

## Internationalized Registration Data Working Group

### Meeting Notes

12 April 2010

**Attendees:** Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Bob Hutchinson, Andrei Kolesnikov, and Steve Metalitz; from staff: Dave Piscitello and Julie Hedlund.

**Action Items:** Based on the working group members' comments the staff will revise the matrix and send an updated matrix for further review.

#### Discussion Summary:

The WG members discussed the revised matrix. Initial discussion focused on a new section, impact to users of Whois (lines 15 through 19 in the matrix). WG members noted that in columns B through D the word "language" should be replaced by the word "script." They also suggested changing the description in line 16 to be: "ASCII-only capable user" and in line 15 to be "IRD-only user." With this change they agreed that lines 17 and 18 could be deleted. The reasoning for the change is that there is no need for a distinction as to where the user is located (that is, local or non-local), but instead users should be identified as to whether they were ASCII-only capable or IRD-only capable, which would not be dependant on the location of the user. WG members also noted that columns 15B and C are incorrect in that in not every case would there be enhanced usability. WG members suggested changing the wording in both to, "may be enhanced usability..." With respect to the description for Model 3, WG members also agreed that the description could be changed to read, "Registrants provide their registration data in a script that can be accepted by the registrar, and registrar provides **tools to assist the registrant** in providing for transliteration service and publish it in a "must be present" language in Whois." [addition in boldface] WG members also noted that to be consistent with the use of "script" as opposed to "language" the description in line 13 column B should read, "Some barrier of entry for registrants, as they have to know or find someone to **transliterate the script** for them." [addition in boldface]

WG members continued with a discussion of the new columns 22-24, the technical impact to applications. One WG member asked why there would be no impact under Model 3. Staff noted that it depends on whether the transliteration is on the fly or stored, but agreed that there may be some impact for some clients (for example, those that cannot process ASCII 7) and that the description in column 22D should be changed to "not sure." WG members agreed that this change also should apply to 23 and 24D.

Finally, the WG members discussed the issue of whether translation in addition to transliteration should be required. WG members agreed that translation could be very expensive and would present a high barrier to entry and, thus, that it should not be a requirement in Model 3. However, they noted that transliteration, although not all countries have standards, is feasible and should be retained as a requirement in Model 3. Staff noted that the WG should consider how transliteration will be automated over time. In particular, that transliteration is a smaller problem than general web pages since we are primarily talking about contact information not every word in every language.