

**ICANN
Transcription
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG
Work Track 5 (Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 15 November 2017 at 20:00 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-new-gtld-subsequent-track5-15nov17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p6e1v2seu87/>

Attendance is on wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/FgNyB>

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

Coordinator: Recordings has started.

Terri: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5 Geographic Names on the Top Level taking place on 15 November 2017. In the interest of time there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room.

If you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now? Hearing no names I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purpose and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to our coleader Martin Sutton. Please begin.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Terri and welcome everybody to our first Work Track 5 meeting. Just to bear in mind there are some apologies so we have apologies at - in the Agenda Box that you will be able to note but otherwise we have a very good turn out so thank you very much for taking the time to join this first session. The agenda is in front of you here and was sent out yesterday. The

intention of the next 60 minutes is to run through some administrative and background information to bring those up to speed that we're unable to join the open session that was set up for Abu Dhabi meeting.

We'll also run through some of the rules of engagement which were clearly useful to talk through at the Abu Dhabi session. We'll also then cover terms of reference and where we are in the current situation with those, bearing in mind that we had opportunities at the open session to discuss and take feedback from members of the community, so those work in progress there that we need to report back and get further feedback.

We'll also then start to talk about the timeline so that we get a good appreciation of where this fits in with the overall PDP Working Group and we'll start to explain some of the work plan items that we've been discussing through the Leadership Team and the meeting schedule going forward. We've also got some any other business to cover but before I go further is there anybody else that would like to add any other business? Okay hearing none okay if we could go to the next slide please.

Now I probably don't need to do this because Christopher is there - preceded me on this but I'd also like to - for you to welcome our other coleaders -- Anna Beth Lange, Olga Cavalli, Christopher Wilkinson and together with myself we are the coleaders of this Work Track. This means that we are leading the group in terms of guiding discussions, allowing the voices to be heard through the community that is represented by all of you joining as members and to guide that work along. So that's our key roles within this Work Track.

And before we go any further there are some administrative practical areas that we need to cover. And I'm actually going to hand over to Jeff Neuman who is the co-chair of the overall PDP Working Group just to run through some - this initial administrative area and also provide a little bit of background to make sure everybody's familiar with why we're here. Jeff with that could I head over to you?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Thanks Martin. Hopefully everybody can hear me. This is Jeff Neuman. As Martin explained, I, along with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who I'm sure we'll hear from later during this call, are the overall Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group co-chairs. And our role in Work Track 5 is going to be mostly limited to an observer kind of role unless we choose to participate in our individual capacity. But we're here to help the Work Track chairs or the co-leaders and to just make sure that things are moving in line with the GNSO policies and procedures. And we'll spend a bunch of time talking about that today.

One of the first items I wanted to cover was the notion of statements of interest. Now most of you have already submitted statements of interest so I think we're looking good from that standpoint. I think from a rough count I mean maybe there's 10%, 15% of the people have not yet filed statements of interest. But there have been a lot of people that have been added in the last couple of days. I think we're up to 132 members and 50-something observers. Only members technically need to file statements of interest.

Statements of interest are for those of you that have not filled it out really just are for the group to understand or to give the group an understanding of the community from which you come even if you're not speaking on behalf of that community. It asks you to list your employer, your affiliation with ICANN and also to just talk a little bit about the kind of work that you do and/or - or I say and other ICANN activities that you may be involved in. This is really important for a number of reasons mostly so that people can understand when you do give a position or you do make a contribution that there can be an understanding of your background and in what capacity you're making those comments. We generally ask at the beginning of each call whether to you have - whether there's anyone in the group that has any updates to their statements of interest. You are not required during the call to disclose any changes to your statements of interest but to the extent you want to, you're strongly encouraged.

And we do ask that everyone keep their statement of interest up to date. We have frequent movement between employers and different jobs and positions so to the extent that you can keep that up to date that would be fantastic. And so usually the calls will start and I guess I'll ask during this call does anyone have any changes if they filed a statement of interest?

Does anyone have any changes to their statements of interest since they been filed? And then I'll wait to see if anyone indicates that there is a change. And seeing none then we sort of continue on with our business. So this is, you know, we view this from the GNSO as being kind of essential and we strongly encourage those that have not yet filled out a statement of interest to do so as soon as possible. That said Martin I don't know if you want me to go into any additional stuff or whether we go into the slides or if there's any topics you want me to cover?

