

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 5 – Geographic Names at the Top Level on Wednesday, 29 November 2017 at 05:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Terri Agnew:Agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_jAhyB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqpzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=ySKvDLtbrVRn9LeHnidvxAmqQVBRxytGpoRm2iDy4yo&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_jAhyB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqpzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=ySKvDLtbrVRn9LeHnidvxAmqQVBRxytGpoRm2iDy4yo&e=)

Terri Agnew:Reminder only members can join, to adjust your status to member, please send an email to [gns0-secs@icann.org](mailto:gns0-secs@icann.org). When logging into Adobe Connect, please log in with your first and last name.

Krishna Seeburn -kris:hi...

Krishna Seeburn -kris:am ahead as usual...

Krishna Seeburn -kris:i'll wait

Julie Bisland:hello Kris! you win again! :)

Krishna Seeburn -kris:yep seems like that

Krishna Seeburn -kris:hope the lot will join soon

Krishna Seeburn -kris:the next gen meeting is back to back...with this meeting

Krishna Seeburn -kris:is it star 6 or star 7 to unmute

Terri Agnew:star 6 to mute and star 6 to unmute (like a toggle switch)

Krishna Seeburn -kris:ok...

Terri Agnew:For those on the telephone only

Krishna Seeburn -kris:yep ok thanks.....terri

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:Hello!!

Krishna Seeburn -kris:hi olga....

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:Hi Krishna

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:Julie Terri can I try my audio?

Julie Bisland:yes please, go ahead

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:can you hear me?

Krishna Seeburn -kris:i heard you but not sure i heard olga

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:I hear nothing .(

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5::(

Michael Flemming:Loud and clear

Terri Agnew:If having difficulties on adobe connect, please check your plug in's:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A\\_tinyurl.com\\_icannactest&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqpzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=F2OZ9j5ZqqPjJK4sEDw5suRZhoO7jUUrl\\_trqHiDxFc&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_tinyurl.com_icannactest&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QjF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqpzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=F2OZ9j5ZqqPjJK4sEDw5suRZhoO7jUUrl_trqHiDxFc&e=)

Michael Flemming:Good morning to all the early risers and good evening to night owls today.

Svitlana Tkachenko:Good morning to everyone.

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:I hear no sound, is this ok? can you Julie or Terri try the audio?

Terri Agnew:@Olga, the op can dial out to you on the telephone if that is helpful

Rahman Khan:Good Morning, Good Afternoon, Good Evening to everyone

Svitlana Tkachenko:sound is ok.

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:I will try to open again the adobe lets see

Krishna Seeburn -kris:perhaps olga should be dialed in...

Carlos Gutierrez:Hi, good night everybody

Kavouss Arasteh:Bunes Tardes Carlos

Carlos Gutierrez:<question> in terms of SOI updates: do we have to declare if we are wearing pijamas???

Carlos Gutierrez:Hola Kavouss  
Kavouss Arasteh:Bunes Tardes Olga  
Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:hola Kavouss  
Kavouss Arasteh:Buened tardes todos  
Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:audio in my computer does not work :(  
Alfredo Calderon:Hello to all from Puerto Rico / Saludos a todos desde Puerto Rico.  
Terri Agnew:@Olga, I am having the op dial out to you  
Kavouss Arasteh:Terri, awaiting to be dialed  
Terri Agnew:@Kavouss, your in the line up for the op to dial out, should be shortly. thanks for checking  
Terri Agnew:@Olga, the op is havign difficutlies reaching you but will keep trying  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Hi everyone  
Annebeth Lange, co-chair WT 5, ccNSO:Good morning, everyone!  
Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:hello can you hear me?  
Terri Agnew:@Kavouss, the operator is getting a busy tone but will continue trying  
Terri Agnew:@Olga - no  
Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:ok I use the phone  
Kavouss Arasteh:Terri  
Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:Im in my phone now and i can see the adobe room  
Krishna Seeburn -kris:yes we do  
Kavouss Arasteh:PLS THE nUMBER IS 0041 79 325 65 34  
Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):Hello all  
Terri Agnew:I confirm this is the number the op is trying  
Kavouss Arasteh:IT IS NOT BUSY IT IS FREE  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):phone is preference anyway for reliable audio if your presenting.  
Kavouss Arasteh:Dial up should done 3 mints before the hours  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):OK shall we start then ?  
Terri Agnew:Yes - we started early with all the dial out requests, some are not going through but we will continue trying  
Terri Agnew:@Kavouss, I see you are now connected via telephone  
Kavouss Arasteh:yes, tks  
Kavouss Arasteh:Dear All, when speaking pls kindly speak slowly and clearly seprating syllabus one from another , particularly for those rapid speaking  
Narine Khachatryan - At-Large:Greetings all  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):If you are having problems loggin n to fill out your SOI let staff know and they can assist you accessing the page you need to fill out.  
Terri Agnew:kind reminder to mute when not speaking  
Justine Chew:sorry I'm late, just, managed to find a spot to log in  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Welcome Justine  
Dave Kissoondoyal:Hi all, I am sorry to be late  
Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):FYI - "bracketed terms are options that were discussed between the Work Track leads  
Goma Serge Parfait:bonjour for all  
Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):This is what we seek input on. Should we include those bracketed terms or not is the question  
Carlos Gutierrez:[treatment] sounds like a medical term, maybe right so  
Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):As you can see there are more bracketed clauses here.  
Kavouss Arasteh:What is the problem with approval ,an alternative wouls be agreement or consent

