DENNIS CHANG: Welcome. So, this is the IGO-INGO Identifiers Protection Policy Implementation IRT Meeting on the 19th of January, 2017. Greetings to everyone. This is our first meeting of 2017, so Happy New Year to everyone.

Also, I think this is the meeting after the last meeting at Hyderabad. We haven't met in between, but I assure you the staff has been busy trying to make progress. We are coming back to you now for IRT review of the required items.

Actually, this should be an easy meeting for you. We only have a couple of things on the agenda. So, let's get started. I'll give you a quick project status, schedule, and we'll review the policy language. Then we'll talk about the next steps.

Status wise, I distributed the version 8 to you for your review. This version incorporates the comments that we received from our Hyderabad face-to-face meeting in ICANN57. I will discuss that.

Otherwise, other status really hasn't changed. We're still seeking the two languages from the GAC. We received the preliminary version and we've provided some comments on that. They're still working on the second language. They have a lot of it, but not all of it and they need more time. We may want to discuss how we proceed if we do not get it in time, but I think we have some time to wait if they can come through for us.

Systems wise, that's within ICANN and we're working with the vendor, as you know – the same vendor as TMCH.

Here is a timeline as I see it. Today, this month, we'd like to complete our draft and review by the IRT of the policy language. In February, we'd like to start publishing that for public comments, and it would stretch into March and possibly across our March ICANN meeting in Copenhagen. After that, we'll revise the policy language based on our public comment, and we'll have another meeting then.

Then 1 August 2017 is our target date for the announcement with the effective date. That effective date is, of course, 1 February 2018. By our policy implementation calendar, we try to give minimum six months for all of us to implement. I think that's an adequate time for implementation of this policy.

Stop me anytime if you have questions as I go.

This is a list of key deliverables. It's the same list. We haven't changed our plan on what we intend to complete and receive before we move on.

Let's talk about the policy language. There's two changes. We'll get right to it then.

Let's see. I'm going to have to [stop] sharing and we'll bring up the draft. Let me bring up the red line version. You have both clean version and the red line version, but let me just bring up the red line version because you need to see the changes.

The first thing I did is, we changed the title because I wanted you to see and recognize the exact wordings that we will be using when we go for public comment. We have been using IGO-INGO Identifier Protection Policy as a working title. But for our public comment, it's preferable to have a more of a descriptive title. The title proposed is Proposed Implementation of the GNSO Policy for the Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in all gTLD.

I would like to hear from the IRT. Does that work for you guys? Is that clean enough and clear enough? I'm sensitive to the title because of so much confusion with the scope of this policy implementation. As you know, there's [a lot] more interesting and exciting discussion going on in parallel in other places that talks about similar things.

What do you think? I know Petter is leading one of those working groups [inaudible] on the CRT. There's a small group discussion on the acronyms with the Board and counsel and GAC and all that other business.

Go ahead, Petter.

PETTER RINDFORTH: I think it's good. Actually, I read the clean version first and I made a couple of [inaudible] in this document. I have a couple of follow-up questions when it comes to those pages, but I'm satisfied with this thought. I think it's clear what the document is about. As you said, it's good that it [syndicates] that what part of the ongoing different kind of works related to IGOs and INGOs we are discussing [inaudible].

EN

DENNIS CHANG: Right. In earlier meetings, that's why we decided to put up the first paragraph – or first sentence – to try to be as clear as possible because I expect that when we go to public comment, we're going to get some reaction like there's some surprise. Do you know what I mean? I know you probably heard as much as I've heard.

Welcome, Lori. We just got actually started and you didn't miss much. I provide you some quick status. We are at the meat of our [meeting] today   and   that   which   is   [inaudible]. So, there is a [inaudible] and there is the title.

The next change that [inaudible].

PETTER RINDFORTH: Sorry. Can I come with other question, as I don't think it's red lined or green lined in your document. I just have a question on .11. It may be that I have missed it. When it comes to reservation, it refers to the identifier list. Then it said "unless otherwise specified."

