

**ICANN
Transcription
IGO-INGO Protections in all gTLDs PDP WG on Red Cross Names
Wednesday, 18 October 2017 at 13:00 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-18oct17-en.mp3> Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p2ds5sxzy14/>
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/ApJEB>
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: Recordings has now started.

Julie Bisland: Okay super.

Thomas Rickert: And so...

Julie Bisland: Good morning, good afternoon good evening everyone. Welcome to the Reconvened IGO, INGO PDP Working Group on Red Cross Names call on the 17th sorry the 18 October 2017. On the call today we have Mason Cole, David Maher, Jeff Neuman, Osvaldo Novoa, Thomas Rickert, and Stephane Hankins. We have apologies from Christopher Lamb, Chuck Gomes and Jennifer Breckenridge. And then from staff we have Mary Wong, Steve Chan, Dennis Chang, Berry Cobb and myself Julie Bisland.

I'd like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. And thank you so much I'll turn it back over to Thomas Rickert.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Julie. You did that - did a great introduction, far nicer than I could have ever done it. So welcome to all of you from my side good morning, good afternoon good evening wherever you are. So let's check

whether there are any updates to Statements of Interest? If you have an update to your Statement of Interest which you should have published on ICANN's Web site please do let us know.

Okay. That doesn't seem to be the case. Then let me ask whether there are any questions or change requests with respect to the agenda that we circulated? That does not seem to be the case either. That allows us to move to the second agenda item. For those who have read the covering note in preparation for this call you will already know that what we're trying to today is the following.

We are going to try to mature our deliberations to a stage where we can more or less proceed to finalizing the recommendation and putting something out for public comment, hopefully soon. At the moment we do not yet have a finite list of strings that need to be – that everyone can review. You will remember that some of you have explicitly requested to see a list of strings that is going to be covered by the protections that are thought for these types of strings.

And therefore what we're trying to do is work on a formula of what strings are protected what variations of the Red Cross, Red Crescent Society names should be added, in what languages, what script, et cetera, so that whenever a new society is added to the international group of societies no further policy development process is needed but that ICANN staff by way of implementation can use the formula to add specific strings to the list of protected names.

So as I mentioned we're - we still don't have this finite list of strings for your review. But what we can do is look at the formula in more detail. And we're going to do that in an iterative process. And in Agenda Item Number 2 we're going to take a look at the original PDP recommendations and how those - and what has been protected according those. And I think that this is something for Berry to or sorry for Mary actually to - no it's Berry. I do

apologize. Berry will now show us through the history of those protections.
Berry over to you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Thomas. This is Berry Cobb for the record. I just wanted to walk the group through basically kind of where we are today from an implementation perspective. And the reason for this is what we've included in the agenda was the - a list of the specification five rule that's posted on icann.org that Stephane's team have provided edits to. And so I just wanted to make sure that the context around their attempt at this list was clear to everybody on the group.

So in our original PDP for the IGO, INGO protections that concluded back in 2013 and as a – and within the section of that report where the Red Cross and society names there was a designation of Scope 2 identifiers that was included in that report. And I have pasted what that Scope 2 statement was over in the right-hand notes pod just to extract from that report.

As everyone is aware the GNSO or that PDP recommendation at that time was that the scope of names would only receive claims protection for 90 days. Obviously we're here in the reconvene group because that did clash with GAC advice. Between then which again was around the conclusion of 2013 and up to 2015 subsequent GAC advice and given the duration of implementation of some of the recommendation had asked ICANN Board to temporarily reserve the set of Scope 2 identifiers.

And when staff was implementing or responding to that board resolution they essentially took the original list that was supplied by Stephane's team in that original PDP. I should have included the link that is attached to that original report. But in essence it was a Word document that listed the formal -- and Stephan please forgive me if I confuse how we should be what the proper term is -- but I try to use the formal designation or the formal identifier of those 189 national Red Cross societies as well as the International

Federation of Red Cross societies and one or two other of those designations.

The point being is that it was essentially a list of formal names that was provided to the working group. When staff was implementing they essentially took that list and scrubbed it to make sure that all of the names that were identified in there could be converted to DNS labels. And so there is a true difference between how a formal name is listed as we might see it on letterhead or in an email versus what the actual DNS label would mean that is something that can be registered at the second level from a particular TLD.

To perform that essentially staff has an algorithm that will take a set of strings and convert those into DNS labels. That algorithm has a series of rules. I've tried to put some of the most common rules within that. I believe that is a Bullet Point 5 at the bottom of Page 1 or starting there. But it'll essentially take a string and in an attempt and the end result to collapse it into a single string that is a DNS label so for instance it will remove any spaces between the formal name.

