

Transcript
GAC/GNSO issues related to International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Red Cross (RC) names discussion group teleconference
22 February 2012 at 18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GAC/GNSO issues related to International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Red Cross (RC) names discussion group teleconference held on Wednesday 22 February 2012 at 1800 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-gac-ioc-20120222-en.mp3> On page:
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

Attendees

Jeff Neuman - Registry SG group leader
Lanre Ajayi - Nominating Committee Appointee
Thomas Rickert - Nominating Committee Appointee
James Bikoff- IPC
Steve DelBianco - CBUC
Konstantinos Komaitis - NCUC
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
David Heasley - IPC
Gregory Shatan - IPC
Osvaldo Novoa - ISPCP
Christophe Lanord - NCSG - International federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Stephane Hankins - International Committee of the Red Cross
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Debra Hughes - NCSG
Joy Liddicoat - NCUC

ICANN Staff
Brian Peck
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies:
Wolfgang Kleinwachter - NCSG
Charles Gomes - RySG

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the IOC call on the 22nd of February, 2012. On the call today we have Jeff Neuman, Steve DelBianco, Lanre Ajayi, Konstantinos Komaitis, Christophe Lanord, Kiran Malancharuvil, Stephane Hankins, Jim Bikoff, Debra Hughes, Osvaldo Novoa, Greg Shatan, Thomas Rickert and Joy Liddicoat.

From staff we have Brian Peck, Margie Milam and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Chuck Gomes and Wolfgang Kleinwachter. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you for that. Thank you everyone for attending this meeting. I know it's - I guess our new time that we did it last time as well so it's a little bit of an extended meeting.

But I hope that we can come out of this meeting with a good understanding of where we are as a group and then talk a little bit about a call that we're trying to plan with the - with representatives of the GAC, you know, again not in their official capacity as GAC or I should say that their opinions will not be GAC opinions they'll be more personal opinions and thoughts on this call. But the whole goal is to prepare us for the Council meeting with the GAC in Costa Rica in just a few weeks time now.

The agenda is up on Adobe for those of you that are following that. It's - we're basically going to recap the current status of where we are in Option 7 and then also do - I guess go back to an overall discussion of what we want to present to the GNSO and GAC because there's been a discussion I've noticed on the list in the last couple hours as to whether we should present just one option or present multiple options so we should have that discussion.

And then we'll go onto the two other - just to recap the - well actually I think just one other issue that's also - was kind of a leftover from last time and that's the foreign translation issue which - which Debra Hughes from the Red Cross has come back with an email and a proposal on. And then we'll talk about the next steps and about this call with the GAC and then finally our objectives for Costa Rica.

So that said is there anyone else that's got any agenda items that they think we should add or anything that we're missing?

Jim Bikoff: Jeff, it's Jim Bikoff. I just wanted to mention that David Heasley and Kiran Malancharuvil from my office are on the phone too.

Jeff Neuman: Great, thank you. And I see that's on the - I see that Kiran has posted that on the chat as well.

Jim Bikoff: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Okay any other questions or comments before we kind of jump right in? Okay so what we have up on the screen right now - and hopefully everyone is on Adobe. If you're not and you want to get in the queue please let me know.

So we have Option 7 which Jim Bikoff has presented after a couple iterations. I will also note that Debbie Hughes from the Red Cross is also - and this is also from the Federation - and I may not be getting all the names right so I apologize, Debbie. But this is - this came in a few minutes ago so I think as we go through each item I'll ask Debbie to just go over some of the wording changes.

I think some of them are just wording changes. There may be a couple of them that may be concepts that we have to discuss. So what I'll do is I'll read

Jim's language and then go to Debbie first to clarify, see if Jim agrees with those first and then we'll go to the rest of the group. Does that make sense?

Debra Hughes: Jeff, can you make the screen bigger on Adobe?

Brian Peck: Oh let me see.

Debra Hughes: Or Brian, sorry.

Brian Peck: That's okay how's that?

Jim Bikoff: Great.

Debra Hughes: A tad bigger would be better.

Brian Peck: How's that?

Debra Hughes: Perfect, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Joy Liddicoat: Joy Liddicoat here. I can't seem to get into the Adobe room. I'm still waiting to get access.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so - yes, I think that's just someone from ICANN staff that just needs to let you in. Is that the problem?

Joy Liddicoat: I think so.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so we'll work on that. In the meantime I'll make sure I read the provision and then hopefully you'll be able to follow.

Okay so this just is a reminder. This is Option 7. We went through six options and some of them had multiple alternatives on the last call. And it seemed like we were getting towards, at least as a group, closer to coming to a sort of - hopefully consensus on a hybrid of a bunch of the options that were presented.

So on the last call - after the last call I sent around what I had taken down as Option 7. That went through some iteration and then Jim Bikoff had submitted some comments and then graciously re-drafted Option 7 so - to what we see right here.

So what it says in Option 7 is we would treat the terms set forth in Section 2.2.1.2.3 as modified reserve names. So just as a reminder 2.2.1.2.3 is a section in the Applicant Guidebook that actually lists the specific domain names - or sorry, the specific strings that have a limited form of protection that we talked about where currently if the Guidebook stood as-is it would prohibit exact matches of those specifically delineated strings. There would be no string similarity review. And so those would just go - be checked as-is.

So this one says we would treat the term set forth in Section 2.2.1.2.3 as modified reserve names meaning A, the names are available as gTLD strings to the International Olympic Committee, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement collectively the IOC/RC or their authorized agents as applicable.

And I'm going to stop there at A and then go to - and, Debbie, I'll just read your changes and then if you have anything to add then you could just add it if that's okay?

So in A Debbie has changed that to the - instead of just the name she's added the reserve name so it would be capital R capital N - the reserve names are available as gTLD strings and then added the word respectively to the International Olympic Committee and to the International Red Cross and

Red Crescent Movement. And they crossed out the collectively component - the definition - and then have said and its components.

So instead of saying collectively the IOC/RC it would say or their - sorry instead of saying collectively the IOC/RC or their authorized agents it would now say and its components as applicable.

So I'll take a queue on that one but I want to go to Jim to see first whether he would just accept that and then that'll make things a little easier. Jim, do you have any thoughts on those changes?

Jim Bikoff: I think we would accept that although I think of saying its components it probably should say their components.

Jeff Neuman: Okay I think that makes sense. That's just kind of a grammar. Debbie, that's fine with you to change its to their?

Debra Hughes: Yes that sounds fine. I'll defer also to Stephane or Christophe if you have any comments on that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Christophe Lanord: Yes, Christophe speaking. I don't know what's exactly the structure of the IOC whether you would speak about components. But that's definitely the way we would define all national societies, the IOC and the Federation; components would be the exact word.

Jim Bikoff: Yes, I think our structure is similar in the sense that we have national governing bodies and committees in every country.

Jeff Neuman: Okay good. So it sounds like at least those two groups agree. So then let me start with a queue. And I see Greg is already in the queue and then we'll go - and Alan. So let's go to Greg first.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. I think - and maybe this is just a grammar point - it probably should be their respective components.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Jim.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Bikoff: Yes, that's fine with me.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Greg Shatan: And the other issue is the crossing out of authorized agents. I think that was added in response to Alan's comment about whether these groups want a designated or authorized third party to operate a domain on their behalf.

Man: Yes, that was the idea.

Jim Bikoff: That was the original idea to speak to Alan's previous comment.

Greg Shatan: So we may want to restore that - those three words or several words.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so first before we do that I just want to double check, Brian, are you able to capture all these?

Brian Peck: I'm trying to, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So I think what the recommendation would be would to say and Red Cross Movement and their components comma - or sorry - and their respective components comma or their authorized agents.

Jim Bikoff: Jeff, maybe you could say and their respective components or authorized agents. Did you say that?

Stephane Hankins: May I make a comment? Stephane Hankins, National Committee of the Red Cross. I'm not quite sure what the notion of authorized agents actually refers to. On speaking, you know, for the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement perspective, you know, the application would have to come from what as was outlined earlier of the respective components of the Movement.

So that - there were two international components and then there's, you know, there's the National Societies of the Red Cross and Red Crescent. So the notion that, you know, the agents would themselves be entitled, you know, to apply is something that appears a little bit curious. I don't know what the situation would be with regard to the International Olympic Committee.

Jim Bikoff: Well the only reason we added that was based on a comment from Alan on Sunday. And I don't have that in front of me. Is Alan on the phone?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Alan's...

Alan Greenberg: I'm here and I have my hand up.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so let's - then I'll jump to you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, yes, I don't feel strongly about it. I was just - when Chuck asked the question of would we allow someone else to ask for it with permission, essentially, and it dawned on me that based on, you know, legal structures or money flow or whatever it's possible that one of these groups might want someone else to operate it on their behalf. In other words they didn't want to do it hands on; they wanted to separate themselves from that and have someone else under contract do it.

And I was suggesting that by not allowing that structure we may be tying someone's hands in the future. And so I was trying to not open the door to horrible things but simply to give the appropriate group the flexibility that it

might want in the future. That was the only issue. If everyone wants to take it out then I have no problem at all. I just thought it was...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...it was not prejudging how something would work in the future that's all.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so let me get - it sounds like - was that Stephane that wanted to jump in?