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):We will come back to all of these

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):This language on this slide was acceptable to all of the WOrk Track Leads (no bracketed language]

Liz Williams:The challenge we may wish to take on is not making recommendations to expand the existing scope of the previous AGB. We may then want to think about writing justification text or an explanation about that which may include a) encouraging innovation b) enabling under served communities c) developing IDN related TLDs and so on...it will be OK to think more broadly about this in any new round.

Farzaneh Badii:jurisdiction of SOs and ACs? First time I hear such a thing. you probably just mean mandate ?

Kavouss Arasteh:I do have problem with cognizance

Heather Forrest:The CWG-UCTN final report was circulated to the WT list a few weeks ago. If anyone has not received it, here is a link: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_ccnso.icann.org\\_sites\\_default\\_files\\_field-2Dattached\\_ccwg-2Dctn-2Dfinal-2Dpaper-2D15jun17-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=ysO5vQkblo3PYeaU67Y8FGSRNTomKjOEu6kd6HrOeHM&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_ccnso.icann.org_sites_default_files_field-2Dattached_ccwg-2Dctn-2Dfinal-2Dpaper-2D15jun17-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=ysO5vQkblo3PYeaU67Y8FGSRNTomKjOEu6kd6HrOeHM&e=)

Emily Barabas:The slides are now unsynced so everyone call scroll

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, ccNSO & RySG:It seems sensible to me to start with the current rules for names of a geographic nature as currently set out in the AGB plus the mountains/ rivers etc questions which have arisen subsequently

jaap akkerhuis:Let's insert a footnote to the CCWG reort as well.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Kavouss - so your recommendation is to substitute "Cognizance" with "consideration"

Liz Williams:I think we also need to think about unintended consequences of being too broad in scope...we will need to find consensus on the basis of reasonably objective rationales; we'll need to think about impacts on potential impacts and we'll also need to think about how one might instruct future evaluators to avoid contention or litigation or unreasonable delay or other negative consequences.

Kavouss Arasteh:I do not clearly understand the last part

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):it was the Johannesberg Meeting Jeff where WT5 was "born"

Katrin Ohlmer 2:What has been the reason so insert the text in slide 2 about "geograhpic features"?

Ann-Cathrin Marcussen, ccNSO:Support to Nicks comment that It seems sensible to start with the current rules for names of a geographic nature as currently set out in the AGB plus the mountains/ rivers etc questions which have arisen subsequently

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):I agree that we should replace "take cognizance of" - I'd be fine with either "acknowledge" or "consider".

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):This text is part of the broader Terms of Reference that we are sending out.

Annebeth Lange, co-chair WT 5, ccNSO:Difficult to hear you, Kavouss

Julie Bisland:@Kavouss, your line is muffled, can you move your phone

Marita Moll:I am wondering about the meaning of "requiring consent or non-objection from applicable gov. authorities." Do you have an potential example.

Liz Williams:@ Ann-Cathrin...reference to geographic features is a two edged sword. We need to be very careful to ensure that the "rules" are indeed "rules-based" to enable applicants to have clarity about what they want to apply for; then for evaluators to analyse those applications and then for any dispute resolution systems to work correctly.

