| UNIDENTIFIED MALE: | Hello, everyone. |
| --- | --- |

| UNIDENTIFIED MALE: | At least I had the same date on my screen, so. |
| --- | --- |

| DENNIS CHANG: | Okay. I'm glad. So this is our IRT meeting for IGO-INGO Identifier Protection Policy Implementation Project. Today is the 28th of July. And let's get started. |
| --- | --- |

So if anybody is on the phone and not on Adobe Connect, please identify yourself. Otherwise, we will note that you have attended.

Hearing none, I will continue then. Welcome, everyone. So today, we have an agenda that you see before you. We're going to cover the project status so everybody can get on the same page. And then we will talk to you about the gating items. I call them gating items so they [are] identifying what we require for the public comment. And then the project scope tracking chart, I want to review one more time. Something that I like to review time to time. This project is kind of confusing, and we saw a lot of confusion at the Helsinki too. So I went around sharing a project tracking chart with several people to get on the same page or keep them in sync. Four, we want to talk about a concept called Protected Identifier Master List. And we'll talk more about that. And then the list update process and next steps.

**EN**

So let me start with sharing our schedule, current timeline. It hasn't changed. I just changed the little format. I took the public comment and I put it on one line. You can see the start of the public comment in August and then the end in the regular timeframe. So instead of having a milestone for another milestone, I just put it all in one line. I think that it simplifies and you can see here. So announcement, of course, is the 1 February we are targeting. And six months later is the policy effective date in 1 August. We're trying to use those, 1 February and 1 August, as the normal calendar dates for our project implementation.

So talking about the status, there are three parts. We need to get our list and the data. And we have to define the update process and the system. As far as the data, we have all except the second language from the GAC. As you know, we submitted a letter in coordination with the support staff for the GAC from the ICANN side. And they are trying to get us their list by October 2016.

Now, we do have to talk about the possibility of them being late or not delivering or only partially delivering, because, as you know, they have to go out to hundred-some members and try to get this information. And I know that some GAC members have already responded, and they are trickling in. But it is an optional item, so we may want to take a position that we gave a deadline and we will go with our first initial list.

Go ahead, Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     Thanks. I probably asked this before, but regarding the two languages – and I presume now that you have some inputs, even if it's not from all.

If you can say if it's normally English and another one or if they are to be very different kind of languages. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:  What I've seen is English plus another language.

PETTER RINDFORTH:  Okay.

DENNIS CHANG:  Yeah. And I think that's the way, even though it's not specific, I think that's the way people are communicating anyway. Because they have already given their first language [first name], so they are adding to that.

PETTER RINDFORTH:  Yeah, I presume so. But on that hand, they're afraid to choose the language and say they want… So it was interesting to see that. There needs to be a [full list] to see if English is one of them. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:  Yeah, it would be interesting to see. It would be interesting to see. So [working]. So we can make that call later. Maybe we can talk about it in October, that time period there. But we'll see what we get then and make a decision whether that will be a gating item for announcement or not.

So next item is the development with the INGO. The MOU, so that we call it, turns out that ICANN has a standard form or process dealing with the United Nations. So we are following that process carefully. And several people who are in the business of UN relations are involved. So that MOU has been drafted and is circulating within ICANN. And it is our intent to, of course, get with them and see how long that takes.

And that is another point where, if it gets delayed beyond August, right now, we are not thinking that will be a gating item to go with the public comment, because I think public comment in the policy language, I think it would be sufficient for us to let everyone know our implementation includes working with the UN DESA and ECOSOC. So whether or not we actually have a signed MOU is probably not going to be needed, and we can consider that part of implementation. That's what we're thinking today.

And next-last item is the development of the system on the 90-day claim system. We're still in discussion with the [CMCA] system vendor, which is Deloitte and IBM. And they promised to provide us a proposal. It's been taking a long time, but we are pursuing that, and they promised us. So that's where the status is.

Any question on the status of the project?

PETTER RINDFORTH:     None so far, thanks.

| DENNIS CHANG: | Yeah. So this is the gating item that we talked about. So I have three milestones identified: public comment start, and then announcement, and then policy effective date. So right now, the public comment, we're saying that we really need to identify the [inaudible] claim solution. I think we're okay with that. We have pretty well defined and we know what to do. And the process needs to be defined, and then of course the document. And the sample protected identifier list – I call it the sample. I'm not sure exactly what to name it. But we'll talk about that a little more later. So that's the first four items we are focusing our energy on to get to the public comment in August. |
|---|---|

Moving, this is the policy recommendation scope tracking chart. You've seen this before, Petter. And as you see, I have tried really hard to identify what's included, but also what's not included. And my original chart did not have this in it. And I added this because I noticed a discrepancy on our policy language draft document and, of course, other documents. And I think this is correct.

