



Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

Implementation Review Team Call 4

Brian Aitchison | 25 October 2016

Agenda

- ⦿ RDAP Status Update
- ⦿ Review discussion of “RDAP” vs “WHOIS replacement system” in context of T/T recommendations
- ⦿ Path forward: IRT Guidelines and Decision-Making Methodology
 - ⦿ Continue with implementation of T/T recommendations
 - ⦿ Refer T/T implementation to GNSO Council for guidance
- ⦿ Hyderabad
- ⦿ Questions and AOB

RDAP Status Update

RDAP Status

- ⦿ RDAP originally slated for inclusion in “Thick WHOIS: Consistent Labeling and Display” policy implementation (Provision 12: “The implementation of an RDAP service in accordance with the ‘RDAP Operational Profile for gTLD Registries and Registrars’ is required for all gTLD registries in order to achieve consistent labeling and display.”)
- ⦿ RySG submitted Request for Reconsideration to remove Provision 12
- ⦿ ICANN has rescinded notification to registries to implement RDAP (18 Oct)
- ⦿ ICANN to issue a revised notification to registry operators regarding implementation of the CL&D Policy, clearly indicating removal of Provision 12
- ⦿ Update the published CL&D Policy on the ICANN website, noting a change has been made (NB: The revised CL&D Policy would not be subject to another Public Comment process)
- ⦿ Extend deadline for registrars to implement RDAP
- ⦿ ICANN intends to issue notices for registries and registrars to implement RDAP after further dialogue with the community

Review: “RDAP” vs “WHOIS replacement system” in T/T Recommendations

“RDAP” vs “WHOIS replacement system”

RDAP **is not** a “WHOIS replacement system” and T/T implementation should be deferred to Next Generation Registration Directory Service PDP

- ⦿ RDAP is a replacement communications protocol intended to replace the current WHOIS port-43 services
- ⦿ Current WHOIS system is much bigger than WHOIS port-43 services
- ⦿ WHOIS replacement system is much bigger than RDAP, which is what the ongoing Next Generation Registration Directory Service PDP work is addressing
- ⦿ Taking divergent paths on T/T IRT and Next Gen RDS PDP not appropriate
- ⦿ Community has been very vocal about the numerous WHOIS projects that are ongoing and that they need to be closely aligned to ensure positive outcomes
- ⦿ RDAP is not the WHOIS replacement system because:
 - ⦿ it does not create/write information
 - ⦿ it does not store information
 - ⦿ it does not display information.
- ⦿ Without significant changes to the current WHOIS system, including several changes to RDAP, this IRT will not be able to fulfill the recommendations of the T/T PDP
- ⦿ Making the needed changes to the current WHOIS system including RDAP, will duplicate work of the RDS PDP team and work may need to be redone/replaced once WHOIS replacement system is implemented

“RDAP” vs “WHOIS replacement system”

RDAP **is** a “WHOIS replacement system” in the context of the T/T recommendations and T/T implementation should be carried out once RDAP is operational

- ⦿ No language in the T/T final report recommend referral of T/T implementation to the Next Gen RDS PDP, despite awareness of the then forthcoming PDP in the T/T Working Group.
 - ⦿ Full Consensus for each recommendation in the T/T Working Group Final Report
- ⦿ “WHOIS” tends to be a catch-all term that encompasses a variety of different aspects of Registration Data Directory Services, which can leave room for interpretation, but...
 - ⦿ T/T WG’s interpretation seems clear and deliberate based on their chosen wording for the recommendations, which explicitly reference RDAP as a WHOIS replacement system:
 - ⦿ Rec 1: "Any parties requiring transformation are free to do so on an ad hoc basis outside **WHOIS or any replacement system, such as the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP)...**"
 - ⦿ Rec 6: "The Working Group recommends that **any WHOIS replacement system, for example RDAP, remains flexible...**"
- ⦿ Rec 7 specifically refers to the technical capabilities soon to be available through the RDAP system:
 - ⦿ "The Working Group recommends that these recommendations are coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary **and are implemented and/or applied as soon as a WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters, becomes operational.**"