Martin Sutton: So Jeff there's just two slides just giving some background information as you'll be - as you've...

Jeff Neuman: Got you.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Sutton: ...heard (unintelligible) of this. It will be useful I think just to come up for those that haven't joined the previous session at Abu Dhabi.

Jeff Neuman: Sure absolutely. So the - just to give some background the GNSO back in 2007 so now we're a decade ago basically formulated a number of policies to guide the introduction of new gTLDs. That policy set forth a number of items with respect to new gTLDs including a discussion of what to do about geographic names at the top level.

And the GNSO at that point in time -- now this is a decade ago -- decided not to do anything special with respect to geographic names at the top level meaning that it did not set forth any policies to let's say reserve country or territory names with the exception of one item which was to keep reserve all two letter combinations for the use of ccTLDs both then existing and in case any future ones were to come into existence.

So the only guidance that the GNSO gave at that point in time in their policy was that two characters should be reserved for use by the country code operators for ccTLDs. And that was put into place subsequently into the Applicant Guidebook in 2012 and has pretty much remained the policy since 2007. Now although that was the only definitive policy regarding geographic names at the top level the GNSO had pointed out at that point in time there were a number of groups that expressed concerns about not having any other types of protections for geographic names. Most notably the GAC - and later on in 2007 had promulgated its advice on the new gTLD process including advice on geographic names.

That advice was delivered to the board and much of it was included ultimately in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. And so certain things like country and territory names were prevented - it says here prevented from registration. It was actually you're not allowed to apply for country or territory names that were specifically listed on the ISO standards list.

And in addition to that because of a number of discussions that took place over the course of the years 2008 through 2012 there were a number of other types of geographic names that were - that required either a letter of support or letter of non-objection by the applicable governmental unit. So if you wanted to apply for a capital city for example you had to have a specific letter of support or non-objection or a regular city for that matter.

And so if you wanted to as what did happen in the 2012 round if you wanted to apply for .Berlin or .NYC or, you know, the dozens of others examples of

cities that were applied for those were required to go through a geographic names review. And if the name was found to be geographic according to the rules that were set in the guidebook you had to have this letter of support and/or nonobjection.

If you want to go to the next slide there were a number of circumstances that happened in the last 2012 round where there were groups that where there were applications for names that were considered to be geographic even though they weren't necessarily enumerated as such in the applicant guidebook. And there were objections that were filed or advice given. There were a number of other avenues that were pursued that were not necessarily set forth in the Applicant Guidebook.

And one of the rules that we have in this particular work track which we will spend a lot of our time in doing is making sure that we are as clear as possible in - for applicants as well as for community members and governments and others that we are clear as possible as to what the requirements are for terms that have geographic significance. There were a number - at the times in which this subsequent procedures policy development process was started back in 2015 there were a number of parallel efforts that were going on and there still are some parallel efforts talking about the concept of geographic names at the top level. Many of those efforts had similar scopes but some of them were much more narrow and did not encompass all of the topics that we are seeking to cover in this group.

So for example there was a cross community working group on the use of country and territory names referred to as the CCWG on UCTM if you see that abbreviation. Hopefully you won't see that too often but hopefully people will spell out what those abbreviations stand for. So that Cross Community Working Group addressed specifically the use of country and territory names at the top level or at least that was in the charter but did not address other types of geographic names.

That CCWG as many of us have been following resulted in really only one concrete consensus recommendation namely to keep the current reservation of two-character letter combinations for the use of country code top-level domains so in other words not to allow in the future applications for new gTLDs that consists of two ASCII letter characters.

The group was also supposed to address the use of three characters at the top level as well as country and territory names but for a whole bunch of reasons we don't really need to get into they were unable to come up with recommendations on those particular subjects. So that was one of the parallel efforts.

There is another parallel effort that is still going on within the Governmental Advisory Committee which we refer to as the GAC. The GAC has a sub team working that - working group that's working on the use of geographic names. In fact one of our - we're lucky to have one of our co-leaders also be the - one of the or I think the chair of that particular working group. They are working on these issues as well. And so it'll be great to get the perspective of that working group into these conversations. And that's Olga Cavalli and also to get that work brought in.

