Transcription
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5
(Geographic Names at the top-level)
Wednesday, 06 December 2017 at 14:00 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-track5-06dec17-en.mp3

Adobe Connect recording: https://participate.icann.org/p7qyvfxecn2/
Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/Cw9yB

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 are now started.

Woman: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening and welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Subteam Track 5 Geographic Names at Top Level taking place on the 5th of December - pardon, taking place on the 6th of December 2016 -- 2017.

In the interest of time there'll 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 co-chair, Annabeth Lange. Please begin.

Annabeth Lange: Well this is Annabeth again. So we start with going through the agenda. And if anyone has suggestions to something else in the agenda, that would be good - it's time to do it now.

We have only an hour, and I think the main discussion here will be on the terms of reference. But we'll start with the statement before. Does anyone have anything to changes in the SOI? Doesn't seem like that.

Then we go directly to the terms of reference. It would be good now that we get - start to discuss the substance. What we have experienced since the last call, it's been a lot of discussion on the mail. And some of it has to do with the scope and the terms of reference. And some of it has to do with other things that we will be discussing later.

We tried to sort it out what should be discussed today. And if we are not mentioning it, it will be taken care of and it will be written down so we can discuss it later.

You can see on the screen here I think it's a screenshot. Is that right, Emily? So I can't scroll so we have to go through this. All of you have got the link from (Steve) earlier today or yesterday. And it is not easy to go through all these different comments in this short time but I think that we should take paragraph for paragraph.

Most of the comments have been on the scope but also something in the problem statement. So if we go through that first and if anyone has any objections to what's there now and there's something that they want to take out, that will be a good time to come with it.

So could you make this so we can see the whole problem statement Emily? Is that possible? Hello?

Olga Cavelli: Annabeth this is Olga. I think that Emily (unintelligible).

Annabeth Lange: Yes, we have it.

Olga Cavalli: But (unintelligible) made an interesting suggestion that the link should be sent to the participants and we can follow from the (full) document in our screen.

Annabeth Lange: That's good Olga. We can always send the link once more. Is that possible to do now (Emily)? Okay so here we first have the problem statement and it's one yellow area here. Does someone have anything, comment at this at all, something that they want to take away or is it okay?

This will all be the first reading of the terms of reference so we will always have the possibility up till the 20th. I don't see a hand up now so can we go on then to the goals and objectives? These seem to be fine. We haven't received…

Olga Cavalli: Annabeth, there's a hand up from Jeff.

Annabeth Lange: Yes, good, good, Olga. Please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, sorry about that. Why don't we go over some of the comments on that yellow highlighted language just to make sure that we address them? It's hard to see on the screen shares. That's why I'm - you know, we're kind of recommending people for the next call print out the documents ahead of time so that they can view it themselves.

But why don't we go over - I see a comment from (Jorge) on the language that we might want to start with and then some of the replies. And (Jorge) says that the PDP tends to coordinate or streamline but it does not consolidate. And then there was comments based on the word "consolidate."

So I thought perhaps maybe I would jump in and just say the reason why I think the consolidate was left in there or was drafted initially was because from consolidate it meant that just a way to - the way it was intended was that there was work on this issue going on in a number of different (shora)

whether it was within - solely within the GAC or within the CCWG or within the other - you know, the ALAC.

The reason why the word consolidate was initially in there was that one of the goals was to bring all of that work into one area, not that it was necessarily stopping work from other groups but it was more to have everybody have one place to address it as opposed to, you know, more than one.

So I don't see (Jorge) on the call but I - you know, maybe we should just stop there and see if anyone has got - anyone other than (Jorge) has an objection keeping the word consolidate in there. And I see that there is some people raising their hands. I don't know - Annabeth I'll turn it back to you. But maybe we'll just quickly start with that just to make sure that we're okay.

Annabeth Lange: Yes. Yes, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think the key here is it says "consolidate the work." So I believe it's syntactically correct. But (Jorge) is probably right in the fact that if you read this sort of casually it sounds like it's trying to consolidate the answers not the effort. So maybe there is some better - I don't have a better suggestion. I think it is accurate but perhaps misleading.

