## Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

## IGO INGO PDP Working Group

## Monday 15 July 2013 at 15:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jul

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Brian Peck: Hi. Good afternoon everyone. This is a meeting of the IGO INGO PDP Working Group. My name is Brian Peck.

I am with the ICANN policy staff and acting on behalf of Thomas Rickert the Chair for this group who unfortunately cannot well fortunately for him unfortunately for us cannot be here in Durban due to the birth of his new daughter. And so I will be acting as chair for this particular meeting today.

Go ahead and start by doing a roll call taking attendance. And then we'll go through quickly the agenda that we plan for this afternoon and start our discussions. So if maybe start here on the - my left go this way here.

Elizabeth Finberg: Elizabeth Finberg.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes.

(Sam Polkesh): (Sam Polkesh).

(Berle Acosta):     (Berle Acosta).

(Jo Tang):          (Jo Tang).

Greg Shatan:        Greg Shatan.

(Rudy Dunsnick):    (Rudy Dunsnick).

Klaus Stoll:        Klaus Stoll.

(Na Tong):          (Na Tong).

(Anewite Nakabuta):   (Anewite Nakabuta).

(Natiticiana Kuawampatuna): (Natiticiana Kuawampatuna).

Christopher Rassi:     Christopher Rassi.

Charlotte Lindsay: Charlotte Lindsay.

Stephane Hankins:     Stephane Hankins.

(Jeb Boddick):      (Jeb Boddick).

Mary Wong:          Mary Wong ICANN staff.

Berry Cobb:         Berry Cobb ICANN staff.

Alan Greenberg:     Alan Greenberg.

Man:                Great. Thank you very much. Brian.

Brian Peck:         Yes.

Man: It'd really help if especially if people are speaking softly get pretty close to the mic or we can't hear you.

Man: And do we have any remote participants on? No thank you.

Man: Joy Liddicoat is also present but stepped away for a moment.

Brian Peck: Okay all right. Thank you very much for that. All right are there any new or changes in statements of interest among the members of the Working Group?

All right okay for this afternoon's agenda what we plan to do was to - for the benefit of the Working Group members who were not able to attend the session between the GAC and the board (unintelligible) yesterday there was a discussion on the issue of acronyms and the current GAC advice related to that issue.

And so we'd like to briefly go through the slide that was provided by the board to the GAC as I say a benefit for the group.

And of course if there are any discussion about that as we take that into account in our discussions and deliberations on that particular aspect of the mandate for this Working Group in terms of protection for IGO names and acronyms.

(Dave) then will then go through some housekeeping matters in terms of our next meeting. As you know we are currently in the middle of our public comment forum for the initial report that has been published.

The deadline for that public comment is actually this Wednesday at 23:59. And then the reply period will start the following day on 18 July ending on 7 August. All right so with that we can go up to yes.

So I think for the purposes of today and the discussion that the board had with the GAC related to the GAC's advice on providing IGO or protection for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

And as you may know that has been implemented temporarily in specification five of the new registry agreements of course which were - have now but adopted by the board.

In terms of - for the dialogue between the GAC and the board the board basically in it's discussions with the GAC yesterday requested that further dialogue be commenced specifically in implementation on how to protect acronyms of IGOs.

And as part of that discussion the board proposed as a way to initiate discussions or at least form a basis of a discussions four possible alternatives to the current GAC advice which is to protect or provide appropriate protection for the acronyms of IGOs.

The first as you can see up on the chart there is to develop a reasonable means for defining the list of acronyms, identifying some of the appropriate for broad protection and others not, require each IGO to identify a subset of the currently applied for gTLD strings for which a designated acronym should be protected due to the related nature of the IGOs work to the applied for spring - string excuse me.

Third is to implement a notice of registration process similar to the trademark clearinghouse or for something else.

So I think, you know, what was - came out of the discussions yesterday between the GAC and the board was that there was, you know, a positive response to the need for additional dialogue or initial discussions to try to

again address the issue of implementation of the GAC basic advice to provide appropriate protection for IGO acronyms.

As you know this is an issue that the Working Group has also been addressing. And some of the policy recommendation options that are currently in this report relate to that and provide for example a similar model to that of number three here from the board which is some sort of clearinghouse model that would also provide a notification process.

So we wanted to make, you know, bring the Working Group members up to date for those who as I say were not able to attend yesterday's meeting or were not aware of that and, you know, certainly we can take this into consideration as the Working Group moves forward on its deliberations and of course also taking into account what public comments received, you know, in terms of providing what type of protection for acronyms of IGOs and other international organizations.