I know I'm taking up a lot of time so I will just try to basically say that this effort here is really to consolidate all of the work that's been going on in the community to try to have one place where we can work these issues out and hopefully come to consensus on. We had a couple of Webinars earlier this year in March/April time frame and we organized a couple sessions during the summer of - sorry the policy meeting this summer in Johannesburg and are now I'm glad to say finally underway. So with all of that said I think Martin that probably provides good enough background and I happily turn it over to you to get the conversation rolling.

Martin Sutton: Thank you Jeff. And I appreciate that. I think it's useful to get everybody up to speed on the background of this as well. So that's worthwhile. If I can move

on to the next set of slides one of the parts of the ICANN 60 session that we held that was probably very beneficial for a lot of the newcomers and those that have not participated in a GNSO policy development process before was just to highlight the rules of engagement.

I will run through this briefly but I would also flag to everybody at this stage that the session was recorded in Abu Dhabi. There were lots of questions and responses to those during that session so I would recommend that if you want to dig a bit deeper on this to find that part of the session and listen to that and to hear the comments and responses. But I will just highlight a few elements of the rules of engagement for those newcomers.

If we could go to the next slide. So membership anyone that is interested can join. So they can join as a member to participate during these meetings and send messages across the mailing list. Alternatively as we've got a large subscription of observers as well these can - the observers can receive emails and monitor what is going on and keep track of anything that is of interest to them.

It is worth pointing out that the work track membership does not mean that you have to become a member of the overall policy development process working group. I know that many are so that they will be familiar with working inside the other work tracks which are dealing with a whole different set of issues and areas to work through. What Jeff mentioned earlier regarding this statement of interest we will keep asking each time as we are - open up the calls to check the SOIs are up to date. If you haven't filled one in yet and completed that that obviously we'll keep encouraging you to get that completed.

Importantly when we start looking at working through to consensus decisions and calls it will be just the members that will be included in those consensus calls. Probably one thing to note is that if you sign up as an observer you can always switch to a member during the course of the working track work. So

that is an opportunity for those that are observers can flip over to a member status. Similarly those that are members now they want to just move down to an observer level they can - they are free to do so at any stage.

Okay move to the next slide please. Okay what is lovely to see today is the number of you that have been able to join this first call. And the whole point of this is to try and encourage all parts of the community to come through and raise their issues, their thoughts and actually work together through probably a whole suite of issues that places with the geographic terms at the top level. The main thing here is that we do operate under a principle of transparency and openness. We want to encourage people to participate and we're trying to work out ways that we can make sure that those coming into the working group for the first time and working on a policy development process they feel welcome and they're able to input and feel comfortable in putting forward their thoughts and ideas.

With that in mind we are looking at various things to make sure that we accommodate, you know, different languages. So for instance we will make sure that transcripts of all meetings are provided so that it's made easier to translate those down the line. All the mailing lists are archived so you can always access those and go and have a look and see what's happened if you've missed anything. And also the meetings like this will be recorded so you can actually play it back live - play the recording back to catch up with anything that you may have missed or if you want to review a particular topic that we've discussed that you were unable to attend.

Okay move to the next slide? Again there was a lot more of this covered in the Abu Dhabi meeting and it's really just to emphasize the point that this work track is an opportunity for members to come together and share their thoughts and ideas in how we can move forward with any issues related to geographic terms at the top level. To do that this whole process allows us to have those discussions, group and discussions to not necessarily have to

keep going back to our respective SOs and ACs because there are ways that this is built into the overall process.

So as the working group develops its topics and discusses those and if there's any output that can then be put forward by way of an initial report there are subsequent opportunities that that is put out to the rest of the community to comment in the normal way that we've always done with any policy development work. So there's - it's important to be able to understand that there are mechanisms built into this whole process which allow the different SOs and ACs to put in their own responses as reports are issued and comments are requested.

Okay I'm not going to go into detail bearing in what the time we've got today but again recommend that if you want to find out a bit more about that please do listen through the session at Abu Dhabi. Also I would recommend for those that were unable to join the classroom comments session yesterday it's got valuable information about how these communication tools work in terms of how we use them for the policy development meetings, resources the training as well. So there's lots of additional support and help that is available and you're pointed into the right direction for those to make sure that you can actually take advantage of the tools, communication tools to be effective within the working group.