Stephane Hankins: Yes just very quickly, I mean, here we're talking about the - an entitlement of the concerned institutions. So, you know, I don't have the - I don't think, you know, we have very strong against with reference to authorizations. But since we're talking about the entitlements of given institutions, you know, not, you know, how they would want to apply or, you know, through what means or through what agents it's really a different question.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and thanks, Stephane. I was going to kind of jump in and say the same thing. I think this Part A is really just saying which groups are able to - who they're reserved for as opposed to who can get it for those reserved groups. So I think taking out or their authorized agents doesn't change the meaning and doesn't limit the possibility of someone submitting the application on the Red Cross or Olympic's behalf.

So if the two groups don't feel strongly about having that language in then I see no reason to actually have that language there.

Jim Bikoff: Yes, I agree. This is - we don't feel strongly about it.

Jeff Neuman: So, Alan, if I could just make the recommendation then...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, as I said I was trying to give some flexibility in the future if the groups don't want it then I'm certainly not going to fight for it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I had one other question. I'm just curious if crossing out the IOC/RC was just semantics because it's only used once later or is there some substantive meaning in doing that?

Debra Hughes: Hi this is - I raised my hand, Jeff, and I was going to jump back into the queue about that issue.

Jeff Neuman: Sure, great. Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: Yes, I think that was just - that was a over-strike I think. I think having the defined term is important because it is mentioned one other time. But, you know, I could go either way on that; I don't think that's crucial.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jim Bikoff: I think it ought to be in there because it's mentioned actually three times.

Debra Hughes: There you go. That's fine.

Stephane Hankins: If I can just jump in? I'm sorry, you know, I can't get to the screen so I can't put my hand up but this is Stephane Hankins again. I - to me, you know, I think it is important that, you know, the text be clear. For me to put collectively the IOC and the Red Cross is a bit confusing because we are talking about two different sets of denominations.

So in a sense we need to make that clear. And that is also why, you know, we sought to add the word respectively as well because of course, you know, the International Olympic Committee will have, you know, the privilege with

regard to the denominations of the Olympic Committee and the Movement in regard to the Red Cross Red Crescent Red Crystal and other denominations.

So I sort of felt that, you know, it doesn't necessarily add clarity to what we're actually saying. But it was a...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: ...we decided to (basically) cross it out.

Jeff Neuman: Hold on, guys. Let me try to stick to the queue. So I got Thomas and then, Jim, did you want to say something about Thomas?

Jim Bikoff: Yes, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Thomas Rickert: This is Thomas. Thank you, Jeff. I'm missing the modified reserve names section in Debbie's proposal. Maybe, you know, maybe, Debbie, you just didn't include the heading. But now that I read that you just use reserve names I think this needs some clarification because I think these names get special treatments. I very much like the modified reserve names heading. And I think they shouldn't be confused with the other reserve names in the Applicant Guidebook.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's a good point. Let me - if I can go to Debbie, would you mind calling them modified reserve names as we do in the heading? I don't know, Debbie, if you're on mute?

Debra Hughes: Oh I'm sorry, I'm on mute. I'll have to confer with my colleagues. At first blush I don't think there's a concern.

Jeff Neuman: Right and the reason we call them modified is because ordinary reserve names are not - they're not allowed to be registered by anyone.

Debra Hughes: Right.

Jeff Neuman: That's why we kind of call them the modified reserve names.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, that should be capitalized then shouldn't it if we're defining a new term?
It's Alan.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, that's fine, I think.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, Debbie, while you're thinking a little bit more about that hey, Brian, is there a way to post this language - obviously not on that main screen but maybe in the notes section?

Brian Peck: Yes, we could try. Yes, let me do this although the colors won't come out. What I've done is I'm kind of redlining Debbie's proposal on, you know, in just a Word document here on my laptop. So I can go ahead and put this up. As I say - without the redline won't show up as the changes.

Jeff Neuman: That's fine as long as we have the language for A...

Brian Peck: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...of it too so I can double check.

Brian Peck: Okay. And I just wanted to confirm that we want to keep - we want to maintain or their authorized agents?

Jeff Neuman: No we'll take that out.

Brian Peck: Okay, oops, all right.

Jeff Neuman: So it should - if I'm reading this correctly it should say the capital M - Modified capital R - Reserved - capital N - names that are available as gTLD strings respectively to the International Olympic Committee and to the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and their respective components comma as applicable.

Brian Peck: Yes. And then we've still got the parenthetical collectively as the IOC/RC right?

Jeff Neuman: I'm not...

((Crosstalk))

Brian Peck: I thought my understanding...

((Crosstalk))

Jim Bikoff: Jeff...

Brian Peck: Yes, go ahead...

Jim Bikoff: Jeff, can I say something?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think Jim wanted to comment on that so Jim...

Jim Bikoff: I just wanted to say to Stephane the - collectively the IOC/RC is simply just a definitional so that we don't have to use the full names in paragraphs subsequently. It's mentioned one, two, three, four times down the line. And instead of having to repeat the full names of all the groups it just gives us a shorthand to use the initials - the acronyms for both organizations.

I mean, it could be IOC/RC; it could be IOC/IRC, whatever designation you want. But it's sort of a simpler way to do it.

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: Jeff - Jeff, I had proposed - this is Debbie, I'm sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: I proposed some language that kind of reflects what we were thinking - language something like hereafter and then the paren IOC or RC respectively.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Is that - Brian, can you incorporate that?

Brian Peck: Sure, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'll just point out this is not the formal policy that will be incorporated into the Guidebook; this is trying to make sure that we have clarity on what the intent is.

Stephane Hankins: Understood.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay, Christophe, you're in the queue.

Christophe Lanord: Yes. I was supporting modified reserve names as proposed by Debbie but I think that now we seem to agree on that. Another way of dealing with collectively the IOC/RC could be to have after the name International Olympics - Olympic Committee into brackets, hereafter IOC and then for the Movement hereafter the Movement, something like that.

I think that if we start speaking about IOC/RC knowing that one of the components of a Movement is definitely IOC/RC it will lead to a lot of confusion. So I think it should be split.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so, Brian, in that language it would say hereafter the quote IOC or - instead of the slash.

Brian Peck: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: The IOC or RC in quotes respectively.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No sorry done.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay. All right great so it sounds like - does anyone else have any comments on that language that Brian has put into the chat that we've gone over for Part A?

Brian Peck: Okay I just put up the - just the slight revision on the hereafter so - oops, it didn't come out, sorry. It should be - sorry, it should be hereafter the IOC quote or RC. I'll fix that. Hold on.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And then Debbie has got another comment to the hereafter not...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...not here and the - as in the hearing from your ear - hereafter.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think the word respectively is appropriate there at this point if we only have one thing in quotes.

Jeff Neuman: So I think that's right. So it would be hereafter the IOC or RC end parentheses. Okay I think we've kind of - although Christophe now has suggested other language so, Christophe.

Christophe Lanord: Yes, to International Olympic Committee, hereafter the IOC, on the International I forgot to type on the - International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, hereafter the Movement, would I think be clear.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, Brian...

Brian Peck: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: It would say now, the modified reserve names are available as gTLD strings for the International Olympic Committee, open parenthetical, hereafter the IOC, close parenthetical, International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, open parenthetical, hereafter the Movement...

Jim Bikoff: Yes, because we're a movement too.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Jeff, I have my hand up on Jim's behalf. Can he speak?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Debra Hughes: ...about that. This is Kiran.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Jim Bikoff: I think we're both movements. I think that's even more confusing. What we're trying to do is make things simple. I thought the best way to do that was acronyms but maybe I'm wrong. But, I mean, the International Olympic Committee is a movement too so I don't know why we're calling one a movement and one an acronym.

Alan Greenberg: Why not just RC? It stands for Red everything...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...Star of David.

Jeff Neuman: Hold on.

Christophe Lanord: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: I think that was Alan. Remember, everyone...

Alan Greenberg: Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: ...introduce yourself before you...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: ...say something for the transcript.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yes that was Alan but I'll keep quiet.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So let me just leave that up to the Red Cross representatives. Is there - would you all be at least for this purpose would it be okay to just use RC?

Thomas Rickert: Jeff, this is Thomas. I have a proposal to make regarding this one.

Jeff Neuman: Okay sure, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Maybe we can take out the names of the organizations and the acronyms by speaking of hereinafter called the beneficiaries or some other generic term.

Jeff Neuman: I'd actually prefer to keep them separate in case there's a need in any foray to discuss these separately. So I kind of like the idea of just keeping the names of the organizations and then, you know, if we have to and it turns out that there's a separate discussion on these I kind of like this.

Also remember we do need to consider at some point soon the second level protections. And if we have acronyms now I - it would make it easier for later. So let me turn it over to Christophe. Is there - is this a drop - is this a - I used to always the word deal killer but it's not the appropriate word. Would it be acceptable to use RC?

Christophe Lanord: Yes, I let Debbie on the - Stephane agreed but, yes, I think that for this purpose it's fine, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. So...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: Maybe I think, you know, I think we should put - I'm not sure, you know, how substantive actually this whole discussion is. And I'm sorry if I - this is Stephane Hankins.

But I'm wondering whether we should - I think institutionally we would prefer RC/RC because it's Red Cross Red Crescent. Because you have the International Movement of the Red Cross Red Crescent so I think if we put RC/RC it's better. But as I said I'm a little bit confused, you know, how substantive the discussion is because I understand this is just the phrasing of the proposal.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, it's not - so this is Jeff again - it's not intended to be substantive; it's just intended so that later on when we...

