

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: All right. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to our meeting of the IGO INGO Identifiers Protection Policy Implementation, IRT, on Wednesday the 20<sup>th</sup> of January 2016. My name is Fabien Betremieux. I'm with the Global Domains Division of ICANN.

Before we start, very quickly, roll call. So we have Crystal [inaudible]. We have [inaudible] and [inaudible] with us today from the IRT. I don't think I'm missing anyone, so please let me know if that's the case. I'll just stop a second. I think we have everyone identified here.

A very quick reminder before we jump into our agenda and discussion today. Please make sure you mute your lines when you're not speaking. The meeting is recorded and will be transcribed. For the purposes of the transcript, please don't forget to state your name when you speak.

And secondly, if you would like to get into the queue to speak, please do so by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect. And for [Eugene?] please just let us know out loud if you would like to speak. [CROSSTALK]

Yes, sorry?

JIM: I just wanted to clarify that while I represent the IOC, I'm also a member of the IPC. So I think I'm probably joining the call in both capacities.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Thank you Jim. Thank you for that clarification. So for the transcript, this was Jim [inaudible]. So the objective of our call today, to provide an update on our progress on the implementation and collect your feedback on the draft of our current consensus policy which we shared last week.

In terms of agenda, we really have three main items. We'll just quickly go through the reminder of, the diagram of our implementation. Then we'll spend most of our time reviewing and discussing the current draft of the consensus policy on which we shared. And finally, we'll talk about status of our implementation role in this.

Does anybody have comments or questions regarding the agenda? Hearing none, so let me move down our presentation. So as a matter of background, you may remember we've discussed this in our last IRT meeting, ICANN meeting in Dublin. We just wanted to make sure, you know, provide this reminder to everyone, that there are a few initiatives going on related to IGO INGO protection, and wanted to make sure that everyone understands the scope of our work here.

So we currently are implementing the policy recommendation which the Board adopted on the 30<sup>th</sup> of April 2014. And this is the blue line you're seeing here, the IGO INGO identifiers protection policy implementation. In collaboration between the cross functional team at ICANN and the IRT.

There is entirely related to that Board resolution, still some outstanding recommendations that were inconsistent with GAC advice, which are

---

---

being discussed. And so when those are ready, they may be incorporating into our work, but until they are, we are focusing on the scope of the adopted recommendations, which were the ones which were consistent with GAC advice.

And finally, a quick mention of the current [inaudible] process that's ongoing on the IGO INGO [inaudible] rights protection mechanism, which is independent of our work, which is ready to implement the [inaudible] charge protection policy recommendation.

Please stop me if you have any questions or would like any clarification on this slide.

Hearing none, I'm moving on. So, in terms of focus of our current work, you may remember that the recommendations that were adopted were for top level protection and second level protection. At the top level, we are working to implement of Red Cross Red Crescent [scope] one, which is a full name reserved at the top level.

We're working to implement protection of the IOC's name at the top level, reserved at the top level. In terms of the IGOs, we're talking about the resurrection of full name at the top level again here. And in terms of the IGO general list, we are working to implement resurrection of the full names at the top level as well.

And as far as the implementation, we will also need to implement exception procedure, which we'll talk about later in our meeting. And at the second level, we have two kinds of protection here. Names reservation and that's for Red Cross Red Crescent name scope one, ICO names and IGOs scope one, full names as well.

---

And the second protection is the claim protection for the INGOs identified. [Inaudible] if you have any question or comment? Did somebody join our call? I realize we have an additional participant.

MIKE: Yes, this is Mike [inaudible] from the IPC. Sorry, I was a few minutes late.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Hello Mike. Thank you for joining. So we just went through the background, and we're now moving on to the discussion, reviewing the discussion of our current draft policy language.

Thank you Mike. So, in terms, as a reminder in terms of deliverables of our implementation work, we have identified three main items. The consensus policy language, for which we've been working on a draft which was recently revised and shared with the [IOT?]. Eventually this would need to go to public comments before it becomes final and is published as a consensus policy language for this policy.