Determining a Path Forward

IRT Principles and Guidelines

- ⑤ 5E: ...the GNSO Council liaison in consultation with the IRT is expected to make an assessment as to the level of consensus within the IRT on whether to raise the issue with the GNSO Council for consideration, using the **standard decision making methodology outlined in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines**. If the GNSO Council liaison makes the determination that there is consensus for such consideration, the liaison will inform the GNSO Council accordingly which will deliberate on the issue and then make a determination on how to proceed which could include, for example, the initiation of a GGP, a PDP or further guidance to the IRT and/or GDD staff on how to proceed. **This process also applies to cases in which there is agreement between the IRT and GDD staff concerning the need for further guidance from the GNSO Council and/or when issues arise that may require possible policy discussion**” [emphasis added]
- ⑤ 5G: “IRT deliberations should not be used as a tool to reopen a previously explored policy issue only because a constituency or stakeholder group was not satisfied with the outcome of a previously held process on the same policy issue, **unless the circumstances have changed and/or new information is available**” [emphasis added].
- ⑤ <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irt-principles-guidelines-23aug16-en.pdf>

GNSO Working Group Guidelines

- ⦿ Section 3.6, “Standard Methodology for Making Decisions”
 - ⦿ Full consensus, consensus, strong support with significant opposition, divergence, minority view
 - ⦿ Gauge dissent rather than consent
 - ⦿ Not looking for consensus on implementation (already a Consensus Policy)
 - ⦿ Need compelling reason not to implement based on line-item dissent against particular recommendation(s), with full explanation
 - ⦿ Steps
 1. Following discussion of issue and circulation of input mechanism, GDD Project Lead and GNSO Council liaison make evaluation of consensus-level designation
 2. Discuss consensus level designation with IRT, reevaluate and recirculate as necessary
 3. Continue steps until evaluation accepted
 4. Refer matter to GNSO Council for guidance
- ⦿ <https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/annex-1-gns0-wg-guidelines-07apr11-en.pdf>

Two Scenarios

- ⦿ Scenario 1 (status quo): Consensus with RDAP as “WHOIS replacement system” in context of T/T recommendations
 - ⦿ Continue to implement T/T recommendations
 - ⦿ GDD continues to draft, revise, and eventually approve policy language for implementation alongside RDAP
- ⦿ Scenario 2: Significant dissent among IRT to implementing alongside RDAP
 - ⦿ Gauge level of dissent against implementing recommendations
 - ⦿ Refer to GNSO Council for guidance via GNSO Council liaison
- ⦿ Any initial feedback from IRT on which path to pursue?

ICANN 57: Hyderabad

- ⦿ Who's going?
- ⦿ IRT Session: Tuesday, 8 November 15:15 – 16:15 (local), 09:45 – 10:45 (UTC), Granite I Novotel Room
- ⦿ Session objective: make determination of path forward



Questions?

Reach me at:

Email: brian.aitchison@icann.org



twitter.com/icann



[gplus.to/icann](https://plus.google.com/icann)



facebook.com/icannorg



weibo.com/ICANNorg



linkedin.com/company/icann



flickr.com/photos/icann



youtube.com/user/icannnews



slideshare.net/icannpresentations

Reference: T/T Recommendations

1. It is not desirable to make transformation of contact information mandatory. Any parties requiring transformation are free to do so on an ad hoc basis outside WHOIS or any replacement system, such as the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP). If not undertaken voluntarily by registrar/registry (see Recommendation #5), the burden of transformation lies with the requesting party.
2. Whilst noting that a WHOIS replacement system should be capable of receiving input in the form of non-ASCII script contact information, its data fields should be stored and displayed in a way that allows for easy identification of what the different data entries represent and what language(s)/script(s) have been used by the registered name holder [emphasis added].
3. The language(s) and script(s) supported for registrants to submit their contact information data may be chosen in accordance with gTLD-provider business models.
4. Regardless of the language(s)/script(s) used, it is assured that the data fields are consistent to standards in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), relevant Consensus Policy, Additional WHOIS Information Policy (AWIP) and any other applicable policies. Entered contact information data are validated, in accordance with the aforementioned Policies and Agreements and the language/script used must be easily identifiable.
5. If the transformation of contact information is performed, and if the WHOIS replacement system is capable of displaying more than one data set per registered name holder entry, these data should be presented as: additional fields (in addition to the authoritative local script fields provided by the registrant) and that these fields be marked as transformed and their source(s) indicated.
6. Any WHOIS replacement system, for example RDAP, should remain flexible so that contact information in new scripts/languages can be added and expand its linguistic/script capacity for receiving, storing and displaying contact information data.
7. These recommendations should be coordinated with other WHOIS modifications where necessary and are implemented and/or applied as soon as a WHOIS replacement system that can receive, store and display non-ASCII characters, becomes operational.