

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
Wednesday, 29 November 2017 at 05:00 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-track5-29nov17-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p8t91xy3dxt/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/iAhyB>

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

Woman: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team Track 5, Geographic Names at the Top-Level call on Wednesday the 29th of November 2017 at 05:00 UTC.

In the interest of time there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourself be known now? Hearing...

Susan Anthony: Yes this is Susan Anthony.

Woman: Oh I'm sorry. Who was that?

Susan Anthony: Susan Anthony, United States.

Woman: Okay great. Thank you so much.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Hi this is Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro calling in from Fiji.
Thank you.

Woman: Okay thank you. I'll note that. Okay and hearing no further names I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. And with this I will turn it back over to Olga. Please begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. Good night from Buenos Aires. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon everyone. My name is Olga Cavalli. I am from Argentina.

I am one of the Co-Leads of this Work Track 5 and I will be leading the call today jointly with my colleague from London, Martin Sutton. So I will start today thanking you for being with us.

We have an – quite important group of colleagues joining and we have two of them in the audio bridge. And we have two main issues today to review for our call, but I would like to start reminding you that please remember to update your Statement of Interest or just prepare them if you haven't done so.

We have checked the list and there are several colleagues who have not completed the Statement of Interest. Please do so. That – that's important for our work as a group and remember that/have that in mind.

So one of the two things that we would like to – before moving ahead I would like to apologize. In the first call we had two weeks ago I was in an airport with a lot of noise and not very good (unintelligible).

So I was only in the chat room of the Adobe Connect and I'm grateful for my other colleagues who were working in the – and leading the call so this time I'm happy.

The idea is that we will take among ourselves and the Co-Leads and – are active in different calls depending on the time. This is a quite interesting time.

We want to start it at 2:00 am. The good thing at this time in my home office is that nobody is calling my mobile or nobody's coming around, so that's very good for me so I will put all my attention in our call.

So let's go to our first – to the first point in our agenda. We have been working on the Terms of Reference. We may recall – you may recall from our last call that this is one of our tasks/the things that we have to develop, and we have been exchanging some ideas among the four colleagues.

And yes please remind to mute your microphones when you are not speaking. We have come to the point that we have a text especially referring to the scope of the Terms of Reference.

So I would – we would like to share it with you and have feedback from you in relation with it and the different options that we have thought about so thank you very much for – Emily for putting the appropriate things, the slides and for putting them on the Adobe room.

So what I will do now – I will go through this text. There are three slides – a few different parts of the - called the paragraph and I will share with you what are they and maybe then you can give us your feedback.

I will open the queue for your comments. Of course this will not stop here. Many colleagues may not – were not perhaps able to join us at this time in this call, so we will open responsibility of you sending us comments for a while.

But for those of you in the call could be good or you can speak up or raising your hand or perhaps you can send your comments through the chat room. That could be also useful so then we analyze all your feedback.

So hello Cheryl. I see you joined. Let's go to the first paragraph. I will read it. "Work Track 5. We started on developing proposed recommendations regarding the treatment of geographic names at the top-level including those in ASCII and IDN form."

I hear an echo. "Iteration criteria, potential grounds for approval and objections as well as addressing would the - such names require consent or non-objection from applicable government authorities."

So we gave some thought about this text and we came to this proposal. The idea of having a footnote about the approval is because some of the potential applications may have different levels of different involvement of different authorities' approvals.

So this – we thought that that could be an option to be included as the first part I guess of the proposed text in the scope. I'm trying to read the text and it just makes a very important point.

Bracketed terms are options that we discussed between the work track leads. Yes track leads. Jeff thank you for that. So what you see in brackets – it's an optional text that we have to decide but we wanted your feedback.

So before giving you the floor I will go through next part, the second paragraph. So it's, "The work track may make recommendations on policy and on variations related to two and three letter codes, on the ISO 1 – 3166-1 list and brackets and other variations of country and territory names as defined in Module 2, Sections 2.2.1.4.1 in Applicant Guidebook 2012," and there's the footnote there.

I will go to that in a minute. “In addition, the work track may make recommendations to city/state/region names and other names that are deemed to be geographic in nature.”

And in brackets it says, “This may include but not be limited to geographic features such as rivers, mountains, various lakes, et cetera including names with an economic or cultural significance such as geographic indicators and geographic features such as rivers, mountains, various lakes, et cetera.”

