

T/T Implementation Questions
For Consideration by the T/T IRT
June 2017

The following list contains a set of questions aimed at 1) evaluating the merits of requesting GNSO input on the T/T implementation and 2) soliciting input from the GNSO on the specific issues the IRT has encountered while proceeding with the implementation.

These questions apply to the specific recommendations noted below, and also to the totality of recommendations contained within the T/T Working Group Final Report and the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Final Report.

Presuming the IRT desires GNSO input, these questions will be added to a letter to the Council to solicit that input following consultation and review with the IRT.

General Questions for IRT

1. Should we refer the implementation-specific questions below to the GNSO Council? Can they be resolved within the IRT?

Potential Implementation-Specific Questions for the GNSO Council

On Tagging and “Easy Identification” of Languages/Scripts:

1. Recommendation 2 states that a “WHOIS replacement system” should contain data fields that “allow for easy identification...of what languages/scripts have been used by the registered name holder.” What does “easy identification” mean? Does this imply that *all* registration data must be tagged with a language/script tag following the adoption of the policy (see questions 1a, 1b, and 1c below)?
 - a. The IRD WG—a Non-Consensus Policy Working Group—recommended that “*Unless explicitly stated otherwise, all data elements should be tagged with the language(s) and script(s) in use, and this information **should** always be available with the data element*”. Does use of “should” instead of “must” in this recommendation indicate that tagging data elements with the language(s) and script(s) in use is not an absolute requirement? Under what

T/T Implementation Questions
For Consideration by the T/T IRT
June 2017

circumstances did the IRD WG envision that it may be necessary or desirable to explicitly state otherwise?

- b. If the IRD WG recommendation for tagging data elements with language(s) and script(s) was indeed conditional, was this something considered by the T/T PDP WG while developing recommendations requiring easy identification of language(s)/script(s) used by domain name holders?
 - c. Several Recommendations mention the identification of “language(s)/script(s).” What does the “slash” mean? Languages *and* scripts? Languages *or* scripts? Languages *and/or* scripts? Determining the meaning of the “slash” has significant impact on the scope and complexity of obligations needed to implement the policy.
2. Should answers to the questions elucidated above be determined by the Implementation Review Team?

General Implementation Coordination Questions:

3. T/T Recommendation #7 states: “These recommendations should be coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary and [be] implemented and/or applied as soon as a WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters, becomes operational.” Does this imply that implementation of the T/T Recommendations is dependent on the implementation of RDAP as a “WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters”? Does this imply that the implementation of the T/T Recommendations should be coordinated with the Next Generation Registration Directory Service PDP? Specifically, with which “WHOIS modification” efforts should the T/T implementation coordinate and should the T/T implementation be dependent on coordination with these other efforts?
4. Recommendation 3 has been uncontested within the IRT (“The language(s) and script(s) supported for registrants to submit their contact information data may be chosen in accordance with gTLD-provider business models”). The IRT has noted that,

T/T Implementation Questions
For Consideration by the T/T IRT
June 2017

in practice, a number of contracted parties are under the impression that RDS contact information can only be provided in ASCII. Can or should this Recommendation proceed independently of the others to establish a policy around this practice while the Implementation Review Team awaits resolution of the other issues detailed in these questions?

5. Should answers to the questions elucidated above be determined by the Implementation Review Team?