
COPENHAGEN – ICANN GDD: IGO/INGO Implementation Review Team
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

MARY WONG: For those in the room, please feel free to come and sit around the table. We should have enough room and it's an open session. So, you're very welcome if ever you're a non-member of the team.

DENNIS CHANG: Hello, everyone. We'll get started here very soon.

Welcome, everyone, to the IGO/INGO Identifier Protection Policy Implementation Review Team Meeting at ICANN58 on the 15th of March, 2017.

Before we proceed and cover the agenda, let's say quick hello to everyone. Please feel free to come up and sit at the table. Make yourself comfortable. We have plenty of room.

So, let's see. Starting from my right, let's just go around and introduce yourself. Go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Crystal Ondo, Donuts.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

IVETT PAULOVICS: Ivett Paulovics, MSFD URS Provider.

PIERFRANCESCO FASANO: Pierfrancesco Fasano, MSFD URS provider.

MERT SAKA: Mert Saka, ICANN Org.

DENNIS CHANG: Dennis Chang, I'm the Program Director and responsible for this Policy Implementation Project.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Petter Rindforth, IPC.

MARY WONG: Mary Wong, ICANN Policy Staff supporting apparently every IGO/INGO project around.

STEVE CHAN: Steve Chan, ICANN staff.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: Michael Flemming, GMO Brights Consulting, also IPC.

LUC SEUFER: Luc Seufer, EuroDNS, a registrar.

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody else behind me want to introduce yourself? No? Okay. That's fine. You don't have to. Alrighty. Then, let's get going.

I'm going to give you a quick project background because this is a public session at ICANN meetings. I like to do that for those of you who are new to this. Although it's hard to believe that people are new to IGO/INGO by now.

But most importantly, I think it's important for us to be clear on the project scope. So, we'll look at that together of how this is different than all the other discussion that's going on. And we'll look at our Project Schedule, Project Status and the actual Draft Policy Language that the IRT has been working on for this year. And we'll talk about the next steps and how we'll move from there.

So, the Project Background, I believe, many of you know by now we had a PDP. We consider the protection of various IGO/INGOs including the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement and the International Olympic Committee, IOC.

So, the PDP Working Group was formed and its work started at 2013. The consensus recommendation was approved by the GNSO Council. In April 2014, the Board adopted those PDP recommendation that were not inconsistent with the GAC advice received on the topic. So, the keywords are not inconsistent.

So, this is an unusual case where GNSO Council made a recommendation and Board decided not to accept all the recommendation but only some part of the recommendation. Henceforth, you're hearing all these things about reconciliation, the informal talks between GAC and the GNSO, Board facilitating that discussion that went on.

So, for the scope of that are not inconsistent is what we're working on today and I'll show you in a pictorial form here. So, high level, there are three streams of work going on in the IGO and INGO protection. The first top row, the blue bar is what this Implementation Project is based on. That is based on that four resolution that was adopted. So, as you see in the blue writing, the Policy Implementation Project is focused on the GNSO recommendation that are not inconsistent with GAC advice.

In the middle, we have this red bar that is Reconciliation of Inconsistent GNSO Recommendation & GAC Advice and that (Board). And those are those topics of things like the acronym, so for the IGOs, the claims, Permanent Claims and then Red

Cross reserved name for the 189 or I guess, somebody is correcting me, is 190 now. Yeah, 192.

So, that was what was happening in those other discussion that some of you have attended. And there, the decision has not been made and we'll find out in a way of Board resolution and their decision where they go from there.

The third bar is this Curative Rights Protection Mechanism PDP Working Group. And Petter is actually the Chair of that PDP Working Group. And we just got out of that PDP Working Group session coming directly through here. So, there's lots of IGO/INGO discussion going on. But I wanted to make sure that everybody is in this room and on this call is on the same page. This session, we're talking about actual implementation of those scope and only those scope that we are authorized to implement.

Here is a table form of what I just talked about. And you'll see two columns and four rows. So, the first is RCRC, that is the Red Cross. Second is the ICO. Third is IGO. Fourth is INGO. And in the first column, there we list the not inconsistent, meaning these are the scope that we're authorized to implement.