Annabeth Lange: Yes, thank you. It's Annabeth again. I think I've seen the word "streamline" instead. Is that a better solution? Olga, go ahead. Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Annabeth. Referring to the comments made by Alan…

Annabeth Lange: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, can you hear me?

Annabeth Lange: Yes, we can hear you now.

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) about the comments made by Alan and maybe - I suggest that if you have suggestion to enhance the text (there) now as soon as possible we have to decide this text for the terms of reference. If you think this is not yet finalized it could be good that you make suggestions, you or others in the call. That would be important to make it now or as soon as possible.

Annabeth Lange: Yes, I agree. Kavouss you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have my hand up. Unfortunately I could not send comment on the term of reference. If you are there you cannot wait until you come to the term of reference or two alternatives. I have another one I couldn't communicate to you.

I have some difficulty with existing wording that mentioned that as we focus on the developing proposed recommendations. So I would like to change that part and I have a suggestion to make if you allow me kindly. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Kavouss. If you could send it in as soon as possible that would be fine. It's quite difficult to hear you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Is it okay now?

Annabeth Lange: If you can - it's a little better but just now we are discussing the problem statement. So if we could get that clear and agree on that as soon as possible, that would be good. I think that Alan's clarification what we really mean here with consolidate is (unintelligible) input. And if it could be worded a better way to express what we really mean, that could be fine.

Olga, do you have your hand up again or is it an old hand? Annabeth here. It's down. Okay so should we go on to the goals and objectives? There is some comments on the side but it's really difficult to see them here on the screen. Is there anyone that wants to comment anything on goals and objectives just now? Kavouss, your hand up again?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have a difficulty on the front page when you talk the problems. It seems to me that this process would work under the PDP principle of the GNSO. I have difficulty with that because it is four chartering organizations involved and we need to have a procedure how to approve that.

We don't want to be under the GNSO maximum or minimum majority or minority or some of those things that would not work for this very critical situations. We need to establish the procedures how we agree on (unintelligible). We need to inject the issue of equal footing and equal status of four chartering organizations.

We don't want to be governed by GNSO principles because we never had any majority at all. We are always in minority with (unintelligible) number of the GNSO attendees in meetings which is not possible for the others. So it is a (unintelligible) CCWG. It is not a GNSO process. I'm very sorry we disagree with that. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Kavouss. If you could send some suggestions to where you would have us alter the problem statement, that would make it very much easier. It is quite bad sound when you talk, so I really have problems with following you. Jeff, go ahead. You have your hand up.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Annabeth. Hopefully I'm clear. I'll try to - I'll restate what I think I heard from Kavouss and then address that. I believe that Kavouss was saying that he takes some issue with the fact that this is a GNSO effort and that he has comments on really the decision-making and that - his comment was there are four chartering organizations and that therefore there should be some more addressing this from the other organizational standpoint.

My comment to that just as one of the overall co-chairs of this group is that - well, two comments. Number one is Kavouss that is a comment related to the decisioning as opposed to the problem statement or even later on when

you - I see you added that into the scope. We'll address it then too. But it's really meant for a different section of the terms of reference if at all. So that's comment one.

And comment two is that there has been a letter sent now from the GNSO perspective to the different - to the GAC, to the ALAC and to the ccNSO addressing the comments of decision-making and how this needs to be in line with the GNSO policy development process.

That letter basically points out that the decision-making is not from four chartering organizations. There's one chartering organization of this group but in the decision-making section it discusses how consensus is measured and how it will be documented.

So the second comment really is that Kavouss we should table this discussion of the decision-making until we get to that section, number one. And number two is we'll again go over the GNSO rules and perspectives that was laid out in that letter. So if I can make that suggestion and then have us move on without addressing the decision-making right now. Thanks.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Jeff. I think that was the sensible way to look at it. Olga, please?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Annabeth. This is Olga Cavalli. I think what…

Annabeth Lange: Olga? You have your hand up. Go ahead.

