

## **INITIAL COMMENTS**



### **IPC Comments on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group Questionnaire**

The Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) welcomes the opportunity to reply to the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group Questionnaire, as well as to contribute with further ideas and suggestions. The following represents our provisional contribution; we look forward to further discussion of these issues within the Working Group.

#### **Question:**

Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.

#### **IPC view:**

As the local WHOIS information is (or at least should) be registered in respect of each language / script related to the home country / address of each holder, it is also desirable and necessary to translate contact information to a single common language in order to keep the WHOIS information easily searchable and readable for all global Internet users.

#### **Question:**

What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact information, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration?

#### **IPC view:**

Without a proper translation/transliteration of contact information, the WHOIS record system will lose its clarity, which may cause difficulties for the domain holders in confirming that they have updated and correct contact information, and may also cause unnecessary legal actions and/or alternative dispute resolution actions where the holder of the domain name could not be properly identified and contacted. In fact, the combination of contact information in both the holder's local language and one worldwide acceptable translation/transliteration should provide an adequate legal basis for sufficient identification of contact information in national legal actions as well in global domain dispute cases.

**Question:**

Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?

**IPC view:**

Although the ambiguities – and thereby need for clarifications – are more obvious when it comes to contact information not using the current ASCII WHOIS, there are difficulties to solve in all languages, therefore, translation and/or transliteration of contact information should 1) be *mandatory* for 2) *all gTLDs*.

**Question:**

Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?

**IPC view:**

Should be mandatory for all (see further above).

**Question:**

What impact will translation/transliteration of contact information have on the WHOIS validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement?

**IPC view:**

Without a proper and global solution of contact information, WHOIS validation will not be possible in many cases, thus causing severe problems that will threaten the system itself.

**Question:**

When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?

**IPC view:**

As this policy should in fact have been in force before the release of new gTLDs, our view is: *As soon as possible*.

**Question:**

Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script? This question relates to the concern expressed by the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG) in its report that there are costs associated with providing translation and transliteration of contact information. For example, if a policy development process (PDP) determined that the registrar must translate or transliterate contact information; this policy would place a cost burden on the registrar.

**IPC view:**

**Here, the IPC supports the ALAC statement that**

“The decision on who should bear the burden of transforming contact information should be informed by the views of and impact on all affected parties, which would include the provider of the information (registrants), those involved in collecting and maintaining the information (i.e., registrar, reseller, registry) and the range of users that include end users and regulatory authorities/law enforcement agencies.”

**Question:**

Who does your SG/C believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set in the Initial Report on this issue?

**IPC view:**

The cost should be divided between Registries and Registrars, however also having in mind that the final responsibility of correct contact information lies on each Registrant.

Respectfully submitted,

Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC)