

**ICANN
Transcription
IGO-INGO Protections in all gTLDs PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names
Thursday, 02 August 2018 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: 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/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-protections-gtlds-pdp-wg-red-cross-02aug18-en.mp3>

AC recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p21qawp4tze/>

Attendance is on wiki agenda page: <https://community.icann.org/x/N4hHBQ>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the Reconvened IGO INGO PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names call held on Thursday, the 2nd of August, 2018 at 1400 UTC.

In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you are on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now? We do have Thomas Rickert...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: I'm on the audio bridge only.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. Thomas Rickert, Stephane Hankins and it looks like David Maher has just joined the audio bridge as well. I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this I will turn it over to Thomas Rickert. You may begin.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much and good morning, good afternoon and good evening from me. It's Thomas Rickert. And we've already done the roll call. Let me hear whether there any requests for changes to the agenda? There don't seem to be any. Any updates to statements of interest? Okay, so I should take note that I have updated my SOI slightly a couple weeks back so you might want to check them out in case you're interested in that.

That allows us to move to the first agenda item and that's the review of the public comments. There's only the two – three public comments in total. And I've agreed with (unintelligible) in preparation for this call that he would show us through the comments and actions that might need to be taken on the basis thereof. And I should also use this opportunity to let you know that I am (unintelligible) on the audio bridge only; I don't have a computer here and not in the Adobe Connect because I'm on vacation and I have to work with my phone only, so that's – might limit my ability to manage queues. But if staff will help with that?

So I would suggest that we start with this agenda today – this call. And as you know, there's likely the last call of this group so hopefully we're going to make this successful and can adjourn after having agreed on the motion that can be submitted to the GNSO Council by Heather at the end of this call. So without any further ado, let me turn it over to you, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. Berry Cobb for the record. As Thomas mentioned, we're first going to go through the public comment review tool. He also mentioned there were three groups that did submit comments, the ALAC, the NCSG and then there was a joint comment submitted by the Contracted Party House from the Registries and the Registrars.

What we're going to do is basically run through each of these comments real quickly. For those comments where there was agreement with or support for

the proposed recommendations, I've kind of taken the liberty of doing a preliminary comment thanking them so you'll see the redlines.

Note that I am sharing my screen for this meeting within the pod where you can see my screen being shared. There is a toggle switch in the top right hand corner that can allow you to maximize what is being shared on your screen so hopefully you can read it a little bit better. And should you need to place a chat or raise your hand you can toggle back out of that screen expansion and do those activities as required.

So the public comment review tool is broken up into a few different sections, the first is general comments. And I'll start with the ALAC, which was submitted by Alan Greenberg. Essentially the ALAC has taken the position that as a humanitarian organization and one that's been regularly the target of those seeking to fraudulently attract donations, the Red Cross should be afforded the courtesy of having its various identifiers protected at the second level in gTLD domain names.

And the third column to the right I had put the tag as agreement. The working group response will be kind of a standard canned response unless you think this should be expanded on essentially just noting that the working group thanks the ALAC for their comment of support, no action is taken and then marking this particular one as completed.

If there are any issues with this approach just let me know and raise your hand and I'm happy to stop at any point. The second comment in the general comments section was submitted by the NCSG. Back in 2013 the NCSG position was that special protections should only be provided to those groups that are legitimately entitled to have a preference over other users of domain names and are not able to protect their interests through existing measures because they lack legal protections. At the time the NCSG submitted its response it believed that no specific harm had been demonstrated to a group

that is unique to that group and therefore no special protections should be provided.

Essentially they're stating that their position remains the same in 2018, that they should be given only under exceptional circumstances. Reserving names can be detrimental to the freedom of speech and the freedom to register names legally. Having said that, we acknowledge that this issue was responded because of GAC Advice which the ICANN Board gave weight to.

Over in column 3 I did not put together a response yet. And I would seek input from this group about how this working group should respond back to this. And I'll just note that as mentioned in their comment, their position is consistent with the original recommendations from the first IGO INGO Working Group. Chuck, I see your hand is raised. Please go ahead, sir.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Berry. I admit I was disappointed in the NCSG response, not because I disagree with their general principle, and it might be good if we acknowledge that we respect the principle of freedom of speech and the other things that they say in their response.

But the reason I'm disappointed, first of all, as you may have picked up if you looked at the email list yesterday, is that they really had nobody who was active in the Reconvened Working Group. There was one member from the – one participant from the NPOC but I don't recall seeing any input from that person and I didn't get a response when I asked that person, Poncelet, whether or not they were representing the NCSG.

Forgive me going on a little bit long on this one, but and Heather, I know that the Council is working on the PDP improvement procedures. But to me this is an illustration of why the PDP process doesn't work better than it does, especially stakeholder groups who in the end are going to have to participate in a vote on the Council do not actively have a representative in the PDP process, it really makes things difficult.

I recognize that the NCSG is just keeping its same position that it had, and they certainly have a right to do that. But not giving the working group – the Reconvened Working Group in particular an opportunity to debate with them during the PDP process is really unfortunate. They may not have changed their position, but we could have at least done probably what we're going to do now when we consider their comments, and debated and discussed the pros and cons of their fixed position.

And that would have been so much better than at the end, after the working group has reached consensus with no objections, having to deal with this. It's just really unfortunate and hopefully in the improvement procedures that are being considered the Council will consider ways to maybe mitigate this going forward and get commitments from working groups to – or excuse me, stakeholder groups to handle it differently.

Now that said, having gone through all of their comments, and again I respect their – the principle that they're upholding, but the reality of the matter is, one of the groups in the community had objections to what was – and that's the GAC – had objections to this and efforts were made to deal with those objections. And to be concerned about this finite list of very specific names, with some variations, just doesn't make sense to me.

Who's freedom of speech is really limited if one of these long names is reserved? And I mean, let's be real, if somebody wants to use one of these names and they're not associated with the particular organization, that's going to create confusion. And one of the principles, certainly with new gTLDs that we had is that, you know, we should minimize confusion. This is not really a limitation. From a mathematical point of view, these 191 names is miniscule amount of the potential names that are available in the whole universe of possibilities.

So it just seems like, you know, fighting for a principle without any real practical benefit to me. So now I definitely think we should respond, I think we should respond and mention the process and the lack of participation. I think we should respect – show respect for the principle that they're supporting but the practical implementation, the actual implementation of this really you know, in all honesty doesn't really limit much freedom of speech or anything else since we have a finite list.

