

**ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
IGO INGO PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names Meeting
Thursday, 10 May 2018 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. Attendance may be found at: <https://community.icann.org/x/TA0FBQ> and recordings may be found at: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-10may18-en.mp3>

Also found on page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you so much, Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to call. Welcome to the IGO INGO PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names Call on Thursday, the 10th of May, 2018. On the call today, we do have Heather Forrest, Thomas Rickert, and David Maher. We do have apologies from Christopher Lamb. From ICANN staff, we have Mary Wong, Berry Cobb, Steve Chan, Dennis Chang and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder, if you would please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you, and I'll turn the meeting back over to Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone to this Red Cross/Red Crescent meeting. Let's start with a roll call, which we're going to take from the remote participation room. So let me ask whether there are any participants that are on the audio bridge only.

I understand that Dennis Chang has only dialed in, but are there more participants that we can't see as participants in the remote participation room? That does not seem to be the case, so we will take these from the remote participation room. Are there any questions with respect to the agenda? So that doesn't seem to be the case. So we have the agenda confirmed. Also, as usual, let me ask whether there are any updates to statements of interest. That does not seem to be the case.

So we can move to the second point on the agenda, and before we do so, let me just put on the record that the number of attendees is very low. We have a group consisting of ICANN staff and of representatives of the GNSO primarily. So I would have hoped that we could get a little broader community representation on this call. Therefore, this group will just take informal decisions on the points that we need to discuss and put out the minutes of the recommendations basically that this group comes up with during this call, put that out to the list, and let all the other participants that couldn't make it for today's call chime in so that we can confirm whether there is full group consensus, or a lack thereof, and subsequently on the mailing list.

The second agenda item is the review of the definitive list of National Society Names and Variation Reviews. Separate in that was sent by Berry thankfully and let me applaud Berry and his colleagues. They did a splendid job in working on the list. Thankfully, Stephane and his colleagues prepared. So Berry, would it be possible for you to show us through the list of open issues/questions that arose when the list was analyzed? Because there does seem to be a quite long list of things that haven't been discussed previously by this group, i.e. there are some strings on the list that deviate from the syntax/parameters that this group has previously agreed upon.

So over to you, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you very much, Thomas. Berry Cobb for the transcript. First, let me start by apologizing to our European colleagues. When I scheduled this a

few weeks ago, I wasn't aware that it was a Bank Holiday and thus, our smaller turnout.

Secondarily, I'd like to - as you noted or noticed on the list, Stephane Hankins and his team did deliver a draft of the entire definitive list of the international Olympic Committee and International Federation of Red Cross Societies as well as 191 National Societies per a spreadsheet or a format that this group had previously reviewed. And I'll talk a little bit more about that in a second.

But first, I'd like to thank Stephane for them doing this work. It was yeoman's work to liaise with that many different groups, to acquire the various identifiers that would be protected. And I know it took me a while to review through all of them. So I can't imagine how much work it was for them to actually construct the list.

So that said, I did send around a Version 2 of the spreadsheet. Stephane had sent Version 1 on the 30th of April off the list. About four or five days later, he had sent an update on a couple of societies that had sent in some slight changes. So that Version 2 that we're working from and reviewing today is the latest and greatest copy of that.

So for those on the call, you have two choices. One, you can bring up the spreadsheet yourself and try to follow along from that perspective. I'm also going to share my screen and try to walk through some of the highlights that I found, and whichever one works easiest for you and I'll try to be diligent about telling you where I am in the spreadsheet when we're reviewing that.

So let me share and as I understand from Michelle, if - you can also go to full view within the WebEx room to hopefully see some of the spreadsheet content that I'm sharing now.

So just a reminder for the group. The reason why we constructed this spreadsheet the way that we did was based on principles or essentially,

lessons learned from staff in implementing prior IGO/INGO recommendations where the consensus policy becomes effective I believe in October 2018. And also, based on lessons learned, providing temporary reservation protections for the strings.

Ultimately, it was difficult to maintain a chain of custody as to what identifier belonged to which formal name or which national society. And it was - the idea here was to try to streamline the approach and so that we can do an appropriate inventory and make a connection back to the formal name, as well as one of the complications is when we're dealing with those identifiers that are not in English. And unfortunately, I only speak American. So anything non-American is - and I do see Stephane Hankins has joined the call, thank you for joining.

But the intent, again, from the spreadsheet, is really to be able to - once the definitive list is completed and agreed upon by the working group and then of course, it goes through the paces of sending the report to the Council for their potential adoption. And if it's adopted by the Board and it becomes implemented by ICANN Org, the idea is that essentially, we would be able to easily copy the protected identifiers, put them into a single list, and then run them through this algorithm that will create the actual DNS labels that will be applied to the Specification 5 and/or reservation sheets that the registry agreements refer to, by which is essentially converted into an XML file that the registry operators can then take that XML file, upload it into their EPP systems, and reserve these names from actual registration.

So that's, again, still the intent of the spreadsheet and the way that it's laid out the way it is. And of course, again, referring back to non-English languages, we thought it would be helpful to also include which language that particular string was applied to just in case if there were any issues in terms of converting these identifiers into the DNS labels and that would allow kind of a breadcrumb to where we can work through those non-Latin script, non-English labels.

Okay. So within, and Thomas, if you see any hands raised or you need to interject, I can't see anything in the WebEx room. So please just interrupt me if anybody has any questions and I'll be glad to pause.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks for asking, Berry. No hands raised at the moment.

