

---

MARRAKECH – Policy Implementation IRT - IGO / INGO Identifiers Protection  
Wednesday, March 09, 2016 – 14:30 to 15:45 WET  
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the ICANN55 Policy Implementation IRT-IGO/INGO Identifiers Protection meeting on March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016, at 14:30 WET, in the Ametyste Room.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, everyone. We'll get started in a minute here. Just getting prepared with the slides.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, everyone. Thank you for joining us in this meeting of the IGO/INGO Identifiers Protection Policy Implementation IRT. So before we get started, I just want to make sure we recognize the IRT members that are with us today. So I see we have Peter in the room. Hello, [Peter]. Thanks for joining us. And I'm looking at the Adobe Connect room. I recognize Christine is with us, and I believe Holly as well, right? I believe Holly joined us recently on the IRT. Is that correct? I see that Holly's typing in the chat. I'll just wait for confirmation.

---

*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.*

---

Okay. So while Holly's typing, let me move on to our agenda. So as usual, as you're used to, we'll just provide a quick background on the policy and the current work that ICANN is doing in the area of IGO/INGO protection. Holly confirmed that she joined us recently in the IRT, so we have two IRT members with us. Three, actually. Sorry.

So once we've covered a quick background on the policy, we'll discuss our implementation deliverables and their status. So we expect that the most of our meeting will be spent on that topic. And then before the end we'll look at next steps. Unless there is any comments, suggestion on the agenda, I'll proceed.

So for the IRT, member this is not news. Very quickly for the audience, the scope of this implementation is defined by a Board resolution from 30 April, 2014, which approves recommendations from the GNSO Council with respect to protection of IGO/INGO identifiers in all gTLDs. There were two sets of recommendation. Some recommendations were seen as consistent with GAC advice, and those were adopted. This is the blue stream that you see on top. And there were GNSO recommendations that were not consistent with GAC advice, and those are the orange line, the second line here, that are currently under consideration by the NGPC, the GAC, and the GNSO towards reconciling those inconsistencies.

---

So the scope of our implementation really is the blue line, and that's those recommendations that were adopted by the Board, and we'll look at what those are in a second. And just to be complete in terms of the type of work that's going on right now at ICANN around IGO/INGO protection, there is also a PDP that's ongoing – a Policy Development Process – regarding the access for IGO/INGOs to curative rights protections mechanism.

So this is to clarify that our work here is the implementing the policy recommendations that were adopted by the Board. And so what does that mean in substance? Here is a picture of the scope of the current implementation. Here you see a distinction between adopted recommendations and under reconciliation, so our scope is limited to the adopted recommendation.

There are two types of protections afforded by the approved recommendation: top level protections and second level protection. At the top level we are considering the protection of Red Cross and Red Crescent names, Scope 1. There are two scopes for those that are new to this work, and we're only covering Scope 1.

At the top level and at the second level – the same for IOC names and the same for IGO scope one, which are the full names of the international government organizations. With respect to international non-government organization, INGOs, the general

---

list is protected at the top level and the general and [consultative] lists are protected at the second level through 90-day claims.

So I'm not spending too much time on this unless somebody requires it. I don't see anyone in the room or in the Adobe Connect, so let's move on.

So our current timeline is the following. So you can see the IRT was formed last summer and we've been working with the IRT up until now. We had three meetings so far, and today is the ICANN55 meeting, which you see here in pink. Our current target is to draft an implementation plan that would be released for public comment this summer in August and would undergo public comments before it is finalized and finally published in January of next year for a potential effective date of the Consensus Policy in July or August, 2017.

So in terms of the implementation work, we've defined and discussed previously a set of deliverables that we're working towards. The first of those is the Consensus Policy. This is the outcome of a policy implementation. This is the document that will be listed on ICANN's Consensus Policy page and which will become a requirement for the contracted party as per their right of an agreement.

---

So currently, in terms of the drafting of that Consensus Policy language, we are at the third draft that's been sent for the IRT's review and we'll discuss it in a moment. When it's going to be ready, as we mentioned, it will go for public comments before it becomes final. So those are the two other sub-deliverables there that we'll have to work on once the draft is agreed upon.

