

**ICANN  
Transcription  
reconvened IGO-INGO Protections in all gTLDs PDP Working Group on Red  
Cross Names  
Thursday, 07 June 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: <https://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-igo-ingo-07jun18-en.mp3>

AC recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p7jvnuzf5e9/>

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

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

Coordinator: Recording has started.

Michelle Desmyter: Thank you so much, (James). Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the reconvened PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names on Thursday, the 75h of June 2018. On the call today, we do have Thomas Rickert, Heather Forrest, David Maher, Poncelet Ileleji, and Greg Shatan. If anyone has joined only on the audio bridge, would you please let yourself be known now?

Thank you. Hearing no names, we do have apologies from Christopher Lamb, Alan Greenberg, and a tentative apology from Chuck Gomes. From staff, we have Berry Cobb, Dennis Chang, Mary Wong, Steve Chan, and myself, Michelle Desmyter.

As a reminder, if you would please state your name so it appears clearly on the transcription. Thank you ever so much and over to Thomas Rickert. Please begin.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you ever so much, Michelle, and hello everyone. We are a few minutes late because we've been waiting for more participants to join. So let's now go to the agenda without any further ado. Are there any questions with respect to the agenda? There don't seem to be any. Any updates to statements of interest? Let me just note that we got one update to an SOI from Chuck Gomes in writing. So let's please add what Chuck wrote to the notes of this call because he also indicated his level of support for the recommendations. So absent his voice will sort of be part of this call. And therefore, we should be diligent and also take note of his update of his SOI.

That allows us to move to the second point on the agenda and that is the review of the definitive list of National Society Names and varying principles. So I would suggest that our capable Berry takes us through the document as he (unintelligible). We will then open it up for questions and Berry, if I would also like you or, I'm not sure whether Mary is going to do that, to speak to the comments that Chuck made on those documents so that we have that on the record as well as (unintelligible).

So over to you, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. Berry Cobb for the record and I'll just note in the chat that Stéphane has now joined the audio bridge. Hopefully, he'll be on in the AC room shortly. So in terms of part of the agenda, I think first, I'd like to talk through the spreadsheet that contains the definitive list. We won't spend much time on this. I'd just like to offer up some of the changes that have been made since our last call. And then we'll definitely spend more time around the variant index that has also been sent out to the list.

So as with previous calls, it's almost impossible to share a spreadsheet of this size within the Adobe Connect room. So I ask you to follow along on your own computers with the spreadsheet in front of you. So when we met I think three or four weeks ago, we were basically working off the version that was sent by the Red Cross representatives, which I'm identifying as Version

1 that contained 193 national society names with the variants that were proposed as Stéphane reached out to each national society across the countries. We had pretty extensive discussion on that. There was some good feedback about some changes and so the first, I'm basically just going to move left to right through the spreadsheet in terms of the tabs.

So the first one on the far left is just a high-level legend of what is contained within the spreadsheet. Essentially, it's identifying or teasing off "Version 2" which I'll talk about in a little bit. Describes what the columns are that are displaying the formal or, I'm sorry, official name or the common names as well as the translations of those names and the languages used. When you look through this list, if you have any other ideas of what things may be beneficial to add to this legend, please send them on the list and I'll be happy to indicate that.

What it does also indicate is that the intent of this list is, again, to be a human readable form. Later, once the list is adopted and passed over for implementation, there will be an algorithm behind this that will be run against this human readable form that will convert them into DNS labels. So it will remove things like dashes or non-DNS label characters to generate actual resolvable domain names.

Most of the tabs in the spreadsheet are colored grey. Those are the more recent tabs and then the last two are colored in black, which is to (unintelligible) prior versions of the list. Before I move to the second tab, so I will talk about the versions. Way over on the far right, you'll see that the ICRC IFFRC identifiers Version 1 and National Societies Version 1, those were the instances that were sent by the Red Cross representatives at the end of April I believe.

And since then, slightly to the left of those highlighted in grey are Version 2 of that list, thus why I have the second tab labeled a change log. And so what I'm trying to do here is to create a chain of custody between these versions

just so that there's any - removes any benefit of doubt about why one particular string may have been included or excluded.

So for example, last call in the middle of May, we had talked about some of the translations for the Red Cross Society of China or the Japanese Red Cross Society. Late yesterday, Stéphane sent a note. I don't believe it was to the list but he did reach out to both of those national societies and received updates from them that include a more complete set of translations against their identified common names, and then had removed or confirmed the translation of, for example, I believe in China it was Red Society, that that translation was not accurate.

And we can talk through some of those in more detail when we get into the variant list. So again, we've got the legend. We have the change log. Then we have the ICRC IFRC identifiers, which is the latest or Version 2. So I'm on the third tab of the spreadsheet. You'll recall that there were a couple of translations from the country of Afghanistan that were included in that list. You'll notice back on the change log no Tab 2, Row 2, again just noting as an example that I had removed those national languages from this particular list. As per the original recommendation was that it was going to be for these international committee and international federation of Red Cross/Red Crescent societies that these would just be reserved in the UN 6 language.

And then lastly, the fourth tab, which is that National Societies Version 2 is exactly the same as it has been. The only difference is that I've made several - a few changes from Version 1 to Version 2, predominantly is to remove, again, non - characters that are non-DNS label compatible such as dashes that were already contained in the human readable form, and/or forward slashes. There were a few other variants that were removed per instruction with Stéphane but it does identify the National Society and what action had taken place.

So with that, before we move over to the variant index, does anybody have any questions about how this definitive list is taking shape? And I'll just close, before I open it up, that the intent after today's call, after we review the variant index, once we've reached agreement on some of these outstanding actions, then I'll go through and make these additional edits. And hopefully by the close of the consensus call, we can say that we are at the true definitive list that would then be passed on for public comment for the Council to consider.

So any questions about the list thus far? Hearing and seeing none. So you no longer have to review the spreadsheet in front of you. From now, we'll be reviewing the document located in the Adobe Connect room. And I believe you have scroll control, so I'll try to be diligent about - Greg, I see your hand is raised. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: One question on the spreadsheet, and maybe I just missed this. There are a number of cells that are colored in yellow throughout the spreadsheet, Row D. Can you tell us what the significance of that is? Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. We'll go through those in a minute, but in short, the reason why Column D and certain cells are highlighted in yellow is that when Stéphane engaged with each national society, their use of a particular formal name and the language they were requesting also become reserved. And the reason why it's highlighted in yellow is that the Red Cross isn't asking for the English version of that to be reserved, but the translation in that official language. And we'll talk about that as one of the variants here in a few seconds.

Okay. David, I saw your hand raised if you'd like to go ahead. Okay. All right. So again, we're looking at the document, which is basically we're calling either the variant index or the variant principles. The first few pages are an outline of the variations that we've seen submitted in the spreadsheet itself. And I should note that Pages 2 through - 1, 2, and parts of the 3 up to

the remaining issue section has also been pasted into the draft or proposed recommendations document. We're just duplicating it here in terms of not having to switch between documents a whole lot.