Berry Cobb: Thank you sir. So basically, there are two tabs within the spreadsheet that are important. The first one was the easiest one, which just outlines the international committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. The original working group recommendation was that these identifiers would be protected in the UN 6. What I noticed from the list that was sent from Stephane and what you see highlighted here in red looks to be when the Afghanistan National Society had their attempt or when they were reviewing this list and adding their respective identifiers.

They also wanted to add the other two official languages. So I don't think that this is anything that this working group has discussed and that definitely goes beyond the scope of the original recommendation of the UN 6. I just wanted to highlight it here because that one is out of scope and likely, these will be deleted from this tab. And the one other thing, again, that I want to I guess emphasize is that my desire of managing this master list to get to the definitive scope of all identifiers is that eventually, whatever identifiers are not adopted by the working group, that they be removed from this master list. So that by the time we package this up to be delivered to the GNSO Council, it will be only those approved identifiers and none of the outliers that we'll be reviewing through today.

So absent any objections, I suspect that the group would agree that these two additional languages from (Dari) and Pashto from Afghanistan would be removed from this list. I'll pause for a second if there's any objections to that. And I see agreement from Chuck. Okay. All right. Let's get down to the

heart of the matter. So the second tab is the list of the 191 national societies and the variations of those strings. The group will recall in prior deliberations that I think was first kind of started by the principles that staff had put forward about, again, this reconciliation/chain of custody, being able to document what the scope of variations would be that help define this list.

In the email I sent yesterday, which I will slide over here for you to say, there were basically two links to the emails that had been sent from the Red Cross representatives, the first one being in February 2018. The scope of that email was our first exercise was to acquire about ten or so national society identifiers and bring them back to the group for review to see or ensure that we were on the correct path.

And within that email, Stephane had taken a draft version on the scope of variations from the formal name to the common names and things like language and the use of the definite article and that stuff. And he did a great job elaborating on that list. And then secondarily, when he sent the full 191 national society names at the end of April, there were also a couple of comments that were of relevance that take us back to the spreadsheet that we see before us.

And then I'll just note that within an email that I sent this morning that contains a draft of the proposed recommendations that variant criteria is a crucial component to one of the recommendations around the definitive list. And after we run through the rest of these identifiers, then we'll switch over and we can pay more attention to that variant matrix when we get to it.

So a couple of highlights here. In reviewing through every row, essentially, and by every national society, what immediately stuck out to me and I believe Stephane had also identified in his email is that several of the national societies actually in fact use the word national. I don't recall the exact count. I would say it was probably at least 20 or 30 different national societies. So there is consistent use of that term and the main reason I'm highlighting it is

that particular term wasn't documented in our variation matrix. And so then the question for the group is first, should the use of this term national be allowed in the variation matrix. And if it is, then we just need to make sure we document it.

And I'll just note that for the draft recommendations, because there seemed to be some pretty consistent use, I have included that into that draft variant matrix. But we can circle back on that. The second thing that popped out that we didn't document in our variant matrix was the variation use of nationality versus country. And one of those examples would be the Ethiopian Red Cross Society versus Ethiopia Red Cross Society.

That was also very prevalent and I believe that that occurred for probably 50 plus different national societies and there seemed to be consistent use across that. For example, even here with the very first row, we had the Afghan Red Crescent but we also had the Afghanistan Red Crescent. Or similarly with the Albanian Red Cross versus Albania Red Cross. So again, I just wanted to highlight that, that there were this additional variation that we didn't have highlighted in our variant matrix. And it was seemed like consistently used and still consistently in line with what the working group had agreed. So I have added it to the draft and the group can come back around to see if that's acceptable.

The third thing I'd like to highlight, which Stephane pointed out in his email, is that for linguistic versions and translations of the identifier, there was a few - so essentially, columns E, F, and on are to identify the non-English, non-Latin character identifiers to be protected. And the only reason for that, again, was to draw this connection back to the easier, for me to read, the English version of that identifier.

But in some cases, there wasn't an English version available and what Stephane had pointed out is ultimately, there wasn't a translation of a particular non-English identifier back into English, and therefore was left

blank. Which still kind of creates this chain of custody. We just don't have an easy to read English version as to where that comes from. But ultimately, it still is connected to Column C, the formal name of that National Society.

So I'm mostly just bringing it to your attention because it's to mostly to benefit myself and staff when we start to work with this list and we have a better understanding of what this inventory is going to look like and again, referencing back to that chain of custody.

So I'm going to pause there before I get into any other details. Any comments or questions for anything that I've mentioned thus far?

Thomas Rickert: Go ahead. I just wanted to say that there were no hands raised.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I didn't raise my hand because I was scrolling through the spreadsheet of the national - the tab that has the national society. Oh, there I go. So I see there are some in the English column, Column 1, that are blank. So now I follow. Okay, I just wanted to confirm that. I'm good. Okay.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Chuck. As we move down the list, I think I still have one or two of those identified. So you'll see that, but yes, I should have displayed that for you in the screen to make that explanation more clear.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay. I'm good. This is Chuck again and I'm good with that. I wonder if -- and I don't know if it would be confusing or not -- if in that table, we ought to just insert a parenthetical in those cases that there's no available English translation. But I don't feel strongly about that. It's just a thought. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great. Duly noted, Chuck. In fact, my intent is that as this spreadsheet matures, I'm going to create an additional tab of footnotes or disclaimers for a lot of this so that there is a connection. What I do want to avoid is anything in Columns D through Column 6 way over here to the right that is anything but

the actual identifiers themselves. Because this is going to be extracted out, as I mentioned earlier, to get into that DNS label.

