ICANN
Transcription
reconvened IGO-INGO Protections in all gTLDs PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names
Thursday, 14 December 2017 at 18:00 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-14dec17-en.mp3

AC recording**:** https://participate.icann.org/p9bbv1tk9wd/

Attendance is located on Agenda Wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/DRJyB

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

Michelle DeSmyter: Welcome everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the IGO-INGO PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names call on the 14th of December 2017.

On the call today, we do have Heather Forrest, Stephane Hankins, Thomas Rickert, David Maher and Chuck Gomes. We do have apology from Christopher Lamb.

From ICANN staff, we have Berry Cobb, Dennis Chang, Marika Konings and myself, Michelle DeSmyter.

As a reminder, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And I will turn the meeting back over to Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much, Michelle, and hello everyone. This is Thomas Rickert speaking. And I am not yet in the Adobe room, I should say, so I hope the sound quality is Okay, and I might need some help with managing the queue when we talk.

Now, the purpose of this call is to continue with our work on defining what strings should go on the list of protected characters or strings for the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement. And there there has been an informal discussion in Abu Dhabi where we had a couple of members of this working group fit together for an informal working group meeting. We made some progress there. And also there's a little bit of progress or, you know, a little bit of an update to give on the presentation, but the status of our work that I gave to the GNSO Council.

So, the GNSO Council, when we reported about the progress of this group, had a little bit of a discussion about this topic. And what I can say is that council members have been quite clear that there would be an issue with a list that is not finite and to make sort of this an open-ended up process where people with Red Cross/Red Crescent organizations can add additional strings as we move on. So I think this is something for our group at least to bear in mind as we finalize our recommendation.

You will remember that we had the two parts in mind, first of which would be the creation of a list that can be implemented by ICANN staff, and the second would be to come up with a formula where additions to the Red Cross and Red Crescent, sorry, Movement would then get their names by means of operationalization of the implementation of our recommendation without the need for additional policy-making. So I guess, this is just a heads up.

In my view, the feedback that we got from council should not prevent us from continuing to work as we did, i.e., work on the list, work on the formula. And then maybe we should just have two distinct recommendations, one of which would be on the adoption of the finite list that we're coming up with, and the second part would be on the application of the formula so in case there are issues by council that, you know, these would be separated.

Talking about the press part, i.e., the finite list, there has been some work going on so we would like to thank Stephane and his colleagues for coming

up with an idea of how we can actually categorize strings, how we can operationalize the protection per the Red Cross/Red Crescent organization.

And I've asked Berry before this call whether it would be good enough to - whether it would be good as to show us through that table and explain the rationale behind it to this group so that we can hopefully make progress in adopting that - some technical or methodological approach to creating strings.

Berry, over to you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. So I think most of the people that are on this call now were in Abu Dhabi for the informal session, so I probably won't be as detailed as I won - as I was during that time. I should also mention that unfortunately I don't see that Mason has joined either, but since he hasn't, hopefully, he'll be able to catch the recording.

So hopefully, I won't repeat too much of what Thomas had mentioned, but I have just put into the Adobe Connect room two PDF attachments that were sent around late last week with your kind of examples to help facilitate the discussions about this finite list. And I should say I guess a slight correction to what Thomas had said, essentially, there's kind of going to be really three recommendations that are coming out of this group.

The first one is really about the deliberations and ultimate outcome of whether the original PDP recommendation, which was 90-day claims for the scope to names of the Red Cross identifiers, which have been agreed upon thus far in this working group that those should be reserved or reservations types of protections. The second will be what is this finite list by which staff can work on, you know, in terms of implementing that style of reservation protection.

And then as Thomas mentioned, third is really this formula or kind of guardrails, for lack of a better word, on how future Red Cross societies can be implemented with the same sort of reservation protection. And then -- and these guardrails are mostly in terms of trying to again kind of define a formula by which this - a new society would be introduced for the protection and what the variation of that might look like.

And one thing that I want to kind of - well, I'll bring this up towards the end after I review through these examples.

So what you see in the Adobe Connect room now is an attempt to try to define a framework by how we create this definitive list of identifiers that will eventually be correct reserved. And the reasoning behind this framework is mostly based on what we've experienced are ready.

As most of you know, once the new gTLD program was launched, there were a set of strings or identifiers that were temporarily reserved up until policy outcomes could be created by the GNSO. And in the implementation of those, there were some challenges as to exactly how they would be reserved on what is termed the Specification 5 list. And in particular, it was, I believe, in late 2014 if I recall correctly, that the board had passed a resolution to temporarily reserve the national society names as well, which at the time was 189. We're now talking about 190.

And the reconciliation of the list that was provided to ICANN staff at the time, it was difficult to make a determination whether that list actually match the recommendation that came out of the GNSO Working Group or not, and so it's based on those experiences on how we've kind of created this example framework, which ultimately will be the - one of the final deliverables out of this reconvened working group.

And as we posted in the email from just a summary perspective, there's kind of three principles that we're hopeful this group will consider as this definitive

list is being constructed. And the first is really, you know, that it is truly reconcilable.