All right any questions or did anyone want to raise a point of discussion? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes:    Thanks Brian Chuck Gomes. Is our exercise going to be modified to include this new what I think is a new option of having a subset of the acronyms?

Brian Peck:     As you point out that's not an option I think that the group had come up with up to this point. So certainly something that we could consider and maybe it perhaps is taking a long into account other public comments we receive posted to the public comment forum.

And then as we'll get into in a minute here the public discussion form that we'll be having on Wednesday will seem, you know, community feedback could be certainly something that we could take into consideration. Yes.

Chuck Gomes:     I was really thinking of Wednesday not necessarily today but yes. Secondly I think it would be helpful -- and this is Chuck again -- it would be helpful if a message was sent out to the stakeholder groups and constituencies to give this information because obviously the public comment period is ending Wednesday. It's going to be to late probably to address it in the public comment period.

But it would be good if there's any time in stakeholder group and constituencies meetings tomorrow if they could at least be made aware of this.

They're probably going to have to take some time to respond but -, you know, so maybe that can happen later.

Brian Peck:      Thank you Chuck. Those are good suggestions. Appreciate it okay? Anyone else? Yes.

Greg Shatan:     I would just second that. And this is Greg Shatan for the transcript. I think that it would be perhaps foolhardy of us to ignore the developing or GAC advice and not to try to find some way if not to converge it at least to take into account what's going on there and put it into our mix.

It may not be what results from our deliberations and from a review of public comment but I think that we need to bake it into our process otherwise I think, you know, we run the chance of if not being overtaken by events at least having kind of a larger almost a constitutional crisis -- which we may end up having anyway -- over the privacy of GAC advice the adoption of GAC advice versus the adoption of GNSO policy recommendations when they are in direct conflict with each other.

I'm not saying that we need to bow to GAC advice but I think we need to think about as we proceed every step of the way from now on where we're going and how we're going to deal with the fact that the GAC advice is baking in the

oven next to us and that they may not be room for two meals on the plate or we may replace the old meal with a new meal but there may be a lot of indigestion along the way. Thank you.

Brian Peck:        Thank you Greg. Just a point of clarification that the alternatives that are up on the chart there are actually alternative suggestions by the board that these aren't necessarily GAC advice points at this point.

Greg Shatan:      Thank you. I think we need then to be looking also at where the GAC advice is and figuring out where it is contradictory to or at odds with our at least our section suggestion.

                   If we're looking at the same spectrum that's fine we may come out in a different place. But we should be looking at what their spectrum is versus our spectrum and comparing those as well. Thank you.

Brian Peck:        No thank you. And just to that point if the current slide was just put up on the screen there the current GAC advice from the Beijing communiqué is IGO names and acronyms warrant special protection in expanded DNS.

                   So that is the current advice. And implementation issues is what - one that the board has come back in asking the GAC for further guidance well, you know, for the clarification was the original request after the Beijing communiqué.

                   In the dialogue that took place yesterday, you know, the board provided its interpretation to what it thinks the GAC advice means expressing some of the concerns it had with - in relation to acronyms.

                   And then as a result of those concerns again raise some possible alternatives with the basic request being that further dialogue be commenced to try to address the implementation issue of the GAC advice and the GAC, you know, at least from those that were, you know, there yesterday it seems to be

positive and willing to engage in further dialogue with the board on finding, you know, a reasonable (unintelligible) alternatives to deal with the protection of the acronyms.

But as you point out Greg I mean the current advice is to provide special protections for both names and acronyms.

Greg Shatan:     This is Greg again I guess special protection could mean almost anything from slightly special to really special. And that's I guess where the implementation issue comes in.

And I know that the - this Working Group and even the GNSO generally does not have a place in the dialogue between the board and - or the engine PC and the GAC on this item of GAC advice but maybe we need to figure out a way to pull a third chair up at the table. Thank you.

Brian Peck:      Thank you. Any other points of discussion are questions or yes Alan?

Alan Greenberg:  I guess I'm not really looking for people to make - have their - use their crystal ball. But I've always read the terms special protections in the GAC communiqués to be block.

Perhaps block allowing the organization itself to get but not one of the far lesser protections that this workgroup has discussed. Am I badly misreading what we think they mean?

