
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you everyone for joining. You heard that this meeting is being recorded, and we'll post the meeting after the meeting, for the others who are not able to join us today. But I think we will still have a...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello?

STEVE: Mary, can you hear me? This is Steve. I just want to see if it works for the rest of us.

MARY: Hey Steve, it's Mary. I can hear you.

STEVE: All right. I'll try to get a hold of Dennis to see, or to inform him that we can't hear him. Because I saw the slide move, so I feel like he's still speaking right now.

MARY: Yeah, that was what I was thinking too. I was hoping it just wasn't me, but it sounds like it, might be on his [inaudible].

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:

Hello. Sorry, I don't know what happened there. But I guess this happens. I heard this happens with Fadhi and the other call too. [CROSSTALK] Okay, everybody is back, so let's resume our meeting. So I was going through the agenda, you can see it on the Adobe Connect room. It's simply, we're going to do status, key milestones, and we'll spend a lot of time talking about the INGO identifier and contact data that Steve was actually able to get.

And I'll talk a little bit about the maintenance of the list. And we'll talk about our future meeting schedule, including the Helsinki plan. So next, this timeline has not changed, so we're still sticking to our original timeline. The only thing that I did was highlight the ICANN 56 in June, that's happening today. You will see the next [diamonds?] in the flow, is called release of draft implementation for public comment. That is happening in August, and we're going to announce the policy effective date in January of next year, or January or February I think it's going to be.

And then, we're looking for the policy effective date in August of next year, sometime in the middle of next year. So those three milestones are what I call the key milestones. And the reason that I separate them, is I think it's critical that we understand as a team, what must we deliver before those milestones can be achieved, and what are the items that we can wait for the next milestone, so let me go through them.

Our first milestone was the public comment for the implementation release, and we're looking to make that happen in August 2016. So that

means we obviously have to have the consensus policy language in the document itself, that we would be posting for the comment, but most importantly, the other thing that we must have for us to write that into the policy document, we need to have some agreement with people like [inaudible] and Steve will tell you more about what that means later.

And also, we have to have some systems well-defined and have some agreement that we can actually deliver, just types of plain system in the period of time we're projecting. And of course, the other thing is that within the policy language, we have to identify or define how these lists will be updated, and we'll talk more about that too.

So, IPT, our implementation team, has gathered and identified those four items as a critical prerequisite for our first milestone. In other words, we cannot go beyond if we don't have all four of them. It's what we agreed to, and we wanted to make sure that the IRT are on the same page, and we all agree with that. So next milestone...

So let me tell you what we can wait for, even though we don't have it right now, is on the next list. It's announced policy effective date, and I have it here as February 27th 2016, so next year. So the things that we can wait for our things like IGO list. As you know, we have the list from GAC that contains English only, however the policy recommendation asked for up to two languages. So we have to seek the second language, which is often from the GAC, and we are pursuing that now.

But even if we don't get that by August, which we probably won't, we can go ahead and publish the implementation plan for public comment. So that's the implementation plan, implementation team's plan right

now. Along with the other list, we have IOC, Red Cross, all of those lists already. And we now just got the [Echo Soft] list, but the point here, there are things that we can do after August time period.

The final milestone is the policy effective date. Of course, this is supposed to happen six months from the announcement, and before the effective date, obviously. Everybody has to be ready to have this policy adhered to, which means for internally, ICANN, we have to develop and make the claim system operational on the date that it becomes effective.

So the future milestones, we may have some more details now, but today, I wanted to focus on the first milestone, and those four items, and bring that to your attention. Do you have any comments about this Peter?

PETER:

Question on, excuse me if you have informed us before, but when it comes to the IGO list in the two languages from GAC, as you said, one big language will be English. The other one is up to the, each IGO. Will it be the official language where the IGO, each IGO has their official office? Or what would be the second language, do you think?

DENNIS CHANG:

So I think maybe Mary... Mary is on the phone, or Steve, do you want to speak to the policy itself? Let me wait to see if they want to speak to that first. Mary or Steve.

I think Mary is coming online.

MARY: ...everybody, this is Mary. Yeah, this is Mary. Sorry, what was the question?

