| MICHELLE DESMYTER: | Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the IGO/INGO Identifiers Protection IRT Meeting on the 20th of April, 2017 at 18:00 UTC. |
| --- | --- |
| | In the interest of time there will be no roll call. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I will turn the call over to Dennis Chang. |
| DENNIS CHANG: | Thank you Michelle. So I know there are a lot of things going on in IGO and INGO world. Let's get this started. As my e-mail indicated, we all ready to help each other to keep track of which is which and what is what. This particular scope may be more clear than anything else that we're doing, but we'll see. |
| | This is the agenda for today. We'll do a quick review, status, timeline, a little language prep, public comments – what I want to talk about – and then next steps. |
| | I always want to start with this chart and Mary and I agreed and see if we all want to use the same chart to keep everybody in agreement, on the same page, if you will. So those top lines, as you know, is the part that we are implementing for this project. The other two – Petter just concluded a meeting on the current Rights Protection Mechanism. For 90-minute meeting, they're going over all the public comments. In the |

middle, we have ongoing dialog with the GAC and the Board. The team here trying to resolve – there's some action items on GNSO, and then we have some action plans. We'll see how they stay onboard. I think this team here, we probably want to consider whether we would absorb those as an additional scope to this project or launch another project. We probably want to talk about that together. I think it belongs to all of us.

Okay. So again, same chart. How to make A and B what we're doing is A. Here's the current timeline. We want to publish the public comments this month and they'll go to June. At ICANN59 – by the time the ICANN59 starts, we would have closed the public comment period and have collected the comments and would be going through it.

I don't know what kind of comments we will receive. For the CRP, it's extensive. And I know that Petter and the team is doing an amazing job of consolidating all that and making sense of it. We'll see if we get that kind of a comment. We may have to put on some things. But our target here is 1 August, 2017, right? Our calendar for public policy implementation is $5^{th}$ month timeframes, so if we miss August, 2017 then we would be resetting to 1 February, 2018. We do want that 1 February, 2018 policy effective date to take effect. At least that's what I think right now but [inaudible].

So deliverables are non-changed. You've seen this before. We need our list and our system. First take a quick look at the draft version 11. I basically added DNS labels to make it clear that what we're protecting is the DNS label. This comment comes from our engineers who said, "Technically, we're not protecting the names, we're protecting the DNS

labels that correspond to the name," which I couldn't argue with him. And he reminded me that some of these audience will be technical people so we better just go ahead and make the change, and why not? We added, as you see. The words [inaudible] of the DNS Label, corresponding to the DNS label is what we added. So that, we'd change within 5.1 on INGO and we also added those words in 4.1 for Red Cross IOC and IGO.

Any questions on this? Petter is happy that this is only 60 minutes. I'm going to make it even happier. I'm going to try to finish it in 30. Let me know if you have any questions on this. Otherwise, we'll move on. I think, it's a minor change to make our engineers happy, and we want to do that. So we'll go back to our slide here. For the public comments that were composed, we'll try to announce.

I know that Crystal's not here, but she wanted to find out what we're going to do for public comment announcement. I thought about that and the typical things that we do for public comment are provide summary of what we're doing, provide background and the dates when we need this by. But we also wanted to maybe, rather than just say, "Please review the policy and give us your comment," maybe highlight a few areas. These three are the ones that we came up with here and I would like your input on this. Go ahead, Petter. You may speak.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     Thanks. I have two questions, both referring to GAC. I presume that GAC is the one that will file comments on this topic. Is there any one group within GAC also dealing with this topic? The other question that came

up when I saw this spreadsheet, will we receive the language list from GAC before we open up for public comments, or will that be expected to be later on?

DENNIS CHANG: This is precisely what I wanted to talk about. You are right on the topic that [goes] in my mind. Number one, yes, there is someone, a GAC representative. Jonathan – what's his name – from OECD? You probably know him. He's a well-known figure from OECD.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. He is the representative who's designated to come up with the list. So he's working on it, and he has been working on it. He has provided a preliminary version, but it wasn't something we could use because he couldn't really say that – some IGOs have three languages. He is trying to find out, well, we can't have all three so you can only have two. But they haven't responded back to him. So he is having a very difficult time, basically, trying to get this information.