But what we have discussed before are that pretty much acronyms and initials are not in scope of what this reconvened group is about. The use of articles and prepositions the and of. We talked about the use of the term association but only when it's a part of a specific name and question, such as the Belgium Red Cross or the Brazilian Red Cross Association. There were a few instances of authority but the same kind of general rule applies that this particular term, which isn't used much, but it is used in connection with the country of that national society, descriptive words like headquarters, national, democratic, and republic have also been identified.

And then of course, the biggest variant, the use of the terms society, which we've seen on the other list - that we've seen in the definitive list quite frequently. Starting on Page 2, there's also a list of - I'll get to you in just a second. Well, Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Berry. It's Heather. I'm happy to wait if you would prefer to take questions when you get to the end. Entirely up to you.

Berry Cobb: No, please go ahead if it's about the previous section and the descriptive word.

Heather Forrest: It is indeed, Berry. It is indeed. I'm realizing a point here in relation to what I think is only two names. But I have concerns about headquarters in that it seems to me that that's a different type of descriptive term than the others that we see on Page 1 and it seems to me that that goes beyond the scope of society names, unless it is indeed the case that that is a society name. And maybe that's the confirmation back on that. I had some concerns about that one.

And let me preface or let me end my comments by saying, much as Chuck said, these comments are entirely in my personal capacity. They're not in relation to any group or anything that I belong to. So thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Heather. I will note that it is only the Red Cross Society of China that is requesting the use of this term. Again, it is connection with the terms Red Cross or Red Crescent and the country or China in this particular case. Stéphane, would you happen to have any response to Heather about the rationale for why this term is included?

Stéphane Hankins: Yes. Stéphane Hankins, ICRC, for the record. Can you hear me?

Berry Cob: Sir, we can.

Stéphane Hankins: Okay. Thank you. Well, so without (unintelligible) this is a question that I myself did raise. I did raise this to the attention of our regional delegation in Beijing and mentioning, and I was explained that that is a specific request from the Chinese Red Cross because of their particular structure. So I didn't - I wasn't able to get a very substantive reply to that. But I understand that the Chinese Red Cross, because its internal organization, they are - there is a common reference to them as referencing their headquarters as opposed to their branches.

So I think it's the only case that we have and I do appreciate Heather's comment. It's true that for the other designations, whether it's association, or authority, organization, we're talking about a word that refers to the structure. Headquarters is a different case. So it's up to the group to decide. But we've had several exchanges with the Chinese Red Cross because I was also checking following the last conversation that we had why, I think it was Red House, had been included.

And so we went back to them and they are saying, calling the criteria. And this is the list - the list came back again with the word headquarters. And I've tried to clarify this all that I had as an extra (unintelligible). Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Stéphane. And so if I'm interpreting this correctly is it is more of a general ask and perhaps not - it's not recognized as a formal combination of their official or common name but perhaps it is used either on their website, or letterhead, or something along those lines if that's a fair statement.

So I do concur with Stéphane's statement. This is probably one of these outliers that the working group needs to make a decision on to advance this forward.

So is there any chance that we can - I'll note that Heather mentioned in the chat that from her personal perspective that the use of the term is outside of the other set here. And she raised her hand, so I'll turn it over to her. Please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Berry, thank you. I suppose it's a follow-up query, which is to say, is this set of principles that's documented here, am I right in thinking that this is the set of principles that would be used to (unintelligible) future names as well?

Berry Cobb: Yes, that is correct. The key goal of this variant index is to pretty much reduce any chance of ICANN and/or the GNSO being put in any kind of difficult decision area if a new society were placed on. At least there would be some guardrails or some boundaries about what these new identifiers might look like anything, as for anything else, just to make the ease of implementation to ultimate reservation that much easier without any ambiguity or as little as possible.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Berry. It's Heather just responding to that. In that case, that furthers my concern here about the lack of consistency with the other principles. So I appreciate the difficulty in getting substantive feedback back from

(unintelligible). But yes, you've correctly read my views into the record.

Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Heather. For those in the Adobe Connect Room, hopefully we can try to make a decision moving a little bit forward here. If you agree with Heather that headquarters should be removed as one of the variant criteria - Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Just a question while I'm considering this. I see that some of the names in Column D are in italics, especially ones like Red Cross Society Headquarters. What does that signify? Is that also signifying it's only a translation and it's not actually being sought in English or does it signify something else? Other than that, thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. To my knowledge, it does not. I believe there were several versions of the spreadsheet flying around and it's like because Column C is italics, which is just the formal name is the national society. I think what happened is when this was being completed and new rows were being added for additional variations, it inherited that italicized font.

So I guess is there any objection from those on the call that headquarters should be removed as one of the variant criteria listed here on the list? Okay. I'll make sure to document this on the meeting minutes as well and when I create the next version, I'll make sure to include this in the change control that I mentioned on this spreadsheet as to why this is removed.

So moving along to Page 2, Section 2, which is a shorter version but it deals with the translations from English into the formal language. And I apologize of the mowing in the background. It always seems to happen to me that when I lead a call there's noise here. So basically, again, acronyms, initials are not allowed. Standalone words like Red Cross, Red Crescent, there is the remaining issues that we'll get to in a little bit. There are translations, transliterations. If there's a need to ensure that all entries are direct

translations or translations of, or otherwise the same as the relevant name in English for column one or essentially what would be column Charlie, sorry, column Delta. And then the use of the words association, will strike out headquarters, national, republican, society kind of has the same rules in English form.

Then there's also the third section, which is just additional criteria that again this is kind of shaping the human readable form, which gets into first letters, the official names, commonly used names, and official languages to provide those guiding rails there. And then Section 4 is basically error correction and additions and deletions.

So I think just a little bit of conversation needs to be had here. The rationale for these three little subsections is after we have created this definitive list that this gets adopted by the GNSO Council and eventually by the ICANN Board, and then is sent over to GDD for implementation. One of our main goals by being diligent with this definitive list is to mitigate or reduce to near zero potential for errors as these human readable identifiers are converted into DNS labels.

And again, I'll just, just to remind the group, what happens with the temporary reservation of some of these names is that I believe there was a string in Russian where there was a carriage return in the translation of that national society name. And a generic term I think, just society, wound up being reserved. So the point is, is that we're trying to mitigate that as much as possible.

However, myself mostly and a few others that don't understand every language out there in the world, I don't think that there's a meaningful way that we could confirm all of the various translations or transliterations of the English version of the formal or common names. Therefore, just in case there is a chance that there is an error, these three little subsections are meant to try to mitigate those in as fast as possible a way as we move

through implementation. So error correction, again, they can only be corrected through the submission of a formal request to ICANN Org that describes in detail the nature of the error.