There are two footnotes. The first footnote is about the reference in the Applicant Guidebook that talks about country names. Then it said – it suggested that we include this as a reference to what is stated in the Applicant Guidebook of 2012 on this issue.

And then the second one is about the definition of geographic indicators and why it was signed. I’m trying to read it here. Any comment in the chat room?

Okay let’s go to the third one – the third slide please. Thank you very much. So the third one says – it’s about the scope again. “The work track will take cognizant on a few additional comment.

The work track will take omissions of previous work in ICANN regarding geographic terms including those that have taken place previously in the GNSO and the Cross-Community Working Group on the use of country and territory names, and the previous processes and procedures contained within the final Applicant Guidebook for the 2012 round of new gTLD.

Broader discussions about jurisdictions of Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees of the scope, and distinctions between gTLDs and ccTLDs and the allocation of second and third level domains are specifically out of scope for this work track.”

So this is the text for the scope. As you have seen there are some text in brackets that we have been talking about and we haven't decided yet which would be they're – the final text to be agreed.

So we would like to get your feedback about this so I will open the queue now for your comments. It could be both in the chat or raising your hand. We only have one hour so I will give some minutes to this issue and then we will move to the next point of the agenda, which is Number 5, presentation of the risk-based approach.

So I will see my dear colleague Kavouss in the queue. Kavouss the floor is yours. Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. I have no problem with the first nor with the second. If there is no disappointment for anyone else I have some comment on the third one when you take content as the (unintelligible).

I have something regarding that work. I'll suggest or consider but not cognizance. This is consideration because – a problem as well and we don't want to by this call approving whatever we've done.

You have about three years, four years and in fact you have (unintelligible) situation and we have difficulties – more than 45 countries. I was disappointed with that so we can't say cognizance. We take or really consider. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Kavouss. I couldn't hear you very clearly. I'm sorry. I'm on the phone – some reason my audio in my...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you want a repeat? Do you want me to repeat?

Olga Cavalli: I don't know if you repeat – I cannot hear you very clearly either.

Kavouss Arasteh: I'll – I put it into the chat. I have difficulty with...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...the cognizance in the third issue.

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

Kavouss Arasteh: I would suggest to replace...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...that by consider.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay thank you for that. That was very clear. Thank you for – apologies for asking you again to repeat. It sometimes are very – are not very clear. Any other comment? Jeff, do you want to say something? Please go ahead.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes and thank you. This is Jeff Neuman. I just want to go back. There was a comment in the chat I wanted to make sure we address. So I think it was - Farzaneh has said that, "Jurisdiction of SOs and ACs – this is the first time I heard such a thing. You probably just mean mandate."

So this is stemming from a paragraph on the last slide, Slide 4 of 4, which says, "The broader discussion about jurisdiction of SOs and ACs and of the

scope and distinction between gTLDs and ccTLDs, et cetera are out of scope.”

What this is referring to - that there were discussions during one of – and – or where were we, two meetings ago. I’m trying to remember - wherever we had that Cross-Community session where there were discussions about what should be classified as a gTLD versus what should be classified as a ccTLD, and which Supporting Organization has exclusive power to develop policy based on the classification of a type of TLD.

While we agree that those might potentially be issues in the broader scheme of ICANN, those issues were not contemplated to be discussed within this particular work track so that’s what was meant by jurisdiction of SOs and ACs. Hope that makes sense. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Jeff. Other comments from the audience? So we will give you some time to review the slides. I know there is different times when you see this text and we are not expecting that you give all your comments now.

But just – I would like to consult with my dear colleagues how – if we have a deadline for that. We may let you know during the next day how much time we have to decide on this text.

I see two hands in the queue. I see Kavouss and Paul. Please Kavouss go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: At this time I’ll speak a little bit more about (unintelligible) decisions but these doses is coming out but not broader (unintelligible) is allowed and do not become broader discussions about the (unintelligible).

Again (unintelligible) the jurisdiction of SOs and ACs when they put cover. (Unintelligible) take on decision with the gTLD and cTLD. I wonder then why

we don't want to do this – regards this. I don't need – discuss this at all. It's raising cover for us. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Kavouss. Paul please go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thank you. This is Paul McGrady for the record. Just can somebody explain – I'm going to the Paragraph 1 proposed text. Can somebody explain the – when we say, "Approval which may concern the ownership, business model and jurisdiction of a proposed registry?" I guess I don't understand. What do we mean by these tests? Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Paul I have some difficulties hearing you clearly. You mean the footnote and the – of the text in brackets that says approval? Is that what you were asking?

