

# DRAFT: Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy

## Scope

This Policy applies to all ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registries.

## Effective Date

TBD

All provisions detailed herein are dependent on the availability of the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) as a production service in the gTLD space and corresponding Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) extensions to accommodate the exchange of transformed contact information and language tag data within RDAP. As of Q4 2017, RDAP is in a pilot phase until July 2018, and the EPP extensions required to implement this policy have not yet been defined.

Those provisions requiring an EPP extensions have been emphasized in the policy text below.

## Definitions

**RDDS** is the acronym for Registration Data Directory Service(s).

**Transliteration** refers to the process of conveying the meaning of some passage of text in one language, so that it can be expressed equivalently in another language.<sup>1</sup>

**Translation** refers to the process of representing the characters of an alphabetical or syllabic system of writing by the characters of a conversion alphabet.<sup>2</sup>

**Transformation** in the context of this policy refers to translation OR transliteration.

**Contact Information** is a subset of domain name registration data. It is the information that enables someone using a domain name registration data directory service (such as WHOIS) to contact the domain name registration holder. It includes the name, organization, and postal address of the registered name holder, as well as contact information for the technical and administrative entities associated with the domain name registration.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See the [Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Working Group's Final Report](#), p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

Specifically, “contact information” in the context of this policy refers to contact information contained within the “Registrant,” “Admin,” and “Tech” fields of an RDDS output.

“Contact information” thus includes the following fields:

- Registrant/Admin/Tech ID
- Registrant/Admin/Tech Name
- Registrant/Admin/Tech Organization
- Registrant/Admin/Tech Street
- Registrant/Admin/Tech City
- Registrant/Admin/Tech State/Province
- Registrant/Admin/Tech Postal Code
- Registrant/Admin/Tech Country
- Registrant/Admin/Tech Phone
- Registrant/Admin/Tech Fax
- Registrant/Admin/Tech E-mail

Not all of these contact information fields are amenable to transformations. Refer to [Section 4](#) for the model detailing which fields can be transformed (indicated by a requirement for a language tag).

## Policy Requirements

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119, which is available at <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt>.

1. The following provisions apply to both gTLD Registries and ICANN-accredited Registrars:

1.1 It is OPTIONAL for registries and registrars to perform transformations of contact information in RDDS data fields.

1.2 It is OPTIONAL for registries and registrars to display transformations of contact information in RDDS data fields.

1.3 If a transformation of contact information is performed, each of the original and transformed contact data elements MUST be accompanied by a language tag per the requirements set out in [Section 3](#) and according to the data model provided in [Section 4](#).

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

1.4 Registries and registrars MAY support any language and script for registrants to input registration data. All data input MUST conform to standards in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), Registry Agreement (RA), relevant Consensus Policy, Additional WHOIS Information Policy (AWIP) and any other applicable policies.

1.5 Registrars who opt to gather language and script data from registrants with the intention to exchange transformed contact information and language tag data within RDAP SHOULD reach an agreement with relevant registry operators to populate and validate the underlying data for language tags in accordance with the provisions outlined in [Section 3](#) and those Policies and Agreements referenced in [Provision 1.4](#).

1.6 Registrars who opt to gather language and script data from registrants with the intention to exchange transformed contact information and language tag data within RDAP MUST validate and verify original and transformed registration data for correct format and accuracy in accordance with the Policies and Agreements referenced in [Provision 1.4](#) (see [Provision 3.4](#) on script validation).

1.7 Registries who have reached an agreement with any registrar(s) to exchange transformed contact information and language tag data within RDAP in accordance with [Provision 1.5](#) MUST validate original and transformed contact information for correct syntax in accordance with the Policies and Agreements referenced in [Provision 1.4](#) (see [Provision 3.4](#) on script validation).

1.8 **[EPP extension required]** If a registrar opts to gather language and script data from a registrant with the intention to exchange that data with a registry or registries in order to populate the underlying data for a language tag within RDAP, and has reached an agreement with a registry or registries to exchange that data in accordance with [Provision 1.5](#), then the registrar MUST provide the registry or registries with the language and script data for each data field requiring a language tag according to the data model provided in [Section 4](#).

1.9 If multiple transformations are performed, each version of the transformed data must include language tags in accordance with the data model provided in [Section 4](#).

