

---

HYDERABAD – Internationalized Domain Name Implementation Guidelines Working Group Meeting  
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 11:00 to 12:15 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...and technical, but maybe not unimportant point of feedback. It's very nice to see that RC 7940, as young as it is, has already been made part of this guidelines, but there is an important issue in 7940, in that the repertoire may consist of either code points, or sequences of code points, and it may be, in fact, that labels contain code points that do not show up by themselves in the repertoire, that only as members of certain predefined sequences.

The way you have worded your recommendation, would make those code points ineligible to be in the LGRs, which is completely contrary to the way RC 7940 works. To explain that a little bit, sometimes certain marks like [inaudible], you may want to limit to occur only on top of certain characters.

And then you would define those permitted sequences explicitly, so that the code point for the [inaudible] mark only shows up as part of the sequences. So it cannot ever occur in any other context, but as a consequence, it does not individual listed as member of the repertoire. And the way you have phrased your sections, I think seven and eight, or six and seven, only referring

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

to the term code point, you must say, code point or code point sequence, in all instances.

It's a minor thing, but you would literally outlaw some of the LGRs we're developing for the root currently.

EDMOND:

Edmond here. Thank you for that feedback. In fact, I don't think it's a minor thing. It's something that I think the, during our deliberations, we talked about whether to use code point or character or, you know, how to specifically say that. So thank you for the input.

So, I think updating it to code point, or code point sequences, is going to help address that issue. Is that the...?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Right. That's what, that would be the correct answer. And, another area of your draft that would be worse, potentially harmonizing with 7940 is, 7940 contains a number of default pre-defined dispositions for labels, that have a particular value, and it might be useful for you to extract those, and comment on whether they're applicable in your situation, or whether there are some that are never applicable, just to help clarify for the users.

---

[Inaudible] blocked and [inaudible] you have, that's in both, but RFC 7940 does not have activated, because it's not needed at that level. It has some other ones, and if they're not needed, it would be nice to call it out explicitly.

EDMOND:

Thank you. Edmond here again. That is actually exactly the point where we are, our discussions are at, at this point. And in the... And it's related a little bit to the terminology discussion. In the ICANN speak, if I may try to use that, it has traditionally been that allocation versus delegation. Allocation is allocating to the particular registrant or applicant, and delegation is delegating into the root or into the DNS.

And with the LGR, allocate, blocked, and then activation, we are trying to harmonize a little bit the terminology, and to move forward as well. So you see that, I think it's point 12? Point four is the...

Point five is the terminology, but I wanted to go to point 12, I think. Yeah. So, point 12 is largely empty at this point, and those, what is coming up is going to talk about activation. We are not at a point to, where we've confirmed the terminology yet, but if there is feedback on where to draw that terminology, it would be useful.

Understanding the activated or delegated or, you know, certain terms that have been used before.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And there is nothing wrong with, for instance, the term delegated, because the LGR describes very succinctly, and mechanically, a process for failures of the application process. But it does not describe the entire application process. And in terms of your implementation guidelines, you could tease out those differences, that the LGR basically, you give it a label, you crank the handle, out comes a disposition value.

Those set of disposition [inaudible] are intermediate in the process. And just like allocation happens before delegation. So allocateable [sic] means it is something that can be allocated, but the act of allocation really happens outside of the LGR. It is fed by that LGR process, you can't get a handle on it based on the machine readable definition of the rule set.

And if you tease that out in your guidelines, I think that will make things much clearer for people, where things fit. And then, you have a place where you can speak about those different labels. They are statuses that exist as a result post-LGR processing, and there are statuses that exist at the end of the process, or certain other intermediate stages in the application delegation process.

---

That will help your terminology be clearer.

EDMOND: Thank you for the feedback. I think that's very useful feedback. In fact, this... Part of the ambition of this document, at least my ambition for this document, is to make better clarification on those issues. The allocateable [sic] to allocating, allocated, and then delegation, activation, and delegated. Okay?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Write it down. [LAUGHTER]

EDMOND: Part of the ambition is trying to lay that out and clarify that. We will try.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And it goes the other direction as well, because one of the issues we had in drafting RFC 7940 was that we have yet another level that is internal to the LGR process, which is the, not a status value, but the type value for the different code point variant relationships, which are feeding into the rule set, out of which you get a disposition for the variant labels.

---

And that distinction caused a lot of headaches, and we worked really hard to try and make that stick. So, if you can carry that work forward on the next level, that would be really appreciated.