In terms of the implementation procedures we've covered in the draft the top level reservation and exception procedures that are required in terms of the policy recommendation. We are currently discussing through our draft the second level reservation and exception procedure and we hope that we're getting close to completion here as well. In terms of the second level 90-day claims implementation, that's still being drafted.

Then we also had identified that we have a set of prerequisites for implementation which are lists of identifier labels and contact information for the implementation of 90-day claims. So the status is shown here. We have completed the listing of Red Cross and Red Crescent Scope 1 identifiers. It's been shared with the IRT for review. We've completed the IOC identifiers list, again complete and for IRT review. We are still working on the IGO Scope 1 identifiers and that's ongoing because, as we'll discuss, we are missing information from the IGOs. In terms of the INGO's identifiers, we have a first draft, but in a context of very challenging problems which, again, we'll discuss today and part

---

of our challenges are in particular with the gathering of contact data for INGO.

So this is an overview of our deliverables and their current status. Sure, please [Peter].

[PETER]:

[Peter] [inaudible] for [IPC]. I noticed that we discussed at last meeting the clarification of the contact information. So do you have clear contact information for IGOs but still for INGOs it's remains a problem to be solved and what is the expected time limit for that? Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So what I suggest is that we get a discussion we have a specific slide to discuss this. It's only INGO contact data we need, because for the IGOs (International Governmental Organization) we only need to protect to reserve the names at the second level, which means that we don't need to contact information so far. Now as to the potential protection of acronyms in the future of those IGOs, which is outside of the current scope of our work, since it's not been approved by the Board, we would eventually need contact if the reconciliation effort were to lead to the protection under a mechanisms of claims. Before those acronyms were to be implemented we'd need contact data. But

---

that's for when we get there. Currently we're meeting data as we'll discuss for the implementation of reservation, but that's not contact data. Does that make sense? Okay. Thank you.

So regarding the draft Consensus Policy language, we've shared earlier this week the next revision of the draft Consensus Policy language. There were discussion in our last IRT meeting as to Section 2.2, which is the reservation at the second level for...taking into account existing registrations of labels that are going to be reserved at the second level. [Denise] do you have the Consensus Policy document? Okay, we'll get to that then. So maybe I can share it here.

So let me just stop here so I'll show where we are. I just want to mention that we've also dated – no, don't worry, I'll take care of it – we've also updated the identifiers through label matching rules and we still have three points to be addressed: the implementation of claim services, definition of DNS labels, specification for INGO and claims protection, and the maintenance of protected identifiers. So those are on our radar and we still need to do additional work before we can share with you Consensus Policy language on those.

So let me just show the draft that we've shared earlier this week so that you get a sense of what we've added and the type of feedback that we're expecting. I'm trying [inaudible] here. For

---

some reason my Adobe Connect is not responsive. Okay. Finally. Okay, that's better. Okay. Now it's better. Sorry, please bear with us just one more minute. I've had a challenge uploading the document. Okay.

So let me just get back to that point because we have an issue here with the files, so sorry. Let's get back to presentation. Sorry but just for this technical difficulty. So we'll come back to discussion of our current draft while we're able to fix the file that we need to show you. So please bear with us. Let's move on to discussing identifiers labels.

So this is where we shared with you our recent progress. So as a reminder Red Cross Red Crescent Scope 1 identifiers labels, as you may remember, the policy has defined lists of identifiers that need to be protected. So for instance in the case of Red Cross Red Crescent Scope 1, the identifiers to be protected are Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Lion, and Sun and Red Crystal in the UN six languages. And those are to be protected at the top level. They're ineligible for [inaudible] and protected at second level through reservation with exception procedure.

In terms of implementation, what this means is that those identifiers needs to be transformed into DNS labels that will then be listed in the reserved names list, which is linked here which you may know already, and especially if you're a registry



---

operator. And for top level protection we'll have this list as an authoritative resource for implementation in potential future application rounds, as the case may be.