The INGO is English only. And that's been specified in the recommendation and all the other scoping documents that I've seen. And I've asked our [ITT] if they know of any reasons or discussions prior to change that from English only to relevant language, which is what our policy document draft currently says. And I have not heard any feedback.

And let me take a moment here and hear from Berry and Petter. Any question on this, really?

PETTER RINDFORTH:    How sure can we be that it stays with English only?

DENNIS CHANG:    That's what I'm asking. I think I'm [sure]. But go ahead. A message from Berry, okay. "English only is what I recall." Okay. So Berry says he recalls English only. And I have looked at the recommendation documents, and it says, "English only," on the top. Oops, what did I do?

Anybody else have any… Let me see. I had here… Let me see. Recent file. I was just looking at the final…

So is the final document, a recommendation, final report. And I think since I'm sharing my screen, you guys can get dizzy reading everything that's going by. But here is the INGO 3.4 section. Can you see this? English only language.

PETTER RINDFORTH:    Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG:    Yeah. So I'm satisfied, unless there is subsequent document decision or direction, that change this, I have no seen no reason to deviate from it. But I want to be very careful, because it has been years that this thing was in development, and many conversation has been had. And you know about the scope confusion already. So I want to be crystal clear that all the [ITT] members and all the IRT members are in sync. That's why I decided to add this here, so that we don't lose this.

So far, the scope tracking document has components: reserved, top and second [inaudible]. So what language? The six UN languages; six UN plus German, Greek, Korean; [inaudible] languages; and English only. So they are mixed, and I don't know how or why the recommendation came over different variety of language decisions, but it's not for me to question it. It's my job, and our job, to implement what we have been directed.

Comments? Feedback? Questions? Are we all clear? So then the subsequent action is that I am going to go ahead and change our policy draft document to say English only, to make that consistent with everything else.

So let's talk about the location of the list. Where do we keep this location? So what you see on top table is the current location of the list. And what you see at the bottom is the proposed new location. So right now, RC, IRC, IOC, IGO, we have a reserved name list on our website. And if you go there, the long list of names and the DNS label for them. And it gets referred to from various sources, like the registry agreement Spec 5, and then other places, I guess. The IGO list in particular, we know that we have that received in a PDF form from the GAC, but then we have taken that and put it onto this reserved name list so that we can have one list.

Now, the important thing here is that the reserved name list only gives the second level. So if you want to know what the top level reserved list is, you have to go to AGB. And then for INGO, it doesn't appear anywhere, because we were given the direction to do that. So that's the current situation.

So what the IPT has come up with is say, why don't we use the same concept as a reserved list, but expand that concept to include the top level [or so] and add the INGO to it, but keep the list a simple list, without interpretation? Meaning that all the treatment of how you use the list and what to do with the list is covered elsewhere, like AGB and registry agreement, etc.

Any reaction? You guys, what do you think?

PETTER RINDFORTH: I think it's very good to have it all at the same location. And then, as I understand it, you will call it protected identifiers list. Although will it still be listed on that as the type of organization? Or will it just be the names? Because I think it will be good to, even if it's on the same list, to add a possibility to identify the kind of organization.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, I was thinking, and we were thinking, that if we look at the current list of reserved names, it comes in categories. It's a list of lists, in other words. The first [crosstalk] –

PETTER RINDFORTH: We'll keep this.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I'm thinking we keep that same format and add to it the INGO. The only thing that you should be aware of is that INGO list is going to

**EN**

be 4,000 long. I am wondering how that would really look on a webpage. But maybe technically we can handle it somehow. So we'll talk with our engineers here. Francisco didn't see a problem with it, and he said he would do it for us. He is not here right now. So I don't think it's a technical challenge as maybe a readability challenge. But maybe we can put a table of contents on top or something. I don't know.

But the concept is that rather than going to keep pointing to if you want something, go look at AGB. If you want something, go look at registry agreements Spec 5. If you want something, go here, go there. And then if you want top level, do this. If you want second level, do this. I will rather have one list. And it won't even say how to use this list. It'll just say, "Here's the Red Cross list." And it's updated as of [inaudible]. And then if you go to the registry agreement or future registry agreement, or AGB, the Applicant Guidebook, of the future, there it will point to this and say, "For top level, you must reserve."

