Internationalized Registration Data Working Group

Meeting Notes

29 March 2010

Attendees: Edmon Chung, Co-Chair, Ram Mohan, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Bob Hutchinson, Andrei Kolesnikov, and Owen Smigelski; from staff: Dave Piscitello, Julie Hedlund, and Steve Sheng.

Action Items: Based on the working group members' comment as well as the comment received in the email list, the staff will revise the matrix, and send an updated matrix for further review.

Discussion Summary:

Steve Sheng first briefed the WG on the draft matrix that the staff has compiled. The draft matrix identifies three different models for registration data and the impact of each model on potential stakeholders.

The WG member discussed the matrix and the three models:

- Some WG members suggested adding a separate category called "impact to the WHOIS system itself", essentially focusing on the technical impact of each of these models. Others suggested adding a category on the impact to the application that uses Whois (Port 43 client, Web browsers).

- WG members also pointed out that the reference to cost in the model needed to be more precise. Some WG member further noted out that any technical development of the system is much cheaper than any organizational cost such as translation of manual procedures or, finding the person who understands the language, etc.

- Some WG members raised the issue of whether to consider internationalizing registration "statuses"? Such a change would pose implementation challenges at least from a gTLD perspective.

The WG also deliberated on the three models:

On Model 1:

- Many WG members felt both Model 1 and Model 2 are feasible.

- Some WG members felt that option 1 is the one that seems to have the least amount of impact potentially to registrars and registries. But in so doing it may also have the least amount of use because local language display is purely optional. So Model 1 seems to be the least common denominator option.

On Model 2:

- Many WG members felt Model 2 is feasible as well.

- Some WG members asked whether model 2 could cause increased inaccuracy since registries may opt not to do any validation of data or even of the scripts of the languages coming in. They may decide to accept whatever the registrar provides. For example, if the data make no sense – such as Cyrillic combined with Chinese combined with Hindi – they may simply take it as is without validation.

On Model 3:

- Many WG members raised the concern that Model 3 will be costly to registrars, that the service fee for translation in many countries is very expensive, sometimes higher than the price of the domain name.

- Also some WG members felt that Model 3 effectively describes 'added value,' but the focus of the WG should be on baseline behavior.

- Some WG members noted that the matrix should make the distinction between translation and transliteration. In particular, in the case of different scripts there will be a need for both. One WG member noted that transliteration could be automated and that many countries have standards for transliteration.

- Another WG member noted that the issue of whether to require translation and/or transliteration relates to the issue of "intended use" and should be discussed further on the next call. It may be advisable to avoid any recommendations concerning translation/transliteration and leave it up to the registrar.