

ICANN
Transcription
IGO-INGO Protections in all gTLDs PDP WG on Red Cross Names
Thursday, 7 September 2017 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-07sep17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p4s9tsrbo86/>
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/rhghB>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. And welcome to the IGO INGO PDP Working Group on the Red Cross names call on the 7th of September, 2017.

On the call today we have Heather Forrest, Thomas Rickert, Chuck Gomes, Jorge Cancio, Greg Shatan, Mason Cole, Ken Stubbs and David Maher. We received apologies from Christopher Lamb, Alan Greenberg and Jennifer Breckenridge. From staff we have Mary Wong, Dennis Chang, Berry Cobb, Steve Chan and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

Do we have anyone else on audio only, please? Hearing no one, I'd like to remind you all to please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much, over to you, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Nathalie. Hello, everyone. This is Thomas Rickert speaking. And I would like to welcome all of you to the short call of the reconvened PDP working group. And as we – as usual, we would like to go through the agenda and before we do so let me ask whether there are any updates to statements of interest? I don't see any hands so there shouldn't be updates to that.

Nathalie has kindly taken the roll call from the Adobe room and asked for additional participants on audio-only so that's done as well. And in terms of agenda, are there any comments or wishes for changes with respect to the agenda? That does not seem to be the case either.

And that allows us to dive into substance straight away and that is the discussion of additional questions on the legal basis, if any. And we've just put this into the agenda to make sure that there are no questions unanswered. You might remember that during the last call we had ample opportunity to discuss the various papers that have been circulated much earlier in the process, and we've also gone into sort of an analysis of the Geneva Convention and to see whether that would suffice as a legal basis for granting protections.

Subsequently, there has been a vivid exchange of emails on the list where questions were answered particularly surrounding the point whether emblems or designations would cover domain names or the word – the words Red Cross Red Crescent and others sufficiently and whether imitations thereof, which are mentioned in the convention, would be covered as well.

I have asked on the list whether all questions have been answered to the satisfaction of the party raising the question. And I got a response from Chuck that he has received sufficient responses. I have not seen any further questions nor did I get any further confirmation that there were aspects of questions that remained unanswered. So let me do another test, and hopefully this agenda point is going to be quite quick, but we want to make sure that there are no unanswered questions.

I see that Greg's hand is raised, so Greg, over to you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. And I want to thank everyone who circulated all the follow up information and the answers to questions. I think it

was important that we made sure we understood the basis for this. This group is – has had a job to do which is not a rubber stamp job so we, I think, independently needed to understand. And we might have done this years ago perhaps if this came up during the part of our work, the first time around. But, you know, timing isn't always advantageous. But now we have the time and this was the time to do this.

Having said that, I think that the issues of protection you know, have been settled. I think another important reason to do this is that blocking is generally considered to be a narrowly applied remedy except in the case of technical problems. And therefore, unless we're changing our overall approach to blocking, which may not be a bad idea, it's important to look at each blocking request fairly carefully so that we understand that when we're potentially pulling a string out of the market so to speak, that we're doing so appropriately. And I think we've discharged that responsibility. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Greg. I think that's a very important point that we need to be very diligent in analyzing where blocking requests can be honored and where they should be declined. This very question is on the legal basis for protections, and we will then discuss at a later agenda point what the scope of that – those protections should be. But I think that your points were very important and well noted.

Heather, over to you.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Thomas, very much. I too would like to express my appreciation for the level of detail to which responding to this has been (unintelligible) phrased the question first. And as a follow up point to Greg's, I would mark it down, if you can Thomas, please that whatever goes to Council at the end of this process needs to clearly, explicitly, (unintelligible) succinctly articulate the basis, the legal basis, for whatever it is that we decide to do.

And I take to heart Chuck's point early on, let's not make that lengthy (unintelligible) buried in interpretations and, you know, multiple pages. I think to the extent that Council has – Council won't have the benefit of the detail to which we've gone into this, not having participated as a group in these discussions; I think to the extent that we can make this as clear as possible for Council that would be very helpful. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Heather. I take this point to heart, I guess that when we come up with our recommendations we will have to make sure that it is succinct, that it is precise and we will get to that point later when we discuss the scope of the protections. I think we also need to be very precise with respect to the strings that shall be blocked, if any.