Brian Peck:      Well I think - thank you Alan. I mean in terms of again obviously I cannot speak on behalf of either the GAC or the board but if you look at, you know, the current implementation of the GAC advice from the Beijing communiqué is the resolution of 2 July of the new gTLD program committee where basically it provides special protections as you pointed basically a block of both, you know, from reservation - excuse me from registration of IGO names

and acronyms at the second level through specification five of the registry agreement.

But that protection is only until the first meeting of the new gTLD program committee after the Durban meeting.

And the reason for that my understanding is so that it would encourage that dialogue between the GAC and the board to try to find a means of implementing, you know, at least the protection of acronyms.

Alan Greenberg: No, no but I was asking not what the board is doing but what do we think the GAC means? The wording they actually use was appropriate - preventive initial protection which sound - the word preventive sounds like blocking to me. So I have assumed that's what they're targeting not a trademark claims notice.

Brian Peck: Greg,

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. I've always assumed the same thing whether there's room for interpretation through dialogue I think without a dialogue that was what the GAC intended the wording to mean which was a big fat block.

Brian Peck: Okay. Well we'll follow up on Chuck's suggestions in terms of raising these alternatives that were discussed yesterday between the two organizations or, you know, if the GAC and the board can try to encourage stakeholder groups and constituencies to consider this and provide comment, you know, if not during the Wednesday session then into the subsequent reply period that's open until August 7. So okay Joy I'm sorry.

Joy Liddicoat: Thanks Joy Liddicoat for the record. Yes just wondering in light of the GNSO and GAC meeting if one of the suggested topics for future meetings one of the suggestions about future meetings was that they be topics of discussion.

And I'm just wondering if there's any way to circumvent (unintelligible) process of trying to work out what we think the GAC means and to cut through them in some way perhaps by suggesting either a, you know, informal session with them or some kind of specific question and some informal way that might be able to be discussed with some of the Working Group (unintelligible) of the Working Group to brief the GAC, you know, to try and find some formal way to open up a discussion about that so as to just circumvent (unintelligible) the infinity mirror trying to work out what was meant and then finding out (unintelligible).

Brian Peck: Thank you. (Unintelligible).

(Rudy Dunsnick): I would like to go back to the first slide when you listed that the four alternatives. Is there any priority on this list given by the GAC so that we know what they prefer themselves?

Is there any indication of what would be the best solution for them so that at the end we know that if we work in another direction it's going to take us a long way to give back to it?

Brian Peck: Based on the discussions during the meeting yesterday there's no prioritization or, you know, favor one of the four any of these four options.

They were just listed as four suggested alternatives, you know, as suggested basis if you will to further discussions on implementation possibilities. Sorry.

Man: My understanding with these were - this was board suggestions so because (Rudy) was asking if the GAC have any prioritization?

These weren't suggested by the board by the GAC my - I believe these were assessed by the board as possible options of something in between what the GAC was asking and nothing possible options that the board considers might be viable.

Brian Peck: That's right.

Man: Okay.

Man: So there was no prioritization either by love board and/or any indication from the GAC which of these four they would prefer?

Greg Shatan: Brian Greg Shatan again. Just as a clarification these alternatives at least the first two alternatives deal only with acronyms and not with names.

The third one doesn't specify whether it's for acronyms and names or only acronyms and the fourth one just as something else so that I could be anything.

Was the board not providing alternatives with regard to names or the board agreeing that names should be blocked?

Did the - or do we have a sense of what the board was thinking with regard to names based on these possible alternatives? Thank you.

Brian Peck: When the GAC issued it's communicate and advice from the - and the Beijing communiqué the board's response and concerns was expressed well there were two.

One was the scope of names in the future and languages the other was in terms of protection was it was specifically to acronyms.

And so in the discussion that took place yesterday the main concern of the board expressed was that of how to implement protection special protections for acronyms.

So you're right. I mean in a sense there's not specific in these particular alternatives but the focus of the discussion for these alternatives again the board's concern over how to implement special protection of acronyms

And the alternatives that were being raised were again to form the basis or to initiate discussions or dialogue in that particular aspect of it.

If you look at the board resolution from 2 July in terms of providing protection i.e., you know, a block of registration of names and acronyms the temporary aspect of that only applies to acronyms it does not apply to names.

Man:            Are we then to assume that they the board has accepted the GAC advice with regard to blocking of names?

Brian Peck:     Again I can't speak for the board but if you look at what has been implemented to date and what resolution again the temporary aspect only applies to acronyms and not to the names at this time.

