
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DENNIS CHANG: Hello everyone. My name is Dennis Chang, and welcome to our IGO INGO Identifier Protection Policy Implementation IRT meeting.

And this is on the 25th of August 2016. Please remind you, before the recording, a lot of people will pick this up in recording format, as we see some regrets from some of the IRT members, so please state your name before speaking as a reminder.

And let's get started. First the roll call. IRT members that are on the call, could you identify yourself?

JIM BIKOFF: Jim Bikoff.

HOLLY HENCE: Holly Hence.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Crystal here too.

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.

DENNIS CHANG:

Excellent, that's all I see. So we have three IRT members here, and I have Berry Cobb from ICANN, and myself, there are two of us here today. And we'll see how it goes here.

So, for the agenda today, we're going to quickly, very quickly, give you some updates on the project status, and our major next milestone, key milestone for the IRT is the public comments, so we'll look at those items. Make sure that we are all ready to go.

And the project scope tracking chart, as a reminder, we like to look at this at every meeting. There is a lot of confusion, and we, at this IRT, have to come together and stay on the same page. And it does require reminders, even for myself.

Next item, we will actually look at the protected identifier list that we produced, and finally, the policy language that we have crafted that will be used for public comment, and we'll talk about the next step. Anything on the agenda, anybody have any comments?

JIM BIKOFF:

I do. It's Jim Bikoff. I'd like to bring up a point that has been pending for some time, that has not yet been addressed. This is going back to February of 2015, when we were dealing with your colleagues, Francisco Aias and Mary Wong, and the concept is protection or... As you know, Holly Lance and I represent the International Olympic Committee, and we have protection granted for Olympic and Olympiad at the top and second levels, in the UN six languages, but also in German, Greek, and Korean.

Here is the issue. If I may say, we wrote to Francisco back in February, saying that one of the problems we have is that we take an example like Olympiad, which is protected under the policy in Spanish, but if you look at then Olympiad, I'm sorry, you look at *olimpiada* which is the Spanish, [dot Moscow?], it has an accented, the protected word has an accent over the "i," the Spanish accent.

However, the word without the accent, which is English, is not reserved. And we put together a list of additional labels that we would like to be covered as a variance. And that list was sent back in April to Francisco and Mary. And we were told that this was really something that had to be looked at by this IRT.

So, we haven't yet heard anything about it. But, if I might, Dennis, I thought we would send you that list. Because what happens is, the same word has these two variance. And this isn't the only language, it's also true in Russia and a few of the other languages, Korean. So that you have one variant protected and one variant not protected, and the up shoot of that is, for instance, in the case of dot Moscow, we have a gentleman in Russia who, at that time, registered the one variant, and he is just a domain name reseller.

And he's trying to sell *olimpiada* dot Moscow without the accent over the "i." So we feel those should be protected to carry out the intent of both the, you know, the former committee who presented the resolution to the GNSO. But also GAC and the Board, because it's sort of doesn't really do the job if you allow somebody to obtain the name of the same word, but without an accent.

DENNIS CHANG: I think I follow you, Jim. And I think I've heard about this before too, actually. So let's go through the meeting today, and certainly you may submit anything you like. You are in IRT. But I want to make sure that it is within the scope of this implementation project. And when we look at the authority we're looking to for sources of the list, maybe it makes more sense then.

So, bear with me, and we're going to go through the entire policy language here, and let's see how that works.

JIM BIKOFF: Can I bring up a second point before we do that?

DENNIS CHANG: Sure.

JIM BIKOFF: The second point, and this is something that a lot of brand owners have grappled with, and we are among them, we have protection for a word, Olympic. When somebody else registers Olympics with an "S," or Olympic with a "K" instead of a "C," that obviously is not included. Now, I agree that that may be beyond the, you know, resolution that was presented to the GNSO and approved by the Board, but it's an issue that, you know, has come up in the context of the new gTLDs where you have dot car and dot cars.

And you know, obviously, in our mind, the use of adding a “S” to a brand name, so you have Nike and Nikes, you know, it’s obviously likely to be confused, and these, I’d say typo squatting type of additions should be considered for protection.

And again, I don’t know whether it’s within the mandate or not, but I’m going to send you something on that too, so that we can at least find out how we best should approach that topic.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Thank you Jim.