We're in coordination with him. We're going to see if there's other ways. But right now, he is the designated representative working on this. Now, he said he was trying to get it to us last year, October, but that was his first my request and he thought he could do it. Obviously right, six months later we still don't have it. And we understand why. It's not an easy thing to do. The decision that we made with this IRT before

was that, we don't have the second language list. We only have the first language list. So maybe we should go forward at least to the public comment, and let the public know that this is all we have and we intend to add to the list when we do get the second language. Furthermore, we may want to ask, "Do you think that we should actually go and publish the policy and announce the effective date without having the second language?"

That's even more important, right? Public comment, we can collect comments. Then there was also a suggestion Petter – I don't know if you recall – at Hyderabad I think or somewhere, I'm losing track that – so they suggested, "Why don't you just have a public comment now, and have another public comment when we do get the full list?" So that's another option. And that's what we really want to highlight with this public comment when we go forward to maybe get some ideas from what people think. Maybe we'll hear from GAC through the public comment there or from registries who says, "We don't want you to go forward until we have a full list." The interesting point here is that, recommendation says that second language is optional. That's another interesting factor to consider. Go ahead, Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yeah, as you referred to that point that also supports that we should go now with public comments, because it's not just the list of languages, it's also a number of other topics in the recommendations. Obviously, I can imagine that he had problems with going out with asking for internal administrative decisions in those IGOs that are actually using three or even four official languages to make a decision within the

organization which would be the official second language in this aspect. So I understand that it will take some time. It's better to go out now, and then hopefully I presume that before the end of – maybe this autumn, perhaps we will have the list of the optional second language. That we can send out just that as a topic for public comments.

DENNIS CHANG: Let me see if I get what you say clearly. I think you're in agreement that we should go forward with the public comment.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Once we receive the comment, the IRT and this Implementation Team, we all together have another critical decision to make – and that is, do we make the announcement with the effective date, or do we wait? Do we go for the 1 August, 2017 date of announcement, or do we pass and reset to 1 February, 2019 announcement? That's the critical decision I think.

So we're in agreement that we should at least go to the public comment and let's see what we get. And in our ICANN59 and wherever, we will be reviewing the public comments together and maybe that will guide our decision. Because I have to tell you, I'm not really clear on which is the right thing to do. We're a very small set of people here.

Lori, did you want to speak? Oh, Lori wants to enter. Hold on Lori. Hi, Lori.

We are talking about the first item on the list. Before you joined, we just went over the typical stuff about the scope of this project and the timeline – probably it's good to show you the timeline here. Our plan right now is public comment and then we review the public comment in ICANN59 and revise based on the public comment and then announce on 1 August, 2017 for the policy effective date of 1 February, 2018. So 1 August, 2017 announcement, 1 February, 2018 – those are two dates. What we're talking about right now is – as for the IGO list, we still don't have that two language list from the GAC and Jonathan is working on it. He's having a hard time. We are right now proposing here our plan should be go ahead with the public comment, noting very clearly that we [inaudible] the second language and perhaps even call out a decision for option. We proceed with the implementation without the list, or we wait for the list? Do we do the announcement on 1 August, 2017 even if we don't have the list? Or do we pass on the 1 August, 2017 and reset to 1 February, 2018 and wait for the list? So that's what we were talking about. I don't know if that's all clear to you. It is rather confusing.

Okay. Lori had another call. Oh my goodness. Let's see. Anybody else have comments on this IGO list? That's what it is, and I think it's the right thing to do is to call out the attention and invite public comments. Okay, so we are in agreement right? That's what we're going to do. Go to public comments. Gather the comments. Then when we see what the comments are, we can go Option A or Option B. Option A being proceed without the second optional language. Or Option B being, let's wait for the implementation until we do get the [final list]. But Petter points out

there are many other things on this policy so it will be good to get comments from those at least, but if not, just push out the public comments.

Now, second item on the list is… Gloria, you have a hands up. Go ahead.