Stephane Hankins: So it's fine.

Jeff Neuman: ...mention it that we just have acronyms instead of spelling everything out. But if it turns out that it's easier to write everything out then we'll do that. I mean, to me this is more of a political issue for you all and so I just want to be sensitive if there's political issues with you and your organizations.

Christophe Lanord: So RC/RC would be fine. Christophe. Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so RC slash RC.

Christophe Lanord: That's...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: ...RC/RC in...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Sorry say that again?

Stephane Hankins: RCRC all attached.

Jeff Neuman: Okay no slash in between.

Stephane Hankins: No slash.

Jeff Neuman: All right, Brian, you got that?

Brian Peck: Okay so RC - yes.

Jeff Neuman: RCRC. Okay do you want to post that again?

Brian Peck: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: And we can all look at it and...

Brian Peck: Hold on. So we just have the one RC right?

Jeff Neuman: No two RC - RCRC. So it's the Modified Reserve Names are available as gTLD strings to the International Olympic Committee, open parenthetical, hereafter comma the IOC - the quote, IOC, quote and then we close the parenthetical and say International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and open parenthetical hereafter comma the RCRC close parenthetical, and their respective components as applicable.

Okay so Brian is going to post that out so we'll all take one quick look and then declare that one completed. Okay Brian's posted it up. And again it says the capital M, Modified, capital R, Reserved and I think the capital of - the N needs to be capitalized in Names - Reserved Names...

Brian Peck: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...are available as gTLD strings to the International Olympic Committee, open parenthetical, hereafter the quote, IOC, end quote, end parenthetical and there should be a comma. International Red Cross and Red Crescent

Movement, open parenthetical, hereafter, quote RCRC, end quote, end parenthetical, and their respective components as applicable.

Any comments on that? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. If we do it exactly that way doesn't that mean when we use the terms later on we're going to have IOC or RCRC and their respective components if the respective components are not included in the definition.

Hello, am I still here?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, yes, I'm thinking about that. Anyone have a comment on that? I think we're okay. I think we should be fine.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: But once we're done with this whole thing we'll take another look at it and see if there's a better way.

Okay Part B - so I'm going to start with Jim's language and then go to Debbie's. I think there are some substantive changes here - or more substantive changes in Debbie's version than in Jim's.

So let's start with Jim's version which says, "Applied for gTLD strings are reviewed during the string similarity review to determine whether they are similar to those in Section 2.2.1.2.3. An application for a gTLD string that is identified as too similar to a reserve name will not pass this initial review."

And I think we would change that, Jim, before we get to Debbie's, to a string that is identified as too similar to a - the Modified Reserve Names. Right, so I think - instead of just to a reserve name we'd say Modified Reserve Names - will not pass this initial review.

Jim Bikoff: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so then we turn to Debbie's language. And Debbie said the same beginning part. It says, "String similarity review to determine whether they are similar to..." and she's added the words, "...or liable to confusion with those defined in Section 2.2.1.2.3."

I'm going to stop there before I go through the other ones. And maybe, Debbie, can you just give a little explanation as to that added phrase there?

Debra Hughes: Yes so first a typo - it should be liable to cause confusion - sorry, I left out the cause.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Debra Hughes: Just trying to make sure that I - okay so the - what we were trying to do was to make sure that we were clear about what we're doing with the string similarity review. And we thought that adding that would help those who are reading the proposal to understand what the intent here is for the string similarity review.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Debbie. And this is Jeff. Just a kind of a comment that I have is that what we tried to do in the proposal - and I think what Jim has kept - is that the language in string similarity review is the same as the language that's currently in the Guidebook with respect to all other reserve names.

And so adding this phrase would give the string similarity review a different meaning than currently given to any of the other reserve names where I think the - with the exception of the Part C which talks about exceptions. Part B was intended to be exactly like the Applicant Guidebook is already with respect to normal reserve names.

So what you've added, although may be a helpful addition for all reserve names in general, would be different for Olympic - for the IOC and the RCRC than it is currently for other reserve names. With that said let me see if Jim's got any comments on it and then I'll go to Alan, Kiran and the queue.

Jim Bikoff: Yes, I don't - I mean, I don't mind the words but I think you're right, Jeff, that's why we did it that way. And I think actually the word similar probably comprehends confusion.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, if you go to the Guidebook where it talks about the string similarity review, that's Section 2.2.1.1, it says explicitly the objective of this review is to prevent user confusion or loss of confidence in the DNS resulting from delegation of too many similar strings. So it explicitly is to prevent user confusion.

So although in some explanatory document we may want to put more words since we're talking about an addition to the Guidebook I don't think it needs to be explained there any further.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Just to sum up, Alan, what you're saying is even without those words in there that's still explicitly the purpose of the string similarity review.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The primary purpose is to prevent user confusion.

Jeff Neuman: So let me then pass it back to the RCRC and any of the representatives. Would it be okay to keep these words out? My fear is if we add these words, to be honest, that the ICANN staff and Board are going to have much more difficulty in getting this through. And I'm also worried about the GNSO Council as well.

Because these add - it's not exactly the words that are used in the Guidebook in the overall objective. And I think implicitly, as Alan has said it's - and Jim - it's actually covered in the word similar.

Stephane Hankins: It's Stephane Hankins. I'm sorry I'm still not - I can't get into the (machine) so I can't put my hand up officially and I apologize for that. The reason we had put the language - additional language is - liable to confusion - is it's a little bit the language that we use when we - when we make interventions in the event of, you know, misuse of the Red Cross Red Crescent Red Crystal emblems or their denominations.

So it was a little bit, you know, in this perspective and - but, you know, we - as far as I can say, you know, we appropriate the reason that you've given, that, you know, you need to maintain - to preserve, you know, the community of language with the manual. So this I understand.

But could we just ask you briefly to outline what the string similarity review will be looking at? Would - it would cover what exactly? It would cover just similar - how is similarity defined? Does it - would it cover, you know, a spelling mistake? Would it cover - is that - is that clarified within the manual? Can we ask that question?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And - yes, this is Jeff. And I think Thomas has done a good job in the chat room. And I understand you don't have access to it. But what Thomas has said is that the Guidebook states, quote, the string similarity panel - the string similarity panel's task is to identify visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion.

In the Applicant Guidebook similar means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

So essentially all it's looking at is visual similarity. And to add that language that you've added in there changes the whole role of the string similarity panel and is not really I believe within the qualifications of the string similarity panel to look at other types of confusion except for visual.

Stephane Hankins: Understood. I think that's fine as far as I am concerned. Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So Greg and then Alan.

Greg Shatan: I'll take my hand down; I was going to make the same point.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, Greg. I didn't mean to steal your thunder. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just onto the process the first pass of the string similarity review is an automated one that is it's tasked by software which tries to gauge a physical similarity factoring in all sorts of fonts. And, you know, because IDN fonts, you know, can cause problems. A Greek Ro looks like a P.

Stephane Hankins: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: So - and I put the URL in the chat that points to the first pass. If something results in a - my understanding anyway and, Jeff, you can correct me if you think I'm wrong. I believe - my understanding is that if this mechanical check comes up with a number saying it's similar - and I don't think anyone has mentioned a percent threshold that is the actual cutoff - then the panel is invoked and will look at it to try to gauge is it a problem or not. I think that's the process.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think - yes you're right. But the panel is still not looking at things like - I don't believe the panel looks at meaning. I think...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The algorithm simply is visual.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Alan Greenberg: There are objections which you can raise based on meaning but I believe the string similarity panel is just visual I believe.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not 100% sure of that though.

Jeff Neuman: No you're correct, Alan. So I think - I think the recommendation then from - but let me hear from the group - is if we could leave this language as-is in Part B at least up until that point I think it - I think it's going to be easier and I think it - the confusion part is kind of implicit in the similar. But I just want to make sure that the Red Cross Red Crescent are comfortable with that.

Stephane Hankins: Yes as far as I'm concerned I've heard, you know, the definition of the process, the string similarity review will go through. From my point of view I think this is - satisfies, you know, the requirements from my perspective. I don't know whether Christophe would have any comments on that.

Christophe Lanord: Yes, very much on the same line. I think it's okay, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Great. So the next part - so that's going to be taken out. Then it says whether they are similar to those - and then added the word defined in Section - so it's added the word defined which I think is a good change. I don't think anyone has - does anyone have an issue with adding the word those defined in Section? Okay seeing none.

The next part that's added relates to foreign - or I should say in translation of the terms. I'm going to put this phrase aside because I think that's more a

question of 2. And I think depending on how we come out in Question 2 those names may be names in Section 2.2.1.2.3. So for now I'm going to defer the conversation on that portion of it until we get to that question. Is that okay?

All right so I'm going to do that. So then the next part is the words or liable to cause confusion with I think is in there but that's the same as the other discussion so I think we can take that out.

Stephane Hankins: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So we are now on C. Brian, you want to post B as it is?

Brian Peck: Sure. So the only change to Be then is just adding the word defined?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Jim Bikoff: And modified.