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, ccNSO & RySG: Not sure whether the last sentence of paragraph 2 doesn't broaden the scope beyond geo terms - 'economic significance' for example seems potentially very wide and out of scope

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair): Yes Olga

Liz Williams: @Nick...geographic features are also out of scope.

Katrin Ohlmer 2: +1 Liz

Kavouss Arasteh: I have some difficulties with the portion referring to jurisdiction

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair): @Paul - this is a good question. The person who suggested that text is not on the call at the moment. So we can take that back as an action item to provide an explanation

Liz Williams: @Marita...the current system refers to, for example, consent of national governments (see .africa example) or non-objection which is so difficult to do...because it is a negative not a positive engagement.

Paul McGrady: Thank you Olga!

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, ccNSO & RySG: @liz agree - generic terms such as 'mountain' and 'river' are not supposed to be included, it's the names of these features isn't it? But the wording is too broad at the moment in the last bracket

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair): @Paul - if we took out the footnote, would that be better?

Katrin Ohlmer 2: I think we need this explanation to understand the scope of those proposed amendments.

Paul McGrady: +1 Martin.

Liz Williams: Yes Martin...will do in the chat...the sound quality is poor.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair): I have raised my hand so I will repeat this, but this is the scope of what we will be discussing. We are not trying to provide solutions right now

Alexander Schubert: Cities always needed a letter of non-objection; and SHOULD. Question: example .berlin: approval from "all" Berlins or just the well known one (capital of Germany)? In the past only major cities had to provide their absolution.

Farzaneh Badii: I agree with Katrin

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5: thanks Jeff, I will repeat this now again

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair): Thanks Olga....just because we "discuss an issue within the scope" does not indicate that we will have a consensus recommendation on that subject. It just means that we will discuss that issue

Justine Chew: Yes, approval by whom exactly?

Kavouss Arasteh: two questions raised are both merit to be discussed

Paul McGrady: +1 Kristina. The red language on slide 1 is a significant sea change from the First Round.

Ann-Cathrin Marcussen, ccNSO: In my opinion the scope should at least refer to the ABG Module 2, section 2.2.1.4.1

Marita Moll: Thanks Liz. What about potential impacts on other groups -- e.g. indigenous groups. I am sure that government is the only constituency that is affected here and that needs to have a say. That idea does lead us to a scope that might be unmanageable. But wanted to bring it up.

Liz Williams: What I am aiming for is to make sure that we don't run into the exact same problems we've had in the past...not just in the 2012 round but also the 2004 and 2000 round of expanding the domain name space. Whatever we do has to make reference to clear lists (ISO3166) or clear protocols (UNESCO World Heritage Sites) or clear policy (RFC1591). We cannot be making sweeping limitations on the new potential for the next round without thinking about the negative effects on potential applicants. We want simplicity, ease, clarity and fairness.

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry): +1 Liz - I'd add predictability to that list.

Marita Moll: Oops. That should read "not sure that government is the only constituency"

Katrin Ohlmer:+1 Liz

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):I was wondering Marita ;-)

Cole Quinn / Microsoft:+1 Liz and Kristina

Justine Chew:I may be jumping ahead but would there be a list to which stakeholders can submit "geographic names" against which then some "approval" or "objection" is addressed?

Liz Williams:@Marita. I agree with you but we need to make it easier for governments and their constituent groups to reach agreement. That agreement may not be possible (refer to the .cat example). It may not be legal (refer to the .gay example and look at, for example, Australia's recent plebiscite about marriage equality) and so on...

Alexander Schubert:I agree with Kavouss: There MUST be a letter of non-objection for cities! As well for states, country names, 3-letter ISO 3166 codes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Exactly Jeff

Liz Williams:@ Alexander. We must turn non-objection into something positive. It is so easy and so difficult to rely on "non-objection". It only takes a regime change or election or change of policy heart on the basis of governments to throw completely awry any applicant's application.

Annebeth Lange, co-chair WT 5, ccNSO:Jeff is right - here we are only trying to define the scope

Paul McGrady:Can we please note in the recording that this draft is not settled, but remains open to discussion?

Kavouss Arasteh:I suggest to just refer to agreement and not non-objection which are the same

Farzaneh Badii:yes I agree with Paul. we should note that.