On the second column is those things that were not authorized because we have a difference in GNSO recommendation and

GAC advice. And what you will notice right away is that IOC and INGO, we do not have any difference. The issue is really the IGO and the Red Cross.

Do we have any questions about the scope of this project now? Let me just pause a minute to make sure that this soaks in before we get started in a substantial discussion. Any questions from any one? Perfectly clear? All right. So, let's move on.

[MICHAEL FLEMMING]: We're still reading it.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. So, the plan and status, mainly, what we are working on is the policy language and implementation. The plan-wise, so there are some development work that we're doing in the background, in the ICANN Org is working on with our suppliers.

But with the IRT, we're mainly focused on getting the language correct for the policy and getting the list that we need to get started and developing the system. So just this morning, I had a meeting with our supplier for the claim system, Deloitte. And seems like there's not going to be a problem in terms of timing. Do we have a question?

[MERT SAKA]: Yeah. We have an online question from [George Cricross]. The question says – I think this is about the scope – “This is only for gTLDs, correct? And not legacy domains like .com?” End of question.

DENNIS CHANG: Correct. Correct on the new. So here is the timeline of our project. So, this month, we're going to finalize the draft of the policy language in ready for the public comment which will start in April and it'll go to May. And then, after we collect the public comment, we're going to revise whatever language we need to and then go to go and make the final policy language and publish that with an announcement on 1 August, 2017.

So, this is the key date. 1 August, 2017 is the announcement. And 1 February of 2018 is the policy effective date. So, we have six months for which we all have to work on the implementation. So, on the ICANN side, we've been working on this and I don't think that we'll going to have an issue. We are going to continue to talk to the registries to make sure the registries are ready and the registrars are ready. And if we start now, we shouldn't have any problem with the timing of the six-month implementation.

So, key deliverables meaning that what do we really need to go ahead and make the announcement. And here, of course, we

need the policy language to be finalized. But I do want to bring your attention better especially you because we really needed to make this decision.

On the IGO, we have a list which is where we refer to as the GAC list and you've heard about this from our last meeting too. The policy says that they can have that list and another language of their choice, of the two languages. The second language is really optional, that can be protected. So, there was an idea that we are going to collect the second language from the GAC. And we will hopefully have both languages before we go and make the public comment and then announcement.

But it seems like that second language list is not coming very soon. So, the Implementation Team met earlier and we thought and we saw no reason why we cannot go forward with a list of public comment and note that when and if that second language list is provided to us that we can simply add to our list. But the policy itself, policy implementation should not be dependent on that delivery of the second list. What do you think about that?

PETTER RINDFORTH: I think I have asked this before and probably got a reply from you but sorry if I ask again. But is it clear that the first language,

is that English or could it be that if they have provided only one language, it could be in a local script, so to speak?

DENNIS CHANG: The two language that specified by the policy is the two language of their choice. So, if they provide one language, it could be anything other than English if that's their choice.

PETTER RINDFORTH: Yes. As we have discussed before, we all agree about it. The best way is to have two languages where one is English and, so to speak, readable or understandable globally and then if there are also ones have in the local. But if it takes too much time, it's better to go out with a list in one language and then have some kind of reminding practice so that they don't forget to provide with a second language. So, they can come out fairly quickly now with the initial list and then it can be added also within a decent time, but rather than to not come out with the list this way [forward].

DENNIS CHANG: Crystal, do you have any comments on that?

CRYSTAL ONDO: About the second language? I guess I'd prefer to have the languages before we roll this out. It seems hard to expect registries to keep. That's adding to the list as opposed to just having it now?

DENNIS CHANG: The issue is that the timing of that arrival of the second language is indeterminant. We're having a hard time collecting the second language. Yeah.

So, at this time, I like to switch to the document and look at it together. So, this is the same document you've seen and I'll point out the changes. The language itself has not changed but we did a lot of work in terms of formatting to prepare for the web display when this will be published.

So, we have our first scope statement that haven't changed. Our effective date, as you see, is 1 February, 2018. That has not changed. And then we added these definitions or that we had that and that hasn't changed. Then we did one thing here, 3.7, if you notice, this was a standard keyword definitions that we had on top where we moved it down to 3.7.