And I think the Council in their guidance to this Reconvened Working Group tried to deal with that by asking for a finite list and the other things that were done. So that said, sorry for talking so much, but I feel very strongly that we ought to respond and acknowledge their input, respect the principle, but not make any changes as a result of their input. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Chuck. I'll also note for the record...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Chuck, this is Thomas. Is there anyone else in the queue?

Berry Cobb: Yes, Thomas, I'll drive from here if you don't mind? So I'll just note for the record the Heather Forrest had placed into that she agrees with Chuck and it's not an optimal outcome for the PDP or the vote in the Council and also acknowledges that Chuck's comments will find their way into the PDP 3.0.

Next I have in the queue is Greg Shatan. Please go ahead, sir.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg Shatan for the record. I agree with Chuck. I also agree with the principle advanced by the NCSG. However, principles are not – should not be considered as absolutes or knee-jerk reactions or frankly unconsidered and unsupported absolute positions. As Chuck notes, there's really no – once you scratch the surface there's really no argument that there's any legitimate

freedom of speech that is being gored by restricting the use of these very particular strings.

And I think, you know, the reason that we're here now and not three or four years ago is because of the level of care that we wanted to take in the group with regard to restrictions, which I still view as strongly disfavored but not impossible to use properly.

And I think that in this particular instance our result is a proper use of restrictions where there is both a legitimate claim and a unique claim to the string and where the harm which tends to come from these types of uses, which often involves fraud and scams and misdirecting of donations and the like is not that easily controlled through, you know, say just a domain name process, you know, a UDRP or some other process without – so that there really is really no – there really are I think as a reasonable analysis of whether an exception should be made to the general principle of avoiding preemptive restrictions, come out with the result that this is the case, one of the relatively few cases where that should take place.

And I think if someone from the NCSG had been involved perhaps they would have come to that conclusion along with the rest of us or they, perhaps more unlikely, would have persuaded us that this is not the place to make an exception. But I don't see any reasoning for that. I can't think of it as a devil's advocate and certainly since they weren't there and they still don't have anything in their comment, they shouldn't be there.

So I think that, you know, in addition to lack of participation, I think that – which Berry notes and I think which should be noted, I think our response also should indicate that in substance, we recognize the general rule or the general – that we are sympathetic with the general concept they advance, but also but in this particular instance after long and reasoned discussions, came to a careful conclusion that we had a very appropriate place where an exception should be made.

And we could note finally that this is not intended to start any sort of slippery slope where thousands or tens of thousands of names will now go into reservations for all sorts of general reasons; this was a specific discussion about a specific set, a specific singular set essentially and that's how we got to where we got. And any further analysis along those lines, you know, could well go along those lines as well. But so any concerns about this kind of opening the floodgates I think should be assuaged.

But I think the fact that, you know, just to wrap up, the fact that they didn't participate and then come out with a very knee-jerk non-analytical absolutist result is sad and, you know, indicates I think there are many people with better nature and better analysis in the NCSG, but somehow that pen was not put into place in this particular comment. And we should encourage them to reconsider based on the analysis and views that both their principle and the rules that – decisions that we've can live in harmony and in fact are the best result. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. And I'll also note that I pasted into the chat a draft response. I'd ask members to take a look at that and if the language there is okay I'm happy to keep it in there but I do welcome edits that I can back in here. I suspect the same response will occur or be applied to the rest – I think the other one or two NCSG comments as we go to sections.

And Heather, I'm sorry, Heather dropped her hand stating that she might tinker a bit and she'll drop in edits shortly. Thank you. And Chuck has his hand raised. Please go ahead, sir.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And sorry for talking so much, but I was really – I kind of got the – where they're coming from, keeping their position the same on the principle. But when they objected to provisions for making deletions or changes, that one I didn't get at all. You want to go through another PDP process if there's

a name, a national society name that goes away? Why? That's just a – an editorial action to keep things up to date or there's a slight change in a name.

You know, I thought we were very careful about putting in procedures that didn't open up doors too wide; they just kind of provided a process whereby reasonable adjustments backed up by evidence from the organizations in a very careful way. And it totally baffles me why anyone would oppose that kind of process. So that to me just really shocked me.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Chuck. And we'll...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: ...Berry, can you put me in the queue?

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...about recommendations. Yes, Thomas, hold on. We'll talk about Recommendations 4- 6 when we run through the final report. Please go ahead, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, and I just spoke up earlier because I wanted to check whether the queue was clear because I want to put myself into it. Now, I think that all the points that were made are spot on. I think we should make a procedural point that we would have welcomed the NCSG to be part of the substantive discussion. But we have made our consensus call, we – I think that the comments don't warrant any changes to our recommendations.

And I think that even the fundamental point is out of scope for this Reconvened PDP Working Group because making the fundamental point that no special protection should be granted on that point the train has left the station when the original PDP was conducted because they're now just

talking about the scope of protections but not about the fundamental question whether special protections should be granted to any special group.

And I think that unless Berry has done so, which I can't see at the moment, we should make that point that on the fundamental question the comment is out of scope. And on the specific points that we made, now we took a very measured approach with the finite list and avoid that there is any creep of scope, you know, freedom of expression and other fundamental rights can be jeopardized. So that's just my five cents on it. Thank you very much.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. I don't see any other hands raised. Again, welcome a refined working group response and I believe Heather was working on one while we continue on.

I'll move along onto the next section which is around the finite list of reserve names. The first one is from the joint Registry Registrar Stakeholder Groups. They're supportive of the effort to identify agreed finite list of full names, the Red Cross National Societies as well as the recommendation for exception procedure for the cases where the relevant organization wishes to apply for their protected string.

And they also mention that they're supportive of Recommendations 3-6. I think it was supposed to be 4-6 but provide guidance for future error corrections, additions and deletions to the list. As I noted, we'll talk a little bit about these when we review through the report. What I placed here for the working group response was that the working groups thanks the Registries and Registrar Stakeholder Groups for their comment that support action taken as none and marking this one completed.

Second comment here, again is from the NCSG. Basically they're taking note of Recommendation 1 about the finite list of names to be reserved. It's in the same spirit as their general comment that we just reviewed above. And then they also pointed to Recommendation 2 as being an overreach at second

level protections, essentially the same rationale that they provided in the – in their general comment. I'm – I see in the chat that there is a possible response and I will read that out for the record. Thank you, Heather.