Here one of the issues is that we're facing is that we're finding names in the current reserved names list that are temporarily protected per Board resolutions that were taken in the context of the new gTLD program. We're finding inconsistencies between what we're finding currently in the list and what is protected through these policies. So what we suggest doing is that those labels that are inconsistent with the policy recommendation will be removed from the reserved names list. So let us show you the Excel file that we shared to provide a bit of an explanation of what this file is. Are you able to show your screen [inaudible] to show them the file?

So we hope that that's readable for everyone. Maybe if you don't mind... Oh, you have it on your screen. Okay, that's great. Thanks.

So what we're showing here is the document we shared with you.

No, it's [Denise's] laptop. Oh, yes, that's showing this laptop here. Okay, thanks. That's helpful. Thank you very much.

---

So what you're seeing here... Let's go to the line 22. Because the Red Cross and Red Crescent names are listed here. So as you can see here, what we're listing here in column C is the organization identifier. So that's the identifier that is protected under the policy for the Red Cross and Red Crescent names which we've talked about. Then, as you can see, the Red Cross is translated in each of the relevant languages, so you have Red Cross line 22 and 23, you have Red [inaudible] 34 and 35. I will not read the translation in Arabic, I'm not competent, and then but that's line 44 and 45 I assume. And then we have the translation in Chinese and so on.

So, as you can see, we've listed the various identifiers that are protected, and for each of those identifiers we've also included the DNS label because eventually, as we've discussed in previous meetings, it's the DNS label that gets protected, and this is why we discussed identifiers to DNS labels rules so that we can match identifiers to actual DNS labels. And for the simplest cases, you may remember the consequence for Red Cross is that for a given identifier Red Cross there are two DNS labels that are protected: Red Cross, all attached, and Red-Cross, because those are the rules that we suggest using for going from identifiers to labels.

So we've compared the list of names that need to be protected with what's currently in the reserved names list which will be the

---

outcome of the implementation. And as you can see here line 30-33, line 42 and 43, and so on – those that are in red – those are names for which there is a potential inconsistency. As for the Chinese, we need additional time to consider with language experts what exactly those terms are, so currently please do not deem those Chinese identifiers as inconsistent, but only the other ones. And so for those, we again are suggesting that they be removed from the Spec 5 list, and that’s subject to the IRT’s review and comments.

Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So just to make sure, the ones in red, do we still reserve them or not for now?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Absolutely. So the temporary reservations are stemming from a Board resolution that is enforced until the policy is implemented. So until the effective date of the policy, registry operators are required to indeed reserve those names.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just making sure.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks for your question. Okay. So coming back to the slides now. We'll come back to this list for the other categories of identifiers. So again, we were introducing to you this spreadsheet which will request that you review and potentially provide comments you may have on it. So I think [Denise], can you accept... Because I think...Thanks.

I don't know why we're seeing your screen [Denise]. Can you...[inaudible] I'm not able to regain control. Can you accept? Thanks. Okay, so back to our slide deck.

Again, here the input we're seeking from the IRT on the specific scope is whether there is agreement from the IRT that those labels that are not consistent with the policy recommendation be removed. And as you'll see in the list we've shared with you, those are highlighted in red, and the Chinese name in the list we shared with you are not highlighted in red because we're still studying those.

So let me move to International Olympic Committee Scope 1 Identifiers. So as you may recall, the scope of protection here is Olympic Olympiad in the UN six languages plus German, Greek, and Korean, those are protected at the top level ineligible for [delegation] and at the second level reservation with exception procedure.

---

In terms of implementation, the same outcome will be applied here. The labels will be listed on the reserved names list and this list will serve as a reference for protection at the top level in the future. If we go back to our list of identifiers... Can you try to share your... The screen, it doesn't work on mine. It's a challenge there.

Apologies, it's a bit of a struggle with juggling among documents. Can you go to the identifiers list and show the IOC names? Thanks. If you go up on the list.

So the IOC names here, this one is simple. We haven't seen any inconsistencies so what's currently in the reserved names list will stay reserved. That's going to be the outcome of the policy implementation. So the same applies here. In columns here we've listed the names in the various languages that are protected, and on Column D you will find the DNS labels that correspond to those identifiers. So we believe that here it's a very straightforward case and that we won't need to discuss any difficulty.