Olga Cavelli: …Kavouss was referring to is the concern that - yes, can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Annabeth Lange: It was a little echo but sorry again. Yes. Yes, we can hear you.

Olga Cavelli: I was just responding to Kavouss's comments. Can you hear me?

Greg Shatan: Yes we can hear you.

Annabeth Lange: Yes we can hear you.

Olga Cavelli: There is a gap in between the way that - there's a gap in between the way the GAC works, which is (on circumstances). And the GNSO style (unintelligible) consensus, so it's not the same. And there is a problem there that we are talking about that within the GAC. So it's an important issue. I think we have to address this in the terms of reference but perhaps in next sections of the document. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Olga. Greg, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan for the record.

Annabeth Lange: Are you there Greg? Are you there Greg?

Greg Shatan: Yes, yes, can you hear me?

Annabeth Lange: Yes.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan for the record. Just want to express that a disagreement with the idea that some - that stakeholders are not participating on an equal basis, that somehow some stakeholders can't be in the minority and others can. There's no one group of stakeholders that's in the majority at any time.

It's all a set of sectors that need to come to consensus together. So this idea that - that has been put forward I think need to discuss it in detail later but I just want to express my disagreement with this. Obviously we need to come to an understanding that makes sense and is appropriate. But I fear that some of what's been said is based on kind of a set of assumptions about the multi-stakeholder process, and especially the GNSO.

Annabeth Lange: Good, Greg. So we have it on record. Kavouss, do you have a comment?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have a comment. Sorry, I had different understanding of multi-stakeholder than Greg. It's totally different. The multi-stakeholder in his definition means that those participating whether some 100 from one SO/AC or two or three from others then those 100 dominate the others. This is not multi-stakeholder.

Second, we are dealing with a very critical situation, geographic names. Geographic names belong to the countries, to the territories. And the territory and country have the right to express its views.

Unfortunately due to certain (unintelligible) condition they may not be able to attend as much as a number of those very kind and respectful professional from GNSO that they are all (unintelligible) out in the absent, all (unintelligible) that.

So I am very sorry. We need to establish this in the four organizations and equal footing. We all must have equal footing. GNSO could not dominate the others because - please let me finish kindly. Please. This is freedom of speech.

GNSO does not dominate the others because of the numerous number of participations. There should be more acceptable criteria how to come to the decision-making. If we don't solve this step, we always remain in minority. This is quite clear. We'd have always in minority. So please we can't go through these things. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Kavouss. But we come back to that when we discuss the decision area. It would be fine if we could concentrate now on the problem statement and the goals and objectives so we can come to the scope. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I do have a comment on decision-making process and I won't make it. But I will make the comment saying please can we try to follow the instructions of the co-leaders of this group and do things in order because otherwise people who ignore that end up getting a chance to put their positions forward without any rebuttal or other comments.

And that's not fair to the rest of us. So let's try to follow the process that's being described. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you. So let us say now that we have said enough on problem statement. We have talked about the word consolidate and we'll see what way - where we go from there. So shall we go on to goals and objectives? Anyone have specific comments to that section?

No hand? Should we carry on and go further down the document Emily? Kavouss you have your hand up?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. What is the objective of second paragraph? Why we dealing with the four other tracks? This has nothing to do with this issue. Why we need that paragraph at all? The four tracks have nothing to do with this. We are talking on geographic names. Four track dealing with something else.

Annabeth Lange: Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. So I disagree with the Paragraph 2. I propose it's deleted. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: I think it's more - it's Annabeth here. I think it's more meant like a description on like what we are doing here that we are part. What we are discussing here even if it's only geographical names, we're part of a bigger picture. All of the work tracks will give their input into the (unintelligible) group. Can you give a better explanation Jeff? Or - I can't see that it's a problem having it there.

Kavouss Arasteh: I see a problem.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. Okay so let's note Kavouss's objection and we'll hear other comments on it. It's only there from - to provide some context. If there's agreement to remove the reference to - in the last sentence, if there's agreement to remove the reference to - I'm sorry, there's someone with an open connection, so it's giving me a little - it's hard to speak.