“The Working Group respects the general principle of protecting the freedom of speech and has given this serious consideration in the context of the finite and very limited nature of the list of protected names being names corresponding to the official names of the National Red Cross Societies. This list was compiled by the International Red Cross and carefully reviewed by the working group and relevant supporting experts.”

“The Working Group considers it unfortunate that these comments were not raised during the Working Group’s deliberations and further that they did not take into account the extensive discussions that the Reconvened Working Group has had to specifically ensure the legitimate basis for and finite nature of the list of protected names. On reflection, the Working Group is confident that the free speech considerations whilst not raised during the Reconvened Working Group’s discussions have been adequately taken into account.”

Absent any other suggested changes to that, I will place that in the response for the public comment review tool. And I will also mark this as complete as well. I don't see any hands or additional comments yet. Do – Chuck agrees with Heather’s version and thanking me for reading it into the record.

So moving right along, we’ll move onto the next section which was updates to the Registry Agreement Specification 5. This is also by the Registries and Registrars, marked it as a concern even in light of their support of the overall recommendations. The Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups are of the opinion that modifying Registry Agreements for this purpose is unnecessary and has some doubts about the logistics of such an operation especially considering the possibility of future changes to the list.

Noting the protections of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLD policy,” with a hyperlink to the policy, “is similar and overlaps to some degree with the recommendations in this report. That policy does not rely on modifications to the Registry Agreement but rather references resources on ICANN’s website,” which is pointing a link to the list of reserved names also known as the Specification 5 list. “The Registries Registrars suggest a similar approach be taken here and that updating this reserve names list is an appropriate and practical alternative to modifying all the Registry Agreements.”

Before I turn this – or open this up I’d like to make a couple of points here. First, I thought within the content of the final report that we were mentioning updates to the Specification 5 list which is indirectly modifying a Registry Agreement but it’s only modifying that particular XML list for use by registries to reserve said names. There are no actual edits to the primary part of any of the Registry Agreements.

And I’m also going to point out and sharing just kind of an additional bit of information since it was pointed here, the Registries had noted that the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs policy which became effective as of yesterday, and the original scope was for all the recommendations from the first working group that were consistent with GAC Advice. And I won’t spend any much time on reviewing through the details, but in short this policy does point to that reserve names list.

And just as kind of a sanity check, yesterday I just tried to validate the implementation of this so for example, I looked up a full name of one of the IGOs listed in there to see if it was available for registration. And it wasn’t. And in particular I also reviewed the dotCom Registry Agreement. Some of the original TLDs out there that haven’t been renewed in the recent past are slightly variant or they’re different in how the overall Registry Agreement is structured for the new gTLDs and some prior legacy TLDs that have recently renewed their Registry Agreement have started to conform to this newer style

or newer structure of the Registry Agreement so these older ones don't necessarily point to Specification 5.

But in particular because contracted parties do have to adhere to the consensus policy, it's this pointer here in the consensus policy that all gTLDs would – would use to become compliant with that consensus policy. And so just to make it more specific, what I have shared on my screen now is this XML list which is termed a part of the Specification 5 and there are different sections throughout this list starting with all of the Red Cross names, secondarily with the International Olympic Committee and then thirdly with the IGOs that are listed there.

And we'll come back to this and talk a little bit more about it when we're going through the final report but I just wanted to make that clear.

Lastly I see that Stephane had posted into the chat that, "You will, I assume, be able to revise some wording to Heather's proposed text, ergo the reference to National Red Cross or Red Crescent Societies, etcetera. I may provide subsequently." Stephane, yes, you're welcome to do that. I think there's always confusion in how these formal names should be used and often we probably incorrectly use a shorthand form of the name. But if you could provide those in the chat that will be helpful so that I can turn these documents around as quickly as possible.

So returning back to the Registry Registrar comments, I think in general the response would be, you know, thanking the stakeholder groups for their response, their concern is noted. However, it is – the working group's understanding that it would only be the Specification 5 list that would be updated and no specific updates to actual Registry Agreements or something along those lines. And I welcome some language from the working group to paste in here.

I'll stop there and I see that Chuck has raised his hand. Please go ahead, sir.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I'm going to put David on the spot. I don't know if he can help us or not. David, like me, I think is trying to retire so I don't know how up to speed he is in terms of the contracted party's comment. But I'm curious, David, do you think that this addresses the concerns that the contracted parties had? In other words if it's just regard to the specification or is this something you're not up to speed on?

David Maher: Hi, Chuck. I'm a little reluctant to speak as a – for the entire stakeholder group. I think it is – it conforms to their program. I don't really see any problems. But that's a private view, not an official viewpoint of the group.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Chuck. And thank you, David. Again, when we go to look at the final report, we'll look at that particular section and maybe it just wasn't as clear as it should be within the report. But in the end it will only be the Specification 5 list that is edited. Any other comments or concerns on this comment?

Hearing and seeing none, and again, which I think Chuck had mentioned this earlier when we were reviewing the overall NCSG comment, specifically they were pointing towards Recommendations 3 and 4 through 6, also not agreeing with these particular recommendations. For the sake of time I won't read through the entire comment, but I'll note that I think it's likely assumed at this will be the same response as what we had – or what we're placing in the prior to NCSG comments' responses which I think Stephane is hopefully editing now.

But in short, again, there's no agreement with those recommendations in line with their overall position and principle on protecting the freedom of expression. Any comments or questions in regard to that particular one? Okay, hearing and seeing none, Thomas, with your permission, I'm going to go ahead and switch over to the review of the final report. And whenever I do get the final working group response I'll be sure to post these in. As a point of

order, right after our call or shortly thereafter I'll make any final edits to these documents and then send them out to the list to make sure that staff has captured everything correctly.

Okay now, what you're seeing in the screen before you is the next version of the final report. The changes that have been made up to this point, first and foremost a few weeks ago Stephane had submitted some suggested edits to the report in redline form. Those are still contained and redlined in this particular version. Also staff has converted basically converting this from an initial report to final report so as you'll see in the screen now that's why you'll see "initial" is marked out and "final" is listed.

And what I intend to do is basically start from top to bottom and I won't going to specific redline edits, but I will be stopping where there was a callout comment to the side. And I should also note that one other primary change that was applied across the entire document is anywhere the use of the word "definitive" was struck out and only "finite" has been replaced and used consistently through the document. And that was my error so apologies for that.

