



Update on the Work of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group

San Francisco, California

13 & 17 March 2011



Agenda



1. Introduction
2. Background & Current Status
3. Summary of Interim Report
4. Questions for Community
5. Outreach
6. Summary of Comments
7. Next Steps

Introduction



- Internationalized domain name (IDN) guidelines exist for domain labels and names.
- No standards exist for submission and display of domain registration data in directory services.

Background and Current Status



- **2009:** Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG) established by ICANN Board.
- **2009-2010:** Study feasibility and suitability of introducing submission and display specifications for the internationalization of registration data.
- **Public Forum (to 14 March 2011):** Seeking comment on Interim Report: <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#ird>.

Summary of Interim Report

IRD-WG Seeking comment on 4 models and preliminary recommendations (see background slides):

Model 1: Registrants provide domain contact data in “Must Be Present” script.

Model 2: Registrants provide data in any registrar-accepted script and registrars provide point of contact for transliteration or translation.

Model 3: Registrants provide data in any registrar-accepted script and registrars provide transliteration tools to publish in “Must be Present” script.

Model 4: Registrants provide data in any registrar accepted language and registrars provide translation tools to publish in “Must be Present” script.

Questions for Community Consideration



1. Which model is appropriate, if any?
2. Other models to consider?
3. Which preliminary recommendations are feasible, if any?
4. Other recommendations to consider?

Outreach



- 10 February: Briefed Security and Stability Advisory Committee;
- 15 February: Briefed At-Large Advisory Committee; and
- 16 February: Held two webinars.

Summary of Comments*

Terminology

- Base definition of IDN on IDNA 2008, not IDNA 2003.

Protocol

- IETF should develop the protocol.
- IRIS would address many of the query and retrieval issues raised in the Interim Report.
- Analyze why IRIS is not appropriate or provide an extensive analysis of protocol features necessary to replace or supplement WHOIS.

*Received in the Public Forum as of 03 March 2011

Summary of Comments, Cont.

Contact Data

- Consider Universal Postal Union (UPU) recommendations (particularly S42 templates) or ISO Standards for transliteration of characters from scripts.

Non-Contact Data

- ISO 8601 for internationalizing dates.
- RFC 5335 not appropriate for internationalizing email addresses.
- Registration status: No requirement for ccTLDs using EPP.

Summary of Comments, Cont.

Variants

- Consider difficulty concerning definition of a variant and avoid adding to the confusion.

Models

- Monolingual registrant could only be expected to provide IRD in a single language.
- Registrar should ensure that the IRD is based on character set and variants based on the “language” table and rules for the IDN TLD, as provided by the registry.
- Translation/transliteration should be the responsibility of the person or organization that wants to use IRD.
- Propose new model 5.

Summary of Comments, Cont.

New Model Proposal

- Registrants:
 - Provide data in script and language of their choice.
 - Specify language (locale(?)) of the data.
- No requirement for transliteration/translation of IRD (so no “must-be-present” script).
- User of the data should use automatic tools/agencies for transliteration/translation, not provider or maintainer of the data.

Next Steps



- Summarize/analyze Public Forum comments;
- Address comments;
- Revise report;
- Post final report for public comment; and
- Publish final report.



Thank You





Questions?



Background Information

The following slides provide background information on the Interim Report.

Definitions

What is domain registration data?

- Data that registrants provide at time of registering a domain including domain name, name servers, sponsoring registrar, contact information.
- Displayed using WHOIS protocol for generic top level domain (gTLD) registries and registrars.