The - and the reason for this one as the past list that we were working from, it was difficult to determine in every case whether a particular society name actually was connected to its formal name, meaning that there were a few of what it - I believe that this group is determining as usual name versus its formal name. And it gets even more complicated or challenging to reconcile that especially when we're dealing with identifiers that utilize IDNs or the formal name is in a non-Latin character format. And it was difficult to know whether this non-Latin character identifier was indeed attached to its English version of or Latin character of that national society name, that formal name.

And so what you see in the Adobe Connect room is basically Column 0, and that's really just an incremental count of each one of these particular society names. And I'll draw your attention more to Page 2 and also un-sync this so you can scroll back and forth.

But Column 0 again is just an incremental count. We know that there are 190 national societies that have been formally created, and this is the first step in the reconciliation process.

The second principle is really that this list can be validated, which kind of speaks to what I was just talking about that the original PDP recommendation had mentioned that it was the English name plus its national language where that society lives or operates. And that's kind of where it became challenging because that original list, in some instances, didn't really have English name. And again by no way does this example provide what the definitive elements are going to be at the variance for these either formal names or usual names, but as part of making this reconciliation process and being able to validate that they are all connected back to a unique formal name from just a reconciliation perspective, probably not doing the best job of making this clear.

And then really the third element is more to do with that they're free from errors. And one of the - there was a small issue with what is currently implemented today on the reservation list, and I believe it had to do with one of the Russian society names. There was a carriage return in this older Word document list, and what ultimately wound up happening is, I believe, the more generic term society was - became reserved when, in fact, it should have been the more formal name, the Russian Red Cross Society or something to that effect. I can't remember the exact details. But ultimately what happened is when these identifiers were formally converted into DNS labels, that's what ultimately happened. And so we want to make sure that we avoid this whenever this group hits the finite list of strings to be protected.

So going back to the attachment that's in the Adobe Connect room, again Column 0 is just this incremental count so that we know that we walk away with the 190 society names. Column 1 is the formal society name, which again is really more the reconciliation exercise that whatever the number of variance that might be that this group will agree to for them to be reserved that we can connect it back to that one formal name.

Column 2 and 3 are eventually going to be the tangible component that staff will convert these formal and/or usual names into the actual DNS labels by which registries can ultimately reserve. And you'll see that the way that a particular row is broken apart, again that it connects back to an understandable version or an English version of that national society, so Row 1 being the American National Red Cross. Should do this working group agree that American National Red Cross and American Red Cross or the appropriate variance that should be reserved, we draw that connection over.

And then, of course, Column 3 does the same thing of identifying should the group agree that a variant of the English version is the language of where that national society is located, then that also is defined in Column 3. So then I'll draw your attention to example for Rows 2 or 3 where Spanish Red Cross.

There is also the Cruz Roja Española that is further defined in Column 4 that that is indeed the Spanish language that identifies the non-Latin character identification of the Spanish Red Cross.

And so while at this particular time we are still working on what are the possible variance or options by which this ultimate formula will determine whether it includes society or includes the - plus, you know, whatever the group comes up with from the foreign language perspective or however many that might be. The end result is that then, as I mentioned, staff can take Columns 2 and 3, put them into a single list, eventually run through the algorithm that will define the DNS labels that eventually would be populated on the Specification 5 list.

And just two more points and then I can - we'll move on to the next example. Just back on Page 1, and the reason why Page 1 is different than Page 2 is that the protections that were identified for the International Committee of Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. And I believe the other one is the International Movement of the Red Cross and Red Crescent.

Those three higher level organizational names - and I do apologize to the Red Cross representatives if I'm not saying these in the correct designation, but these international organizations, at least from the working - the prior working group, were afforded protection across the UN6 languages.

And so what you'll see here or grow one for the International Committee of the Red Cross basically had just kind of use this as an example of what exists out on Specification 5 today. And the same reconciliation exercise can be conducted as you move from left to right.

First, you know, the number one is the first international organization. It is the International Committee of Red Cross. And then Column 2 designates the

formal name in English and in the UN5. And then, of course, Column 4 is just to confirm which language those represent.

When we get into Row 2 as the example for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, this is an example of why it became challenging for staff to implement. And looking at the current Specification 5 list, I believe that the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies are truly reserved on the Specification 5 list, but there's no way for me to confirm or ultimately validate that all six of the U.N. languages have made it. And there is probably at least for one or two of these, because this organizational name is very long and the number of characters, there is a chance that once they - once you look at its foreign language equivalent that it may be greater than 63 characters or certainly once it is converted to a DNS label, that may extend it beyond the 63 characters.

And for those who may not know, that is a technical limitation of the DNS label as defined from IETS specifications. And so the idea here is once we get to the final product and staff starts to implement this, that will be able to highlight which of those particular identifiers exceed that particular limitation and know or be able to connect back why a certain identifier didn't show up on the list.

