Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

Implementation Review Team Call 3

Brian Aitchison | 25 August 2016

Agenda

- Discuss "RDAP" vs "WHOIS replacement system" in context of T/T recommendations
  - Objective: to gauge IRT perspective on which of the following paths to pursue:
    1. Continue with implementation of T/T recommendations
    2. Refer T/T implementation to the Next Generation Registration Directory Services PDP (projected 2 + years from completion)

- Questions and AOB
  - ICANN 57 Hyderabad

"RDAP" vs "WHOIS replacement system" in T/T Recommendations

"RDAP" vs "WHOIS replacement system"

RDAP **is not** a "WHOIS replacement system" and T/T implementation should be deferred to Next Generation Registration Directory Service PDP

⊙ RDAP is a replacement communications protocol intended to replace the current WHOIS port-43 services
⊙ Current WHOIS system is much bigger than WHOIS port-43 services
⊙ WHOIS replacement system is much bigger than RDAP, which is what the ongoing Next Generation Registration Directory Service PDP work is addressing
⊙ Taking divergent paths on T/T IRT and Next Gen RDS PDP not appropriate
⊙ Community has been very vocal about the numerous WHOIS projects that are ongoing and that they need to be closely aligned to ensure positive outcomes
⊙ RDAP is not the WHOIS replacement system because:
  ⊙ it does not create/write information
  ⊙ it does not store information
  ⊙ it does not display information.
⊙ Without significant changes to the current WHOIS system, including several changes to RDAP, this IRT will not be able to fulfill the recommendations of the T/T PDP
⊙ Making the needed changes to the current WHOIS system including RDAP, will duplicate work of the RDS PDP team and work may need to be redone/replaced once WHOIS replacement system is implemented

"RDAP" vs "WHOIS replacement system"

RDAP **is** a "WHOIS replacement system" in the context of the T/T recommendations and T/T implementation should be carried out once RDAP is operational

- ⊙ No language in the T/T final report recommend referral of T/T implementation to the Next Gen RDS PDP, despite awareness of the then forthcoming PDP in the T/T Working Group.
  - ⊙ Full Consensus for each recommendation in the T/T Working Group Final Report

- ⊙ "WHOIS" tends to be a catch-all term that encompasses a variety of different aspects of Registration Data Directory Services, which can leave room for interpretation, but...
  - ⊙ T/T WG's interpretation seems clear and deliberate based on their chosen wording for the recommendations, which explicitly reference RDAP as a WHOIS replacement system:
    - ⊙ Rec 1: "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)...**"
    - ⊙ Rec 6: "The Working Group recommends that **any WHOIS replacement system, for example RDAP**, remains flexible…"

- ⊙ Rec 7 specifically refers to the technical capabilities soon to be available through the RDAP system:
  - ⊙ "The Working Group recommends that these recommendations are 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."**
  - ⊙ RDAP can receive, store, and display non-ASCII characters and will be operational in 2017.

"RDAP" vs "WHOIS replacement system": Possible Steps

⊙ Need to determine consensus level in IRT with either perspective according to IRT Principles and Guidelines: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irt-principles-guidelines-23aug16-en.pdf

⊙ Two scenarios:

  ⊙ <u>Scenario 1</u> (status quo): Consensus with RDAP as "WHOIS replacement system" in context of T/T recommendations
    ⊙ Continue to implement T/T recommendations
    ⊙ Draft, revise, and eventually approve policy language for implementation

  ⊙ <u>Scenario 2</u>: Significant IRT opposition to RDAP as "WHOIS replacement system" and T/T implementation should be referred to Next Gen RDS PDP
    1. Discuss and gauge sentiment among T/T Working Group re: referring to RDS PDP
        1. From IRT Principles and Guidelines, 5G: "IRT deliberations should not be used as a tool to reopen a previously explored policy issue only because a constituency or stakeholder group was not satisfied with the outcome of a previously held process on the same policy issue, unless the circumstances have changed and/or new information is available." <u>To T/T WG: have circumstances changed? Any new info?</u>
    2. Refer to GNSO Council via liaison (liaison TBD at Sept 1 GNSO Council meeting)
    3. Await outcome of their deliberations

  ⊙ Any initial feedback from IRT on which path to pursue?

AOB

- ICANN 57 in Hyderabad
  - Who's going?
  - Session being booked

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: 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.

Thank You!

Questions?

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

twitter.com/icann

gplus.to/icann

facebook.com/icannorg

weibo.com/ICANNorg

linkedin.com/company/icann

flickr.com/photos/icann

youtube.com/user/icannnews

slideshare.net/icannpresentations