But that being said too if you look at the rationale of the board decision, you know, and especially when it - the board decided to extend special protection for IGO names it specifically says that it acknowledges the GNSO PDP of currently, you know, going on and that it will be used in general but such measures should be, you know, worked through the policy development process.

So there's an acknowledgement by the board that okay these are our protections that we're putting in place but also keeping in mind that there's an ongoing PDP.

And that if indeed there might be additional or further actions required for many final policy recommendation that's taken into account.

And I'm only reading from the rationale and the decisions. I can't, you know, obviously speak on behalf of the board beyond what you can see and that's available to us. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes from I know there's some philosophical disagreements but I haven't heard many operational reasons from anyone including in this group why we could not protect the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund as a name?

So, you know, and the same for most of the others. So, you know, I think if it came down push to shove I don't think there's a use dispute over those long full names. Maybe just one or two that might have some overlaps.

You know I know the ALAC disagrees philosophically that they don't need protection at the first level part because no one's likely to register them if they do there should be an objection process that can easily kill it. But if someone is determined to do it go for it.

Brian Peck: Okay Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Brian Chuck Gomes. I know this isn't the time to talk about them but I find it difficult to separate one and two.

If you did two buy itself everybody would just ask for their acronym. They would have to be some criteria established as implied in number one that is fairly objective otherwise it would be a probably waste of time.

If you just give them the option they're going to say give it to me so...

Brian Peck: Okay. All right thank you. The other main part of today's agenda is to provide the Working Group a brief update on how we are going to structure the format for Wednesday's public forum discussion.

And we have some outside facilitators here from XPLANE for those of you participated in the strategic planning session after the opening ceremony you might be familiar or at least got a little bit of a taste of what we try - will try to do on Wednesday.

Keeping in mind that the objective for Wednesday's session which were agreed upon by the Working Group members are twofold.

One is to raise the awareness and the importance of this issue to the community and two is to try to engage as much as possible an interactive session with the community to try to come up with some ideas or at least provide some further guidance on where the community is on this issue on the four core issue questions that we've identified.

And so were going to have representatives from XPLANE provide a brief explanation on how Wednesday's session will work.

And then we will finish today's session actually with an exercise amongst ourselves with XPLANE in working over the four issues.

One to try it again try to get some dialogue within the group on the four core issues questions. The other is to in a sense provide a dry run for Wednesday's session to make sure we need any - have any concerns that need to be addressed prior to the session.

Before doing that though I'm one minute (unintelligible) thanks. Before doing that we have a couple of housekeeping items.

One is of course scheduling our next meeting. And then also wanted to provide an opportunity for the workgroup if they had any issues related to our work that they wanted to raise at this time before we break into the session would certainly allow members to do so.

So before we go into the basic housekeeping administrative issues or matters and then the XPLANE portion of this meeting are there any other issues or questions that members of the Working Group would like to raise at this time? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I'd like to bring up the letter from the Red Cross Red Crescent Society. So Stephane if you can help clarify some things.

I know that the content of that letter I believe has been raised before. I don't think it's the first time but there's a formal request now to add names at a point in the game where we were hoping we're getting ready to be closed.

And where GAC advice hasn't considered it and everything frankly it - it's very frustrating when you work through a process over a long period of time and get close to I hope close to closure.

And all of a sudden there's a major change. So maybe Stephane -- and I'm not trying to put Stephane on the defensive either -- but it would be helpful maybe if you provide a little explanation here or whoever wants to provide the explanation.

Charlotte Lindsay: Hi. Thank you I'll take that one as I sent the letter to the GAC and to the board on behalf of the director general of the ICFC and the Secretary General of the International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent Society.

So my name is Charlotte Lindsay. And I'm the Director of Communication and Information Management for the ICRC in Geneva.

So as you quite rightly pointed out most of that information has already been contained in letters to the board that were sent over two years ago and a reminder letter that was sent a year ago to which we haven't had a response.

We've also raised a number of those issues in their on many occasions during these meetings from Costa Rica onwards.

The - for us we have never seen that the protection accorded to the name and terms Red Cross Red Crescent are any different from those of the names of the organizations that carry them.

So the protection of the term Red Cross or Red Crescent and then the American Red Cross or International Committee of the Red Cross they carry those terms within them and therefore were afforded the protection.