But in the first paragraph - in the first paragraph if we can eliminate the language that says "as with the other work tracks," we could just say, "Work Track 5 leadership is coordinated by the PDP working group co-chairs." I mean, that's - it's fine. I'm not sure it affects the substance. But let's note Kavouss's objection and see if there's others with issues and then move on.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Jeff. Greg, your hand is up again.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan.

Man: Hello?

Terri Agnew: Greg, this is Terri from staff. We heard you state your name and nothing after that.

Man: Yes, I heard nothing.

Annabeth Lange: I heard it.

Alan Greenberg: He's on Adobe Connect but it doesn't go onto the bridge. The bridge connection seems to be severed.

Annabeth Lange: Okay.

Christopher Wilkinson: This is Christopher Wilkinson. I apologize for joining late but Adobe Connect has crashed in this environment and there is no connection so I'm on a phone line. So while we're waiting for…

Annabeth Lange: Yes, you have echo Christopher.

Christopher Wilkinson: I'll go onto mute in a minute. I'll come back on when I have something to say but just to let you know that with great difficulty I am here.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Christopher. Greg did you finish or…? You have your hand still up. Okay.

Terri Agnew: This is Terri from staff. I apologize. I do believe I have the Adobe Connect issue fixed if you want to go ahead and continue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terri, Cheryl here. It doesn't seem to be the phone bridge connecting to Adobe Connect is picking up because I'm…

Annabeth Lange: Okay, better.

Terri Agnew: Yes for those - thank you Cheryl. For those that have activated their mics at the beginning of the meeting, you may have to reactivate your mics at this time.

Alan Greenberg: That's the mics on Adobe Connect you're talking about. It's Alan speaking.

Terri Agnew: Correct, thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Yes. This is Annabeth again. You hear me now?

Terri Agnew: We sure do, Annabeth. Thank you everyone for your patience. Please continue.

Annabeth Lange: Okay. All right, we try again. Kavouss your hand is up. Is it an old hand or (unintelligible)?

Alan Greenberg: Maybe we need to go back to Greg because we never - most of us didn't hear him.

Annabeth Lange: No, but Greg is not there just now. So he has to come back again. I think he's trying the phone.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I'm here.

Annabeth Lange: There is Greg. Good, good.

Greg Shatan: All that I said was that the - after the first two sentences, the rest of the paragraph is about Work Track 5. And the first two sentences are transitional sentences which is just, you know, good writing to help the flow of the writing and help the reader understand what's being discussed.

So we go from the general to the particular. So I don't see an issue with briefly mentioning the context in which this work track exists. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Yes, thank you Greg. I see in the chat that (unintelligible) also has suggested that we change the word "goals" with "context," and that's perhaps what we mean with this paragraph, context and objectives. We'll look into that. So Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I suggest that please kindly put them in the (scroll) back. We can come back to that later please. I don't see any relevance of this…

Annabeth Lange: Yes, we will.

Kavouss Arasteh: …at all. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Okay, thank you so much. (Susan), you have a hand up? Have to open your mic.

Susan Payne: Hopefully my mic is working.

Annabeth Lange: Hi Susan.

Susan Payne: It is open? Can you hear me?

Annabeth Lange: Yes. Yes, it is. Go ahead.

Susan Payne: Yes, okay. Sorry. I was just going to say I can - well very personally don't have an objection to the reference that Kavouss is objecting to. I also think we could probably dispense with it. And so if we're talking here about the first two sentences in the numbered Paragraph 1 underneath Goals and Objectives then we could just delete them.

And we could just simply say, "The co-chairs of the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group have established a fifth work track." I think that would then address (unintelligible) and I don't think we would lose anything by it.

Annabeth Lange: Agree. Thank you Susan. Shall we move on to the scope? No more hands up as far as I can see. Emily, could you move the document a little ahead? There we are. So this is the difficult part because we have had a lot of input here and it's been several suggestions for different wording. And what we have tried here - and (unintelligible) have had input and Jeff has tried and Nick Wenban-Smith.

