

---

**ICANN Transcription**  
**GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Work Track 5 (Geographic Names at the top-level)**  
**Wednesday, 25 September 2019 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/hoTkBg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

JULIE BISLAND:

Alright. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub-Team Track 5 Geographic Names at the Top Level call on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room, and if you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now?

Hearing no 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. With this, I will turn it back over to Olga Cavalli. You can begin, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Good afternoon from my spring afternoon here in Buenos Aires, and thank you for joining us in this Work Track 5 call today. We have sent an agenda and some documents, but

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

before starting let me know if there are any Statement of Interest updates.

I see no hands up and no comments in the chat. Okay, let's start with this call, which is mainly about process, the process to completion of our Work Track 5 work, which is a long way up to now. You may recall that you have received by e-mail some documents that I will review in a moment. It's important that you acknowledge these documents, because we would be expecting feedback from you during the next days. I will show you in a minute a timeline that we are proposing, a work plan that we're proposing.

If you're so kind to go to the next slide, please? As I said a moment ago, we are in this call mainly focusing about the process for completion of our Work Track 5 work. These items we'll share with the agenda. You received this some days ago, so it's important that you know that you have these documents. If you don't have them and you need them to be resent, please let us know. Send an e-mail to our e-mail list. We have shared with you a proposed work plan, which is a table that I will review with you in a moment, with several dates. It's a kind of tight work plan, it's for the next month. It's important that you acknowledge all of these dates. We will review them in a moment.

Also, you received another document. I have printed it here just to have it at hand. It's the draft outline of the Work Track 5 report, the full working group. It's not the full report, but it's an outline where you can see some parts that will be filled after this call, and some other parts that have been selected. It's important that we acknowledge the content of this document, and the rationale of the recommendations. We have considered with the leadership team,

---

and thanks to my co-leads for joining this call today. We have carefully considered the discussions that have been taking place during the Work Track 5 meetings. As you know, there are divergent views, there are different views for the same issues, and mailing list contributions and straw poll conducted this month. With all this input, and drawing on these materials, the leadership team has prepared a set of draft recommendations.

It's important that you acknowledge the difficulties that we had. The co-leads believe that these recommendations are ultimately a final product that the Work Track can accept. The co-leaders do not believe that there is sufficient support with the Work Track for additional recommendations that go beyond what is drafted. Some may disagree with some parts of it, and some others don't, but it has been a long process and this is what we have achieved so far.

It's important that you review this document and you send us feedback on these items to the mailing list, no later than Monday, 30 September, which is next Monday. It's a short time, but it's not a long document to review. Of course, you may have in mind all the different ideas and discussions that we had in our Work Track 5 work, but let us know if you have any feedback up to Monday, 30 September, which is next Monday.

At this stage, we are not seeking additional sustainable debate. Just provide comments if you are unable to live with what is being presented. We are not going to debate again all the issues that we have debated for months, or maybe years. Someone has a mic open. If you can close it, because the noise ... Oh, thank you so much. It made me difficult to hear what I say. This is the situation. We have this draft Recommendations document. Please review it.

---

If you didn't receive it, let us know. We will review, now, the process for completion of our work.

There's a comment from Paul. He says, "Olga, to be clear, the only document that needs to be reviewed is the document titled, 'Work Plan, Outline, and Draft Recommendations: Work Track 5 Report.'" Yes, this is correct. You should have received the document. It's a table that we will review in a moment, and then there is an outline of the document and then draft text. It's a five-page document, okay? It's good that you asked that, so we are all on the same page.

I don't know if there are other comments in the ... "Can we have the documents put into a link?" I think it's already shared, so those are the documents.

Let's go to the next slide, please. This is the work plan. 30 September is the deadline for providing feedback on draft recommendations and rationale about the document that we have shared some days ago. Not a very long timeline, but it's not a long document to review.

2 October, which, if I am not mistaken, is a Wednesday meeting, we have a meeting to discuss resolution of any items raised on the list, if needed.

7 October, which is Monday, if I'm not mistaken, the draft report will be shared with the Work Track members, and the members will have one week to review and raise any specific concerns about the content on the mailing list. As you can see, we have several iterations of comments, possibility of comment.

---

After 7 October, which is a Monday, then 14 October, which is a week after, is the deadline to provide any feedback and report.

