

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

### **Notes from Meeting on 8 June, 2017**

#### Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Satish Babu
2. Edmon Chung
3. Mats Dufberg
4. Dennis Tanaka

Staff:

5. 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. Update on follow up with SSAC and IAB.** The members shared that Patrik was contacted regarding the NS records containing non-compliant IDN strings. SSAC is now aware of the issue and the discussion is ongoing regarding if IDNGWG should consider this point. IAB has also been contacted recently regarding clarification of their comments.
- 2. Comment GoI3 and GoI4.** It was noted that GoI would like to see more regulation around confusables. It was discussed that TR39 gives an algorithm but the challenge is that there is no authoritative data source to run this algorithm. Confusables.txt is too broad and intentional.txt is too narrow. If the recommendation is changed to a “must” from “may”, then it is not clear how registries will implement it – they will need to devise their own data sources which is difficult to implement. Also, the files released by Unicode also includes ASCII confusability, which is beyond the scope of IDN work. Thus, it was concluded that the GoI requirements are too restrictive and cannot be implemented at this time based on the lack of availability of data sources. In the response to the comment, it would be good to share an example to illustrate why IDNGWG is not able to address the comments at this time. As the current data sources are incomplete (e.g. 0643 and 06A9 are missing in intentional.txt), if only this incomplete source is recommended, it will present a false sense of security for those who implement it. So this may adversely impact the implementation. However, Root Zone LGR is producing comprehensive and usable data and so once the work is completed, it can be referred to as an authoritative data source. At that time the recommendation should be updated to a requirement.
- 3. Comment GoI5.** It was discussed that Emojis are not PVALID so out of scope. As there is already a requirement to adhere to the IDNA2008, additional text is not needed. In the comments the WG should point to SSAC document, but it is not even clear if these should qualify as an IDN.
- 4. Comment RySG1.** The WG said that it has already decided to exclude the reference to RFC 2119.

5. **Comment RySG2.** The WG agreed to accept the comment and add “and their successors” to the recommendation.
6. **Comment RySG3.** The WG agreed to accept the comment and update the recommendation adding “both”.
7. **Comment RySG4 (originally mistyped as 5).** It was raised that Recommendation 2 second half is similar to Recommendation 5, so both need to be reviewed. The WG agreed that the guideline can be made less verbose and simpler, though it generally captures the cases effectively and appropriately and so there is not much review needed.
8. **Comment RySG5 (originally mistyped as 6).** The current guidelines are intended for previously domain names which are no longer conformant – so covers pre-existing domain names. It has been taken care that appropriate transition possibility is provided. It was noted that the registry operator is only asked to make clear the actions it will undertake but the recommendation does not specify any particular actions. It was suggested to make it explicit that the guideline does not require the existing non-compliant domain names to be removed for further clarification.
9. **Updates based on comments.** It was discussed and agreed that the WG will go through the comments first and then make a second pass to make the changes. It was suggested that the conclusions from the discussion should be annotated into the main document, to facilitate the redrafting in the second pass.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Annotate the document with the decisions of the WG to facilitate the redrafting in the second pass by the WG</i>	SH