And it might be a bit easier to have a lightweight that covers everything instead of being too specific. But if you have input to this different wording, it would be the time now to come with it. So Kavouss your hand is up.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have a comment please and I wish to propose an alternative for that. And I tried to put it if possible in the chat in order that you can see (the whole thing). Yes.

Annabeth Lange: Yes I can see it in the chat. That's good that you have it in writing.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I did it in the chat, yes.

Annabeth Lange: Good.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. So a couple things. Number one is I just wanted to point out that the alternative number one, if we went with that - that's the version that I had initially suggested changes with (Jorge) and then Nick Wenban-Smith had made some comments on.

If we went with that version I just wanted to be clear that we would not need Paragraph 2. So it would only be Alternate 1 and then jump - and skip past Paragraph 2 and go into Paragraphs I think 3 and 4 which we can't see on the screen right now.

I believe same thing would be true -- although I'll let Kavouss speak -- but I think the thing that's on the screen now labeled as Alternative 2.1 which is suggested by Kavouss, I think that would also be a lightweight version that would not necessitate having Paragraph 2 in there. But we can let Kavouss speak on that issue.

But in Alternative 2.1, the version that Kavouss has suggested, you'll notice that I've made a suggestion on deleting the language that he has on there which says "to be proposed to chartering organizations ALAC, ccNSO, GAC,

and GNSO," simply - well, for the two reasons we discussed in the problem statement that that's more to the decision-making as opposed to scope.

And the second reason is that it wasn't chartered by other organizations. It was only chartered by the GNSO. So for those two reasons, I think what we should do is discuss number one whether we want the lighter version which is either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.1.

And if we're all good with the lighter version, we can actually skip Paragraph 2, cut that out completely, and go to Paragraphs 3 and 4. Thanks.

Annabeth Lange: So Jeff, just to clarify, then what's the first Paragraph 1 would then also go out. So we go directly to Alternate 1 or Alternate 2.1. Is that right?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Yes, this is Jeff Neuman. It seems like most of the discussion on the e-mail list have focused now away from what's labeled Paragraph 1 and is now more focused on Alternatives 1 and 2 now. And if we go with one of those versions, then clarify it was not…

Annabeth Lange: We then skip 2 and go to 3 and 4.

Jeff Neuman: Correct. Thanks.

Annabeth Lange: Yes. Thank you. Any comments from anyone here? More hands? We have a question from (Unintelligible) that are we also considering subdivisions in (ISO 31661) list? Annabeth here. I think that we have to discuss later on what will be geographical names. And this is under that discussion if I am not mistaken. Any comments to that? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I was commenting on Jeff's original proposal. I strongly support omitting Paragraph 2 and using one of the lightweight versions. And I have a slight favor for Alternate 1 as opposed to 2.1 because it is less prescriptive.

It includes the options I believe that are explicitly mentioned in 2.1 implying the potential for consent but doesn't necessarily focus on them, which I think gives us a more clean ground to do the work with. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Alan. That sounds like a good idea actually. If it's too specific then it's easily to forget something. If it's more lightweight it opens up for more discussions in my view.

So more hands up here or should we just carry on? Seems like it's no one there so we go on. So Emily could you scroll down? There's a hand. Paul McGrady, please go ahead.

Paul McGrady: Thanks. Paul McGrady here.

Annabeth Lange: Paul?

Paul McGrady: So before I scroll down I guess - hi there. Can you hear me?

Greg Shatan: Yes we can.

Annabeth Lange: Yes we can hear you.

Paul McGrady: Okay great. Before we scroll down, can staff scroll back up please? I guess I'm trying to understand was a decision made on this or was it just input taken? And if a decision was made, what was the decision?

So for example in Paragraph 1 are we keeping in the alternative approval language in red, "approval and…"? I hope we're not. And did we decide between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, Alternative 2.1? Did we decide anything or did we just talk about it? If we just talked about it, fine. We can take it back up on the list again or in the next call. But if we decided something, I sure would like to know what it was. Thanks.