So I think it's a clear and straightforward concept. So everybody liked it here. And I just wanted to make sure that IRT… If you had a different perspective, I wanted to find out if you do.

No? Are we okay?

PETTER RINDFORTH:          Yes.

DENNIS CHANG:          Okay. Okay, so we'll proceed with this approach. Now, one thing that we also talked about better is when we do public comment, we will

# EN

have our document, of course, the implementation plan document and consensus policy language. But we will attempt to actually create this whole list as a test model so that people can see what it would look like when they comment on it, instead of just mentioning it. So we haven't done that yet, but that's our plan before we launch. And via e-mail, we will communicate this with the IRT and let you guys have a look when it is ready.

Let's talk about the update process. So let me talk about one process. And there's more than one option, but I want to talk about this one first, because this is the default process and this is what I call as-needed update. And what is says, that we have already identified the authority for the updates. So when ICANN receives it, then we will have to notify those affected parties, such as the claim system service provider, and tell them, "Hey, we have an updated list. Go ahead and update your system. And you have to be ready by a certain date." And then after that, we actually do the update and make the announcement.

So simple concept, but this is as-needed basis upon required. And we don't know how often this is going to happen. And we'll have to find out if there's any kind of legal timeframe of notification to the contracted party. And we'll find that out. If it's ten days, or sometimes we have these kind of requirements that we have to let them know ten days prior to any kind of changes that have [asked] them. And we'll find that out. But I'm thinking maybe a month is an adequate time. And we'll spell that out in our document.

So this is one concept. And let me go to the next page, where the first concept is the as-needed model default. That's the first bullet. The

# EN

second bullet is calendarized model. And this is like the policy implementation calendar that I talked to you about, 1 February and 1 August. We always think in those terms. So biannual, twice a year, you can expect that any kind of policy effective dates, effectiveness, a new policy will be implemented or effective on those dates. So you don't have to worry about it.

So this is another concept that one of the [IP] team member presented how this would be. And I thought about it, and I wanted to talk about it here to. So we can probably accommodate twice a year, as an example. And it may be even nice to synchronize those with those same days, February and August. But the consequences is what happens if we get an update from a GAC on January 31$^{st}$? We can't possibly react quickly enough to get it updated by August. So we have to set up some sort of rule that it has to be received one month prior to the effective date, or something. The worst case would be almost a year delay. So it presents potential delay upon receipt to effective date, basically. So I can kind of see the criticism from community that [that style where] ECOSOC gave us an update in January, but we haven't updated our system until August.

So that's my thought. Any reaction here.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     I think the calendarized model might be a more safer model for all parties, because then you have specific dates that you are, so to say, forced to manage and to file your amendments in due time. Having said that, for example, with the February, the 31$^{st}$ of January amendment, I

**EN**

don't know if it's possible to make a quick search if there are updates at the beginning of the year that is ready by New Year or ready in the middle of January or so. The February 1$^{st}$ date specifically can be changed a couple of weeks perhaps, if its more convenient for the parties, as a general policy, with [main] change at the beginning of the year.

But otherwise, I like the twice a year example. Giving it some more clear both for you, ICANN, and for the organizations and such.

DENNIS CHANG:          Anybody else? Go ahead, Steve.

STEVE CHAN:            I was just thinking that the calendarized model doesn't have to be just two times. It doesn't have to be strictly modeled after the implementation calendar. So if you wanted to alleviate some of the issues of just how the calendar sets up, then you could potentially have four points for updates or [crosstalk].

DENNIS CHANG:          [crosstalk] updates.

STEVE CHAN:            Yeah, something other than just twice a year, to hopefully avoid that situation.

DENNIS CHANG:

Okay, that's another option. Yeah. So if it gets too frequent, then I would rather go with the as-needed model so that we don't have to remember. Because I think my prediction is it's going to get infrequent update. So if we just react to the updates from GAC and UN DESA, we only have two sources. And I would rather just have it one month after we receive it or something like that. I think, for me, that seems like it's easier implementation. From my side, that's what I see.

And I'm trying to consider the direction that I would have to give to my suppliers [too here]. It's a lot easier to say, "Update it within a month," or, "Update two weeks," or something like that, per contract. And then once they have that updated, [to hound] for three months to make the announcement seems like that's actually less efficient, I think.