Liz Williams:@ Jeff...so I wonder if it is better to come up with a table of principles that will help guide us. For example, we originally asked the question about "whether" new TLDs should be allowed. Perhaps this time we should do the exact same exercise and develop a schematic around that...we need to be looking for agreement/consensus on as much as we can possibly achieve.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Paul - We can note that of course. The scope section is one part of the Terms of Reference which we are sending out. We will continue the discussion on email and come back to this on the next call.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):we know you are only seeing this for the first time

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, ccNSO & RySG:+1 that the purpose of the scope at this stage is to get down what is to be discussed, and not the solutions (yet). 'cultural significance' for me is again too wide though as a subject in its own right without being anchored in the name of a place or country etc

Paul McGrady:Thanks Jeff!

Heather Forrest:+1 Paul. I share the concerns raised by Paul and Kristina as to creep of the scope of this WT to cover names that are broader than purely geographical. This Work Track should not, in my view, be a catch-all for other categories of name.

Kavouss Arasteh:I am afraid that going involved in such topic would create a big hole that we are digginfg for ourselves

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Heather - I think you have hit on why the language was bracketed. It was proposed by one or more leaders and not supported by others. So feedback is absolutely requested on those

Paul McGrady:+1 Heather. As written, the red language on the second slide really takes us far afield of "geographic terms".

Liz Williams:@Martin This is excellent...from this flows the more detailed 'justifications' for how a decision or recommendation has been reached. For example, we are trying to prevent applicant confusion; we are trying to prevent contention sets; we are trying to prevent auctions. We are trying to promote consumer trust; consumer choice; diversity; innovation...or whatever other terms we come up with.

Kavouss Arasteh:I also disagree with any attempt that somebody brings the sTRESS TEST

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Yes please focus on getting the Leaders your comments on the bracketed text over the next week via the mailing list.

Liz Williams:@Kavouss...why...stress tests are exactly what we need. We need to work out what tolerance any system has for "stress". Without that we have no way of managing risk.

Annebeth Lange, co-chair WT 5, ccNSO:It would be good to have comments from you all on the bracket text in the scope in time for next call

Katrin Ohlmer 2:From my point of view, the idea of a risk-based approach helps to move forward.

Paul McGrady:@Cheryl, for sure. But I'm concerned that 20 minutes on 1 call and emails on the list will not be sufficient to deal with the scope issues. Hopefully, we won't end up with conversation cut off early and the current text just adopted without a real chance to see if there is consensus around it.

Liz Williams:@Paul... I wonder if it would be wise to ask GNSO support staff to come up with a straw man on scope in a document that we could consider...and then move on from?

Alexander Schubert:@Liz: Good point. But then regime changes DO happen. We could have a provision that such expression of the relevant government authority has to be issued within 6 month to application (or if granted prior: it would have to be refreshed). It would be grossly unfair if an applicant entity were to "secure" such letter 2 years prior to application - long before the competition is established.

Emily Barabas:The slides on scope language and the risk based approach are available here:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_jAhyB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB\\_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqgzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=ySKvDLtbrVRn9LeHnidvxAmqQVBRxytGpoRm2iDy4yo&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_jAhyB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=7w3MrkHTD1vJsPNTKho8YrXqgzT5ejEIWCNf7TqVH3g&s=ySKvDLtbrVRn9LeHnidvxAmqQVBRxytGpoRm2iDy4yo&e=)

Emily Barabas:\*language

Ann-Cathrin Marcussen, ccNSO:If using risk-based approach, it is important to take one category of names at a time and evaluate them and consider risks etc. to decide how to go forward with that category, if at all

Ann-Cathrin Marcussen, ccNSO:If using risk-based approach, it is important to take one category of names at a time and evaluate them and consider risks etc. to decide how to go forward with that category, if at all

Ann-Cathrin Marcussen, ccNSO:Sorry for posting twice there!

Farzaneh Badii:I wonder so one co-leader just adds stuff in bracket that broadens the scope and now the group has to deal with it? (it's not really a question I am just puzzled)

Annebeth Lange, co-chair WT 5, ccNSO:@Paul: If we have comments before next call, we will of course continue discussion. And we should try to arrive at consensus.

Barrack Otieno AFTLD:Goode proposal @ Liz on strawman poll

Paul McGrady:@Liz, that might make sense if we get to the end of the discussion and don't have consensus. Sometimes, changing the format helps creativity. But after just 20 minutes on 1 call, we aren't there yet.