EDMOND:

Thank you. Edmond here again. Yeah, so that is precisely the part where we're actively talking about in terms of the difference of the code point, or code point sequences, in the LGR. And the variant, I guess, IDN variant of that, and then the IDN variant label. You know, the label it generates. And distinguishing between them as we...

And the terminology for distinguishing between them to be consistent so that in the, you know, as we move forward, it's could be described in ways that are accurate, and people can have a common understanding of it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Right. So it strikes me that for the purposes of your implementation guidelines, that you may want to investigate whether it's useful to treat the entire label generation rule set definition, as well as the mechanical evaluation of those label generation rule sets, as a black box for the purpose of the larger application and delegation process. So that you are, that you can...

---

For some part of your discussion, treat that as a fixed unit, that you give labels, you have a specification of the LGR in one hand, and a label on the other hand, and they get fed into the black box, and out comes a series of variant labels with disposition values.

And if you explain that concept very clearly, then you can get in some other part of your guidelines, if necessary, talk about useful steps that people can take to align the LGRs with each other. As opposed to aligning, you know, the rest of the process with each other.

EDMOND:

Thank you. Edmond again. So, I'm looking to [inaudible], and part of the discussion was actually, a lot of what you mentioned may be fleshed out in the terminology and the definition section, which we are, right now, starting to try to draft. And one of my personal suggestions was to define IDN variant to basically be the...

IDN variant label, I should say, IDN variant label to be what is, what comes out of the LGR, or the IDN table, versus the more loose term of variant, which we have used in the past. Sorry for the use of that term again, but varying degrees, different things are being called variants at this point, but part of the ambition is trying to say that, you know, every time we called IDN variant,

it's actually talking about, you know, referring to LGR, or a language table, and what comes out of, you know, that magic, or black box.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. So you run into this issue, which is a longstanding and well known issue, that the word variant wants to be used in [inaudible] phrase. So, you have to put it into a [inaudible], into a non-phrase, was another thing. It's a variant label, variant co-point, variant sequence, whatever happens to be what you're talking about. So the word variant by itself, unless you understand that second part out of a very clear context, is highly confusing and should be avoided at all costs.

And I was looking at your terminology section, and I was not seeing that warning.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, this is [inaudible]. So, currently the terminology is not developed. What we're doing is we're just making a note of all of the different terms which are being used in the, within the guidelines, and probably related to, in the related work, and we're doing a list. So we've actually, at this point, we're just drawing a list. Once we have a larger list, then obviously, the

---

working group will go back to it and see what eventually to include, and how to define it.

And I think it's very useful that you point out that some of those definitions, for example, do exist in 7940. And so, the current list is tentative, that is not something that is finalized, and that is something which we are working on. And I think that would be great if you can give feedback into how to complete that list, and populate those definitions. Thank you.

EDMOND:

So, I notice there is a comment, I'll go back to that. Edmond here again. So on [inaudible]'s point, actually the internal drafts have that specific item, which is saying, at least I'm pushing for that, which will say, variant is very confusing and should be avoided, it could mean various things. So, going forward, it should be IDN variant something.

And that whole term should be used even though it's longer, it's more cumbersome, but for official documents, or for documents that we need common understanding on, the longer form is important, because variant, just that word, out of context, is I find, very confusing, many times.

Sometimes it's refer to things like confuse ability, or string confusion, or plurals even, you know, as variants. Then that

---

confuses that matter, and part of the ambition for this document is to hopefully try to clarify. I'm not sure we will be successful, but at least I'm attempting exactly the direction that [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm looking forward to your next draft that addresses those, then we can see what we can give you as further feedback.

EDMOND: So, the comment from online, or the question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. We have a comment from Matt [inaudible] of ISS. This is in reference to Patrik's comment. He says, "The target of the guidelines has been second level. Should it include the aspects of the root zone?"

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Patrik Fältström here. It doesn't have to, but just that when you are coming up with something that you think should be applied to the root zone more specifically, because you might have a may or a should, when you talk about different zones, but they don't have to be equal or whatever, but when you talk about only one zone, there must be a must.

And then for example, it might be different on the, in the root or the second level, or it might be the case that it is a must to come up with some rules for one zone, regardless of whether it is a second level or the root, but there is not a must when you talk about the same rules for two different zones, two different TLDs.

EDMOND:

Thank you Patrik. Edmond here. And on that particular point, and that's the point where I wanted to turn to [inaudible], not putting it on the table. But yes, just following what Matt said, the original discussion, this is really focused on second level registration, but as we... And I think what Patrik point out, is both that, you know, since we are talking about this, and if there are certain pointers that we can provide, it may be useful.