I'm not sure if – I don't think there are any specifications in the document, but can it be more clear with some references or some kind of examples of how it could otherwise be specified? It seems that it otherwise could be a very large gray zone, so to speak.

DENNIS CHANG: I see your comment. Any other – anybody else have comments on that – "unless otherwise specified"? I know that we wrote that in for a reason.

Go ahead, Crystal.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I think it's in there because, under this new policy, registry operators are allowed to release the Red Cross IOC and IGO if it's requested by the matching – like if the Olympic committee wants Olympic.whatever, they can request it. You don't have to keep it [reserved] for that instance.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. We call that "exceptions procedure," and then we'll talk about that. It's in 1.3 I think. Petter, do you have a proposed language or proposed change?

PETTER RINDFORTH: Did I understand you correctly that you said that there were some clarifications in 1.3?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes –

PETTER RINDFORTH: [Refer to] that.

DENNIS CHANGE: – the procedure.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes. Maybe we could just add that ["unless otherwise specified, as for example in 1.3,"] if there could be other specifications, just to give the reader some kind of understanding on what kind of specifications we're talking about. Could that be enough?

DENNIS CHANG: Is this what you are thinking? I've typed that in the chat. Go ahead, Crystal. Crystal, did you want to speak again? No? Okay.

                        So, "unless otherwise specified in section 1.3". Is that what you're proposing, Petter? Right.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes. That could be clear enough.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes, and we will review 1.3 below. Let me see. Okay, so 1.3 is actually where the change was. The change was adding a footnote on 1.3 with this language. This is difficult to see. You should have a copy of this that I sent to you. Why don't I do this? Why don't I bring up the clean version because I think it will be easier to see because we added a footnote.

                        This was based on a comment that we received at the Hyderabad meeting. What it said is, "registrations in the TLD remain subject to

registry operator's registration restrictions including community based eligibility requirement and public interest commitment."

What it was intended to do was that we're not going to obligate a registry operator to register a domain name just because Red Cross asked for it if the domain name happens to be under a TLD that was community based. The example that people were using were like .bank. If you're a .bank TLD operator, you want banks to operate. And if IOC comes or Red Cross comes and says, "I want to register redcross.bank," then they don't have to because of this policy. That was the intention. Does that make sense?

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you, Petter, for confirmation. That was the only change we have. I know that Petter says that he has a few changes on the clean version that he's going to distribute to us. We'll look at that, but do you want to cover that now?

PETTER RINDFORTH: [As I see it] right now, no. Just a simple formal addition to Appendix A when I read it compared to Appendix B. As I presume what we will show the readers here are the full appendix, so just add something with [their] and the name as they have in Appendix B.

DENNIS CHANG: I see what you mean.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

PETTER RINDFORTH: That was the one. Then I had [might be a] stupid question when it comes to 2.4, but I don't remember what we decided on that when we talked about the protected identifier list upon ten calendar days' notice. What did we concluded when it comes to updates? Was it continuously ongoing or is this ten days based on a periodical use of incoming requests from [admin] and then ten days after that?

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. It's ten days after notification, [but that's] ten days' notices in the existing registry operator agreement. It's the same condition. It's a [registration] list is updated and we'll notify everyone and we all update it in ten days.

Now, EqualSoft, their process is they update annually, sometime in October. The list that we have is actually current, ad we won't see another update until next year, October.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Okay. Thanks. That was actually the only thing I had.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you, Petter. Crystal. Do you have a suggestion on INGO? I see you. Go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes. I was looking at 2.1, and I think the point of 2.1 is to say that it's for TLDs that are delegated after the effective date of this policy. Right now, it said "the domain delegated." I think that's just confusing, so if we could put "gTLDs delegated [by any registry operator"] after this policy, I think that makes it more clear that –

DENNIS CHANG: I see what you mean. Yes. That's a big difference, huh?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes. And I would actually put that [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Domain names are registered, not [them]. Okay. I see what you mean. I think that would make it clearer because there is that confusion that this only applies to new gTLDs after the policy is effective. By that time, we expect very little until the next round, really. It is not meant to be proactive in any fashion.