JIM BIKOFF: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So, those two topics Jim brought up, and we’ll see if we can address it here, or at some other forum. At this point, I’m not clear whether it’s in the scope of this implementation project. So let’s get to it, and we’ll find out the timeline assumptions. This is the same timeline that we’ve been looking at, so there is no change here.

And the important date here is, of course, right now, public comments starting, and then it will last up to here, and just before ICANN 57 it will close, so at ICANN 57, I’m thinking that we might have an opportunity together to review what we received from the public comment, and that will be interesting.

And then finalize that implementation plan where the IRT made the announcement on 1 February, and then go ahead and everybody implement, and policy effective date is 1 August. That hasn't changed. None of this has changed. We're sticking to our plan.

Status wise, we have received the IOC identifiers from the part of the recommendation for adapters. So we believe that's complete. IGO, we also received from [UN] [inaudible], and the IGO, the list that we have, is only one language, but the recommendation says up to two languages, so we've submitted a letter to the GAC, and the GAC is expected to respond to us with a second language in October 26.

Now what we've decided to do is proceed with the public comment, noting that [inaudible] [and not holding?] the public comment until receive that. And the other things are in work, as you will notice here. We have, we're in talks with [UN] [inaudible], we're developing our [plane?] system, and what not.

Next item, the first item here, the implementation plan...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hey, Dennis?

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Before you move forward. So you're planning on putting out for public comment and saying, eventually, maybe, there will be a second language. At that point, I expected another public comment. I just, I'm wondering, that is kind of a big policy decision, right? If you choose French over Spanish over Russian. That's something the public may want to comment on.

It just seems odd to not include that as part of the commentary.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay. So, well, sorry, did you miss...? I guess you may have missed a couple...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I did.

DENNIS CHANG: ...discussed several times with the IRT, whether or not what the dating items for, and this public comment is. And we decided that there was an updating item. We have a list. And let's look at it together, okay? We have a list right now, and the recommendation says that they can have up to two languages, so they are going to provide their second language, right?

And do we really need to know what that second language is and what it looks like? We said no. We can proceed with a public comment, and if we do receive that second language, within October, it's still within the public comment period, we'll go ahead and refresh it. [CROSSTALK]

...public comment, yeah. That's what I intend to do. As soon as I get it, I put it up. Now, if we don't get it, let's say, public comment is over, and we don't get it, and we received a second language, I would still go ahead and publish it. It's not going to be a secret.

So before the announcement is made, I'm sure that we are going to, well I guess I can't speak for the GAC, right? So, we'll have, the IRT will have another decision to make, and that is, when, before we make the announcement, right? In that this may be a stronger point then. Before we go ahead and make the announcement for the second date, do we have to have both languages then? We said yes, here.

Before that, we must have both languages to get the full list. So if we don't get the full list, we may not go to the announcement. So this was a point of discussion, but we decided to talk about that after public comment. Does that make sense?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yup, thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, good. Thank you. Yeah, we talked about that quite a bit. Just tricky for this team to move forward while we're being dependent on this big, you know, entities like the GAC, and the United Nations, right? So, Crystal, I think you've seen this, but I'll just go over it one more time. And for example, using the IOC as an example, right? We received specific names. I mean, these two names, period. And this is what we will do in UN six, plus German, Korean, and Greek, of course.

So very clear. So whether or not variance come into this equation is debatable, I think. One thing we know, the variance, there is a whole team, an IDN team, if you guys are tracking that work stream. Lots of people working around the world on what is and what is not a variant, and how we should treat that.

But that discussion is going on. But for our purposes, we're taking the recommendation, and the Board, and the prior decision, sort of a precedence, seriously, and we're going to try to track to that, and we'll actually look at the list together.

So hopefully, this chart makes sense to you. The things that are not in the scope, we're not going to talk about, under [99 national?], or we're not going to talk about acronyms. They're completely out of the scope. Next, let's look at the protected identify list before we look at the actual list. We are intending to have this on a permanent basis, on ICANN dot ORG.

Of course, I think that's where you would expect to see it. But public comment, we may choose to move it there, or we may just choose to keep it in the IRT community Wiki page, because for now, this is for your IRT consideration. It's appropriate that you have it under your domain. It's similar to the current reservation list, but it's different, right?

So we need to be clear, the IRT must be very clear on what the differences are and how we treat them differently. The idea here is that we're going to use the list as a simple list, no commentary on the list. Here is the list, one list, two list, three. The commentary or the treatment of how to use those lists and language, or names the

identifier, will be in other documents like AGB, Application Guidebook, policy, contracts, and whatnot. That's the idea. Because we envision the same listing used for different purposes, and we didn't want to start creating a multiple list in multiple locations.