Jeff Neuman: We'll get back to the foreign - the translation issue when we talk about Question 2. Okay and please if anyone's got any comments on these from a substantive perspective, they disagree or agree just make sure we know because once this goes in I'm assuming everybody on this call is okay with this. You know, and again we're not coming up with the perfect solution but hopefully one that we can get consensus on that addresses the needs.

Oh and Kiran is right, you should add the word modified in there when it says the Reserve Names...

Brian Peck: Okay yes. Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Right. Thanks, Kiran.

Brian Peck: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: In Part C it says, "If an application fails to pass initial string review," - sorry, string similarity review the Red Cross Red Crescent has added the words and if. And I think - well let me see, Debbie, does anyone want to talk about why we - is that just a grammatical - trying to see if - I think - yes, because you've crossed out the and in 1 and if in Part 2 so I think that's okay. I don't think that changes the meaning.

And then in Part 1 it says, the applied for TLD matches any of the terms in 2.2.1.2.3 and then it says for example Olympic or - sorry, dotOlympic or dotRedCross. In Jim's version it says, it cannot be registered by anyone other than the IOC - it would now say or RCRC.

And I don't know if it needs or their authorized agents anymore.

Stephane Hankins: No.

Jeff Neuman: I think that would be taken out. Debbie and the RCRC have added the foreign translation issue which again I want to take off the table at this point and address that when we get to Question 2 if that's okay because I'm hoping that we'll come out with an answer on Part 2. So let's strike - or let's not adopt that for now with a decision that will come back to it if we need to as a result of Question 2.

Then it says it cannot be registered by anyone other than the IOC - so I think if we just say IOC or the RCRC I think that takes care of the other language that the Red Cross has added. Debbie, Christophe, Stephane, if we - instead of adding all that language at the end where you have or the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and its components respectively if

we just say other than the IOC or the RCRC would that take care of it as we've defined it above?

Stephane Hankins: Again, you know, Stephane Hankins speaking. The word respectively is certainly not the best. This (unintelligible). But just to introduce this notion, I mean, to be precise, I mean, you know, just to introduce the notion that, you know, the IOC would have this authority with regards to the Olympic names and to the RCRC as we have defined it on the Red Cross Red Crescent Red Crystal and related denominations.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: I think somehow we, you know, for clarity - I can't imagine that, you know, people who have not taken part in this conversation who would see this would be a little bit confused.

Jeff Neuman: What if instead of the words respectively at the end we would say IOC or the RCRC comma as applicable.

Christophe Lanord: Christophe. Yes, very good.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, fine.

Debra Hughes: Yes, that sounds good.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Brian, you got that? Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No I was going to offer a very - different variation for that but if that's fine with the various bodies it's fine with me. I still, as reading it, think if we want to include their respective components - if we want to include the intent of their respective components here then we either need to say it or put it up into the definition in each case. But if the bodies concerned are happy with it I am.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jim Bikoff: Yes, we're happy with it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so Number 2 then. I'm going to start with Jim's - actually I'll start with Debbie's version on this one because we added the words and, if in the beginning part of C. So Debbie's and RCRC's version it takes out the word if. So it would say, the applied for TLD is not identical to any of the terms in 2.2.1.2.3 comma but fails initial string similarity review with one of those protected items colon. And I don't think there's any changes recommended there.

Part A says in both versions the applicant may attempt to obtain a letter of non objection from the IOC - and I'm jumping back here - it should say the IOC or the RCRC.

Christophe Lanord: As applicable.

Alan Greenberg: As applicable.

Jeff Neuman: As applicable, right. So we could add the words as applicable. Sorry, Brian if we're going too quick.

Brian Peck: That's all right.

Jeff Neuman: So can we - I'm just trying to jump between two. So it would say other than the IOC or RCRC comma as applicable semicolon or - and then we get to Part B.

Stephane Hankins: Can I just make a comment? I see that under 2 we have a reference to those protected terms. So I just wanted, you know, should we refer to the

modified reserve names or - because those protected are suddenly a new - a new we're referring to them or...

Jeff Neuman: Yes...

Stephane Hankins: It's all right then I suppose.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thank you. So would anyone object to changing that - those protected terms saying with one of the Modified Reserve Names?

Alan Greenberg: Where do you see those protected terms? Oh okay.

Jeff Neuman: That's...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...on line 2...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: ...so it's C2 the end of the sentence and right before the colon.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Couldn't we also remove the reference to 2.2.1.2.3 with Modified Reserve Terms - capitalized there too...

Christophe Lanord: It would be more user friendly definitely.

Alan Greenberg: ...in the first phrase of the sentence. That goes for everywhere it shows up in this document after the first time.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so I think that makes sense. Does anyone disagree? So, Brian, when we go back through this - we don't have to do it right now - so just make a note...

Brian Peck: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: ...to replace except for the first sentence where it says Option 7 treat the names. All other places Section 2.2.1.2.3 be replaced with the capital M Modified, capital R Reserved, capital N Names.

Brian Peck: Okay except we have - and you have the - you know, under B the first part of it you have similar to those defined in Section 2.2.1.2.3. So defined as Modified Reserve Names? I'm not sure if that works.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...be similar to the Modified Reserve Names.

Alan Greenberg: That's correct.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Brian Peck: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Right, exactly.

Christophe Lanord: But perhaps we need to insert into A not 2(a) but A a reference to Modified Reserve Names being (all) defined in Section 2.2.1.2.3...

((Crosstalk))

Christophe Lanord: It would be most logical.

Jeff Neuman: Yes...

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I think that's what's up at the very top where it says Option 7 treat the terms set forth...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...in Section 2.2.1.2.3 as quote unquote Modified Reserve Names. It should probably be capitalized that first time it's referred to as well.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Yes. Okay...

Greg Shatan: And then that should carry through everywhere else.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and Brian and I can go through it - when we post the new version after this call we'll go through and make sure it makes grammatical sense in the other places. But I think the concept is a good one. I want to go to Steve because he's had his hand up for a while. Sorry, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Hey thanks, Jeff. It's Steve DelBianco with the BC. The language about pursuing a letter of non objection is really helpful although I can't see how that gets us around the string similarity fail. So it's more than just pursuing a letter there has to be something in here articulating that the obtaining of such a letter would be sufficient to override the failure to get through string similarity. And I guess have you anticipated getting into that on this call today or at some point?

Jeff Neuman: I think that's - let me think - so what you're saying is there's nowhere that states that if they get that letter then it should overcome the failures. Is that your point?

Steve DelBianco: That's right.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay I think that's - I think that's the intent. And - but let me throw that out because if - you're right if it is the intent and everyone agrees that's the intent we should explicitly state it in some way. But does anyone disagree that that's the intent? And I throw this especially out to the RCRC and to the Olympic Committee.

So if someone obtains a letter of non objection from the IOC or the RCRC as applicable that that would override the string similarity review?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I do have a case where that wouldn't be - that shouldn't be the case.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: But Joy was first I think.

Jeff Neuman: Hold on a sec, Alan. Joy, do you have a comment on that one or is it on something else?

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Jeff. No it's related to this point - well to this cause. But it's more one of related to the procedure by which one attempts to obtain a letter of non objection and whether there's any clarity for applicants about - needed for an applicant about what that process might be. But if you need to finish the point that you're discussing and then come back to this point I'm happy for you to do that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Joy. I will come back to you so keep your hand up please.

Joy Liddicoat: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes it strikes me that a letter of non objection is fine for - how do I put this - a virgin term that hasn't existed anymore. But the letter of non objection can't - could not be used for a second string in the same ilk. In other words if the Olympic Committee registers Olympiad and then tries to give a letter of non objection for something - or Olympics and then tries to give a letter of non objection for one ending in X that violates the confusion of users and that can't be overridden.

Jeff Neuman: Well wouldn't that - just to kind of throw the little wrench in it - wouldn't that - if the Olympic Committee - IOC - gave two letters of non objection to two strings that are similar to each other then wouldn't those go in the same contention set...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Well they would if they're done in the same round, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So let's start with this round. So I see what you're saying of subsequent rounds.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, okay. It just strikes me that you can't override a real similarity which is, you know, which is there without - with an opportunity for confusion which is there without any doubt by a letter of non objection. I don't know - if we have to cover that or how we phrase it but that's the case which we...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...where permission is not enough.

Stephane Hankins: But they only applies to two doesn't it? This option is only open in the event of two. It's not similar but not identical.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Jeff Neuman: Right, that's correct. So if it's identical then it's - Part 1 would hold true which is you can't register it. If it's just similar but not identical then it would go to the letter of non objection and then - yes, so it would go to letter of non objection or Part B.

Thomas Rickert: This is Thomas. If there were a preexisting TLD then the - then you could use the string confusion objection which is exactly for the scenario where a certain string is not rejected to string similarity.

Jeff Neuman: Right that's true. None of this - and it's made clear even at the end of this proposal - is meant to supersede any of the types of objections that may be raised including the legal rights or, as you've pointed out, the string similarity if in subsequent rounds there is that issue.

Let me go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: I guess my question is whether the letter should be dispositive or merely a document which would be taken into account by the string similarity panel. It seems to me that if they, you know, come to a judgment that it's still too similar by their lights that I'm not sure that that should be overridden by the organization submitting the letter of non objection. And it obviously would have evidentiary value. But whether it has string similarity value is kind of another question.