EN

CRYSTAL ONDO: Thanks, yes. And I would actually put that first sentence that has slightly different font – I would make that the second sentence. So, you'd start by saying, "New gTLDs delegated after August 1st have to do this 90 days" and then "registry operator [might apply]." I think that just flows better. It makes it clear to the reader.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. I see. Is that clear to you?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Antonietta is clear, so she's going to help me. I think it's clear.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Okay. Then the other thing is, in that first sentence, which is also repeated in 2.2, it says, "Registry operator must provide the INGO claim services for the first 90 calendar [days name] is available." Did you mean domain name or applicable domain name? "Calendar [days name]" just doesn't make grammatical sense.

And I have one more suggestion when you're ready.

DENNIS CHANG: Let me see. I want to get this right. We're going to revise it and get it out. We'll see if we can get it right. Your second comment is on 2.2. You

would like to see instead of "domain name being registered", you're saying "applicable domain names", plural?

CRYSTAL ONDO: I mean – it doesn't have to be "applicable." It's actually the first sentence in 2.1, and then it's repeated again in 2.2. It says, "Registry operator must provide claim services for the first 90 calendar [days name] is available for registration." I think it should read ["calendar days. The domain name…"]

You're clear about what "name" means?

DENNIS CHANG: I'm not sure. Antonietta, Caitlin, is it clear to you? I think Crystal is asking us to duplicate a sentence from the 2.1.

CRYSTAL ONDO: No, it's duplicated already.

DENNIS CHANG: Duplicated already. So, it should not be duplicated?

CRYSTAL ONDO: I've put it in type. The sentence is already in 2.1 and 2.2. You guys have "name." Here it says – where I have capitalized "Name."

PETTER RINDFORTH: If I understand you correct, Crystal, you refer to it as a typo.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes.

PETTER RINDFORTH: It should be "domain name" and not just "name."

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes.

PETTER RINDFORTH: If you read the first sentence of 2.1, "Registry operator must provide… calendar [days name] is available for registration." That should be "domain name."

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I see. Okay.

PETTER RINDFORTH: You also have it in, I think – is it 2.2, the second sentence there? "Registry operator must...calendar [days name] is available for registration." It should be "domain name." It's just a typo.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Just a typo.

DENNIS CHANG: Instead of "name", "domain name." Okay. I got you. Were you okay?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you, Antonietta. I don't want to be the only one-

CRYSTAL ONDO: I have one more question.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO: For 2.4, in "a ten calendars days' notice," I'm just trying to think out long term. If I have, let's say .home – that's not out yet – and we delegate .home and I'm in the process of running a 90-day claims period and I get a notice from ICANN that a domain that I've already let be registered because it wasn't on this list now requires to be part of this claims period. I'm not really sure what to do in that instance.

If you're adding names to the INGO list once the names are out, how does the claims period apply? Or even after the claims period is over and you add name, are you saying you want us to run claims just on that

single domain? Because I'm pretty sure most registrars and registries are not capable of doing that.

I'm just asking you guys to think about, for names that you're adding to the INGO list, are you saying those newly added names, even after five years after this TLD has been delegated – you'd like claims to be run on that singular name or that list of new names? I'm not sure that's feasible or recommended.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. If it's a name that's already registered – is that what you're referring to?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Not even that. The thing up above in 1.2 that you're talking about doesn't include INGOs.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh. 1.2 does not include INGO. I see. Yes, of course not. That's for specifically Red Cross, IOC, and IGO. So, we need to make it clear. If we don't have a case what to do, it's already registered domain names on the INGO. I think that's what you're pointing out.

CRYSTAL ONDO: That – there's two issues: it's already registered and if the TLD is already through claims. So, it's not registered, the name didn't go through

EN

claims because it wasn't on the list, but now you're adding it to the list. Are you asking a registry to run claims on just that name?

DENNIS CHANG: I think so. I think that's what we have to do. Yes. If they're newly added, we have to provide a 90 days' claim period.

CRYSTAL ONDO: So, that I just want everyone to think out long term. This could happen in ten years. The INGO gets updated and no one is running claims. The TMCH isn't up and running. What happens if the ISOC adds names in ten years, which presumably they will?

