

**Internationalized Registration Data Working Group**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**27 September 2010**

**Attendees:** Edmon Chung, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Jim Galvin, Robert Hutchinson, Steve Metalitz; from staff: Julie Hedlund and Dave Piscitello

The Working Group (WG) continued discussion of the [Staff Summary of Issues 30 July 2010](#). Refer to the [Transcript](#) and [MP3](#) for the detailed discussion. The WG proceeded at page 6 on the following topic:

**Entity names and Address (RAA 3.3.1.6,7,8)** include registrant, admin contact name and addresses, technical contact name and addresses. Recommendations concerning entity names will be discussed in detail in next section.

Jim suggested that the recommendation could be that the labels should appear in US-ASCII with the option to localize them. Dave noted that US-ASCII labels would help with automation and that this should be called out for observation in the WG's preliminary report with a request for comments from the community from those who do automation. Bob asked about languages that are read from right to left, such as Arabic and asked whether the report should outline the problem or to recommend solutions. Dave noted that the report for Cartagena would be preliminary and could indicate areas where more work could be done. Jim noted that the recommendation to display entity labels in US-ASCII is far-reaching principle that applies in multiple places. He added that it would be helpful to call these items out in the report as points of observation on which work more is needed to reach consensus. Bob asked whether the report should outline the thinking on localization of string names and entity names and point out that more work needs to be done in this area. Jim agreed and noted that the report for Cartagena would be an interim report.

Next the WG moved to page 7 and to the following topic:

**Backward compatibility issues**, i.e. should previous, non-IDN registrations records also conform to this requirement?

Bob noted that for Port 43 and UTF8 responses for WHOIS the WG could propose some sort of a header to come back that identifies internationalized WHOIS responses. This would be a versioning so that automated tools will have a way of keying their partners to the kind of response that they're getting as a way of dealing with compatibility. Dave asked whether the WG should make the observation that if we wanted to stay with Port 43 that some convention for illustrating or distinguishing between versions is necessary. Bob said he wasn't sure if the WG had discussed this issue or how to address it. Jim noted that since this is a significant technical question it might be more appropriate to discuss in the broader technical community. Bob suggested that this might be more of a policy issue for ICANN to consider.

Jim asked whether the WG's recommendations are about things to do to WHOIS protocol as a policy matter and whether the recommendations of the WG were just about the format of the data regardless of how it's returned (in the context of WHOIS). He also asked whether the WG also could include a recommendation that doing something other than the WHOIS protocol is worthy of more study and does that also take off the table this issue of versioning and Port 43. Bob noted that the WG could make the observation that the protocol needs a change to accommodate the change in data model and that the WG could recommend further study by a technical group. Avri agreed.

Dave asked whether the development of protocol is beyond the remit of the IRD-WG. Avri agreed and said that the WG is just specifying the data and how it needs to be used. Bob asked Avri whether anything having to do with the overall form of the data coming from Port 43 or the request record going to Port 43 is protocol work, or is it part of the scope of this WG. Avri responded that there is an IETF ownership issue in terms of making sure that things still work over Port 43 with the WHOIS protocol. Bob said that he thought that everything within the data formatting of request response of Port 43 is 100 percent within the purview of ICANN. Dave suggested in wrapping up the call that there are three steps: 1) the WG determines the data that are needed for international registration; 2) ICANN forms a WG to decide how to actually signal this so the clients and servers know what they're doing; 3) that WG decides who is going to publish this standard (ICANN or IETF).