It's only during the last meeting that in Beijing that there seemed to be this question about whether there was the protection was actually accorded in the same way.

And that was the first that we had heard that maybe all the names were not being protected in the same way because it was just about the terms.

And that's why we clarified in meetings directly and in this letter that we had clearly seen from the beginning in the submission of the name that there - the terms Red Cross Red Crescent and other designations which are protected under international humanitarian are also covered names.

So there are two protections granted in international law to the names and terms. That is the protected use of the Red Cross and Red Crescent and the indicative used to cover any organization which has been recognized by the ICRC. And is part of the movement to Red Cross and Red Crescent Society.

There are any time a new status formed recently South Sudan. There is a formal process of recognition that would happen for any national society with very strict criteria whereby the ICRC would then need to recognize them and that has been done in the case of one or two national societies in this whole GAC process started.

So if there are any new names that have been added to that list it would be also either because of the clarification necessary or because we considered it was covered or because they are new states formed since then of which there has been a recognition of their Red Cross or Red Crescent Society.

Brian Peck:     Okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:  Chuck has a follow on I think so...

Brian Peck:     Okay Chuck.

Chuck Gomes:    Thanks Alan and thanks for the explanation. I guess where I'm more concerned not the - I'm not looking for the justification because you guys have laid that out pretty well.

But one of the things the GAC provided in their advice was a very specific list of names. And apparently it didn't include all possibilities that you think should be included. Am I correct in that conclusion?

Charlotte Lindsay: What we had clarified also in talking with some of the GAC members is they believe they covered every name of the national society or component of the movement the other two being International Committee or the Red Cross International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

But it was not necessarily explicit in there in that letter that was sent. So we have updated the list with all of the national societies which exist which there is a finite list unless there is a national society recognized. So there is one in every state recognized as well as the two international components.

Chuck Gomes:    Thank you.

Brian Peck:     Alan.

Alan Greenberg:   Yes as a follow on to that I'm just a little bit confused but I don't - I'm not really one to make a debate how the wording in applicant guidebook which was published could be construed as including all the national names.

But that that's my own confusion. The question I have is a very simple one. In the letter you talk you give an annex two I think the full names of the national societies and the common names.

But in the actual request you are only asking for the full names in both English and the official languages of the country not the common names is that correct?

Charlotte Lindsay: Yes.

Alan Greenberg:   So let's give the common names list for information but not related to the request?

Charlotte Lindsay: Yes exactly.

Alan Greenberg:   Thank you.

Charlotte Lindsay: There may be for example the Red Cross Society of China which it might be commonly known as the Chinese Red Cross but it's registered as the Red Cross Society of China.

Alan Greenberg:   So you are not seeking in this request the common name to be protected?

Charlotte Lindsay: No. What we're seeking is the protection of the term so Red Cross Red Crescent and its application to the name.

So the terms that protect the name so it should not be able to be used nobody else should be able to register as Chinese Red Cross either. But it's correct name is the Red Cross Society of China to give an example.

Alan Greenberg:   I don't think that is clear in the letter other than being included in the strings contained request which is a separate one.

Charlotte Lindsay: Happy to look back at the letter on that one.

Brian Peck:   Greg.

Greg Shatan:   Greg Shatan. A follow up question to the ICRC I'm having trouble reconciling the letter and this PDP process.

As I read it the letter makes a direct request to the board to take permanent action without - with regard to all of the strings requested without any, you know, mention or consideration of this PDP process.

Are you suggesting that - and I don't believe you've made the same all of the same submissions of all those names that were listed to this body.

So are you suggesting that the board should then ignore this PDP process or are you suggesting that either the letter should somehow be folded by us into this process, are you ignoring this process, I'm just I'm having trouble reconciling it?

It seems like it's a parallel track and then to something extent kind of an end run around this process. So can you clarify that for me? Thank you.

Brian Peck:   Charlotte please.

Charlotte Lindsay: So we have on many, many occasions requested all of the names of all of the components that carry the term Red Cross or Red Crescent within as I say

there's a finite number of those one and only per country. And that has to be recognized by the ICRC through a very clear statutory process.

So it's not an easy feat to become a member to be recognized. So we have on many, many occasions requested that all of the organizations carrying that name is covered.

We have not at all suggested that the board should override the PDP process. What we have said from the beginning and in letters that this is a question of international law.

There we would follow the PDP process. But fundamentally this is a question of law. And that law is not normally subject to a policy process.