Annabeth Lange: Annabeth here again. Thank you Paul. What we considered this discussion is the first reading. So it's not decision per se. But Jeff can you comment on that?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks Annabeth. This is Jeff Neuman. And (unintelligible).

Annabeth Lange: Jeff, you have your hand up?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. I notice we're having a little bit of problems with Adobe and delay with Annabeth's connection. So we should try to fix that the next time. But yes, so Paul this is a discussion. We have - this is the first reading as Annabeth said.

We'll do a second reading and decision - hopefully decision-making on the next call. But it would be good to hear from those on the e-mail list -- and here if they want -- whether Alternative 1, Alternative 2.1 work and if that's the - or if there's objections to those. And if that's the case then we can skip out Paragraph 2. I think that's what we're trying to collect comment on for now. Thanks.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Jeff. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I suggest that as Jeff mentioned we maintain the two alternatives, Alternative 1 and 2.1, and reflect on that and perhaps come back to that to see whether we could agree on that or not because I tried to avoid those hard (roads) that people have difficulty (unintelligible).

And I take the Alternative 1 some of the words into Alternative 2.1 in order to be more clear. But let us think it over. Let us sleep it over and come back at the next meeting if the (unintelligible) kindly agree to that. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Kavouss. Javier?

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Yes, hi. I just - I put my comment in the chat (unintelligible).

Annabeth Lange: Can you hear me Javier? Go ahead.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Thanks a lot. Yes, I put my comment in the chat.

Annabeth Lange: Okay, thank you.

Javier Rúa-Jovet: Just a note of it please.

Annabeth Lange: Okay. Then we will have it in writing so we will have a look. Shall we continue? Emily, can you scroll down a little? Just a few comments on three. So what will be kept if we have Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.1 and then goes to 3 and 4? So if you have some comments on these two that would be fine as well. Is there anything there? (Raoul) you have your hand up.

No? Hello? Can you hear me?

Christopher Wilkinson: (Unintelligible) I asked for the floor.

Annabeth Lange: I can't see you (Christopher). But to ahead, (unintelligible) on you (Christopher). Hello?

Christopher Wilkinson: Christopher Wilkinson for the record. The meeting is proceeding with great, great difficulty. I don't want to comment further on that either from the point of the view of the co-chairs or from the point of view of the staff that there is a problem that has to be resolved for the next meeting.

Regarding the substance I think we should be clear that if we go for a light of the terms of reference and I have understood the arguments that have been put forward in that favor in order to get a decision so that the work can continue, there is no question of that decision of including or excluding any particular specific of geo - category of geo names. I've seen on the list

proposals which would try to exclude certain categories of geo names. And all I can say at this stage is that some of those proposals would guarantee the failure of this project though I ask for first of all procedural simplification but not a substantial simplification and secondly a degree of yes, political realism on the part of some of our correspondence. Thank you Annabeth.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Christopher. It's duly noted. There's two more hands up there. It's (Aruli Gusan). Can you hear me? I just see your hand but I can't see you - anything. Okay then Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I put an alternative...

Annabeth Lange: Go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...version for three I'll put in the chat. Will you kindly look at that one? But I would replace the (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...with could also and then if appropriate. I don't want to bind - bound ourselves to what was (unintelligible). Then you say when, when is a deterministic word. That means you must take that into account. I think it could take it is appropriate. I propose a change and put it into chat. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Okay. We'll have a look at it. So then it's number four some yellowing there. That - anything there we should discuss? I think that is your comments Kavouss. What does it mean? I suggest that it should be deleted. Is that right? You writing this?

Kavouss Arasteh: No I said that it says of will take (cognizant). I says that could also. Take out the (unintelligible) is appropriate. This is a difference between the...

Annabeth Lange: Yes but that is in Number 3.

Kavouss Arasteh: I'm talking about Number 3. Am I wrong?

Annabeth Lange: Yes.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes which number are you talking...

((Crosstalk))

Annabeth Lange: No, no that's right. It's Number 3.

Kavouss Arasteh: Okay Number 3 I have...