So essentially the first two pages, you know, cover letter and table of contents. From Stephane's discussion – or proposed edits that he sent a few weeks ago, he did have the comment that, you know, is it sufficiently clear that this – these consensus recommendations and the consensus policy itself as, does it apply in all gTLDs? And asking, you know, should it be further stated or is it implicit? Basically the response I made is that it is implicit that all these changes do all apply to all generic top level domains and not just the new TLDs.

I see Stephane is typing into the chat. I am hopeful though that this should alleviate any concern that he had here. All right great. And from the chat Stephane says, "That's fine." So I will delete these out. And moving straight along to the next proposed edit, which is still a part of the introduction. And

essentially there's a statement here that refers to the scope of this Reconvened Working Group, which was essentially in regards to the IFRC, ICRC National Societies and did not include any of the other identifiers outside of that specific scope nor did it include the acronyms that are still pending reconciliation with the Board, GAC and GNSO.

So I took the liberty of adding this kind of extension statement essentially stating that, "In prior GNSO policy work they are not converted by the Reconvened Working Group's recommendation and will remain reserved pending further deliberations external to this working group." I'm hopeful that that will sufficiently cover this concern. And if that's not adequate please raise your hand or state a comment.

Hearing and seeing nothing, okay, now we'll move on down into the summary of Recommendation 6. I'm going to go ahead and spend a little bit of time about Recommendation 6, it's really kind of Recommendations 4-6. And then hopefully that will alleviate us needing to go through these in detail when we get to the actual substantive content of this report.

Essentially again, Recommendations 4-6 an the intent of these is to help correct any errors that may be found should this finite list be implemented into the Specification 5 reserve names list. And they were predominantly created based on lessons learned of when staff had temporarily reserved these names back in 2014. Specifically Stephane's question here is in relation to kind of the communication path of how these changes might be invoked and specifically he's asking, "Would such cases also implicate Recommendation 5, i.e. that the changes have to be notified to the GNSO Council and the GAC if Recommendation 5 applies to this situation? I believe we should say so explicitly. And I personally believe that it should apply."

I also added a follow up comment here that, you know, should this recommendation be more explicit in that registry operators detect an error, so again, to put some real world example behind this, when the at the time the

189 National Society names had been reserved it was essentially taken from a Word document that – and given the urgency to get those identifiers reserved, it turns out there was an extra carriage return on one of the National Society names from Russia. And as it turned out, then an error appeared in that I believe the word “Society” by itself became reserved.

That was only uncovered by one of the registry operators from the Russian area and thus the nature of these three recommendations. So I think the general question is should there be changes to any of these Recommendations 4-6 or is it implied that essentially anybody in the community can inform us or inform ICANN Org of a potential error and how does that process play out? And again I should note that these three recommendations are only up until essentially the policy effective date, or maybe sometime after that, that some sort of error is discovered and communicated back to ICANN Org.

And in particular it tries to create a fast track by which this error can be rectified as opposed to what we’re dealing with now where that particular generic phrase is still reserved. So I’ll stop there and open it up to the floor for any comments or questions. And Stephane, you know, for the sake of time if your comment is going to be substantial it’d probably be easier for the record to speak in to the mic instead of typing.

I’m hearing and seeing nothing so I’m going to try a different avenue, specifically Recommendation 6, “The Reconvened Working Group recommends that a proposed correction of any errors, example given in translation or spelling in the finite list of reserved names be made only through the submission of the formal request to ICANN Organization by official and designated representatives of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent describing in detail the nature of the error and the specific correction to be made in the form of direct replacement to the erroneous entry. The ICANN Organization shall have the right to refer the request to the

GAC or otherwise conduct an investigation into the accuracy of the correction sought.”

Whereas Recommendation 5, “The Reconvened Working Group recommends that any and all future changes to the finite list be made only upon notification to ICANN Organization and the confirmation by designated representatives of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. To that effect, A, the proposed changes have been communicated to the GAC as well as the GNSO Council and any new National Society names to be added to the list have been recognized in accordance with the applicable rules and procedures of the Movement. Any proposed deletions from the list would be based on the cessation of operations of the National Society or its removal from the Movement in accordance with all applicable rules and procedures of the Red Cross Movement.”

And the last thing I’ll state here and I’m starting to question whether Recommendation 5 is even necessary. Again, the intent here is a fast path to correct errors. And I should note, I’m sharing my screen, within the policy that became effective just yesterday for the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers, this also does include the Red Cross name.

And within this policy, there is a change procedure loaded in here, which I believe is 4.4 which will also be leveraged should this become implemented by Dennis and the GDD team but 4.4 for Red Cross, IOC and IGO identifier list changes, “Names may be added to or deleted from the Red Cross, IOC, and IGO identifier list upon 10 calendar days notice from ICANN to the registry operator. ICANN will consult with the GAC and the GNSO in relation to the proposed changes to the names on the Red Cross, IOC and IGO identifier list on the reserved names.”

So I think the intent here is that after this finite list is implemented and we've gone to the policy effective date, this 4.4 procedure within the consensus policy is the ongoing procedure for any future adds, changes or deletes to

this particular list noting that the GAC and the GNSO are a part of that process. So I see that Heather has her hand raised. Please go ahead, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Berry, very much. This is Heather Forrest. Berry, I think I agree with you that I'm not – it seems to me that 5 and – Recommendations 5 and 6 overlap. I wonder, given that you, you know, quite rightfully referred us to the ongoing – the extant policy, do we need, Berry, for clarity to be referring to that policy and the applicable section there? Is my first question.

My second question is, to the extent that we're going to remove Recommendation, you know, one of them if we determine it duplicative, 5 and 6, I note that one thing that's missing from 6 that's present in 5 and the provision that you've just read, 3.4 I think it was, is the reference back to the GNSO as well as to the GAC. So I suppose two points for me, Berry, one is do we need to reference that 3.0 of the existing policy? And two, in these recommendations if we're going to delete one or the other I would say we delete 6 and drag anything across to 5 that might be dependent on it. So thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Heather. I'm going to answer your question with more rambling by me. Why – I'm going to move down to the, you know, these are just the summary recommendations from the executive summary and this is where Stephane had originally started. So I think maybe what I'll do I'm going to migrate down quickly to the actual recommendations themselves, the full recommendations. And there was also one other comment as it related to this issue.