So as I mentioned in terms of status, we're still working on a draft and will be discussing this in a few minutes. The other main deliverables is the list of identifiers label, for each of the identifiers protected. As you can see here, the status of each of those is viable.

We are almost complete on the Red Cross Red Crescent identifiers. We still have some issues to resolve, so we are working to resolve those with the Red Cross. The [inaudible] identifiers list is complete. Scope one of the IGO identifiers is currently challenged because we're meeting

---

additional two languages that are mandated by the policy recommendations, so we're working on that, on correcting those two languages.

I mean, those identifiers in two languages. As far as IGO identifiers and contact data, which are prerequisite for the implementation of the [inaudible] of the identifiers, we are having, we are seeking to have our issues with reaching out, with reaching the [inaudible] organization, which we understand is the [major?] of those register of name.

And finally, the third element of our deliverables, implementation procedures, internally for ICANN to use in terms of implementing the protection, and that's [inaudible]... I see that [Peter] has raised his hand. Would you like to go ahead [inaudible]?

[PETER]:

Thanks. [Peter] for the record. Just quickly going back to the list of the identification, as we've discussed it last time as well, and importance of, be sure to have the correct correspondence address to identify the correct person for each organization. So, when will that be solved, do you think, in a timely manner?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

So are you specifically referring to one kind of [inaudible] the INGO ones for instance?

---

[PETER]: Well, as far as I remember when we discussed this last time, I think it was not so much trouble with IGOs, but as the IGOs are so many, and really you didn't have all 100% correct contact information for those. We discussed that, the importance for you to, going back and make sure that everything was correct and when you communicate with the right person, so to speak, identify for each INGOs.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, so you're speaking about the INGOs. So we're currently working on that. And I think Laurie [inaudible] has showed up on our proposal last, during the last meeting and shared some analysis which we're processing. And so that's one of our objectives is the need to have the appropriate contact information for those identifiers.

I see that Berry has raised his hand. Berry, would you like to go ahead?

BERRY: Thank you Fabien. This is Berry for the record. Yeah, [Peter], just to put more substance around this. The first step to this is that we need to make contact with organizations [inaudible] as they aren't the formal managers, but they do manage the overall authoritative list to as to who is on special or general consultative status, which is the basis for the scope of the protections for the INGOs.

First and foremost, we need access to that authoritative list so that we can help reconcile exactly what we are getting ready to deploy as it relates to, you know, setting up these protections that have been offered to them.

---

The second part of then is, directly to your point is, how do we get the contact information for all of these different organizations? Which is something that the IRP is going to have to work through. As you noted, there are, you know, there is a large quantity especially under the general consultative status, over 2,000 that will be difficult to manage.

So once we, if and when we do make contact with the CSO [net?] to get that actual scope of names, then the subsequent step is then to figure out well, how do we acquire the minimal contact information necessary to bulk add and to the claims solution, as well as any other aspects to that?

And as you noted, it could be a management challenge in addition to what has been pointed out by others that, you know, not all INGOs even have a website to begin with, so those are some of the things that we'll have to work out.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah [inaudible], so not an easy task to solve. But again, you have some kind of time scheduled for, when you presumed that this will be solved?

BERRY: This is Berry. No time schedule as of yet. And again, this is something, I think, that the IRT needs to discuss is, when do we call when? It is a challenge to try to make contact with this particular group. I'm not even sure that they're even aware of these protections being offered.

And in terms of trying to acquire the list and implement the protections, that's something we're going to have to work out because if we don't

---

ever get an authoritative list, we're pretty much stuck right at the beginning.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah, okay. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Fabien, are you still on the line?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, sorry, I was muted. This is Fabien speaking. Apologies. So thank you [Peter] for your question and Berry for your input. I'm having difficulty loading the consensus [inaudible] language, for some reason.

So while I'm trying to do that, let me go back to my slides. So at a high level, in our revised document which we shared on the mailing list last week, we've covered four elements of the open items that we have discussed in Dublin.