Annabeth Lange: I think you have a comment on Number 4 as well.

Kavouss Arasteh: Wait a minute. I will come to Number 4 because I cannot follow-up with (unintelligible). Yes I have the comment. I don't...

Annabeth Lange: And do...

Kavouss Arasteh: ...understand the meaning. What does it mean that why you brought that? We don't need that. We don't talk about that at (unintelligible). Or we take this outside at (unintelligible). You take on at a later stage. So I have two positions, either delete the (unintelligible) or reword it, put something at this stage at the end that not totally exclude that. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Kavouss. Yes?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. I just wanted to explain why - what that paragraph is supposed to mean and of course we can always work on

wording if we don't think it's clear. But basically that wording was to specifically avoid discussions of what came up in I think it was Johannesburg which is attempting to define what is a gTLD versus what is a ccTLD and which supporting organization or which advisory committee had jurisdiction over the policies of those types of domains.

So the - what it means is that we're not going to be discussing those issues. The reason it was put into this section was because we wanted to make it very clear upfront that we'll stop any discussions that take place that attempt to redefine or clarify what is a gTLD or ccTLD and really focus on the substantive issues of geographic names. That was what it means. Thanks.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Jeff. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes but I think that we don't need to go back what who (unintelligible) in Johannesburg. We are at this end of stage of the workings. We don't need to mention that. If somebody brought any issue about that we could re-discuss that and put it at this stage. We don't need that.

So I suggest that we delete that. You have difficulty with that because it may have some unintended consequences. It is not necessary. It is better to be silent. Thank you.

Man: And I will introduce (Matthew Kane). And (Matthew Kane) is (unintelligible) important (unintelligible).

Annabeth Lange: Alan? Alan you have your hand up?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you very much. I have a question for Jeff and I ask it with some trepidation and fear. But if we in our process decide that .canada is a valid TLD and we determine a process by which it could be allocated do we then have to go back and decide whether it is a ccTLD or gTLD? That's a question for Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Annabeth I don't know...

Annabeth Lange: This is for Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks. Yes Annabeth you weigh in first and then I'll jump in.

Annabeth Lange: Yes okay. And actually I think that that's not what we are discussing here because we are discussing the policy for new gTLD whether or not a geographical name should be a ccTLD. A ccTLD is a ccTLD and that's a two-letter code but it might have great impact on countries even if it's a gTLD. And that's what we are discussing, what to do with it in my view. So I think that discussing whether it should be one thing or the other if outside were (remit) but I might be wrong. Any comments on that from others?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I hope you're wrong but what Jeff said sort of led me to believe that if we can't discuss it here then when do we discuss it or does some - when does someone discuss it?

Annabeth Lange: Yes okay. (Martin) do you have comments on that or something else?

(Martin):   Hi Annabeth. It's for something else. It's going back to Kavouss' comment regarding scope including something that is suggested out of scope. So I just want to mention that I don't see any reason why if there has been previous comments about areas that do not need to be explored and should therefore be avoided, I don't see any harm in actually quoting that in a terms of reference so that it's very clear from the outset and particularly for those that may come into the membership of the worktrack at a later date they've got a clear understanding of where it's coming from. Thanks.

Annabeth Lange: I agree. Thank you (Martin). Greg?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan for the record. I think, you know, first off it's outside this group's remit if we were to reopen the definition of ccTLD. I think Annabeth your statement of kind of our scope and remit and they kind of settled matter on which we base our discussions makes sense. I don't know if we need to essentially notice that we acknowledge the current definition of ccTLD as a two-letter code based on ISO-3166 and move on from there. It seems that some people want to discuss that here. This is not the place to discuss it. And I for one think that is a settled issue until someone unsettles it somewhere else which I would think would be a very, very radical move.

Lately I think we need to avoid mission creep. And I think stating where - what is beyond the bounds of the mission is important. It's certainly will aid the leaders of this worktrack to be able to site for the scope both in positive and negative terms. Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Greg, Annabeth here again. I totally agree with you. Actually it's like when you are a lawyer you always, always set a kind of a (unintelligible) for what you're not discussing to - just to avoid the mission creep. So Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I'm very...