Paul McGrady: Yes so there was two things. The first is the bracket which has approval which I understand to mean that somebody is proposing a change to what's happened in the first round, namely moving away from a model where there are possible objections and moving towards a model of seeking approval, and also possibly offsetting the rejection process so I understand it.

I don't know that I would agree with that. It's a pretty big change. We'd love to hear more about that. But also I guess I don't understand the footnote where it says, "Approval which may concern the ownership, business model and jurisdiction of the proposed registry."

So are we – and again I've – this is I guess in Round 1 the jurisdiction of the proposed registry as far as I know was never an issue that's new. Business model as long as it was not illegal – business model – I don't know of any objections based upon that or I guess I should say any need to seek approval for that.

There was approvals as to ownership, namely individuals cannot be registries but other than that there – and board members couldn't have a - particularly poor backgrounds.

But those are not really issues related to geographic terms so whoever drafted Footnote 1 – if they could explain that they're trying to get to in that because I think it's – it's just not clear what it means. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Paul. The second part of your – of you speaking was much clearer than the first one. Thank you very much. As Jeff raised the point in the chat the person that suggested this text is not in the call now.

But I understand that there are some doubts and there are some suggested changes to this text, so we will take note of this and we will work on that. I have four colleagues in the call. Paul this is an old hand?

I have Martin, Kristina and Kavouss and I will close the queue because then we have other things to review and we are almost 22 minutes on our call. Martin good very early morning for you. Go ahead.

Martin Sutton: So yes I was just going through the comments because we asked people to put in comments in the chat as well. So just picking up on some of these or at least one from Liz Williams about we need to think about unintended consequences of being too broad in scope, and need to find consensus on the basis of reasonably objective rationales and think about impacts – on potential impacts and we'll also need to think about how one might instruct future evaluators to – with consensual mitigation.

So the basis of this is I'm just wondering if Liz could expand on that. From the text that's been presented is there anything specific that she's referring to that she feels is too broad in scope, or otherwise is that something that can be followed up with just to make it clear as to where there's concerns with the scope? Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks to you Martin and thank you for helping me with the chat. Kristina good morning for you. Good night. Go ahead.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you. Thank you. Kristina Rosette, Amazon Registry for the record. I'm actually going to go farther than Paul in terms of my concerns about the bracketed language on Paragraph 1.

The entire model for the most – the previous round of new gTLDs was based on a kind of philosophical basis that an applicant that met the technical criteria, the financial criteria and the overall applicant criteria in terms of being an illegal entity and some of the other points that Paul pointed out, that an applicant that met all those criteria would receive the – would be awarded the applied for TLD unless there was an objection through the objection process or a string contention or, you know, some kind of objection speaking broadly.

The insertion of approval really flips that model on its head and I don't think that is an appropriate change, because then it takes us back to kind of the 2003 round where applicants had to prove to ICANN that, you know, not only was the TLD that they wanted quote unquote a good one that should be added to the root, but that they were the appropriate applicant to operate it.

And quite frankly if we are going to go down this route I think this – you can't have this approval and criteria limited to just geographic names. I think you would then need to take this back to all of the other work tracks and have them consider it broadly.

And I think that would be extraordinarily counterproductive so I feel very strongly that this language should not go forward. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Kristina. Kavouss go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes two questions I've raised. One is getting agreement to someone. The first is that that effort or for instance from who receives this agreement or (unintelligible) whether a name, the country – where that's a capital of a country or other cities all around the world.

These are the two questions to be discussed. However, I have previous difficulties with the people proposing some changes to the approval or agreement of consent of the countries.

This is important. I don't understand what is the problem. That is the issue that we haven't solved the problem with some type of – years ago. This agreement or approval or consent of the country is essential.

No doubt those issue like that (unintelligible) issue or that we want to post – that's to be discussed. Was our government involved? But that are the question as well and that capital city or that city that's also involved if you say that there is then we need to (unintelligible).

But it is a capital of (unintelligible) so who will have to get traction on but I don't want to - saying the term agreement. Agreement/approval/consent – all of them are the same and must be retained. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Kavouss.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Hi Olga.