So let's look at the list right now. So everybody is familiar with the IRT page. And under documentation, we have a protected identifier list right here. This is what it looks like. So first thing that comes up is IOC, and per the direction, we have Olympic and Olympiad. And it just happens to be very easy in English, right? The exact one-word identifier is the same as DNS label.

And here is, let's see, somebody help me with the type of languages. Maybe in French. But the idea here is that for each language, and when it becomes an IDN DNS label, of course, turns into extend labels. We have Chinese, we have Korean, Greek, and Russian, and Arabic.

So these are the exact identifiers, that we have received for the Olympic and Olympiad. So, the fact that Jim was talking about their variance that should be lifted, we didn't feel that this was within our authority to add to this list. And it just happens that it's the same thing that is what's on this list. Right? This is the current reserve list, and I think Jim is very familiar with, and this is what Jim was talking about.

This is basically the same list. So, that's the first list, Olympic...

HOLLY HENCE:

Dennis, I'm sorry to interrupt you. This is Holly Hence. I'm not sure if you had an opportunity, we sent it to you and you might have seen it

before. It's an email from ICANN that states that these issues regarding transliteration, and IDN variance, would be within the work of the IRT.

DENNIS CHANG: [CROSSTALK] ...exists. Has the IRT discussed this in this forum? At the IRT meeting?

HOLLY HENCE: Jim.

JIM BIKOFF: Dennis, this is Jim Bikoff. We missed a couple of the meetings, because we were tied up in other client matters, but it was always our understanding that this issue, and again, we corresponded for quite some time with Francisco back in 2015. It was our understanding that this belonged in this implementation group rather than handled separately by ICANN staff.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. My recommendation in the future, is that if it's an IRT issue for this implementation, probably should write to the IRT. You know, you have the email group, for you, that you guys are, should be using. And it goes into the email archive and everything, so it gets documented.
[CROSSTALK]

JIM BIKOFF: We apologize for that, but we are going to send you the correspondence [CROSSTALK] ...necessary, we sent you a correspondence. But if necessary, we have spoken to GAC representatives who agree with our view, and if you need something from GAC, addressing this issue, I'm sure we can obtain it.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Yes, good point. And that's... I want to get to that section of the consensus policy, where we talk about who the authority is and how it should come. So, GAC is the authority that we are pointing to within our consensus policy, and that's what we want to agree to. But okay.

So, understood. You have [CROSSTALK]... Go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO: This is Crystal Ondo. And just, [inaudible], Jim, I haven't met you personally. I'm with [inaudible]. Just to give you a little color about variance. Each registry sets its own policy with regards to variance. So I actually went on and looked at the dot Moscow registry agreement just now, and they don't even have their IDN tables listed on IANA.

So I'm not really sure what language script they're using to allow kind of that. I know that we, as a policy, don't allow variance to be registered. So, for example, if the "I" had an accent in one word, it would not be available without the accent in the same word in our registry. So I'm just not sure if that's for the IRT or if that's, you know, a compliance issue with ICANN, or specifically, it might come down to registry versus registry at this point, because I know that having your IDN tables

approved as part of the amendment to the IRA as it stands now.
[CROSSTALK] ...actually be in there.

JIM BIKOFF:

I hear what you're saying. I think, you know, we'll consult with the GAC on that, because we've been told that they support our view here. So whether it's possible or not, I think we'd have to look at that issue more thoroughly probably. There are probably, you know, registries like yourself that are, you know, that will not register variance, and there are probably others that don't have a policy on it.

But we want to make sure that, I mean, you know, cybersquatting is one of the biggest problems that we have, and I think that, you know, it's sort of ridiculous to protect a word with an accent and not without the accent. It doesn't make much sense to anybody I talked to.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

And I totally agree with that. I'm just trying to say that use of variance is part of our registry agreement, as part of our registry services. So if they have, you know, already gotten ICANN approval, I'm just not sure how this would work on top of that, if that makes sense. Dennis, I'm not sure who at ICANN does the IDN tables or approves them or any of those things.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. There is a whole big global IDN project going on in multi-languages. And [inaudible], I don't know if you know [inaudible], he is the ICANN staff who is consulting me and advising me that variance is

not to be discussed in any form until it becomes a policy or direction. So I'm trying to be very careful within this forum that we don't actually use the word variant at all.

