included in the document (as a footnote?). "May" should be replaced with "are encouraged to use". Further, the last sentence needs to be rewritten as currently it suggests that the LGRs which pose a security and stability issue could move forward with a justification, which is not intended. The intention is to require details from registry operators where such possibility exists to confirm that it is not the case. This part of the recommendation will be revised to capture the latter interpretation.

3. **New recommendation on registry collaboration at the end of Section 2.4.** The recommendation only refers to language tables. It was suggested that this may be expanded to include script based tables. Further, it was discussed whether cooperation would be possible between ccTLDs and gTLDs, and if such cooperation is not likely, whether it is feasible to have this recommendation. The group agreed to think about it and address it in the next call.

4. **IDN Variants, Section 2.5.** The WG members agreed to take this up in the next meeting.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Review second part of recommendation 7 in Section 2.3 to suggest stronger language in addition to the current language as an option for public comment.*	EC
2	*Review the last sentence of Revised new recommendation re:LGR in Section 2.4 to call for registries to provide further details and justification for cases which may pose a security and stability issue to clarify that these issues do not occur.*	DT
3	*For the new recommendation on registry collaboration at the end of Section 2.4., update to include script based tables, e.g. by introducing reference to RFC 5646 for language/script tags.*	MT
4	*For the new recommendation on registry collaboration at the end of Section 2.4., suggest if this recommendation should be included for public feedback (or is not needed and be taken out).*	ALL
5	*IDN Variants, Section 2.5 should be reviewed for discussion next time.*	ALL