There's a slide modification from the IETF keywords. And that is the IETF keywords have "shall", "shall not" and we decided not to use "shall" and "shall not" and just go with "must" and "must

not”. It seem like “shall” and “must” conveys the same meaning. We keep getting question about what's the difference. So, if we just limit it to these words, then we won't have those questions.

That seems to work okay. We went through the document and we replaced all the “shall” with “must” and didn’t seem like it read any differently, just more of a modern English language situation I think.

So, 4.1, 4.2, that hasn’t changed. 4.3, 4.4, that hasn’t changed. The claim systems identifier list, INGO identifier list. I don’t know if I can bring it up but maybe I will. If I have time later on, I will bring it up if we have time. And that is to go into the Community Wiki page.

And I think in our last meeting, I showed you that we split the list into two list. And that is the one list is for INGO only. And that is because INGO only gets the claims treatment on 90 days’ claims. They don’t get any reservation.

The other list combines the Red Cross, IGO and ISC. They do get reservation without claims. So, it may sense that we have two lists because they are treated differently and that seem to work out very well.

Again, we will use the Community Wiki page meaning the IRT Wiki page for the purposes of public comment. And through the

public comment, maybe we'll get some suggestions on how to treat the list.

So, INGO claims, services, this is how we do the INGO claims services. The idea is we will get the list from the United Nations, ECOSOC. UN [inaudible] once a year. And last update we got was October last year. And they do an annual update. And what we do is when we get it, we provide it to our claims service provider and they load it into their claims service system database and is treated very similar to the TMCH but it is not TMCH. It has nothing to do with trademark. It is based on that authoritative list that we receive from the United Nations.

Our process here does not get into any type of evaluation of the list. We simply use it in because ECOSOC themselves has that application process and verification. So, we leave that whole, the validation and verification of the names to them. This is where we talk about the fact that we get it from the United Nation. And we have a –

Go ahead.

CRYSTAL ONDO:

Thank you very much, Dennis. It's Crystal Ondo with Donuts. I just thought that we discussed in our last meeting or the one before that adding a sentence to 5.3 that made it clear that

additions to the INGO list after a TLD's first 90 days, that we're not required to go through their own claims period.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yes. Sorry. This is following up on our last IRT discussion. We concluded that we agree with your interpretation and we added that change. Yeah. That's probably was in our other earlier iteration of the changes.

So, you should have this copy because I sent it to you. But I'll send it again. Please look for it because everybody actually liked the way you interpret it because it makes sense and it's so much easier. Yeah. Okay. Let's make sure it's in there before we go to public comments. So, let me do one more round of distribution to the IRT for like a final comment. And then once we get verify that's in there, then we'll go ahead and proceed with public comment.

The Appendix A is the notification that will be displayed to the potential domain name registrant that their advice that domain you're about to register is an IGO/INGO name. And then we have implementation note that talks about the DNS label conversion rule. So, there's one more thing that we added. For the purposes of public comment, somebody suggested that rather than going right into the conversion rules, we put in some description of

what it is that we're talking about and so that when you pick up this document and read the conversion rules, you will have some basic understanding and some examples such as the fact that if you have a name that exceeds a maximum number of 63 characters, it will not get a DNS label. It won't resolve.

So that's the advice that just in case somebody's wondering why. And you will see that on the list that some of the identifier does not have an equivalent DNS label and this is why. Go ahead. You have a question?

[MERT SAKA]:

Yeah. We have a question online from [George Cricross]. "Will ICANN be creating an FAQ regarding the INGO notices?" (We have been talking about this in the RPM PDP Working Group as we are on TMCH topic now).

DENNIS CHANG:

It's interesting that you asked that. Along with doing these policy implementation projects, we're also working on creating a standard process for policy implementation. And one of the suggestion is doing an FAQ right alongside of the policy implementation development. Therefore, we can all use it during the implementation and afterwards, we can post it and publish it for the remaining consumers. So yes, we're definitely

going to work on. And that will be added to our list of task for the IRT to review our FAQ once we put together.

So, as we receive these questions that we get, we will collect them and add to our list. So, it'll be a living document and it'll grow as we receive questions. And some of these questions I know we keep getting. And as much as we can, we try to make our language clear on the document itself, the policy language. But I know that we can only go so far with that.