Olga Cavalli: And it was – it's – Sala you want to say something?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes please. Yes thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Please go ahead.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salan – thank you. Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the record. I'd just like to follow up on the immediate past speakers and in relation to geographic names and having consultations and approval by the regions affected and concerns.

I sort of agree with that but happy to put the – something on the mailing list later pertaining to this particular note and knowing the country and - that we have. Thank you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Sala and Jeff you want to say something? And you're the last one in the queue because then we have to move forward.

Jeffrey Neuman: Yes thank you. This is Jeff Neuman. I just want us to just kind of go back a step real quick and just to say that the scope for the Terms of Reference is not – the discussion – having is not trying to find a solution to the ultimate question.

It's really to define the scope of what the questions will be, what the discussions will eventually be. So while the discussion is very fruitful as to whether certain people think approval should be required or – and others that think that approval should not be required, those are the discussions we will have.

What we're looking at here is is the scope itself broad enough so that we can have those discussions? I think the reason why some of the leads agreed with this language or I should say disagree with this language is not because they didn't want to discuss whether certain applications may or may not require consent.

It's just that approval is also a – subsumed into the words evaluation criteria and also into the last part of that sentence, which says, "As well as addressing whether such names require consent or non-objection from applicable governmental authorities."

So my interpretation of why some of the leaders put that language in brackets – bracketed is not because they didn't want to discuss whether certain things require consent or don't.

It's just that that language may have been, number one, redundant to language that's already in there; and number two, it may have implied – I think – I can't remember who made this comment but it may have implied that we are answering the question, which is that approval is needed, but we haven't yet even started talking about the questions that we're asking.

So the word approval seems to imply a solution in the question itself and we're trying to stay away from answering questions right now - just defining what those questions are. Sorry for taking so long. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Jeff. Yes this is exactly what I wanted to explain. So you did it very clearly and we will close the queue about this issue now. You will have the text for sending us your comments and the idea is as Jeff said to define the scope, not to resolve how we will deal with other things now.

And thank you for that and for some of you I have difficulty in hearing clearly because I'm using my phone, not the Adobe Connect so my apologies if I sometimes have to ask you to repeat again because I cannot hear what you're saying clearly.

We will move now to our next agenda item, which is the presentation of the risk-based approach. So for that I will give the floor to our colleague, Martin Sutton. Martin the floor is yours.

Martin Sutton: Thank you. Okay we've got the slides here now so thank you Sue. So based on our previous call this is a follow on to really dig a bit deeper on what a risk-based approach is and how it would be applied – this particular work track activities.

So to start with we could've taken similar approaches as before with the CCWG and some processes that led up to the African Guidebook. The only issue there is that that seems to have led to a lot of issues being unresolved, so we wanted to try and take a step back and consider the different ways that we can approach this activity amongst us across the Work Track 5.

So in here I'm just going to talk through what is a risk-based approach so that it's clear and that there's no sort of strange scientific aspects to it, why we could use that for the Work Track 5 and how that can be – applies.

And then I'll talk a little bit more detail about things like a risk register and how to address some of the risks as we go through the Work Track 5 discussions, and then talk about a very high level plan as to how we could accommodate this within the proposed timeline that this covers at our last call.

So I think we could just go to Operate, the first slide here. So risk management is essentially a talk how organizations evaluate risks effectively. It is something that can be a living document if you like whereas risks evolve which they inevitably do. You can refer back to this process and make some adjustments.

Like the terms of policy development it could be a useful tool going forward as well. But the whole intention here is to really take away the (unintelligible) previous discussions and try to introduce a more guided, informed decision making process.

So here I am just trying sort of take away as sort of scientific terms specifically within risk management (unintelligible) what the impact would be? (Unintelligible) and the litigation of those risks.

In simple terms it is about why and how is what we are looking for. And that translates into policy type terminology. And so (unintelligible) sort of pose the

question that these really (unintelligible) which is what we are trying to prevent? And/or who are we trying to protect?

So that would be the area where we initially I (unintelligible) risks that we are trying to (unintelligible).

We then move onto this why area which covers impact to (unintelligible) questions that would be (unintelligible) is why are we trying to prevent this? And so that is understanding how it is going to lead to some catastrophic event or is it going to lead to multiple smaller issues that (unintelligible) frequent basis?