And for those that maybe can't see in the Adobe Connect room, I'm on Page 13 which is part of Recommendation 5. So the text of the recommendation is the same as it is up in the executive summary, but there are also recommendation details here. And specifically Paragraph 2 of the recommendation details used to state that, "The Reconvened Working Group

also understands that the GAC is,” I think – I think I used the term “authoritative channel for any proposed changes that are to be made to the reservation list.” Chuck had made a follow up comment about changing it to an important channel, and Heather had supported that as well.

Again, I’m going to try to be – and I’ll come to you, Mary in just a second. The idea of the current consensus policy that went into effect yesterday is that any – and I’m just going to use Red Cross although it does apply to the IOC and to the IGOs, but the intent is let’s say a week from now the 192 Society were to be approved by the Movement.

The formal path to get that added to the Specification 5 list would be Red Cross representatives or Stephane would notify the GAC of the 192 Red Cross Society name and the variant identifiers of its formal and usual name, and the GAC would then therefore inform ICANN Org and in parallel the GNSO, that these changes were going to be made.

Absent objection from the GNSO and ICANN Org and specifically the GDD team, not hearing any objections, they would make that update to the Specification 5 list, they would notify the registry operators and according to the current policy would have 10 days to implement that change to the Specification 5 list.

And so my use of the term “authoritative” was meaning that it’s a formal request coming from the Red Cross representatives through the GAC and then communicated to the GNSO and ICANN Org.

So that’s the permanent policy. And then again just a reminder that Recommendations 4-6 are really only in terms of identifying errors to this finite list up to a certain point when it becomes implemented. So I’ll stop there and I have Mary first and then Greg. Please, Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Berry. And hi, everyone. It's Mary. I think Berry, you explained quite a lot of the background that I was going to go into. I think it is important to understand how implementation of these recommendations will align with how implementation of the consensus policy that just went into effect yesterday was done. And there are mechanics to that as in, you know, the communications procedure does what. So that's one observation.

Secondly, and as Heather's noted in the chat, there is a distinction between Recommendations 5 and 6. And it may not be as clear in the executive summary versus the main body of the text that Berry's pointed to. So from the staff perspective, neither is redundant, they cover a similar type of scenario in that writ large they are about changes, using that word very generally, to the list and how it's done. But they really are about different kinds of changes, whether something is added to or dropped from the list of names and identifiers is one thing; but something that's already on the list that needs a change because it's spelled incorrectly or the characters are jumbled up is a different kind of change. So just an observation is that these two recommendations do cover different types of changes.

Third observation is that I would suggest that if necessary we could add a sentence in the executive summary to point people to the main text to avoid confusion. But I would not advise adding further to the executive summary simply because of the purpose of the summary versus the purpose of what's in the main text.

And finally, with regard to the role of the GAC, whatever word we end up with, and I see the change here from the authoritative word to an important channel, I think what we're trying to get at really, and again this harks back to Berry's explanation of, you know, how the implementation was discussed for the consensus policy, what we're trying to get at here is first of all that this is not an ad hoc process, and that second of all, that communications especially of substantive changes need to come through the GAC.

It cannot be a phone call from, you know, a Red Cross Society, for example, or someone claiming to be a representative of International Olympic Committee. There is a process, the GAC has an important role in the process. And that's what this is trying to get at here.

I did have one last point and sorry that I forgot, but that is as to the error correction. I think it is a good point that it may be something that's spotted by registry operators so to the extent that we haven't specifically included that you may want to add that to the recommendation. Thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mary. Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I also felt uncomfortable with the use of the word "authoritative" because it implies a substantive as well as a procedural appropriateness. I'm not sure that the word that's in there now, which is a strong channel or whatever it is, quite goes there. I was thinking the way you actually described it, Berry, you used a different word which was the "formal channel." And I think that – and I see Mary – great minds think alike or at least minds think alike – that, you know, formal channel or appropriate channel. I think formal probably has the – is best because it kind of has a singularity to it.

Unless the intention of importance, and that was the word, was to imply that there could be other channels, but I think if the idea is at least administratively there needs to be a single channel but not that the GAC has kind of a – has the sole decision as to whether a change is appropriate but that the change process flows through them. So I think formal kind of gets it right. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. And I see Chuck is typing. And in the meantime, this next comment, since we're here, let's go ahead and take care of it. And then I would like to circle back about how do we incorporate maybe, you know, registry operators or some other party identifying an issue.

The intent of this last paragraph of the recommendation details again in general to avoid front-running any potential new Societies being created. And Stephane had made a comment here, you know, that he's conversant in this process by which a National Society is recognized by the ICRC in accordance with Article 4. And essentially there's a date on which this happens. And of the statute – you know, that the statutes are recognized by the ICRC and the Red Crescent Movement.

My point here – or why I had intended when I first drafted this paragraph is somehow before there's any public notification of the creation of a new Society, that is when the, you know, Red Cross representatives, before that date, the Red Cross representatives should invoke this change process, submit the formal and usual names based on our variant criteria to the GAC to allow the implementation to occur before that date is announced.

And my point is is that, you know, ICANN doesn't want to be, or none of the stakeholder groups and constituencies or SOs or ACs want to interject in any process of the IFRC but I think it would be good for the Red Cross in general to front run this notification or advance this notification prior to it becoming public so that there's time to implement those names and protect them before it's publicly announced.

So, you know, Stephane, I don't know if that covers your concern that you had mentioned here or if it's possible for you to communicate internally to your organization that this should be somehow updating the process. It's really kind of meant as an advisory to you and your organization, not so much anything that ICANN Org would implement should this become consensus policy.

And Stephane, please go ahead. You're speaking we can't hear you.
Stephane...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Stephane, your mic appears to be enabled and you are connected. Are you just using Adobe Connect only are you also connected on the audio bridge? If you are connected on the audio...

Andrea Glandon: He's also connected on the audio bridge.

Berry Cobb: So perhaps select star 6 to unmute yourself?

Andrea Glandon: I'll have the operator check the line as well.

Berry Cobb: Thank you.

Andrea Glandon: The operator has confirmed that his line is open. So possibly did you mute your phone, Stephane? Stephane, would you like the operator to dial back out – to dial out to you to see if we can get a better connection? Thank you, Stephane. If you would like to just send me your phone number privately I can have the operator call out to you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Andrea. So while we're waiting for Stephane to get the dial out, any suggestions on how we can update Recommendation 5 and/or 6 to make it clear that other parties besides the Red Cross can make a notification of error change? And, Mary, I might look to you if you have a suggestion.