So for example, if the registry operator of (.matva) identifies the error, he would immediately communicate it to GDD or ICANN Org. ICANN Org would then communicate to the GAC and the GNSO advising of that particular quick error correction and thus, making the change to the specification five list. And that communication would be quickly pushed out to the registry operators.

Same for additions. Actually, not the same, the opposite for additions. Essentially, once we have this definitive list and it goes to implementation, there won't be any additions to any of the identifiers listed within the spreadsheet. That's not to say that again there is already a procedure for future changes or future additions of national societies by leveraging the procedure as noted and the policy that will go effective September 2018 of the prior IGO/INGO policy implementation. And then of course then the same applies (unintelligible), if for some reason hopefully there won't be but either through implementation or one of the national societies comes across one of the particular strings that they don't want reserved, the same quick process would apply about deletion.

So before I go into remaining issues, are there any questions or concerns about those last four little sections that talked about translations, additions, deletions or changes? Okay, hearing and seeing none, okay, remaining issues, the first one which is the use of Red Cross or Red Crescent as a standalone term in certain national, non-English languages, in some cases with the definitive article of "the" or Red Cross Society or Red Crescent Society. Stephane had provided a rationale to the list and I'm sure he can repeat it here if need be on the phone.

But in short, the use of these terms are commonly known by that respective national society and in general, they're not asking for the English version of that term to be reserved which would kind of bypass the policy or that set of strings that was already implemented but the request is that that English translation of that country's national language could be – or they're asking for reservation of that.

And so the fourth – or third bullet here on this item Number 1 for remaining issues, there are a number of countries, it looks like about 15 or so, that are listed where this kind of request is taking place. And as Greg had asked earlier, those are the ones that remain on the version 2 list that are still highlighted in yellow. So I will stop here and open up the floor for any questions or concerns or how the working group should progress with these.

I think in general it's kind of – it's almost – without coming to a conclusion, it's kind of the same nature of discussion that we just had about the headquarters. So I'll open up the floor.

Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Berry. Forgive me, I don't want to (unintelligible) but I'm the only one that puts up my hand so if anyone else would like to speak, I don't want to seize their opportunity. I suppose I have the very same concerns at I raised earlier in that Mary's very (unintelligible) in the chat, you know, in the absence of a combination with the country name I think that – and, yes, you see that a helpful – you've given a helpful example there, Berry. So I think I understand the point that you're trying to make and is there a way it can be avoided?  
Thank you.

Berry Cobb: I have Stephane and then Greg in the queue. Please go ahead, Stephane.  
Stephane, if you're speaking we cannot hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: Yes, okay. So I can – this is a very different question to the previous one about headquarters, because in fact, this really – Stephane Hankins, RCRC, this brings us really to the essence of the whole discussion that we have, which is that, you know, at the source of the conversation is the protection of the words, “Red Cross Red Crescent Red Crystal” under international humanitarian law treaties. So you’ve, at the outset of this conversation, we, you know, we didn’t fight for the names to be protected in each every language and, you know, we settled for the six UN languages protection of those words, Red Cross, for example.

But under the treaties and under the national laws of, you know, in multiple jurisdictions, the words Red Cross are or should be protected under domestic law in the national language in the first place. So, you know, when a national legislation such as, let’s say, the Lithuanian legislation on the protection of the emblem, refers to the protection of the emblems and of the names. You know, obviously the legislation is in Lithuanian and, you know, the spirit of the international law norm is that, you know, these names be protected in each and every language.

So I do want to make this point, you know, clear that, you know, that’s already a first argument which, you know, I have to position from a legal point of view. This being said, yes indeed, you know, the justification that we put in writing and that I sent several times, was that, you know, at least these names should be protected, the words Red Cross Red Crescent Red Crystal, they should be protected in other national languages where they correspond to a usual name of the national society. And this has been said to me in a number of – by several national societies.

I was in Nairobi recently and I even asked the taxi driver who was taking me back to the airport, I asked him, you know, is the national society known in Swahili by the word, you know, how is it known in Swahili and he said it’s known as Red Cross. It’s not known as Kenya Red Cross. You know, so, you

know, that's the whole, you know, that's the justification I think we should – we should usefully accept.

And then it's only – I think Berry, it's only 15 national societies which actually could, you know, or made that request, but I'm quite – I'm very positive, you know, that for example in Kenya, the national society is really not known with its full name, it's known by the words Red Cross in Swahili. So that's my, you know, I think there we, you know, there's – these are two important legitimations for keeping this. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Stephane. Before you go, and I turn it over to Greg, Mary posted into the chat is that something you could respond to on the phone? Basically Mary is asking, "Stephane, is it possible for the Red Cross to verify that for all the countries that we have listed a request to reserve Red Crescent or Red Cross without a country name; that these terms are indeed protected as such in the relevant national language." So please go ahead, Stephane.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you. My screen is gone but I took – it's something that we can indeed – that we can do. But again, you know, these – the treaties we're looking at, the first one, the Convention of 1949 and, you know, it's universally ratified and in fact, you know, the states have an obligation to implement domestically, you know, the obligations they're under. So they would have by virtue of being party to the treaty, the obligation to actually protect the words "Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal" you know, in their national languages by virtue of them being a high contracting party. So I don't want to go into too much detail.

You know, so the obligation anyway is there. It's true that you know, some – in some legal orders there is a need for, you know, national implementing legislation, I mean, if it is, you know, useful, I mean, of course we can look through the laws of those 15 countries and reply. But frankly, you know, the – in principle, you know, the protections should in fact apply in every legal

order, even if, you know, national legislation, at least in common law states and national implementing legislation might be required.

So that's, you know, it's a complicated answer. If, you know, if there is an insistence then, you know, we – I can – we can indeed verify and, you know, send you, you know, the national laws in force. Normally we have them at least in English and – or in French, so if that's needed we can send it. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you very much, Stephane. And almost, Greg, I just want to read in for the record that Heather Forrest had mentioned the domestic ratification would give us the national legislation that Mary asked about, and then Jorge Cancio had just confirmed – we had already checked the international protection standards – standalone words, if he recalls correctly, on initial debates. And Mary responded in that regard, "That's why those terms are already protected under existing permanent consensus policy in the six UN languages," she thinks.

The question here is whether the reservation must be extended to additional languages ergo, Afghani, Mala, Dutch and Swedish. Greg, you had your hand up for a while, apologies. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan for the record. I think behind all of this is the necessity really of creating a rule-based system such as has been outlined in the document on the screen and to have rules that apply to each. And I think the rule that's suggested here or the reason that this discussion is suggested here is it ties back to the need to have a rule that covers the particular requests.

