

IDN Implementation Guidelines (IDNG) Working Group (WG)

Notes from meeting on 31 August 2017

Meeting Attendees (in alphabetical order)

WG members:

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

Staff:

6. Pitinan Kooarmornpatana
7. Sarmad Hussain

Meeting Notes

The WG discussed the Initial Public Comment Response Report.

1. **CL1, CL2.** The WG discussed the comments and agreed on the proposed analysis.
2. **O-X1-O-X3.** The WG agreed with the summary and analysis. It was proposed to add 'should' to complete the last sentence of the O-X2 summary.
3. **IAB1-IAB5.** The WG discussed and generally agreed with the proposed text for summary and the analysis in the document. The additional editorial points include:
 - For IAB2, update the analysis statement to reiterate that it has been the intention of the WG to make a clear statement of compliance with IDNA2008.
 - It was noted that IAB5 refers to the RFC 5890, RFC 5891 and RFC 5894, which states that IDN2008 is a starting point, but expects registries to review and conduct additional analysis to finalize the IDN tables they implement, considering the code points to support and additional variant and label-level rules to implement.

The WG agreed to combine the response for IAB3 and IAB5 to say what is currently suggested only for IAB3.
4. **GoI1-GoI4.** It was discussed and agreed that there should be a separate analysis for the comments from the GoI1-GoI4 and then it should point to the analysis of O-X1 and O-X2.
5. **GoI5.** The WG agreed on the proposed analysis for GoI5.
6. **RySG1-RySG5.** The WG discussed and agreed on the proposed text for RySG1-RySG5.
7. **RySG6.** The WG discussed and reconfirmed its position that LGR format is significant for interoperability and usability. The WG suggested this be reflected at the end of first paragraph and delete the second paragraph as at this time there was no data to support what is being claimed in it.

- 8. Format of the document.** It was discussed to adjust the format of the document to have the analysis right after each comment summary to keep the flow easy for the readers. It also agreed to use the progressive tense in the document. Finally, it was suggested that if this interleaved format is possible, then it may be better to have forward pointers to sections, instead of backward pointers. The format for the response will be confirmed from the relevant team in ICANN organization.

Action Items

S. No.	Action Items	Owner
1	<i>Edit the analysis as discussed by the WG</i>	SH
2	<i>Review and edit RySG6 analysis at the end of paragraph1 in the context of interoperability and usability argument</i>	KF