It will also convert a space and put in a dash which is a character that can be part of a formal DNS label. And where it runs into issues for instance if a particular name when collapsed or converted if it exceeds 63 characters I don't have the RFC number on me but essentially there's a part of an RFC out there that states that second-level names or any part of formal domain string can't exceed 63 characters. So if it turned out that it was 64 that particular string could never be registered anyway.

And then of course if there are strings that are not based in ASCII format I think that original list had a couple of images from some non-Latin character names of a few societies. Obviously that can't be converted into (able). And then lastly if there are non-Latin character names that would be converted into a U label which essentially is what you might see as the XN dash, dash

in a series of characters that is showing the conversion of that non-Latin script into a DNS label.

So after that algorithm was run that was posted up on to the link that Mary put into the chat which is the formal place where registry operators will go to meet compliance with the registry agreement on what name should be reserved. One section of that is the set of names that are reserved from the International Olympic Committee, the Red Cross as well as IGOs and IGOs.

So that's kind of a short history where that list has come from. And then just my last statement before I turn it back over to Thomas what was included in the agenda was also an attachment of that Stephane's team attempt to help us come up with a definitive set of society names and strings that would eventually receive this protection. And so - apologies I have a little bit of noise behind me.

And so what they had basically done is taken a copy of that reserve names list and then made their suggested edits to that. And we can talk a little bit more about that when we get into Agenda Item 4 when we talk about the formula and what we should do with that.

So I'll turn it back over to you Thomas. And hopefully what I stated was somewhat clear. This really starts to get confusing when we're talking about the number of strings and how that actually might be implemented and the difference between a formal designation of a name versus what would actually translate into the DNS. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Berry. Well done. Are there any questions for Berry? Stephane do you have a question? Go ahead. Stephane if you're speaking you might be on mute. We can't hear you. Stephane? There seems to be some audio issues. Stephane, we can't hear you. Okay so I suggest that we proceed and whenever Stephane has solved his audio issues we'll bring him back into the queue and give him the floor.

Okay so with only Stephane having a question on this did everyone have an opportunity to take a look at the list that Stephane and team have provided which has been attached to Berry's email? So I guess that's been brought up in the Adobe room yes appearing on my screen. So we just, you know, I think we can't really go through and analyze this list as a collaborative effort that we wanted to bring this up in the agenda and at least give everyone the opportunity to ask questions with respect to that list. So anything in there that you find particularly odd or where you have questions on? I see Jeff's hand is raised. So Jeff please fire away.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. For the list are you asking whether we just have comments on the Red Cross ones or on all of them?

Thomas Rickert: You can ask whatever questions you might have with respect to the list as provided by Stephane and his team.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So this list again just to clarify this list that's sent is what's currently protected. And I guess since Stephane's on here at least with request with aspect to the Red Cross ones I mean, you know, most of them seem like their full names and that's fine that those make a lot of sense. The ones that don't make as much sense to me are the abbreviations things that are like three or four characters. So things like CVTL and there's a couple others in there that have three or four characters.

So I just if Stephane could explain whether those are actually protected under the law or whether those are just commonly known abbreviations for those in a particular geographic area. I'd like to understand a little bit more about those with the Red Cross.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. Thanks Jeff. Before we move to Stephane for an answer let me just clarify. What Berry has linked to is the list of currently protected names. What Stephane has sent to the list as forwarded by Berry and as you can see in the

Adobe room now is what the Red Cross, Red Crescent movement have suggested as the protected list. And this is just for us to review and potentially comment on.

This is nothing that we should - that we are obliged to take on as a basis. But it was the first crack at creating a finite list that was kindly offered by Stephane and his team. Mary, do you want to offer additional explanations then I would go to you first and then to Stephane for a response to Jeff.

Mary Wong: Thanks Thomas. Yes this is Mary from staff. So just a little bit of additional background on the document that you see on the screen which is as Berry said in the chat a first attempt to try to reconcile the names. And as I also said earlier as we go along with this discussion in this group as we agree on criteria and principles then working through the implementation this list may look a little different.

And the other thing I wanted to add is what's on this screen what we are concerned with in this group is really the list of names that start on Page 2 I believe because on Page 1 that is the specific names and designations of the Red Cross, Red Cross, Cross (En Rouge), Red Crescent, Red Crystal those are the ones that have already been reconciled and adopted. So what we're concerned with in this reconvened group are the national society names and the international movement names which start on Page 2.