Our direction is, here is the word, you protect the full name, exact match, is how we are directed to do. So that's what our interpretation is here in making the list. So, this list is now on the IRT page, and it's for the IRT to comment on it. So Jim, Holly, Crystal, you're here, look at the list of IOCs, and we'll look at the Red Cross too, right? Red Cross now beginning to get a little more interesting. Right?

JIM BIKOFF:

Dennis, before we get, before you get to Red Cross, I just want to say, in response to Crystal, maybe this could be called transliteration. So we might want to look at that too. But I don't want to take up the time now, because when we talked to staff previously they said it could be transliteration rather than variance. Anyway...

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, okay. Right away, there is another implementation project called transliteration. [LAUGHTER]

JIM BIKOFF:

Maybe we ought to merge. [LAUGHTER]

DENNIS CHANG: We tried to merge it, but [inaudible], but the community said no. They want it separate. [LAUGHTER]

Oh boy, we just had a meeting on transliteration at 8 AM this morning with the IRT. So I'll try to keep everything separated and try to be clear here as much as possible, so help me here.

JIM BIKOFF: I think I've said enough. I think I'll be quiet for a while.

DENNIS CHANG: No, no. It's okay. So we have a Red Cross and Red Crescent. And again, we were given exactly the names to use, right? There was no question about our work scope here. Right? Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal, Red Lion, that's it. So the Board, obviously the Board, and let's see, who else?

The GNSO Council tried to make it easy for us. So that's what we did. So this is the... And it's only on UN six languages here. So that's what we have populated. DNS label one and label two, just so that you guys know, who are not familiar with DNS one and two, one basically takes out the spaces and merge it all in one string. As you can see, it's pretty obvious. Two, put hyphens in.

This is just following the same DNS label conversion rules that have been used and adopted. We applied that to the identifier and it just spits out in computer. Next is the IGO, and this is when we said, yeah, we have one language right now. And they all seem to be English, right? The Board, the recommendation didn't say it has to be in English, but

they are. So, the GAC is and has agreed to provide a second language, and the second language is actually optional. So they don't have to, because some of these words, that looks like, oh, this one looks like it's not in English, right?

So this is okay for us. We'll just keep it here. And the one that have extent marks is not in English. So there is a long list of them. And then we get to the INGOs. This is from the Echo-Soft UN [inaudible], but on this one, the requirement is full name and English only.

So we had to go through and take out all the non-English words. And we are, at this point, trying to get from UN [inaudible] to see if they can just give us the English name, full name only, without acronyms, the first list we received had acronyms, so we deleted it manually.

So if you see things like ARP, it's not really an acronym. It's actually their company name. So we left it there. So that's the list. And the interesting thing about the INGO is that the [inaudible] statuses is added when special [inaudible] 90 day claims, and here the top level, the general list gets the reservation, and the 90 days.

So that's the list. It's in the IRT page, and...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Dennis, can you remind me how we distinguish between special and general?

DENNIS CHANG: We don't. Oh, I'm sorry. What we... So UN [inaudible] make their decision through their process, and just gives us what the status is. So we don't question why is one special or general. What we are asked to do though, is very clear. If it's general, we do, reserve full names, right? With exceptions procedure.

And if it's special, they don't get the reserved, they only get the 90 days claim. That's how we treat them differently. Does that make sense?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Are we talking about at the second level or at the top level?

DENNIS CHANG: Second, okay. Okay, so are you...? The 90 day claims, is second level only. The top level is the only one that gets reserved, with the INGOs. Does that make sense?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So when you say general, the special they're getting 90 days at the second level. General, they're getting full reservation at the top level, or full reservation at the second level as well?

DENNIS CHANG: Full reservation only at the top level.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Got it, thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: [Inaudible] 90 days claims for, the entire list... Let's just make it easy, maybe I should talk in this way. For entire list, they get 90 days, right, claims. But if you are a general, then you get to get your name reserved at the top level.

Make sense?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yup, thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, Berry typed into the chat. Believe me Crystal, I spent like hours, and hours, and hours on this chart, with Berry, Mary, Eric, everybody I could get attention to see if I could make this clear for me. And it's difficult, because as you know, and Jim knows, that there is lots of conversation going on all over the place about IGO, INGO protection and continues to go on.