But for documentation purposes, yes, I agree with you that we need to highlight that and make it easily readable.

Chuck Gomes: That makes sense and I understand why you might not put it in the column itself. That's good. This is Chuck again.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, sir. Okay. So from now kind of the shopping list for lack of a better word of reviewing through these, I'm going to jump into the details. I don't want to get into all of these but there are a few that I do want to highlight for the group to consider and understand how we can navigate around this.

But predominantly, the fourth biggest outlier that you'll have noticed in reviewing the spreadsheet is that there are several that were highlighted in yellow. And Stephane can correct me if I'm wrong, but what is going on here is that in their engagement with the various national societies, they have learned that often, several of these societies refer to the parent level or the more, for lack of a better word, but the more formal name of the international federation of Red Crescent/Red Cross society names, as opposed to their in country national society that they are more referenced or that has what has been formally adopted via the Geneva Convention.

So the intent of this highlight, and in some cases also included a translation. So Heather, for example, which is this Row 16 right here on the shared screen. And for those that aren't looking at the shared screen, I'm on the fourth tab of the spreadsheet titled national societies, Row 16. Thank you, Heather.

So I believe there's probably, I don't know, 35 or 40 instances where this highlighted yellow cell will appear. The intent for Stephane to do that was mostly for documentation purposes and to just, again, reinforce that there are

instances where these national societies use the parent level organization name, mostly if - probably if for anything else because it's short and sweet, as opposed to always having to rely on the Red Crescent Society of Afghanistan.

But I'll just note that Stephane's intent was only for documentation purposes and there is no intent to actually have these names as listed in these yellow cells reserved. And so the list that I had sent to the mailing list yesterday, I still made a notion of or a note of what row where those existed because in terms of maturing this list and making it ready for distribution and use down the road, again, we'll want to delete out any identifiers that are not within scope for the protections here.

So just again, referring back to my email yesterday, probably about the fifth bullet or so highlights Row 16, which is supposed to say the Red Crescent. And then of course, they have this translation in Dari and Pashto as well. So again, just to kind of reconfirm that after the group has worked through this definitive list, eventually these will be deleted. I noticed that Heather had mentioned in the chat, is there a legend that describes all of this.

Not yet, however within the draft preliminary recommendations document, I've made reference back to this variant matrix that will describe how the variations of common names are formed off of the official name, as well as guidance around the language and the use of definitive article or whether there's the use of society or use or non-use of national et cetera. And we'll walk through that in detail, because not only does that shape the creation of the list before us, but it will be the kind of checklist in the future that should there be additions of new societies formed that will guide the creation of those identifiers for those new societies that would be eventually passed back to ICANN to update the reservation list.

So I guess just to kind of complete the answer to you, Heather, yes, as a part of this spreadsheet, like I said, we'll create an additional tab that has - that

will list out all of these kind of outliers or things to be aware of as well as kind of a legend of sorts to navigate through this.

I'm still on the fourth tab of the spreadsheet and now, I'm going to move to Row 170 and 171 and again, this is just to kind of re-highlight the - it's just another example of what we just discussed. The National Society of Azerbaijan also heavily make reference to Red Crescent Society and Red Crescent.

And I think the term here, Red Crescent being used here on Row 71, is of particular value here. Because the term Red Crescent is already reserved. It is already confirmed by the consensus policy that was implemented by Dennis's team that becomes effective, again, October 2018 I believe, or August, in the next several months from now.

But the scope of that reservation of the Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Lion and Sun, again, was only within the UN 6. But their use of Red Crescent as a part of Azerbaijani or Russian is out of scope in terms of that original recommendation. Thus, why it's highlighted yellow and thus why it would eventually be deleted from this spreadsheet when we mature it, finalize it, and again, prepare it for extraction of these identifiers to go through the algorithm to create the DNS labels.

Okay, I'm going to move on. Row 290, 293 I believe, is another example. Here, we get the full spectrum, Red Cross, the Red Cross, Red Cross Society. Again, two of those, well, the Red Cross itself is reserved but again, in the UN 6. But they use these parent type organizations or these short forms of the Red Cross Society within that region. As I've mentioned, these will be deleted.

So now, let's move onto Row 332, which I believe is one that did stick out and Stephane, in his email, had also mentioned this. So the British Red Cross Society, in addition to the variations in their common names per our use or

per our definition of these variants are fine. But there was one outlier here and this is the use of Red Cross Charity. First and foremost, the term charity wasn't identified in our variant list and I'll also point out that this is one particular term that is only used once. And so I do think that the working group needs to make a determination here. Is this single use outlier worthy of incorporation into the variant matrix that we have defined or do we keep it - do we have it removed because of just this one outlier.

Stephane Hankins: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Please Thomas, go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: This is Stephane actually.

Thomas Rickert: Stephane go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: It's Stephane Hankins speaking here for the record. I'm sorry, I had problems joining at the beginning of the session, but I thank you very much for all the work that Berry and colleagues have put into this. Just to explain a little bit this particular aspect, and I think in the previous conversations that we had, I think I tried to underline that we would need in exceptional cases some level of flexibility to some of these criteria.

And one of them we've already examined, which is national societies of the Red Cross or Red Crescent that are known in their context by the short name and that's the usual name by which they are called and known. Therefore, the legitimacy of having those names reserved in the national language.

Another exception or the second exception is indeed, where national societies requested that their legal form be indicated as part of one of the reserved designations. So indeed, the British Red Cross asked that the words Red Cross Charity be reserved and there are other cases that are

similar where national societies asked for their names to be reserved with another legal designation.