The last thing I want to say here, which is really kind of connected more to this formula that this group is discussing or deliberating on what it might look like is that, in Abu Dhabi, we made up a brief discussion about the current IRT higher key that is implementing the recommendations that the board did adopt from several years ago. And it's the process for the maintenance of these reservation list.

And Abu Dhabi I had mentioned that, at the current time, the implementation review team, that process was in a generic form that the GAC chair would notify GDD, and that those lists that if there were any changes or new additions of - for example, a society name, that they would be communicated

to the GDD they would essentially implement. And then once finalized and there would be a communication, that would be sent out to the registry operators to implement that particular change.

That process has slightly changed now based on input from a registry operator, noting that the GNSO should also be included in that process. So while the policy language is still in flight from that - from the Implementation Review Team, it does now include that the GAC chair or the GAC will advise ICANN staff and, in parallel, advise the GNSO of any proposed changes. And then if - and once agreed upon then it'll be essentially upon GDD staff to make that change. And then once finalized will send the communication out to the registry operators for implementation based on the terms of the registry agreement.

So I'm going to pause here for just a second. And yes, I wanted to see if there were any questions about this list before I move on to the next document.

So, Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Berry. In the case of countries where they have more than one official language, am I correct in assuming that Columns - Column 3 would have more than one language for the national names, but the national societies?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Chuck. I - you know, I think that's an option that is open for deliberations on this working group. The original PDP recommendation was really just the English version, and that - and was only - it went so far as the state that was the language of where that national society existed. It didn't really go beyond the detail of if there were more than one language for that particular country. For example, China might have two or three different designations. And so I do believe that that is an element or a component that should be deliberated on by this working group.

And in turn that does feed into this final formula, whatever that may look like, because it ultimately is if there are future changes once staff has already implemented this finite list, if there are future changes, we need to make sure that what that formula dictates will prevent ICANN from being stuck in a position of trying to interpret whether this new submission is - meets the criteria of what this group ultimately comes up with. And so thank you for raising that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Okay. I'm going to stop sharing this document, and I'm going to pull up an example that was provided by Stephane and the Red Cross representatives. This was also presented briefly there in Abu Dhabi. There was - there's essentially three mock-up examples of national society names, and the intent here is to try to help understand their view on the possible variants of a particular national society name.

The original version also included dashes in between the words that make up a formal name or their usual name. And I'll just remind everybody on the group is that for our purposes, we're really only concerned with the human readable version of a formal or usual name. Once the group has developed all the criteria of the possible variant of these names, whether it be formal or usual or language or society, whether all of these options should be or shouldn't be included, the end result is that we walk away with just the human-( )readable name.

Once staff goes to implement it, so there is this algorithm that will then take that human-readable name. It will collapse any spaces that may occur. And where space occurred, it will also add a dash in between them. So, for example, American National Red Cross would come up as what you see here in Row 1, but would also be American dash national dash Red dash Cross. So don't worry about any hyphenations in terms of looking at this particular

example. And Stephane has gone back through and his team have removed those dashes.

And again we get to the closer to developing this finite list, this example would really just be a human-readable kind of a name where American would be capitalized, space National would be capitalized, space Red Cross would be capitalized as well, and again just human-readable.

So I will un-sync this so that the group can scroll at their leisure. Again, the first example is the American National Red Cross. The second one is one for the Society of Azerbaijan. And the third, which is still, I believe, Latin character script, and then the third one just as kind of very Asian starts to get in and to some of the other foreign languages. And do note that where there's non-Latin characters and the conversion of this algorithm will convert many of these names to what you might see as a true DNS label, which would be X and dash dash and a string of random characters on how the conversion to an IDN label would look.

So I think what's important here about this example provided by the Red Cross representatives is more into the detail of what kinds of variance should be acceptable or to at least help facilitate the deliberations of this working group as to what kinds of variance might be acceptable in terms of building out this formula. And so I think that pretty much kind of takes care of my overview. Apologies if I was a little bit confusing on some of the principles. I think as we start to get closer to formulating a finite list that the principles may probably become more clear.

And before I turn it over to Thomas, I would like to ask Stephane to speak to his example that I was provided here in case I missed anything or if he would like to add any additional commentary to the purpose of this. And then we can probably move in which is really Agenda Item Number 2 to discuss the possible variance in formula.

So please, Stephane, go ahead. And, Stephane, if you are speaking, we can't hear you yet.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, I'm sorry. I'm online. You can hear me now (don't you). Can you hear me?

Berry Cobb: Yes, sir.

Stephane Hankins: Okay. Well, good morning.

Berry Cobb: I guess, we can.

Stephane Hankins: (Unintelligible) good evening to those that are in Europe. So thank you very much, Berry, for explaining all of this. You're really becoming an expert, including on Red Cross/Red Crescent affairs.

But I am - to come back to the mock-up we prepared, what we were trying to do is to reflect on, you know, the correct the initial criteria, which this group was looking at. So I am - I'll just repeat them because I'm not sure, Berry, that you went into that detail. But initially what we had suggested, and I think this is also discussed when we were in Denmark. One was - so official and usual names.