But these are very encouraging comments. I don't see any further hands raised. Therefore I think it's safe to assume that there are no further questions on this and that we can conclude that there is a legal basis for granting protections, that satisfy our need for this exercise and therefore let me proceed to what I've tentatively called a mini-consensus call on the legal basis. So it's not the – a formal consensus call on the overall work piece or work result that we're still in the process of finalizing. But I would just like to take this aspect of the list and therefore ask for objections to establishing what we discuss as a legal basis for protections. So are there any objections to taking this interim result off the list of our to-dos?

I do not see any hands raised nor do I see any stop signals, which we have available in the remote participation room. And as to our usual practice in the absence of objections, we can assume that this mini-consensus call was successful, so thank you for that. And that allows us to move to the third agenda item, and that is the review of the scope of protections.

And I hope that everyone has the opportunity to take a look at the list of strings that are – that can be found in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, with respect to Red Cross Red Crescent names. And this is a list

that I think we need to discuss at least a little bit because this is a list that was not the basis for our deliberations, but it was the list that was used as the basis for the Board to grant temporary protections.

And if you look at that list, there are two parameters, excuse me, that we should reach agreement on. I'm sorry. Let me just drink a sip of water, just hold on for a second. So I'm back.

So if you look at this list that was – that is now in Specification 5, that includes the society names that were prevailing at the time when the original work was done. And as we've learned from the Red Cross representatives, in the meantime, two additional societies have been added. So what we need to do as this group, and I will go to Ken in just a moment, is to discuss, number one, how we make this list sufficiently clear and finite; and at the same time, having sort of an opening clause in our recommendation that doesn't make it necessary for policy work to be reconvened whenever a new society is being added to the list.

The second point that we need to discuss is what languages should be covered. And the third point that we need to discuss is what variations of the society names should get protection. If you look at the list and if you search for Bahamas, you find various variations that have been asked for for the Red Cross Bahamas Society, with hyphens, without hyphens, I guess in total there is a list of eight variations thereof.

And I think we would be well advised to maybe establish a formula of Red Cross country names and then maybe specify that for new arrivals without hyphens, with the addition of society, with the addition of the prefix "The" the strings should be blocked so that we can both add a finite list to our recommendation, as well as have a clear and unambiguous – unambiguous formula for new additions to the list that allows for Specification 5 to be amended without the need to reopen policy debates.

So I should stop here. This was basically just an introduction to the points that I think we need to go through in this third agenda item. And I see a queue is forming so let's go to Ken first and then to Ben, then to Berry, excuse me.

Ken, in case you're speaking, you might be talking to a muted microphone?

Ken Stubbs: Yes, I apologize, I could not get my microphone unmuted. Can you hear me now, Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: We can hear you all right.

Ken Stubbs: All right, fine. I'm somewhat troubled by some of this so let me explain; I'm going to give you a perfect example of this. I live in Florida. One of the leading cancer centers in the southern part of the United States is the Moffitt Cancer Center. They have been using CIRC as part of their identity for many, many years. And it would seem to me, and please correct me if I'm wrong, Thomas here, that they could hypothetically be exempted in the future from using CIRC in the descriptor.

And I just don't like the idea. I think it's too far of a reach. I have no problems at all with the names, but when they start using acronyms or abbreviating and so forth, I feel they're going too far. We live in a world where just I could probably find 50 or 100 examples of where abbreviations like CIRC are being used by legitimate organizations for legitimate purposes and have been for many, many years.

And I just don't see where the Red Cross or any of these organizations have the right to capture those identifiers and say that they are particularly pertaining to us and that no one else can use them. I think that's what creates the resentment that you see in the community against some of these issues. Thank you for hearing me.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Ken. And I should have clarified when I did my introduction that this list that we see on the screen right now is the list that was used by the Board. And at the time the Board did not only grant temporary protections for the complete names, but also for acronyms. But as we've discussed previously, and as we've also put in writing as interim results, we can establish that our work only focuses on full names and not on acronyms. So when we continue our work, we need to go through this list that you see on the screen and take out the acronyms.

So I think that your concerns with acronyms, Ken, are widely shared, but actually that is out of scope for this group to decide. So I think I can put your concerns at rest. We do not discuss granting protections for acronyms.

So I hope that this clarifies things...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: ...sufficiently?

Ken Stubbs: Is there any problem with us commenting on it? It may be out of scope but we're coming – it's still a topic that's coming before the group and the group has an opinion. Does our scope preclude us from making a group opinion or are we so worried we can't get consensus amongst the group that these acronyms are probably impractical and inappropriate? That's all.