Annabeth Lange: (Unintelligible) again?

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I'm very sorry I am not lawyers but I have some (dual) background. I suggest a text which is in the chat that's saying that could be considered out of the scope of (tech) this at - at this stage that we do not close the door totally as Alan mentioned. We may come back to that if required. So this is something we can (include). Thank you.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Kavouss. That's duly noted. Okay then no more hands so should we scroll longer? (Emily)? Then we're coming to the deliverables and reporting. And we haven't had as many comments on that but there's been some. So and some of those are from you Kavouss so your hand...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

Annabeth Lange: ...is there so perhaps you can explain?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I can explain that. This is a difficulty that I have that also (Olga) mentioned this definition or term of consensus. It is about 2-1/2 years we have difficulty with that. We tried some way in ICG but we did not succeed in CCWG because in CCWG consensus we used the roles of those people attending the meeting as I have mentioned.

There are many, many other people that they don't have that possibility due to various reasons to attend that. Therefore we need to establish another procedure what the consensus means. And I have difficulty with draft consensus, small minority, big minority and so on so forth. In jurisdiction we have suffered a lot that our views were considered a simple number of minority because we were dominated by the majority of those people most of them from one country and so on so forth and we have lost the battle totally. We left with almost nothing some (fury).

So this time we would like to have equal footing. There are CC. There are ALAC ccNSO, GNSO and GAC. We should have equal footing. So we should establish a procedure how to decide and also we should establish procedure how the chair is tasked to resolve the problem of minority to bring their views to allow them to access themselves and not to try to have some sort of repressions that their voice be shut down inappropriately. This is something very, very important. We are dealing with a very critical situation geo traffic names.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: We must have something. Thank you. Thanks very much...

Annabeth Lange: Yes Kavouss thank you so much but you know that - some of this will be when the discussion comes to then discussion procedures when we're talking about consensus and these things. So we'll come back to it. So just...

Jeff Neuman: Yes just thanks. This is Jeff Neuman.

Annabeth Lange: I can't see you (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Annabeth Lange: Where are you Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Hello, Christopher Wilkinson for the record.

Annabeth Lange: Christopher you're talking?

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes just a gloss on Kavouss' comment. The conclusion of the Jurisdiction Group's work was in effect to reject the concept of a minority report and the most of accent the reports which were different from the majority report would be dissenting reports. And we have on record so in the Jurisdiction Group dissenting reports. I strongly recommend that as a minimum position vis-à-vis the problem which Kavouss has described there's minimum position we should reject the word minority. We're talking about of the least dissenting report. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Annabeth Lange: Thank you Christopher. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Just doing - it's Jeff Neuman just doing a quick time check. It's the top of the hour. What I recommend is two things. Number one is that Kavouss we're going to take your comments related to decision-making and put them into the decision-making sections. So we'll do that and that for discussion on the email list.

Number two is to just say when we get to decision-making this is going to be as the GNSO rules currently state for now there are bigger issues than that as (Olga) alluded to earlier. If the GAC is working on a response to that let's have it come in through that as opposed to, you know, the objection.

We noted it. It's in the record and I think we do need to end this call just simply because we're at the top of the hour. Let's continue the discussion on the list and Annabeth I'll turn it back to you to end the call if we could.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you so much Jeff and I'm sorry that we didn't come any further than we did. Greg has still his hand up but could you please put it in the chat Greg? We have to stop now. This discussion shows that sometimes we might have 90 minutes because we don't get so far. But please send in your comments again on the mailing list or in the - in terms of in the Google document if you can do that and we will discuss more next time on the 20th. It's some problems with the audio calls and the sound is not so good but I we've had some good things done today. So thank you everybody for attending and have a nice day or afternoon or evening or night or wherever you are. Talk to you next time.

Woman 1:   Thank you everyone. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Operator (Chris) please stop all recording.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman 1:   Everyone else please remember to have a wondering rest of your day. Bye.

END