So that's where it is. You feel strongly one way or the other, Petter? Or do you think that you can leave it to us to pick the appropriate –

PETTER RINDFORTH:

Basically, I'll leave it to you. I thought that if we had the specific dates, it would be more convenient also for you to collect and then make the changes. But if you say that it's better way to have continuous update, and if it's convenient and you can do it within a month, well, I have no problem with that. And of course, it will be more appreciated, I presume, also for the organizations that want to update it, so that they don't have to wait for another five months, in worst case.

# EN

DENNIS CHANG:            Yeah. How do you feel about the month's reaction time? Do you think that's a reasonable time? I feel comfortable with a month, in terms of implementation. That's from the community side. Do you think that's pretty timely?

PETTER RINDFORTH:       I think that's okay.

DENNIS CHANG:            Okay. Okay. So that's our default lead time that we're going to start working with. And we're going to make sure that it gets reflected in our policy language too so that we can have public comments on it. It may take us too long or something. But I think it's probably okay.

Okay, thank you. Next steps, so we're going to pursue the MOU with UN DESA [inaudible] systems claim, and then complete the [trial]. We're going to try the policy language. Something else that Antonietta is working on with the team right now is that we are going to go ahead and draft up the notice language. And it's going to be like a form for registrant and the protected organization. In other words, if a registrant is registering the name, they will see a message pop up before they register that, "Hey, you are about to register a name that's in the claim system. This notice will be posted for 90 days." And then if they go ahead and still register, then a notice will go to the protected organization saying, "Hey, so-and-so registered your name. Just wanted you to know."

**EN**

Okay? So I think that will paint the complete picture for the public comment. They have the policy language. They have the actual list of what it looks like, and notifications that people will see. That will be a good set of documents for them to comment on, I think.

So next scheduled meeting for next IRT call is the 25th. And that's the last one we'll have before the public comment. That's an important call. So looking at the attendance for these meetings, I'm so glad you're here, man. We have to make sure that we get their attention somehow and that you can do something, Petter, to encourage them that at least if they can't attend a meeting, at least look at the documents and provide feedback. Because I have no reason to delay the public comment here at this point.

Go ahead, Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH:       The PowerPoint presentation I see right now, will you send it out to the full list, together with the invitation to the 25th of August meeting?

DENNIS CHANG:           You mean the… What were you asking for? The [crosstalk] of the –

PETTER RINDFORTH:       No, the PowerPoint presentation.

DENNIS CHANG:           Oh, the PowerPoint presentation, yeah.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     It will make it a little bit more easier also if I reach out to [other] interested parties.

DENNIS CHANG:     Yes, that would be good.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     I think it's also [inaudible] yeah. It's a very good and usually readable presentation, obviously.

DENNIS CHANG:     Okay, we'll do that. Thank you for that suggestion. Yeah. There'll be, I expect, lots of communication, speaking and communication, all the way to our next IRT meeting. So PowerPoint presentation will certainly be one of them. And it will basically contain the things that we discussed on the e-mail list. That's what I'm envisioning right now.

PETTER RINDFORTH:     Good.

DENNIS CHANG:     Okay. Well, anybody else? That's all I have for today. Anyone else have anything else?

Can I ask you a question, Petter?

**EN**

PETTER RINDFORTH:          Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG:          Since you are the man, and I know it's a little off topic, but on the reconciliation of GNSO differing from GAC, are you involved in that at all?

PETTER RINDFORTH:          No, I'm not.

DENNIS CHANG:          Okay. But you are running the Curative Rights Working Group, right?

PETTER RINDFORTH:          Yes, I'm one of the co-Chairs there.

DENNIS CHANG:          Sure. Yeah, this one. This one.

PETTER RINDFORTH:          Yes.

DENNIS CHANG:          Anything that this team should be aware of there?

PETTER RINDFORTH:      What we are waiting for there, as you may know, we have focused now on [IDOs]. And what we are waiting for now is a little bit of what we're talking about there, the protection to get an input from the Board so that we also can see what kind of other protection, when it comes to dispute resolutions, we need to deal with.

DENNIS CHANG:          Okay.

PETTER RINDFORTH:      But this is another topic, but [inaudible] next to this. But it's more of the very protective, and of course what we're dealing with here is the identification to make that commitment and the work [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG:          Okay, thank you. Anybody? Mary, did you want to talk? I saw your chat? Okay then. I'm going to conclude the meeting. So I'll see you next month there on the call, but we'll be talking online with e-mails. Bye, everyone.

PETTER RINDFORTH:      Yep, thanks.

DENNIS CHANG:          Thanks. Oh, I got a compliment from Mary. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**