PETER: The first question was that, if I understand you correctly, one of the two languages from the IGO list is English, and the other, as it is up to two languages from GAC. The second language, will it be each IGO officially registered, or what language will it be? From the countries that speak... Are there any specific policy about that, or is it free to choose?

MARY: So this is Mary. And Steve, or Dennis, or anyone else, do feel free to jump in. I think we did have a discussion about this at some point, and the assumption is that though many of the IGOs, one of the languages will be English, but this is not necessarily going to be the case for all. So the request that we have out to the GAC, basically says that up to two languages to be set by the IGOs through the GAC.

And as I mentioned, we expect that many of them will indicate English as either the only language, or English as one of the two. But recollection is that that is where things [inaudible]. Does that help?

PETER: Okay. So we'll have to wait to see.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah, we had several discussions on this. And what Mary stated is what we came to.

PETER: Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. We'll continue then. Any more questions? Hi Laureen, welcome. So I was just going over our key milestone. The first milestone being the public comment released in August. That's the target we're all trying to work to, and those four items are, we believe, is required to achieve that milestone.

So quick status about the policy, the plan. We have the draft policy language, the version four is in development, and there hasn't been much update, so I have not reissued it yet, but what we're looking to is add those items right now that are missing the update process, and the 90 day claims process, things like that.

So in regards to the 90 claim implementation, we are in design phase. And we have reached out to our current TMCH service providers, and we're talking to them about adding this as a feature to the existing system. So we'll probably here back from them in a week or two, but this is something more I can tell you about at the next meeting.

Regarding the list itself, we just spoke about IGO speaking up to two languages. That is a letter that we drafted. And it's in review at the ICANN executive, and after we get their approval, or it will be fine

probably by Akrim, and it will go to the GAC chair requesting up to two languages. And then after that, the follow-up with the GAC liaison.

On the INGO, the good news, of course, is that we received the [Echo Soft] list, and that's coming up next on the next slide, and Steve will tell you a lot of details about that. Any questions on the project status?

Then we'll move on. Steve, do you want to take it from here?

STEVE:

Sure, thanks Dennis. This is Steve from the policy support staff. And I just wanted to take you through the update of where we are in regards to INGOs. First I'll just start with a reminder of the policy recommendations scope. The scope one is the general consultative list, of which there are 144 organizations. Scope two is the special consultative list of which there are approximately 3500 organizations. And throughout this top level, scope name, in full name, English only, receives protection and they're ineligible for delegation.

And at the second level, scope one and scope two, the full names, in English only, receive 90 day claims. Essentially the scope of the policy recommendations. As a status reminder of where we are in terms of procuring those lists, we've actually established contact with [inaudible], or the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. They've provided us with a list of the organizations for both the general consultative list and the special consultative list.

And they've also provided the pertinent contact data that would be needed for a claim service. However, in providing us with this data, the

way in which they've described ICANN's usage was perhaps not as precise as we think is ideal. And so the thought was to bear a lightweight memorandum of understanding, or MOU, to ensure that both ICANN and UN [inaudible] are absolutely clear how the data will be used by ICANN.

And so where we are now, is that ICANN is currently preparing a MOU, which will then need to be discussed with UN [inaudible] and hopefully come to an agreement. So the intention is that the MOU would limit ICANN's use of the data to what is spelled out in the policy, or other words, the top level protections and the second level claims notifications I just mentioned previously.

And the MOU would be simply a mechanism to ensure that there is mutual understanding of how ICANN will use the data, and that the data would not be used for any other purpose. Any questions on this page and where we are in regards to that? Peter, please go ahead.

PETER: [Inaudible] is there a possibility for, if there were would be someone that claims to be [inaudible] unlisted? Is there a specific deadline for that kind of company to come up with their identification status and so on? Or is this the final list that speak?

STEVE: Thanks Peter, this is Steve again. And I can't claim to be a complete expert on how the [Echo Soft] list is maintained, but from what we've been able to determine from discussing with our contacts at [inaudible],

is that there is an official approval mechanism to be included on the [Echo Soft] list, and the Counsel that approves the additions to that list, they actually only meet once per year.

So in essence, for ICANN, we'd only be updating that list once a year, when we're provided an updated list from [inaudible]. Hopefully that answers your question.

PETER: Thanks.