And so that we can try to prioritize and adjust how we manage those risks which is coming onto the how. So there are lots of things we can do to mitigate this.

And we need to look at this suite of controls that perhaps already exists within. There is policy and the (unintelligible) or whether there are any gaps that we would like to make more effective and introduce other controls.

If you go to the next slide please. So why use this approach? So as I mentioned earlier we applied some other approaches in the part and they haven't been entirely fruitful.

They have obviously opened up the discussions and tried to tease out the positions that are sort of entrenched within certain groups. And within the different constituencies that exist within the ICANN community.

So taking that step back and really looking at what are the risks that we are trying to deal with here and understanding an mitigating those risks would be as far as we are concerned a different approach that we can introduce how to resolve and move away from entrenched positions that may exist within the constituencies within ICANN.

And then that translates as we go through that process into policy documents. And clearly articulating the what, why and in turn how that can be (unintelligible).

And with the risk register (unintelligible) I will refer to in a minute. It does it make a useful tool to reconsider and adjust policies as more evidence comes to light or different risks that emerged. (Unintelligible) easy to refer back to and consider how to make adjustments that would be effective in mitigating any future risks.

Can you go to the next slide please? So just to reinforce this. This is how do we apply risk based approach to Work Track 5? So within the scope which is honestly what we have been talking about and there are some (unintelligible) workable for Work Track 5.

But we have already got a core set I would say of areas to at least begin those discussions and identify the risks that actually can prevent us from taking that first leap into core work.

We will then assess the risk. So looking at is the occurrence of something that we do not want to look at a high impact? What is that impact and consequences? Or other (unintelligible).

And it is something that is likely to occur frequently or is it something that is a perceived risk that may or may never occur in the future?

Looking at those risks then make some judgment on, you know, what is acceptable? Is there a certain tolerance you would be able to apply in terms to avoid introducing sort of negative effects of – impact on competition and innovation for instance?

So then we can take that forward to looking at how best to address those risks. Taking all those considerations into those discussions. And we either (unintelligible) so big that we have got to eliminate those risks and prevent them from (unintelligible).

Or there are ways that we can actually manage those risks and through a process of perhaps monitoring it (unintelligible) allow those methods to work.

Okay and move to the next slide please. So I just wanted to illustrate how this could start to look and feel as we go through the process. Identify the core risks that we are trying to deal with. We can then look at the severity of what would be the consequences and the potential clauses that trigger those consequences.

And then we can start to add some kind of objective analysis to this which (unintelligible) some kind of scoring mechanism. So if it is a catastrophic event, you know, that would achieve a higher score rating impact. It may also something that would occur frequently also occur in kind of a high score.

And just multiplying those through you would then see which of those risks need (unintelligible). And that would actually help prioritize our work and effort as to which things must be addressed and discussed further. And others that we might be able to hold back on until we have actually (unintelligible) the more higher risk cases.

So (Terry) I think it would then help us to one, prioritize our work effort. It then creates a living document that can be used in the future to evidence how effective have these controls been? So kind of backwards looking effect of just checking (unintelligible) as we intended.

But also to think about how these may be impacted with future and emerging risks that you become aware of in the future.

As an example and not tied to geographic terms. But, you know, something like GDPR is something that has hit the industry at a stage where they have to start thinking about adjusting or how to deal with that. Under the current controls and agreements that are currently enforced.

So this would be a (unintelligible) used to identify where those risks are and to adjust those in recognition of something that is emerging in the future.

Okay if we move to the next slide. I just like to raise the point that we probably have a suite of controls already that we will be able to think about tying or applying differently as we go through the process in Work Track 5.

I have highlighted some here. Not all the different controls. But we already have what I would term as pre-application controls, application process controls and post-allegation controls.

Under pre-application we have got some policies built into the guidebook. A sort of (unintelligible) not permitted control or restricted where there needs to be some pre-application conditions met.

During the application process I think it was highlighted earlier in the comments as we were discussing the terms of reference that there is a whole suite of (unintelligible) and evaluations that occurs during this process including the (unintelligible) confusion aspects that apply there.

Objection processes are available and other controls such as the (unintelligible) introduced as well.

And then post-allegation. So this is more of a sort of monitoring and enforcement area which relies upon the gTLD registry agreements, compliance checks, dispute mechanisms (unintelligible).