So if you look at the American Red Cross, the example - for example, so American National Red Cross is the official name of the National Society. And then American Red Cross is, as you will understand, you know, the usual what we, I think, referred to in Abu Dhabi as, you know, commonly used names.

On that, you know, the intention - because I saw some of the exchanges that followed, you know, there's no intention, you know, to blow this up out of control. It's not the idea. But I think, for example, the American Red Cross cases is quite clear that, you know, the national society in this case is ready

known by, you know, a usual name and not it's official statutory denomination.

If you look at the case of the Chad - the (Kwahu Du Chad) or Chadian Red Cross, it's a little bit similar because, you know, the official name will be (Kwahu Du Chad) so Red Cross of Chad, but the usual name of the society is, you know, it's known by the name (Kwahu Chad Diez), which is the objective, you know, in French.

So, you know, this is the logic of all of them, you know, considering that, you know, to be - to reasonably encompass, you know, strings that would replicate the name of the national society as it is known, you know, we need to extend a little bit. But it's not - you know, the idea is really not to having a thousands of examples.

The second criteria that we had was - but I know that this is, you know, then it was being discussed was that the name should be protected both in English and in the national languages. And I think this comes back also to Chuck's question.

The idea here is obviously either that we consider, you know, to have the names protected in the national languages of the country in which the National Red Cross or Red Crescent Society is established. And so, you know, in Belgium, for example, well, you know, there's three official languages then, you know, you would have the denomination, you know, protected in these official languages. When I say official, I mean, you know, recognized as state language.

Then - and then, you know, there is the question as whether, you know, the protection should also extend to the name in English. Our initial proposal and, you know, we'd like to submit that to the group is that the names be automatically protected also in English. I think there's a variety of reasons for this one is, you know, it also makes the exercise seem simpler, also to

monitor. But at the same time, you know, because the English language is probably designed, you know, potentially, you know, to gain even more ground on, you know, in the digital world. I mean, feel that, you know, it would make whole legitimacy to indigenous to having vision.

Of course, if, you know someone wanted to do (ordinently) seek to register a domain name of a national society in a country which has just been affected by natural disaster, for example, you know, to - I mean, the likelihood is that, you know, they would do it in English so that, you know, the (unintelligible) ambitions is best met.

Then we had discussed the issue of with or without the article "the" or The American Red Cross - American Red Cross Society, and I think that - you know, I think that was part of the points that we discussed when we were in Denmark. You know, this is also for the group to make a determination.

With or without the word "Society," this is also something that we had discussed. National societies, you know, sometimes they're called as American Red Cross or sometimes as American Red Cross Society. At least it's the case of many national societies. And here, you know, that criteria with or without the word "society" be actually catches, you know, also the same question as, you know, a formal name and a commonly used name or, you know, official name versus a commonly used name. So, you know, that's something that I think, you know, would have some legitimacy, which is to protect the names both with the words "society" and without.

And then, there is this question of, you know, protecting the name with the objective of what the name of the country, American Red Cross or Red Cross of America, (Kwahu Chad Dien) or (Kwahu du Chad) in French, for example, there is really legitimacy to have both. So that is a little bit, you know, what these three mock-ups are intended to do.

If you look at the Red Crescent Society of Azerbaijan case, you see that, you know, the name is protected in Azeri language as well. So this is where we're coming from, but I will stop here. Thank you.

(Crosstalk)

Male: Hello? Thanks very much, Stephane.

Berry, do you want to take over that?

Thomas Rickert: So, Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you.

(Crosstalk)

Berry Cobb: And I will turn it over to you, so thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Berry.

Thanks very much, Stephane, for your additional explanation.

Let's see whether there are questions or comments from the group.

Chuck, please?

Chuck Gomes: I don't know if anyone can answer this. But I understood that the GAC recommended the national name and not the official names. Is that a - is it fair to assume then that they don't think it's necessary to do multiple official languages and just it's Okay to do the national language? In other words, did the GAC really consider that?

It kind of surprises me that they would be restrictive and just say the national language when it's possible that it might be beneficial for multiple official languages where that occurs. Does - and I don't see anybody from the GAC on here, but does anyone know anything about that? Is it that something we should go back to the GAC just to clarify that they are indeed satisfied with just the national language even if that means only one in cases where there are multiple official languages?

Stephane Hankins: So, Chuck, I guess, that (Mary) put into the chat that English and the official languages of the respective state of origin on the PDP recommendation that GAC advised both for English and the respective national language. I think we are safe to assume that the GAC didn't need to limit that to one language, but that the national language should actually be the national languages that are in the respective countries of origin.

Maybe somebody has a has a better idea, maybe Greg even does. He's next on the queue.

Over to you, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Thomas. This is Greg Shatan for the record. Unfortunately, I don't have a better idea on that particular point of what wasn't intended. I guess, I would say just looking at this individually that, you know, I think we need to get a sense of where there are differences between national languages and official languages and which countries know that makes a difference.