GLORIA:                          Yeah, hi. I apologize. I don't remember – with the two languages. The first language is English, and then the second language could be any optional as long as it's one of the UN6 or was the second language a specific language? I just can't remember.

DENNIS CHANG:               Actually the policy recommendation is they may choose any two languages. It's just so that when we got the first language, I think there [inaudible] English, or certainly Latin script. I think so, right? Were there some Arabics? I can't remember right now. But the policy is two language of their choice. The second language – when I say second, meaning, if they only submitted one that's fine. If they want to submit two, that's fine. But they don't have to submit the second one. That's the recommendation and we have our list right now with one language only.

And I was saying earlier that Jonathan who is working on behalf of the GAC, he has been trying to collect this list and having a difficult time. Trying to contact IGOs is difficult and from his database that he holds he finds that some IGOs have more [inaudible] languages like three, four, etc. So then he can't make that decision so he has to reach out to have

them decide which two languages they want. He's having a difficult time gathering. That's the situation.

Okay, are we done with the IGO list issue? It's something that we do want to highlight and public comment as I think we're all in agreement that that is something that we want to know from public, what they think.

INGO claims. There's still confusion about trademark and whether these INGO claims has anything to do with trademark. So in our announcement we just want to highlight that. Even though when they read the policy – our policy and policy language and all the examples, it says nothing about trademark. It doesn't have trademark on it. It doesn't have TMCH on it. But because of the conversations that have been had, people may confuse still, so we want to highlight that. So that's the second point we want to highlight.

The third point is the DNS label conversion rule. This rule – I don't know how well known this rule is. This is something that we have developed early on. Lori, I think you were there when we first talked about it with the IRT. Things like – there are characters that get thrown out. If it's more than 53 characters they don't get any DNS labels as of this conversion rule, that kind of thing.

What we are proposing here is, we are going to use the same DNS label conversion rule, but the policy recommendation does not say to do that. It is silent on what and how we convert the names to DNS label. So we want to make sure that the public knows that and if somebody wants to suggest another conversion rule, this is their opportunity. It would cause

a lot of confusion if they do because we already have a messed up DNS label. The Spec 5 and all the registries we are using. But if something that's important we thought we would highlight.

Any more comments on this? Petter, Lori, do you have anything that you think that we want to highlight for the public for public comment?

PETTER RINDFORTH:          [inaudible], I've got a proper list here.

DENNIS CHANG:          Thank you. Yes, yes. Not the examples. Actually we did put in some language – thanks to Antonietta – on the conversion rules. Instead of originally we just had the rules. And then Antonietta inserted some preamble or introduction to the rule giving examples and things. But we are also publishing the full list, names, and DNS labels. The full list for every single name that they can review as part of this public comment. So we're not only providing examples but we are actually providing the result of the conversion.

Oh, it's not? Okay, so the way that we structured it is that we have a report that is only five pages, right? That our policy document is five pages long. The actual list of names is on our IRT wiki page – community wiki page. You look under the documentation area of the wiki, it's listed there. And the policy language is linked to the wiki pages, so they are not going to have it as part of the policy language. That's what we are going [inaudible] in the future [inaudible]. The list has to be separate online. It will be maintained online. A long list of examples – thousands.

Yeah, I think this is probably the longest list anybody's ever going to review. We had a heck of a time trying to deal with all the… especially the INGO ones, we have [inaudible] had to deal with it, the ones with the Ecosoft. So there's people who put in a ton of hours going through every name.  But we have it and we're ready for review and we may hear some [inaudible].

Okay, let's see. The next steps are open public comment, our IRT meeting. We have one more meeting in May. We'll see. By that time it would have our public comment open and we'll see if we get anything. We may or may not have that meeting based on comments received. Then any development on the GAC side, I will communicate to you of course, online. This is our favorite wiki page.

Well that's all I got for you. Marking 11:27 a.m. I'm here to make Petter happy. He worked too hard. I heard him working hard, slaving away for 90 minutes earlier. So he needs a break.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     Well, thanks for a good report.

DENNIS CHANG:     Thank you, everyone. Okay Michelle, let's conclude the meeting. I'll see you online. Bye now.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     Thanks, bye.

DENNIS CHANG: Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**