
DENNIS CHANG:

Welcome, everyone. This is the IGO/INGO Identifiers Protection Policy Implementation meeting for the IRT on the 23rd of February 2017.

So, I'm going to get started right away and I will explain why that's probably okay. Let me go to the next slide – the slides that we prepared.

First, Agenda. We're going to be talking about Project Scope again, and I'll tell you why we are going to do that again. Project Status, then Schedule. We're going to look at the Policy Language and Next Step and the ICANN 58 information for you.

This is our current activities streamline – Stream 3, stream of work, or three tracks of work which you've seen many times before. But what I agreed to do with Mary and Steve in the Policy Team – and Petter, too, probably, because you're running one of the work tracks – is to use the same slides each and every time we talk about IGO/INGO because we have noted that there has been confusion and there were likely to be confusion continued and it's going to be higher and higher visibility with these other activities going on, especially at ICANN 58 now, that people are going to confuse these three streams of work.

So, I know that all of you here are not confused and you guys are understanding why you are here supporting this IRT meeting, but it's our request that [you] please watch out for this confusion when you're talking to your constituents and help them understand that these activities are related, but they're actually separate.

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.

The first line on top is what we call the Implementation Project that's "authorized," that is not inconsistent that Board has adopted. So, this is the only authorized work that this Policy Implementation team is allowed to do and is doing. That's the first blue line, and there's some little bit of modification Mary made for us and that is in these two lines, the following. They're sort of competing. And one is the Reconciliation of the Inconsistency, right between GAC and GNSO, that is work [inaudible] with the Board.

You probably know then, and I will talk about it again later when we talk about ICANN 58. There's a couple of sessions set up where they were going to have informal dialog and discussions trying to resolve this. So, that activity is going on today.

Of course, the Curative Rights Protection mechanism, PDP Working Group, is very active and they put out their preliminary report for public comment today. That's also an activity that you will see in ICANN 58, which Petter is leading.

Do we have any questions about these three Work Streams? Anybody? Is everybody on this call clear?

MARY WONG: Dennis, this is Mary.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Mary. Feel free to speak.

MARY WONG: Thanks. I'm noting some comments and questions from Lori Schulman in the chat, so for purposes of the transcript, I guess we can just note that when you spoke of the Reconciliation of the Inconsistent GNSO Recommendations and GAC advice, that is a decision pending at Board level and, as I noted, that Reconciliation is still ongoing.

There actually will be some dialogs between the GAC and the GNSO that will take place in Copenhagen, and that's why on this slide you can see that we've tried to align the timing of that ongoing process with the Curative Rights PDP that Petter is co-chairing. And you see that for both, as well as this Implementation, there is an arrow which indicates that that's still pushing forward. I hope that helps.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I believe it helps. Anybody else have any other questions in terms of...

LORI SCHULMAN: I do.

DENNIS CHANG: Hi, Lori. Go ahead.

LORI SCHULMAN: Hi. I'm just curious with the consultation that's going on in Copenhagen between the GNSO and the Board, is that going to be open or is that closed? I think that Petter and...

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Mary. Do you want to answer that question?

MARY WONG: I can answer that, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, please do.

MARY WONG: Yes. Lori, the sessions in Copenhagen will be open to observers and anyone in the community, so there will be the same arrangement as for all the other open community sessions. The participants and the dialog would be representatives of the GAC and the GNSO that were nominated by both communities, but it will be an open discussion—well, it will be an open session. I don't know if there will be opportunity for the audience to ask questions. I think that's still to be worked out, but it will not be a closed session, in essence.

LORI SCHULMAN: Okay. And it will be published on the general calendar as well?

DENNIS CHANG: It is already.

LORI SCHULMAN: Oh, it is. Okay. I haven't looked at the last iteration. Sorry.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. It's going to be my last slide have that information for you.

LORI SCHULMAN: Oh, sorry, Dennis. I'll shut up now.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, no problem. No problem. Go ahead, Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Just a quick question. I looked at the new schedule today and I noticed before that we have a very early first meeting on Saturday morning, but I couldn't find that on the new agenda. It may have changed.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, really? It may have because let me tell you, I put this together yesterday. I'm just going to go forward to the...since there's so much interest...here.

This is what I had captured. Mary, did you note that these were the times, too? Because the first sessions – there's actually two sessions they have scheduled. The first one is on Saturday at 7:30 a.m. – early, yes. And then the second session is the next day, Sunday, at 18:30.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Now just let me have a very quick look at...

MARY WONG: Maybe I can step in here, Dennis.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead. Mary, go ahead.

