

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from the meeting on 25 January 2018

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

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

ICANN Org:

6. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
7. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

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 continued the discussion on community feedback received on the IDN Implementation Guidelines following the second public comment.

1. **BC-6.** The IDNGWG reviewed the criticism on automatic activation. The members noted that the it is a fundamental part of CDNC approach for Chinese. A longer description was provided in the previous version of the draft guidelines, which were reduced in the current version. The members discussed if more explanation was needed. The number of automatically activated would be managed by the registries, but the IDNGWG can suggest further constraints. It was also noted that more active variant may not translate to more abuse, but that if a registry responds to an abuse, the response should include all the active variants as well.

It was raised that the current comment perhaps notes two issues, that these are not restricted to certain scripts and there is no constraint on the number of variant labels which can be activated. SSAC SAC060 notes that there is manageability issue due to many variant domain names.

Members noted that one way to address this is that if the registry has automatic activation, it must have a low limit on the no. of variant domain names which can be activated. Also, it could be possible to state certain scripts, where there is a tradition. However, this is arbitrary in both cases. And then new script community may also want to explore the possibility. Members noted that there may not be a security issue.

IDNGWG agreed to add back some more explanation and provide some restrictions, including a mechanism to have some limitation on the volume. The earlier text does not provide a guideline and the update should provide a guideline to the reader.

The IDNGWG agreed to re-draft the guideline to put a reasonable limitation on the activated variants.

- 2. AB-1.** The WG considered whether the comment, though useful, is in scope of the guidelines. There are three parts: numerosity of IDN tables for a TLD, multiple IDN tables from the same script and cross-script variants. The users do not see these tables, but just the domains which are registered, and they interact only with one table at a time during the registration. In general the number of scripts or languages for registries should not be restricted, unless there is a good reason. Also, the recommendation on harmonization of IDN tables also manages variants across IDN tables.

The WG agreed that as a response to AB, it should be noted that though numerosity of IDN tables is a challenge for implementation at the registry side, it may not impact the end-user, as end-user deals with one IDN table at a time. However, there are Guidelines being included to address the other points related to harmonization of variant labels across IDN tables from same script and addressing whole script confusables, covered by Guidelines 13-17.

- 3. AB-2.** The IDNGWG discussed that a guideline talks about whole-script confusables. It was discussed if ASCII should be added explicitly in it. The WG agreed that the current Guidelines sufficiently covers such cases and the example provided is for a TLD not following the Guidelines. However, the WG agreed to include the additional reference to Unicode's TR#36 to make this more explicit.
- 4. RYSG-1.** The WG agreed that the WG should not try to define security and stability. The Registry agreements do not have any definitions either, and WG is taking the same approach. This will be managed through the PDT and RSEP process. The WG decided to continue the discussion on this item next week.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Redraft Guideline 12 on automatic activation to put a reasonable limitation on the number of variant labels which can be automatically activated.</i>	EC
2	<i>Update Guideline 17 to include a reference to Unicode's TR#36 as well.</i>	SH