IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from Meeting on 26 January, 2017

<u>Meeting Attendees</u> (in alphabetical order)

> WG members:
> 1. Dennis Tanaka
> 2. Edmon Chung
> 3. Mats Dufberg
> 4. Satish Babu
>
> Staff:
> 5. Sarmad Hussain

<u>Meeting Notes</u>

The WG members continued the discussion on the document and the recommendations to be proposed for public comment. Updated document *IDN Guidelines 4.0 20170119* was discussed.

1. **Commingling of cross-script code points in a single IDN table (recommendation 5, version 3).**
   The WG discussed the revised text in Section 2.7. The first part of the recommendation is the same as recommendation 5 from version 3.0 of the guidelines. It was suggested that previous version used "will" perhaps because they intended both ccTLDs and gTLDs to use the guidelines. It was noted that the WG should be consistent in the document. And "must" and "should" is used in other places. Also, the latter are clearer. The WG members agreed that they are comfortable with using "must". So it was concluded that "must" should be used. And this may be noted in the public comment.

   Further it was presented that "explicit" script is not generally used. However, it noted that explicit script property of script beyond inherited and common is used by Unicode in Annex 24. But alternate wording could be done.

   The last sentence of the first part of the recommendation was edited from the original version. It was suggested to keep the original version from ver. 3.0.

   Current version:
   > Even in the case of this exception, visually confusable characters from different scripts will not be allowed in a single label unless such confusability is addressed by explicit rules.

   Original version:
   > Even in the case of this exception, visually confusable characters from different scripts will not be allowed to co-exist in a single set of permissible code points unless a corresponding policy and character table is clearly defined.

   It was suggested, as an example, that "o" and "0" are often considered confusable. In such cases, addressing the confusability may not be necessary, as long as the policy was available on

using them. Further, the language community may not consider certain cases confusable where other language communities may find such cases confusing.   Other WG members considered that both the current version of the text and the original version are not right. The current version is too strict whereas the older version does not require any measure beyond inclusion in the IDN table (or character table). It was suggested keeping the old version and then add some additional text, e.g. "The IDN policies are not intended or designed to eliminate all confusabilities. There are other dispute mechanisms, e.g. UDRP, that need to be in place for other types of confusabilities, including visual confusability." It may not be useful if community thinks that these guidelines can address all confusability.

It was also noted that the heading says "single IDN table", but he first sentence says "single label". So this needs to be streamlined.

Finally, it was discussed that this recommendation is talking about two separate items. First, comingling of code points from different scripts and when that should be possible. And, second, how to manage any confusability in case it occurs by mixing code points from different scripts in exceptional cases. It was suggested that these be split into separate recommendations – keeping the original version completely (for now) and adding a fourth recommendation in this section 2.7. This should talk about similar characters causing confusion between labels, regardless of whether they come from same or different script. WG members did not agree to the case of same script confusability, e.g. "1" and "l".

In summary, heading needs to change from "IDN table" to "label", second the "will" should be changed to "must" and the last sentence provisionally moved to a fourth section which would add more material pointing towards other mechanisms to handle similarity.

2. **Harmonization of variant rules across same-script IDN tables.**   It was explained that this is a new recommendation addressing variant rules two or more IDN language tables from same script should be same for each table. This is also applicable if a new IDN language table is introduced. It was discussed how to deal with this practically, i.e. if a registry introduces multiple IDN language tables for same script, how will the variant rules be determined, if each individual table does not have any variant rules? There does not seem to be a reference. For example, Kanji and Chinese. These should be transitive and symmetric. The WG generally agreed with this recommendation, though the WG agreed to continue the discussion from here next week.

3. **Next meeting.** The next meeting of the WG will be on 2 February, 2017.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	*Draft the additional fourth part of the recommendation by splitting the first recommendation on comingling cross-script code points on addressing similarity cases*	EC

2	*From 20170119 - Update recommendation on grandfathering current registrations based on the discussion*	KF