Overall, my tendency is to go to the broader list even though my overarching goal is that reserved names list should be construed narrowly, but I think the concept of a - the difference between a national and official language, so for instance, in Switzerland, I don't know if Italian and Swiss, German and French all national languages and as (Romanche) an official language but not a national language. I don't know if you want to get into that kind of a

parsing. I was thinking that maybe we should only have the language - national or official languages, what the society actually uses, but that could be unduly narrow and also require more fact-finding.

So, I would say overall, with both lists, I'm fairly comfortable until we get to what I would call the permutations or almost kind of misnomers, if you will, where you've got (the) included where it's not actually used or something like Red Cross of America, which (as a) lifelong resident of the U.S. I've never seen it called that. Obviously, somebody could call it that but somebody could also call it The Red Cross of the USA or Red Cross of U.S.

You know, permutations get us in a slippery slope. So, I'd like to stick to official - to the two names, you know, that being the formal name and the commonly used name, that's actually commonly used, and then put those through the national and official languages and English. That would be kind of where I would see the natural boundary. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Greg. I'm not sure whether (Kasan) or Mary are with us, but let's say Mary first because she also wants to make a correction, I guess, on the - on our previous comment on the chat.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Thomas, this is Mary from staff, and indeed, I just wanted to put a correction on the record on the A.C. note that I put in. The quotes that I have in the A.C. room are correct but attributed them to the wrong party in reverse.

So, in actual fact, and this is for the record, the GAC advice that came out in March 2014 where we first got the specificity that it was at the time the 189 national societies. The GAC advice also said, English and the official languages of the respective states of origin were as the GNSO policy recommendations for Red Cross national society names says, English and the respective national language. So, thanks for allowing me to correct that on the correct, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Mary. So, I guess that makes less likely easier.
Stéphane, over to you.

Stéphane Hankins: Actually, thank you very much. Stéphane Hankins, for the record. I was
going to, you know, also clarify what Mary just clarified, which is indeed, the
GAC's advice back in 2014 (in the call) it says in English and it also said
official languages in approval because I think the intention is really to catch,
you know, the different official languages.

Now, we - the official I think was intended, you know, to clarify that, you
know, it's not every single language that is spoken on the national territory
but it is, you know, the official language that is used in government circles
and for, you know, in official matters.

So, you know, I think that should remain the understanding. And so, in
Switzerland, yes, I believe it's four language - it is indeed four languages. If
you count French, German, Italian and Romansh then you would have four.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stéphane. I guess just for this group to decide whether
we wanted to maybe try to take stuck on this. I would suggest that the
original PDP did mean the official languages when they spoke of the national
languages, I think we wanted to reflect what we heard from the GAC at that
point.

So, I would like to hear whether there are any objections to what, you know,
on the basis of official languages. So, I don't see or hear any -- and so,
Chuck confirms that there is no objection from him. So, let's take note of that.

And so, I'm not sure Greg and Stéphane, whether these are new hands from
you. If so, let's move to Greg first and then to Stéphane. Okay, so Greg's
hand is lowered. So, Stéphane? Good.

So, I would suggest that we try to go through the - Chuck is making a comment in the chat. Should we call the working group membership on this one? Chuck, what I suggest is that we don't make this a definitive decision today but we put that back on the agenda in our next meeting and, you know, as we do in the CCWG, for example, where we have the two meetings. So, let's confirm with that to give those who are not present today the opportunity to chime in and object if needed.

Good. Let's then see whether there are any further comments on this list? I don't see any hands. Berry, your hand is raised, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. So, you know, I guess it's assuring that we've kind of got the language part nailed down. Can we perhaps expand on the article that Stéphane has, which right now, I think I have kind of captured the society or of, you know, should there be kind of a formula - just kind of like how we've done with the language so we try to put some guardrails or definition around the use of articles. And I guess this really kind of falls more into the -- or at least has a connection with the common or usual name. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much. Yes, let's - I guess the comments of the - or the points that are jotted down in the notes section can be a helpful guide there. But let's start with the articles. Do we have any comments on the articles?

So, Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan, for the record. And I recognize even I'm almost monolingual that their languages or articles are much more formally used or regularly used in English, it isn't necessary one of them.

But I have a problem with kind of adding articles everywhere where they are not part of the usual or official name but just deciding we're going to, you know, put "the" or "la" or whatever the article might be on top of everything because I think that - you know, that gets us into the permutation business.

And I'd like to generally speak, to keep us out of the permutation business especially in terms of natural language issues. You know, Berry maybe - can tell us what - how the permutations might work when we get to the implementation where it's kind of the machine issues of permutation.

But I'm concerned that every permutation, you know, doubles, triples the size of the whole list, quadruples even. So, I am not a big fan of the article unless the articles are, in fact, what's used and then maybe a question about whether we should have than without the articles. And if there is actual regular use with the articles to consider it. And I'd like us to have a bright line rule but I'm concerned about an expansive bright line rule. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Greg. Do we have any further comments on that particular point? I think that during the last discussions that we had on this, there was no severe objection against having the article included as an additional string.