So the four are: the reservation of the top level, the documentation of standards... So the [inaudible] procedure at the top level as well, implementation of the exception procedure at the second level, and identify matching [inaudible]. So those four are the slide we have addressed in the conduct.

And the three items at the bottom are the ones that we submit to a draft, a later draft. And those include an implementation of claims service, protections. The definition of [inaudible] will include the labels



---

for IGO and INGOs. And which will be protected through claims services. And also the mechanisms for the maintenance of the protected items [inaudible]. So that we attempt to load this file again. For some reason, I'm having issues and I apologize for that.

So [inaudible], I have been disconnected from my Adobe Connect. So in the meantime, may I request for those of you who are on your computers to try to have the document in front of you, that might help us solve the Adobe Connect issue that I'm experiencing. Can you please confirm when you've been able to load the document?

So while I try to...

MARY:

Fabien, everyone, this is Mary. I'm going to try... I'm just trying to make sure that I have the latest version. So I guess [CROSSTALK] whether I get there first off, Fabien. Just give me a second.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, so the document is the one... This is Fabien speaking. The document we shared on the mailing list. The last document we shared on the mailing list, so maybe you can have access to that while I'm trying to log in again. Hopefully, re-launching Adobe Connect will solve my issue.

So I'm connected to the Adobe Room so let me try to load the document. We apologize for the issue.

---

Okay. Finally, again apologies for this issue. So I've loaded our document, which we've shared. I've loaded the red line version so that you can see our edits compared to the previous version. We had chaired an event of the Dublin meeting. So our protection, our consensus policy document contains four sections.

Section at the top level, second level domain, second level name services, and [inaudible]. So, here on section one, protection of the top level, so here we kept this language as simple as possible. So in terms of the reservation the policy states, the consensus policy states, labels corresponding to the following items are reserved from delegation as gTLDs, and shall be applied for by the relevant protected organization.

And then list these items that are protected for the Red Cross, then the IOC, the IGOs, and INGOs. In terms of application, which is the exception procedure, the application process for the introduction process of new gTLDs during eligible application windows, shall include a process allowing for the submission of application by a relevant protected organization, seeking to apply for the delegation of a label otherwise reserved under section 1.1, which is the section previously, regarding the reservation of the identifiers.

The application process shall require the organization to provide documentation to establish itself as a [inaudible] organization. The application will be subjected to applicable processes governing the introduction of new gTLDs.

So here is the, what we suggest as being the language for the protection of the top level. We have a reservation section, an application section.

---

I think what we are seeking is the IRT confirmation that this is their understanding of the intent of this policy. And we are also interested to hear your thoughts on the documentation standard for protective organization to establish itself as the right of an organization to apply for a reserved main.

So we'll stop here and provide an opportunity for any comments or questions. I just want to note that we will provide you with enough time after the meeting to provide any feedback in writing. So please be aware you also have that opportunity, but in case you'd like to express any of these elements here, we are happy to do that as well.

I'm not seeing any hands raised nor hearing anybody, so let me move to section to two....

JIM: Fabien? Hello?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes. Can you hear me?

JIM: Jim [inaudible]. Are you asking for us to comment on the ability of owners of reserved names to register the names within the gTLDs.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I think this section here is really about the protection at this top level, so that is the reservation of identifiers as gTLDs. And the input

---

we're seeking specifically here, is whether the IRT has any thoughts on the documentation standards for established, for an organization to establish itself as the [inaudible] organization, that would like to apply for its name as a gTLD. So we're really at the top level here, in this section.

JIM: Yeah, I just wanted to say, on behalf of the IOC, we recommend that the owners of reserved name have the ability to apply to their own names, which they don't have now.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So I think at the top level, it's being seen as a policy, and that's the intent of the policy... The policy recommendation at the top level and second level, for the right event [inaudible] do call for this. So our implementation is... The consensus document here, does reflect that. I just want to confirm that.