So that we would follow this process that was put up through this multi-stakeholder model but fundamentally underpinning the question of international law and ICANN's articles of incorporation clearly state that it would follow international law.

Greg Shatan: So then you're suggesting that the board should override the PDP process because what you claim is international law rather than work through this organization's PDP process to try to achieve that result through the laws and organizational structures of this organization?

Charlotte Lindsay: On this one we've got many reasons that we've had in all of the various ICANN sessions we've tried to follow every single route possible to ensure the appropriate recognition of the protection accorded to the Red Cross and Red Crescent names and designations.

We have done that through every process that anyone has asked us to including engaging directly with the board from the beginning.

And there we have also it - be highlighted by the members of the board that they appreciate that we have also worked directly through all of the various PDP processes.

But the letter that we sent last week was a confirmation of the letter that we'd already previously sent to the board.

Greg Shatan: I still don't feel like you've answered my question of how you see this playing out between this PDP process which could come up with a variety of results which may or may not be consistent with your letter and the letter to the board and whether your kind of giving kind of due respect to this PDP process.

I don't know why the letter wasn't sent to this, you know, submitted into the PDP process rather than submitted to the board with almost complete lack of recognition of the PDP process.

Brian Peck: Okay Charlotte if I may just ask is a point of clarification I believe to public comment that was submitted the current public comment forum that the request was also included in that particular submission or at least the scope of the additional names were included in that and it was done through this public comment forum process?

Charlotte Lindsay: Absolutely yes.

Brian Peck: Okay.

Charlotte Lindsay: And I'm flanked by 55 national societies who have submitted it through the PDP process team.

Brian Peck: Okay. Although I think we have, you know, evidence of submission through both the process and other avenues.

You know, I understand the concerns that are being expressed here but I think, you know the points have been made at this point so we can move on to another issue I think.

Okay last point of business before we get to XPLANE and thank you for your patience is housekeeping matter and that is the scheduling of the next meeting of the Working Group.

As you - as I mentioned the current public comment forum reply period closes on August 7. We are considering tentatively scheduling the next meeting on Wednesday, 31 July.

Next Wednesday of course most people are getting back from Durban and getting back catching up on other matters.

We'd like to tentatively schedule it for 31 July pending to see how many public comments there are to review.

If there aren't that many and we're still waiting for the reply period perhaps then we might agree to postpone it.

But we will go ahead and send out a notice for tentatively scheduling the next session of this Working Group deliberations on 31st of July during which time we would start considering or reviewing public comments that have been received.

And also by that time we will compile the feedback that we get from the community from Wednesday's public discussion session here in Durban.

So unless there's any objections to that particular scheduled date the time would be the normal time at 1600 UTC. And again we'll certainly send out your notifications beforehand.

Okay. All right with that I'd like to bring up the representatives from XPLANE. And as I mentioned they're going to briefly explain the format for Wednesday's public discussion session and lead us through a discussion of these issues amongst ourselves here again to solicit some further views on the issues that are before us.

And again for our sake to help provide kind of a dry run for Wednesday's session. So appreciate your participation. Thank you. And Mr. David King from XPLANE.

David King:     Thank you. Good afternoon. Thanks for having us. I just want to briefly introduce my colleagues behind me (Patrick) and (Raul) next to him.

And we'll be working together to help through this process. So over I think about the last two weeks we've exchanged calls and emails and various things to do go through a planning process. And has should I - I'm going to walk through the presentation is that fair?

Brian Peck:     Yes.

David King:     Okay good. So - and forgive me I'm going to read just a little bit but this is our outline of what we plan to do and how we reached consensus on this.

So the purpose of the public session on coming up so first is to raise awareness on why the issue - why these issues are important and to provide transparent Working Group's deliberations and positions to date so kind of level set and create awareness and understanding.

Then the active part is to facilitate an interactive discussion to solicit new ideas new perspectives, and see what the public - get their feedback on the ideas as well as see if they have any new ideas for how these challenges are being approached.

So by way of agenda we have a very limited amount of time but we'll start with just, you know, getting the room settled down, and brief welcome and introductions, a 15 minute period description of the activities what we plan to do, a presentation of the topics themselves and the propositions against each topic so that everyone in the room has a basic understanding.

And then we're going to conduct what we describe as a gallery walk kind of exercise where the four topics A, B, C and D will be set up.

And we've actually kind of got prototypes or models of this behind you here on the wall or on the easels over here so A, B, C and D.