Also we'll talk a bit later about some other aspects that came about these ideas from yesterday's call as we go forward. But I'll stop there for a moment before we move on to the next point which is terms of reference. This does actually feed into terms of reference but it's - it was just an area that we just wanted to make sure people are comfortable with early on and if there's any questions at this stage I'll be happy to respond. Okay hearing none we'll move on to the next slide please.

And the next one please. So if you're not familiar with the process here we have a charter already for the PDP Working Group. And underneath this

charter there's various working groups. There are various work tracks. One to four have been already going for some time. This fifth work track is just underway and to make sure that we understand what we are going to be doing in terms of reference is developed to achieve that. And this is defining three main areas of which is the problem statement, goals objective - goals and objectives and scope which we will run through in a minute in terms of some of the feedback that we had in Abu Dhabi. Rules of engagement the decision-making process that's contained in - it's actually part of the PDP Working Group rules and they are cited in the bylaws as well. So it's all looped back. I won't go further into the rules of engagement having just covered that previously but we will touch upon the deliverables and reporting as well.

So if you could move to the next slide. So we have to try and frame what the actual problem is that we're trying to resolve through the work track. So this is elements of the initial wording or elements of the problem statement that is being built. But we did have discussions at the open session to gather feedback. And what was noticeable at that stage is that there are very different ideas about the types of strings that should be in scope and should be under consideration, how to define some of these aspects in terms of geographic terms and how they may relate to things like national monuments even.

So there was a broad coverage and there was also concerns that that may be overreaching as well. So as the Leadership Team is reviewing the feedback and comments from that session we will need to take a look at this problem statement and revise as we deem necessary before posting out a document for consideration amongst the work track. But there are a number of factors that came up and we're still working through those.

Okay if we move on to the next under the goals and objectives I mean in simple terms it's looking to create ideas and deliver consensus driven recommendations. That ultimately ends up with an initial report with

subsequent comment periods and revisions before anything actually is posted towards the GNSO council and subsequently to the ICANN board. So there's quite a lengthy process and we will look at the timelines that we intended to work towards very shortly.

That again we'll - we've discussed in terms of what would success look like at the meeting, quite a wide variety of comments provided through the chat boxes and during the meeting. So again a number of things that we've got to work through in terms of is there anything else that we need to include in the goals and objectives based on that initial feedback.

Okay if we move to the next slide I think that this created quite a lot of discussion points. I've mentioned some earlier where there's lots of different opinions but I think this at least starts to list down some common terms that people are familiar with in terms of the top couple of lists, the country and territory names, the Output 2, Output three, capital cities. As we go down the list things start to get more subjective and people are worried that there is a misunderstanding of what these terms could be. And that's an area that we've got to focus on to try and hone in and create something that's understood that we can work towards within the working track.

Okay I'll move on to the next slide. I think initially we were looking at probably years in this list is that sort of a staging post to go through, you know, a work process. We'll talk a bit about alternative ways to approach this work track activity and we'll cover that very shortly but I think, you know, people are familiar with this kind of list and trying to work out what might be the right way to deal with it, others may have other opinions. So we will have those opportunities to discuss. We can also leverage some of the work that's been done previously and help us with understanding what the issues are, the risks are to develop those discussions.

Okay further slide. And the last but not least is, is looking at the deliverables and reporting. We'll run through this on the timeline just briefly in terms of

what is the outputs but specifically we should end up with a set of recommendations ideally where there is consensus or rough consensus that will top to present to the community for comments and then on to the GNSO before anything is approaching the ICANN board.

Now as I mentioned at the beginning the work track co-leads who've been appointed by the various SOs and ACs we're here to guide that that work along. We will be providing briefs back to our respective SOs and ACs on a regular basis. But it really is down to the members, the work track members to make sure that input is provided, thoughts, ideas, positions that you may have and if it is for respective organizations that's - that is made clear that who you are representing when you make those comments. But that is where we are going to draw all of the information from and how we are going to manage the work is through members' input. So that's important to understand. It will not be for the coal leads to present any of the positions from ALAC, ccNSO, GAC or the GNSO. So I just wanted to make that clear.