So there are other cases, but in all the other cases, it's in another language than English. The British Red Cross Charity case is unique in the English column. But you have other cases in the list, so I want to highlight them because we're going to come to them. But there are national societies that, for example, requested that their names be reserved not with the designation society but with words such association, organization, authority, or non-governmental organization, as in the case of Russia. The UAE Red Crescent idea, the Saudi Arabian Red Crescent society asked for their name to be reserved as authority because that is actually their official name in their legislation of recognition domestically.

So it's a cluster of limited exceptions that we're looking at. The Red Cross Charity is one that the British Red Cross came up with but there are five or six others in the list, which are similar, which try to ensure that the official name of the society, which may not be registered in domestic law, as a national society, but in another legal form. So it can be charity, as I said. It could be association, non-governmental organization, charity organization.

I think there's five or six similar cases, but again, the others are not in English. They're in a foreign language only. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stephane. We have Heather than (unintelligible). Heather, go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much. So I think Stephane has answered my question at the end of his last interaction there, which was to say I put my hand out when it was mentioned that this was the legal name and I was wondering what that meant. So I understand from what Stephane has just said that legal name means let's say pursuant to the laws of a particular jurisdiction. It wasn't quite

clear to me if that meant trademark, if that meant some sort of a statutory name in a particular jurisdiction or so on.

I wonder given that there are a number of different possibilities by which you might call something a legal name. For example, the use of the term association might come from, for example, a national business register. Whereas another version of a name might come from the trademarks register, whereas another version might come from legislation.

A, should we be recording them? B, should we be looking for proof of these and somehow appending that to this document just as a complete record.
Thanks very much, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Heather. Any further comments? That doesn't seem to be the case. So Berry, why don't you continue then?

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you, Thomas. So I guess I would like to add onto this. I think what's going to be very critical - let me back up. Personally or as staff, we don't have a dog in the hunt or we don't have any say as to what should get reserved or what shouldn't. But I think as we mature the report and we mature this list that as Mary mentioned in the chat, we need to identify these outliers if they're going to be used.

I think from a staff perspective, the concern here is not so much coming to a conclusion with this finite list and getting it implemented, but where confusion may occur down the road is if a new society is formed and there are identifiers that are being proposed that may not be in line with the guidance of our variant definitions. And I think one term that Stephane had mentioned was the flexibility based on legal name.

So I guess the point I want to make here is that staff is going to need guidance from the group on how we can navigate around that and document it in a way so that when a new society is formed, ICANN is not in the position

of judging whether this is in or out and creating a discussion about why it should be in or why it should be out.

So definitely note that and staff will appreciate any guidance from the group to make sure that we go through that. And also - please Thomas, go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: I guess the only point that I would make at this stage is that, as has been said in the chat and on the phone bridge, we need to explain what this is. I guess the outliers need to be put into a separate recommendation so that the GNSO Council has an opportunity to carve that out if necessary. And so that would be the formal approach. And I also think that with only a handful of potential new additions to the list, because there are only a couple of countries that could be added to the whole list of national societies. I think we would need to close it down and say that this type of exception is limited to what we have in the finite list so that ICANN staff doesn't have to speculate over what outliers might be acceptable and which aren't.

Does that make sense to you?

Berry Cobb: Yes, thank you. Much better well put than what I tried to state. And I guess kind of continuing on with the example, because Stephane had also mentioned association and I had browsed by Row 321 where within the variations of the common names, which I guess are legal names, the Brazilian Red Cross is listed here as well as it's a non-English equivalent. But then as well, they've also asked for Brazilian Red Cross Association.

And the use of the term association I think is probably a candidate to add to our variant index or variant guide because I do see it several times. But again, as you pointed out, Thomas, let's identify these. We can kind of keep them separate from - in terms of how the Council will make a decision on this. And if they don't buy into it then it can be easily carved out.

So I'm only going to go through a couple of more examples because I'd really like to spend more time on the draft recommendations. But these are pretty - what I'm about to highlight are some things that we're going to want to change and address as well.

So I'm going to move to Rows 489 through 498, which is the Red Cross -- no, sorry -- oh yes, which is part of the Red Cross Society of China. So first and foremost, what I noticed here is that there's also a use of the new term headquarters. There's use of a new term or a term that we didn't have identified in our variant index, which was association. But most importantly what stood out to me was the use of the forward slash. And so really, I guess this question is for Stephane. Is this how these common names are recognized in that country with the use of these forward slashes?

And if so, if there any objection to deleting them because they won't work as DNS labels. They would effectively be ignored, but my preference would be for reading this list for that eventual conversion is that these slashes and non DNS label type characters would be deleted out just for the sake of trying to keep it clean.

Stephane Hankins: Berry, this is Stephane Hankins speaking for the record. This is a question to me, right?

Yes, sir. Please.

Stephane Hankins: Well, yes, I actually, you know, my knowledge of Chinese is limited. Basically, in this case, we relied on our delegation in Beijing and on the names that the Chinese Red Cross submitted. This is how we received them. I think in the English version, as you see, there are four of those names that we actually didn't - we inserted in yellow, which means that their protections in English are not proposed or recommended for the names in the yellow sections.