Okay, let's go back to the presentation. No, you need to go from the Adobe Connect. Okay, and you can load the slides from there. I can do it. Okay.

Moving on to the INGO identifiers. So here we're addressing the labels and as well as contact data. So as you may remember, the

---

scope of the policy protection here is to protect both Scope 1 and Scope 2 identifiers from the ECOSOC list, both general consultative list and special consultative status. Those will be implemented through 90-day claims, and only the Scope 1, I believe, are protected at the top level.

In terms of implementation challenges, as we have shared with you before, we've been unable to establish a channel of communication with CSO.Net, who is the manager of the ECOSOC list we've identified, despite repeated attempts, and so we're at a point where we're welcoming assistance from the community while we still work on trying to establish that connection to help build this working relationship with the CSO.Net.

So, so far what we've done is drafting a first list of identifiers that's extracted from the list that the policy recommendation referenced, knowing that this list might now be outdated and also knowing that we made a very manual attempt at extracting those lists of identifiers and generating the relevant labels. So the issue with not establishing a working relationship is that we've not been able to obtain a spreadsheet containing all those identifiers up to date in order for us to generate the lists of labels that we need for implementation. And what's also the reason why establishing a relationship with CSO.Net is important is that we do not have any information pertaining to the contact

---

information of those organizations, and so we believe that this information we need to obtain from that organization.

[Peter] you had mentioned that this was a topic you'd like to discuss further, and this is our update. We're at a point where, despite our attempts in various shape and form, we've not been able to establish that communication, an actual relationship. So we've been seeking in the community various participant that could assist in reaching out to that organization, so we welcome any additional suggestion you might have.

[PETER]:

Good to know. I think I'll have to come back to you with any possible proposals to solve that, but it's as we agreed about, identification is important to have a secure communication and find the right person or department in each organization to communicate with.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

With regards to the 90-day claims period for INGOs, once it goes past that can we still offer them on a first-come, first-served basis, or do they have to keep [coming] for reservation after that?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I think the principle of the implementation is to only provide a claims mechanism for the notification of the protected organization and I believe in this case the registrant. So once that mechanism would be implemented, those names remain available for registration. Does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. [inaudible] we have the [launch] and we have the 90-day mechanism where the registrant can claim it. If the registrant does not claim it for their INGO, then can anybody claim it? Or do we just reserve it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So the claims mechanism is to cover the launch of a TLD. So the names are available for anybody to register, and the claims mechanism is only a mechanism to notify both the registrant and the protected organization, the holder of that name – that notifying the registrant that this name is a special name and notifying the protected organization that a registrant has registered the name. Does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's the standard claims period procedures then?



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So let me make sure here... Yes, I think we've covered the identifiers. So let me go back to our current draft of the Consensus Policy, which we had a bit of a challenge to share with you, so let me take another attempt here.

Okay, so what you're seeing here is our draft Consensus Policy language with which – and I can remember you should be familiar with that may be new to the audience in its meaning and the remote participants as well, so we'll take just a little time to introduce the document. So as you can see here we've divided this... So this is to become the Consensus Policy, which will be applicable to contracted parties once it is effective. So this is a draft. This is one of the main deliverable of the implementation, so this is why we're discussing this with the Implementation Review Team.

There are four section in our document: one that addresses the protection at the top level, and one addressing the protection at the second level for reserved name. The third one addresses the protection at the second level by 90-day claims services, and the

---

fourth section is about the management of the lists of protected identifiers.

So in the Section 1 that was discussed with the IRT, as I mentioned, we've closed the discussion on this section. There were no specific comment from the IRT. As you can see, there are two subsection, one that specifies what identifiers are reserve and how that reservation is implemented. So here we're at the top level so the protection pertains to potential application by the relevant... It pertains to the ineligibility of protected identifiers [full] delegation at the top level unless the protected organization applies for that TLD. And that's applicable to all future applicable processes covered in the introduction of new gTLDs.