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Ken. Thanks, Ken. I guess that since we have been given a very narrow mandate by the GNSO Council, we should stick to that limited mandate and not form views on aspects that are outside this limited mandate. But I think we can conclude that the concerns about acronyms have also been widely shared when the original PDP work was done. So let's now move to Berry and then to Greg, please.

Berry Cobb: Hi, Thomas. Can you hear me okay?

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. This is Berry Cobb for the record. I'd just like to provide some background about the list that we're looking at now. The 189 names at the time, which is now technically 190, was given to the original working group midstride, and it really only contained the formal names of the Red Cross National Societies. So for example, Barbados Red Cross was actually capitalized, B, Barbados, space, Red, space, Cross.

When staff was advised by – or instructed by the Board to reserve these society names, they had to be converted into DNS labels that would allow for the registries to block these within EPP the SRS systems. In that conversion there's basically a standard algorithm that is used, I think it almost mirrors, for example, what the Trademark Clearinghouse database uses in the algorithm. But in essence, it will collapse a full name that has spaces or other characters in the middle of it and remove the spaces or any other types of characters that may not – that would violate DNS label conversion rules. For example, you can't have an ampersand in a DNS label. It wouldn't ever resolve.

And so as a part of that algorithm, when it collapses or, you know, when it collapses the name it removes spaces but there is also a variation introduced in that, and that's how you see the hyphens in between some of these names I won't state how the working group should deliberate this or not, but that is – it's the same algorithm that's been applied for the IGO full names that are being implemented as a part of the IRT. It's also kind of the same process that will be applied for any types of strings that may be – enter into some sort of Clearinghouse for any claims notification.

So I think for the deliberations of today I wouldn't worry so much about the hyphens that you see here, but what could be or what should be up for

discussion is when you look at the original Scope 2 statement it basically says that the society name should be – is within English as well as their respective national language.

So in the case of Barbados one here, we have – I think the formal name is Barbados Red Cross, they are also well known, I believe, as Stephane would state, that they're also well known as The Barbados Red Cross. And that's what needs to be decided here because Barbados Red Cross is English only so there isn't technically a secondary language of its national language that would be used. So the working group should deliberate on whether this variation of the use with the term "the" is appropriate or not. I hope that clarifies what we're looking at with the list.

And the last thing that I would point out here is, you know, this particular list is what is extracted by the registries to make these reservations. And the reason why it does include the strings from the acronyms and those kinds of things, again, was a result of implementation from the Board direction to staff. So for example, at some point in implementation this particular list will be updated to allow the registries to implement appropriately the appropriate reserved list after it changes.

So for example, within the IRT today, that are implementing the other protections, there will be an update to this Specification 5 list that'll be propagated out and the registries have to implement it by a date. Some point down, if for example this working group does formally adopt reservations to there, and if there are any changes to how this list is structured, that IRT then would basically review this list from an inventory perspective, make sure it aligns back to the policy recommendation and an update would go with that.

So as an example, the acronyms that are listed on here could possibly, you know, actually be removed and then they would follow a particular release protocol should that be the final outcome from the Board. So I hope that that makes things clear. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: That's very helpful. Thanks, Berry. Next in line is Greg. Greg, please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I think the list we're looking at here is causing some confusion since it includes things that we're supposed to consider and those that we're not supposed to consider. So it would be helpful to see the list without any acronyms on it so that we can concentrate on what we're supposed to deal with.

I'm also curious since this table does include acronyms, how this was put in place in terms of temporary protections without protecting the acronym or was this in fact implemented with the acronyms in place, since they're on the list.

Finally, I'm curious how many strings are on this list in total. And I also, like Heather, would like to see the list that came from RCRC before this was turned into the list we see in front of us. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Greg. There were a couple of questions in your intervention. We will go through the recording later on. I think that we can't give answers to those immediately, you know, but the number of strings and all the rest of it, and get back to you regarding those questions on the list.

Next in line is Stéphane.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, hello to all. This is Stephane Hankins, International Committee of the Red Cross for the record. Thank you very much for allowing me to take the floor here.

I concur with the explanations that have been given on, you know, how the list was prepared and provided. Basically, and we had communicated this to ICANN staff and to Mary in particular some time ago, that we stand ready of course to revise the list as it now stands in accordance with the requirements

that will be, I understand now, decided during this call. So we of course can, you know, will rework this.