STEVE: Okay. Moving on to the next page, next slide. So this touches on the statistics I mentioned about the number of general and special consultative organizations on the [Echo Soft] list. Below that though, is the information that we requested, and as I mentioned, we already received from [inaudible]. These are the fields that we thought were necessary for the claims service. It's an official name, which we'll eventually be converted into the DNS label, that English name of the organization.

If the official name isn't in English, address, phone, and email at URL, and then also the consultative status, whether or not it's general or special. I see no hands raised, moving on to the next slide.

And so finally, we just wanted to share a few examples of some of the names that are on the list, and just explain how these names would be converted into DNS labels. And so as a reminder, the policy says the full name of the organizations in English, and so these are the... These are

examples of names from that official names, quote/unquote, official names column on the data export that [inaudible] provided to us.

And so the implementation or the conversion of these strings in the DNS labels, we would utilize an algorithm that's already actually been used in support of the development of the spec five reserve names list. And what that essentially does is that it removes or replaces characters that are not valid in the DNS. So, in essence, there is no evaluation or adjustment on ICANN's part. It's treating the list that's provided by [Echo Soft] as the authoritative list, and then simply making them usable in the DNS.

I think that's actually all I had so if there is any questions, please go ahead and raise your hand or speak up on audio.

LAURIE: Hi Steve, Laurie.

STEVE: Hi Laurie.

LAURIE: Hi. So my question is, looking at these names, so that would mean that the [inaudible] disappear, and are the spaces condensed? Because I mean, it really bastardizes the name, almost. I don't know how that's helpful. I mean, I understand why you wouldn't want to make any real changes, but I almost feel like by not making some sort of editorial adjustment, that it might actually undermine the purpose.

STEVE: So that's a fair point. This is Steve again for the transcript. And I might look to Francisco for a little understanding on exactly how that algorithm works, but acknowledging the point you made, I would just try to take about mechanically how it works. What I understand, there is actually two versions generated. One, in which it would take out things like the brackets, and either one version would have a space, and then one version would have an underscore, I believe.

And that doesn't respond to your functionality query, or whether or not it meets, I guess, needs of the organization. I guess I just want to at least answer mechanically. And Francisco has raised his hand, hope you save me here. Thanks.

FRANCISCO: Hi, this is Francisco. So just to clarify, yeah, generally [inaudible] has been proposed as it said it would generation two versions of the names, for a name that has at least one character that is not allowed in DNS names, one version would be by removing all the not allowed characters, and the other version would be by substituting the not allowed characters with hyphens.

And in the case of characters that are not ASCII only, think of a Chinese name, or you know, names with accents or things like that, that would be converted to IDN, but you will get two version of the name. That is at a high level, proposal works. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Laurie, this is Dennis Chang speaking. The concept here, is the implementation of the policy as a rule. The implementation team here discussed whether or not we're going to try attempt to evaluate what [inaudible] provides as the official name, which they have reviewed and accepted as official names.

Now for us to, for anyone else to start changing it, we didn't feel that was warranted, or part of the scope of the implementation plan. I understand, when I first saw this, I thought, oh my gosh, we have acronyms, that looks like acronyms, and we have quotes, we have parenthesis, we have different language of things, it's all mixed.

So to go through 3,000 names and try to make judgment about what the name should be, or trying to ask [inaudible] that maybe they have to reach back out and get the correct names, or different names, we didn't think that was part of our chart. So what we wanted to do was to make sure that the IRT, because IRT will probably have to answer this questions when it comes, that you guys have understanding why we are choosing this path, and we must, we don't see any options. Does that make sense?

LAURIE:

Yeah, it makes sense administratively, and it's the low bar, I think, and the least controversial, but at the same time, from a practical perspective, I think mentioned to this group back in Dublin, and I think I did send the list, Mary, that you know, when we had done a little bit of research on these groups, and if they're even using domain names, who have their domain names.

And I understand this is not about their domain names as much as it is about their legal names, which can be different, that many of these organizations don't even have, don't even have websites set up, or working emails, or whatever. I mean, it's a very messy list, and I guess we should acknowledge that, and to the extent that if we choose this path, that we are really being super technical, and not necessarily in my mind, speaking with what I think is more the spirit of what the projections are supposed to be.

