RECONVENED PDP WORKING GROUP ON RED CROSS NAMES: NOTES ON INFORMAL DISCUSSION
30 October 2017

<u>In attendance</u>: Thomas Rickert (Working Group chair), Jorge Cancio, Mason Cole, Heather Forrest, Chuck Gomes, Stephane Hankin, ICANN staff (Dennis Chang, Berry Cobb, Mary Wong)

<u>Items for Further Discussion and Action</u>:

Chuck had suggested that the Working Group consider two separate recommendations: (1) an actual finite list of names; and (2) a mechanism to update the finite list according to a set of specific criteria. In further discussion, there was general support for Thomas' proposal that the group develop the following two lists:
- A specific, finite list of the official name of the Red Cross National Society (as reflected in its official documentation in accordance with the stringent requirements for approval as a National Society)
- A specific, finite list of the "commonly used" name(s) of the Red Cross National Society – for this, the group will need to develop an agreed understanding of what the term "commonly used" means, and its scope.

The Red Cross will have to provide the initial lists, which the Working Group will need to review. The final lists are what ICANN organization will implement.

Any future updates to the lists must come formally via GAC communication to ICANN organization (note that there are 196 signatories to the Geneva Conventions, and currently 190 National Societies, with one in process, so there are few countries left on the signatory list which may in the future create National Societies).

<u>Notes</u>:

Thomas reported on the update he provided to the GNSO Council during the GNSO Working Sessions on Sunday 29 October. The Council did not raise concerns with the suggestion to reserve all 191 Red Cross National Society names, but expressed concern about the WG only proposing a formula for additions to the final list. They emphasized the need for the list to be finite and not be viewed as some sort of brand management portfolio for the Red Cross in place of their own monitoring of potential abuse.

Berry noted that staff had experienced some challenges with implementing the original list approved for interim reservation by the Board (e.g. whether the entries for non-Latin scripts were accurate, whether the names themselves are in fact the official names). He proposed that the Working Group discuss the development of the final lists according to certain principles, i.e.:

- There is a clear understanding between what the original PDP recommended for the Scope 2 National Society identifiers compared to the final recommendations of this group. It will be staff's duty to properly document these deliberations to ensure there is understanding in the community, Council and eventually the Board.
- The primary deliverable of this group should be a definitive list of identifiers (reflecting the Council's resolution to reconvene this Working Group).
- The final lists should be reconcilable, validated, and free from errors:
  o Reconcilable – meaning that we clearly can articulate the names to be protected.
  o Validated – meaning that it is easy to determine that any variants meet the criteria developed by the Working Group.
  o Free from errors – meaning that the entries accurately reflect the actual official names.

What might the final deliverables look like?
1. A staff prepared draft document, vetted by the Working Group that outlines the reconvened group's deliberations and final recommendations.

2. Definitive lists of all the names to be protected (Berry provided an example of what those lists could look like in tabular format – the actual name in English, the actual name in the respective national language for that National Society, and what that language is.
3. A formula and process by which adds, changes and deletes of these identifiers will be handled – this should not be something that ICANN staff has to make subjective judgments or educated guesses about.

What will be the process for updating the list?

- The staff assumption is that this will be the same process as was outlined by the Implementation Review Team (IRT) for the recommendations adopted by the Board, and that is now the subject of Consensus Policy – essentially, the Red Cross will inform the GAC, who will formally communicate it to ICANN.

The most difficult determination will concern what goes on the list as a "commonly used" name for a Red Cross National Society. The Red Cross can provide more detail about what sort of official documentation is required, or which exists, that can be relied on for verification.

It may not be accurate to assume that there is only one national language for each Red Cross National Society, or that there is only one "commonly used" name for each National Society. The final list may therefore contain more than just two entries per National Society.

The scope of this group does not extend to the International Red Cross acronyms (e.g. ICRC, IFRC). These remain outstanding issues where the GAC advice and original GNSO PDP recommendations are in conflict.

The Working Group's proposed final recommendations – and the lists – will need to be published for public comment before they are voted on by the GNSO Council.