So we look at the list. And you know what it is? I don't think that... Now you know how to look at the list, right? And you're free to do so. So what I would like to do is actually go and look at the language, the language that we have drafted together. So we are beginning to adapt this paragraph as a standard, so that we can understand the requirements, right?

When it says [show?], means requirement, it means saying that is a must. So if you're not familiar with how to differentiate challenge here,

you should look up the ITF text there. The 1.1 basically states August 1, right? August 1 is our target date. That's the time that you saw on the timeline. That's when it will be effective.

Number two is the top level reserve name. And this is basically what ICANN will do, right? And reiterate the policy recommendation pretty much. And the IRT has discussed this and adapted this language, and there really isn't no change there. At the second level, it's more interesting. And this one, reservation at the second level for this list, and you notice that there is no INGO here, Crystal.

So, don't worry. Okay. And the, we adapted this language. No change here. How we treat them, what we're excepting, and the fact that if you're, protect your organization, you can apply for it. Four is the 90 day claims. And this language also looked at the four, and hasn't changed. We tried to make it clear that this is not TMPH, and that is one of the confusions that we have to work to make sure that we don't promote confusion.

The language of the recommendation, the policy recommendation, mentions TMPH, and what they meant was do it in a similar fashion, because they are accustomed, or familiar with the 90 day claims, the way it works. We want to do something similar.

And in fact, like on my status page, we are in touch with the current TMCH service provider, and they gave us a proposal, and we're working with them to leverage the existing systems so that they can provide us... And this implementation is what's going to be happening. Registrants, when they are trying to register a name, they'll get notified. And this is

only for INGOs, right? And I'm not sure if there is INGO people here, yeah. And Berry is right, we don't... Yeah, we don't use trademark. There is no trademark or IT law in this at all. Yes.

But okay. Good, thank you Berry and Crystal for clarification there. So registrant, the person who is trying to register a name, will get a warning during the process, telling them that hey, this identifier or this domain name that you're asking or you're allowed to register, is in the system that may be protected.

That's what happens. That's all that happens. So once the, and hopefully the person who is registering can then make a decision whether or not to proceed. But if they proceed with registration, then the protected organization will receive a notification that says, hey, somebody registered the domain name that is exact full match to your identifier.

So that's the implementation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Dennis, I have a question about that. So the 90 day claim applies to TLDs that are delegated after August 1st next year. I think when we all started this, we assumed that this round of applications will be delegated by them. It looks like that's not going to be the case with some of the remaining outstanding TLDs.

So this is going to be required for this round of the TLDs that have not yet been, you know, gone through the [inaudible], or have not been delegated. It's going to be really important for registry operators who

eventually launch those strings, that it is operationally, I would say identical, if not extremely identical, and EPP standpoint to what we've launched for claims for the CMCH, just because...

I mean, it's going to take development work if it's a different system, and I'm not sure if we don't know if this is going into effect until February, if that gives people time... I mean, it took registrars a long time to get onboard with the TMCH, and they had to be TMCH accredited. Are we expecting registrars to become accredited with whatever system is used for this notification as well?

It's a lot of work on a registry and a registrar. So I'm just trying to figure out how...

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. Yeah, and that's why your input is very valuable here, because from the prior discussions where we were, the IRT discussions, we thought the... I was making an announcement in 1 February, and having the implementation done by 1 August, and make it effective then, will be enough of a duration for implementation phase. Of course, we have the rest of the end of the year to be prepared.

But then after that, [inaudible] a domain name delegated and put into the system, and it becomes GA. For 90 days, this claim system will be alive and active, right? And on the ICANN side, we're going to work with the claim systems service provider to mass load the [inaudible] list into their system, and so that they can respond to queries from wherever they come.

And I'm not sure how the registry and registrars are going to be implementing it after that. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's not... So what we have done is we have registrars who don't do claims at all. And so they just don't offer any names with claims for those 90 days, because they just [inaudible] implemented at. So if you're asking for them to, if you're asking for all registrars to go in and add a different form of claim, I just have a feeling it's not going to be picked up.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, I feel [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...for 90 days. [CROSSTALK] ...but if it's exactly the same as what we've got going on already for claims, then the ones that already have that implemented, I think it's an easy ask, and it will be more effective if it's exactly the same with what claims looks like now, is kind of what I'm saying.

DENNIS CHANG: I understand, okay. Yeah, so that's the, Berry is saying the same thing that you're saying, that we're taking [CROSSTALK]...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...as soon as you guys have the agreement set in place with whoever is going to be doing this, it might make sense to have, you know, my operations teams, or other registrars or registries operational teams, talk with them about what it actually looks like from a technical perspective.