And you can imagine the room moving in groups from the - across the different positions. So what we'll do is kind of load balance the room.

Anybody who wants to participate spread out into groups and they'll get 12 minutes at each position to provide their thoughts.

And it's difficult to see at this distance but as we get up there you'll see there is the topic itself, the override - overarching question and then with the propositions that are there. And then do what we describe as a post-up exercise.

They can provide their thoughts and have conversations with the people around them to give their input into those things.

And so we'll do 12 minutes four cycles of 12 minutes. And then we can talk about the end. One there are different ways to wrap things up.

We can either do a read out to the whole room of some of the topics and some of suggestions that were made or we can just allow for more time and conversation and not do a read out at the end that's we can - there's a few different ways to play out the scenario.

Would you mind toggling ahead one. I just want to talk about a bit about the nuance. And the text gets a little hard to read here but you can see the graphic at the bottom of different groups moving across topics A, B, and C and D.

What - part of the exercise is to position at each easel two people who will stay there they won't rotate.

And the two people will be one of us from the XPLANE to serve as facilitators and we've drawn somebody else from the community who is going to help or has been through some of our exercises in the past so they'll have an understanding of how to interact with a group when they're there.

So they'll be a facilitator at each easel. And then we also recommended having a subject matter expert there.

Somebody who can speak to the topic and the propositions so that folks who are newer possibly to policy somebody newer coming into the meeting they can get - ask questions and have answers immediately from somebody who really understands the information.

So that's the basic plan. It's not terribly complicated. It's designed to create conversation, to surface new ideas, to go about the - to sorry to -- I'm suffering a little from jet lag -- to engage the community in a conversation so that's what it's designed for.

Brian Peck:        Thank you very much.

David King:        No that's...

Brian Peck:        Okay.

David King:     ...in general. Unless there any questions.

Brian Peck:     Yes.

Man:            Yes I've got a question. What was wrong when we were sitting around in a
                room talking to each other?

David King:     Nothing. This is mainly an exercise to facilitate interactive session with the
                community on Wednesday.

                The, you know, one of the objectives again that was agreed upon by the
                Working Group was to try to engage the community to solicit feedback as,
                you know, to provide maybe perhaps some new ideas or fresh approaches
                but to try to make it as interactive as possible.

                And, you know, sometimes just because of the physical layout of how these
                rooms are set up at these international meetings sometimes it's difficult to
                facilitate that kind of open ended discussion or, you know, greater interactive
                engagement with community members and members of the Working Group.

                And so this format is designed only for the purpose of trying to engage the
                community members that normally aren't part of the process in a more, you
                know, enhanced manner.

                This is not an indication of any way of, you know, frustration or a sense of a
                failure of how the Working Group works.

                It's (unintelligible) as a way to facilitate greater discussion and engagement
                with the committee members on the public discussion forum on Wednesday.

Brian Peck:     Chuck?

Chuck Gomes:     Thanks Chuck Gomes. Could you move back to the previous slide on the
                 timeline slide I guess is the one I wanted? Yes.

                 In that 15 minutes are the questions all questions going to be discussed
                 then? And hopefully enough clarity okay good.

                 I wanted to make sure that because it'd be really easy to get to the flip charts
                 and spend 12 minutes on understanding the questions.

                 Okay so that's really good. Second thing is what is the output that we want to
                 get out of this and how will that be captured?

David King:      So the output will be a collection of the ideas in conversation. Any insights or
                 any questions they might have will be applied directly to the posters
                 themselves and they'll be done via Post-it note frankly the Post-it note or a
                 very analog process.

                 But it has the benefit the added benefit of being very modular. We can move
                 in infinity map Post-it's together and collect them.

                 So ultimately the output would be high resolution photos of the verbatim
                 feedback as well as they can be collected, and typed up, and provided either
                 to the community or just the Working Group itself.

Chuck Gomes:     So yes I think it would be -- this is Chuck again -- it would be good to provide
                 it to the Working Group I mean it's okay to provide it to the community too but
                 hopefully it'll be most useful to us. So that's very good.

                 I'm optimistic that this might work. It depends how many people show up I
                 guess. I'd like - I'm supportive of giving it a shot. I'll be honest with you I didn't
                 think it worked very well on the strategic plan this morning.

It's too high level a topic. And the time was much too short. Now this is short time too but if our questions are brief enough it might work as long as the facilitators at each place make sure that they give everybody a chance to weigh in because 12 minutes is still really short.