Jeff Neuman: I think with normal reserve names it undergoes string similarity review or I should say I think with reserve names that undergo string similarity review based on an existing string I think you're exactly right. I think in this case a string similarity panel is making a determination based on a reserve name but not for any technical reason or not for any user confusion based on technical aspects it's more a policy aspect.

And I think in this round at least when you're not talking about string similarity it still may make sense to have it be dispositive. Because I'm not sure what a string similarity panel would be saying if you're basically saying that the organization is giving their permission for someone else to register a similar name like - I don't know, Olympus Camera, let's say that falls into the similar.

I don't know why a - unless there was an existing string that was so similar to Olympus I'm not sure why the thoughts of a string similarity panel would have any affect on the security stability of the Internet. Does that make sense? But I totally agree with you if it's based on an existing string because they're looking at other things other than meaning; they're looking at, you know, just technical stability. I don't know if that made sense or not.

Greg Shatan: Oh that made sense.

Jeff Neuman: Konstantinos.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Nothing. I just wanted actually to say to say in completely different words what you said, Jeff. I mean, I think that in this case - I am trying to understand what the string similarity review would look like to begin with. Are we - I mean, my understanding is that the way it's phrased here it doesn't really talk about the technical aspects within the Applicant Guidebook but it is about, you know, whether it is confusingly similar in the eyes of the consumers. This is the point. I would like to make another point when the discussion is over. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So I think that addresses Steve's initial point. And I want to go back into the queue I think to Joy. I don't know, Greg, if you have another question.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Jeff, it's Alan. I want to stay on this item for a moment if you could?

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'm not sure I agree with you. The string similarity review process and panel is there to make sure that in their judgment users will not be confused and type the wrong one in and therefore not have confidence in the DNS because they're getting to the wrong place.

So I think ultimately the string similarity review panel has to agree that there will not be confusion. We're adding an escape hatch for other things but ultimately there has to be no confusion. I don't think - I don't think they can sign off on something unless they're confident in that.

Jeff Neuman: So, Alan, what is the confusion to? That's my point. In the other reserve names they're confusion to some technical element or an existing string. Here it's not a technical element and it's confusion to a set of rights that are granted...

Alan Greenberg: Oh okay, okay I see what you're saying.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: It's because there is no - the other string is not actually registered and in use it can't cause a user confusion. Okay you're right. I take it back. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Anyone else on this point? Steve, do you have a question on this point?

Steve DelBianco: I did. And I put in the chat what I guess I was thinking of to qualified what you've got in there right now under 2. Under 2 right now you just indicate that the applied string is not identical but it fails you go onto A and B. And I added at the end if it fails the applicant may override the string similarity (unintelligible) and then you delineate methods by which they can override the failure.

And that's a different approach - it's a little different than Alan's because it suggests you don't go back to the string similarity group at that point. They've given you their sort of ruling on similarity and now it's moved to a different venue a venue whereby the reserve name holder can give a letter of non objection because whatever string similarity reviewer said the holder of the underlying reserve name is suggesting that they're not concerned about confusion that might be possible with respect to that string. So it takes it out of their hands. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So what - let me actually throw that out then. What do people think of that language that Steve has added? I think it makes the point that we were just talking about. So I want to - any of the hands up to address Steve's point?

Greg Shatan: Yes, this is Greg. My hand is up on this point.

Alan Greenberg: And Alan.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so let me go to Greg and Alan.

Greg Shatan: I think this language makes sense. So we'll need to change the language after that so that it - rather than saying may attempt to obtain a letter of non objection it would say that they - applicant receives a letter of non objection from the IOC or RCRC as applicable.

Alan Greenberg: Precisely.

Greg Shatan: And then onto B if they cannot obtain a letter of non objection move onto B. And I guess the question is to whom is this letter of non objection being submitted. I recognize the string similarity panel may or may not be the right place for it to go. If it's not where would it go in the world of ICANN? Because right now we have it in the - we have it kind of in the extremely passive.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...be given to the applicant who would presumably...

Greg Shatan: But then what do they do with it?

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...takes a letter of non objection on the geographical name at the second level.

Jeff Neuman: I think what would happen essentially in putting in Guidebook-speak is that if it fails string similarity review unlike the other ones which fail string similarity review this would go to some sort of extended evaluation where the applicant would at that point be asked to do either A or B or withdraw its application. And so it would be submitted to the extended review panel I think.

But let's not get into that level of detail because I think if we pass this and the GNSO and GAC agree I think ICANN will then add that aspect to it of where it gets submitted and how.

Greg Shatan: I'm fine with that, sure. That was Greg.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I may be looking at too many edge cases but if - in the first round it doesn't matter but the implication here is that if the IOC - if the string similarity review panel says Olympus Camera is too similar but the IOC says okay you can have it that would imply that the IOC in Round 2 could not apply for Olympics. And I'm wondering what we're getting ourselves into here.

Greg Shatan: That's kind of backing into string contention.

Alan Greenberg: Well if the string similarity review panel really says Olympus Camera and Olympics are too similar then if Olympus Camera is there as a real string in the root we have an interesting situation. So again that's a Round 2 issue. I don't know to what extent we want to think about it here.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Alan. I think let's defer that one but I'm sure that your question will be thought about a lot by the groups that grant a - or that choose to grant or not grant a letter of non objection.

Alan Greenberg: Exactly. Perhaps that covers it but it may also prevent them from granting letters just on that worry when otherwise it would be reasonable. Okay let's go on.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks for that wrinkle. Okay anyone else on this particular point? Okay so, Brian, I think if we can put in the language that Steve had mentioned that was further modified and we'll go back to the transcript by Greg. I think then - I think that's the intent to put that in there. And then - and we'll go back to the transcript to get those words again.

Let me go back to Joy's point which I said I'd come back to. So, Joy, let me go back to you.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Jeff. And, yes, my point was really in - seeking a question of clarification in relation to the process by which an applicant may attempt to obtain a letter of non objection.

And was really to the IOC and RC participants on the call to perhaps explain if they're able to for our understanding what that process - that process might be. Because I can see questions coming around this proposal and discussion at GNSO Council and with GAC about, you know, what the - what that process might be and how transparent it will be. So if you could - if there's

someone who's able to just respond to that in terms of steps in the process or outlining that that would be extremely helpful.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Joy. And maybe so - because I think that's kind of putting these organizations on the spot; maybe they have not even thought of that issue. So if I can give that as an action item to the IOC and the RCRC to think about and maybe post something on the list of how they would envision someone approaching their organizations for such a letter. Does that sound like something you all could think about and put on email?

Konstantinos Komaitis: Yes. Joy - sorry, Jeff, this is Konstantinos. As a follow up to that (unintelligible) I wanted to ask something these organizations that they possibly can also consider. My initial reaction to this letter of objection I want to understand whether for example that it would be a (unintelligible).

Say for example that the Olympic Committee says okay go ahead and use the term will that be under a licensing fee? Because that would be, I mean, that - my initial reaction I know that the Olympic Committee in particular (unintelligible) license the names for the Olympic Games to various companies. Will that be part of this whole thing if also they could answer that that would be fantastic. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, I think you're bringing up a good point as far as what would the terms and conditions would be for the granting of a letter of non objection. But I'm not sure we as an organization can get in the middle of that. If the two organizations are not able to agree on how to get that letter of non objection then I think the default would be to go to Part B which is, you know, if you can't get that letter of non objection then you have to show 1 and 2 or however we come out on that discussion.

But I think for us to get in the middle of that is almost us getting in the way of market forces or the things that are way beyond the scope of what we should be dealing with. I'm not saying they're not important but I'm just not sure how

we could as a policy organization address those very - probably very complicated issues.

Stephane Hankins: Can I just chip in please?

Konstantinos Komaitis: Sorry, Jeff, can I reply very quickly? This is Konstantinos. I am not asking to interfere as to that whether a fee should be imposed or not. I'm just asking what are their thoughts because I think that this is very important - a very important detail that the GNSO should also consider when they're considering these policy recommendations.

So what I'm asking is not to come up with a plan and we tell them whether this plan works or not but what I'm asking is a clarification as to whether there is a plan and if this plan includes, you know, a licensing fee. And that would (unintelligible). Thanks.

Stephane Hankins: Can I chip in, please?

Jeff Neuman: Yes please and then Steve brings up a good point. This call is scheduled for two hours but I'm not sure how many people have to leave after an hour and a half. So let me go to Christophe and then let me just see how much time people have on this call.

Christophe Lanord: Okay thanks. From Red Cross Red Crescent perspective it's very clear that we would not ever allow anyone to use the name under a kind of license, etcetera. The rules on the use of the name, an emblem of the Red Cross Red Crescent have been actually defined by states, are very strict on whether even no possibility to think that we could do that.

So in practice I don't see exactly of the letter of non objection could be given but in any case not in financial terms that's for sure.

Stephane Hankins: Can I chip in? This is Stephane Hankins. I just want to add to what Christophe has said. If I may? Yes I would say we were discussing this before the call with Christophe and Debbie exactly what, you know, the letter of non objection would mean.

It's not entirely, you know, a proposal from our side. This is something that has come up in discussions and what was in the proposal that was tabled to us. I think what is important from our perspective is that the Red Cross Red Crescent be able to part of the process if, you know, an applicant whose application has been turned down wants to make a claim.