So I would support the need to see the national legislation to see whether the, you know, more generic forms are actually protected as such. Otherwise we're just creating another rule or creating a whole list of exceptions to the rule any time we feel like it. If we're going to create a different rule, then we

need to know what it is, and if we're going to create exceptions I'm against it except if we have some very specific discussions about very specific exceptions. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. I'm just going to mute for one. All right, apologies for that. I'll just also note for the record that Jorge Cancio mentioned in the chat that the international protection is not restricted to six UN languages as far as he can recall. It makes little sense not to protect them and the national languages while protecting them in the six UN ones.

Stephane, I see your hand is still raised, did you want to respond to any of this? Okay, hearing none we'll get your hand lowered in just a minute. No, please go ahead, Stephane.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, sorry, it was a mistake but I will take the floor. I think that, you know, it's – it doesn't make very much sense, you know, to contest this. I mean, we – but I – if it's needed again, we will provide, you know, relevant extracts from the national laws of those 15 countries. But for the record, I do want to position that, you know, it is an, you know, an implication of the international treaties that ground this whole conversation, that these names be protected in each and every language. So, you know, for the record I think it's important to position.

As regards, you know, looking to see, you know, if it's Swedish Red Cross, etcetera, I already know that, you know, I will find the provisions that we require for the 15 national societies or national legal orders concerned I'm not sure, but we can commit to do that here. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you very much, Stephane. Well, for me consulting with staff, I'm kind of at a loss about a next step as it regards to this. So what I suggest is that hopefully as we advance towards the rest of this call, and we have a discussion about launching a consensus call, we can draw this out specifically and see where the working group stands. I think that there's both

sides to the argument but in terms of trying to wrap this up a decision needs to be made somehow and staff's not in a position to make that decision. So like I said, we'll move this on to the list as part of the consensus call and we'll see how that plays out.

So in the interest of time I'm going to move forward onto the next one, Number 2, this one should be easy. If you'll review through the spreadsheet this is part of the change log that specifically – there were Spanish translations of the term “Red Cross” which was already translated as part of the original recommendations. So unfortunately I neglected to highlight that this has been resolved so I think we can move on in terms of getting to the definitive list.

Moving onto Page 4, Number 3 specifically called out two countries, China and Japan. As I mentioned earlier, Stephane had reached out to both of those National Societies. He did send in updated versions of both of those societies and they have been incorporated into the version 4 Excel spreadsheet, so I ask the working group to take a look at those. Again, personally I can't confirm that whether Red Society or Red Club or Red Day had been removed.

But Stephane did mention on the call earlier that those – when he collaborated with those National Societies that the translations of those terms didn't actually in fact mean those. So I'll consider this quasi-resolved but we should take a look at this. And again, if for some reason because most of us can't speak Chinese or Japanese, I'll revert us back to kind of the mini-exception procedure should we run across any errors or that we uncover that a certain translation is really reserving more of a generic string than what we're trying to accomplish here.

Not seeing hands or anything in the chat. Moving onto Number 4, there is this – the following request in Arabic seemed identical Syria as a Red Crescent, Egypt as the Egyptian Red Crescent and Palestine with and without “the” and

note also that Red Crescent in Arabic is already reserved under the 2014 consensus policy. And this is really kind of combined with Number 5, the next one. And I don't believe that there's going to be a concern about this but several of the National Societies interchangeably will use the country name versus the – what was the term? Well the example is Ethiopia versus Ethiopian or Egypt versus Egyptian and that those two can often be interchangeably used when making reference to that particular National Society.

So we just – staff wanted to confirm with the working group if this is a acceptable variant principle that we've been having the discussion on. If there are any objections to the use of those, please state so now on the list I mean, by raising your hand or something in the chat. Hearing and seeing none.

Okay, so Number 6 is a combination of some various examples that we just wanted to highlight for the list or for the working group here. Basically there were other specific requests that do not fit any of the above rules or categories. So for example, the Russian National Society includes the all Russian Public Organization, Russian Red Cross; Lithuania has Lithuanian Red Cross Organization. I believe that one is acceptable because we are – we had just talked about the use of the country or the ethnicity of the country or Lithuania versus Lithuanian and the potential use of "Organization."

Kazakhstan included Red Crescent National Society of the (Kerz) Republic Public Association which kind of starts to get out of the bright line we're trying to draw here. Red Cross in Ukraine, we haven't talked about the use of the use of the word "in" as in pointing to a particular location. And then as well the Belgian Red Cross had also requested Belgian Red Cross, French-Speaking Community and the Belgian Red Cross German Speaking Community.

And then lastly, the British Red Cross request in English for Red Cross Charity. So again, you know, these are very targeted examples that do fall kind of outside of the bright line that the group is trying to get to here. I think

the same positions apply, repeating from what Greg and Mary were stating about, you know, is there documentation that these variations are recognized in the national law of that country or, you know, even though they may not be recognized by any legal instrument, are the uses of these phrases still commonly used and because they do contain the term “Red Cross” thereby they should – they should be protected based under the Geneva Convention of 1949.

I see that Heather Forrest mentions in the chat, “What would be the future implications of these outliers in the six that are identified here? And would these be acceptable models for future names?” That’s a difficult one to answer. I’ll try taking a stab at this is that, you know, the – what we actually see here with the exception of using, you know, the country name or the use of the term “Organization” or including “Red Cross” or “Red Crescent” within that combination of names, none of these six, this variation criteria at least as I can understand, would be singled out or identified in the variation principle – the variant principles that we have listed up in the document.

That’s not to say that future additions by a National Society would include some of these examples that may be outside of the bright line but I would note that in future cases that when a new Society is added that the process would flow through the GAC and be communicated to ICANN Org and the GNSO for, you know, a review of those formal and common names. And if, you know, there were some – an extreme outlier there could be – there’s an ability for input from the community as to whether those should be included or not.

Greg Shatan, I see your hand is raised. Please go ahead, sir.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Berry. I’m wondering whether any or all of these six can in fact be fit under any of the above rules if we had further information or if there is another – or if there’s another way that we can state a rule or rules for these. Absent that, you know, I would want a specific justification, an explanation,

for why this needs to be added to the protected list. But first, you know, looking at the rule of commonly known – commonly used names, I'm wondering if in fact any of these are in fact the way it is commonly used.

You know, we don't know the syntax of Ukrainian, but Red Cross in Ukraine might be a way or the way that in Ukrainian one would refer to the Ukrainian Red Cross; similarly the Russian version and maybe again, that is kind of the way Russians, you know, construct that sort of name. So, you know, none of these – other than the request for Red Cross Charity standing alone, strike me as odd. And knowing what's going on Belgium with regard to languages I'm not surprised that they would be language-divided, although I'm surprised it's German and French. Then again, what do I know about the Belgian language spats.

But in any case I'm just wondering if these really are as outlier-ish as they seem to be. Because what I don't want to create is a rule that outliers are kind of allowed without any real justification, without fitting under a rule because then the exception swallows the rule. So if we could explore perhaps a bit whether these are in fact commonly used, you know, logical requests or if there's a request based on, say, a high degree of prior abuse, maybe that is the Red Cross Charity request.