Mary Wong: Sorry, Berry, can you repeat that? I stepped away for a minute.

Berry Cobb: Apologies. So the – again, I kind of – the way Recommendation 6 is worded is essentially that, you know, official representatives of the Red Cross and Red Crescent would notify the ICANN Organization and it's very explicit there. I'm looking for a suggestion change that can pen that up that as per a real world example, a registry operator can also notify the organization of this potential error.

Mary Wong: Understood. Thank you. I see Chuck is typing and I guess while we're trying to get Stephane on the phone, Chuck, I hope you can hear me.

Berry Cobb: I can hear you just fine, Mary.

Mary Wong: All right so I'll just keep going and hopefully everybody might get fixed. You know, I guess my question back to the group and you, Berry, is are there any other potential channels that we can foresee as being able to spot errors that should be corrected? I acknowledge I think like I said earlier that we probably should have included registry operators, that's why my question back is besides the Red Cross, who should know, because this is their list, and registry operators who have to implement this, are there any other parties?

The intent of Recommendation 6 is, you know, is again so that not anyone can just cry wolf essentially, that there is a process and that ICANN Org can receive those requests from the proper people and channels and act on them. So I think there's two parts to this is who else besides registry operators or is it just the Red Cross and registry operators and secondly, to make sure that whichever and whoever they are that they do go and through ICANN Org.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mary. So, you know, I'm – I would say it's most likely going to be those two parties, either representatives from the Red Cross or registry operators so I've updated Recommendation 6 to basically mention by official representatives of the Red Cross and Red Crescent and/or registry operators describing in detail the nature of the error and the specific correction to be made. Would that be a sufficient change for the group?

If there are no objections...

Thomas Rickert: Berry, it's Thomas. I have a question because if it is...

Berry Cobb: Please go ahead, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: I was sorry I think it's sufficient because even a third party – even a third party that tries to register a name which happens to be reserved, can then go to the registry operator and use that channel. So I think we don't need to open up additional communication channels, which might open this up (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. And welcome back, Chuck. Stephane, have you connected yet?

Stephane Hankins: Can you hear me now?

Berry Cobb: Yes I can, Stephane. Please go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: Okay. Okay great. I'm sorry for that. Okay, I understand that we were discussing this question of, you know, at what point the ICANN staff would be informed of the creation of a new National Society so that steps can be taken for the identifiers of that new National Society to be entered into the system. Is that correct?

Berry Cobb: Yes it is.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, okay...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...on Page 13.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, it's a little bit delicate for us to, you know, we wouldn't be able to, you know, request for the reservation of the names of a new National Society to be entered into the system prior to the formal decision that is taken within the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement for the recognition, which is – it's actually the ICRC senior governance body that does that.

But I mean, I can rework this paragraph, you know, that we would give a – that we – that, you know, the – we could commit to send an advance information that, you know, a new name is upcoming. That would be, you know, the – what we would be able to do. I don't know whether this answers the question. But I don't think we, you know, we would want to communicate with external stakeholders such as the ICANN that a new National Society's name should be protected until the, you know, the actual – the actual recognition has taken place.

So I mean, it would be the Reconvened Working Group's suggests that, you know, the International – it's actually the ICRC, the International Committee of the Red Cross inform ICANN staff or, you know, in advance of, you know, the process of recognition of a National Society so that, you know, steps for the protection of the names may be immediately taken from the time the recognition has been pronounced, or something of the kind.

Berry Cobb: Thanks, Stephane. So what I did was just amend the statement but possibly prior to to, as soon as possible after publication, and I'm going to create a footnote of your comment here that just kind of adds some extras around the process by which a Society is recognized by the IFRC. So thank you for that.

Stephane Hankins: I will send revised text in a minute.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. I think we got it but thank you.

Stephane Hankins: Yes.

Berry Cobb: We only have 12 minutes left, sorry, Heather, this is going longer than I had expected. So I just want to quickly walk through – I'm going to work my way back up the list. According to Recommendation 4, which in essence is describing the variant principles that the working group has outlined here, there is one highlight that we – that it was my mistake but in review of the

finite list and specifically around Societies that wish to use Red Cross or Red Crescent in their official language, the group had agreed to that or there was no objection to the use of that for that particular Society in that country.

I had forgot to delete this second bullet as it pertains to the permitted variances in language. So far there hasn't been any objection to the removal of that so I just wanted to confirm with you that that particular variant principle was being deleted here. I see there are two chats. All right, thank you Heather.

And Stephane, I'm assuming your hand is an old hand?

Stephane Hankins: It's an old hand, yes.

Berry Cobb: The other thing real quick that I wanted to just point out to you is – those are fine. Towards the bottom of the report there's background here. There was clarification comment in the background section as it relates that there are no legitimate uses for these terms. Stephane had wanted to add in the additional language for the identifiers of the Movement components. So I'll get that added in.

But what I wanted to put out to the bottom here is the approach taken by the working group because Chuck had mentioned this as well, that after this call I will update this chart of attendance. Again, this is a short form of those members that had reconfirmed their membership in terms of producing the consensus level for the proposed recommendations. And once I do that I will post the full updated attendance chart back over onto the wiki.

And I'm just quickly running these to make sure we covered the primary aspects of the report. Okay, so this is – I forgot this one. So as part of Recommendation 1, which essentially gets into the finite list, I wanted to make clear, Stephane had asked a question about this. Essentially the term is – I think the originally the interim list of reserve names and relevant DNS

labels would need to be either replaced or reconciled with the finite list of identifiers. And so I want to assure the group here that this has been completed.

So first and foremost, I'm going to refer back and share in the Adobe Connect room the Specification 5 list as it exists today as part of the August 1 consensus policy implementation. And Dennis Chang and his team and the IRT went to great lengths to organize this in a more structured way. Again, the scope of this working group is only those Scope 2 names that were originally identified by the original working group and specifically apply to the ICRC and IFRC and their National Society names.

And so this fourth table here, and Stephane, you may want to mute your line. This fourth table here contained, at the time, the 189 National Societies as well as a few suggested acronyms. So I went through this table essentially doing the reconciliation exercise and there are seven acronyms that I have identified here in the callout or the comment to the right.