So, you know, in the proposal that we have - we sent earlier on this afternoon we actually worked - we worked that into the little B. I'm not sure that, you know, the A, as Christophe has outlined, you know, is necessary for us. You know, I'm not sure we want to insist on the A.

But, you know, because it's - we feel it is important that, you know, the Red Cross Red Crescent because of its, you know, its - because of international law and its one entitlement to use and to use the emblems and its particular role also in support of states to monitor misuse, you know, that we be worked into the mechanism of little B as we have proposed I think would be sufficient for us.

Which is, you know, if the, you know, if the applicant makes the claim and, you know, that he has a legitimate interest, that, you know, he can explain why he believes that the new TLD is not similar and not liable to confusion and so on and so forth.

You know, if there is, as you have suggested, you know, this extended examination procedure then, you know, what we would - I think what we would (unintelligible) is that, you know, potentially at least with regard to the Red Cross Red Crescent, I'm not sure what our colleagues in the International Olympic Committee would think, you know, that we be able to

take part in the extended evaluation or to be consulted in the extended evaluation.

I think that would, you know, little A is maybe not so useful. But we would work in, if you like, the role of the Red Cross Red Crescent in the little B. I think that's a little bit how we were thinking. I don't know if it makes sense; maybe not.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so this is Jeff. I understand what you're saying and I think you bring up a couple issues that were not necessarily contemplated by the language because you always have the objection right after the fact. So if you don't grant the letter of non objection the way the language is written now is that it would be up to the applicant to demonstrate 1 and 2.

And then if they could do that to, you know, without your assistance then it would go - it could go through but you would still have the right to object and so you'd be involved in that sort of manner.

But I want to just take one second and we'll come back to this but I just want to go over - although Konstantinos, is this on this subject because I do want to go over for like five minutes what we're going to do with the GAC hopefully.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Sorry, it was an old hand, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay. So the plan is - or the hope is - and I'm hoping Brian is going to tell me that this is now in the works - is that we are going to have a call with the GAC to discuss our progress. And when I say the GAC I mean representatives of the GAC that are interested in this subject that choose to attend the call. I've been clearly instructed to make it clear.

There's been some experiences with GAC members in the past where they've participated in working groups and people have wrongly attributed their statements or statements from members of the GAC to mean the GAC

thinks this or the GAC says this. And they want to be very clear that they're interested in this subject and they're participating but that doesn't mean that their views or their thoughts have been accepted as any GAC position unless of course they make that statement.

So hopefully we can get that on March 2 I think is the goal. And I don't know, Brian, if you have any update on whether we're able to set that up?

Brian Peck: Staff is still working on it but with that date of March 2 as being the target date.

Jeff Neuman: Right. We were going to do March 1 but then that apparently is a policy workshop day pre - for the Costa Rica meeting. So I have been tasked then with kind of drafting a status report of where we are and that they could look at it so if it's March 1 then I could hopefully get it out by next Monday or - sorry if it's March 2 hopefully I can get it out by the beginning of next week.

And again it's really going to be just summing up the options that we considered but in a little more watered down approach or a little more sensitive approach I should say. And then I will draft that up. I'll send it to the group, see if there's any comments on it and then we'll send that to the GAC as to where we are on these.

And then to just basically go through with them our discussions and where we ended up and seeing if anyone wants to add anything. It's also open to GNSO Council members as well. Any questions on that?

Steve DelBianco: My hand's up Jeff. Steve.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, sorry, Steve, yes please.

Steve DelBianco: And I'm sorry that I have to drop in just a few minutes. I'd only booked this for 90 minutes. But I'm running a couple of other working groups where I have a

similar dilemma of trying to do midterm status reports to particularly sensitive audiences like this.

And I feel that the risks for us are huge that we have focused so much initially on top level protection when the GAC letter from September is only - no not only - almost entirely about second level protection with top level almost a footnote at the end of the Page 2.

And that takes nothing away from the great work that's been done on the Modified Reserve Names and everything thus far. But my fear is that none of that work will be appreciated if it seems as if we have missed the point that this is really about second level registrations not top level applications.

Jeff Neuman: Right so...

Steve DelBianco: And you probably thought this through many times. What I'm saying is probably obvious to everyone on the call. But how can, in the limited time between now and that meeting, how can we show real progress on second level to complement the genuine progress on top level? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So, Steve, I've thought about that question a lot. And I've had some pre-discussions with some members - with Heather and with people that she's designated from the GAC so - on that subject because I definitely saw that coming up. I explained to them the immediate need of why we were focusing at the top level. And you're right, we should be prepared for some of those comments.

I'm not sure there's anything we can do. I will sum up - what I'll try also to do before the call is to sum up the questions that we're going to have to consider for the second level and hopefully a timeframe in which I think we can accomplish this.

But the good news is that we have more time before any contracts are signed so as long as we can show - at least I hope as long as we can show a path of these issues and why it was so important to consider these issues now and first I'm hoping that, you know, we'll take a couple lumps but, you know, I'm hoping in the end they'll see the rationale and understand. So - but I've also tried to prepare a couple of them for that. So...

Steve DelBianco: Thank you very much and I have to drop. But I appreciate that reply.

Jeff Neuman: So thanks, Steve. Joy then Alan then Greg.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Jeff. And I just wanted to echo Steve's point but also to support you, Jeff, in terms of your approach with the GAC. And I think - just to go back to a procedural point you mentioned that those - that you might be giving the status up to on the GAC where it (points) to be clear that they're not representing the views of the GAC as a whole.

And I would just reiterate that of course the same is true for the work that we've been doing within this working group under your stewardship. We are simply having an informal status update but we're not, you know, binding in any way or representing the views of the GNSO Council which has yet to formally receive, you know, any outcomes from this process that we might be engaged with the GAC on formally as a council.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And I think that's a good point. I'm hoping - and you guys let me know if I can make this statement - I'm hoping I could say that these - the status of what's been going on and questions that have come up have been shared with our respective communities so it's not like they're going to be - they won't be caught off guard.

I totally agree with you that the positions we come out with may not be the positions that each of the groups take but at least they've being kept

informed. So would it be an accurate statement for me to say that our groups are being kept informed about these?

Or let me throw it out the other way: Would it - does anyone think it would not be accurate to state that we've been informing our groups of the progress and status so as to make it - to hopefully make it clear that we do need to come to a decision point in Costa Rica on the top level?

Joy Liddicoat: It's Joy. Just responding, Jeff, I mean, I think absolutely I think you should indicate certainly there have been actively discussions - active discussion amongst our constituency in the NCUC and NSG not simply updates. And there is, you know, a considerable degree of constituency interest and engagement on this issue. And I think that would be a - worthwhile to pass back.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. Let me go to Alan and then Greg.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, on both those points I think both those points are important. And I think you need to cover them in the preamble to whatever document you give and not just in talking. So in other words to lay out why it is we're doing the first level domain - the top level - as a priority right now I think is something you need to put in the preamble.

Regarding the - Joy's point and your last formulation I think all you can do is say you're understanding is that the people who are working in the drafting team or whatever it's called, you know, have been actively discussing it with their respective communities.

I know in my case I've been discussing with a number of people. In general ALAC people are vehemently against us doing anything. You know, the position I'm taking is if something is going to get done better that we do something rationally than the Board does something randomly. And I think that's the alternative right now.

So - but I think all you can say is your understanding is since you haven't taken (unintelligible) survey of the design team to get in writing that everyone has been talking to everyone.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And I think that's important, Alan. The other thing I would ask is I - and if it hasn't been done yet I would hope that the policy staff, Brian and Margie and Nathalie and others are sharing this at least our progress with the ICANN staff so that, you know, if this does get approved in Costa Rica it's something they can act very quickly on so that they can get it in this first round.

Brian Peck: Yes, Jeff, we've made the internal aware of your objective and goal with this so...

Jeff Neuman: Great. I knew you had that's why I stated it.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Jeff, it's Alan. One further thing on that the last thing we want is to be told afterwards that what we're suggesting is not implementable so we're hoping the staff is doing sanity checks as we go along.

Jeff Neuman: Yes that would be a shame. All right let me go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: I would just echo what Alan and Joy said that this has been the subject of active discussion and engagement by the IPC.

Jeff Neuman: Great.

Greg Shatan: And I also would suggest that, you know, in terms of talking about a roadmap or pathway to an answer at the second level, you know, we should consider how the first level suggestion might map down to the second level. And whether...

Jeff Neuman: Yes and I think that's...

Greg Shatan: ...I'm not sure that it does because there's no string panel at the second level and there's all sorts of different things to perhaps model on in the second level.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And I think some of the questions with respect to foreign translation - which is actually something I do want to touch on for a minute because that might relate as well.

So can I jump then to the foreign - I know we still have some elements on Part B that we need to discuss. And so what I'd like to do is if we have time we'll come back to it; if not we'll just address it on email.

But I'd like to just touch briefly on the foreign translation issue. So on the last call we had a discussion that, you know, although the ideal was to protect these strings in the languages that are used on the Internet we all realize that practically speaking the string similarity panel needed to work off of a list.

And if that list couldn't be - if you couldn't do a list or you couldn't include the languages that you thought of then it would be impossible to ask a string similarity panel to consider those names that weren't on the list.

So the thought last week was - or two weeks ago - was that the Olympic Committee and the Red Cross would get together and try to come up with a list of those languages and of course the respective marks in those languages and submit that to the - well to the group.