Liz Williams:@ Barrack...I am happy to support the drafting of that document...it will help everyone to have a document to work from as an output from the WT5 work program.

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, ccNSO & RySG:So how does one evaluate the potential risk of introduction of e.g. a country name as a TLD, when it's not registered? It's just opinion, or does this approach envisage consumer surveys or something?

Ching Chiao:@Julie @Terri pls kindly note my attendance. Thank you and sorry for being late .

Paul McGrady:@Annebeth, thanks! However, I think we have enough questions/concerns from this call alone to continue the conversation in the next call. Hopefully, a lack of comments on the List doesn't serve to cut off conversation. 20 minutes on 1 call isn't nearly enough.

Liz Williams:@Nick...I think in some jurisdictions the country name is protected in existing legislation. Using Australia as an example...one could do it but you couldn't do ANZAC. Other countries will have similar restrictions. A document listing those exclusions would be helpful to read alongside other lists I've referred to above

Liz Williams:@Martin...so what your slide is really doing is providing an application screening process BEFORE an applicant does what they want to do...who would do it; when and with what authority?

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Paul - This was just an intro into the scope. The full Terms of Reference Doc will be sent out (if not already) and we will devote time to get agreement on that document. That said, calls are not the most efficient places to address issues (especially for non-native speaking english speakers). So discussion on the lists is HIGHLY encouraged

Julie Bisland:@Ching, thank you, you'll be included on attendance

Farzaneh Badii:so we don't have the scope nailed down yet and we are discussing our approach. not sure I follow the logic

Justine Chew:Thanks, Jeff. I thought it was going to be circulated before the call but noted we have time for proper consideration and discussion.

Annebeth Lange, co-chair WT 5, ccNSO:@Jeff, agree! This is complicated stuff for many, and time is needed to think through. Please give your input on mail.

Paul McGrady:@Jeff, agree. The list is great tool. However, it is hard to post comments on proposed language when the drafter of the language was not on the call to clarify what was meant by the language. So, I just want to make sure that silence on the List does not equal assent.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):Martin is illustrating the overall approach....please do not focus on the substance or the examples he is using

Liz Williams:@ Martin...it might be useful to think of this as a pre-Applicant Guidebook informational document...this is a solution not a question which is premature...but it might be helpful to think on how we could think about "do not go here for this reason"; "do go here if you think you've got a good idea" "only rely on this as information only" and so on.

Marita Moll:I think a risk assessment approach is definitely worth a try.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@PAul - absolutely. We will make sure the drafter of that bracketed footnote responds

Heather Forrest:Picking up on comments here on the Terms of Reference, it seems to me that the most productive approach would be to say simply that geographic names are in scope, and make defining geo names one of our substantive objectives (rather than attempt to do so in the Terms of Reference) - I'm speaking from experience in the CWG Use of Country and Territory Names, where defining geo names took us some months

Paul McGrady:Thanks Jeff!

Paul McGrady:+1 Heather.

Darcy Southwell:A risk-based approach is probably the more objective way to approach this work. But I agree with Farzaneh's comment about needing to nail down scope before we can actually identify risks.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Heather - Thanks. That is a good comment. Will make sure we flag that comment.

Justine Chew:@Heather, agree with you.

Alexander Schubert:I disagree that "risk management" should be the commanding basis of our decision making. At minimum as important are CHANCES for the Internet users impacted by the (potential) existence of a geo based gTLD.

Darcy Southwell:+1 Heather - and that should be our first substantive objective

Farzaneh Badii:+1 Heather

Kristina Rosette (Amazon Registry):+1 Heather

Svitlana Tkachenko:+1 Heather

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Alexander 0 can you expand on that

Liz Williams:@ Alexander...not the commanding base but something that we take into account. We need to be sure we provide policy clarity...that needs risk management or "consequences" analysis...

Barrack Otieno AFTLD:+1 Heather

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):yes

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Sala - it was a little tough to hear you....can you send in a written comment after this call

Svitlana Tkachenko:Is it possible to zoom the slide ?

Svitlana Tkachenko:Thank you!

Steve Chan:@Svetlana, all, slides are unsynced now.