JIM: Thank you. Great.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Any other comments or questions? Hearing none, so let me move on to section two. So I'm scrolling the document to section two. So here we have three subsections, one subsection, 2.1, regarding the reservation of identifiers at the second level.

---

We have another subsection which is regarding the handling of existing registration for protected identifiers. And finally, we have a third section about the registration by protected organizations. So that's the exception procedure for the protected organization.

So section 2.1 on the reservation, we have not made any change to that, a treaty about registry operators withholding from registration the second, at the second level the DNS labels corresponding to the identifier, which we list underneath. The second subsection, regarding the existing registration. So here, we've documented the principles that are recommended by the final report and policy recommendation, which in a sense calls for existing names in legacy TLDs.

The TLDs that were delegated prior to 2012, so not the gTLDs but the ones prior to new gTLDs. So when those, when protected identifiers, at the second level, is reserved in those TLDs, we really here reflect the policy recommendation that if a name is registered before the effective date of this policy, and not renewed by the registrant, [inaudible], then such registration must be deleted by the registrar after termination of any renewal grace period.

And at the end, and eventually this name cannot be reserved any more, registered anymore. So that's... Do you have any more suggestions? So regarding new gTLDs, in case there has been registration of protected identifiers in new gTLDs, we suggest that those be handled in the same way.

This should not be the case because those names are temporarily reserved as per definition five of the registration agreement. But in

---

case we find that indeed such names have been reserved, this is what we're suggestion in terms of handling those registrations.

And finally, the exception procedure, 2.3, section 2.3. Here... Yes? Crystal?

CRYSTAL:

This is Crystal for the record. Quick question on that. There are some, there is the ability for, I believe, the IOC [inaudible] and the RC to add additional second level domains. So I believe about a year ago, we got a list of quite a lot of new SLDs to reserve that weren't included previously.

So are you saying that 2.2.2 would apply to those?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

So, 2.2.2 only apply to names that will be, that should be reserved under this policy, and that may have been registered already. I don't know if that... Does that clarification enough in response to your question? I'm not exactly sure of the names you are referring to.

CRYSTAL:

Right, and Berry put it in. Those are the names, right. They weren't initially reserved under our RA, so I don't know how many registries have actually made them available or what made them available before that list came out, but there, I'm sure there are some that have been registered.

---

Just [inaudible]...

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. So Berry, would you like to speak to this one?

BERRY: Yeah. Hi, this is Berry. I think, you're absolutely right. There are going to be some fringe cases where a few of these names that were temporarily reserved until the outcome of the policy process could have been registered. In that case, again, it will default back to 2.2.1. The trigger here is whatever the IRP decides the policy effective date, and they will be able to run a scan or some analysis to see what that really looks like.

But the idea is that if the name was registered prior to the policy being effected, then it would traverse the natural course of the domain registration cycle up until it wasn't renewed.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Crystal, does that answer your question?

CRYSTAL: I mean, I understand... I'm just questioning now why it says in gTLDs, delegated prior to 2012 as will be the case in some that delegated post 2012 as well.

---

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I'm not sure. I couldn't hear everything you said Crystal. Would you mind maybe typing in your remark or question?

CRYSTAL: I guess I'm just trying to figure out why this only applies prior to 2012? If we roll this policy out, new registries would be confused by this.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: So yeah, I think the difference here is really to the fact that the legacy TLDs did not have spec size, and the temporary reservations that were mandated under [RSSAC five?]. So this is really the core of the difference.

I see that there is typing.

Okay. So they are suggesting an edit to section 2.2. Would that help with making that difference? Or does it need more work?

CRYSTAL: I agree with his add, I'm just trying to make it clear to you guys why that needs to be there. I think Berry understands that. We can talk offline about it if there are no questions.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Sure, okay. Thanks. And so finally in section two, we have this subsection 2.3, with respect, which is the suggestion for the implementation of the exception procedure. So reservation about protected organization relevant to [inaudible] organization, may request



---

registration of domain names matching [inaudible], otherwise reserved at the second level per section 2.1 of this policy.

