

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 25 May, 2017

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Dennis Tanaka
2. Mats Dufberg
3. Satish Babu

Staff:

4. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

The WG members continued to discuss the public comments received, based on the PC summary circulated to the WG members.

- 1. Comments: O-X1 - O-X3.** The discussion continued from last meeting. It was noted that first the confusables are not limited to IDNs. Second, TR39 is an algorithm but the real issue is the reference repertoire and that there is no authoritative source available – WG considered confusables.txt and intentional.txt at the time of the initial discussion of this recommendation and decided that neither was sufficient, one is too liberal and the other narrow. Thus, the suggested text was proposed as a compromise.

It was proposed a middle way could be to require at least the intentional.txt should be required. However, other members of WG stated that it should be addressed by the registries. It was shared that there may also be some misunderstanding between what IDN Guidelines can do and community expects, e.g. the example of "g00gle.com" given in the comment of Gol, which is ASCII.

However, it was also raised that a gap still exists between what has been suggested by the guidelines and what the community is asking for, for protecting the end user by preventing the user confusion.

There are two points raised by O-X. First, the point being discussed, of changing “may” to “must”, and second, that these labels should be termed as variants and thus allocated to same registrant or blocked.

It was agreed to defer the discussion until more members of WG are online for discussion. An alternate would be to have an initial discussion and get others’ feedback through email, in order to make progress.

It was suggested that if the change to “must” is needed, a short rationale should be developed for it with its potential impact on the registries. The final decision on how to proceed was parked.

2. **Comment: IAB1.** RFC 2119 is designed to use terminology for interoperability or security purposes. The current guidelines could use it but then it may be explained that these are used for security purposes, e.g. those arising from confusables. Other option is to leave out the reference to RFC 2119 but keep the same terminology. It was suggested that the definitions could be picked up from the RFC or defined directly. E.g. “must” for compliance purposes.
3. **Comment IAB2.** It was discussed that this remark supports the WG recommendations and no further action is needed.
4. **Comment IAB3.** WG discussed the comment by IAB but was not clear what IAB meant as the comment spans six different guidelines.
5. **Comment IAB4.** WG members agreed with the comment on why it is a separate paragraph. Check how the recommendation can be rectified by editing or removing the last part. In addition, WG discussed that the recommendation is quite long and should be reduced.
6. **Public Comment Report.** The working group discussed when it can finish the response to the public comments. It was suggested that two more months may be needed. Staff to confirm if that would be procedurally ok.
7. **Attendance to make progress.** The members present also raised that it is essential for the WG members to make the weekly calls to make the necessary decisions. The chairs to follow up on it.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Develop a short rationale to change “may” to a “must” in recommendation 16, with its potential impact on the registries</i>	MD
2	<i>Review recommendation 13 to address the comment IAB4</i>	EC
3	<i>Check when public comment report could be published and if two more months is a feasible timeframe?</i>	SH
4	<i>Maintain consistent attendance of WG members in weekly calls to effectively discuss and conclude on the feedback by the community</i>	MD, EC (co-chairs) and all