16 October, which is two days after, a meeting to discuss resolution of any items raised on the list, if needed, and to discuss consensus call process. I will go into that in a moment.

18 October, revised report sent to the Work Track.

21 October, final deadline for review and comments.

23 October, final version of report sent to Work Track.

24-28 October, Work Track 5 consensus call on report to full working group. I will go into detail about what does it mean, a Work Track 5 consensus call.

Do we have any doubt, comments, questions, up to now?

Katrin is asking, "How are we supposed to provide feedback until the September 30 deadline?" Let me check. "B and E are missing. At least the document presents only answers to C and D." We are supposed to provide feedback by e-mail until 30 September, and I will defer to my staff colleagues to let us know which parts of the document are missing, and when they will be available.

Emily says, "Hi, Katrin, this is the deadline to provide feedback on the recommendations and rationale, just those two sections. The remaining sections will follow." Okay, Katrin?

Any other questions or comments up to now? It's important that we understand what we have to review and the deadlines for each part.

---

I saw a hand up, let me check. Martin, your hand is up and the floor is yours. Welcome.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Hi, Olga. Thank you. I just thought I'd make sure that it was understood. I think it has been covered in the chat, but just to be clear. So the deadline for 30 September is, as stated here, just to focus in on the draft recommendations and rationale. Some of the other ... sections, largely from information that we've prepared previously in other reports, plus summaries of discussions. Those will then feed into the draft report, so that's what's highlighted for 7 October. Then, that gives opportunities for feedback on all of the remaining elements of the report. For now, the key element is related to the draft recommendations, the rationale to support that. That's what we want your feedback on, and if you have strong objections to that then please make sure that we're aware of those by 30 September. We'll be reviewing those feedback comments ahead of our next call. I hope that helps. Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Martin. If you have the document at hand, it's a section called C and D, named C, "What recommendations and/or implementation guidelines does Work Track 5 submit to the full Working Group for consideration?" and D is, "What is the rationale for recommendations and/or implementation guidelines?" It's not very long, it's a three-page document in two parts. As Martin said, the other parts will be completed after we've received your comments about these two sections, C and D.

---

Let's see if we have other comments. Vrikson Acosta, "Hello, sorry to be late, just left another meeting." Okay, welcome, Vrikson. More comments, questions? Okay. This is the proposed work plan that is included in the document that we have received. If there are no further questions or comments in the chat? No? No hands up. Hands up? No.

Let's go to the next slide, which is the process about the consensus call within Work Track 5, which is an overview of that part of the process. Once the Work Track has had an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the report and the text has been finalized, the leadership team proposed having a consensus call within Work Track 5 to ensure that there is sufficient support for the content of the report as a whole, before it is submitted to the full working group.

The consensus call will follow the process outline in Section 3.6 of the GNSO Working Group guidelines, and the Work Track terms of reference. The consensus call will take place on the Work Track 5 mailing list, to ensure that all Work Track members have the opportunity to fully participate in this process.

Let's see, we have some comments in the chat. There is a link to the terms of reference, thank you for that, and no other information. This is about the consensus call, and ... No hands up? No.

Let's go to the next slide, please, then we have more details about this process. This is about the level of consensus. There are two slides about explaining the level of consensus, which is important that we all have in mind.

---

The Work Track leads were collectively responsible for designating the level of consensus. Definitions below are quoted from the Work Track guidelines. There, in the chat, you have the link to the GNSO Working Group guidelines, if you want the full reference.

I will describe these different levels of consensus. Full consensus, when no one in the group speaks against the recommendations in its last meetings. This is also sometimes referred to as unanimous consensus. The second bullet is consensus, a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. The third bullet, strong support but significant opposition, a position where, while most of the group supports the recommendation, there's a significant number of those who do not support it. Divergence, also referred to as no consensus. It's a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes, this is due to irrecons ... Oh, that's very difficult for me. Irreconcilable? Is that okay? Irreconcilable, I hope I said it right, differences of opinion, and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one had a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that this is worth listing the issue in the report, nonetheless.

In the chat, you also have a reference of the section where you can find this text. These are four different levels of consensus. This goes to the fifth one, which is a minority view, refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a consensus, strong support but significant opposition and no consensus. It can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.