But just a few words on, you know, where we had set the criteria at the time, you know, the initial list was listed. Our criteria was several fold, as I think already mentioned partly. The intention was to include within the list the names of the respective national Red Cross Red Crescent Societies both in their official version as well as in their usual version or the usual names national societies are known by.

The American Red Cross has a very long official name so that has been submitted, but they also – they're of course known essentially as American Red Cross, so we've submitted of course the names in those two versions.

Then we included a variety of variations and indeed there we require indeed instructions and then we will do it. But it's clear that, you know, the inclusion of the article as well as variations such as the inclusion or not of the word "Society" – American Red Cross, American Red Cross Society. This is also something that, you know, we need to consider again more precisely.

But we ask national societies of the Red Cross Red Crescent themselves, which were the designations – which of their designations and names they wanted to be protected, and this list reflects that. However, we of course will want to harmonize this potentially by including the names with and without the word "Society" for all the societies if indeed we want to be – to have full consistency.

As regards to languages, yes as mentioned, we provided a list of the names of the respective national societies in the respective official languages of their respective countries. And of course obviously also in their respective fonts, which immediately raised a number of questions on the technical ability of doing so within – within the Domain Name System. But the intention is indeed to provide the names and the different official languages of the state, for

example, in Switzerland it's four languages that you know, the name (unintelligible) Swiss and it would have to be, you know, protected in German, French, Italian and the additional language in Switzerland.

So this is how we proceeded, but again, we – following this discussion and the agreement reached, and we will rework this and potentially also you know, make a proposal to the ICANN and to the GNSO for its consideration.

As regards acronyms, once again I want to give up our perspective. I tried to do so in the first reconvened group we had. But basically we have...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Sorry, I suggest we...

Stephane Hankins: I go quickly.

Thomas Rickert: ...acronyms now, right?

Stephane Hankins: Yes, but I just – I just wanted to...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: Yes, I just want to (precise) that the request and this is a request that was formulated in the GAC in its previous advice, is that the acronyms, when they are requested, and that is for the international organizations of the RCRC and the IFRC, that they be afforded the same across mutual reservation which will be accorded eventually, potentially, to the international organizations. So that's where we stand. And of course as we revise the list then you know, we would – we will take out the acronyms that are there. Thank you very much.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stéphane. Again, regardless of what other communication has taken place with respect to acronyms, this is something

that we can't chime in on even if some in the group would like to. So let's please not further discuss acronyms in this group. But with respect to the other criteria that you mentioned, I've tried to sum this up in the chat window of the remote participation room, and so let me try to summarize this again and then hear comments from the group.

So I think we have two criteria for establishing a list. And that is, number one, a general formula on how strings shall be composed, and that is irrespective of what exact names are on the list at the moment. That would be a general formula under which additional societies could have their names added in future, so that we don't have to go through the policy process again.

And the criteria that I picked up from what Stephane said are, number one, the names of the societies. And that would be both the official version as well as the version of the societies that they are known by. Second criterion would be with and without hyphens, if it's – since it's composed of different words; thirdly, the inclusion of the article or not; and fourthly, the inclusion of the word "Society" or not. So that would be our finite list on how to create those names.

And the second general criterion would be, the languages that shall be protected, and there we would have official language or as the case may be, official languages of the countries of origin of the society plus the English language. So can I please hear views on this or concerns with this? Otherwise, I would suggest – I see Chuck ticking green. Thanks very much for that support.

Greg's hand is up so let's hear Greg now. Greg, please over to you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I just wanted to understand practically what that means and I tried to count this up rather quickly. Does mean that for each national society name, assuming that English is the language of the country, there would be eight separate blocked strings combining those

different criteria across each other? And eight for each additional language unless articles aren't used in that language? And I'm only going to kind of – that's not covering IDNs which, you know, may work differently.

And I did ask earlier how many strings are on this entire list and that – just trying to get a sense of what in fact, you know, is happening here? You know, it's like (unintelligible), you know, hang onto two bunnies for six months. If it's a male and a female you're not going to end up with two bunnies. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Greg. As I mentioned earlier, we do not – or I do now know the exact number of strings on this list. But since we have established that there is a legal basis for blocking these strings or the societies' names as well as imitations thereof, I think our group needs to establish how those imitations are composed and therefore I think technically you are correct that it is a maximum of eight variations per language.