Okay now as I say this is a work in progress bearing in mind that various comments and broad comments were being received during the Abu Dhabi session. So there is some requirements still being worked on for the draft in terms of reference. We hope to issue that is soon as possible ideally by the end of this week for feedback and comments amongst the work track members. I shall close off there but if anybody has any questions I've got Christopher with his hand up and so feel free to form a queue if there's any questions. But Christopher please go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you Martin and thank you for an excellent expose of the whole background to our work. There's just one point that I want to put on the record. I think in the personal (unintelligible) there's a long-standing international economist is nothing to do with At-Large as such. There is another list of ISO codes, the three lesser codes for currencies of which I suppose the biggest one is the USC, the United States dollar and there are lots of others.

Those absolutely have at some point somewhere they have to be reserved. I don't want to be involved in something which results in ICANN in sort of competition or protest vis-à-vis the central banks worldwide. These are codes which are used in the financial system and because it's money I don't think anybody else should use them. So I really think the three lesser currency codes should also be added to that good list that's new and I think (Alan) had produced which reflect the existing reservation and protections of country codes.

Martin Sutton: Christopher thanks. And I suspect what we'll be looking at is gathering that input as we issue out the terms of reference in draft form at the end of this week. So I think...

Christopher Wilkinson: I thank you for that. It's such a big points and it's sort of outside most of the mandates of this group that I would just like to settle that up front and get on with some of the more complicated issues which you so ably described. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Point taken, thank you Christopher. So I'm not seeing any other hands at this stage so if I can move across to Anna Beth who will take over charts for the next few items of the agenda. Over to you Anna Beth.

Anna Beth Lange: Thank you Martin and thank you for what you led us through, much clearer now. So this is Anna Beth Lange for the record and welcome to everyone. It's amazing how many people have joined us tonight or morning or day -- whatever. So I will try to get you through the time than that we have set up. As you see in the slide now we have already started the deliberations now in November. And it seems like it's very quick here but this timeline is set up with a thought that Work Track 5 focuses on a single issue unlike the other Work Tracks. So even if we have started later the work we work through is converging with Work Track 1 and 4, 1 through 4 later in 2018. If we can manage that that would be great.

So you can see here that we start in April. We aim to April to send Work Track 5 preliminary report to the full working group. In June 2018 finalize the preliminary report for public comment. Between June and July public comment period and November 2018 then Work Track 5 final report to full working group. And we must remember also that all the different stakeholder groups and our affiliations can send things when they want us to as Martin said.

Next slide please. We go now to the work plan and meeting schedule. So and you can take one more please (unintelligible). So based on the comments during at ICANN (unintelligible) we have been considered a risk based approach. And we are exploring this option since that Cross Community Working Group did not succeed we will try not to replicate but to try another way forward. And this risk-based approach would intend to identify risk what are we actually trying to prevent and why, assess these risks, what is the impact and the likelihood and apply mitigation measures commensurate to the group review mitigation measures against existing policy and controls. And therefore we would like to ask members to think about the difference risks we're trying to prevent for it possible to use geographic terms at the top level.

Next please. To get forward with the work since time schedule is quite tight we start in the beginning at least with the biweekly calls. The frequency may increase and it might be that we will require flexibility here depending upon how the work is developing. As usual in these working groups we have rotating times to support inclusiveness. And based on the number of participants from each region to minimize the inconvenience and share the burden we have proposed so far three different times that calls will take, 20 UTC, 05 UTC and 14 UTC. And we propose to have the next meeting the 29th of November 05 UTC.

So before I go further I would like to hear if anyone have any comments on this? Any hands here? I can't see anyone? No? Okay, then we have actually managed to get through the agenda. And then I would like to give the word to Cheryl for saying something about informal memberships that has been suggested during the two workshops they had yesterday. So Cheryl could you?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Pardon me. Thank you very much Anna Beth and Martin.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And yes at the classroom, the tools classroom yesterday which I'm going to say it was a privilege to listen into. I thought there was some excellent material covered. So even if you think you know your tools and you need a little update I'd encourage you to attend the one that is coming up that was listed in the chat.

