

Implementation Plan

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

ICANN Org Global Domains Division

Updated November 2019

Status of This Document

This is an Implementation Plan for the 7 recommendations of the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Working Group (TTWG), prepared by ICANN staff for consideration by the Translation and Transliteration Implementation Review Team (IRT).

This is a living document that may be amended to incorporate the evolving circumstances of the project.

Project Objective	Implement 7 recommendations from Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Final Report
Coordinating Entities	ICANN Global Domains Division (GDD) and Translation and Transliteration Implementation Review Team (IRT)
ICANN Org Department	Domain Name Services and Industry Engagement (Global Domains Division)

Background

This implementation project is addressing GNSO recommendations presented in the [Final Report](#) on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process (PDP). The goal of the PDP was to determine 1) whether it is desirable to translate or transliterate contact information and 2) who should bear the burden of such transformation.

The recommendations from the Final Report are as follows:

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.

In sum, no party is required to perform transformations. But those who do choose to perform them will be required to adhere to the policies emerging from the Recommendations.

Implementation Plan

The Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information (T/T) IRT convened in July 2016. The IRT began work via a series of calls and a public email list, and has provided feedback regarding the implementation of the recommendations.

All IRT call materials and discussions can be found on the [T/T community wiki](#). The latest summary updates on the project can be found on the [T/T implementation page](#).

Current Status (Updated November 2019)

The implementation of the T/T Recommendations has been on hold pending full deployment of the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP), which is a minimum requirement to implement the T/T Recommendations. In addition, the Phase 1 Team of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) recommended the following in its Final Report, which is relevant to the T/T implementation:

Recommendation 27: *The EPDP Team recommends that, as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, **and any others that may have been omitted** [emphasis added], to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations as, for example, a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact which will no longer be required data elements:*

- *Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy*
- *Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS*
- *Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy*
- *WHOIS Data Reminder Policy*
- *Transfer Policy*
- *Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules*
- *Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy*

Given the implementation's relationship to the evolution of registration data policies and procedures, the T/T Recommendations will be assessed in terms of Recommendation 27 to ensure policy and implementation consistency across the many work streams in this area. This forthcoming assessment is a result of both practical and mandate-driven considerations. The mandate stems from T/T Recommendation 7, which states that implementation of the policy recommendations be "coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary and...implemented and/or applied as soon as a WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters, becomes operational." As a practical matter, assessing

the T/T recommendations in the context of Recommendation 27 may provide insight into any potential conflicts and/or dependencies as they relate to the EPDP Team’s work. It also allows for an assessment of whether the T/T recommendations could be “bundled” into the broader implementation work likely to emerge as a result of EPDP recommendations

TIMELINE (tentative and subject to change)	DATE
Recruit Implementation Review Team (IRT) via email community-wide (by staff)	July 2016
Share preliminary implementation plan with IRT via email (by staff)	15 July 2016
IRT Call #1: Introduction, discuss implementation plan and potential new policy language, schedule next calls	19 July 2016
Share revised implementation plan with IRT by email (by staff)	22 July 2016
Share first draft of new consensus policy language as discussed with IRT and ICANN Legal and Compliance staff (by staff)	29 July 2016
IRT Call #2: Discuss draft new consensus policy language and technical updates to RDAP profile	2 August 2016
Share draft new consensus policy language/red-line document with IRT	12 August 2016
IRT Call #3: Discuss “WHOIS replacement system” vs “RDAP”	25 August 2016
Share draft new consensus policy language/red-line document with IRT	30 September 2016
IRT Call #4: Review T/T recommendations in context of RDAP implementation	27 October 2016

Share latest consensus policy language document with IRT	31 October 2016
IRT Face to Face/Call #5 in Hyderabad, ICANN57: Discuss updated new consensus policy language	8 November 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share latest consensus policy language document with IRT • Update on implementation plans for 2017 	7 December 2016
IRT Call #6: Discuss revised policy language on language and script tags	15 December 2016
Share revised policy language with IRT	16 January 2017
IRT Call #7: Discuss decision tree on data provisioning for language and script tags	25 January 2017
Share latest decision tree with IRT	30 January 2017
IRT Call #8: Continue “decision tree” discussion on data provisioning for language and script tags and T/T’d data display	8 February 2017
Share latest decision tree with IRT	14 February 2017
IRT Call #9: Continue “decision tree” discussion on T/T’d data display provisions	1 March 2017
Review and revise decision tree per IRT input	2 – 9 March 2017
IRT “Call 10”, Face-to-Face, ICANN58 Copenhagen: Continue “decision tree” discussion on language and script tags	15 March 2017
Review and revise decision tree per IRT input	20 - 31 March 2017

IRT Call #11: Continue “decision tree” discussion on language and script tags	6 April 2017
Review implementation status and build clarifying question set for submission to T/T Working Group members to resolve outstanding questions pertaining to the intention of the T/T Recommendations	10 April – 2 June 2017
IRT Call #12: Discuss questions for potential submission to GNSO Council and/or T/T PDP Working Group members	8 June 2017
Circulate questions on T/T Recommendations with IRT	12 June– 23 June 2017
Craft strawman policy language document based on answers to T/T questions and decision tree input	26 June – 15 September 2017
IRT Call #13: Discuss policy language document	11 October 2017
Revise policy language document as necessary for submission to public comment forum	12 October – 14 November 2017
IRT Call #14: Discuss revised policy language document and implementation plan for 2018	14 December 2017
Project Plan for 2019 - 2020 (tentative)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Q4 2019</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Begin assessment of T/T recommendations per EPDP Recommendation 27 (“assessment report”) ● <u>Q1 - Q2 2020</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Draft T/T assessment report ○ Review/revise report in consultation with IRT ● <u>Q3 2020</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ready policy language for public comment based on assessment report in consultation with IRT ● <u>Q4 2020</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Public comment period (TBD) 	Q4 2019 - Q4 2020