So, thank you for your suggestion and we will definitely deliver. And you can probably look for it in the IRT Wiki page. That's where we'll start posting that document along with the policy language document. Does George have another question or just a comment? Just a comment?

[MERT SAKA]: Just a comment but it's not in the comment brackets.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. After that, we have a background information. This is something new also. We want to get in the practice of adding background information on the policy language. We didn't have that before. But we thought that was working on the standard

and comparing it with other policy language, we thought that would be a good addition and so we did. We added it. Okay.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Can I ask you a question? With the second to the last paragraph that you have under background, it says, “With respect to the delegation of gTLD strings, ICANN shall reserve the gTLDs corresponding to the abovementioned identifiers.” And that's not true for INGOs, is it? You might want to go back to the slide where you had all the various consistencies and inconsistencies.

DENNIS CHANG: Sorry. Which paragraph? The policy?

CRYSTAL ONDO: The second to last.

DENNIS CHANG: You're talking about paragraph?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Paragraph, this last sentence of the second to last paragraph. It just says, “ICANN must reserve gTLDs corresponding to the

abovementioned identifiers” and that implies you mean IGOs, INGOs and everything.

DENNIS CHANG: That's correct. That does imply that. Yeah.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I don't think that's accurate.

DENNIS CHANG: You're right. It's the INGO. Thank you. INGO does not get renovation. So, we'll correct that background. Anything else?

CRYSTAL ONDO: You got to turn on your mic and say that for the record. That would be great.

DENNIS CHANG: I was just asked to repeat my comment that that Crystal is so good.

[MERT SAKA]: There's a comment from [George Cricross] as well. “One should also clarify it's only for new gTLDs, just in case.”

DENNIS CHANG: Correct. Is there anyone else have questions? No? Okay. So, we have time left. So, I'll ask you on the IRT. Do you want to see the list on the IRT Wiki page or no? No? You've seen it? Yeah, those of who you are interested, you can certainly go and look for it on the Community Wiki page. Let me share. Okay, there it is.

So, in a way of next steps for our IRT work, we are having another meeting as scheduled. It should be on your calendar for 20th of April. And by that time, hopefully, we would have our public comment open.

And this is the Wiki page. If you click on the link, it's a live link. And it should go to our Community Wiki. And then in there, you will see the actual list and all the identifier and corresponding DNS labels for them.

PETTER RINDFORTH: But just a quick practical question. The public comment periods will start just before April 20. How much work is left? Because I think it's just small adjustments now. Four months. So, when can go out?

DENNIS CHANG: It depends on how fast Crystal can review that document and let me know exactly what she needs to change. No, I'm just kidding. We do have internal process in ICANN that it's not a simple matter. We have to prepare the public comment in terms [or] the introduction language and schedule them. And there's an elaborate process that we go through.

So, every public comment that request for public comment that you see on ICANN Org has a lot of work behind them. So, it'll probably be early April at the earliest, maybe mid-April. But I'm hoping that we'll get to it before our meeting so we can see the public comment being open together.

MARY WONG: This is Mary from Staff and forgive me because my brain is mushed. And even though I've been dealing with IGOs and INGOs at different levels, ways, shapes, forms, times of night. I just wanted to go back to the question of the scope of this policy because the GNSO's Policy Development Process was for protections for IGOs and INGOs in all gTLDs. And obviously, there's issues and we've discussed in this IRT with applying some of these recommendations to the so called Legacy gTLDs meaning the ones that were obviously delegated prior to the 2012 program round.

So, Dennis, I guess this is the question. Is too confirm that this proposed policy language going out for public comment is for all gTLDs, new gTLDs or new gTLDs but with the feasibility for reservation, for example, for the legacy gTLDs to be worked out.

And just to clarify, I'm just asking for the record, because we probably will have folks who are not able to follow this meeting who since we're coming on public comment, I thought it might be helpful to clarify that.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah, you're right. It is confusing. So, it is for all gTLDs but in terms of INGO, it is only for the new gTLD after the policy effective dates. Delegated after policy effective date which Crystal reminds me.