MARY WONG: Dennis, we are still working on updating the published schedule because there are a few things that dropped in the translation from the internal scheduler that we were using to coordinate and what was published instead. But as far as I know, I can assure folks that these two sessions, Dennis, that you have on this slide, are indeed in those time slots and are indeed intended to be open to observers.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Good to know because I had it on my personal agenda, but I couldn't see it on the official ones; and, especially, I have no information on which room we are going to be in.

DENNIS CHANG: Which room?

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yep.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Let me see which room. I didn't put that on there because I figured that would be coming. Let me see.

MARY WONG: I'm sorry for jumping in again. As far as I know, both sessions will be in the GNSO room. And the only other thing I'll add here is that the intention at the moment is that one [inaudible] session will be devoted to discussing the Red Cross inconsistencies and the other to the IGO acronym inconsistencies. But as noted earlier, the sessions that Dennis had are the times, are intended to be open, and as far as I know will be in the GNSO room.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Okay.

DENNIS CHANG: The GNSO room is Hall C1.4. I hope that helps.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yep, thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: You're welcome. Any other questions about that? No? Okay, then. We'll move on.

Thank you, Lori, for bringing that up. You know, I don't mind telling you that I have to remind myself all the time, so I have this thing posted on my wall to look at.

This is what is and is not in Scope, and for a project and the project manager is critical to pay attention to in scope, out of scope. So, that's how I think of it and I try to make it easy for me, as much as possible. You can clearly see that there is no inconsistency on IOC or INGO here.

There are inconsistencies in RCRC and IGO. This is the reference chart that I would like us to use whenever we talk about – and I call it the Scope Tracking Chart. Any questions here? And if you have suggestions about how to make this easier or more clearer, please suggest.

Michelle, do you mind – oh no, I can't do that – make me the presenter. Let me see if this works better. It doesn't work better. Okay. Any other questions on this? No? If not, we'll move on. You'll have these slides posted on the Community Wiki after the meeting so feel free to grab it from there.

The Plan and the Status. Let's see, oops, Version 8. This is not the right slide. Okay, hold on. Okay. We're going to look at Version 9 today, I believe.

The one more thing that I wanted to talk about is that we had a conversation with a representative who's working on the IGO, up to two languages, and it seems that that project to gather the second language for the IGO is a lot larger or more difficult than first anticipated.

Realistically, what we found is that it's not going to come soon enough for us to have it before we're ready for public comment. So, it's the implementation team's suggestion that we go with a public comment without the second language and with a note in the public comment that whenever we receive the second language, we'll add to the list.

Does anybody have any comments or questions about that approach? No? Okay.

So, this is the timeline that we're looking at. We're in February. We're going to look at our draft, our latest draft, and we want to finalize it in March. I have distributed the latest draft yesterday, so I didn't expect you to be perfectly comfortable or 100% reviewed as of today. What I wanted to do is just present to you and you have the time between now and the March meeting in Copenhagen to look through it and make sure that you're comfortable with going to public comment with it.

This is important, that we are reporting this draft for a public comment. It's not the final version, so we are going to have to work on the final version after the public comment based on what we receive. Some of the things that we may receive are comments like, "We don't want you to announce the policy until we receive the IOC second language."

And I'm curious to see who and what's out there in terms of opinion on that and things like that.

Go ahead, Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Sorry, just when I went through the draft – just a practical question. It may be the same in other documents over in ICANN, but it just struck me. Can we maybe find another way to use the key words in the text in order to separate them from acronyms? I mean, “recommended” and “required,” and that kind of words are obvious, but the shorter ones such as “GAC versus may” and [“GNSO versus must”] – when they are mixed in the text, it may be a little bit difficult to read for those that are not familiar with what is Key Words and what is acronyms of organizations and that. I don’t know. For example, in bold type or something like that.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I think I understand what you’re saying, but can we talk about that again when we look at the policy itself? I’m going to bring it up.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes, of course. Yes. Just a quick practical question.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, yes. I am looking for practical suggestions, and I’ll tell you why in a minute here.

As far as a timeline is concerned, the key dates, of course, 1 August is when we would like to make the announcement for the effective date of 1 February of 2018. So, there is sort of our current assumption target date. Of course, it may change with all the other things that are going on surrounding this. But in terms of authorized Scope, this is what we’re looking at.

Okay. Now, let's see. So, this is our deliverables for each one of the milestones, and the way I look at implementation is in three milestones: When do we open public comment? When do we make the announcement? And when does the policy become effective? So, those are three key milestones that I'm tracking.

Here, we're going to be looking at the policy, so I'll bring that up here. Let's see, Version 9.