The sooner we can get people looped in, the better.

DENNIS CHANG: I agree. I agree with you, 100%. Yeah, okay. Let's talk about the authority, and let me see, these are the lists. This is basically where we got the list, right? We got the list from and how this one... Okay. Management of the protected [inaudible]. So what you will note here, six one, six two, six three, identical in language but it was important for us to list them separately, because we wanted to make sure just in case that if one has to be different...

Like INGO is different. INGO, the authority, the UN [inaudible]... echo soft list and echo list is owned by UN [inaudible], therefore we're asking, well work in consistent with those policy recommendations, and that we have to look to them to provide us with the changes. So ICANN is not authorized, or any other party is authorized, to make changes.

ICANN will simply implement the changes, if it comes from them. So that's the idea. For IOC, it's the same ideal, but we're going to look to GAC. So if you're talking to the GAC, as the authority, you're doing the right thing, I think, Jim. Right? Because when we had looked at this implementation, we said well, who can come to...? You know, who is the one who is asking who to make the changes?

And we said, well, how about all of these organizations? If they all come to ICANN, does ICANN have the authority to make the change? We said no. The appropriate way is, let's look at the source of the authority. And of course, for the staff is the Board. And where did the Board get the list?

The Board got the list and sponsored by the GAC. And this is why we put it this way.

JIM BIKOFF:

Yeah. And I would just mention that throughout the early process, both the Red Cross and the IOC worked very closely with the representatives of GAC who are most concerned with these issues. And we continue to, you know, work with them, so I think you're right, they are the ones who have been the prime proponent of these proposals.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. I thought you would agree, Jim. I would like to hear from Crystal. Do you agree to look to the authority as the GAC? It makes sense, right? Who else could we look to?

Okay.

Okay. Let's see. I mean, if you think about it, right? If Red Cross directly to ICANN and said, I want to make a change. How should we do that? Right? Which we really have to... Somebody has to... ICANN is not in the business of making decisions, right? We're the implement, facilitation and implementation body. So these authoritative subject

matter decisions, especially the staff, really have to be some other body.

And it becomes really, really difficult if you think about IGOs with their hundreds of thousands of different IGOs coming to different places, going to ICANN, it's just going to be unmanageable. And how is registry and the contracted parties going to keep up with all of that?

So, this is the proposed language, and I think it makes a lot of sense. And is it descriptive enough, Jim, what we say here, 6.2?

JIM BIKOFF:

I think it is. I don't really... I mean, I read this and I don't have any real issues with it.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. Good, good. I am trying to keep this document as brief and simple as possible, but not to leave out any, you know, nuisances that could be interpreted this differently. I am looking directly at the GAC. I spoke to the GAC support staff, the GAC liaisons, and the ICANN staff, and they had no opinion one way or the other.

It's up to the GAC. If they want to take on that charter and to do these, it's up to them. Of course, the reason for the public comment is so that GAC has the opportunity to look at that and say, no, we don't want this job, right? If they say that. And we have to look for someone else who wants the job of being the list keeper, basically.

Right. Okay. Crystal, this is implementation time. And this is where I need your input more than anyone else, because I know that Jim and Holly is probably not going to be the one implementing, they're going to be watching us implement.

ICANN will implement the claims system people will implement, and registry and registrar will have to implement. And that is basically reacting to changes, what I'm saying. In setting it up, we have six months, right? But, if there are changes, how does that work? So, let's see.

So changes shall be implemented by all affected parties within 45 days, from the date that ICANN's GDD received the formal notification. Now the fact that we have, we're very specific about the GDDs, so we're trying to say this is the GDD staff, like just myself, or Akrim, right? Or CEO.

Not CEO, it has to be Akrim, because we say GDD here. Of course, if it comes to CEO, he'll just give it to Akrim anyway, so that's probably okay. But the point is, there may be a lot of things making the requests, a lot of things could happen within the ICANN meetings and at the high level discussions. But we can't track all of that.

The only thing that we are trying to track is the, when we receive it, and we're going to count 45 days from that point, and we want this to implement. So, or, let's see, GAC advice to provide the Board, right? That's one way it could come. And the other way it could come is UN [inaudible] to the GDD. So that is two ways we will receive it, and then as soon as we receive a notification of change, we'll notify everyone

like, we'll send out a mass email to everyone, hey, we have got a change here, and we need to start working on it. And hopefully, it will be easy to identify what the changes are.