Yeah, I saw Mary's comment in the chat. I understand. I just... I wouldn't want us opened up to criticism that, that we're being so technical that we're undermining purpose. That's all.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. We hear you. I mean, we all feel the same way. But we have to be very careful about not pointing any kind of finger or criticism to [inaudible] on how they chose to accept domains, or evaluate them. So, and then of course, the GNSO, the working group, you know, already evaluated this, and they probably thought about this a lot too.

There are lots of opportunities we thought about, you know, do we go out to NGOs separately and try to contact them? You know, should we ask them to come in and register themselves? We thought about a lot of options, but the implementation team had concluded that this is probably the cleanest and the non-controversial way, even though we may see some flaws in the [inaudible]...

LAURIE: Would there be...? Sorry, I have a question then. Would it...? Understanding why you chose this path, and not necessarily challenging it, because I understand the predicament you're in, would it make sense to have some sort of collaborating policy that would allow anybody on this list to, I don't know if challenge is the right word, but to correct? If they're even following, I mean, my guess is the ones who haven't expended the effort to even keep their domain names alive, probably aren't even watching.

And from a practical perspective, but those who are, may want a way to correct, maybe not call it challenge, maybe call it correct, clarify.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. So this is something maybe we can discuss with the [inaudible]. I know that they have a process that they go through for accepting and renewing, right? They update their list annually. So whatever process that they have adapted, we can certainly propose. And one of the things that we talked about was, before we launch anything, we're going to ask [inaudible] to send out a notice to all of these organizations, so they can take appropriate action.

But the only way we see if they want to change anything, is to go back to the [inaudible] and change the [Echo Soft] list at the authoritative source for us.

LAURIE: I see.

My guess is those INGOs that are there, who have a real [inaudible] protection mechanism in place, will be watching anyway. And the others, I don't know if it makes any meaningful difference.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. That's what we were thinking.

Okay, so let's move on, that we'll probably, not all of the IRT members are here, but this is an important point, and I'm glad that Laurie that you considered it and you see the reason for this position, and we probably have to make sure that the other IRT members are aware of this approach.

Okay, next page, for maintenance. So we talked about the [Echo Soft] list, and as Steve explained, [inaudible] has a process, annual process, of updating their list, and they've agreed to send that to us, and for us, it's simply an updating our list, with their list, mirroring all of the changes. So that's relatively straightforward, and I think that needs no policy recommendation.

On the IGO, as you know, we've received a list from the GAC, and we've heard that, and I think it's written into the policy documentation recommendation that GAC may provide updates from time to time, and our process will be that when, at such time, we receive a list from the GAC, then we will update our list.

That's the process. And in regards to RCRC or IOC, we do not have any policy language, recommendation language about how to update, or even if we have to update, but this is where, in spirit of the program, I

think that they probably were intending to go ahead and update these lists. I mean, nothing is permanent and forever. So the implementation plan for those two are, we'll just make it the same as IGO, so we're going to rely on the GAC to provide any updates to those lists, and then we'll follow along in implementing it on our side.

Does that make sense?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] then you obviously access the identification policy, that GAC is automatically, or do you have any...? Do you look at this before? Because I mean, the idea from GAC is not the same as the ideals for protective body [inaudible], for example, I presume that their list is a little bit, it's more extensive.

DENNIS CHANG: Sorry. IGO list from the GAC is different from some other list, did you say?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mean, they have their own, it's not based on the Paris convention, on the protected ideas. So I mean, the idea obviously is for the RCRC and IOC, what will that be based on?

DENNIS CHANG: So Mary has her hand raised, and I would like Mary to perhaps address this. Go ahead Mary.

MARY: [Inaudible] thanks [inaudible]. So indeed, as Dennis noted, the IGO list is the list provided to ICANN by the GAC, and the policy recommendations were limited to that list. The inclusion of IGOs on that list, is on the criteria that was supplied to us with the GAC, would seem to correspond more to eligibility for registration in dot [inaudible]. In other words, in terms of your other comment, this is not based on article six or anything in the Paris convention.

