

# Recent ICANN work on IDNs and Internationalized Registration Data

Steve Sheng

12 March 2013 @ IETF 86

# Goals

- Brief weirds WG on relevant ICANN work
  - Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Final Report
  - IDN Variants & Whois
- Identify implications for protocol work

# **Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Final Report**

# Is it suitable to internationalise Domain Name Registration Data?

- Yes
- Registrants have the right to be monolingual, which is the expectation and motivation behind IDNs
- It is unreasonable to assume all of them know or can enter the registration data in languages other than their local language

# what data element is suitable to be internationalised & what standards?

Fields	Internationalize?	Output Standards
Domain Names	Yes	Both A-label and U-label
Name Server Names	Yes	Both A-label and U-label
Sponsoring Registrar	NO	US-ASCII
Telephone/fax	N/A	ITU.T E 164
Email	YES	RFC 6531
Registration Status	N/A	exact EPP status where applicable
Dates	N/A	RFC 3339
Entity Names and Addresses	YES	Local languages/scripts

Should contact data be translated/transliterated into a single language / script?

- Central issue: balance the needs and capabilities of the local registrant with the need of the (potential) global user of this data
- Recommend a GNSO issues report; interim advice is to provide language and script tags in Whois output to enable users of data to translate or transliterate themselves

# Implications for protocol development

Translation or transliteration: currently still in development with possibly the following outcome:

1. Only localized data
  2. Localized data + translation / transliteration
- Scenario 2 is used in some ccTLDs
  - Observation: the better structured the address object, the easier it is for automatic translation / transliteration system

# **IDN Variants and Whois**



# IDN Variants

- Variants may bring a paradigm shift for WHOIS
  - 1 – 1 look up => 1 – Many or Many – 1 look up
- Active variants vs. blocked variants
  - Recommendations: Query of an activated variant should return information of the canonical label + indicating variant relationship
  - Query of an reserved variant should be a matter of local registry policy