So, I thought I could sense the groups' consensus feeling that we would use both variations including "the" and without the article. Let's go to Chuck now.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Thomas, and thanks, Greg. I think Greg brings up a good point. I don't think we want an ever-expanding list of all possible articles. But it seems to me that the definite article, whatever language is used, is Okay, whether it's used commonly or not, so I guess that part I would disagree with Greg.

I think it would minimize the opportunity for mischief if we at least include the variations as Stéphane and his team has done here with the definite article in the case of English, "the", and in French I guess it "la", and so forth.

So, I think that's the only thing I would differ with Greg on. I think that I don't think there's a problem if we restrict it to the definite article. I do agree with

Greg that we don't want any possible article unless that's part of a commonly used name. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Chuck. So, let's try to see whether there are objections to using the definite article only and be more precise in our recommendation at that point. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: You know, this is Greg. I will just register my objection. It might be a lonely objection, but I will register it.

Thomas Rickert: Noted. And this is just testing the water. You know, I want to try to get a sense of what this group is leaning towards. So, since there are no further hands raised nor any declarations of we're using the possibilities of the remote participation room, I think that this group is leaning towards accepting the definite article in the English language that would be "the", that not endorsing any further articles that could be offered. Okay, so let's take that as an interim result.

I'd like to hear some views on common names or usual names and whether you think that is something that we can - that we can work on or include. Chuck, please?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. I have a question there. This is Chuck speaking. As long as we have a clear process for the term and objective process for determining what the common name is, I don't think I personally have a problem with that. But how do we come up with a way to objectively determine what a common name is, how would we do that?

Thomas Rickert: I guess that's an excellent point, Chuck, and this is sort of why I'm asking the question because if we want to endorse common names, we need to find a way to formalize that.

Greg, let's hear you now.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg Shatan, for the record. And I think my concern somewhat overlaps with Chuck's. As I indicated before, I'm concerned about things beings listed that are not really the actual common names that is actually kind of commonly used but are kind of misnomers or permutations like Red Cross of America, which I guess if your syntax is non-English, it might just seem it's like it's the same as American Red Cross, but it's not in fact and it's not a common name that I know of, that is actually used by the Red Cross in the United States.

So, those sorts of permutations or rearrangements of the words that might be the official or common name. I would put those on the outside of the - and put them not on the list but the actual common name, you're recognizing that the formal name is often - you know, not the one that's snapping enough to be kind of used in - on Web sites and correspondence and fundraising and the like. That - both of those should be, to my mind, you know, on the list of - without articles but that's a different point.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Greg. So, we've reached the top of the hour, so we need to end this call in a moment. I think that we need to continue the discussion on this. I think it will be particularly difficult to come up with - I'm sorry, we have 19 minutes, so I'm sorry, I was jumping the time here.

So, I guess what we first need to further discuss is how we deal with the common names particularly with if we think about the formula that also allows for your additions to be reflective. And one suggestion that I would have to offer is to simply give all the chapters the opportunity to give one common name basically they suggest. So, I guess that, you know, in the countries where the chapters are operational, they would pick the names that they actually use in the trade.

And where, let's say, I think we have only two or three countries where it's possible to add new chapters and they can then pick one of their choice, and

we can even have some additional qualifiers in that. I knew that those strings must include Red Cross or Red Crescent as part so that we don't run the risk of having other names, unrelated names being put on the list.

So, I guess the - you know, to cut a long story short, my proposal to you would be to consider that each of the organizations can choose a common name or add the name they commonly use to the list if it has this string limit because that would save us the hassle of coming up with a formula to generate common names which might be composed differently in different countries.

And the answer to Chuck's question, it was my understanding that we want to limit this, in fact, to one common name where the proposal on the table is one common name, one common name of the choice of the chapter and it needs to contain Red Cross or Red Crescent. Stéphane?

Stéphane Hankins: Yes, thank you. Well, I think that, you know, this is the proper approach which is, you know, to ask the different national societies themselves, you know, whether the name under which their common name, you know, known by - you know, is different from their official name and then to hand it over.

I think the notion of saying just one is - it might not be the proper approach but I, you know, sense, you know, the unanimity in the group because, you know, it might be true, but I think it's not going to be thousands, it's not - you know, the intention is not to blow this up in a relative control at all, but it - you know, it's to have an approach that, you know, make - that makes the best sense.

So, you know, but I - at least in regard to, you know, asking the national societies themselves to make that determination I think that has full legitimacy because, of course, you know, each - in each context, you know, it might be a different sort of - a different situation.

And there will be, you know, national societies that just do not have a - you know, that just use one name and, you know, weren't using coming forward with - you know, with any alternative for the commonality criteria. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Stéphane. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan, for the record. I think a common name has to be common. And if in fact there is more than one name that is commonly used by the organization, and I'm putting the side languages because obviously there - I think there'd be one common name for each official language assumedly. It may not exactly be the same, you know, for translation.