Definitions, Continued

What is internationalized Registration Data? Various elements of registration data could be separately internationalized as follows:

Fields	Possible Ways to Internationalize
Domain Names	Both A-label and U-label
Name Server Names	A-label, and optionally U-label
Sponsoring Registrar	US-ASCII
Telephone/fax	UPC E.123
Email	RFC 5335
Registration Status	Publish exact EPP code
Dates	Not discussed yet by the IRD-WG

Model 1

Models	Russian Example	Chinese Example
Model 1: Registrants provide domain contact data in “Must Be Present” script	<p>(Showing Translation)</p> <p>contact: Petr Ivanov (Петр Иванов)</p> <p>organisation: OAO «Cicle»</p> <p>address: Office 1, Lenin st., Kovrov</p> <p>address: Vladimir region, 601900</p> <p>address: Russia</p>	<p>(Showing Translation)</p> <p>contact: Zhang, San (张三)</p> <p>Organisation:</p> <p>address: Apt 13-203, Ludan Village</p> <p>address: Shenzhen, Guandong Province</p> <p>address: P.R.China</p>
	<p>(Showing Transliteration)</p> <p>contact: Petr Ivanov</p> <p>organisation: OAO «Tsirkul»</p> <p>address: Office 1, Ulitsa Lenina, Kovrov</p> <p>address: Vladimirskaia oblast, 601900</p> <p>address: Rossiya</p>	<p>(Showing Transliteration)</p> <p>contact: Zhang, San</p> <p>Organisation:</p> <p>address: Ludan cun 13 dong 203</p> <p>address: Shenzhen, Guandong sheng</p> <p>address: zhong guo</p>

Model 2

Models	Russian Example	Chinese Example
Model 2: Registrants provide data in any registrar- accepted script and registrars provide point of contact	Registrar POC: http://nic.ru phone: +7 800 234-5689 fax-no: +7 800 234-5699 email: info@nic.ru contact: Петр Иванв organisation: ОАО Циркуль address: ул.Ленина, офис 1, г.Ковров address: Владимирская обл. 601900 address: Россия	Registrar POC: http://registrarA.com phone: +1 86 755 5555-5689 fax-no: +1 86 755 5555-5390 email: info@registraA.com contact: 张三 Organisation: address: 鹿丹村13 栋 203 address: 深圳, 广东省 address: 中国

Model 3

Models	Russian Example	Chinese Example
Model 3: Registrants provide data in any registrar-accepted script and registrars provide transliteration tools to publish in “Must be Present” script.	contact: Petr Ivanov organisation: OAO «Tsirkul» address: Office 1, Ulitsa Lenina, Kovrov address: Vladimirskaya oblast, 601900 address: Rossiya	contact: Zhang, San Organisation: address: Ludan cun 13 dong 203 address: Shenzhen, Guandong sheng address: zhong guo

Model 4

Models	Russian Example	Chinese Example
<p>Model 4: Registrants provide data in any registrar-accepted language and registrars provide translation tools to publish in “Must be Present” language.</p>	<p>contact: Petr Ivanov organisation: OAO «Cicle» address: Office 1, Lenin st., Kovrov address: Vladimir region, 601900 address: Russia</p>	<p>contact: Zhang, San Organisation: address: Apt 13-203, Ludan Village address: Shenzhen, Guandong Province address: P.R.China</p>

Summary of Models

	Transliteration	Translation
Registrant's responsibility to provide	Model 1	Model 1
Registrar's responsibility to provide	Model 3	Model 4

Model 2: Point of Contact by Registrar

Models



Why are there different models?

- Accommodate local language preferences;
- Balance between cost and usability;
- Consider a range of submission and service scenarios; and
- Consider needs of human users and automation.

Preliminary Recommendations for Community Consideration

Preliminary Recommendation (1): For a directory service in the IDN environment:

1. WHOIS protocol clients (both port 43 and web) must be able to accept a user query of domain name in either U-label or A-label format;
2. WHOIS protocol clients must be able display result of queries in both U- and A-label for the domain names; and
3. Domain registration data should include variants of an IDN label in the response as well.

Preliminary Recommendations

Preliminary Recommendation (2): How could each data element be separately internationalized?

1. Directory services should return both A-label and U-label representation for the given IDN domains queried;
2. Directory services should return both A-label and U-label representations for name server names (to the extent that such information is available);
3. Directory services should always make sponsoring registrar information available in US-ASCII; and
4. Directory services should always return the exact EPP status code for Registration Status.