---

In cases of consensus, strong support but significant opposition, and no consensus, an effort should be made to document defiance and viewpoint, and to present any minority view recommendations that may have been made. Documentation of minority view recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponents. In all cases of divergence, the working group Chair should encourage the submission of minority viewpoints.

You have the full text of these GNSO Working Group guidelines in the chat, and I think this is all about process, about the minority views. Let's go to the next one. Do we have any comments?

MARTIN SUTTON: Olga?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just before you do ...

MARTIN SUTTON: Sorry, Cheryl's got her hand up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Cheryl? Sorry, I didn't see it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's alright. Thank you very much. I just want to jump in with my full PDP co-Chair hat on, and just remind everybody on this call, and for the record, that what the leadership team from Work Track

---

5 has just gone through is indeed the criteria and referencing and terminology that we will be using, Jeff and I will be using, for the full work PDP consensus establishment. We would welcome any such characterization, or the degree or lack thereof, of consensus or lack thereof, to come out of Work Track 5, based on the leadership team's opinions. If you can do that, that's great, but it is not a requirement. You only need to make a consensus call and establish whether you have consensus to whatever degree, or not. If you don't, well, that's okay, too.

We will be using that criteria very strictly in the full working group outcomes. If you can utilize those criteria in the Work Track, it does bring continuity and understanding to the process, particularly because we have many people in Work Track 5 which are very unfamiliar with the workings of the GNSO policy development process, and of course may come from parts of ICANN where the very definition of consensus is different from these. Important information, please make sure you understand it.

However, your reporting and proposed recommendations, or lack thereof, need to come to the full work group regardless of whatever degree of agreement, or otherwise, you come to. Thanks a lot.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, for reminding us of the frame in which we are doing our work. Any other comments or questions from colleagues, or my dear co-leads want to add something to what Cheryl said? Important ... What Cheryl said is that this is a group that is formed with members of different parts of the community, different stakeholders, SOs and ACs. Each group has its different

---

rules, so the rules of the GNSO apply at this time. No comments in the chat.

Let's go to the next slide, which explains about the minority views. There are two slides about the minority views, and then we will open the floor to your comments, questions, about this process. No hands up. Okay, minority views. In addition to containing recommendations, the Work Track report to the full working group will document proposals discussed over the last several months that the co-leads determined would not be able to achieve consensus report in the Work Track.

After the Work Track has held a consensus call of the report and sent it to the full working group with the process that I just described, the full working group will consider the Work Track's recommendations, and hold a consensus call of its own. When the full working group publishes its final report containing recommendations that the full working group has agreed to support through the consensus process, there will be an additional opportunity to document minority views.

Finally, if you disagree with the recommendations that are ultimately put forward by the working group, you will be able to put your position in a minority statement, which will be appended to the working group's final report. As you can see, there are several different options that colleagues that have different opinions may have a chance to make them be included in the final document.

We have a final slide, number nine, about the consensus call within the Work Track 5 process. The main steps of the consensus calls are: after the group has discussed an issue long enough for all

---

issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Work Track leads make an evaluation of the designation, and publish it for the group to review. After the group has discussed the Work Track leads' estimation of designation, the leads should evaluate and publish an update evaluation.

Steps one and two, or (i) and (ii), should continue until the Work Track leads make an evaluation that is accepted by the group. This is the process for the consensus call, and all the process that I have described, as Cheryl said, fits into the GNSO Working Group guidelines that you have the reference in the chat. I will open the floor, now, for comments, questions from colleagues. I don't know if my dear co-leads want to add something to what I said, or Cheryl, maybe, further explanation about the full process of the other Work Tracks? I see no hands up. Any other comments, maybe from my co-leads?

Annebeth says, "Nothing to add, Olga, you have covered the process well." Javier says, "No comments from me." Gracias, Javier. Hands up?

Okay, I will ask my dear colleagues from staff if we can review, again, the dates, so we are all on the same page and have this in mind? Thank you very much.

Next Monday, please send us comments about the document that you received, especially the parts named ... Let me check the document. The parts named C, "What recommendations and/or implementation guidelines does Work Track 5 submit to the full working group for consideration?" and section D, "What is the rationale for recommendations and/or implementation guidelines?"