But for the others, yes indeed, I see that there are slashes. I think it's not an issue at all, I think, to take them out because obviously we're - it's probably, in a case like this it will be the Chinese names that we will want to ensure, you know, in the correct form in Chinese. So I think there it's something that probably we - I could have - we could have taken out ourselves but we didn't. It's no problem to take out, the dash out.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, sir. And I guess you do kind of raise an interesting point and I, like you have no experience in the Chinese languages at all, which makes me wonder if - is it possible that these types of non-Latin characters or these forward slashes, are they even translatable and do they show up in these strings? According to Mary, there is no hyphen or slash equivalent in the Chinese language so I think we're good for this one.

Stephane Hankins: Yes.

Berry Cobb: All right, great. Thank you, so and...Go ahead, Stephane.

Stephane Hankins: No, I agree, I think actually we - in this case, we just transcribed what was received and certainly I don't see that as I see the Chinese script either, so it's fine to take them out, I think.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you. And just because it's here, I'll just note for the record that this - the Red Cross Society of China also has - so there are - there's a reconciliation difference here in that the Red Cross Society of China is translated both in Mandarin and traditional here, and so that's what's going on in that -- so the reason that's kind of separate from what we discussed earlier is we don't want to repeat the same English string when there are two translations of it and so what I'll be doing is actually merging this particular cell, which isn't showing up that - the way that we'll need it for that reconciliation aspect.

Okay, moving on is going to be Row 559 and I believe what we just discussed with China will probably occur with Côte d'Ivoire. Obviously for the non-English names listed in Column 2, it's clear that when these identifiers are converted into DNS labels, oh, I'm sorry. Mary wants to go back to the Chinese list real quick. Mary, do you want to speak? Please go ahead.

Mary Wong: Yes, if you don't mind, Berry, Thomas and everyone. This is Mary from staff and it just took me a while to get on full screen and raise my hand. So what I noticed on the Chinese list is that in that one row between the two yellow sections, so right after where you talked about the Society/Association, Berry and Stephane, the Chinese, what was received, the two characters in the Chinese column and maybe it's just the way I'm reading it but it actually seems to say Red Society, not Red Cross Society, so again, it may be, as Stephane said, that these are the lists that are produced by the delegations in each country and of course, I don't mean to pick on Chinese because I can't speak some of the other languages, so this may actually arise in some of the other national language variance that we have for some of the other entries. But it may be worth noting that at least for the Chinese entry and maybe for some others, some of the national language variants actually don't have the full word Red Cross, like in this case, it just says Red Society, not Red Cross Society. Thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mary. Obviously that is something I would never have picked up on and that is on a very important point and in fact, I believe staff will want some guidance from this group about how this goes to public comment.

That specifically speaks to a current problem that we have, so rewind back to 2014 when the ICANN Board instructed staff to temporarily reserve an original list of the Red Cross Society names. It turns out from that original Word document and it looks like there was an additional carriage return but what actually got reserved from the Registry, it was from the Russian Red Cross Society, is a generic term of just Society and it was one of the - I think it was - I believe it's dot Moscow dot (foreign language) because they're

familiar with the Russian language, were able to pick up on the fact that this uber generic term wound up getting reserved and they've even actually had customers that wanted to reserve or to register for that generic term and so I guess somehow we're going to need to figure out a way, how to avoid that.

Obviously we're dealing with 150 or so potential different languages and so I guess that's something to put in the back of this group's mind on how we can try to overcome that possibility, because first and foremost, as Mary points out, this - these aren't translations to Red Cross Society, they're perhaps, it can be argued a more generic term of Red Society and how do we avoid that issue and again, this kind of just reinforces why this matrix was being put together the way it was, is to try to help call out some of these issues.

So I will - I'll make that as a note and make sure that is documented in the meeting minutes and I do believe this group is going to have to come up with some possible ways to get around this. Some of the languages or at the very least, any UN six-type languages, we could perhaps pass these identifiers on to them to help confirm that they are indeed translations back to the English version but beyond the UN six, how would we identify this type of issue?

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Berry. It's Thomas, for the record. I'm not sure whether this is at all possible, but Marika or Mary might have an answer to this. Would it be possible to make the list part of the recommendation and the entries in the list conditional to them being the correct spellings/correct names and have a clause in there whereby that can be rectified if need be? Sorry, I don't want to put anyone on the spot, but maybe we can...

Berry Cobb: Well...

Thomas Rickert: ...check that. Go ahead, Berry and then we will move to Heather.

Berry Cobb: Okay, I guess just quickly to respond, and maybe I didn't understand the exact question, but I think the concern here is, at least from a staff

perspective is once this gets published on the Specification 5 List, that list is not meant to be a dynamically changed list. For example, and the main reason why staff has held off of correcting the example I raised, with the Russian Red Cross Society and that generic term is that it was only one small edit to that list that would put a bigger burden on the registries of them having to update their systems for that one small change. So I guess ultimately, the idea is that somehow we can identify all of these potential nuances and errors and make sure that we're completely 100% certain that we're not reserving something in error so that we don't have to go change it six weeks after we implement.