There is also some external aspect here which is beyond (unintelligible) but there is law enforcement aspect to consider here that also support monitoring and control or enforcement of activities.

So this is just trying to illustrate that when we hit the stage of trying to address the risk that we want to identify and are concerned about that we already have a suite of controls that we can look at and see if they are effective in doing those tasks. Or whether we need to sort of attach or apply them in different ways for the different geographic issues that we are going to discuss.

And at that stage it is probably at a point where once we have identified those risks and looking at the mitigation points we would go in reverse order. So we would look at the post-allegation controls to see if they are effective in themselves to manage those risks.

And if we feel that they are insufficient we can move through to the application process controls to see whether they could be applied effectively to manage those risks.

And then if see those risks are still too high and (unintelligible) those particular controls we move into the pre-application process area to apply stronger, more (unintelligible) mechanisms for those applications (unintelligible). So that is just to illustrate how that sort of the sort of end space (unintelligible) approach.

And then if we can just move to the next slide please. There should be another one. (Unintelligible).

Let's leave it here for the moment. I was in (unintelligible) high level as well for delivering (unintelligible). So the first stage of a deliverable Work Track 5 was the preliminary (unintelligible) and we spoke about this at the last meeting and that would be to aim for April, end of April (unintelligible).

In order to do that the areas that I would think two chunks of work that we need to do would be throughout the remainder of November through to January is to identify those risks as (unintelligible) based on the available information. And actually (unintelligible) ICANN reviews (unintelligible).

We then can apply that methodology through to (unintelligible) different types of geographic terms and that probably needs to be (unintelligible) in the scope of (unintelligible) so that we can then go through things like starting a two character and country codes, three character country codes and country names and territories and so forth.

And applying variance in those risks and we look at those different aspects in geographic terms. Then from the end of January – so from February through to March it would be looking at (unintelligible) risk mitigations and controls which (unintelligible) working that through these different controls we have got (unintelligible).

So that would then end up with either a report that is produced in April posing questions it could if we have worked through some and are comfortable with our recommendations or I would imagine (unintelligible) report.

But that would then give us the opportunity to meet that timeline by splitting the workload into two key areas of identifying (unintelligible) risks and the second phase of looking at mitigations and controls that should be applied to those risks.

So I will stop there for now to check. I haven't been reading through all the comments coming through. So I will take a moment to look through the comments and take a few.

So we have got (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) start to discuss issues we have risk based management, risk based approach and so on. (Unintelligible) but perhaps (unintelligible). It seems to me that (unintelligible) go into the (unintelligible).

What I suggest is I don't know whether the slides that you have shown here have already discussed with three other people, four other people in the management team (unintelligible).

Because (unintelligible) that we may have (unintelligible) risk based management, risk based approach is very, very difficult and requires a lot of (unintelligible). And I remind myself (unintelligible) at the end it was not useful.

Which comes to the main point that what is the issue of the (unintelligible)? And what is the issue of the (unintelligible). So please kindly reconsider the matter, the procedure that we have to do. Where you have to start.

I have (unintelligible) risk based management or risk based approach. It suggests a lot of problems and difficulties and it is time consuming. Please kindly first consider the management team whether everybody agrees with that?

And then (unintelligible) whether people agree to (unintelligible). By the way thank you very much for all the work that you have done.

Woman: Hi Olga (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Martin (Sala) is on the phone bridge. She wants to make a comment.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead (Sala). (Sala) are you there?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes we can hear you.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Wonderful. Okay very quickly following up with (unintelligible) risk based approach (unintelligible). One of the things that I think should be considered in terms of approach is (unintelligible).

The risk to the stakeholders involved both in terms of application and based in terms of (unintelligible). But in a sense we have (unintelligible). Thank you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Sala).

Martin Sutton: Thank you very much. It is Martin here. I am sorry (unintelligible) the line is really bad so I am afraid that have been unable to deduct a lot of what was said.

Could I please ask you to perhaps (unintelligible) what you said to the (unintelligible) so we can actually take that into consideration as we move forward?

If you could just start (unintelligible) during the last point that would be very helpful (unintelligible). Just to I think in terms of gathering some of the points that I had on the list was in terms of a risk based approach.

I believe that most of the activities performed there have actually started to (unintelligible). And a lot of the time the questions are what are we trying to do here? Why are we trying to do it based on evidence? And so in simple terms that is what this approach is trying to do.