Since then we got a note from Debbie and the Red Cross Red Crescent that they would prefer to just stick with the language as-is. And I think again I'm not sure if the Olympic Committee feels the same way. I'm a little disappointed that we couldn't come up with a list by this point.

But I do think that even though the concept is that we want to protect it at all the levels what I've discussed with certain people and thrown this back and forth is that even if we don't come up with every single name - first of all I'm pretty confident that we could come up with the most likely strings that people would apply for.

And if for whatever reason we completely miss it, like there's some language that's used on the Internet that we just missed, there is always the objection process, the legal rights objection.

And to make it clear in the legal rights objection to the extent we miss something there would still be a ground to object based on the fact that it's a foreign translation of a Modified Reserve Name.

And I think - again it's not to take anything away from the position of the Red Cross and it's not meant in any kind of way to diminish those rights but when it comes to working with people that actually have to deal with lists from a practical standpoint we kind of need that middle ground there.

So - but let me throw it out because I see Kiran and Christophe and Konstantinos. I'm not sure if Greg is left over. Greg, are you left over or do you want to...

Greg Shatan: Well I guess I'm just curious well while the list may not be completely exhaustive it would seem that, you know, given that they know the names of their constituent organizations in nearly every country that it should be possible to come up with a nearly exhaustive list with the understanding that there's no penalty for missing the 127th language that could have been on the list.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So let me then throw it off to Kiran and then Christophe.

Jim Bikoff: Actually I'll answer that, Jeff. What - we have a list of about 90 languages. And I think we were hoping to try to work out a joint list with the Red Cross. But I think we've got most of the languages - we have all the languages that are used on the Internet now we believe as well as other major languages that probably will be used.

And I guess the question is do you need translations of each of those languages for the words that are in question or do you need just the language listing?

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry so you mean like the word itself in the script and then...

Jim Bikoff: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: ...what it means in English or - is that what you're...

Jim Bikoff: Well let's take - you need for instance the word Olympic in Afrikans.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Jim Bikoff: And in Albanian. Or do you need just the list of the languages?

Jeff Neuman: I think to help ICANN staff and to make sure it's easily implementable if we could get the list of both I think that would be a big help. And certainly, again, the application window is closing so the more help you can provide ICANN staff the better it would be at least in my opinion.

Greg Shatan: It would seem to me if we're putting an algorithm into a computer to compare strings you've got to have the actual strings you can't just say Olympics in Albanian.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Jim Bikoff: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: It's a computer process and computers are stupid; they can't translate it for you.

Jeff Neuman: Now that's not very nice to call your computer stupid.

Greg Shatan: I'm sorry, I've got a PC what can I say?

Jim Bikoff: Well the hope is...

Greg Shatan: All due apologies to the PC world.

Jim Bikoff: ...that we could maybe talk to Debbie and her folks about coming up with a joint listing and then give the translations. We don't have these yet except for a handful of countries. But I think it's doable.

Jeff Neuman: Great thanks. And then Christophe.

Christophe Lanord: Yes, we're definitely on the same line as we defined two weeks ago, i.e. that the prohibition asked to be in all languages because it matches the legal situation. We cannot say that would apply in one given country about their language could be used as a name.

We (unintelligible) any consequences however prohibition does apply to all languages but still for practical purposes we fully understand that we need to give a list of not only languages, as you have mentioned, but the translation of Red Cross Red Crescent, etcetera, in all those languages.

We are working on that. It's not that easy to do because you need to identify the languages, you need to check the names, you need to make sure that

you have the right version either in Latin characters or in non-Latin characters. So believe me that's really a big task. But we are working on it. We will submit something at one point, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Great. I appreciate that. And the reason that list is important then is if you go back to the language we have in let's say B for Option 7 the language that you all added was that there would be a string similarity review to determine whether they are similar to those defined in - or I should say similar to the Modified Reserve Names.

You all have added or any translations thereof. But I guess my point would be if you've done the translations on that list they're going to be a Modified Reserve Name so you won't need that translation language.

Jim Bikoff: Right.

Jeff Neuman: Does that make sense?

Jim Bikoff: Yes.

Christophe Lanord: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. So to the extent we can get that list I think we're actually getting very close on Question 7. I think it also comes up somewhere else. But yes so to the extent we can do that that would be great.

And the extent I could report that to - and I guess the question is could we get that list in by the Costa Rica meeting in March?

Christophe Lanord: Oh yes.

Jim Bikoff: I think so, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay I'll ask a tougher question. Is it possible to have the list by the meeting with the GAC on March 2?

Christophe Lanord: I'm not sure.

Jim Bikoff: Yes, I think it's a question of how fast we can get the translations. It may be not until Costa Rica.

Jeff Neuman: Okay but I could at least report...

Jim Bikoff: We'll get at least some of them to you.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: ...would like to bring to Costa Rica is, you know, generic principle with reference I think to all the official languages either spoken in, you know, the 196 states, you know, in existence. And then, you know, have an as complete indicative list as we can of the denominations in the various languages.

But we will - we have taken the contacts with the national Red Cross Red Crescent Society so we should be able to provide something quite exhaustive.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think - I think in - for Costa Rica I - we do need to have the exhaustive list because again that is going to be used by the panel to look at string similarity and everything else. So they need that exhaustive list.

Remember the application period is ending and if someone is thinking of applying for one of those strings they're going to need to see that list. Right? It would be unfair to have someone apply, submit the \$186,000 to apply but

then not receive that exhaustive list until after the application window closes after they've paid their money.

Christophe Lanord: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So I understand but I think for transparency and fairness purposes we would need that full list. So let's...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: ...yes it's an ambition that we will set for sure.

Jeff Neuman: Okay well I have confidence in you all and I think you all can do it. I certainly - I know Jim for a long time now so I know he's got the ability to do it for the IOC. No pressure, Jim.

Jim Bikoff: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay let me go to Konstantinos and then Alan.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Thank you, Jeff. I have to admit I'm quite baffled with all this discussion. I mean, we're talking about 196 languages which is way beyond the number of what the Applicant Guidebook is saying. Is that it's not - I mean, the reserve names are not even protected in so many languages.

It is obvious from the discussion for the past 15 minutes that not all languages can be foreseen. And I don't understand the justification of producing the list in so many languages especially when there is this - the objection mechanism in place. And these entities can easily go and object when there is a registration in one of these languages.

I mean, right now we're expanding way too much the work that this group is supposed to focus on to begin with. And secondly even the policy within the

Applicant Guidebook because we're creating this special provision for those two names that goes beyond what has already been foreseen by the GNSO, the main Council group, about the reserve names.

So I personally think that we need to focus on the languages that are within the Guidebook that I think also reflect the languages of the UN - the official language of the UN. And if an Albanian goes and registers dotOlympic then I'm sure the objection mechanism is there and the International Olympic Committee can object. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: So thanks, Konstantinos. Let me give one question to Brian first and then I'll go to Alan and then I'll interject a thought. Brian, were you able to - in the Guidebook right now it does talk about some of the reserve names being protected in multiple languages.

Brian Peck: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Were you able to find...

((Crosstalk))

Brian Peck: Yes specifically for test and example. And yes, I mean, the result I got from - or the answer I got from the general counsel's office and the TLD team is that there is no specific list of languages at this time.

Jeff Neuman: So is there going to be a list?

Brian Peck: To be determined - to be determined I should say.

Konstantinos Komaitis: Sorry, this is Konstantinos. Don't you think then that we should wait until there is a list for this original reserve names before we start building up lists in however languages for all other names?

Jeff Neuman: Actually I would - so Konstantinos, this is Jeff. I would say the opposite. I think it's incumbent upon ICANN staff to make sure that they get those languages to the community before anyone actually pays the \$185,000 to apply if they will only then be rejected and lose at least 30% of their money going in.

So I would not tell us to wait but I would actually say to ICANN staff they've got to get on the ball and get this done because that's just - that would be inexcusable for someone applying not to have ample notice of what's on that list.

But let me go to a point that I wanted to also bring up because Konstantinos had said something that this is out of scope of this group. And I do want to remind everyone of the proposal - again I'm not expressing an opinion one way or the other - but the proposal from the GAC that this group was to consider does have the language in there that is similar to what the Red Cross Red Crescent had submitted in their proposal which is any translations in any language or script used on the Internet.

So it's not beyond the scope of this group to look at it. You may not agree with it but the GAC proposal did mention that. So I just want to point that out and then go over to Alan and then Kiran or Jim and Christophe. So Alan. Alan, are you still there?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, sorry...

Jeff Neuman: That's okay.

Alan Greenberg: I thought I was off mute but I still had mute on my own phone. You just raised part of what I was going to say in terms of the original GAC request. I have a question and then maybe a comment. I thought that when people formally say - push the button saying I am applying they have to deliver the \$185,000 not on the last day of application. Is that not correct?

Jeff Neuman: It is correct that they do - that they will submit it not on the first day that they're applying but any time before April 12 so they've got to pay...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Right but at some point - at some point they will commit and they may have done that already.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I am hoping - and I agree with that - this is Jeff. I would hope that if they added something last minute like that they would refund any amount that was paid totally. If they add a foreign translation there has to be something...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay that was exactly the point since regardless - it sounds like from what was said it's already the case with example and it may be the case with us that the Bulgarian translation of Red Cross may map to, you know, a trademark someone has and is applying for a TLD.