That's another potential rule. I'm a little wary of throwing that out there, but I can understand that, you know, once, twice, three times bitten, one hopes to get rid of the future opportunity for hanky-panky and, you know, and we're really, you know, looking at a very specific, you know, set of circumstances here with the Red Cross, you know, that leads us, you know, to this at all but recognize that while Red Cross is almost uniquely used for the Red Cross it's not completely uniquely used. So, you know, we need to be careful.

But if we can be careful and rules-based and include these because we understand why they're being included, then my comfort level goes way up with this section. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. So and the group is welcome to correct if I'm misstating this, but what I'm hearing is, you know, for these – these one-off examples that prevent us from creating a bright line in our variation principles or rules is that for - while the GAC and Stephane are citing their position that the use of any term of Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal they should be protected based on the Geneva Convention and/or the national legislation of that - in the country where that society exists versus the other side of the position that these start to get outside of, you know, or creating this definitive list or the specific criteria by which new names can be reserved that the only way that some of these exceptions would be allowable is if there's documented proof that they are in fact - these specific identifiers are protected by specifically by national legislation. As Greg Shatan notes in the text or in the chat that we're protected organization names not terms. So I'm going to turn it over to Stephane for his response and then likely would - to move onward got about 55 minutes remaining left in the call. Stephane please go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you. And just -- Stephane Hankins for the (unintelligible) for the record -- a couple of initial comments one of them is that obviously we can't have a criteria that the designations be all specifically protected under domestic law. That just doesn't - it obviously doesn't fly. I mean we don't have the legislation that protects, you know, the words Red Cross the official name of the national society and then, you know, the usual names which we agree to reserve. So, you know, that's not going to be possible.

The second point is that the - as regard to these six examples that are here they first of all they all include the words Red Cross, so they're not outside of that criteria. And second, you know, if you look at each of them I think there is, you know, there is there a legitimacy for their protection. I mean Ukrainian Red Cross in Ukraine I think indeed that I have a feeling speaking Russian that that's probably also linking the international syntax. With the British Red Cross request I had a lengthy discussion with the legal advisor of the British Red Cross on this. And, you know, the British Red Cross is actually

incorporated under British and the UK legislation as a charity and therefore, you know, the national society is known under this (unintelligible) association of the name to that.

So the Belgian (unintelligible) the Belgian case we read in the document that (Berry) sent and indeed it's not it's obviously it's French, German, Flemish or French, Flemish and German and not just French and German. The – this is indeed, you know, linked to the specific context of Belgian and the specific structure of the Belgian Red Cross which has, you know, quite a level of autonomy of its branches and on the linguistic communities in Belgium. They have separate headquarters, et cetera.

When we had the conversation in Denmark and I didn't go back today but I went back a few months ago to the conversation that we had I think we had - we did have, you know, I at least very clearly stated that we would have or we would likely have to recognize some specific exceptions for specific context. And I think for example for the Belgian case they came back with that request and they firmly that for example we would consider, you know, really fits squarely in this notion that we need to have a level of flexibility.

So I don't know how you want to reflect it in the preserved in, you know, the criteria that, you know, will be circulated or but I think that, you know, the necessity to recognize exceptions which, you know, again, you know, I have made quite clear in what I said during the Danish - the discussion we had in - during the ICANN meeting in Denmark. I think here we do have to have some level of flexibility to accommodate, you know, the request of the national society. And, you know, I, you know, again, you know, each of these six cases has, you know, there's different legitimacies. But I think here, you know, these are ones that I think we could safely agree to and probably would require to agree to. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Stephane. I appreciate that response. And also in the interest of time so we're going to move on but how I'm going to suggest we proceed --

and Thomas can certainly overrule me if I -- misspeak as similar to the previous one about the translations the Red Cross or Red Crescent and other languages other than the UN six that have already been reserved when the consensus call goes out I'm now seeing kind of two channels of the consensus call. One is going to be around the definitive list and they're basically two subsections that will be a part of that. One is whether the terms Red Crescent, Red Crystal those kinds of terms can be reserved in other national languages and we'll produce the examples that are easily readable for the working group to make a decision on. And then the second kind of subcategory are these outlier that - outliers that may require some flexibility or exception that Stephane is referring to.

And I what I think I'll do specifically as I will go to the transcript and Stephane I will extract what you just explained to the working group here so that those that aren't on the call can make this connection about why these national societies are asking for the flexibility and for, you know, these extraordinary outliers. But ultimately in terms of we have to move this group forward and come to some sort of conclusion. So ultimately it's up for the working group to define its support or nonsupport for these two categories. It's ultimately up for Thomas as chair to determine what the consensus level will be for these then, you know, we move into a consensus call timeframe. And once there's agreement or once we've moved past those then we'll move this into public comment and we can get feedback from the community.

So that completes the review of the -- of this particular document moving on into the rest of the agenda which is to review the preliminary recommendations so when I sent out the agenda I also included a fresh document that contains the draft recommendations. I know that the group hasn't had a lot of time to review through these but I'll walk through the structure of them. I won't read out the details but basically helping to try to define why they're structured the way that they are and then we can open up this for any discussion or concern about any of the proposed recommendations.

Again this is only an extract of the initial report (Mary) and I are still working on that draft but these proposed recommendations are at the heart of that report. And in essence the initial reports going to be structured so that the first portion is an executive summary highlighting the main sections of the report mostly pointing to very brief summary statements of the proposed recommendations. Then the structure of the report is essentially the document that you see before you in the Adobe Connect room.

Then the third section of the document will be to essentially document without creating thousands of pages the deliberations of the working group. And right now we see it as two sections. The first section is kind of a high level summary about the deliberations regarding the legal basis on why the national society terms and the international committee of Red Cross societies and the IFRC why those are protected and as generically discussed earlier although much more involved in circling around the Geneva Convention of 1949, et cetera. So there will be a high level summary of those deliberations and the legal basis on why the working group agreed against that legal basis for protection.

And then the secondary section will be the deliberations around the creating the definitive list which is essentially what we went through and will probably most likely refer back to the final variation principles document that is included as a part of one of the recommendations. We just want to make sure that we capture those well. And in the last section will be background of what led us to the reconvened group being started and of course linked to things that is – that were to the prior working groups even before the reconvened group started. And then lastly is a list of those members participation in the working group calls as well as, you know, a distinction between their - whether they're members or observers.

Okay so moving in to this document essentially again this is I think there is five or six proposed recommendations here. Each recommendation after

contains three components. First will be the recommendation itself which is what will be published in the future GNSO resolution should the council, you know, adopt these recommendations. The second area is the level of consensus on that recommendation. And I will go ahead and note here as of now staff has put in full consensus.

