Stakeholder Group / Constituency / Input Template

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group

Once you have filled in this template, please submit your repose at the latest **by 11 March 2014** to the GNSO Secretariat (gnso-secs@icann.org), which will forward your statement to the Working Group.

The GNSO Council has formed a PDP Working Group on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information; the relevant Issue Report can be found here. A more detailed background as well as the WG's Charter is available online.

Part of the Working Group's effort will be to incorporate ideas and suggestions gathered from Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies through this template statement. Inserting your response in this form will make it much easier for the Working Group to summarize the responses. This information is helpful to the community in understanding the points of view of various stakeholders. However, you should feel free to add any information you deem important to inform the Working Group's deliberations, even if this does not fit into any of the questions listed below.

For further information, please visit the Working Group's Wiki.

Process

-   Please identify the member(s) of your stakeholder group / constituency who is (are) participating in this working group:

    David Cake (Observer)

    Chris Dillon (WG Co-chair)

    Amr Elsadr

    Ephraim Percy Kenyanito

    Patrick Lenihan

    Anthony Oni

    Rudi Vansnick (WG Co-chair)

    Zang Zuan

- Please identify the members of your stakeholder group / constituency who participated in developing the perspective(s) set forth below:

  The statement was drafted by Amr Elsadr with additional comments included by Kathy Kleiman, and a revision by Avri Doria.

- Please describe the process by which your stakeholder group / constituency arrived at the perspective(s) set forth below:

  The statement was submitted to the NCSG-Discuss list and NCSG Policy Committee list, and received the necessary level of support to be granted NCSG endorsement.

Topics:

The WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation regarding the translation and transliteration of Contact Information. As part of its deliberations, the WG is expected to consider the topics listed below. Please provide your stakeholder group's / constituency's views on these topics (for further information on each of these topics, please see the WG Charter :

- **Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.**

Your view:

There is no justifiable reason to create a policy requiring translation and/or transliteration of contact information within the WHOIS/gTLD Registration Directory Services into a common language and/or script.

The Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD WG), in its final report, published some very substantive findings. Those included that it is both suitable to internationalize the data elements of domain name registration data (with the exception of the sponsoring registrar), and that it is suitable to introduce display specifications to address internationalized registration domain name registration data. These two functions would enable potential registrants whose native languages are not based on Latin script to register domain names (and internationalized domain names) using their native languages and script for registration data purposes. This option should be made available to registrants and should not affect the validation requirements of registrars as stipulated in the 2013 RAA.

There is, however, no basis for any assumption that those registrants will benefit whatsoever from translation of their contact information to a single language or transliteration of their

contact information to a single script. The parties that are most likely to benefit from translation and transliteration of contact information (also pointed out in the IRD WG's final report) are intellectual property rights holders and law enforcement agencies.

- **What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact information, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration?**

Your view:

We believe that the benefits of translating and/or transliterating contact information to the community will be limited to end users seeking the contact information of domain name registrants. As mentioned in the IRD WG's final report, those are most likely to be intellectual property rights holders and law enforcement agencies, specifically IPR holders and LEAs using the English language and Latin based scripts. Since they are the beneficiaries of this service, the burden should fall on them to translate and/or transliterate contact information, not domain name registrants, registrars or gTLD registries.

- **Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?**

Your view:

For the reasons stated above, we believe that translation and/or transliteration should NOT be mandatory for any gTLDs.

- **Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?**

Your view:

For the reasons stated above, we believe that translation and/or transliteration should NOT be mandatory for any registrants in any country.

- **What impact will translation/transliteration of contact information have on the WHOIS validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement?**

Your view:

In the event that mistakes are made, we foresee that translation and/or transliteration of contact information could possibly lead to problems in WHOIS validation. Validating contact information in the WHOIS database would likely be more successful and less burdensome if it was carried out in the original language/script provided by the domain name registrant.

- **When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?**

Your view:

We believe that there should be no policy requiring translation and/or transliteration of contact information. However, if this PDP WG should determine that it is desirable, the policy should not come into effect until the conclusion of the two post-Expert Working Group PDPs have been concluded (gTLD Registration Data Services EWG and Internationalized Registration Data Services EWG), and their recommendations are taken into consideration.

- **Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script? This question relates to the concern expressed by the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG) in its report that there are costs associated with providing translation and transliteration of contact information. For example, if a policy development process (PDP) determined that the registrar must translate or transliterate contact information, this policy would place a cost burden on the registrar.**

Your view:

The domain name registrant should be the only stakeholder making this decision. The registrant should decide if he/she/it (in case of an organization) will bear the cost of translating and/or transliterating the contact information associated with the registered domain name, or if this cost should be born by the end user of WHOIS lookup services. There should be no policy requiring a specific stakeholder to bear the costs, whether this be a registrant, registrar or registry. In the absence of such a policy, as is the opinion being expressed here, it would be the registrant's choice to submit contact information during domain name registration in the language and script of his/her/its choice. In the event that the contact information is submitted in a language and script requiring translation/transliteration, it is up to the end user of WHOIS lookup services to bear the associated costs.

- **Who does your SG/C believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set in the Initial Report on this issue?**

Your view:

As stated above, since the end user of WHOIS lookup services is the beneficiary of the service, the end user of WHOIS lookup services should bear this cost. This would become the de-facto rule if no policy requiring translation and/or transliteration of contact information be made. In any other scenario, the only purpose this policy will serve is to shift the transaction costs of

translation and/or transliteration from one stakeholder to another, and ultimately serve the end user and place a burden on registrants, registrars and gTLD registries.

Nb, If there is any other information you think should be considered by the WG as part of its deliberations, please feel free to include that here.

Other information:

We finally have the promise of IDNs coming to fruition, and hopefully many new Registrars coming online in Africa and other regions, which need them. To burden these new Registrars with additional cost (of translation or transliteration) seems not only burdensome and potentially quite destructive; but will also be anticompetitive - to burden Registrars working with IDNs with higher operating costs then English-oriented Registrars?