And so as Berry has also said in the chat -- and Stephane I know you did have a question about this in the email that you sent up last night -- we are not talking in this group at the moment about acronyms. And so you see some of those acronyms were not included by staff. And so that's something that is out of scope for this group. We're looking right now as directed by the council at the names of the international Red Cross movement and the names of the national societies of the Red Cross. Thomas, I hope that clarified and didn't muddy anything. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: I think we should ask Jeff is the one who's asked the question in the first place. Jeff, does that answer your question?

Jeff Neuman: Sort of. Hi. This is Jeff. There are I'm trying to reconcile there are a number of quote acronyms on that list that are not on pages one and two. So there are things like SPR, and FRA and a whole bunch of other ones. So I'm completely confused as to if it's out of scope then why is it on the list? And I mean I see changes are the red line ones. So sorry if I'm just acting a little dense here but please help.

Stephane Hankins: Thomas, can you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Just one, yes just one second Stephane. Perfect. Thanks Jeff for raising that point. And as I said previously this is a list that has been provided by Stephane and team. And I can - also concerned that we've made abundantly clear that accidents are not part of this exercise. And therefore at least the acronyms need to be removed from this list if this list were to serve as the basis for creating a finite list of strings that shall be protected. Stephane I'm glad that your audio is working. So please do make your original comment that you wanted to get in for earlier as well as your response now.

Stephane Hankins: Yes. Thank you. Hello so you can hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Yes. We can hear you all right.

Stephane Hankins: Okay. Thank you very much. I apologize. And okay well first of all what I would like to underline is what is on the screen is not - I'm not sure we can truly discuss this because since this was prepared we have received a lot - we have a lot more clarity on, you know, one on eventual criteria and what needs to be done.

So I wouldn't necessarily want to, you know, to comment on the list on the screen because we obviously need to rework this. I agree that, you know,

when we did this, you know, we, you know, there were mistakes made because there were acronyms in there and they shouldn't be or that shouldn't be there. So, you know, it's really a list that needs further reworking. And on the basis of the criteria which we are about to discuss I understand.

So I want to insist on this. Just to give you a short background it took, you know, a very big effort to get this together. I - we as I mentioned I believe when we were in Copenhagen we produced this list by consulting national Red Cross, Red Crescent societies directly and asking them, you know, what they would see fit to have on the list. And of course we had quite some difficulty for some of the scripts, you know, not being able to get some of the names in scripts that, you know, can only be or were only sent in PDF format and so on.

So I think we - what we – I would propose that we rather agree on the criteria, you know, the different formulations or potential formulations of each of the names with the hyphens, without the hyphens, with the word society, without the word society, with the article without the article. And then, you know, we would have to rework this.

We have started in fact but it takes a lot of – it will take a lot of time because by adding words with the hyphens by adding the names with the word society then, you know, it does increase the number. So I think that will – that has to be, you know, the way we need to proceed today. And then we will work on this for sure in the shortest possible time. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Stephane. I think we should in fact move away from the list. You know, it was intended to give you a flavor of what's strings might be on it but I guess that particularly the acronyms in there, you know, cause some questions. And so I think we should try to move on and define criteria. And then work on how to operationalize those criteria and while doing so I think it would be most helpful for you Stephane and your colleagues to reach out to the national societies and ask them to provide exact strings based on the

formula that we agree on. But I have another hand raised. Mary, maybe you can upload the list of principles for discussion while Jeff is making his intervention. And then we'll proceed to Agenda Item Number 4. Jeff, the floor is yours.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. And I'll just support what you just said that let's get the principles down because these lists are not helpful because again they're kind of, you know, a comparison of what the board has already approved on an interim basis but they don't take into account GNSO policy that we passed that went to the board has in there.

And that's - if we're going to look at a list it should be that list that the GNSO has approved versus what they're asking us to approve in the future. That's the only list that's going to be helpful to us not a list compared to what the board already requires because we started this policy development process with a blank slate not with – it sounds like there's a lot of noise back there.