That's not to say that our chair Thomas Rickert has designated this consensus level. I did go ahead and publish full consensus in here because all the deliberation to date I have not seen any dissent against the two main aspects of what this group was tasked to do. First understand the legal base for the protections. There seemed to be agreement that yes these terms should be protected. The second is to create a definitive list and criteria by how that definitive list was put together. So again if in your review of these if you disagree with the term of full consensus please state why or list your objection out.

And then the third subsection of the recommendation is the recommendation details. The section itself would not be a part of the GNSO resolution that moves or advances this forward however they are details to further explain or attach components to the recommendation. And most importantly is for GDD staff should they implement these recommendations if they're adopted by the board that it provides them with as much guidance as possible to streamline and expedite the implementation so that the Implementation Review Team has very little to work on. So that's kind of the structure for each one of the recommendations, recommendation level consensus and details.

Okay recommendation one - Stephane I see your hand is up. Is that an old hand or did you want to intervene in anything? Great thanks sir. So Recommendation 1 I'm not going to read the full text here but the essence of this is to - that the reconvened working group confirms the GNSO Council's instruction back to this working group on the proposed amendment outlined in its resolution. And in short basically its 192 or 93, 192 national societies.

But in short the Council instructed this reconvened working group to confirm an amendment to the old working group's recommendation that originally had recommended that these terms or these identifiers only be supplied with the 90 days claims service which was essentially scoped to identifiers from the original working group. The proposed amendment here is that those identifiers with a definitive list be reserved as commonly identified to a Specification 5 of the base gTLD Registry agreement. And, you know, based on the deliberations of the working group, you know, there seems to be supportive of the legal basis for those protections.

And noting (Jorge)'s chat or comment in the chat Stephane's comments be read out. I do have that handy and I'll note that in the recommendation details and just before the call Stephane did submit comments against or regarding this document and the draft of proposed recommendations. And his comment was basically at whether the reservation of these identifiers are they extended to the so-called legacy TLDs? And yes or the answer to that is absolutely yes.

The original scope of the original IGO, INGO Working Group was protection of identifiers in all gTLDs. And so if the – there was – it was a nuance that from the original IGO, INGO PDP that these particular identifiers would only receive claims protection essentially that only applied to the new gTLDs launching from 2013 forward as they completed their launching programs. But now that this particular working group is likely to convert or amend its original recommendation to reserve these then yes that is for all gTLDs. And yes they would be applied to legacy TLDs some of which have older agreements that do not specifically point to a Specification 5 like the new gTLD Registry agreement.

As those expire and are renegotiated they'll likely convert one way or another. But one way or another those legacy TLDs do point to a reservation list and implementation those would be separately updated with the same identifiers that are reserved here. And I would like to make a very important

point for this group -- and I believe most of you understand -- let's hypothetically say well American Red Cross it's a string that would in new gTLDs because it's been temporarily reserved since 2012 or 2013 that it has not been registered in any of the new gTLDs. However in the legacy TLDs at least for com, net and org and I don't know specifically there's a high probability that, that term is already registered.

The only way that term will become reserved is if over the course of its natural domain lifecycle that it expires, enters pending delete and/or I should say it expires, goes through its redemption grace period, nobody registers it or picks it up in the aftermarket, it hits pending delete by which then the registry would reserve that name. So which - matches the implementation of the other previous recommendations as a part of the policy effective date of September 2018. So I just wanted to make that point and that is kind of the essence for the recommendation details. Any questions or comments regarding Recommendation Number 1?

Great moving on to Page 2 which is Recommendation 2 this one is pretty easy - oh Stephane no please go ahead.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you very much (unintelligible) for this explanation because it was indeed one of the questions that I had. I personally, you know, not being versed in these issues especially from a technical point of view I did not comprehend - I didn't understand necessarily, you know, the conclusion that you've just spelled out from the narrative that is under Recommendation 1. So, you know, if everybody within the group considers that, you know, this is sufficiently clear then, you know, it's very well for me. But I didn't - it wasn't - it was not fully understandable to me from the narrative that is there. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Stephane. I'll try one more time and if you still have confusion I'm glad to explain it on the list or we can have a chat after the call or sometime. So there are 17 legacy TLDs com, net, org, pro, biz, info, pro several others.

Up to this point none of the terms that are being discussed here were ever instructed to be reserved even temporarily by actions of the board in response to GAC advice. And because those TLDs have been delegated for many, many, many years there is a possibility that some of the identifiers that are within the scope of our discussions here could have already been registered.

So americanredcross.com I don't know for sure but let's hypothetically - let's assume that it has already been registered in .com. So that name can't be reserved because it's already registered. However let's just hypothetically assume that americanredcross.org is not registered. When this policy goes into its policy effective date PIR as the manager of .org would immediately reserve americanredcross.org because it's not registered, it's not in use they would remove it from registration via their EPP systems.

However americanredcross.com because it is already registered by a registrant maybe it is the American Red Cross, maybe is (Joe Bob) from Texas that was hoping to sell it to your organization someday the implementation of this policy this reservation policy cannot interfere with the natural course of the domain name lifecycle meaning that from the policy effective date ICANN or its contracted parties could not take that name away from the registrant regardless of its use or how long it's been registered. The only way americanredcross.com again hypothetically assuming that it's registered now and that it's not being used by American Red Cross is that if it enters what we call the deletion cycle meaning that the domain would (expire) by such and such date. It has to naturally progress what is called the redemption period or what allows the registrant to renew the name should they not have missed being notified that it expires.

And then only then until it enters the final phase of this lifecycle called pending delete is when that registry in this case VeriSign could take action and then reserve the name thus withholding it from registration ever again.

So I know that that's a little bit confusing. I'm happy to take this off line to explain in details but that is the...

Stephane Hankins: Thank you very much (unintelligible). That's fine, understood.

Berry Cobb: Right great.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you very much (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Okay moving on to Recommendation 2. Again this is just the confirm confirmation of the GNSO Council's resolution that an exception procedure be put in place for the Red Cross. There was a little bit of deliberations by the group about this. I believe staff had said on several occasions that this is something that was already considered in the protection of IGO, INGO identifiers and all gTLDs policy the consensus policy that is effective August 1, 2018. I was mistaken earlier.

Again there is an exception procedure loaded into that consensus policy. In short should any national society want to register the name that has been reserved they would essentially contact the registry that they're interested in registering that particular name. They can unlock the name and then get it registered should they choose to use it. So that in essence is mostly just to confirm the council's resolution and then inform the group and the community that there are really - there's already an exception procedure available. I've got 29 minutes so I really want to kind of move through these.

The third recommendation it talks about the error corrections, additions and deletion. Essentially that's just reinforcing what we discussed when we went through the Variant principles document. Again this is mostly around the notion that should any of the definitive list need to be error corrected in implementation that, you know, that there is some flexibility to make those changes to avoid any errors or duplications.