So if I might just then add another comment, that takes it outside of the remit of today's discussion, I would imagine that one of the reasons you're asking is the possible implication for the rights work that we are doing. And I think in that context, that's still going, but what we're doing here is simply implementing, or attempting to implement the policies that have already been adopted by the GNSO and the Board.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, thanks, [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, thank you. So the RC [inaudible] and IOC, the implementation considered, since we have no recommendation for updates, should we remain silent? And we thought that wasn't a responsible thing to do. So we thought we would at least provide a mechanism, and propose it. And of course, to the IRT here, but along the way, public comment, and we see how the public feels about this methodology.

So yes, so we are, indeed, giving the GAC a lot of authority here, to make these changes.

Okay. Next. So let talk about the future meetings. So it is our intent that we are going to have three more meetings before the August... The meetings are scheduled to drive to our next milestone of publication for public comments, our documents. So that is, we want that to be in August, that's what we said, right?

So we'll have four more meetings to then, so today's the 9th. So the next meeting will be in Helsinki, it is on the 28th, and it's an hour, 9:15 to 10:30, so it's a 75 minute meeting. And then after that meeting, we'll have two more meetings. So that's what we have planned. And as we've go along, of course, if we are in good shape and we don't need one or two of these meetings, we can always cancel, but we want it to put them on your calendar, so that we can have you to review.

The other meetings of interest at ICANN 56, I think, I wanted to bring to your attention, are two more meetings. One of them is the curative mechanism policy development process that Mary just spoke about, and I know Peter, you're very involved in that, so you'll probably be in there. And [inaudible] also.

And the other is the, and I picked these up from the calendar that was just published on ICANN website. So look through the Helsinki meeting calendar and see if I missed anything. But the other you say, sort of a presentation to the GAC on the IGO and INGO, the names and acronym protections. I suspect this is a follow-up meeting about the acronym,

and I think somebody else knows more about these meetings, feel free to speak up.

Go ahead Mary.

MARY: Thanks Dennis. So just to note this last session you just mentioned is a GAC session, so there has been no involvement from the GNSO or GNSO staff side, or GDD. We don't know what the [inaudible], so Dennis, I think that [inaudible] probably will be [inaudible]. The other...

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

MARY: I think many of us will try to be there, because my assumption is that this will focus on the unresolved recommendations, which as yet, therefore, is not the subject of implementation, but it will nevertheless be interesting. The related point I wanted to make, and this may or may not be confirmed, but given that there has been some recent correspond between the GNSO Council and the Board, about the unresolved IGO and Red Cross identifiers, that this could potentially be something that may be discussed perhaps between the GNSO and the Board will be [inaudible].

When I get any details about that, I will make sure to send them to the list, and so I just wanted to highlight that for you. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG:

Thank you Mary. Yeah, we'll look forward to hearing what's been said there, and we'll see all of you there. So the next steps, Steve and the team pursuing the agreement with UN [inaudible], and we agree that that is one of the critical deliverables before we go out for public comment. We must have something in writing as to how we're going to get the [Echo Soft] list, and how it will be maintained, and we're dependent on them.

So that's the required item. The other item is, of course, the claim system definition. We're close, and we need to get that done before the public comment period. The other items, we just need to [upload?] the update process into our language document, and have the [lead?] all ready, and maybe version four is our final version, maybe not. But it will be the next update.

And I put the Wiki website on this page here, and this is where we will log all of our meetings. I think that's about it. So, any other discussion? And this is for you later, I'm maintaining some background information for you, so as a reminder. But we won't go through them. We've been looking through them before, but I don't see any point of reviewing that again.

Any questions? Comments? Everybody is good? Okay, I think then I'll conclude this meeting. And I'll see you in Helsinki. Bye now.

PETER: See you there. Oh yes, one question. Peter here. Is there anything specific issues that we can [inaudible] with in the mean time?

DENNIS CHANG: So glad you asked. No, I cannot think of anything right now, but you're so wonderful to offer. We are trying to do as much as we can on our side, so that we come to you with a solution that you can review and approve as much as possible. But like we did in the Marrakech, when we thought we hit a roadblock, we'll reach out to you, again, and maybe we'll... Hopefully, we won't [CROSSTALK]...

PETER: ...okay, you know where we are.

DENNIS CHANG: I know where you are. Thank you so much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]