

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

### **Notes from Meeting on 29 June, 2017**

#### Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

1. Edmon Chung
2. Mats Dufberg
3. Kal Feher
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. **Comment RySG6.** The WG discussed and decided to review all feedback from RySG before writing to RySG on comments 6.1-6.4, based on the action item from the previous meeting of the IDNGWG.
2. **Comment RySG7.** The WG noted that the RFCs do not provide sufficient advice and there is need for additional suggestions for developing the LGRs, which is the motivation behind the reference second level LGRs. The definition of stability was discussed, raising that the “standards” body may be too broad, and RySG is suggesting limiting that to IETF. However, it was noted that the second (B) part of the definition is even broader. WG agreed that in the past IAB, Unicode and SSAC have made relevant comments on security and stability, even though not all these become standards. Therefore, just focusing on IETF may make it too narrow. It was suggested to move the definitions of security and stability to the glossary.

It was discussed how such advice and definitions may be incorporated by the contracted parties, as this has compliance implications, and that the guidelines should be crafted to manage this. However, it was also raised that these definitions of security and stability are already applicable on contracted parties, through the RSEP, when an IDN table is added by a registry. It was also discussed that these definitions may be taken out, by deleting the footnotes – however, such lack of definition may make these terms even broader. The WG also considered the possibility that the definition of security and stability should be inherited from the contract for the contracted parties, and should not be defined in the guidelines.

The WG did not come to a consensus. It was agreed that the footnotes will be removed and the definitions should be moved to the terminology. And the WG can come back and review it further.

3. **Comment RySG8.** The WG considered that registrant may go to different registrar and thus this term can be confusing. Other issue could be how to define “same”, i.e. is it based on email

address, or some other contact information. Is the registrant apparently the same or actually the same? So a solution would be to tie it to the original registration. The WG also noted that RySG may not be asking for a definition in the comment but perhaps asking that this be posted as part of the registry policy. It was also discussed whether implementation details should be included – how same registrant is managed by the registry.

It was agreed to update the text from “same registrant” to “same registrant of the primary IDN label”.

- 4. Comment RySG9.** WG agreed with the comment. It was suggested to include it as a separate part of the recommendation. However, it was not clear if the comment refers to recommendation 12 or 13 (as it uses the reference to “activation” which is discussed in recommendation 13). The discussion did not complete and will continue next time.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
	<i>None</i>	