I don't think it is rocket science in any way but it actually just tries to do it in a very orderly manner so that across the different constituencies of ICANN

there is a clear understanding of why we are dealing with a matter in such a way.

And for future (unintelligible) it gives those that need to review and assess this in the future a better (unintelligible) information to report back to us to why this was implemented in the way it was. So I just like to just comment that back.

And this is an opportunity to talk about this approach. We do want your feedback so, you know, if there are huge objections to this we will take that on board.

What we would also like to hear then is what are the alternative approaches that we think would be suitable for this Work Track (unintelligible)? If anybody has got any comments on that? I would be happy to take those now or (unintelligible).

And then I am conscious of time so if anybody is – nobody is in the queue. (Unintelligible) when you look at what aspects of the risks how they could be triggered. I won't go through an example. (Unintelligible) but how frequently is that likely to occur?

If you allow no controls to be in place it is the negative impact something that is going to occur, you know, regularly or is it something that will be one in 10 years? That is where you try to then weight down the risk priority. So if it is a catastrophic event but it is only going to happen once in 100 years in all likelihood. And that is where there would be discussion.

Then that was probably, you know, that was (unintelligible) it will have a low score on that. So bring it down in terms of an overall score prioritization (unintelligible).

So I have got nobody in the queue. I think we will take one more any further comments coming through the chat and we will review those (unintelligible).
Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Martin. Thank you very much. This very interesting presentation (unintelligible) having an informed decision making process (unintelligible).

So please take a look at it. There are many variable comments in the chat and also we will follow up with (Sala) she was in the phone bridge and we had some difficult to hear her clearly.

So please think about this. There are comments to the (unintelligible) as much as you can. As detailed as you can so we can work on that for the next call. And we have like two minutes left. Are there any administrative issues that we should have in mind (Terry) and (Steve)?

Man: Olga I think maybe I am – any other business (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Emily and I see Jeff is raising his hand. Emily can you help us with that?

Emily Barabas: Sure Olga. Hi everyone this is Emily Barabas from staff. So I am just going to provide a brief update. Last week on our call we discussed the possibility of having a buddy system or an informal system of mentorship for new members who are unfamiliar with the PEP process.

So we sent them an email asking people who might be willing to serve as informal mentors if they could reach out to us. And we got some interest which is great. We got 11 people volunteering.

So the next step is going to be to reach out to the working group or I am sorry the Work Track more broadly and see if there are individuals who would like to have a buddy or a mentor to help them along the way with the process and answer questions informally.

So look out for an email today about that. It will explain the next steps. If you have any questions feel free to reach out to staff. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Emily. I see raised hands from Jeff and Kavouss. Jeff go ahead please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. Jeff Neuman. Just to kind of follow up and try to close this call. So there is a – the next call of this group will be next week. I believe it is December 6th. And then another call on December I want to say the 20th.

What we would probably ask for is that we are going to send out the terms of reference right after this call or shortly after. And what we are going to ask for is that if you can think about – starting with the discussions on the list we can go over some comments for next week's call.

I think that that will be helpful. But we won't make comments until the following call after that which will be December 20th. So again while comments won't be due for a few weeks on the terms of reference.

The earlier you can get comments in like in the next few days just questions or comments. Then we could put those on the agenda to actually discuss during the next phone call.

So I just would put in a plea to use the list to make comments. And then we can make sure that we can bring this up as discussion items on the call next week. Back to you Olga sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. No that is – you read my mind (unintelligible). Then we have to wrap up because it is the hour. Kavouss go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Olga (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: I cannot hear you Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: You have discussed it among yourselves whether it is the right moment or right topic (unintelligible) risk based management or risk based approach which I have certain difficulties with that (unintelligible).

And second, would it be possible (unintelligible) send the email address or address of the tax file in an email to all of us. It was in the chat but I couldn't copy so we need to have (unintelligible). Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Kavouss. If there are no other requests for the (unintelligible) I would like to thank you all. Thanks (Steve), (Terry), Emily for your help. Thanks to my colleagues. Thanks to Jeff and (unintelligible).

And please send your comments to the email list. We will meet in a week and hopefully have some summary of all the comments we have received and so we can move forward.

Thank you. Thank you very much. Have a nice rest of the night, morning, week or evening. Wherever you are and the work. Thank you.

Woman: Bye bye Olga. Bye everybody.

END