But I think that we should assume that there is but one common name and - but I think we might want to leave an option for a second or a third to be listed, but with some demonstration that it is, in fact, common and commonly used by the organization as its kind of street name, if you will.

And that gets us kind of out of the permutation business but also I think emphasizes that generally there is an official name and a common name but recognizing if there may be situations where for whatever reason there is more than one common name in addition to the official name and will provide a pathway for that but not just give people kind of a bunch of slots because there is a - I think a tendency if you tell people to just list it.

Give us as many common names as you think you have whether you use them or not or other people use them by accident or, you know - then we're just going to get some sort of - we are going to have a big list and I want to avoid that.

So, I think we can recognize the idea that there is a common name or can be one but not kind of give a default that there could be as many common names as one might want to put on the list. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Greg. And your suggestion got support from Chuck, but let me ask you this, how would we determine whether a name is commonly used or not? You know, I guess the question that we will like to get from counselors will be, you know, what are the safeguards, are there no value limitation on this, who validates whether a name is commonly used or not.

We are not against it, I'm just, you know, cautioning that, you know, if you limit it, you know, you can still have that requirement in our recommendation that only names must be names that are commonly used, but I think it would help secure counselor support if we could limit that number.

Greg Shatan: Thomas, if I could answer, I would say, first...

Thomas Rickert: Okay, good.

Greg Shatan: ...I think the number should be limited.

Thomas Rickert: Okay, good.

Greg Shatan: And not, you know, just presumptively as many of you can think of, but also I would think that from the point of view of showing a common name and maybe we give them a free ride on the first common name and only ask for a proof on the additional ones, but I think the proof could be, for instance, used on a Web site and not just once in passing or in, you know, third-party commentary or something like that, but used on the Web site, used on a mailing list, used on an appeal or campaign, used on official vehicles or uniforms or the like, you know, some sort of kind of - if you will, used in commerce. Commerce isn't quite the right term but, you know, used in the field and not just kind of on an accidental or one-off basis but regular.

So, they might also ask for a declaration that this is an example and that this is the name that we regularly use to refer to ourselves in addition to our formal name in the first common name which we've got as a freebie. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Greg. I know that Chuck is supporting these ideas. Let's see what Stéphane has to say in response.

Stéphane Hankins: Stéphane Hankins, for the record. I - you know, I totally agree with what Greg said. And what we're -- again, really the idea is not to multiply and, you know, I agree, demonstrating that, you know, it's commonly used and indeed, you know, the Web site will very often give us quite a good idea of that.

The logo of the national society may also give a good idea of that, but in most cases, it will be Norwegian Red Cross as, you know, the usual name, and Norwegian Red Cross Society is the official name. That's really, you know, it -- from, you know, my awareness of this. You know, this is really what we're looking at.

You know, the American Red Cross case is very -- you know, I don't have many in my head, you know, where the official name is just something that is different from, you know, the commonly used name or, you know, with or without the word "Society".

So, I don't think there is an enormous risk, frankly not, and - but I agree that, you know, if you meant to me matched with the national societies' concern, if we ask them then, you know, it's a perfect - it's perfectly possible, we need to ask them to legitimize and to justify where the - you know, where their usual denomination comes from, this being legitimate. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Stéphane. So, it seems like there's no wish from our group members to speak on this so I think that there is no objection to allowing for the addition of more common names if there is evidence for those names actually be used.

Greg gave some examples which have been captured in the notepad of the remote participation room, so I suggest that we keep those and particularly

list them. Stéphane also thinks that this is a good and feasible way and that there is no risk of this be of use. I think that's something that we should capture for the package of recommendations or of aspect of the formula.

And I think that, you know, America or American, and as I see in the examples for the American National Red Cross, it shows as a good example of two distinct destinations that are being used.

Okay. So, I guess that's good progress. Let's see whether - oh, Berry, your hand is raised. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Thomas. I'm kind of maybe jumping the gun just a bit, but this is a little bit more associated with number three. And if you think that we're kind of ready to head towards that, I think I've got a couple of options or maybe a minimal path forward between now and the beginning of next year when we think of this group can meet again.

Thomas Rickert: Go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Okay, so what I'm about to say if anybody has any issues with this possible path forward do chime in, but it does fall around about, you know, kind of what the next steps are. As Chuck, you know, and I think as Thomas followed up, you know, there's no formal decisions being made here but I do believe that we know we're starting to define some of those guardrails about, you know, the attributes of possible variance.

And so, what I suggest is kind of a path forward from where we're at today to somewhere in January that perhaps offline myself and working with Stéphane and his team that we kind of - we blend our two examples.

So, what I mean by the two examples is taking the variations that he's defined in his mockup examples and we load those into the spreadsheet that I've created for final output and we basically identify five to 10 national

societies that have a spectrum of this variance of formal versus common or usual names that have the definitive articles and a couple that, for sure, have English as well as maybe one or two official languages and we basically try to work towards creating this finite list that the council has instructed this group to do.

But again, it gives us that cross-section of all these possibilities of the identifiers or the top five to 10 national societies. And I think based on what Stéphane and his team have done in the past, we could probably pick those without necessarily needing to communicate with those national societies right now on a more formal basis.

