Agenda

- ◉ Review questions from previous call

- ◉ Discuss Internationalized Registration Data Final Report

- ◉ Review T/T policy language V1

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

- ◉ Questions and AOB

Questions from previous call

- Q: Is this implementation mandatory? [see Rec. 1]
- A: Yes. While *translation and transliteration* are not mandatory, registrant contact information must "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" (Rec. 2). In short, translation and translation are not mandatory, but those who wish to carry out T/T must have the foundational language/script data to enable translation and/or transliteration.

- Q: Are language/script tags validated/verified the correct language/script? [e.g. Can a registrant enter data in Cyrillic script, and the language tag output read as Latin script?] – in progress
- A: From Rec 4: "Entered contact information data are validated, in accordance with the aforementioned Policies and Agreements and the language/script used must be easily identifiable." Per RAA, (see WHOIS Accuracy Specifications, Sec. 1), data must appear in correct format, although it does not need to be verified as "correct" (Toby Test, Testtown, toby@test.com' passes validation but wouldn't likely be *verified* as "correct", unless there's a Toby Test living in Testtown) .

- Q: Why are we not holding off on this implementation until the results of the Next-Gen RDS PDP have come out?
- A: We are required to implement Board-approved consensus policies that emerge from community-driven Policy Development Processes. The Next-Gen RDS PDP may take years to complete and the outcomes are uncertain. Rec 7 states: "These recommendations should be…implemented and/or applied as soon as a WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters, becomes operational". RDAP will be operational in early 2017.

Internationalized Registration Data Final Report

Overview

ICANN

Internationalized Registration Data Final Report

◉ IRD Working Group formed as a result of WHOIS Review Team recommendations, and intended to complement the work of the T/T Policy Development Process (p. 8)

◉ Purpose: "To recommend submission and display requirements for internationalized registration data (IRD) and produce a data model for the IRD that matches the requirements (p. 4)

◉ High-level recommendations:

1. Registrants should only be required to input registration data in a language(s) or script(s) with which they are skilled.
2. A registry must be able to accept and store any language or script that might reasonably be expected to be used in their target market.
3. 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.

◉ Working Group noted that "many [specific] recommendations…may have policy implications, [and] recommends the Board send [the] final report to the GNSO for appropriate follow-up."

In sum: T/T PDP focused on quality of registration data in terms of translated/transliterated accuracy and guidelines for translation and transliteration. IRD report focused on which data elements need to be internationalized.

IRD Final Report: Status

See Board Resolutions 2016.03.10.06 – 2016.03.10.07

"Resolved (2016.03.10.07), the 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."

Notable positions of IRD-WG:
"One of the central requirements in this document is that registrants can submit the registration data in a language and script with which they are familiar. To enable consumers of the data to translate or transliterate the data, language and script tags are required along with the registration data" (p. 14)

"Taking the language and script information from the registrant requires registrars to be able to detect, validate and verify the script in use. This functionality does not exist in today's registrar customer interface. This would necessitate changes in the registrar workflow to accommodate this requirement" (p. 16).

Link to report

IRD + T/T Recommendations Side-by-Side

T/T Recommendation	Corresponding IRD Recommendation
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. 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.
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.	1. Registrants should only be required to input registration data in a language(s) or script(s) with which they are skilled 2. A registry must be able to accept and store any language or script that might reasonably be expected to be used in their target market
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 polices. Entered contact information data are validated, in accordance with the aforementioned Policies and Agreements and the **language/script used must be easily identifiable.**	3. 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.
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: [1] additional fields (in addition to the authoritative local script fields provided by the registrant) and that these fields be [2] marked as transformed and [3] their source(s) indicated**	3. 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.

*NB: Recommendations 1, 6, 7 do not have corresponding IRD recommendations

Translation and Transliteration

Policy Language Discussion

ICANN

Policy Language Review: Recommendation 1

Recommendation Language:

"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."

Policy Language:

Parties requiring transformation of contact information MAY do so on an ad hoc basis outside of WHOIS (or replacement) systems. If transformation is not undertaken voluntarily by a registry or registrar, the party requesting the transformation SHOULD carry out the transformation itself.

Policy Language Review: Recommendation 2

Recommendation Language:

"Whilst noting that a WHOIS replacement system should be capable of receiving input in the form of non-ASCII script contact information, the Working Group recommends **its data fields 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.**"

Policy Language:

"Any WHOIS replacement system SHOULD be capable of receiving input in the form of non-ASCII script contact information **and its data fields MUST 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.**"

⊙ Who indicates what the data entries represent ? Who indicates what language(s)/script(s) are used by the registered name holder?

⊙ Strawman policy language: "Registrants MUST indicate the language(s)/script(s) entered into a registration data directory service and gTLD providers MUST offer registrants the ability to indicate what language(s)/script(s) are initially entered."

⊙ How does this mesh with Recommendation 3?

Policy Language Review: Recommendation 3

Recommendation Language:

"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."

Policy Language:

"gTLD providers MAY choose the language(s) and script(s) supported for registrants to submit their contact information."

Policy Language Review: Recommendation 4

Recommendation Language:

"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 polices. **Entered contact information data are validated, in accordance with the aforementioned Policies and Agreements and the language/script used must be easily identifiable.** "

Policy Language:

Regardless of the language(s)/script(s) used, the data fields MUST remain consistent with standards in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), relevant Consensus Policy, Additional WHOIS Information Policy (AWIP) and any other applicable polices. **Entered contact information data MUST be validated, in accordance with the aforementioned Policies and Agreements and the language/script used MUST be easily identifiable**.

Recommendation Language:

"**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**."

Policy Language:

If transformation of contact information is carried out and the transformed data is entered into a WHOIS system, **the transformed data MUST be presented as additional data fields along with the local script fields provided by the registrant, and these fields MUST be marked as transformed and the source of the transformation MUST be indicated**.

Policy Language Review: Recommendation 6

Recommendation Language:

"Any WHOIS replacement system, for example RDAP, [is to 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."

Policy Language: ?
⊙ Already integrated into RDAP profile
⊙ Applicable more to development of RDAP profile than contracted parties' obligations as they relate to T/T

"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."

Recommendation Language:

"These recommendations are to be coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary and are to be implemented and/or applied as soon as a WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters, becomes operational."

? Policy Language:
- ⊙ Applicable more to development of RDAP profile than contracted parties' obligations as they relate to T/T
- ⊙ GDD already coordinating T/T implementation with RDAP development

"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."

AOB

⊙ Who is our GNSO Council liaison?

T/T Requirements and Deliverables

Bottom line
No party is required to T/T, but RDAP must accommodate those who wish to do so.

Summary Implementation Plan

- Add one RDAP extension to provide additional data fields for transformed contact information. (**Recommendations 2 and 5**)
- Add one Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP extension) that includes tags for registration data that shows (**Recommendations 2 and 5**):
    - That a transformation was performed
    - The source of the transformation
    - The languages and scripts present in the initial and transformed fields

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** [emphasis added].

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 polices. 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: [1] additional fields (in addition to the authoritative local script fields provided by the registrant) and that these fields be [2] marked as transformed and [3] their source(s) indicated** [emphasis added].

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.

Thank You!

Questions?

Reach me at:
Email: brian.aitchison@icann.org
Website: icann.org

ICANN

twitter.com/icann

facebook.com/icannorg

linkedin.com/company/icann

youtube.com/user/icannnews

gplus.to/icann

weibo.com/ICANNorg

flickr.com/photos/icann

slideshare.net/icannpresentations