Okay. So, let me – so this is the title that we agreed to go with. Quick comment about the title. When we were discussing internally with our IPT (Implementation Project Team) – I referred to that as the ICANN [inaudible] or Staff Team here; we're working daily on this policy – there was a question that if and when a policy recommendation gets adopted regarding the IGO/INGO and it comes to us, we have two choices. We can create another Consensus Policy or revise the Consensus Policy that we have today.

And it was sort of a consensus with our team that we are going to look at this policy as the only existing policy, and if we have to change something about this policy, we will be revising this policy rather than creating another one which could potentially cause more confusion.

With that view, does the IRT have any thoughts on that? No? Okay. We'll keep going.

“Protection of IGO/INGO Identifiers in All gTLD” is the title. Now, the first statement here is the master keywords that Petter just mentioned, and these are the standard ITF terms that ITF uses and we have adopted here for our policy implementation. And we're trying to restrict the

requirements type of statements using capital letters for MUST, SHALL, MUST NOT, SHALL NOT, and MAY, for example.

So, if you look through the document, there may be words that are stated as “may”, but if it’s not capitalized that could either be that we forgot to capitalize it and we meant to capitalize it or it wasn’t what we meant as a keyword.

Now, Petter, can you repeat your suggestion of practical matter what we should do here?

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes, it was when I compared it to the shortenings, like the names of the organizations.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

PETTER RINDFORTH: And when you read that in the same text, it’s not always clear what is a keyword and what is the shortening of an organization as such. I don’t know if it can be...

I understand that you want to keep it in the capital letters if that’s in the document you referred to, but can it be underlined or something like that just to separate it from the names of the organizations? If you understand what I mean there.

DENNIS CHANG: I think I understand – like IOC and IGO that we’re looking at here. Those are capitalized.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes, I mean, we all know about what it meant and we... But for the ordinary people that speak – that should read and understand the document and if... I mean, you have the identification of the keywords at the beginning of the document, but then you started to read the document and then it’s a mix of the keywords and the shortenings of the names of the organizations as such.

If we could find some way to just identify what is what. Mary has a suggestion there, I think.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, go ahead, Mary.

MARY WONG: Hi, and thanks, Petter. I think that’s going to be really useful. So, I’m going to see to Dennis, Antonietta, and my other GDD colleagues because I know that we do try to be consistent in how our various consensus policies that bind the contracted parties are shown, but one way that we could think about, Petter, is maybe between that paragraph “Key Words” and that first paragraph, “Scope”, we could have a short paragraph that says, “The following abbreviations are used in this policy:” and then we have bullet points that say, “International Olympic Committee...IOC, International Government Organization...IGO.”

Is that what you had in mind?

PETTER RINDFORTH: Oh, yes. That seems to be a practical way to do it because then you have an initial clarification that if you're a common reader and you're on page 3 or 4, you can go back and see what is what in an easy way.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, okay. I really like that idea. So, one more thing that is not on the – We did not implement it in this document yet, but we have a team that's trying to standardize the implementation documents, and what we decided to do is take this whole Key Word paragraph, the first section, and move it under the Definition section.

So, that when you are looking at a document you will see the Title, and the Scope is the next thing you will see. And you will see Definition, and under Definition, you will see the Key Word statement described. I think maybe under Definition, we could continue to effectively describe the acronyms.

PETTER RINDFORTH: I think that it's what you're into as long as you, when you initially read the document, you have a clear description of what is acronyms and what is the Key Words.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, gotcha. Keys Words and Acronyms. Okay.

PETTER RINDFORTH: So, when you then read the document in full, you can easily go back and see what is what.

DENNIS CHANGE: Yes. We have Key Words. We have Acronyms. And we have these Definitions. Sort of a three category of things. Okay. Thanks for that suggestion. Let me take it back to our Standardization committee. It's a lot of work for just a bunch of us trying to make it easier. It's all voluntary.

Okay. Thank you for the suggestion.

Let me just go through the document quickly here and tell you what we did. So, what you notice is Section 1. We decided to number all the sections and be consistent in our numbering, too. So, you will always see the Section 1 as Scope; and Section 2 as the Definitions. The words they heard, you probably noticed that we had tried to define all the specific definitions that we're using in this document.

Then, third is the Effective Date. We wanted to prominently display the Effective Dates as a section in a section so that you can quickly find it. Then, the Policy Language that follows.

Over here, we have, we decided – well, I think we made this change probably before, but when we looked at it there was actually two categories of names and the treatment of those names. The Red Cross, IOC, and IGO full names is treated one way; and the INGO is treated another way. So, INGO is treated as a claims only for the approved

scope of our implementation and, of course, the Red Cross, IOC, and IGO are reserved.

