



# Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information IRT Face-to-Face

Meeting 5 | ICANN57 Hyderabad | 8 November 2016

# Agenda

- ⦿ Background
- ⦿ RDAP Update
- ⦿ Review of overall implementation plan
- ⦿ Policy language discussion
- ⦿ Questions and AOB

# Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

## Background

- ◉ Policy Recommendations approved by Board September 2015
- ◉ Registries and registrars may voluntarily translate and/or transliterate registration data
- ◉ Policy recommendations provide some requirements for how registries and registrars may translate and transliterate registration data
- ◉ Policy recommendations also require working to coordinate implementation with other WHOIS efforts

## Current Implementation Status

- ◉ GDD Staff and Implementation Review Team are in early stages of discussing requirements for the scope of the policy implementation project
- ◉ GDD Staff and IRT examining early drafts of policy language

# RDAP Update

- Version 1.0 of RDAP gTLD Profile mapping RDAP features to allowable policy and contractual requirements published (July 2016)
- Implementation of the RDAP Profile was initially required in the Consistent Labeling & Display Policy
- RySG submitted a “Request for Reconsideration” regarding the inclusion of the RDAP Profile in the Consistent Labeling & Display policy
- ICANN plans to request RDAP implementation, via existing contractual requirements, once the Consistent Labeling & Display policy is finalized and following consultations with the community

# Overall Implementation Plan

- ◉ Stay synced with implementation of RDAP at a minimum per T/T Recommendation 7: “...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.”
- ◉ IRT to continue to review policy language
- ◉ Discuss areas for experimentation and testing of T/T policies e.g. 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

# Policy Language: Proposed Requirements for Rys and Rrs (1)

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 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.

1.4

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

1.5

If the script cannot be determined, or in case of mixed scripts, the script subtag "Zyyy" MUST be used in the language tag.

# Policy Language: Proposed Requirements for Rys and Rrs (2)

1.6

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

1.7

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

1.8

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.

1.9

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.



# Policy Language: Proposed Requirements for Rys and Rrs (3)

1.10

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

1.11

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: Proposed Requirements for Rrs

## 1.12

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

## 1.13

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

# Questions? AOB?



Reach me at:

[brian.aitchison@icann.org](mailto:brian.aitchison@icann.org)



[twitter.com/icann](https://twitter.com/icann)



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



[facebook.com/icannorg](https://facebook.com/icannorg)



[weibo.com/ICANNorg](https://weibo.com/ICANNorg)



[linkedin.com/company/icann](https://linkedin.com/company/icann)



[flickr.com/photos/icann](https://flickr.com/photos/icann)



[youtube.com/user/icannnews](https://youtube.com/user/icannnews)



[slideshare.net/icannpresentations](https://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 [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 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.