We started this policy development process with a blank slate on developing principles not with taking into consideration what the board has already done on an interim basis. So for the future if we can just I guess destroy that list for now. Let's agree on the principles. And then let's compare the principles and if we're going to do a list do the list of what the GNSO has proposed already not what is already from the board. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Jeff. And I think you're spot on that we should be doing our own analysis and recommendations and not base this on what the board has previously done. So yes that's particularly true for the list. But I guess that the run through of the criteria that has been applied by ICANN staff to operationalize the earlier recommendations that of course helped for us to understand how actually a formula can be operationalized. Now what you see in front of you and the Adobe room is a extract that Mary Wong has kindly prepared based on Stephane's email. So some of the questions that you find in here are criteria that at least work on comparable work that's been

described by Berry or that we've discussed earlier. But I suggested that we run through them one by one, collect feedback and then hopefully come up with an exhaustive list of criteria on how a protection list can be established.

Now the first criteria on that you find at the beginning of the document is full matched names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Cross Societies in six UN languages. And is there any opposition to adding those strings to the list? Again six UN languages, full matched names. And we're not talking about variations with hyphens and stuff. That's for later.

Okay I see a green tick from Jeff. I don't see any opposition. Another tick from (Jorge) green tick that is so that's great. So I suggest that we take note of no objection to the protection of those names. I see Stephane's hand is raised and now it's lowered again. So Stephane if you want to go back and listen to the queue.

Stephane Hankins: Yes.

Thomas Rickert: Please raise your hand and there it is again Stephane please.

Stephane Hankins: Yes, Can you hear me Thomas?

Thomas Rickert: I can hear you and I'm sure the rest of the group can also here you.

Stephane Hankins: All right so Stephan Hankins. I wanted – but maybe we need to come back at a later stage of this conversation. I noted in the document that you sent Thomas that you were referring to the list which, you know, two names that we included on the list or that the board adopted for the temporary protections. And I was unclear, you know, in your formulation whether these, you know, should be taken into consideration or not. But for instance in the list of that was adopted by the board there is – there are the words international – there is the name International Movement of the Red Cross

and Red Crescent which is the overall statutory name of what is called the movement, the International Movement of the Red Cross Red Crescent which is also a text which is adopted and endorsed by the government and by the state. So I was, you know, I was hesitating yesterday put it in what I sent. And eventually I put it simply in the later points in a comment to your document Thomas.

But it's true that you know if we're talking about the overall names if we wanted to be consistent you know we would – that there would be a value to also add to the name of the movement itself. So I ask - I'll just mention this here for the record and then I don't know whether we need, you know, we come back to it at a later stage in this conversation. But it's true that as regarding international names that would be a valuable addition.

Thomas Rickert: Sorry I had to get myself off mute. Then I suggested that we put that into the notes . I think we need to be very precise with respect to the exact strength that we protected. So I don't see anything in the notepad to that effect so far so let's just wait for I guess it's a Mary who's running the notepad. But to take stuff that we've discussed so far there's no opposition to using the things that you have mentioned with the first bullet point in your email. We now, you know, once we see the strength in the – once we see the strength in the notepad sorry for the delay with this but I think we just need to do to be crystal clear on what we add to the formula.

Mary Wong: This is Mary.

Thomas Rickert: Mary please.

Mary Wong: Yes thanks Thomas and Stephane can correct me. What I put into the notepad under the heading question is something that I think he had raised in his email and I believe he was speaking to that. Specifically I think in terms of this first suggested draft principal the two international organizations the question is the word quote International Red Cross and Red Crescent

movement. And you see that in that was something he explained he did not include in that first draft principal. So per Jeff's comment in the Adobe Chat adding the word but the specific name I believe would be international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement.

Thomas Rickert: Okay but I don't seem to see that in the notes section I'm afraid but I see...

Mary Wong: Let me try this again and see if...

Thomas Rickert: No other addition is coming through.

Mary Wong: Yes because I had it – I had put it down and I put the entirety of Stephane's question in the questions section because I wasn't sure that I could capture everything accurately. But I think that this is the exact international name that Stephane had mentioned that he had not included in that first draft principal. And the question is whether this should also be included. Is that right...

Thomas Rickert: Okay.

Mary Wong: ...Thomas and Stephane?

Thomas Rickert: Mary what I suggested - go ahead Stephane.

Stephane Hankins: Yes. So that is correct Mary. The words international movement of the Red Cross Red Crescent are actually in the list that is – that was endorsed by the board at the time. This is the statutory name of the International Red Cross Red Crescent movement which, you know, is endorsed by states because that's the states endorsed and adopted those statutes. So I just, you know, I'm mentioning it so that, you know, we address it now and, you know, it comes as no surprise.