---

The rest of the document will be filled up soon. Have that in mind until Monday. Send those comments to the Work Track 5 list.

Then, 2 October, meeting to discuss resolution of any items raised if needed.

7 October, draft report shared with Work Track. Members have one week to review.

And then 14 October, one week after deadline, to provide feedback on the report. I see a hand up from Paul. Let me check the dates, and I will go to you, Paul.

16, meeting to discuss resolution of any items raised on list, if needed, and to discuss consensus call process.

18 October, revised report sent to Work Track.

21 October, final deadline for review and comments.

23 October, final revision of report sent to Work Track, and then finally 24-28 October, Work Track 5 consensus call on report to full working group with the process that I have just described.

I have a hand up from Paul. Paul, the floor is yours, and welcome.

PAUL MCGRADY:

Thank you, Olga. I apologize for asking a bunch of silly questions tonight, but it's late where I happen to be at this evening. In terms of the comments that you're looking for from back from this Work Track group by Monday, just to clarify, you're not looking for us to write any of these sections that are still missing, or anything like

---

that? You're just asking, essentially, for us to put comments on the document as-is, correct?

I want to make sure that I understand the scope of what we're asking for, and that if we don't provide giant, detailed comments on each of these, that we're not missing some opportunity. If you could go into that just a smidge more, what should our comments be on Monday? Not the substance of them, but what's the level of comments you're looking for? What do you want us to comment on? Is it the document as it exists now, or are you looking for the team to help fill in some of the blanks? Thanks.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Well, that's a very good question. I have no idea what you can comment. We would all love to have a perfect document that everyone is very happy with, but we know that this happens only in some movies.

Annebeth says, "No substantial comments on the content. The document as it exists, as I have understood it." Yes, me too. If any of you find a part of it that you really think that it's not acceptable, and you cannot live with it, it's the time to comment. We are not looking for, again, opening the things that we have been discussing for almost two years.

I see Julie says, "Wrong info." I don't know what Julie is referring to. And I don't know if Martin or Javier wants to add something to what I commented on. Martin, the floor is yours. Go ahead.

---

MARTIN SUTTON:

Hi, Olga. I was just going to say, I think that's covered very well, and it's a good question, Paul. Just to clarify, it was included in the note that was sent out, so it's really looking at the set of recommendations that are included in there, and really ask, is that something that you can live with as a participant on Work Track 5, after the two years of deliberations that we've had, all of the comments that we've had in from public comment periods, and subsequent discussions on our calls after that?

We've included a rationale. We haven't included the rest of the document yet, because a lot of that is copying in a lot of text that would hide some of these important elements. These are the ones that we really want you to focus on this week, and if there's strong objections to that content, or any suggestions as to how it may be improved, if you think it's not articulated effectively, and could be improved in some form, that would be welcome, I'm sure, as well. Essentially, it is more or less along the lines of, "Is this something that you can accept as the output from Work Track 5 deliberations?" I hope that's helpful.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Martin. Julie has just copy-pasted the text, that may help you, from the agenda. "Note, at this stage, the co-leaders are not seeking additional substantive debate. Please, only provide comments if you are unable to live with what is being presented."

"Agree," from Annebeth.

Any other comments, questions, reactions?

---

I would like to make sure that you all have these documents, which are important, that you have received them. In the case that you haven't, send an e-mail to the Work Track 5 list, or the GAC staff, and we will be happy to send them back to you. It's not a long document to review, it's quite short and concise. The expectation is that this new report is shorter, more concise than the other documents that we have been working with.

Julie, thank you. She says that we'll also resend them with today's action notes. That's very helpful, thank you for that, Julie. Any other comments? Other comments from my dear co-leads? No hands up, no other comments in the chat.

Okay, Martin says, "No for me," and "No," Annebeth.

Okay. This was a short call, quite easy. Thank you for that. Please look at the document, send your comments, send your feedback, if any, and let's follow this proposed work plan that we have on the screen. Let's go towards finalizing our work in the Work Track. There is the link again. Thank you all very much for your attention, and for being such a good and quiet audience today. Thank you very much all, and have a good morning, evening, afternoon, night. Bye-bye.

JULIE BISLAND: Thank you, Olga. Alright, well, this meeting's adjourned. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.



**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**