So we'll do that right away. And then, ICANN is going to run through the GNS label generation process, and populate or make changes to the protected identifier list, and stage it somewhere. And then we're going to let everyone know 20 days prior to the effective date.

So let's say we received the change notice today, and we will say, hey, we are going to make the protective identifier list update, and 20 days prior to the effective date. So if the effective date is December 1st, we're going to back up 20 days at a minimum, as much as we can, but at least 20 days.

So about November 10th, we're going to produce and provide for you this updated protected identifier list, that stage where you can start working with it to update your system. And on the change effective date, everybody on that same date will make it operational.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

So Dennis, my one question is, what happens if you add names to the list that are already registered?

DENNIS CHANG:

I think it's the same case scenario. Let's see, what did we say? We addressed...

CRYSTAL ONDO: 3.2, but it only says registered before the policy effective date. It doesn't talk about those that are registered before change is implemented.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh. You know what? This is an excellent point, Crystal. I think we need to make that clear. Do you have a suggestion?

CRYSTAL ONDO: I don't know.

DENNIS CHANG: I'm kind of thinking we do the same thing, right? We note that, and at the time of renewal, we stop renewing, no?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Not at renewal, [inaudible]. I can't prevent a registrant from renewing.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's see. Not renewed. At expiration. Okay, well, what can we do, right? So this is the time where you jump in, and we put out a proposed language. Berry, has an idea, I think he's typing.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yeah, I don't want to throw out language just now.

DENNIS CHANGE: Okay, it's okay. I think we'll have to discuss this in detail, okay. Well, everybody...

BERRY COBB: Hi Dennis, this is Berry. Crystal raised a good point. Hypothetically, at some point in the future, if there are any changes to this list, and let's say a new string is added, this might be the wrong terminology to be using, and I think we do need to discuss this in detail, but potentially it could be kind of like a dynamic policy effective date, because we are getting new identifiers that are receiving protection, and you're correct.

If it happened to be registered, it would probably follow the same protocol that we have outlined here when we're entering into this policy effective date, that if that new string happened to be registered, and there is a new string that's added to the protections list, we have to wait likely until that name became deleted before, it would then be pulled back into a reservation of sorts.

I'm not sure how... I'm concerned about my use of the term dynamic policy effective date, because...

DENNIS CHANGE: Yeah, I am too. [CROSSTALK] [LAUGHING]

BERRY COBB: But we'll have to work through that in detail and figure out a way around that. But I think that the process itself still applies, that just like today if there is a name that's already registered, that wasn't under the

scope of protections, just like it would be in the legacy TLDs, that we have to wait until that name is deleted, therefore it could be pulled back and reserved.

DENNIS CHANG:

I think, yeah, I agree. I think conceptually, I understand. That's probably the only thing that we can do, and we should do. So let's crop the language and we'll have the IRT review, then [inaudible]. So that is one thing that we must address. I knew there would be something on this document that we forgot. Thank you Crystal.

So we'll add that and recirculate that for IRT review. And we're about time. Please look at this, these notices to remodel them after the TMCH notices. So one thing we tried to do, of course, is not mention TMCHF at all, and we wanted to make sure that this only applies to INGO, so that nobody gets the idea that it's for other.

So I don't think there are any issues there. Please look at the DNS label conversion rule. I put in here for your reference, but it is really nothing that we're doing different than we've done before, and I've put in some background, again, to address possible confusion about the scope of the project.

That's about it. We've got one minute left. Anything else? Questions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Nope.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, then quickly, in 30 seconds. So, I was hoping to go to public comment at the end of this month and we'll see if we can still do that, but we do need a positive confirmation from IRT, and so please respond to me. We'll try to do it as quickly as possible.

And other things that we've already talked about, next scheduled meeting. We may have to do an earlier then, maybe early September meeting, if we don't get this out by this month, which is coming to an end very closely. But [inaudible]... And after that, once we get the policy public comments out, I think we can do a monthly meeting, and we do have a session in ICANN 57.

Anything else other than that? We'll conclude the meeting, and I have some back up slides here for your reference.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Great, thank you Dennis. So we'll just wait for you to send additional language maybe for 3.2, for our comment. And I agree, we should probably meet before those public comments one more time.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Will do.

JIM BIKOFF: Okay, thank you very much. And we'll be in touch.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]