So here, we are providing the implementation of the exception procedure that is recommended in the policy for the protected organization.

Any additional questions or comments on section two?

Hearing none, not seeing anybody in the queue, I'm moving on. Section three, as we mention in the high level overview, we will need to come back on this section in later draft, when we have more clarity as to the list of identifiers. So we focused on the other section for now. Any questions related to section three, the [inaudible] protections at the second level, which will apply in our current scope to the INGO identifiers, scope one?

I see that there is... Okay, [Peter], would you like to speak to this one?

[PETER]:

Just a practical question. Is it so that the headlines are related, these are still questions or topics that will be solved [inaudible] on a later stage? Because in that case, I would suggest that we keep the headlines and fill in with updated text and information later on, just so that we see that this chapter is not just three lines, so to speak.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, thank you [Peter]. So I think one of the reasons why we removed the headings that we had there, is because we weren't sure of what was

---

going to be the structure. So we didn't want to necessarily stick to those, but you know, in essence those headings that we had in the previous version are indeed compliments of what we would most likely include.

But because we're not exactly sure yet of what is going to be the outcome of this, the implementation of those protections, we just wanted to remove them. But again, we will certainly address those things into what will suggest in later draft.

[PETER]: Okay, just so we still have them in mind.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yeah. Thank you [Peter]. Crystal?

CRYSTAL: I guess feedback or question. Aren't registries required to run claims on names that were previously reserved anyway? So is this a bit [inaudible] in the obligations we already have?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Berry?

BERRY: This is Berry. So Crystal, there are several moving parts with this particular protection. The first is, what are going to be the final

---

requirements of the policy that outflow, or what are going to be the requirements outflow of this policy? So there still, it's still being discussed as to what exactly the claim service might look like.

There is some indication that it could potentially be a permeant claims versions 90 day claims. That's still unsure. And it's further complicated by it's not just necessarily the IGOs, but as well as the Red Cross. So that's just implementation of the claim service as well.

Clearly, most of the TLDs have delegated up to this point, so it's likely, once this becomes effective, we're probably talking about future rounds. But to your point, and I think this is something that IRT needs to discuss, when we implement the final reservations of what is going to be reserved and what's not, clearly there are some strings that are temporarily reserved, and it should be a decision that is made by the IRT exactly how that goes.

And as you stated, current practices, if something does come off of a reserved list, not necessarily spec five but what has been reserved from other mechanisms that they still go through that claim service as well. So that's why just when there is so many moving parts as to what the end solution is going to look like, and for now until we have better clarity, we're kind of just skipping over this particular part of the implementation. Hope that helps.

CRYSTAL:

Okay, thanks Berry. That makes a lot of sense. And so just you guys all understand. [Joe's] position that things that come off this list all to go through claims, [inaudible].

---

BERRY: Yes.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Any additional comments on section three on claims services?

Okay. Not seeing any hands raised, not hearing anybody, moving on to section four. So here is the main addition to section four. Section four is about listing and specifying, in all details possible, the protective identifier. And section 4.1 is the section in which we wanted to document the rule of matching identifiers to DNS label.

That you may recall our conversation on this topic in Dublin where, in order to protect identifier, what we can protect at the top level and second level, are DNS labels. So we need to define how we go from an identifier, which is a name of an organization into an actual DNS label that's valid in the DNS.

So the section is aimed at documenting the rules that would apply, to go from a protected list of identifiers that's provided per the policy, into a list of applicable DNS labels. And what we've done here is document the conversion algorithms which we've used for domains that are currently, the DNS labels that are currently protected under spec five for IGO and INGOs.

So in a sense, in summary, we've provided all of the details in terms, in technical terms. But in essence, to take an example, what we document here is the rule by which Red Cross has an identifier becomes two labels, Red Cross without a space, all attached, and Red dash Cross. So

---

this is the mechanism which we have documented here, and which we proposed for your consideration.

Any question? I see Berry, additional comments?