We have then our Section 2, which was discussed in our last meeting and to which we've made some slight revisions based on the discussion of that last meeting. So here we're again reminding of what are the identifiers that are protected through reservation at the second level. We have a Section 2.2 that addresses the case of existing registrations of identifiers that would be protected once the policy is effective. And for those, the implementation is going to be that those names may not be renewed by the registrant at expiration, or when they are not renewed upon – apologies – when they are not renewed, such registration must be deleted by the registrar after the

---

termination of any renewal grace period. So those names that are covered by this policy but pre-existing the implementation of this policy will remain used as they currently are until the registrant does not renew them, in which case they would be deleted. So this applies to all gTLDs and that was the topic of the discussion in our last meeting.

And as far as the exception procedures that's called for in the policy recommendation, if a relevant protected organization requests registration of a domain name matching an identifier otherwise reserved at the second level, they may request the registration. That's the purpose of Section 2.3.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Request of registration through a standard registrar, from registrar registry, or through the registry directly? Is there any sort of validation verification there from anybody's side? I'm just thinking of how do I know that that is the actual guy before, as a registrar, I delegate the name or I put the registry and the registry delegates the [zone].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So I think here the spirit of the implementation is that those parties are responsible for making sure that this is the right of organization and the organization is identified in the policy, its

---

names are identified in the Consensus Policy. So we'll believe that this is a matter for the protected organization and the contracted parties to determine.

In our draft Consensus Policy language, we also have a Section 3 which is about the 90-day claims protection. So we're still working on that, and so once we are able to make sufficient progress and engage with the IRT we'll update that section and engage indeed.

And so as I mentioned earlier, Section 4 is about the management of the lists of identifiers. There we have defined and refined in this version the rules for matching identifiers to DNS labels. And the gist of the changes we've introduced here are related in particular to the management of IDNs. So there is no substantial change to the outcome which, as you may remember we discussed, and that is that for non-IDN domain names – and taking Red Cross as an example – the identifier Red Cross is protected through two labels: Red Cross attached and Red-Cross. The rules are a bit more complicated when it comes to IDNs and that's what we've tried to reflect here and which we've applied to the list of identifiers for INGOs in particular in the list we shared with the IRT.

Section 4.2 and 4.3 and following are just specific definition of where those authoritative lists of identifiers are defined. Section

---

4.6 is regarding the maintenance of those protected identifiers lists. So, as we mentioned earlier, that's an area for which we have further work to complete.

So in terms of how does an identifier is added to the potential list of protected identifiers and labels when a new organization entering the scope of the policy is created, the same when one organization is terminated or its name is not used anymore. And so here we intend to describe how those changes should be handled.

I see that we have a question? Okay.

All right, so this is the document. Again, we shared this revision Version 3 with the IRT, and we expect your input. And we'll get to discuss a timeline for those next steps now, unless there is any questions or comments. So let me go back to our slides. Sorry.

Okay, so jumping to next steps... There's no question in the chat? Okay.

So in terms of the next steps... There's a typo on the slide, I apologize for that. So we expect the feedback from the IRT, we meant to say here, the 31<sup>st</sup> of March, 2016, not 1<sup>st</sup> of March, which is past already. Apologies again for the typo. So through our mailing list we would like to receive any comments on the revision of the draft Consensus Policy language, as well as the

---

lists of identifiers, and the proposal we've put forward to manage inconsistencies between the current – and particularly for the Red Cross and Red Crescent name – between the identifiers that are currently in the reserved names list and what the policy recommendation is in terms of protection of those identifiers.

So following your feedback, we would expect to hold a conference call to discuss your feedback and our additional elements that we would bring up until then. I'm also looking at [Peter] here. Any time you have feedback and would like to get in touch with us, please do. If you have suggestions for resolving the CSONet difficulty to gather INGO data, that would be helpful.

[PETER]: Thanks. Will do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. And so I believe we've covered our agenda for today, and so we can either open it up for question and comments if there are any. And otherwise we can give back the time left to everyone. I'm looking at the room. I'm looking in the room, looking at the chat remote participants.

Okay, so hearing no comments or questions, we'd like to thank you for attending our meeting today. We look forward to your

---

feedback on the documents we've shared earlier this week and we will soon be in touch via the mailing list and the next conference call. Thank you again for your time today and have a nice end of your day. Thank you. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**