And I think what I'm trying to understand is whether there is any objection to using that general formula. And if we assume that the legal basis is okay, then I think it – the total number of strings is interesting for information purposes but it can't change our decision with respect to the composition of the names and the length of the list in total.

Stéphane, is that a new hand? Stéphane, did you want to speak again? Your hand is raised. Okay that's probably an old hand. And I don't see any further hands raised nor do I see any objections in the chat window.

I see Chuck's hand is raised. Chuck, over to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Thomas. I just want to ask the question, we know how creative people are that want to use names that aren't names they should be using. Do we need any sort of a general criterion with regard to any other variations not covered by the rules that you proposed that might create confusion? And I'm not necessarily advocating for it, I just wonder whether we ought to

consider that so again, we wouldn't have to come back to a policy development exercise if somebody found some creative way to follow the rules, but still create confusion for the societies.

Thomas Rickert: That's a good point, Chuck. I guess what we can do probably is – are two things. One is to actually clean up the list that we see in front of us so that it exactly matches the current state of play, so we would make that a finite list. And then make it abundantly clear that the formula, i.e. the criteria that we've just discussed for composing strings of newly founded societies, is actually a finite list as well. And I guess with these two limitations we might be able to prevent gaming from taking place.

Greg, I see your hand raised, and while Greg is speaking, maybe, Chuck, you can give me an indication in the chat whether this was a sufficient response to your question? Greg, please.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I'll try to be brief. And I think first it's important that the list be finite and I think that getting – going down the variations route especially when we're using creativity as the benchmark is not a place we can go. More importantly, I would say that this is what rights protection mechanisms are for. And that sort of, you know, dealing with variants should be dealt with in that fashion just as brand owners do. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Thomas. I'm not sure what you said addresses what I said. In the case for example, of trademarks, we have the UDRP and the URS that allow the owners of the marks or the rights to object if there's some confusion. So in cases not covered by the rules, they could, you know – they have mechanisms for dealing with some creative way of doing confusion.

Is there some mechanisms, for example, that a Red Cross society could challenge something that maybe follows the rules but doesn't – but creates undue confusion? Is there some mechanisms for doing that like, for example, with trademarks?

Thomas Rickert: Okay, so understood your question to be the other way around, that the – that additional strings could be sneaked into the...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No, no...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Yes, okay, I'm sorry for that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, no, I was fine with what you said but I don't think it addressed what I was getting at, okay? Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, and I guess that the only – or there are two avenues that can be pursued, one of which would be the rights protection mechanisms offered by ICANN such as UDRP and URS where applicable, or were opened up to these organizations following the Curative Rights Protection PDP that's still going on, or through national courts where relief can be sought. But I guess anyways I guess it's an important remark that you make, but I guess there's little that this group can do in order to grant additional protections for the societies.

Chuck Gomes: So, Thomas, this is Chuck again. So maybe we could make a comment in that regard that the issue of – that I raised should be handled or we're assuming that it would be handled by the Curative Rights PDP?

Thomas Rickert: Let's take note of that, so I suggest if we want to add a little bit of color in terms of what aspect this group has discussed beyond its scope, we need to find a way to do that formally. But I take away two aspects from today's call, one of which would be the acronyms thing, you know, where we clarify that we did not consider acronyms, and the second thing would be the point that you just made. So I will discuss with staff on how we can best do that.

Great, so what I suggest doing, since we can't...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: Excuse me?

Thomas Rickert: Stéphane.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, this is Stéphane. I'm trying to raise my hand but I'm not sure if it's appearing on the screen. I would like to abide with what Chuck just said, and simply to remind that in the treaty provisions that we discussed in the past few calls, the prohibitions are not only on misuse of the names, but also imitations of the name. So indeed, you know, this is not a new concern, it's one that we have raised very long ago when, you know, when discussions were for some reflections on whether some form of string similarity mechanism would be amiable to be set up. We were explained that that's not the case.