DENNIS CHANG: They could, yes. That's the idea.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I just think we [need to] think about the technical capability there.

DENNIS CHANG: The claim system will be there because that's required. Never mind the TMCH.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Right. But those of us who are already operating TLDs, we're assuming that this is going to be similar with TMCH and all of our systems are tied in that way.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I just don't want to get in a place where the ISOC adds to this and you add to the INGO and there's no physical way for registries or registrars to provide these because every other use of claims notices has gone by the wayside.

DENNIS CHANG: I think what I'm hearing is that you understand the requirement and intent of the policy. You're foreseeing a technical difficulty in meeting the requirement ten years from now, for example. Right? You have to keep up a system just to service this. It has to be designed and provided.

CRYSTAL ONDO: On an individual name basis, right, because it's not just for the whole list. It's for individual names that are added.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. It is the whole list. It's just that the whole list gets updated.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Right, but if [inaudible] whole list goes through 90-day claims, that's over and now we're five or ten years down and some thing's added to

that list. So, we're not running on claims on the whole list again. We're just running claims on the individual name.

DENNIS CHANG: That is true. Yes. 90 days' period is over for the other names. So, on that one name, if a new gTLD gets delegated, then if everything on the list gets 90-day claim service, that happens once. Then after that, a new name is added. That particular name has to get the 90 days' claim service. [This is before], right? Yes.

I think your understanding is correct and I agree with you. As to the technical challenges of meeting the requirements, I can't really comment here. But I think that is the full intent. Yes.

CRYSTAL ONDO: So, Dennis, if you could point m – I just haven't been following tons of back and forth on this, not in our group but elsewhere in the policy development. Is there a specific place that says new names are required for the claims as well? If so, could you show that to me?

DENNIS CHANG: On the policy itself? Okay. Can someone help me here? See if you can find the language. I think that's what Crystal is asking for.

Hi, Petter. Did you find something?

PETTER RINDFORTH: No, I'll try to.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Yes. I'm pretty sure because I remember talking about this and deliberating that it was required. We went through a great extent of updating. Talking to the UN was not an easy thing to do. And you know that we were struggling to make a contact. We finally made a contact, and getting a good cooperation in updates. So, updates were designed into [word envision] and there must be a reason for the updates. Otherwise, we would need a second list.

Okay. I found a footnote. That's number 21 on page 15 of 85. I'll put it on the chat. This came from the section 3.4. of the final report.

Crystal is asking us to verify the requirements of this update. It would be a lot. Do you have the link?

[PETTER RINDFORTH:]   Oh, link.

DENNIS CHANG: Link of the final recommendation?

[PETTER RINDFORTH:]   Okay, hold on.

DENNIS CHANG: That should be on our Wiki. I keep it on my computer because I refer to it, but we should be able to find it from our Wiki page.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: I just sent a link to the [PowerPoint].

DENNIS CHANG: You did? Okay, thank you. Thank you, Caitlin. Are there any other items of discussion while Crystal looks that up? Let's see. Petter is here. Berry is here. Lori has left already, I guess.

PETTER RINDFORTH: I don't have any.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Do you have a recollection of what was envisioned by the working group? You were in the working group, right?

PETTER RINDFORTH: [inaudible]. I don't have any fresh on that right now.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. The question is really, do we have to deal with updates of EqualSoft list and maintain an updated list, or do we just use one single one-time list and not bother anymore because it wouldn't make sense to get updated lists from the EqualSoft if you don't use it. The only use is 90-day claims.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. We're not reserving anything.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Not referring to any previous discussions about that, but I agree with the more simpler, more effective way to do it, as I said.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. How we handle it, how the registries and registrar handle it – maybe we may want to have a technical discussion on how to implement it.

                        ["We could update lists for newly delegated TLDs, but retroactive addition to delegated TLDs will be hard."] Okay.

                        Lori, you have a raised hand. You're back. Go ahead, Lori. Lori? Oh, she wants to enter the room. Hi, Lori. You're back. Welcome back. We were just having a discussion on whether the requirement to EqualSoft list for INGO was part of the requirement or not. And if it is, Crystal is concerned about implementing it that it will be technically challenging.