On the other hand, because this document, in fact, may have some implications on how new gTLD applicants or, you know, the new gTLD program, because even the applicant guidebook refers to this particular document, we might want to think about, you know, an appendix of sort to clarify these issues, to avoid the confusion that what is said here is just, you know, applicable to the zone, or we create the disclaimer at the very beginning that says, this is not pertaining the root zone.

I don't know, Matt or [inaudible], you have any thoughts on that particular point.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] here. If I may suggest, Patrik, I think mentioned this already implicitly. But for instance, inside the single zone, you might have a number of LGRs for different scripts or different languages, or different user communities within the overlapping repertoire of some kind, and as in this case with the root specifically, you may want to think through whether there is a requirement, for instance, that the definition of a variant co-point is unique and shared across all LGRs within a single zone.

Not across different TLDs, but within a single TLD. And that is the kind of thing, I think, Patrik was thinking about. And the... For something that is root specific, for instance, is in the root, we are adopting restrictions that we only allowing one LGR per script, whereas for, that's a restriction that's not envisioned for the second level, where there can be language based LGRs.

And so that might be a difference, if your document only talks about the second level, I want to second Patrik's comment, that in the footnote, you might explain how the second level is different from, for example, the root. Or how it is different when you're looking at two LGRs that are in the same zone. Those are really important.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, so from what I'm understanding, you're suggesting that we clarify how a particular point may be different at second level, from the root zone, in order to actually clarify the second level handling of that issue. Not specifically to actually, in a way, address it should be handled at the root level.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's one item, and the other item is, not forget, if you have two LGRs that are in the same zone, even if it's in the second level, they may have some harmonization requirements that are not really optional for a workable and secure system, which is different from parallel TLDs, and you may want to tease that apart in your...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. So that is something which was raised in one of the working group meetings. Those are the pending things in IDN really labels discussion, which we have not got to yet. But yes, that precisely actually was raised in one of the meetings.

EDMOND: So I understand that Matt has a comment.

---

MATT: Yes. I think we could include aspects of the root zone, if the community and other stakeholders think so. We just have to make the decision. I think it is a good suggestion that we add in the document, add in the document, the limitations.

EDMOND: Thank you. Trying to look around the room and see if there is any... [Inaudible]

HIRO: Yes, thank you. I'm Hiro [inaudible] registry of dot JPA ccTLD and dot [inaudible] ccTLD as well. So, for example, seeing point nine, yes. This may not be a right question cast to this working group, but the points explained here, have a couple of should clauses, and there seems to be no clear, concrete criteria for being secure or stable.

Then my question is, who, through what kind of process using these guidelines, will authorize the LTR of each registry?

EDMOND: Thank you Hiro. Edmond here. That is... Well, we are, that is precisely why it is a little bit fake, because the document is trying to straddle both ccTLDs and gTLDs. For gTLDs it's more specific, for gTLDs there would be, what is called [R SEP?], the

---

registry service evaluation process, which triggers a R step, registry service technical evaluation process.

That would be, I think, the mechanism for authorizing...

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Okay. So for gTLD, that's very specific. For ccTLD, it's that the reason why it's left [inaudible]. We might need to message the, with the feedback, we might need to massage the word authorized as well, which is a good point.

But in terms of the definition of the security and stability, there is some definition in the document, pertaining this specifically, and what does it mean by opposing that? And I think I will leave to [inaudible] to add to that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Right. So, unfortunately because of the, I guess, we need to make the presentation a bit concise, but if you go back and look at the document itself, we are actually bringing in the definition. We have actually stated the definition of security and stability, as has been defined through the gTLD processes, because so, for the context of gTLDs, of course. For the context of ccTLDs, obviously, there is no authorization process.

---

That these are just recommendations where gTLDs can themselves, sorry, ccTLDs can themselves consider adopting. There is no requirement. So, that aspect has obviously left out, or focused just from the gTLD perspective. However, if you have any suggestions from a cc context, I think that would be very welcomed as well.

EDMOND: Thank you. Trying to look around the room and behind me. And online.

In that case, it seems like we can end, wrap this up early. Any other burning questions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, thank you all for attending. There is a document online. There is a link on the last slide to that Wiki page which hosts not only the document, but also there are meeting recording and meeting notes from all of the meetings which the working group has held. So please, feel free to go and look at that document, and other materials available on this Wiki page from the working group.

We would really welcome your input into the process, so that we can make these guidelines usable for the entire community. And

---

thank you for attending this session. We'll just close this session now, thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**