This fourth table will be replaced should this be adopted by the Board and implemented by GDD and the IRT. It will be replaced in its entirety with the finite list that we have in our spreadsheet now. So the seven acronyms that exist in this table will still remain reserved pending the reconciliation of recommendations between the GNSO and the GAC Advice that's not a part of this scope.

What I did discover though, is that the International Movement of the Red Cross and Red Crescent was also not on our finite list. So I have added that over into our spreadsheet, so again, there are two tabs. One tab is the now 191 National Societies and their variants from their formal and commonly used names, but then there was also the International Committee of Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. What we didn't have on this was the International Movement of the Red Cross and Red Crescent and I've added those with their UN 6 here.

Chuck, I'll come back to your recommendation or your comment in just a second, or Mary will take care of it in chat. So I just wanted to point out that, you know, we had forgot to add this in here and I don't think that there's going to be concern about this being a part of the scope. But I do want to make clear that if this gets implemented this fourth table within the Specification 5 list of reserve names will be replaced with the finite list that we have in our spreadsheet with the exception of the seven acronyms and it'll probably be a separate small table separate from our finite list.

And to Stephane's concern, this third table here, there were also an additional four acronyms as well as the magnum of David Adom, Red Star of David and a couple of others that I can't pronounce. This table will remain intact as well. It's first of all, not in scope of this working group but secondarily, it will still continue to remain reserved until the reconciliation process. And I think Mary may have a statement or two about this and I know she's responding to Chuck's comment, but hopefully Mary, if you're available can you go ahead?

Mary Wong: Hi, Berry. It's Mary. So yes, talking about this list and what stays on it after this Reconvened group is done with its work, and I recall I think just a few moments ago you had said that the acronyms out of this group, so that is part of the table here. Similarly, these names such as the Red Star of David and the other equivalent, they are also out of scope for this group.

So for immediate purposes of us completing our work in this group, those are not acronyms or names that we need to incorporate, but following our work, certainly in terms of what happens to these specific names, such as the Red Star of David, that is something that will need to be resolved outside of this group. Essentially, these names that you see from the table, are currently on the interim temporary reserved list at the second level. At the top level they have been withheld from reservation through the Applicant Guidebook for the 2012 round.

So Berry and I have done some digging back into history to look at when that happened, how it happened, and through what mechanism. And we traced it back more or less to the drafting team for the Red Cross and the IOC that preceded even the original IGO INGO PDP but whose work of course led to the formation and initiation of that PDP. And those terms were within discussion of that group. We believe that therefore the origin of where and why those terms came to be on this list can be traced back to that.

But like we said, for purposes of this Reconvened group, they really are not within our scope and so Berry and I will continue to document that other process and we will hopefully have information that will be helpful to Stephane and others involved in that external discussion. Thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mary. And we also have about two minutes left of this call. Before I turn it over to Greg I'll just point out that we only have – well Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Just quickly, I mean, it's a quick question, not a quick answer. We could take it offline if need be. I just don't quite understand why Red Star of David and its Hebrew equivalent, Magen David Adom, are not included when every other National Red Cross Society's identifier is. What's the problem?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. Again, the – and I'll turn it over to Stephane in a second. My understanding though is the specific scope of this Reconvened Working Group was what was considered the Scope 2 names from the original group, which have to deal with the IFRC, ICRC and their respective society names. And the Magen David Adom or Red Star of David were not part of that Scope 2, thus why they're considered out of scope.

I'm going to let Mary speak and then turn it over to Stephane and I'm sorry, we're probably going to run over a few minutes, but I this is probably the most

important issue, probably should have got to it earlier. Mary, please go ahead and then Stephane.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Berry, and thanks, Greg. I haven't had a chance to go back and look at the list of National Society names and the variants that we've added to this report. So one quick response is to the extent that names are on that list of National Society names, then yes, indeed, they are protected by way of the work of this group.

But if they are not, and we had thought that these three terms in particular are not, then if you look at the instructions to this group from the Council, if you look at the Board resolution that preceded the Council's reconvening this group, if you look at a number of the other, you know, prior resolutions, communications and discussions, they really, for our purposes, focused on, as Berry said, the names of the Red Cross National Societies, which were 189, and they went to 190, and the specific names of the International Movement. So that's kind of where the line and how the line was drawn.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mary. Stephane, please go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, can you hear me?

Andrea Glandon: Stephane, I can hear you. Go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: You can hear me...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: We're hearing you loud and clear, Stephane.

Stephane Hankins: Okay, yes, I'm sorry, I thought you couldn't hear me. So okay, I appreciate that we you know, the reference that is made to the designations and names that are currently protected. As regards to the Magen David

Adom and the name Magen David Adom is Israel, as noted, I think, they are included in the names of the National Societies proposed for reservation, so they are already in our table. So I, you know, I believe that at the time, you know, we had proposed Magen David Adom in the sense that you know, there was a little bit of confusion how the different – how the names were then placed under the different lists of the current reservation.

But in principle, and I see that in our current table the words “Magen David Adom” are protected as commonly used name of the Magen David Adom in Israel National Society. I think we – we’re safe there. So I hadn't realized that, you know, those names, Magen David Adom with and without spaces, that you know, they would now remain under this additional list, not covered under the scope of this group.

So I think that they don't – we don't need in fact to include them here any longer because they are already now included in the full list which is now going for consideration to the GNSO Council as an annex.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Stephane. That is clear. And you are correct, so the only two full names of this table 3 up here that aren't on our finite list are Red Star of David and (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: Yes, well, Red Star of David is of course an English translation. I think in light of the criteria that we have retained, which is that English translations of the names proposed for reservation, you know, would be included, we probably should have included it. I'm not entirely sure now, you know, where we stand. What is important is that, you know, Magen David Adom and Magen David Adom in Israel be protected because, you know, these – in Hebrew these are commonly – they're both used names for the National Society in Israel. So but I'm no longer sure now how you know, what is protected in English and what is not.

Berry Cobb: Thank you.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, so – yes.

Berry Cobb: So again...

Stephane Hankins: I think if we stick to the list that you've just projected, I think this – this would work. I think this is – this is adequate I think. And of course this was also prepared in consultation with our colleagues in the Magen David Adom in Israel National Society so, you know, that is also, you know, in consultation with them; it's their submission. So I think you know, the inclusion of these names in this additional table is no longer required entirely.