                        You can see in the chat.

                        Crystal, I think what you're saying is you're going to pull in the technical person outside of this meeting. Right? We can't address it here. But I think we have an agreement, at least, on the policy – I just want to make sure – on the policy that we're implementing requires that we

refresh the EqualSoft list as updated by the United Nations. And then we do have to provide that 90 days' claims to those names that are added to the EqualSoft list.

I just want to make sure the clear requirement from the working group because, otherwise, if we don't do that – let's see. Any other interpretation? Is there any other interpretation of updating a EqualSoft list?

CRYSTAL ONDO: By my reading of the policy, it just says the IRT has to determine how it's managed. It doesn't say that newly added INGOs will have to go through claims even after a TLD has been delegated for five years.

DENNIS CHANG: Let me see. It says that "for newly delegated TLD after the effective date of this policy." Right? Yes. What do you want to do here? Let's see. Crystal, are you proposing a different interpretation that does not necessitate the update of the EqualSoft list at all?

CRYSTAL ONDO: I think so. If you're looking at something at the link that Caitlin put in and you're looking at six, right? "[enter] INGO scope and scope 2 if [added] to TMCH allowed to participate in 90-day claims notification phase of each new gTLD launch."

That's saying if it's on the list, when you launch, you have to put it through a 90 days. It doesn't say you have to go back and do another

separate 90 days for newly added INGOs. It just says during that phase of launch, if it's on this list, you have to do 90 days. But by my plain reading, it doesn't require going back and running a new claims period each time the UN updates the list.

DENNIS CHANG: What do you think? What do you think, Petter, Lori? I'd like to hear from you two.

PETTER RINDFORTH: I have no reason to vote against Crystal's suggestion. I'm not familiar with all the details there, but it sounds like we're going to do it, so...

DENNIS CHANG: I can see. Let's look at the scenario. If we go with Crystal's interpretation, we provide a 90 days claim alongside the TMCH for every delegation after the policy is accepted, right? If the TLDs delegated, after the policy is effective, we run through the 90 days' claims system. Right?

After that, new names are added. We don't do anything about that. But then when a new gTLD gets delegated in a separate round five years from now, at that point, we run the 90 days' claims service along with the TMCH.

That's how it works. So, we do need the updated list. That requires an updated list because we don't know when the new gTLD is going to get

delegated. Did I understand this right, Crystal? Did I describe that correctly?

CRYSTAL ONDO: I think you did, yes – that we have to update the list and that registry operators based on their delegation dates may have different lists depending on when it's updated. But that updates to the list don't necessitate previously delegated names or TLDs to run the newly added INGO labels through a claims period again.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes.

PETTER RINDFORTH: As long as we have one updated list, that's okay. I don't want to come to a situation where we have [it goes] that's updates and it will be hard to [mash] them to one readable list that it's easy to find.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. One list. I have no intention of creating multiple lists. I'm already worried about this one list because we already have the other list. Reconciling that with the currently existing reservation list is not something that we are trying to tackle on here.

But for this, okay, so I think that's the way… If you have no objections, we're going to try to make sure that's clear on our next revision. Okay?

Yes, it is an implementation detail and we will have time for that. But it's good to have a common or same understanding of the policies so we can implement it the same way.

Thank you, Crystal, for joining.

Petter, Lori, any other items that you like to discuss before we conclude the meeting? What I like to do is ask Petter, if you have comments that you have written up, just send it to me; send it to us. Then what we'll do is we'll go ahead and make revisions based on your comment and this meeting and we'll push that out as a version 9. We'll see if we can get to public comment with that with your agreement online.

I don't know whether we need another meeting. And you can decide if you want, but we'll chat online to ask that question. We can certainly have another meeting. I think we already have a scheduled meeting in February, actually. Yes. We preschedule all our meetings monthly so maybe we'll just use that opportunity to finalize our policy or we can do it before.

Thank you very much.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: That concludes our meeting. Michelle, you can stop recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]