For some of the people who were in that call mention that as this was one of the first forays into GNSO PDP style work that they would feel a little more confident if they had a - that the term then used was mentor. And I encourage to use - the use of a buddy or peer support. Mentoring to me has very specific connotations but I shan't bore you all with that now.

But what it would do is provide you all with an informal list of people who have extensive experience in PDP processes and in the simplest things like operating some of the tools. And we would list ourselves and make ourselves available so that any of you at any time using either a Skype contact or whatever you want to work with or an email or during calls using the private chat facility for those of you who don't know if you pick on a person in the participants list you will get an option to start a private chat. And that chat space is in fact absolutely private. Staff and administrators do not get to see what goes on.

And so that would allow you to say for example to Jeff or I, "Why are we doing this this way or is it okay if I say this or I don't understand can you help me understand or what is the reference to something," and just to increase

your confidence and be there as a bit of a peer support. So if you are all interested in doing that I'm certainly confident that Jeff and I can find a short list of names of people who would be willing to assist any of you at any time. It's an informal mechanism and it can operate during meetings or during intersessional work on mailing lists.

So if you want us to do that we're more than happy to do so. And perhaps you might want to express your keenness of this proposal or otherwise by using one of the other tools that you'll find in the Adobe Connect room if you are in the room. And you go to the little person whose hand can wave that set of tools in a drop-down menu where you can raise your hand or agree or disagree with things that are being said and do some other things like applaud or laugh or tell people be glad or (unintelligible).

But perhaps if you think the idea of a buddy or support system, a resource list to be made available for you all is a good idea you can put a green tick up as I am now and if you do not like that idea you can always put a great big red X. But with that I think that's about as much as I need to say on this one. Back to you Anna Beth and Martin.

Anna Beth Lange: Yes. Thank you Cheryl. I think that we have gone through the agenda and we thought we had too little time but now it seems like we have time for questions. And Martin I see you had your hand up. So perhaps you can take over. Martin? Jeff could you chime in here if Martin is not there?

Jeff Neuman: I could.

Martin Sutton: This is Martin.

Anna Beth Lange: Oh there you are.

Martin Sutton: Can you hear me now?

Anna Beth Lange: Okay fine I hear you.

Martin Sutton: Sorry I was having trouble with the speakers here. We've got a couple of questions I noticed in the chat. So I think it will be worthwhile going through those. Very quickly in terms of co-leaders there are four co-leaders. So they have been appointed by the various supporting organizations and advisory committees which is the GAC, ccNSO, GNSO, and the ccNSO. I think I've covered them all there. So that's to make sure that we can try bring this together as a working track that covers all of the various components and interest areas within the ICANN community that would like to work on this topic. We will be looking to rotate chairing of the meetings. So you won't have to worry about hearing my drones every time. It will be shared amongst the group. So we will be working on that process.

I also see some comments about the timings of the calls. It is a kind of a shared pain process but it is the most inclusive way of trying to ensure that across the globe where we have lots of members in this group represented in different regions that we try and accommodate best the opportunities for them to participate in calls. So unfortunately it does mean that there are some awkward timings of calls. There is, you know, that many that do attend those in other work tracks otherwise they'll use the recording to catch up the following day. So that the whole point there is to make it as inclusive as possible.

There was also some comments regarding risk management, a risk-based approach. If we could just go back to the slide please and I'll just try and give it a little bit more description at this stage because we have a number of minutes available to us so we can - it's just down a couple more slides. A couple more.

Oh no, we're going the wrong way on the slides. Okay so I'll just briefly describe the risk-based process. This is where having looked at a number of the previous attempts to explore this topic in the - in various constituencies

within ICANN we then want to repeat the same thing again and again and not make any progress. So during the discussions at the Abu Dhabi meeting there were comments from the audience regarding looking at the risks associated with what we're trying to do and understand what are we trying to prevent or protect in applying policies and controls in relation to geographic terms. So that's start a thought process which is actually we could look at this from a different perspective to encourage everybody to have an open mind, come into this with an understanding and appreciation and of all the different components and concerns of various parties within ICANN and then work through these so that we understand what are the biggest risks that we're trying to treat and deal with, have we got the most appropriate policies and controls in place to mitigate those risks effectively and also bearing in mind then are they over-cumbersome? So do they prevent other opportunities and create other risks in themselves by doing so?