1.10 Any script entered into an RDDS MUST be supported by the latest version of Unicode (see [Provision 3.4](#) on script validation) so that registries and registrars MAY use automated means to identify the entered script.

2. The following provisions apply to Registrars only:

2.1 Registrars MAY allow registrants to provide language data for the registration data elements requiring a language tag in the data model provided in [Section 4](#).

2.2 Registrars MAY allow — but MUST NOT require — registrants to provide transformations of registration data elements requiring a language tag in the data model provided in [Section 4](#).

3. Requirements for language tags within the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) (for those parties opting to exchange transformed contact information and language tag data):

3.1 **[EPP extension required]** If a transformation of contact information is performed, an RFC 5646-compliant language tag MUST be provided with the original contact information fields provided by the registrant and the transformed fields according to the data model provided in [Section 4](#).

3.2 **[EPP extension required]** An RFC 6497-compliant language tag MUST be provided with all transformed data fields to indicate:

1. that a transformation has been made.
2. the transliteration standard that was used in cases of transliteration.
3. the source of the transformation, the values for which are limited to: “registrant”, “registrar”, “registry”, “reseller”, or “other”.

3.3 Language tags for each data element requiring them per the data model in [Section 4](#) MUST contain at least the primary language and script subtags per RFC 5646.

3.4 A script subtag MUST be valid for all Unicode code points detected by automated means (see [Provision 1.10](#)). Registries MUST validate that the Unicode code points in the entered data match with the corresponding script subtag, provided they have reached an agreement with a given registrar(s) to process language tag information in accordance with [Provision 1.5](#).

3.5 If the language is not known, the primary language subtag "und" MUST be used in the language tag.

3.6 If the script cannot be determined (e.g., in cases of mixed scripts that do not conform to mixed-script usage within a language) the script subtag "Zyyy" MUST be used in the language tag.

3.7 Private use language tags as described in [RFC 5646, Section 2.2.7](#) MUST NOT be used to generate language tags.

#### 4. Data Model for RFC 5646- and 6497-Compliant Language Tagging for Original and Transformed RDDS Outputs<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> This data model is derived from the one included in the [Internationalized Registration Data Working Group's Final Report](#), and has been incorporated into the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information implementation per [Board Resolution 2016.03.10.07](#): “Resolved (2016.03.10.07), the

NB: The table below is to be utilized by those parties who opt to exchange transformed contact information and language tag data within RDAP. Language tags need to be present with the data fields indicated below.

Data Element	Format	Min length	Max length	Cardinality	RFC 5646 and 6497 Language Tag Requirements
Registrant/Admin/Tech ID	Freeform text	1	255	1	n/a
Registrant/Admin/Tech Name	Freeform text	1	255	{0,1}	<b>required</b>
Registrant/Admin/Tech Organization	Freeform text	1	255	{0,1}	<b>required</b>
Registrant/Admin/Tech Street	Freeform text in a language or script appropriate for its region.	1	255	{1,3}	<b>required</b>
Registrant/Admin/Tech City	Freeform text in a language or script appropriate for its region	1	255	1	<b>required</b>
Registrant/Admin/Tech State / Province	Freeform text in a language or script appropriate for its region.	1	255	{0,1}	<b>required</b>
Registrant/Admin/Tech Country / Territory	ISO 3166 part 2 code list	2	3	1	n/a
Registrant/Admin/Tech Postal Code	Freeform text	1	255	{0,1}	n/a
Registrant/Admin/Tech Phone	RFC 5733		64	1	n/a

---

President and CEO, or his designee(s), is directed to work with the implementation review team for the new consensus policy on translation and transliteration to consider the IRD Working Group's data model and requirements and incorporate them, where appropriate, to the extent that the IRD's recommendations are consistent with, and facilitate the implementation of the new consensus policy on translation and transliteration.”

Registrant/Admin/Tech Phone Ext	RFC 5733		64	{0,1}	n/a
Registrant/Admin/Tech Fax	RFC 5733		64	{0,1}	n/a
Registrant/Admin/Tech Fax Ext	RFC 5733		64	{0,1}	n/a
Registrant/Admin/Tech Email	RFC 5322 / 6532		255	1	n/a