Berry Cobb: Thanks, Stephane. If you can mute your line? It's pretty loud. All right, thank you. So I'm noticing Greg's comment that it also says that it looks like the Red Star of David should be included as well, and perhaps the French translation of that. And I think unless I heard wrong that, you know, these four high level – these four full names here, two of which are already on our finite list, so we're really only talking about these two translations, if there are no objections, it seems like they're confirmed that they're part of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement as the National Society names and secondarily, because Magen David Adom is already included on our finite list, all that we're adding is the English and French translation of that.

And so absent objections, I will ensure that they're included on our finite list on the spreadsheet. And then that makes this reconciliation process that much easier that the only remaining terms would be the acronyms which I think are a total of about 11 now that again are outside of the scope of our – of what we're working on here. And, Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Berry. Just to clarify or maybe correct what you were saying, (Leon Sole Rouge) is not a translation of Star of David – Red Star of David, it's a

translation of Red Lion and Sun, which is the Iranian International Red Cross Federated Society while these names are here in part because of political delicacy, or delicateness, so confusing Israel and Iran probably not the best thing to do right now or ever.

So and I don't think – unless we're taking the French translations of everything, I don't think it seems like we would take the French translation of Red Star of David, which I guess would be (Etoi De David Rouge) or – unless it's called – that's only a literal translation, that may not be the actual vernacular translation. But again, Red Lion and Sun is an entirely different Red Cross Society and not a translation. (Leon Sole Rouge) is the French translation of that. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg, for the correction. Duly noted. I barely speak American let alone anything else so again, thank you for the correction. I see Stephane lowered his hand so I imagine he was in line to correct me as well. So but and in the end the principle is still the same that this third line here this French translation is for Iran and not – thanks, Rick. Anyway, in general principle, these four strings here I don't think that there's objection that they be included on our finite list. If for anything else is to make the reconciliation a cleaner separation when these go to get – should be go to get implemented by GDD down the road.

And absent of any objection here on the call or over the next couple of days, I will get those added to the list, we'll get this sent out for your review today. So two things – two last thing I want to wrap up. As I mentioned, we've made it through the public comment review tool, we'll make those edits, suggested by Heather and Stephane for the response comments back to the NCSG. We're go to make the final updates to the draft final report and I'm also going to make one last edit to this finite list and send those back out for the group to consider.

The deadline for any last suggested changes, objections, agreements, whatever needs to occur will happen until the 5th of August, this coming Sunday, at 2359 UTC by which we'll incorporate any last changes as long as there's no disagreements and then staff will ready the documents for submission to the GNSO Council by the 6th of August at 2359 UTC, hopefully earlier, noting that this is already on the draft agenda for the GNSO Council's meeting 10 days after that on the 16th.

The last thing that I want to talk about here is Mary had sent a draft resolution to the list. Stephane had made a couple of suggested changes, I don't think were controversial to that draft resolution. Mary will I think make those edits and also send that out in combination with the other documents. If you have any other objections to that draft resolution, please also send those to the list. And as Mary noted in the chat, Heather has a final say on the motion as she'll be the one formally submitting the motion to the Council.

And yes, Greg, that is correct. I will make sure that those get added to our finite list. I will highlight them in red for you. They'll also be noted in the change log which is tab 2 of the spreadsheet, and again, until Sunday by the deadline for any review and comments.

So Stephane, I see your hand is raised, please go ahead and then after that I'm hoping we can wrap the group up.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you very much. Stephane Hankins, ICRC. Yes, I actually I wanted to react to the earlier point about the red lion and sun which is not the name of the Iranian Red Crescent Society but is actually the name of one of the distinctive emblems protected under the Geneva Convention so it's actually this name, Red Lion and Sun in the six UN languages should in principle be corrected – protected elsewhere in this process.

But in any case, I had just one question which relates to next steps, if you can just clarify, you know, the next steps and, you know, how – what is the

timeline then for the GNSO to examine the recommendations? And then, you know, the timeline for this to be submitted and examined by the Board?

Thank you very much.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Stephane. As mentioned, we have to get these documents in by Monday for the Council's motion and document deadline. This group will have until this Sunday to review any of the documents. The GNSO Council meeting is the 16th of August, it's hard to handicap what will happen at the Council level but because these are full consensus recommendations I don't have the expectation that this would be a deferred motion. But that's not to say that that's – it is possible that it could be deferred. I would say so worst case scenario this gets adopted, considered and eventually hopefully adopted by the Council no later than September, hopefully it occurs in August.

The steps after that is that staff will prepare a Board report and there will also be a public comment period on the consensus recommendations submitted by and adopted by the GNSO Council. The Board will consider those comments and eventually deliberate on whether to adopt the GNSO recommendations, again not predicting any future outcome but should the Board then approve the recommendations which could probably be October-ish, maybe November timeframe, again it's kind of thumb in the air guessing about timeframe, but let's assume that the Board were to adopt it in Barcelona or at its November meeting, then the GDD would then take the helm of implementing the recommendations.

Because we've done all the groundwork here, it should be easy for GDD to implement these changes, but they will engage the IRT, there will be another public comment period on the implementation, so roughly the – and again this is a very thumb in the wind guess, that the policy effective date for what this particular group is considering would occur formally probably around May or June of next year because there is a six-month implementation period from

once the consensus policy has been adopted as implemented to the policy effective date.

So that's kind of a rough order of steps. It is a little slow but necessary per the ICANN Bylaws. I hope that helps answer your question. Any other comments, questions or concerns before – Thomas, would you like any parting thoughts before we disconnect and close down this working group?

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Berry. And in fact I would just like to say thanks to everyone involved in this group. And in particular to yourself, Berry, and to Mary and the other staff that have supported us during this journey. And actually for everyone that was involved in this exercise, we wrote history because this is the first reconvened working group ever that ICANN has seen how the community has seen.

So it was a honor and a privilege of working with you guys. I hope that the Council will adopt our recommendations on an as-is basis and I hope that this subject is now concluded for good. I think we've worked with the diligence required. I think we've built in the processes to make any changes where necessary. And with that I'd like to thank all of you and leave it for Berry to adjourn the meeting. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you very much, Thomas. And thank you to everyone. And look forward to seeing emails on the list and down the road as this process traverses through the Council and beyond. Again, the list will remain active for a while so if there's any concerns please do send to the list and we'll take care of that. Thank you, everyone and this meeting is adjourned. Have a good day or a good night.

Andrea Glandon: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END