But certainly, you know, this is of course a clear concern. And indeed to be in line with the international law requirements, you know, we would also strongly you know, recommend, you know, that there be some kind of process procedure whether rights protection mechanisms, curative rights, you know, be foreseen for this. So I think this is a very important point and I think if indeed, you know, the GNSO is amiable to do so, I think it would be very valuable to reflect. And if my memory is correct, this was also part of the conversation we had in Copenhagen already that, you know, there were two

– there were potentially or the need to reflect on those – on the two dimensions. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stéphane. Great, now in terms of next steps, I hope to be safe to assume that we are in agreement that the formula that we've discussed for creating protected names is fine by everyone. So that's going to be one part of our recommendation, that is the general abstract formula for establishing strings in addition to the finite list that we're going to add to our recommendation and that allows for future societies to get their names added to Specification 5.

The second aspect in terms of scope is the actual finite list of the status quo protections. That we can't sign off today because we don't have it as of today, but we will ask staff to work with Red Cross Red Crescent to establish a variation of the list that we see in front of us based on the formula that we have discussed, right? So if we have those two components, I think our work is done.

So what we should be doing then, is discuss next steps, because I'm not – I think that in terms of substance, we are aligned, we certainly need to put that in writing, we need to send it to the list and what I suggest doing is that, you know, once we have this – the Council explicitly asked us to deliver this defined limited set of variations of the names basically carved in stone, we will send that list to the list – that list to the list, which is nice – give you a few days to review.

And once we have all agreed that this list is fine, then we will proceed to a consensus call. I'm not sure whether we even need another teleco for that, but I'd rather try to do that remotely on the list. That means that we will give the list two weeks' time to raise objections to the language that we will then have proposed on the list.

And in the absence of objections, we have consensus on our recommendations, which we then put out for public comment. And according to the instructions that we got from Council, we need to go through a 30-day public comment period. And if you do the math, that takes us very close to Abu Dhabi, so there's no chance for us to be done by Abu Dhabi, but if everything works according to plan and if we get this list and the language sorted very shortly, then the public comment period will end shortly before the Abu Dhabi meeting starts.

So we can then even without not being able to close the process formally, we will be able to give a good report to the GNSO Council. So that's – after Abu Dhabi, assuming that there will be no public comment that suggests that we need to reopen our debate, we can then formally do the public comment analysis and formally close our work.

So that's just in terms of next steps. But let's do first things first, and establish this list for everyone's review offline and then wait for comment on the list. I just hope that, you know, what I've outlined in terms of process is okay with everyone on this call. I do know that not everyone is on this call so as Jorge rightfully suggested, we will certainly put that in writing and send the plan and the time windows when you need to pay special attention to the list in writing so that everyone knows exactly what's going to happen. But for the time being, let me just check whether this is okay with everyone.

And if you don't object, we can actually end this call before the top of the hour. But that certainly should not keep us away from being as diligent as we have to be. Stéphane, your hand is raised, please

Stephane Hankins: Yes, thank you very much. I'm sorry I'm not sure I understood correctly whether the list itself or the precise list with all the – with the different names and their respective variations according to the criteria discussed and agreed during this call that is the list to be circulated as well? And the reason I ask that is we require – if, you know, this is – it depends if this is to be prepared

by us or prepared by ICANN staff. If it is to be prepared by us, we need time for that. We have – there are various, for example, as far as I'm concerned, I have various missions coming up so I need, you know, we will need a little bit of time.

So if it's a two-week deadline, then that raises for me some concern. So I just wanted to – I just want to table that. Would the – is it the criteria that will be circulated or is it the so-called finite list? Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you for the question, Stéphane. What I said, and I think that this is the group's request, we need to circulate both the formula as well as the finite list because participants of this group do want to see the list. So the two week time window that I mentioned is the time window for the consensus call. That is not the time that we have until we have something that can be put out for a consensus call. But since we've promised to Council that we would be working on this as quickly as we possibly can, I do hope that we can produce the list quicker than that.

I do understand that there are time constraints, but let's take this offline, I suggest, and see how quickly we can produce something with staff and with your participation as possible that we can put out for everyone's review.

Okay, so I think that's pretty much everything we can do today. I think this has been a very productive discussion. And I think we have a clear path toward completion, which is great. And we will not schedule a subsequent call for the time being because – and I think this suits most participants needs in terms of availability and time zones, we will try as much as we can to do the remaining work asynchronously on the list.

And with that, I think we can end this call. Thanks, everyone, for your participation and engaged discussion. And talk to you soon. And this call is ended. The recording can be stopped. Thanks very much.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Thomas.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for joining, everyone. You may now...

((Crosstalk))

Stephane Hankins: Thank you.

END