Thomas Rickert: Yes okay but just in terms of note taking I think what we should list is are the agreed principles that should go into the formula? And I think the first

principle is that we have – that I have as Stephane mentioned at the top of his note to match names of International Committee of the Red Cross and of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies in six UN languages. And then the addition to that would be international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement right in six UN languages?

Stephane Hankins: Correct.

Thomas Rickert: Plus is do we need to add what Jeff has put in there no section international movement of the Red Cross and Red Crescent so movement at the end of international movement?

Stephane Hankins: Those names are used. So in principle, you know, if the agreement is to add this because it's the next designation of the international structures of the movement then in principal the two versions should be added...

Thomas Rickert: Okay.

Stephane Hankins: ...because that's movement of the Red Cross and Red Cross or international movement international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement.

Thomas Rickert: Okay so let me now ask for any opposition to adding those two strings in six UN languages to the principles? Any opposition to that? So Stephane that's now an old hand or at least should be in opposition. So I think we can take that criteria on off the list as well. So that's great.

Now let's now move to the next criteria. And that is under the heading with regard to national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. And I'm now reading erratic one those official and the usual names, you know, so we - Stephane is using different technology here than Berry has. Names of Red Cross, National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies that are recognize as components of International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, e.g.,

American National Red Cross and American Red Cross or for (Quhuse Duchat) and (Quhuse Chabien). So I'm not sure Jeff to whether this comment to this point or to the previous point but or any means fire way.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks to this one and I guess it applies to this one and I guess it applies to the next one as well. We need to be very precise with all of these principles. And so usual names is not a term I'm familiar with. I mean official would be (usually) of James I would think. But usual is not a term I would like to see in a principle because I don't know what that means without seeing every specific one because usual in theory could be an abbreviation. It could be I don't know. So is there a definition of that?

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much for that comment Jeff. And that's actually the question that I would've brought up if you hadn't brought it up. And I think that using the official name is likely uncontroversial. Usual names and let me remind you of what Stephane has mentioned earlier in this call when he said that they've reached out to the national chairperson, asked them what they see fit for protection so that might be a broad and potentially ambiguous. I'm not saying that any of those proposals would be rejected but we need to come up with a formula that is actually unambiguous to the extent that staff can just use an official name of any new chapter and come up without external help with a finite list of additions that need to be made to the mailing list. So what I see is that there is at least one concern raised with the word username. So let's please move - remove usernames from this criterion and I will now ask whether there are objections to include the official names of the respective organizations to the list. So let me check whether there is objection to add the official names to the list.

I see one re-tick but as usual we are primarily testing for objection. Our definition of consensus is testing whether there are substantial objections. So that does not seem to be the case thanks very much. Mary do you have another comment to make?

Mary Wong: Yes I do Thomas. This is Mary from staff. I wanted to note (Jorge)'s note in the chat where he speaks to usual names and he also notes something that staff wanted to remind the group about. Well he does note that as a criteria we do need a form of a finite number of names pursuant to the list from the Red Cross team. And that question of a finite number of names harps back also to the instructions we received from the GNSO Council that whatever the principles and criteria is that we develop it should relate to a specific limited set of names and a finite, you know, set of variance of those names. So to the extent that the term usual name can be better explained and understood it still needs to be within that instruction from the council. Thanks Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Mary. That's a useful addition. I also take note of Mason Cole's, about full names. So for the voice of doubt we should clarify in the notes section that official full names of the organization shall be added to the last. I see that Jeff's hand is raised so let's move to Jeff and then to Stephane and then let's move to the next recommendation or the next proposal.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I actually want to point out for the record to (Jorge) I'm not saying that names shouldn't be protected. I just don't know what usual means and if there's a way to describe it, you know, under US law, you know, we'd say something like doing business as or something like that. We don't know – we can't just leave a term in there like usual and not have that defined. So just for the record we're not saying we don't want to protect names. We're just saying we don't know what usual means. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Jeff and yes. So maybe I can briefly jump in before Stephane responds because we do have criteria later on that sort of likely make it what the use of the names in - for that target body with adding the article with adding possessive pronouns. I'm not sure whether that's the English word of this grammar of this work type but we do and that and other things that can be added to make it more like it's used in the trade. So I think if you want to capture the notion of usernames it needs to be a description or

a formula that can be applied by the folks that need to be – that are involved in the implementation. Stephane your hand is raised.

Stephane Hankins: I think the answer's that I would have – was going to give have been given. The notion of usual names of course we, you know, we - I agree that, you know, the concept can certainly be refined whether, you know, we replace it by commonly used or, you know, but it's – the example that is there such as for example American National Red Cross and American Red Cross is a very good example and, you know, that the, you know, the national Red Cross Society in the United States is not, you know, it's statutory names or official name is different from, you know, the name it is commonly known by. So, you know, this is what obviously we're trying to capture here.