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Berry Cobb: And Mary and then Heather? Or Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: And just before we move to Heather and Mary, because Mary might wish to respond to that as well. The idea was, Berry, and I appreciate your explanations about the list and the work for the registries, but the idea was that since we can't get 100% certainty that there are no errors in that list, and since if we have a finite list in the consensus policy, which would be binding, if we don't put any caveats or conditions into the language of the resolution, we might not have a chance to rectify things and this is why I was asking whether is a possibility procedurally to say that, you know, the list made an appendix to the resolution is conditional to its correctness, basically. So that we would have the opportunity to spot errors, that those can be updated, you know, and they could be updated over time but then it wouldn't be too static list. Let's - I think Heather raised her hand before Mary raised her hand, so let's go to Heather and then to Mary.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Thomas. I'm - look, I admittedly come to this with a slightly different hat on here as Council Chair and I'm mindful of the fact that the brief of this group is to prepare a finite list so I take your point, Thomas as to the utility of the list if it's not accurate but I think if we're going to do that, it needs some

really tight, really clever wordsmithing here that we're not then ending up with an interpretation of this list being dynamic. So my perspective on that, Thomas. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Heather. That's helpful and certainly the language would need to be like if there are typos in there or something like that, so that there is no risk of new strings creeping in. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Thomas, and actually, I was going to pretty much say what Heather said so first of all, the Council's expectation, I think, is that it has to be a set certain and finite list. So if there is going to be the possibility of updates or corrections, then it's - I don't think it's just the resolution, I think that has to be in the actual policy itself. It will have to be very specific so the basis, for example, will have to be that there is an error in the original list, which is a different matter from whether there was an omission or whether there was an inclusion that should not have been there.

These are all very different, so there's the need for not just error correction perhaps but also the more overarching need for certainty and a limited list. We can certainly talk about how we can try and balance the two, but I think there is a distinction between correcting errors and on what basis, on whether there were any inclusions that should not have been there in the first place and on what basis and other circumstances like omissions which, like I said, they're all very different.

The group could obviously take the view that what's on the list is on the list and that there definitely needs to then be a set procedure within the policy and published for correcting the list. If that's the way you want to go, then I agree that needs to be in the resolution, that needs to be in the published policy but I think overall, it still needs to be a finite list that's published for the registries. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, I agree. Thanks very much, Mary and Heather. It's Thomas, for the record. Let's hear more views. I mean, we can certainly take the view that we're just having the finite list and we need to talk about exceptions that - or the outliers, as Berry called them in a moment but do you think that it is worthwhile discussing some language on how to deal with errors. I'm worried that we have things like Red Society or stuff like that on the list forever, without any chance of at least removing things that shouldn't be on the list. The additions, I agree, are a completely different thing and I'm also cognizant, I guess, this call has been scheduled for an hour, we are seven minutes past the hour already.

Berry Cobb: Ninety minutes.

Thomas Rickert: Ninety minutes? Okay, so then we're still fine. So let's hear some views on whether you think that we should try to work on sort of a rectification mechanism or language.

Berry Cobb: Thomas, I tell you what. Just in the interest of time, I'll make note of this in the minutes that this is a pretty big one that we should discuss at our next session and I'll extract some of the conversation from the transcripts to put some context around it. I don't think we have enough people to try to solve it today but it sounds like we have a maybe partial path forward to at least put some guide rails around this issue.

Thomas Rickert: That's fine. So why don't you then continue with your presentation?

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you. So I just want to highlight two more notions. I think this is - these should be fairly easy to get through. So back to Rows 559 to 581, which is again, for the Côte d'Ivoire which I'm sure I'm mispronouncing. So as I mentioned, the translations over here in French are kind of a no-brainer for me, these will easily be converted into what we call U-labels from the - to the - when the conversion to a DNS label happens, these will be converted to what we call U-labels which is the XM dash, dash something, something,

something. My concern here is that some of these English names, like the very first one, the Côte d'Ivoire Red Cross contains a non-Latin character of the - it's not an umlaut O, I'm not sure what kind of O we call that.

I'm concerned that if the algorithm that converts this to a DNS label will also make this a converted to a U-label and we won't get to the point of where we're actually trying to reserve the English label. So I'm going to ask Stephane and we can take this offline, but I'm hopeful that we can kind of take a creative license on this that we strip out, or I would convert this O with the triangle on top to, for example, a normal O, an English O so that we ensure that we actually get an English conversion to the DNS label. And like I said, we can take this one offline but I just wanted to highlight that one.

And then secondarily, just another highlight, we'll take this down to Row 943 to 950, and this is I think the only one that I saw that had this issue, but I'm not going to - I'm not 100% certain but the Red Cross Society of Guinea-Bissau, looks like they formally use a hyphen between their two names, or I'm sorry, the two words used to make up their country name. What will happen is that if I get, if I were to convert this with the DNS label, it's going to actually put two hyphens in between the word and so what I'm proposing is that those also be removed so that we get one version where the two country - two words that make the country name are collapsed together without it and that we wind up with just one of the hyphens in between.

Again, the algorithm for the DNS conversion will collapse a space and where a space would normally occur, will also input a hyphen so while we have almost 4,000 identifiers listed in this list, including the non-Latin character translations, ultimately that DNS label algorithm will probably spit out about, I'm guessing, 10,000 total strings that would ultimately be reserved and essentially, it's going to be - it's almost going to be two for every English one and then one, at the very least, if not two, when it converts non-English identifiers. So I just wanted to highlight that one for you as well.

Obviously there's still a lot more to go through the list, for example, the use of Republic and some others, but in terms of the meeting minutes, I think we have a path forward. So I'm going to stop sharing my screen at this point and I would like to take the group over a quick review of a very much draft preliminary recommendations. The original desire was to have the full report, draft report available for the group to review. I think it's clear that we have a fair amount ahead of us just on the definitive list, let alone the report so I'm comforted by the fact that we have a little bit more time.

So if you'll just give me five minutes, I'm going to just walk through the high level structure of these preliminary draft recommendations. I don't even think Mary has even had a time to read through it in great detail yet, so none of this is formal and all of this is wide open and subject to change, however the group wishes to go.

