



Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group (WG) Charter

WG Name:	Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group	
Section I: Working Group Identification		
Chartering Organization(s):	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council	
Charter Approval Date:	TBD	
Name of WG Chair:	TBD	
Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):	TBD	
WG Workspace URL:	https://community.icann.org/display/tatcipdp/Translation+and+Transliteration+of+Contact+Information+PDP+Home	
WG Mailing List:	TBD	
GNSO Council Resolution:	Title:	Motion to Approve the Charter for the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Working Group
	Ref # & Link:	TBD
Important Document Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information (http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/transliteration-contact-final-21mar13-en.pdf). • Final Report of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/ird/final-report-ird-wg-07may12-en.pdf) 	

Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

Mission & Scope:

Background

On 17 October 2012 the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report to address the three issues that were identified by the IRD-WG:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.
- Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script. This question relates to the concern expressed by the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG) in its report that there are costs associated with providing translation and transliteration of contact information. For example, if a policy development process (PDP) determined that the registrar must translate or transliterate contact information, this policy would place a cost burden on the registrar.
- Whether to start a PDP to address these questions.

The [Final Issue Report](#) on translation and transliteration of contact information was submitted to the GNSO Council on 21 March 2013 and on 13 June 2013 the GNSO Council approved the initiation of a PDP on the translation and transliteration of contact information.

Mission and Scope

The PDP Working Group is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a policy recommendation regarding the translation and transliteration of contact information. This recommendation also will be considered by a separate Expert Working Group that is tasked with determining the appropriate Internationalized Domain Name registration data requirements and data model for Registration Data Directory Services (such as WHOIS). As part of its deliberations on this issue, the PDP WG should, at a minimum, consider the following issues as detailed in the Final Issue Report:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.
- Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script. This question relates to the concern expressed by the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG) in its report that there are costs associated with providing translation and transliteration of contact information. For example, if a policy development process (PDP) determined that the registrar must translate or transliterate contact information, this policy would place a cost burden on the registrar.

With respect to the first issue above, it should be noted that text requests and content returned by Domain Name Registration Data Services (such as WHOIS) are historically encoded using US-American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII). This is a character-encoding scheme originally based on the English alphabet. While the WHOIS protocol does not specify US-ASCII as the exclusive character set for text requests and text content encoding, the current situation is that no standards or conventions exist for all WHOIS protocol implementations to signal support of character sets other

than US-ASCII.

In the context of these issues, “contact information” is a subset of Domain Name Registration Data. It is the information that enables someone using a Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (such as WHOIS) to contact the domain name registration holder. It includes the name, organization, and postal address of the registered name holder, technical contact, as well as administrative contact. Domain Name Registration Data is accessible to the public via a Directory Service (also known as the WHOIS service). The Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA 3.3.1) specifies the data elements that must be provided by registrars (via Port 43 and via web-based services) in response to a query, but it does not require that data elements, such as contact information, must be translated or transliterated.

With respect to the two issues identified above concerning the translation and transliteration of contact information, the following additional background may be useful. On the first issue, whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script, the IRD-WG noted that, “[t]o balance the needs and capabilities of the local registrant with the need of the (potential) global user of this data, one of the key questions ... is whether DNRD-DS [Domain Name Registration Data Directory Services] should support multiple representations of the same registration data in different languages or scripts.” In particular, the IRD-WG members discussed whether it is desirable to adopt a “must be present” representation of contact data, in conjunction with local script support for the convenience of local users. By “must be present” the IRD-WG meant that contact data must be made available in a common script.

In general, the IRD-WG recognized that, “the internationalized contact data can be translated or transliterated into the ‘must be present’ representation. As noted above, in this context, **Translation** is the process of conveying the meaning of some passage of text in one language, so that it can be expressed equivalently in another language. **Transliteration** is the process of representing the characters of an alphabetical or syllabic system of writing by the characters of a conversion alphabet.” Based on this definition, and consistent with the current state of domain name registration data, the IRD-WG noted that if transliteration were desired, then the “must be present” script would be the Latin script. If translation were desired, then the “must be present” language would be English.

The IRD-WG did note that many language translation systems are inexact and cannot be applied repeatedly to translate from one language to another. Thus the IRD-WG noted that there will likely be problems with both consistency and accuracy, such as:

- Translation/transliteration may vary significantly across languages using the same script.
- Two people may translate/transliterate differently even within a language and the same person may translate/transliterate differently at different times for the same language.
- How would a registrar determine which particular spellings to use for a particular registrant? How would a registrant ever verify the correctness of a translation or transliteration, even if presented such data by the registrar or by a third organization that does the translation/transliteration?