So, you know, the formula whether we say, you know reference to official names and commonly used names or, you know, it – that would do perfectly. And just to abide by what (Jorge) was saying it's clear that it doesn't mean, you know, a multiplication. It - what it means is, you know, that you can't just have the official name if, you know, the commonly known name is different. And of course, you know, we're - this is where, you know, obviously -- and this comes up to the other criteria as well -- this is where the absence of, you know any form of string similarity review needs to be, you know, addressed and complemented. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Stephane. And there's some communication going on in the chat and particularly (Jeff) is coming up with a proposal it looks, you know, for different variations of the American Red Cross. So Jeff would you possibly volunteer to come up with a set of words that we could use to circumscribe how these variations can be created?

Jeff Neuman: Yes this is Jeff. So I mean I've put something in the chat because the term that Stephane had used is commonly known as. And I think that's better than using the term usual. So if we can put the official and commonly known as

names I think that's – I think that would be much better and would help us produce a full list and give us better guidance.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Jeff. What I'm struggling with to be quite honest is whether – regardless of whether we call it username a common name. How can staff possibly determine what's a username or what's a common name for a society that's been added into the current list of society? So is there a way that we can use to describe what common names are because I trust that there are limits to what's common, commonly used for these types of names. So I think that, you know, if we say American Red Cross it can have the, you know, that each and every string can have the addition national that the article can be added to that that the order can be changed from American Red Cross to the American Red Cross or what other variations we had in the chat. You know, so can't we come up with a formula of a general nature that can be more or less parsed by a machine? Jeff is that a new hand?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So I was going to say, you know, we could employ something like the Trademark Clearinghouse stuff where they have to show you right so that, you know, it's not that they're just making it up but in order to get on the list if, you know, other than the official name if they want a commonly known name as added they're going to have to show some period of usage either on the Web sites, on their collateral material so it just can't be made up. And not that I think that they would do that but, you know, I'm sure you would find lots of literature for example that has just American Red Cross on it as opposed to American National Red Cross.

And I'm assuming you'd find existing literature with the other usual names. So I do think that it could be, you know, it's going to require a little bit of additional work from staff but I do not see that as a - an impossible task. If they want protection for the quote, commonly known as names I'm sure they'll of materials that would justify that to put that on the list. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. I see Stephane's hand is raised and I guess that will be the last intervention from the team on this call and then we have to adjourn.

Stephane Hankins: I have to say, you know, that on the usual names I think that we will fall back on the criteria that are lower because when I – most of the time the usual name is the name without the word society. That's what it is usually. So, you know, when I – when we say usual names, you know, most of these will in any case be covered on, you know, lower with the other criteria. You know, the nationals like they may be called the American Red Cross will, you know, the usual name will be the American Red Cross or, you know. So I think the idea is really not to, you know, to multiply indefinitely. The second point is that it's perfectly fine of course for the staff to look for that.

But of course we, you know, the other way is, you know, to base ourselves on, you know, the information we received from the national society itself. I don't think they, you know, they will inventory. There's no - there's not much of a risk for that. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Stephane. We have three minutes left before the top of the hour or now only two minutes left. And so I guess we need to continue this exercise and come up with a refined formula and work through the criteria. I'm not sure who of you will be in Abu Dhabi for the face to face meeting but, you know, although we don't have a formal meeting scheduled for Abu Dhabi we might be able to get a room to further discuss unfortunately without the more participation facilities but it would not be a meeting in which decisions are made but it's rather to use the opportunity of having at least some of you in the same place to continue working on that and then prepare a proposal that can be presented to and discussed by the group.

I would suggest that, you know, that staff sends out a proposal on when and where such meeting can take place and for (Jorge) you can even have two cups of good coffee I'm sure. So if you guys volunteer to work with us in Abu Dhabi that would just be awesome.

So I would like to thank staff for preparing this Stephane and team for preparing the additional documentation. I would like to thank all of you for your active participation for your participation in listening today and I'm looking forward to seeing some you in Abu Dhabi and the rest of you and we see each other next time on the call. Thanks so much in this meeting is now adjourned. Bye now.

Stephane Hankins: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Julie Bisland: Thanks everyone for joining. Today's meeting's adjourned. You can disconnect all lines and Jeff can you please stop the recording?

END