BERRY:

Yes, Berry. Just real quick. I think we might want to add that 1.5, which I just remembered. There is the limitation of 63 characters, and so we may want to mimic 4.1.1 in a way that, you know, if being reduced down it exceeds 63 characters, then it won't be converted because it couldn't be reserved. Thank you.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

Yeah, thank you Berry. That's a good catch. I think we need to add this, thank you.

Any other questions, comments on section 4.1?

And on this proposed rules for matching protected identifiers to DNS label?

Hearing none, I just want to very quickly browse through the end of that, the rest of section four. This is here really only two documents, precisely what are the [inaudible] as per the policy recommendations? And as you can see here, we just have place holders for names and identifiers that are not in the scope of our current implementation are still subject to reconciliation of the attending recommendation.

---

And then eventually, subsection 4.6 is about the maintenance of the identifiers list, which we discussed earlier. So we haven't made any changes to these parts, and as we've mentioned we're working on finalizing these lists of identifiers and their corresponding labels, which we will document, either in [specific size] for those names that are reserved at the top level and second level, we will use not [inaudible], sorry, but the reserved names list which is referred to from specification five of the registry agreement.

And we will create a specific [inaudible] specification for the names and the labels that are protected under claims protection. So this is it for our proposed revision for the draft consensus. I will go back to our slides for our update on the implementation and next steps.

So before we get there, we just wanted to quickly mention those challenges that are still current. So we expect that the resolution of the [outstanding] policy recommendations may have an impact on how changes may be implemented. So this is a possibility. So we are moving ahead, and we will be developing the proposed implementation claims protection, but we are certainly aware that there may be an impact.

But until those recommendations are reconciled, we will move forward with what our current scope of the implementation. And in terms of implementation related challenges we've mentioned the two languages for the IGO identifiers, as well as the [inaudible] the measurement of identifiers and compact data of INGOs.

Unless there is any question or comment, I will move to our next steps in the timeline. Not hearing comments nor seeing any hands raised, so

---

moving to status of implementation and next steps. In terms of next steps, what we propose is that the IRT takes another week to provide feedback in writing if any, on our doc consensus policy language.

And that we schedule our next meeting depending on your feedback. Either during ICANN 55, we are currently trying to determine if we can have a face to face meeting there, and we will confirm that. And we could also organize a conference call before ICANN 55 to discuss any feedback, as needed.

In terms of timeline, you may remember our assumption as of our meeting at ICANN 54. We were, which we've adapted now to our current progress. So we're looking now at, due to the various challenges we're having with the identifier data and contact information. We've revised our timeline assumptions, and we're now looking at an implementation period of first half of 2017 instead of second half of 2016.

And we will keep working against the principle of organizing an IGO meeting every month, which we've not been able to complete at the end of last year, which will try to organize from now on. And once we are able to finalize the drafting of our implementation timeline, which includes the consensus policy [inaudible] and contact data, as appropriate, we will then submit for public comment the implementation plan.

Then eventually work to finalize the implementation plan which would become, which would be announced along with the policy effective

---

date. And this ends our presentation. Are there any comments or questions on next steps and timeline?

Okay. I'm not seeing anybody in the queue or hearing anyone. So this ends our meeting of the... [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...Fabien, can I ask a question to Jim? I think I read somewhere in the back email, that David [inaudible] is no longer on the IRT. Is that correct?

Jim, are you still there?

JIM: Yes, I'm sorry. I was on mute. David [inaudible] left the firm a couple of months ago to become a judge at the US Trademark Trial Appeal Board, and Holly Lance is joining the IRT in his place.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Holly Lance. I don't think we have that person's name on our list. So...

JIM: I think she has just prepared a statement of interest.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Oh, okay.



---

JIM: So it should be coming in the next few days. She was not able to make the call today.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

JIM: Okay.

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Okay? Thank you. So unless there is any additional comments or questions, I think we can give you back the 10 minutes and thank you again for your time today and your participation in our meeting. We look forward to any you would like to provide in relation to our draft consensus policy.

And we will keep you posted on the next meeting.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**