But the concept of this approach was essentially, based off of our high-level deliberations. For the first half of our deliberations, was essentially about the legal basis by which the strings would be reserved or deserve the reservation protection.

And then the second half is getting to the definitive list. So that kind of same structure applies to how this is set up as well. But, you'll take note in the very first section, that the direction of this working group was, you know, based off of the amendment process from the GNSO operating procedures and working group guidelines.

And had a direct instruction from the GNSO council which is pasted here in the very first page which ultimately, Section A is, you know, should these identifiers be reserved and should they have an exception procedure if they are reserved?

So, the first section of the preliminary agreed recommendations and - is Section 2.1.1. And the first recommendation is that the reconvened working

group does, in fact, confirm the GNSO council's proposed (commitment) as outlined in its resolution in May 2016, whereby, a definite list of full names, and now is what the 191 Red Cross Societies and the full names of the ICRC and IFRC and Red Crescent Societies via this agreed definitive list be placed into Specification 5 of the base gTLD registry agreement.

You'll notice that I have some comments over here onto the side that I think we also need to work out. I will remind the working group that this is for all gTLDs, not just the new gTLDs.

And there's still a handful of TLDs delegated prior to ICANN's existence, really, or certainly the registry agreements of these legacy TLDs. And I really don't like the term legacy.

But, basically registry agreements prior to 2014 that haven't been renewed yet have a different method for highlighting the list of reserve names. And so, the main example is dot com.

When you look at that registry agreement, it actually goes - points towards Appendix 6 versus quote, unquote, "specification 5 of the registry agreement." I pointed out in detail and which is - includes a subsection called Recommendation Details.

And why I'm proposing to be very prescriptive to this is I'm trying to eliminate any ambiguity for what seems like this will eventually be implemented by ICANN staff, and specifically why Dennis Chang is on the call.

The desire here is that we be as prescriptive as possible in these details so that they really have nothing to deliberate or determine when this is pushed over to the IRT and they can fast-track implementation and make it as easy as possible.

Again, kind of circling back to some of the lessons learned in implementing the other recommendations. So, that's why these details are very prescriptive as they are. And I'm sure they could still use more prescription.

The second recommendation under this section, which is, again, confirming the council's instruction to determine whether the amendment will work is, in fact, that the exception procedure be created whereby the Red Cross Society's for representatives can eventually go register these names.

The detail here is that there really is no need for this group to create or determine an exception procedure as one has already been implemented for the policy that I mentioned at the beginning of the call which is called the protection of IGO, INGO identifiers in all gTLD policy, consensus policy, and the link is there.

The point being is that it's already been created. It's already a part of consensus policy. We just need to attach on to that. But I think it's worthy of making it a recommendation because specifically the GNSO council pointed it out specially to this reconvened working group.

Lastly, the second, 2.1.2, is recommendations in addition to the proposed amendment as instructed by the GNSO council. And, again, this is just to reinforce what I was mentioning about trying to be overly prescriptive of making it easy for when we get to implementation at some point down the road.

But recommendation three is essentially talking about future changes to this reservation list and the use of the variant criteria or variant index or however we want to title it.

I tried to keep the recommendation language itself pretty short. But, you know, at a high level, that the variations are based off of official name,

common name, country of designation, use of definitive articles, use of terms like society, national and official languages.

And we can probably - we'll need to adapt that based on some of the other trends that we saw in the use of these terms as they're defined by these particular countries and their legal name.

And the recommendation details is where I think this group needs to spend a lot of time on in making sure that we get this correct. So, the recommendation details of recommendation number three are, in fact, this variant index or this variant criteria that defines the list.

So, again, it starts with the official name. Moving over to Page 3, talks about the common name and all of the text underneath it where certain terms can be used with or without it such as the country it represents, the use of the term or the definitive article such as the, terms like society national.

And then the third component is national language and what is listed down there. Again, I thank Stephane for putting that together or formalizing what we had on a previous draft list that we have been using.

But, for sure, the group will want to spend a lot of extra effort to ensure that we have this variant index criteria list shored up. Fourth recommendation is also in relation to future changes of this reservation list.

And it's essentially just to reinforce that there's already a process as defined from the IGO, INGO consensus policy. Essentially, the implementation of that policy for IGO names, for the IOC and for the Red Cross umbrella considers the GAC as the authoritative channel by which any of these changes will occur.

So, for the purposes of the Red Cross, at - you know, assuming hypothetically that a new society is formed, they would engage with the GAC

leadership. GAC leadership would notify ICANN org as well as the GNSO of this proposed change.

And then the process would work its way out. The biggest proponent of that or biggest component of that is that the GNSO is also informed of this change which was based on some feedback that we have received a couple of meetings ago and the implementation of that consensus policy.

But again, ultimately, there is no reason for this working group to create a process. There is one defined in the consensus policy that exists today. And the last thing I want to draw your attention to, and this is mostly for you, Stephane, because I believe it falls outside of the scope of ICANN and certainly the GNSO.

But in the case where a new society is formed and it's working through the process of that formal adoption into international law, at some point, you'll want to trigger your process to engage the GAC early so that ICANN org and the GNSO can sign off on that change.

And that update to that reservation list can occur before there's any public announcement of the new society. That way we can avoid frontrunning of anybody trying to register names before the actual implementation begins.

And this group may want to have some dialogue about that. But, that certainly something that stuck out in my mind. So that's kind of the general approach to the recommendations framework.