Keep in mind that this document is targeted for Registries and Registrars and the domain name owners and whatnot. So, we have them in mind when we're writing these words. That's why we're talking about second level names only.

Then, after that, we have what we call an Implementation – Implementation Notes, right? Claim Service – Sorry, after that we have Appendix which are the Notice that we'll have to provide to the Registrar and Registries. Following that are Implementation Notes.

For example, if you notice that DNS Labor Conversion Rule that used to be in the part of the policy document – Policy Language – on top. We decided to move it down as an Implementation Note and, also, we put some words in here – thanks, Antonietta, for doing this – some text around what does this mean?

Instead of just going directly into the conversion rules, we put some words introducing what GNS Label conversion is and why we're doing it and how it really works in “laymen terms.” I think that helps.

All these things that we're doing now is that we feel like we're fairly stable in terms of the interpretation of the policy and the policy itself. Now, we're paying more attention to publishing of the public comments. So, making that easy as possible for public to read these documents so they can digest and give us comment.

Of course, we're trying to think of what questions people might ask and then we'll see if we can improve the language to anticipate the questions and answer them within the document. That's where the Implementation Notes, I think, comes in.

After the Conversion Rules, we have the [first] of INGO Identification [lists]. And here, this used to be like a footnote and we decided to put it here, so if you are interested in where the INGO names are coming from, you can find it here instead of a footnote.

And, of course, adding the background to every policy is going to be our standard for now. So, something you all know, everybody here, but if you are looking at this policy for the first time, you can go look at the background and understand it without having to go back to all the other documents. That is voluminous for anyone to deal with if you're trying to do a public comment.

Do you have any thoughts on this format? Any other suggestions? If not, as I said, if not – unless you have questions about specific things, I don't think I'm going to go over this again. A lot of it is shifting it around and recategorizing, but the policy itself hasn't changed. We've been looking at it for a long time together, so I think we're all good with it.

So, let me stop sharing and please – you have now, I guess, our **[inaudible]** as the next step kind of thing. Let's see. We looked at our policy.

Next step is for you to look it over, make sure that you guys are comfortable with going to public comment. And we're going to be

looking at this document at the Copenhagen for a revised version of this document if you do have any more changes.

For the Copenhagen meeting, we'll do the same thing together. We'll make sure, whoever attends – we'll start with a clear explanation of the Scope and then –

Go ahead, Holly. Do you want to speak?

HOLLY LANCE:

Oh, no. Sorry. I just got knocked off the Adobe Meeting Room. I'm still on the phone, so I just wanted to get back into the room. Sorry.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay. It's okay. You didn't miss much from the Adobe because I was just looking at the – showing you the document that you received from me yesterday.

So, please look over the language document and, for the ICANN 58 meeting, we'll gather and we'll present this sort of as a preview of the public comment that we'll be coming to them and answer any questions.

Unless the IRT has any more discussions to be had, I think we're in pretty good shape to start the public comment. The only clear decision – and I think you're in agreement – is that we don't have all the data, but luckily the data that we don't have is optional data. So, I think we're comfortable in going forward.

I showed you the list that's on your IRT Wiki page, so you've seen that last time. If you haven't, please go have a look. We have two lists now, the INGO list and the Red Cross, IOC, and the other – the reserved list. The reserved list and claims list. Basically, we can think of it that way.

Our meeting is on Wednesday, March 15, 3:15 p.m., and that is posted.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Can you show the next slide again, just with the meetings?

DENNIS CHANG: Absolutely.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Thanks a lot.

DENNIS CHANG: Hall C1.4. ICANN saturation. I know, Lori. You're everywhere. I hear you. In all the PDP Working Group. The last of the e-mails. Oh, boy.

Any other comments? Nope. Questions? Suggestions?

So, let me work on the policy document with the team here. And probably the next time you see it – and I'll distribute before the meeting – is maybe that format change where we take the Key Words; pull the Key Word section and bring it down into the Definition Section so it's not the first thing that they see.

It always bothered me, to tell you the truth, and I've been waiting for an opportunity to do something. And I think we have an opportunity here because – and Petter, thanks for bringing up that suggestion – I really like that list of acronyms right up front, and those are the ones that we use.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Good.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. It is my hopes and dreams, if you will, that as we standardize here – and I know Petter, Lori, and all of you are involved in PDP Working Group – that this somehow flows up to the Upstream so that when we get our policy recommendations, that we use the same kind of key terms like we use “must” for [“requirement.”] And we don't use the word “should” when we mean “must.”

Okay, guys. Thank you very much.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Thanks. I'll see you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]