So I'm presuming - and I think we need to say that if anything is added after the beginning of the application period if a string similarity is deemed to be existing that there be 100% refund at that point not just the 70% or whatever.

I mean, if we're changing the rules after the beginning of the process we have to make sure that we're not causing harm by doing that. I'm presuming ICANN will make that decision themselves but maybe we need to say it also.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Kiran or Jim?

Jim Bikoff: Yes, I think, Jeff, one of the points here is that if the word is prohibited and somebody applies for it in another language like - I don't know, Georgian, which is a language on the Internet, that the possibility here is, I mean, the reason to do this is to avoid a lot of legal objections later on tying up these applications.

Because if the word is prohibited it should be prohibited in all languages that are used on the Internet. So I think the principle should be all languages used on the Internet. And whether we can get all languages that are used on the Internet as eventually they will be I don't know. But we will certainly be able to come up with a fairly big list.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Jim. And Christophe.

Christophe Lanord: Yes thanks. Exactly there's no reason to exclude the user of a language which is not a UN language and you are taking the example of Georgian but we may take even languages that are used by many countries such as Portuguese for instance.

So in practical terms we know that it won't be 6000 languages because the number of languages that exist on Earth. My bet is that we will end up with something like 80-100 languages probably which are the real importance.

If someone is trying to register the name Red Cross in a language which is spoken by let's say 100 people the practical value is very low. What we are facing these days is people trying to use the name Red Cross or Red Crescent in frequently used language on the Internet and that's the real heart of the issue. Still if this is a law then it's a breach of law; it's a breach of international law, it's also a breach of US law in a way.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Christophe. I - you are correct that even if it gets through this process in some sort of way there certainly are other remedies or legalities

that would have to dealt with. And if to the extent we can deal with them before they get to that level, you know, it's one of the goals of this whole process.

And, you know, particularly Red Cross where incidents can happen in any country and do that are not necessarily in the five UN or the UN languages I think is one of the intents that was made clear in the GAC letter in the original request.

So and Konstantinos, from my perspective - again this is my personal perspective - to the extent that someone who's applying could know up front this list rather than wait for an objection process afterwards it would save them a lot of time, money and heartache. So from the selfish position of an applicant I'd want to know that list up front; I'd rather deal with a list than a concept.

So Joy.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks, Jeff. I just want to try and bring us back to the scope of our work which is not to deal with the use of the terms Olympic and Red Cross Red Crescent on the Internet but simply to deal with the strings that are designated in the top level domain and as we may get to discuss how those issues are dealt with at the second level for these specific terms.

So - and I think it's not helpful for the constituency that we're dealing with to get into wide ranging discussions about wider - about wider issues however strongly and passionately one might feel about them. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Joy. Any other comments on the foreign translation issue? So just to sum it up I guess the action item is for the IOC and the RCRC to come up with this list that we were talking about - the list that contains the language - the name of the language and the actual string itself.

And certainly to what extent you can do some of it by the meeting with the GAC that would help. To the extent, you know, obviously we have to set a deadline on that list by the Costa Rica meeting so that we can approve it and then send it to the Board if that's what we do at that meeting in enough time to actually implement it for this first round.

Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, it would be useful prior to the meeting with the GAC on the assumptions that they may distribute whatever we give then to the whole GAC that the list of languages be available by that meeting if not the translations because that way they can look at it and say ah-ha you're missing a language that's important.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. I think that's a helpful suggestion. Jim and Christophe and Stephane, does that sound like - even if you can't get the actual string will you be able to have the list of languages?

Jim Bikoff: Yes I think that's reasonable and I think we can get that by the 2nd.

Christophe Lanord: Yes from Red Cross Red Crescent perspective. I've contacted some colleagues from West Africa in the last couple of days and some of them tell me well in all language the words - the expression Red Cross does not exist; we use the French or the English version. So you also have some countries where it won't be relevant to have a translation.

Some of our colleagues told me in (unintelligible) context Red Crescent is never used so we don't know how to say that. So it may not be that you have an exact list but we can give a try, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay appreciate that. Okay any other questions or comments? All right so...

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. Just on that point is the point of this to translate Red Cross and Red Crescent and the Olympic terms into every language or only into the languages that are kind of functionally used for such things? In other words if the language of a given country or region is Woloff but in Woloff they call it the Red Cross or Croissant-Rouge or, you know, Croix-Rouge, then is it relevant to translate those words into Woloff for the purposes of this exercise?

Christophe Lanord: Yes, that's exactly I believe the point I was trying to make which is that in Woloff it may not be relevant to get the translation. Why I see that we have a translation in Albanian yes it is relevant because in Albania on the - in that region the words are used in Albanian.

Greg Shatan: Right which is...

((Crosstalk))

Christophe Lanord: ...language by language.

Jim Bikoff: Yes.

Greg Shatan: Yes, but I think it should be focused on the functional languages and not on technical translations into...

Christophe Lanord: Exactly.

Greg Shatan: All known languages.

Jim Bikoff: Right.

Greg Shatan: So I think it makes a smaller list and I think, you know, goes at least partially to Joy's concern that we're kind of, you know, going beyond, you know, protecting these terms for their value.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'm not near my computer. But the intent is not to invent words in languages that don't already exist but to protect the terms that are use and are there so...

Greg Shatan: That's correct. That's what I'm - I think we're all saying the same thing or hopefully now saying similar things at least.

Jeff Neuman: It sounds like we have violent agreement. No actually not even violent; we have agreement.

Stephane Hankins: Could I just chip in one question which is the script issue? How does that work on the Internet? We would - the machine that will do the string similarity review would obviously be capable of reading script that - the different scripts in which the said languages are being spelled out or written. Is that the case? I assume the string similarity review will have that mechanism.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: To read Arabic, to read, you know, I know how complicated this is to Chinese or to Cantonese. But how does that work? Is that something that we need to consider as well?

Jeff Neuman: Let me - Alan, do you have an answer to this or should we...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the - it looks at the typical fonts in those languages because remember this is a visual similarity. You can have visual similarity with no intent on meaning. Jeff gave the example of string similarity in IDNs for country codes. And the letters that Bulgaria wanted in Bulgarian happened to look a lot like a BR which is the same as Brazil. And they weren't allowed to use that.

And there was no intent to impersonate Brazil but the belief was that there might be some similarity. So, yes, essentially the strings will be compared in

the scripts that they would be used for that language and then visually compared to other things.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you very much. This is a question that, you know, we were wondering a little bit, you know, how to work that into the paradigm. But I suppose we would provide anyway the strings in their original form - scripts.

Alan Greenberg: Well it's one of the reasons you need to give the language so people can figure out how to put them into a computer readable form.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Okay guys any other - oh sorry, I got Greg's comment and Kiran or Jim.

Jim Bikoff: Yes, I was going to say to Stephane or Christophe it might be helpful if we talked offline to try to have a joint list of languages so we wouldn't have to submit two different listing.

I mean, we would obviously take care of ours and you'd take care of yours but if we could have at least a joint list it might be helpful and then we wouldn't have to - we would save some time I think.

Christophe Lanord: Okay.

Stephane Hankins: Yes why not.

Jim Bikoff: So maybe what we'll do is contact you offline after this conversation tomorrow.

Stephane Hankins: Good.

Jim Bikoff: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay everyone is there any other - so right now as it stands we are set to meet - let me look at the calendar here - so two weeks from today would be March 7.

Brian Peck: March - yes.

Jeff Neuman: I'd still like to keep that just to kind of finalize and go through what we're going to be talking about in Costa Rica. I don't know if people will have left by then. But to the extent we can keep that 7th date or maybe move it earlier into the week.

So what I'll do is maybe, Brian and Nathalie, if we could send out a list to see who cannot make it on the 7th and if there's a substantial amount of people maybe try to do a Doodle for the 5th or 6th. I still think it's a good idea to have a call after the GAC call to kind of sum it up and help prepare us for the Costa Rica meeting.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So right now...

((Crosstalk))

Brian Peck: I was going to say, Nathalie? Nathalie? Okay I'll - Jeff, I'll work with - work around that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so the plan is as a default let's go with the 7th but let's send out a note to just double check and see who cannot be there on the 7th. And if it's a substantial amount of people then we'll see if the 5th or the 6th.

Alan, did you have another comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the presumption...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I'm hearing interference.

Jeff Neuman: I'm hearing that too; I'm not sure...

Alan Greenberg: Okay I'll try to speak over it. The presumption - since we haven't - didn't actually finish all the points in Option 7 the presumption is we will have closure on the list otherwise we really need a meeting next week.

Jeff Neuman: That is the presumption. But I - yes so let's - I want to - there's been a lot of comments that have come in even during this call so I want to kind of try to assimilate the comments that we've received and see if I can come out with, you know, a list of where we still have points outstanding.

And then there's still the question of whether we present one option or present all of the options to the Council. And there are pros and cons going back and forth. I have not read all the emails on these yet but that subject needs to be discussed as well.

Alan Greenberg: You're sounding more and more like we might need a meeting next week.

Jeff Neuman: Let's play it by ear. All right everyone any other questions? Thank everyone for staying on for longer than two hours; I really appreciate it.

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: Thanks.

END