As I mentioned, way open to that it's, improvements and enhancements especially since it's the first time people saw it. So, I'll stop there and turn it back to you, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Berry, and (unintelligible) with your work. So thanks a lot for that. Sorry, my headset was just running out of battery. I hope you guys can hear me.

So thanks very much for all the work. Are there any questions with respect to the language of the recommendations?

Berry Cobb: And I should point out, Thomas, I think there's a fair amount of action items for staff coming out mostly related to the definitive list. But in parallel, I'll be working with Mary to refine the overall draft.

And so hopefully early next week we can have the entire report submitted for the working group to start review and as nuances about the recommendations, such as variants or whatever needs to be updated, we can make those changes and (apply it) to the list or to the document. So, I just wanted to let you know that that'll be sent to the list very shortly.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much. So, do we have any instant feedback to the language of the recommendation or other observations that can take it to the Council in further refining this?

Are there any objections to staff working on this as proposed by Berry? That doesn't seem to be the case, so Berry and team...

Stephane Hankins: Thomas. Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, Stephane, go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: This is Stephane, Stephane Hankins, for the record. Yes, thank you, (interns), for all the work that is being done. Apologies for, you know, the Red Society name.

I'm surprised because, you know, we put a lot of effort in explaining exactly where we were heading and what we were authorized to do. But as I note from Mary's lines in the chat, there is this possibility, indeed, that the national society - National Red Cross Society in China is known by the name Red Society.

And then, you know, if we define usual name - commonly used names, then you know, there might have been (the error). But we did try to do the best we could.

There are a couple of mistakes, but I'm just wondering how, you know, we could find a way, indeed, to get this - at least to get this proofread and it's just coming to my mind, you know, whether the form of the GAC, you know, might be a possibility, or if it would make matters very complicated and very lengthy.

As with regard to the recommendations, I, myself, was - I saw them earlier this afternoon - I was interested to see that, you know, there might be a possibility for this to somehow be flagged or to be extended to the so-called legacy gTLDs.

And, you know, it's always been an interrogation for us, you know, how we could indeed ensure that, you know, there's protections of, not just for the new gTLDs.

So that's something that, you know, I - that I think is legitimate indeed, you know, for the group to consider. And my third point is, reading through this, it is important, before it's circulated broadly, you know, that the group be able to indeed comment.

There are some elements in there that are incorrect such as, just for example, how a national society becomes a member of the International Red Cross, Red Cross (Movement) and so on.

So, there are some elements there that are slight mistakes they need to be corrected so it is important that, you know, we be able to comment on it.
Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stephane. And it's good advice. I think we're going to have that feedback loop on the list and that sort of links to the question asked by Mary in the chat on how - what we're going to do in terms of scheduling the next call.

So, Berry, you were saying that you think that refining of the report can be done within a week or so. Can I ask those who are not speaking to please mute their mics? We have a lot of background noise. So, Berry, can you confirm how much time we will need to get those defined?

Berry Cobb: Hi, Thomas. I believe that - and (Crystal), I believe that your line that's not muted. Thank you.

(Crystal): Nope. It wasn't me. I'm muted.

Berry Cobb: Call in user four.

Thomas Rickert: All right, (it looks fine).

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. So, you know, I think it's going to take - it'll probably be middle of next week that I would hope to have both - well, let me back up. In the next couple of days I hope to have the updated meeting minutes and circle back with highlighting some of the extracts from the transcript and everything we discussed today to just shore up this particular meeting.

As a part of that, probably another day to have the list, the next version of the list worked on. And some of those variants that we discussed and so

hopefully by middle of next week, maybe later of next week, that we have the entire draft report together.

I'm mostly kind of leaning on Mary for - she's much better at documenting this at for sure, Stephane, I apologize if I misstated any of the process. I'm a spreadsheet guy. I'm not a writer.

So, most definitely there'll be more than ample opportunity for this group to make edits and correct any misstatement that I've made in this very first draft. So, for the most part, Monday, meeting minutes and kind of capturing what was discussed in the group.

Wednesday-ish to Thursday, that will have an update to the definitive list and a draft of the report.

Man: Okay, so with GDD taking place next week, I think it wouldn't be a good idea to have that conflict with our next meeting. So my suggestion would be to get the note out as you discussed, and if you could, highlight the questions that were asked of us today about potential - you know, about the outliers and how we're going to deal with those.

And the exception process, should there be any rectification process. That we can get the discussion started on the list. And then, let me check with the group whether you guys would be fine to schedule the next meeting where we hopefully can do a consensus call in two weeks from today.

Berry Cobb: And so that would be the 24th of May that we would target a meeting. I note that there's also (Enta) and (Rightscon) going on those weeks as well.

Thomas Rickert: Well, can we afford to push it back more? So there's the Council meeting on the 24th - so what are you guys thinking?

Berry Cobb: Thomas, what I can do, I'll take the action to send out a Doodle poll and I'll try to - if not the 24th, maybe we can shoot for early morning the 25th or something along those lines. I'll provide a few options and we'll see what comes out.

Thomas Rickert: That's awesome. So, since we have four minutes past the end of this meeting, let's adjourn. So we have our action items clear. And, you know, I don't want to - want us to end this call before applauding you guys for all the hard work that you've done, both Stephane and team, as well as particularly you, Berry, for analyzing the list and, you know, talking us through all the changes.

That has been a hell of a job. Thanks so much. Much appreciate it. Let's have the recording ended. Thanks and goodbye. Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: Thank you all.

Woman: Thanks Thomas, Berry, Stephane and everyone.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thank you so much. The meeting has been adjourned. Operator, please stop the recording. Have a great day, everyone.

END