Furthermore, the IRD-WG noted that for a given script, there may exist multiple systems for transliteration into Latin scripts. In the case of Chinese, the multiple transliteration systems are not only quite different from each other, but most of the systems use particular Latin characters to

represent phonemes that are quite different from the most common phoneme-character pairings in European languages.

Also, it is unclear whether translation or transliteration would serve the needs of the users of contact data. For example it is unclear that translating the name of the registrant and city would be useful. Would one have to translate "Los Angeles" into "City of the Angels" and translate "Beijing" into "Northern Capital"? The PDP should explore whether such translations facilitate or hinder the ability to contact the registrant.

Finally, as part of its discussion on this first question the WG should also consider discussing the following questions:

- What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact data, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact data be mandatory for all gTLDs?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact data be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?
- What impact will translation/transliteration of contact data have on the WHOIS validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement?
- When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?

To help to determine whether translation and/or transliteration should be mandatory, and to help the Working Group to consider to the costs of translation and/or transliteration, the Working Group may wish to develop a matrix elaborating a ruling and costs in each possible case for countries and non-ASCII scripts. The second issue, who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script, relates to the concern expressed by the IRD-WG in its report that there are costs associated with providing translation and transliteration of contact information. For example, if a PDP determined that the registrar must translate or transliterate contact information, this policy would place a cost burden on the registrar. The IRD-WG considered several alternatives to address translation and transliteration of contact information as follows:

- The registrant submits the localized information as well the translated or transliterated information.
- The registrant only submits the localized information, and the registrar translates and transliterates all internationalized contact information on behalf of the registrant.
- The registrant only submits the localized information, and the registrars provide a point of contact at a service that could provide translation or transliteration upon request for a fee to be paid by the requester.
- The registrant only submits the localized information, and the registry provides translation or transliteration.
- The end users of the registration data translate and transliterate the contact information.

The PDP-WG will not be limited to considering the above alternatives, but will be encouraged to

consider all possible alternatives. The PDP-WG also may consult with ICANN Legal staff when considering alternatives. In addition, the PDP-WG should review the work of other PDPs and WGs relating to IDNs and WHOIS. These include the following PDPs and WGs: [gTLD Data Registration Data Services](#), [Thick WHOIS](#), [WHOIS Survey WG](#), [IRD-WG](#), the [IDN Variant TLDs Issues Project](#), [Technical Evolution of WHOIS Service](#), and the [Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services](#).

As part of its deliberation on who should decide who should bear that cost of translation and/or transliteration, WG members might also want to discuss who they believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set in the Initial Report on this issue.

During their deliberations the members of the IRD-WG recognized that many registrants will need to access domain names in their local scripts and languages, which is the one of the primary reasons for the expansion of internationalized domain names. Therefore, the IRD-WG determined that it is unreasonable to assume all registrants – wherever they happen to be located – will be able to enter the registration data in scripts or languages other than their local script or language.

The PDP WG is also expected to consider any information and advice provided by other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees on this topic. The WG is strongly encouraged to reach out to these groups for collaboration at an early stage of its deliberations, to ensure that their concerns and positions are considered in a timely manner.

Finally, the Working Group is expected to review/check relevant recommendations that may arise from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Service if/when those become available and determine possible linkage to the issues at hand.

Objectives & Goals:

To develop, at a minimum, an Initial Report and a Final Report regarding translation and transliteration of contact information to be delivered to the GNSO Council, following the processes described in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the GNSO PDP Manual.

Deliverables & Timeframes:

The WG shall respect the timelines and deliverables as outlined in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the PDP Manual. As per the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, the WG shall develop a work plan that outlines the necessary steps and expected timing in order to achieve the milestones of the PDP as set out in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the PDP Manual and submit this to the GNSO Council.

Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria:

The Working Group will be open to all interested in participating. Individuals with experience in translation and transliteration of languages and scripts will be encouraged to join, as well as those with experience in internationalized domain names (IDNs). New members who join after certain parts of work has been completed are expected to review previous documents and meeting transcripts.

Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:

This WG shall be a standard GNSO PDP Working Group. The GNSO Secretariat should circulate a ‘Call For Volunteers’ as widely as possible in order to ensure broad representation and participation in the Working Group, including:

- Publication of announcement on relevant ICANN web sites including but not limited to the GNSO and other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee web pages; and

- Distribution of the announcement to GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies and other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Working Group Roles, Functions, & Duties:

The ICANN Staff assigned to the WG will fully support the work of the Working Group as requested by the Chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate.

Staff assignments to the Working Group:

- GNSO Secretariat
- 2 ICANN policy staff members (Julie Hedlund and Lars Hoffmann)

The standard WG roles, functions & duties shall be applicable as specified in Section 2.2 of the Working Group Guidelines.

Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:

Each member of the Working Group is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Section IV: Rules of Engagement

Decision-Making Methodologies:

The Chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:

- **Full consensus** - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as **Unanimous Consensus**.
- **Consensus** - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. *[Note: For those that are unfamiliar with ICANN usage, you may associate the definition of 'Consensus' with other definitions and terms of art such as rough consensus or near consensus. It should be noted, however, that in the case of a GNSO PDP originated Working Group, all reports, especially Final Reports, must restrict themselves to the term 'Consensus' as this may have legal implications.]*
- **Strong support but significant opposition** - a position where, while most of the group supports a recommendation, there are a significant number of those who do not support it.
- **Divergence** (also referred to as **No Consensus**) - a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.
- **Minority View** - refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**; or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

In cases of **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**, an effort should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present any **Minority View** recommendations that may have been made. Documentation of **Minority View** recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s). In all cases of **Divergence**, the WG Chair should encourage the

submission of minority viewpoint(s).

The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:

- i. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.
- ii. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.
- iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group.
- iv. In rare case, a Chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:
 - A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
 - It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between **Consensus** and **Strong support but Significant Opposition** or between **Strong support but Significant Opposition** and **Divergence**.

Care should be taken in using polls that they do not become votes. A liability with the use of polls is that, in situations where there is **Divergence** or **Strong Opposition**, there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results.

Based upon the WG's needs, the Chair may direct that WG participants do not have to have their name explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus view/position. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls were taken.

Consensus calls should always involve the entire Working Group and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all Working Group members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the Chair to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the Working Group. Member(s) of the Working Group should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair as part of the Working Group discussion. However, if disagreement persists, members of the WG may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a WG disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the Chair, copying the WG explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the Chair still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair will forward the appeal to the CO liaison(s). The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison(s) supports the Chair's position, the liaison(s) will provide their response to the complainants. The liaison(s)

must explain their reasoning in the response. If the CO liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the CO. Should the complainants disagree with the liaison support of the Chair's determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. If the CO agrees with the complainants' position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair.

3. In the event of any appeal, the CO will attach a statement of the appeal to the WG and/or Board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the CO (see Note 2 below).

Note 1: Any Working Group member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Working Group member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison of their issue and the Chair and/or Liaison will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal process.

Note 2: It should be noted that ICANN also has other conflict resolution mechanisms available that could be considered in case any of the parties are dissatisfied with the outcome of this process.

Status Reporting:

As requested by the GNSO Council, taking into account the recommendation of the Council liaison to this group.

Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Processes:

The WG will adhere to [ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior](#) as documented in Section F of the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Frameworks and Principles, January 2008.

If a WG member feels that these standards are being abused, the affected party should appeal first to the Chair and Liaison and, if unsatisfactorily resolved, to the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, by itself, grounds for abusive behavior. It should also be taken into account that as a result of cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful or inappropriate to some but are not necessarily intended as such. However, it is expected that WG members make every effort to respect the principles outlined in ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior as referenced above.

The Chair, in consultation with the Chartering Organization liaison(s), is empowered to restrict the participation of someone who seriously disrupts the Working Group. Any such restriction will be reviewed by the Chartering Organization. Generally, the participant should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme circumstances, this requirement may be bypassed.

Any WG member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted or wants to appeal a decision of the WG or CO should first discuss the circumstances with the WG Chair. In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the WG member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative.

In addition, if any member of the WG is of the opinion that someone is not performing their role according to the criteria outlined in this Charter, the same appeals process may be invoked.

Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment:

The WG will close upon the delivery of the Final Report, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the GNSO Council.

Section V: Charter Document History

Version	Date	Description
1.0	19 September 2013	Final version submitted by the DT to the GNSO Council for consideration

Staff Contact:	Julie Hedlund	Email:	Policy-staff@icann.org
-----------------------	---------------	---------------	--

Translations: If translations will be provided please indicate the languages below:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--