So, in terms of reservation, it applies to all gTLDs. And that is currently, there are temporary reservation under Spec 5 and those apply. And this list is very similar but not exactly identical. And there's another further confusion that we have to be careful about. And that is the current list includes acronym and this policy list does not include acronym. So, thank you.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Just to clarify one more thing. This also provides for a mechanism whereby registries of all new gTLDs can release their reserved names which is not something that's in the contract but it does apply to all previously delegated gTLDs. Yeah.

DENNIS CHANG: Good job. Thank you. Thank you, everyone. I hope that made it clear. Okay, there's more questions.

[MERT SAKA]: Yeah. There's one question online from [George Criccross].

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

[MERT SAKA]: For legacy domains, I assume all existing domains are grandfathered. This should be explicitly stated given all domains .com or four characters or less are taken.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. I'm not sure if I understand the question about the legacy domain.

CRYSTAL ONDO: This doesn't apply to legacy domains is my understanding. This is just for the new gTLDs that came out this round. Yeah.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: The release because they don't have. They obviously don't have it. Yeah.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Nothing's reserved in .com. So, this obviously doesn't apply to those. They don't have the same contractual obligations that new gTLDs do.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: So, a basic clarifying question would be the claims policy, for example, would apply to all TLDs delegated after the effective date of the 1st February 2018. However, there's another clause in here from just what I've heard now that allows for the release of these strings where it was previously set for reservation by ICANN within their contracts. And that would inclusively include all the new gTLDs but for the gTLDs, the legacy gTLDs, that does not include the all those .com and whatnot.

So, what George is getting at, where Mary said this applies for all gTLDs too – now, I'm lost too. Okay. I'm sorry. I'm just trying to figure out what George wants to know.

DENNIS CHANG: Let's do this.

CRYSTAL ONDO: So, there are no names required to be reserved in .com. So clearly, a mechanism to release reserved names does not apply to .com or .net or any of the other legacies because they never require to reserved names. So, you can say it applies to them but it doesn't apply to them because they don't have that.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. This is why this project is so much fun because the policy language must say all gTLDs because that is the policy. But in practical sense, .com.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: Okay. So, George's question is now going to if it gets deleted, then would it go on to the reserved list?

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes. There's another section in this that talks about if it becomes deleted that it must be registry reserved but only by new gTLDs who have the obligation to reserve the names in their arrays. But you are allowed to transfer and all these other things but the

ones that are already reserved because you can't prevent that as a registry.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: So, on the whole, it applies to all gTLDs that are delegated after such effective date but there are specific clauses that are specifically for new gTLDs exactly. Okay.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. Go ahead, Mary.

MARY WONG: I'm really sorry I started this.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: No, it's a good thing.

MARY WONG: But maybe it's a good thing. So, we're talking about a few different things. So, get the easy ones out of the way. Right? We have well relatively. In terms of things like Claims Notification

which is the INGOs, the non-governmental organizations, that clearly doesn't apply to legacy gTLDs. Clearly.

With respect to those names that are currently under Interim reservation in Spec 5, that's what we were just talking about in terms of the release. No?

DENNIS CHANG: No. Okay. So, let me say yes and no. I think George's point is the legacy –

MARY WONG: I haven't got to George's point but please go.

DENNIS CHANG: Yeah. So, the new gTLD is what we were talking about. And in practical sense, it applies to new gTLD of this list reservation. However, because .com doesn't have any reservation, so then the only way it would apply is when somebody gives up a name and drops it. And then if it happens to be on the list, then it gets reserved. So therefore, it applies to all gTLDs.

MARY WONG: This is Mary again from Staff and sorry for dominating this. I think that was probably the understanding of most people so I

just wanted to get it clear that we are talking about not just legacy and new gTLDs. We're talking about legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs that were delegated before the consensus policy is adopted and gTLDs, they're not delegated after.

So, we're really talking about three types of gTLDs. And we're talking about names that are currently interim reserved which is new gTLDs. And that's why George's question is somewhat different but I just wanted to make sure that we have those distinctions and that we know whether all of those scenarios are covered by the consensus policy that we're now talking about. I think it's important that everybody understands this because consensus policy is binding on all our contracted parties.