Emily Barabas:Work Track mailing list: [gns0-newgtld-wg-wt5@icann.org](mailto:gns0-newgtld-wg-wt5@icann.org)

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):I just realized Sala is on the phone only and probably therefore couldn't see my note. Olga - can you follow up with Sala to have her submit her comment in writing so we make sure we captured it

Terri Agnew:@Svitlana, you can increase the size of the slides yourself at this time.

Svitlana Tkachenko:Thank you. Terri!

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:@Jeff yes I will, she is in the phone bridge, it was difficult for me to hear her clearly

Ching Chiao:I am not quite sure about the "likelihood" part ... and how this can be measured quantitatively.

Alexander Schubert:Jeff: In 2012 we denied countries to apply for their country based gTLDs (e.g. .spain or .turkey) on the sole basis of "RISK management" - never anybody considered the POSITIVE impact of such applications. If potential positive impacts outweighs potential "risks" then we have to look "beyond" just managing risks.....

Cole Quinn / Microsoft:probability

Liz Williams:@ Martin...it is interesting that you have referred to objections. Objections are only a very small (and then sometimes a very big) part of any application evaluation. Just because I object to you applying for .liz doesn't mean that is going to make any difference at all...

Kavouss Arasteh:mARTIN, THANKS AGAIN BUT i am sure starting with Risk Based approach would be a useful start

Ching Chiao:thanks Martin . answer could rely on opinion of historian ;)

Cole Quinn / Microsoft:basic risk calculation = probability\*impact

Susan Payne:I think this risk based approach would help give us a good structure. in other WTs we have been using the approach of what is the harm we are trying to fix, and where is the evidence. I think this a formalisation of that. r

Katrin Ohlmer 2:+1 Susan

Kavouss Arasteh:Correction, I am not sure

Paul McGrady:+1 Susan. This moves us away from vague feelings "that something bad may happen" and forces us to look at the probability that something bad may happen and take a look at how bad the bad thing might be.

Ching Chiao:+1 Susan

Kavouss Arasteh:to co- chairs of Track 5, pls discuss any issue you wish to raise within the team before submitting it to the group

Susan Payne:@alexander, couldn't loss of opportunity of itself be a potential risk that would get weighed?

Farzaneh Badii:how does it move us away from that feeling Paul? I am still not sure about the method...

Ching Chiao:@Alexander -- for future round(s), I hope things can be different

Liz Williams:@Susan...yes absolutely...why would we want to be limited when that would be totally counter intuitive to "enabling" new users/new communities/new services.

Alexander Schubert:Susan: GOOD POINT!

Alan Greenberg:There are a lot of people on this call. Are mentors still being accepted?

Olga Cavalli - Co-lead WT5:@Alan please contact Emily Barabas on that

Emily Barabas:@Alan, yes!

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, ccNSO & RySG:is there any precedent of using this risk based approach?

Emily Barabas:@Alan, we will include that in the follow up email today

Alexander Schubert:When we proposed .berlin in 2005 - everybody told us it was useless and plain nuts. Now by 2017 everybody loves city TLDs.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):@Kavouss - Can you let us know your specific objections to the risk based approach, so we can address them.

Jeff Neuman (Overall SubPro co-chair):Thanks Olga and Martin. Great call

Dave Kissoondoyal:Thanks all and bye

Annebeth Lange, co-chair WT 5, ccNSO:Thank you for an interesting discussion. Talk next week.

Julie Bisland:Next call: Wednesday, 06 December 2017 at 14:00 UTC

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Thanks everyone. Looking forward to your input on the list or to the TOR Doc

Ching Chiao:Thanks all.

Katrin Ohlmer 2:Thank you all!

Alexander Schubert:bye

Martin Sutton:Thanks Olga, and all

Christa Taylor:Goodnight

Paul McGrady:Thanks Olga!

Narine Khachatryan - At-Large:Thank you all and bye

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO - PDP Co-Chair):Bye for now then

Kavouss Arasteh:No publicity Alexander

Farzaneh Badii:bye

Kaili Kan:Thanks. Bye!

giacomo mazzone:ciao Olga and best to everybody

Alfredo Calderon:Bye

Darcy Southwell:Thank you, bye.

jaap akkerhuis:bye

Svitlana Tkachenko:Thank you. Have a nice day

Ann-Cathrin Marcussen, ccNSO:Bye everyone

Barrack Otieno AFTLD (ccNSO):bye all

John Rodriguez:Goodbye...thanks.

Michael Flemming:Thank you

Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, ccNSO & RySG:bye