Fourth recommendation this section is basically as (Mary) noted here additional recommendations in relation to the scope of Red Cross names to be reserved. Recommendation 4 future changes to the definitive list of Red Cross national society created as a result of this policy amendment process can be made in accordance with the following criteria. So as noted, you know, in the prior document this is a cut and paste of what we've been working on. You know headquarters as we discussed will be removed from this list and other than that I think the list will pretty much remain the same. This Variant Index I think will pretty much remain the same except removing headquarters.

And then if we still have the two categories that I've mentioned about the definitive list itself which is I believe the next recommendation.

Recommendation 5 is essentially the notification that if there are future national societies created, this is the process by which that will occur and I just realized, for this section, when we get into the Section 2, Stephane had made a comment about this section, that this should remain explicitly limited to the scope of names which the Working Group agreed to include within its deliberations, an example without prejudice to temporary protections of other Red Cross, Red Crescent identifiers that are additionally covered under the existing temporary protections agreed by the Board. This is another conversation which was excluded from the Working Group's preview. So just to provide some additional insight into that.

So in essence, there's kind of two categories of Red Cross names that are already implemented here. First are those recommendations that were consistent with GAC Advice that have been implemented, so for example, Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal, Red Lion and the UN Six, those terms are permanently reserved as per the consensus policy adopted by the Board that was consistent with GAC Advice. Nothing we are doing here will undo any of that.

However, there are a set of national society names that were temporarily reserved as a result of actions from the ICANN Board in 2013 or 2014. I think as Stephane noted in a prior comment, essentially this sub-category, this second category will be deleted and what we've created here is this definitive list will replace only those that still remain "temporarily reserved", but so I think that that should satisfy the comment that was listed there.

All right, so back to -- Stephane, did you want to speak?

Stephane Hankins: Yes, please, Berry. This is Stephane Hankins, ICRC for the record. Yes, there's - I observed this issue in two places. One of them is the commentary to Recommendation 1 and now here where Berry noted. It is said that in the ninth paragraph of the commentary to Resolution 1 that the list that is being prepared of national societies names and (unintelligible) and Federation names will either replace or need to be reconciled with a definitive list of identifiers and I think this relates to the other, to the comment that I, that Berry was referring to and the temporary reservations that have been agreed by the Board, they include a number of identifiers which are not covered by the list that we are discussing now, the list of national society names, both (unintelligible) and Federation. There were additional names which the Board agreed at the time to temporarily reserve and this includes the acronyms. Sorry, I know that acronyms is a very, very complicated question and I'm not wanting to position it here or to discuss it here.

It's, as we said many times, that acronyms and or initials are outside the purview of this Group and so I'm not bringing them but what I'm saying is that, you know, to me, the list that will be submitted for comment and then hopefully approved by the GNSO Council, that list cannot - should not replace. It should be made, it should be reconciled but it should not replace because, you know, certain names that were temporarily reserved are outside the purview of consideration of this Working Group. That's a point that I would like to position so that, you know, so that we already, you know, be able to reflect on it. I hope this was - what I just said is clear. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: (Greg), please.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan, for the record. Stephane was clear, but also very troubling. This is a major problem. I had understood that this group would be dealing with all of the outstanding Red Cross related protection issues and that no temporary lists relating to Red Cross issues would survive. This was supposed to wrap this up, those temporary lists were created - they were temporary for a reason which was the reason that this group was sidelined for some period of time and not dealing with anything, unfortunately. Now we're back in the saddle and we should be resolving all of these issues.

I had not understood that there would somehow be some other list of temporary protections for which there was no plan on how to either make them permanent or make them disappear. I thought this was the process and this was the place and I did not have an understanding that that was somehow outside our purview and would survive our discussion.

So I'm quite troubled here, hate to see this come up at the eleventh hour, but the idea that there is some other list out there that is somehow being preserved in spite of all of our work on taking the temporary and eradicating it feels like a real problem, maybe even a bait and switch. So I'm hoping that maybe staff or (Thomas) can clear up where we stand here, because it's like a quite a big difference between what I expected the outcome to be and maybe I'm just confused, but I'd like to know that others - other than from those that have a vested interest in preserving those lists, regardless of the will of the community. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Greg. Okay, so hopefully I can put some fears and troubles to the wayside. I pasted into the chat a link to the current reserved name (unintelligible). This is the list by which registry operators use to implement

the DNS label protections into their EPP systems. At the very top of this list, and this is the version that is a part of the consensus policy with a policy effective date of 1 August and GDD staff went to great lengths to separate out different aspects of this reservation list across the different types of organizations.

The first section is the IOC, that's been implemented already. The second section is specific identifiers of Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. That has been implemented as a recommendation based on the GNSO Working Group's recommendation that was consistent with GAC Advice.

Then there's a third section, International Red Cross Red Crescent Movement and the National Red Cross Red Crescent Society Names. So you will see a list of, there are four acronyms there and then secondarily and most importantly, the scope of this group is the fourth section, the International Red Cross - I should back up.

None of those acronyms there or those terms will be touched upon in that third section, but the fourth section that will be "replaced" is that that is labeled International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Society Names. This entire table will be replaced with what is the definitive list that this group is creating with the small exception of those acronyms that are listed on this table, because the acronyms are out of scope.

But this list that has been temporarily reserved is really only 190 national society names with one or two potential, if listed, translations of the English stream. The list, the definitive list that we're working on now eclipses this by a high degree order of magnitude and there really is no way to reconcile it other than to just - to reconcile out the acronyms themselves. But this entire table, once implemented by GDD staff will be changed, based off of this group's definitive list and after it goes through the DNS label algorithm concern.

So I hope that that helps clarify Stephane's point earlier. Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Berry. Thanks for the clarification, I guess my recollection was incorrect. I am still concerned in a bigger picture in how the acronym issue is going to be dealt with. I see (Mary) says that that's with the Board, GAC and GNSO but that was, you know, and having spent years in the original iteration of this group, that was one of the decisions, the policy recommendations of the GNSO that was basically nullified by the temporary actions taken which have now been temporary for the entire first round, so hard to call them temporary except in a much longer range view of what temporary means.

So I really hope that we are going to get to that because, you know, by comparison, maybe this was the low-hanging fruit, but the fact is that that fruit is still on the vine and to my mind, it's fruit of the poison tree in the sense that it is a temporary spec which has now gone and missed being put into a reconvening of this Working Group and so is this Working Group going to be reconvened again to deal with acronyms? Is acronyms somehow going to be - is the will of the GNSO and the policy recommendations that were supposed to be dealt with on an up or down vote by the Board going to be thwarted forever? What is the game here? It makes this group seem a little - a bit like a frippery by comparison. This is really just dealing with a technical issue, we've missed the policy issue. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you for that. I'll note that this group's charter is very specific and it was strictly the IC/IFRC formal names and the National Red Cross Society's formal or official and com names and that's the scope only. This group has nothing to do with acronyms or any of the other temporary reservations for IGOs or anything else going on in that regard.