And exercise like this ideally would require a lot more time and you know that better than I do. But if it's managed properly and it's clear before they get to the stations I think it could provide some good input.

Brian Peck:    Thanks Chuck. And as you point out I mean we're going to - that 15 minutes is to provide kind of a theme setter to go through the four topic issue questions and relevant propositions.

And let me just quickly show you what they are and again these were determined by previous discussions of the Working Group.

We have four topic questions issues if you will. The first one is should the identifiers of IGOs and IGOs INGOs be protected at the top or second level with the four different options?

Topic B is if protections are provided through a reserved names list should there be an exception process to allow the relevant organization and original right older to register the identifier in the top or second level?

And again with the exceptions that are currently the two exception options that are being provided in the initial report.

Topic C is should organization acronyms be protected at the top of second level. And we will add I think the one that was yes we will add that and I'll work with you on that.

And topic D what should be the objective set of criteria to determine whether an organization should receive special protections again working off the matrix that we have in the issue report.

We also have printed copies of the exception options and the matrix options available at each of the stations so that people will have access to the actual language on that.

So we're hoping by providing the background at the introduction and having both facilitators and subject matter experts at each station having these materials there that it will help, you know, people to be able to, you know, get into the substance of discussions as much as possible.

And we think one advantage of this particular format as well is it gives equal time if you will to all four issues and among all four groups that participate. So Mary?

Mary Wong: And if I might add to that going back to Chuck's point about the limited time problem and Klaus's -- who's no longer here -- their point about how this is different.

I think the idea too is that on Wednesday and again depending how many people show up but we expect that they're going to be more than just a Working Group there that on Wednesday priority and (pre-events) I should say would be given to non-Working Group members because the Working Group has had adequate opportunity to talk through a lot of this.

David King: Okay. Yes and to the question of would we have enough time, you know, we've built into the schedule 20 minutes at the end to go around and read out ideas that were discussed.

If the information is most valuable to the Working Group I would recommend taking that 20 minutes and dividing it among the four station rotation so that

there's more time for people to spend at each station to provide their feedback and really have a quality conversation there as opposed to reading it out at the end of the room but that's - I leave that up to you.

Brian Peck:    Okay. Are there any questions about the format or how we plan to conduct a session on Wednesday or yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes:    Chuck again. Just want to respond to that because that might be a very good idea. I guess we can judge that I say we I probably won't be able to be there because I have the finance session going on.

But if the stations are really looking like they need more time all of them -- if just one of them does it probably doesn't work -- but that wouldn't be bad as long as we - we're capturing the input we're getting.

That's what we really want out of this. It's nice to have a summary but the more important thing in my mind is for us to get the input from the exercise.

Brian Peck:    Okay thank you. As I mentioned what we'd like to do we have one hour schedule for this session so unless there's any other business for the Working Group we would like to - for those we would hope that all of you be willing to stay and participate in going through this exercise again to, you know, to spur discussion amongst ourselves and also to add to provide a dry run to see if there's anything we need to adjust or tweak for the purposes of Wednesday.

And we'll again we'll let Dave and his team take us from this point forward. And so last call for any other business for the Working Group itself?

Okay for those who are participating remotely we are breaking up into groups. And so basically there will not be any audio or anything really going on that you can hear over the line.

I think the purpose or the idea is is we'll have to spend a little bit of time on the breakout sessions and do kind of a summary at the end.

So you're certainly welcome to stay along remotely to hear any sort of summation or results of the discussions here.

But just to give you a heads up at this point forward there won't be any audio or substantive discussions taking place, you know, unless you're here in the room so all right. So Dave go ahead.

David King:     Yes. Great so effectively what we want to do this afternoon is run kind of a beta is too fragile sounding a description of it.

We want to run the exercise here with you. I know you have discussed these points already and many of you already have your clear points of view about, you know, the different propositions against the different topics.

So this will be a little different than when we have people who are coming to the table fresh with fresh perspective on - well I'll just say with hearing these topics and hearing the propositions for the first time.

So if we could let's see I think we've got about five, six, seven yes let's form three groups. No, yes thank you for reminding me actually.

We're for the purposes of this afternoon's exercise we're going to contain it to the Working Group members of the Working Group participation.

So to our friends who are here observing the meeting and listening please come back on Wednesday for the full public participation but for just this afternoon we're going to keep it just to the Working Group. So...


END