



# 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

- ICANN should not do protocol development.
- IRIS would address many of the query and retrieval issues raised in the Interim Report.
- ICANN should consider the features necessary to replace or supplement WHOIS.

\*Two comments received in the Public Forum as of 10 March 2011 from John C. Klensin and Dr. Sarmad Hussain.



# 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 (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><b>(Showing Translation)</b></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><b>(Showing Translation)</b></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><b>(Showing Transliteration)</b></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><b>(Showing Transliteration)</b></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: <a href="http://nic.ru">http://nic.ru</a> phone: +7 800 234-5689 fax-no: +7 800 234-5699 email: <a href="mailto:info@nic.ru">info@nic.ru</a> contact: Петр Иванв organisation: ОАО Циркуль address: ул.Ленина, офис 1, г.Ковров address: Владимирская обл. 601900 address: Россия	Registrar POC: <a href="http://registrarA.com">http://registrarA.com</a> phone: +1 86 755 5555-5689 fax-no: +1 86 755 5555-5390 email: <a href="mailto:info@registraA.com">info@registraA.com</a> 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
<p>Model 3: Registrants provide data in any registrar-accepted script and registrars provide transliteration tools to publish in “Must be Present” script.</p>	<p>contact: Petr Ivanov organisation: OAO «Tsirkul» address: Office 1, Ulitsa Lenina, Kovrov address: Vladimirskaya oblast, 601900 address: Rossiya</p>	<p>contact: Zhang, San Organisation: address: Ludan cun 13 dong 203 address: Shenzhen, Guandong sheng address: zhong guo</p>

# Model 4

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

# 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.