I don't know exactly where the acronyms issue stands other than to state that I believe a status will be provided to the GNSO Council at ICANN62 on where

that stands and it will be considered separately. How it will be considered separately, I am unable to say other than what (Mary) notes into the chat. So again, we only have 12 minutes left, I'd like to try to finish the agenda where possible because we do need to talk about next steps in addition to the recommendations.

So again, Recommendation 5, just to recap, is referring to the variant index or variant principles that we've discussed, any new societies that are brought forward will follow the process via the GAC notifying the GNSO and ICANN Org and essentially that is a procedure that is already a part of the consensus policy that will start on the first of August.

And then lastly, Recommendation Six is again having to do with the correction of any errors as it may relate to translation or spelling and again, just reconfirms the process by how the GAC would be - GAC, ICANN Org and the GNSO would be notified there.

So last thing I'll state about this document is that again, right now, the way these recommendations are structured with this draft, we've placed the preliminary consensus level at full consensus, (Thomas) will actually confirm those based on his understanding of the deliberations to date. On the list afterwards and when the consensus call is started, if you have any objection to these consensus designations, then please state so in responding. Greg, I still see your hand is up. Did you want to respond to anything else in this document - thank you.

Okay, last part of the agenda to go through, the timeline and next steps and this was also sent as part of the agenda and I'm giving you scroll control. So essentially, you know, we've met today. We can - we have time to meet next week if this group feels that we need to, if we can't complete any of the consensus call or any other deliberations over the list.

The target is to start the public comment period the 18th of June. That could even go to the 21st of June before I myself fly out. The intent is to start the comment period on or around ICANN62. We'll be able to brief the Council the latest deliberations and we can at least send along to the Council an updated or a summary of the proposed recommendations and advertise the comment period as open.

There is no dedicated session regarding this reconvened Working Group and we'll be working with Council leadership, too in understanding the GNSO Council's agenda. At the very least there will probably - there can be five or ten minute update on where the Group is at, depending on what we see over the consensus call. If there's anything crazy, we can look to expand that discussion. I don't think it's warranted in that so far there seems to be general agreement about where this Group is going and if there is any major disagreements, that that can be a part of the public comment period.

So on or around the 18th of July, should this Group wish to do a 30-day comment period, I would note that this is a little bit complicated in that first, it was listed within the Council Resolution that it be 30 days, however, that doesn't specifically note that an ICANN meeting may fall in the middle of that.

There's been resistance in the past for having short public comment periods so the staff recommendation here is that we still move to a 40-day public comment period. That will give the community enough time to understand what was announced at ICANN62 and give them time to travel back and take time off, consult with their respective stakeholder groups and constituencies and then create the comments.

Thus, that would be the 28th of July before the public comment period would close, however, I would recommend that this Group reconvene on the 26th and hopefully there will be at least a few comments that we can start to review and we can also start to deliberate or collaborate on any edits to that initial report as work our way to the final report.

The 2nd of August we will for sure meet to review through all of the comments. Staff will be diligent about trying to force some of the review of those comments over the list but our main target date that we're shooting for is August 6th for the motions and documents deadline to send the final report to the Council. It does get a little tight towards the end of July and August, but given that there is general agreement about the Working Group's recommendations, we should be able to get this done and get this off our plates.

The last thing that I'd like to mention here, you'll recall I sent an email to the list confirming members for the consensus call. The list that you see before you at the bottom of this schedule are those persons that responded back to that. The only change that will occur, you know, I think if when we do send out to the list the formal consensus call from (Thomas), he'll predominately be looking for consensus among this particular list, however there are 30-plus other people that are part of the mailing list. If they've been following the deliberations at all, Thomas and I haven't discussed this but what if somebody on the short list decides to say that they accept the recommendations, we wouldn't neglect that particular input.

Predominately why I'm drawing attention to this, though, is these are the members that have participated the most, that have acknowledged they want to be a part of the consensus call so that's our primary target area. All the others that are on the list that were previously identified as members, the only thing that will change is the list of membership on the Wiki, those that aren't on this list will be downgraded as observer, however, we will not change how they are associated on the mailing list, it's not really worth the effort since this is coming to a close. But the main intent here was to right size the list so that we can get a clearer understanding of what the membership will be around the consensus call.

So with that, I'll turn it back over to (Thomas) for closing comments and then we can close the call, with four minutes to go. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, Berry. That was an outstanding piece of work that you delivered so thank you very much for this and for guiding us through that and also to (Mary) and other team members who have prepared all this.

Now we have four minutes left on this call, so I think, you know, what I'd like to understand is if we proceed to the consensus call, we have a collage of items that we've discussed today and I don't know exactly where the group stands on those and so you (unintelligible) so that we are sure we're on the same page with respect to those things.

So it was my understanding that the headquarters outlier be removed. Is that kind of the understanding in this Group? So if not, please let me know. So then we the discussion around traditional generic or general terms without any (traditional) languages, my sense is that given that we have the UN Six languages in the other consensus policy that it would be beyond the scope of this group to add (traditional) languages for general terms (unintelligible) under national law. So just indicate, please, if you think this understanding is incorrect and the third point is to confirm that there's little we can do with respect to acronyms because that's covered elsewhere and outside of this purpose of our Group.

Any further points that were discussed today as last minute challenges that we need to capture? Maybe (unintelligible) with this?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, (Thomas). Again, just to clarify, the second part of what will be sent to the list is the next version of this definitive list and the two categories that I mentioned earlier and I think it will be important since we don't have - we have full membership participation on the call, I think it's important to take this to the list but to confirm those two areas. One is higher level organizational names and the use of that term in a jurisdiction or a country

such as The Red Cross being translated into that official language and we want to draw that out. And then secondarily was the category of those exception names, I believe six of them, and I want to include Stephane's responses from the transcript in those and I think it will be important to highlight those to seek support on in addition to the draft recommendations. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Berry. That's very helpful and I guess that also responds to the (unintelligible) point. Stephane, you have your hand raised? (Unintelligible).

Stephane Hankins: Just very briefly, thank you. This is Stephane Hankins, ICRC. So what I - what we will seek to do is prepare a table of relevant extracts from national legislation for those 15 countries in as far as possible. I can't promise. I know for some of them, it's okay, to confirm that, you know, the national legislation on the protection of the Red Cross emblem and names includes, you know, the protection of the names.

Of course, you know each country has national legislation in its own language so obviously the names are protected, you know, they would be protected in the national language, same for the treaty that the state is a party to. Thank you very much for all the work that has been done. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stephane and with that, I think an agenda with an (unintelligible). Thanks everyone for taking the time to join the call today. Thanks again to staff for doing the job on this and talk to you soon. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you so much for your participation today, everyone. You may adjourn. Operator, please stop the recordings and disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great day, everyone.

END