So having a good understanding at the start of what the actual risks and problems are that we're trying to solve is very important in terms of trying to then come up with the solutions and recommendations between us as the work track. So that hopefully does give some explanation as to what we're exploring here from the risk-based approach.

It will no doubt play itself into working through, you know, a list of types of categories of geographic terms at some stage. But if we can actually step back and actually have a look at what we are trying to solve and what problem is it that we're trying to prevent that is the intention of that risk-based approach. I hope that makes sense but please do feel free to ask any questions. Okay hearing none I've got Anna Beth your hand is up?

Anna Beth Lange: Yes it's Anna Beth here - Lange here again. I just wanted to ask something on the time schedule or the time difference slots that we have decided on. And I went through the participant list today and tried to figure out how many from each region and try to find the most convenient time where we risk to lose less people.

So for the time being out of the number that we have today or the distribution from different areas in the world this is the best way to do it. We always have some inconvenient time but if we change it, it must be - it could be more people having this inconvenience. So it might be that then if the participants' number change and the region change that we can change that as well but I think we could start with this and see how it works. Thank you.

Martin Sutton: Okay thanks Anna Beth. So I know some comments coming up from the risks side of things. So as I mentioned this is being explored at this stage in terms of an approach that will then obviously have an impact on how we plan out the work. So I think what we will need to do is to elaborate further on that and how that could actually be a positive way to approach this to make sure that we can get that understanding across more effectively.

The risk can be - thanks (Robin). I (noticed) those comment there but the risk can be from all sorts of quarters. So it could be without trying to preempt anything I suppose it's just looking at the consequence of actually putting a block on applications for whatever reason it falls into a category of some type that there is a high risk to consumer confusion. I think that's a regular term that's reflected in the comments back from CCWG activities and the ATB development work.

So we need to assess that risk more closely as to does it cause consumer confusion? What is the impact of that and what is the likelihood of it? And do we have other controls in place rather than just a blocking mechanism that would actually be as effective or more effective and actually then take away risks of impeding competition, choice and innovation?

So that could be one way to look at it whether it's multiple different risks that you're trying to balance but nevertheless they have been quoted from time to time from various quarters of ICANN and we could work through those. But we do need to understand what people's real concerns are, whether it is, you

know, a consumer confusion issue, whether it is wanting to preserve a certain type of string for a type of group, whether it is relying on those blocking mechanisms or do we have sufficient other controls in place within the application process and post delegation process that actually combats or mitigates a good proportion of those risks. So sometimes it can be the controls are affected but they're over effective. They don't allow the competition and innovation. So how do we better improve some of those controls if you feel that that is a concern?

And now we're just coming up to the time. Does that for (Robin) and I think it was (Kurt) you had some comments on there which I'm just trying to get back to. Does that help for now on the understanding that we need to further explore that within the leadership and come up with some more meat if you like around the idea? Okay thanks (Robin). Anna Beth I've got a hand up.

Anna Beth Lange: Yes just a short comment on that. The reasons why we discussed it at all is that I was sitting at the co-chair in the Cross Community Working Group for years and we didn't achieve as much as we wanted. So to - instead of going down the same road as it's worth a try to find another angle to look at this. And that's why we opened up for this since it was suggested in Abu Dhabi by one of the participants. So we'll see how this works. I see that Christopher has his hand up as well and then since we are close to the hour I would just say thank you for attending and talk to you next time.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Christopher we are now on the hour so if you have a brief comment please...

Christopher Wilkinson: It's very...

Martin Sutton: ...go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: ...hi. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. Martin I think part of the problem is what's in other sectors of the economy we'll just describe as political risks. That should be minimized.

Martin Sutton: Okay. Thank you. So we'll continue on that exploration amongst the leadership and be prepared for the next meeting to delve into that a lot more. And the terms of reference also will be circulated very shortly for your review and comments. I'm not sure if there's anything else I need to cover at this stage. Okay hearing none and no hands up thank you very much for joining everybody and look forward to continue these discussions and the ongoing work with Work Track 5. Thanks very much.

Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you everybody. Good night.

Terri: And thank you. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Operator (Jeff) if you could please stop all recordings. To everyone else please remember to disconnect.

END