



Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information IRT Call 6

15 December 2016

Agenda

- ⦿ Review of Hyderabad meeting
- ⦿ Policy language discussion
- ⦿ Questions and AOB

Review of Hyderabad Meeting

- ◉ Discussed overall project and plan
- ◉ Discussed latest status of RDAP
- ◉ Reviewed policy language with focus on language and script tags

Basic Tasks:

- ◉ To identify whether the proposed policy provisions align with the T/T Policy Recommendations
- ◉ To identify any specific issues related to a particular policy provision
- ◉ * indicates updated Provision or issue for discussion

Policy Language: Provisions 1.1 – 1.3 on Language Tags

1.1 *

The RDAP service MUST provide language tags as defined in RFC5646 for the *adr*, *fn*, and *org* members of an *entity* object.

1.2 *

The RDAP service MUST provide language tags as defined in RFC5646 for the label that is being registered by the registrant.

* Previously: “The RDAP service MUST provide language tags as defined in RFC5646 for the leftmost DNS label of the domain name computed in A-label form in the case of IDNs.”

1.3 *

The language tags MUST contain at least the primary language and script subtags .

* Update on 1.1 – 1.3 re: provisioning of data for language tags:

Added Provision 1.13 to requirements applying only to registrars: “1.13: Registrars MUST provide language data to registries to populate language tags in RDS outputs for the *adr*, *fn*, and *org* members of every *entity* object as well as for the label that is being registered by the registrant (see Provisions 1.1 and 1.2). Registrars MAY gather language data from registrants in a manner of their choosing.”

Policy Language: Provisions 1.3 – 1.4 on Script Tags

1.3

The language tags MUST contain at least the primary language and script subtags.

1.4 *

If the language is not known, the primary language subtag "und" MUST be used in the language tag. If the script cannot be determined, or in case of mixed scripts, the script subtag "Zyyy" MUST be used in the language tag. This provision applies only to registrations made before the effective date of this policy.

* Integrated into one provision and added third sentence. See question 2a on following slide.

Policy Language: Questions on Script Tags

Questions for IRT:

- 1) Recommendation 2 “allows for easy identification of...what language(s)/script(s) have been used by the registered name holder”. What is meant by “language(s) **[slash]** script(s)”?
 - a. Language OR script?
 - b. Language AND script?

- 2) How do we identify script?
 - a. Rely on the Unicode properties of the code points (automated process)? *
 - b. Require registrants to provide script data for a subtag?

* See sentence 2 of Provision 1.4 on previous slide.

Policy Language: Provisions 1.5 – 1.6 and IRT Question

1.5

Registries and Registrars MAY generate transformations (e.g., transliteration or translation) of contact information.

1.6 *

If transformations of contact information are known, the transformations and the original data MUST be available in the RDAP service.

* Changed from “shown” to “available” in second part of Provision 1.6

* Question for IRT: Should the policy allow for multiple transformations or only one?

Policy Language: Provisions 1.7 – 1.10

1.7

The language tag used for transformations of contact information MUST define the type of transformation per RFC6497, and in case of transliteration the standard that was used.

1.8

The language tags used in transformations of contact information MUST be specified as defined in RFC6497. Additionally, the source of the transformation (i.e. Registrant, Reseller, Registrar or Registry) MUST be included when displaying transformation of contact information.

1.9 *

Registries and Registrars MUST NOT require other parties to provide transformation of contact information elements described in section 1.1.

* IRT began discussion on this provision during ICANN57 session.

1.10

Registries and Registrars MAY support any language and/or script of their choice to input contact information elements described in section 1.1.

Policy Language: 1.11 – 1.13 Applies to Registrars Only

1.11

Registrars MAY allow registrants to provide language tags for the data elements described in section 1.1 and 1.2.

1.12

Registrars MAY allow registrants to provide transformation of contact information elements described in section 1.1.

1.13 *

Registrars MUST provide language data to registries to populate language tags in RDS outputs for the *adr*, *fn*, and *org* members of every *entity* object as well as for the label that is being registered by the registrant (see provisions 1.1 and 1.2). Registrars MAY gather language data from registrants in a manner of their choosing.

* Added to provide for provisioning of language data

Questions? AOB?



Reach me at:

brian.aitchison@icann.org



twitter.com/icann



[gplus.to/icann](https://plus.google.com/icann)



facebook.com/icannorg



weibo.com/ICANNorg



linkedin.com/company/icann



flickr.com/photos/icann



youtube.com/user/icannnews



slideshare.net/icannpresentations

Reference: T/T Recommendations

1. It is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory. Any parties requiring transformation are free to do so on an ad hoc basis outside WHOIS or any replacement system, such as the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP). If not undertaken voluntarily by registrar/registry (see Recommendation #5), the burden of transformation lies with the requesting party.
2. Whilst noting that a WHOIS replacement system should be capable of receiving input in the form of non-ASCII script contact information, its data fields should be stored and displayed in a way that allows for easy identification of what the different data entries represent and what language(s)/script(s) have been used by the registered name holder.
3. 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.
4. Regardless of the language(s)/script(s) used, it is assured that the data fields are consistent to standards in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), relevant Consensus Policy, Additional WHOIS Information Policy (AWIP) and any other applicable policies. Entered contact information data are validated, in accordance with the aforementioned Policies and Agreements and the language/script used must be easily identifiable.
5. If the transformation of contact information is performed, and if the WHOIS replacement system is capable of displaying more than one data set per registered name holder entry, these data should be presented as: additional fields (in addition to the authoritative local script fields provided by the registrant) and that these fields be marked as transformed and their source(s) indicated.
6. Any WHOIS replacement system, for example RDAP, should remain flexible so that contact information in new scripts/languages can be added and expand its linguistic/script capacity for receiving, storing and displaying contact information data.
7. These recommendations should be coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary and are implemented and/or applied as soon as a WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters, becomes operational.