LISA: Lisa, INTERPOL, for the record. I have a question. What kind of protection has been put in place for ICANN actually it's a acronym for organization.

DENNIS CHANG: You mean domain name for ICANN.org? Is that what you mean?

LISA: Yes.

DENNIS CHANG: I don't think we have any protection, do we? I'm not sure. Do you know?

CRYSTAL ONDO: We do?

DENNIS CHANG: We do? Yes.

MARY WONG: And I'm looking at Francisco. He probably has the right answer because I believe there is text in the Applicant Guidebook that that list those examples and including example.

LISA: So that means that ICANN was reserved, right? The string.

DENNIS CHANG: Well, ICANN.org is already registered for ICANN.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: I think the question is whether or not ICANN, the string is a reserved name or not.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, I see.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: This is Francisco Arias from ICANN Organization. So, the question is whether the string ICANN is reserved at the second level for new TLDs.

LISA: For new gTLD or legacy. Both, yes.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: The answer is no.

LISA: You mean no reservation yet?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Correct. No reservation. It has no special status. From policy or contractual requirements, the registries, of course, are free to do so. They can reserve names if they want to but they don't have a mandate from contract or policy to do so. And I know this because I'm not a lawyer but in doing in a project where we were

doing for Universal Acceptance have to research names in several new TLDs.

And while we were doing so, we didn't wanted to be very creative on what we were going to register. So, we tried to register ICANN-dot-something whatever the new TLD was. And we encountered some new TLDs that had that string reserved and other cases in which it was registered by someone else.

LISA:

Then I have another question. INTERPOL now registered interpol.int domain name. Currently, it's permitted for someone to register that interpol.com, interpol.net. It's permitted, right? So, from our perspective, it should be confusing. So, if someone want to register like interpol.com, how should the INTERPOL do to protect our brand or our reputation?

MARYWONG:

This is Mary from Staff. I think the answer to that is actually longer than some people would like because if you're talking about an acronym, the abbreviation of an organizational name, then most of these are not on reserved list at the second level and we're talking about the second level.

With respect to acronyms for certain types of organizations, IGOs, INGOs, the acronym issue is currently subject to a number of discussions. One of the recommendations that was part of that PDP that we're now implementing does relate to acronyms but that particular recommendation that came out of the GNSO PDP has not yet been adopted by the ICANN Board. And there is some reconciliation that's ongoing because there is some issue as between the GAC and the GNSO on this.

Then with respect to your question about, and you used the example of INTERPOL but we can use any sort of organizational example with an abbreviation, what can you do if someone registers at the moment, then we're talking about the UDRP, the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy or if you're talking about say a new gTLD, so it's not a .com but it's a dot-something that was delegated under the new gTLD program. You also have the Uniform Rapid Suspension process.

Whether or not on top of these, there may be additional processes whether these processes may need to be modified because we're talking about international organizations of particular status is a subject of an ongoing policy process that Petter is actually co-chairing. So that's why I said the answer was a bit longer than most people probably care about.

LISA: Okay. To be clear, the only way to protect it is to go to the UDRP?

MARY WONG: So, in the absence of a second level reservation, then the only solution, I suppose, is what we're calling curative in the ICANN context. So, within the Domain Name System, the existing processes that we have would primarily and in this particular scenario that you're raising, I believe it would be the UDRP or if it's a new gTLD, the URS. There may be other legal remedies outside the Domain Name System.

LISA: Okay. It's clear. Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: No. Don't feel bad because this is why I put up this chart of the three streams because what you just talked about applies to all these three streams. So, we have to be very careful about the topic that you speak of and which scope it is because it could belong to one, two or three. And so, we can talk after work. If you like more, I'll be here. Go ahead, Mert.

[MERT SAKA]: There's a comment about the document you were sharing I think. It's from [George Cricross]. "4.2's language seems to say that it would apply to .com if any acronym, etc., gets deleted. I think .com should be explicitly excluded." This was his first comment.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, hold on. Let's treat on comment at a time. Let me see if I follow what he's saying. He's saying that .com should be excluded. So, there is no policy language that says we're excluding .com and therefore we cannot do that in terms of policy implementation. So, what's the second comment?