But once we get this small list or short list together, we can bring that back to the group to help reconfirm what this possible variance might be and at least identify if there are any outliers that may make some in the group uncomfortable.

And that point then we can start to approach, you know, more a definitive agreement or determining consensus around these attributes. And if that is a more acceptable path forward then the step after that would be then to spend the time for the Red Cross representatives of building the complete list of the 190 national society names.

I think in the end, it will be important for this group to have all 190 national society names defined based on the framework that staff has provided, and that, again, it comes back to our principles of that it is reconcilable, free from errors, and that there is a connection, you know, back to the 190 national society names.

And in parallel, when we get to that point, staff will be putting together a draft report that will, A, talk about the deliberations of the group, ultimately kind of the three recommendations that I mentioned at the beginning of the call that, you know, the legal basis behind why the group thinks reservation protection

is warranted, that there is this definitive list and it - and then the third at least, you know, some kind of guiderails, not so much of formulating more but guiderails - or guardrails of what, you know, possible attributes would look like for future society names being introduced.

So, I'm hopeful that if Stéphane that - I know we're running into the holiday season but perhaps at the beginning of the year, we can get back together and turnaround that short list for the group to delivery further on and perhaps maybe like the last week of - or the week of the 22nd or so that when we can reconvene this group again to review to that example and then we'll have a better understanding how long it might take to complete the full 190 should the group agree with the possible variant attributes.

And so, that would likely probably take us into February, maybe March, depending on how long it would take to complete out the finite list of 190 society names, or we may get lucky that if the group is comfortable with the 10 or so short lists that filling out the remainder 180 wouldn't, you know, escape the guardrails, so to speak, that we could start to try to fast-track that a little bit closer to get back to the council.

I'll leave it up to the group to make that decision, but let me know if you think that's the way - reasonable way forward. Thank you, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Berry. I think Chuck's time is up. So, Chuck, over to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Thomas. A quick question for Berry, and if I missed this, I apologize, I had a little interruption. But are we going to go ahead and reach out to the individual societies and ask them for their common names right away? And how do we do that? I don't - I'm fairly flexible there, but it seems to me if you haven't already said that, that's something that should happen right away.

Thomas Rickert: Berry, why don't you respond to that?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Chuck. I was hoping to avoid it for just the short list to kind of, you know, take our working examples that we have in front of us now to the next step to help this group liberate and confirm that they're comfortable with these variant attributes.

Once we think that there is consensus around these - you know, these types of attributes or the variants that might be created then yes, the task - the next task would be for the Red Cross representatives to move forward in formal communication with the various national societies to help complete that list.

I suspect that that's not an easy task, but Stephan has his hand raised, so I'll let him speak to that more closely.

Thomas Rickert: Stéphane?

Stéphane Hankins: Yes, this is Stéphane Hankins, (I shall speak). Yes, thank you very much for the different remarks and Berry's proposal. I think this is - what Berry proposed is a very good way forward I think, is that we need to work together with staff, with the ICANN staff now.

And indeed, I think the idea of picking, you know, 10 national societies as an example is the right - is a very good way forward, it will give us a better idea also of, you know, where, you know, the - exactly where we're heading.

If we choose the national societies, we can even go through the exercise quite quickly depending on which national societies we choose, but we can work also to, you know, (NCIC) in federation delegations in the different parts of the world.

You know, we can also - you know, for the 10, we can also go through the exercise of communicating with the national societies' concern and asking them, you know, about their - you know, the official versus commonly used names that we can do fairly easy.

We have, you know, colleagues in every - in many countries in every region of the world and, you know, the - in very regular contact with national societies, so this we can do. And I think it's the proper way and then, you know, we can bring back to the group, you know, concretely how this came about and the outcomes.

So, I would be very much in favor of that, that, you know, early in January, we touched base and then we've designed a strategy to move forward for the 10. Thank you very much.

Berry Cobb: And Thomas, you're on-mute if you're speaking.

Thomas Rickert: In fact, I was talking to my muted microphone. I apologize for that. I was thinking, Stéphane and yourself for the reasonable approach, I would like to hear whether there is anyone on this call who object to following that suggestion? That does not seem to be the case. So, why don't we then implement your suggestion?

And I would really like for Berry, maybe you or somebody else from the staff, you know, send in the summary of this, you know, a little bit more than the link to the recording and the notes, but just a little summary of this proponent to the list so that everyone is fully aware of what's happening and then we're going to reconvene as you've suggested and probably meet January.

Okay, so, Berry, concerning this and the thought, and that I guess allows us to adjourn a little bit earlier. I guess this has been a very productive call. Thanks, everyone, for participating and actively contributing to this. I think we're on a good path to completing this as well in the future. So, thanks, everyone, and bye-bye for today.

Stéphane Hankins: Thank you very much.

Michelle DeSmyter: Thanks, everyone. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator, (Marvie), if you could please stop our recording. To everyone else, please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END