[MERT SAKA]: The second comment goes, "Perhaps to eliminate gaming explicitly provide a safe harbor or exception for second level domains that are five characters or less to prevent an IGO from renaming itself to a short name."

DENNIS CHANG: So, the policy did not permit us to treat any names in terms of number of characters. When I spoke about number of characters, the only way that it applied is the DNS conversion rules where our DNS infrastructure is built to a limitation of 63

characters. And that's why it came in. So, it had nothing to do with policy. And therefore, we, again, cannot do any limitations on number of characters for the protection.

MARY WONG:

I'll agree with Dennis because the policy does not actually have that particular obligation. But on top of that, just to note that we are actually talking about implementing adopted recommendations that deal with Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Crystal, Red Line and so on, Olympic, Olympiad and full names of international governmental organizations, that that really is the limit of this current policy at the moment.

DENNIS CHANG:

I think I see what George is asking. The IGO may rename itself to get different type of protection. And that's the kind of gaming that you're talking about. But remember that the IGO list that we're using is not directly from the IGO themselves. We do not take IGO names from the IGO. It has to come from GAC.

So, they have to go to the GAC and somehow convince the GAC to change their name to five characters or one more. And it has to be provided officially to us. Did you want to tell us? Okay. Exactly.

MICHAEL FLEMMING: Dennis, just a quick question. Once the list is provided, it cannot be updated, that is correct? No, it can be updated.

DENNIS CHANG: Yes. If you look at the policy, we have a update mechanism built into the policy. And, of course, this will go out to the public comment and you guys can all comment on this. So, nothing is permanent and we do recognize there are changes. But we have somewhat of a built-in process so that it's not changed to willy-nilly and it's not an ICANN only decision, if you will. Like I was saying, the INGO list is entirely from the United Nation's ECOSOC list. And ICANN has no authority or interest in evaluating that list. And it gets updated every year.

George, if you are wishing to provide a question, please make that clear for us. And we will try to answer them for you.

Okay, we're looking at chat here and there isn't any more question in the room. Let's see if there is a question that comes. So those of you in the back, the chats that are going is who has the remit to make judgments on the proper names getting on the list or not. And we're just clarifying that ICANN does not. ICANN itself organization does not make the judgment in who

gets on the list and who does not. And this is because the ICANN itself provides a facilitator role and not a judgment role.

How are we doing on time? We have time left over? So just to be fair, I want to let you finish because we have allocated this time for this topic. So, feel free to observe the chat and contribute if you like.

George, I think Ronald Raegan was... What's the word? He wasn't serious about that. He was joking when he said that. And maybe you're joking too. Thank you. We take our chat so seriously, George. You're like Michael. Michael said one time, call me.

Thank you very much. Okay, everybody loves Raegan, for the record. Any more questions on the IGO/INGO protection? Anything more? Do you want to talk about – or maybe not?

MICHAEL FLEMMING:

Yes. I can rephrase. The only thing that might be noticed is that we are discussing two separate ways to identify IGOs and INGOs. For the other working group, it's now IGOs more. As we said that INGOs can use to dispute resolution procedures as they are.

But it may be noticed that and I think I have the working group the me with that conclusion but just to be sure, it's my own

personal conclusion is that the lists you have as provided by the GAC can be used as this. I see this more as an administrative work whether we must be very sure what kind of identification we use. And it could be that list at the end, you never know. But we must be very sure which kind of identification we use when it comes to taking case to a National Court for disputes and so, so that every party can accept the identification whether it's Article 6ter of the Paris Convention or something else.

But we're not talking about WIPO and UDRPs. And so only we may talk about the local court in... let's say back in Sweden that have to understand what this is about which is exactly when I had my first domain related Civil Court action back in the middle of 1990s up in the North of Sweden. I had to start for one hour to explain to the judge what Internet and domain name is. So, I know that there can be some issues and we must be very clear with identification. And that is also generally accepted for a legal point of view.

DENNIS CHANG:

Yeah. We're watching with a great interest on how that public comment goes. Any more comments or questions, George? Okay. Thank you, George. Thank you for participating and contributing, by the way.

So, if it's okay with everyone here, we're going to conclude the session and give you some time back. Thank you, everyone. Goodbye now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]