

TRANSCRIPT

Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories

15 October 2012

Attendees:

Jaap Akkerhuis, Specialist
Martin Boyle, .uk
Joke Breaken, .eu
Becky Burr, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Henry Chan, .hk
Chris Chaplow, CBUC (Observer)
Keith Davidson, .nz
Eduardo Diaz, NARALO
Heather Forrest, IPC
Sokol Haxhiu, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Maureen Hilyard, PICISOC
Hiro Hotta, .jp
Annebeth Lange, .no
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO (Liaison)
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Josh Rowe, .au
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Cintra Sooknanan, ALAC
Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Baher Esmat
Gabiella Schitteck

Apologies: Elise Lindeberg, Norway

Unidentified Participant: Meeting of the Country and Territory Names Study Group. Gabi, do we have remote participants? Nope. Good. And do we have any apologies or other notes?

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible).

: Don't we all?

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) government believed that they had a high level group meeting today in the GSC so she didn't dare to leave.

Unidentified Participant: Actually Paul, more seriously, could I apologize. I have to leave at three. As do a number of others so I shall, as I tend to do, speak quickly and hopefully we can get through a lot of what we've got to cover today. There isn't that much actually. So I'll start with an apology because we've been, for the most part, in hibernation mode between Prague and this meeting. Put that down to a number of reasons. My domestic workload commitment, Peter's smiling at Cheryl. But most notably, the summer vacation in Europe and then leading into us sitting and waiting for responses to come back as part of the UNESCO survey which has been in circulation since late July, early August and I'll get into the detail of that shortly but responses are only coming in slowly.

I sent around to everyone yesterday and obviously I don't expect you to have analyzed it yet, but the raw data that's coming back from UNESCO. And the reason I did it that way is because any attempts I make to summarize it, I may well miss something of significance and it will probably be best for everyone, that is if they're so inclined, to have a look at the feedback that's coming back.

We'll also just quickly touch on our final report as we're getting towards the end of our working timeframe and we should start thinking about end game.

So again, I think I'll basically give them the status update that we're heading to the end of our work. Slow progress on the survey. Technically, we're supposed to wrap up by about the end of 2012. The rather rubbery deadline for our work was before the second round of new GTLDs. While I'm confident we could all go ahead and work now for the next three years and still meet that deadline, reasonably speaking, we were looking at the end of this year going into early next.

As I said the UNESCO survey is what we've really been waiting on because this was supposed to be evidentiary-based and some hard data that we actually get back that will give us some idea of what's out there. Are there any types of country and territory names we haven't thought of? Have we forgotten anything? What happens when you see the name of Armenia or Sweden or Finland in New Zealand's Maori language? Does that give rise to permutations or combinations nobody else thought of before? So this is where the data's useful.

We also had a little bit of a glitch which, putting it mildly, when the survey went out. Question seven, of, course was the one that referred to how would you, in your native language, in your official language; refer to the other countries and territories that are participating in the survey? It kind of, would have helped if the survey went with that list of countries attached.

That's since been revised and we've got some responses back in along those lines so we're proceeding well. And I've just been told by Bart that I should give the GAC a little bit of an update about that and I will tomorrow which will, essentially, just be a heads up, this survey's out there and then maybe members of your administration from a different portfolio that maybe contacting you about it or have already done so.

That was also attached to my email. That's the master list of all the countries that were approached and it's something that I'll reiterate to GAC because we didn't choose those. As you know, there was an absence of consultation within this group as to who we're going out to. And that's simply because it wasn't our decision to make. We did provide broad guidance to UNESCO saying we would like geographic diversity, linguistic diversity, script diversity and, if possible, a number of respondents who have multiple official languages.

There was a probably a little bit of administrative manipulation on UNESCO's part because they tried to factor in member states which they were confident they could get response -- acknowledging all of those above provisions, member states they were still confident they could get feedback from.

That said, three months later, the ones that are boldened and underlined, so five from Europe including North America, ironically enough, one from Latin America, one from Africa, three from the Middle East and North Africa, and two from the Asia-Pacific. So they're the ones that we've gotten back so far. So as you can see, whilst UNESCO staff are still trying and are still encouraging administrations to complete the survey, which after all is only ten questions, we're still running a bit short on data from that.

And, as I said, look (inaudible) in terms of low response rate. That's fine but we will need to close it off relatively soon given our deadlines. And my preliminary reading of it is that there aren't any clashes. Nobody's responded with something as we had in the case of new GTLDs, there were a few aha moments there where, for example, the three letter codes were applied for as, potentially, new generic TLDs but they actually turned out to be three letter country codes. Those issues aside, none of those seem to have arisen in response to the survey yet but what it does is highlight the complexity of the issue because, as I said, the list of names that were provided in Armenian or Arabic thanks to the response from Egypt or even in the Maori language as I said, that provides this really long list of names which is just raw data at this stage but it just serves to show how complicated the whole thing is.

I haven't yet, sort of, deliberated too much. UNESCO said that they would try to bundle up what comes back into some sort of meaningful summary and then I suspect this group would have to do bit of its own analysis but, at this stage, all I suggest that that would mean is looking through what's come back. And, unless somebody finds something in particular, I think the evidence gained from it would simply be yes, this is rather complicated and there's a long list of names and there are some permutations that we haven't come across before. And then we will just refer in our final report to the survey and leave some sort of aggregated results as an annex to our final report. But again, I encourage everyone to look through it. I'll keep you updated as to what comes back and, perhaps if we have a call in a month's time or three weeks' time, we might be able to delve into that in greater detail with everybody a bit better prepared.

At this point I just want to check, were there any questions about that survey process, in general, what we intend to do with it? Go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Hi, this is Heather Forrest. Just a quick question. Where some of the countries I noticed the difference in some of the answers -- some of the countries seemed to link back their response to either an official document or an unofficial document or something like this. Were counties asked to do that or was that voluntary on the part of those who did?

Paul Szyndler: I can't recall which meeting it was at. Probably Costa Rica where we went through the formulation of our ten questions in quite a great deal of detail and you'll note that many of them, we didn't ask for evidence for two or three letter codes. We pointed them to the ISO list. But in some of the other cases yes, we did ask for -- actually, in all the other cases which weren't tied to ISO, we said could you please refer to a document or your source (inaudible). Humorously enough, there were a couple that referred to Wikipedia as their source but, aside from that, that was an effort that was made at our request. And if they omitted to do that, they just felt that it was appropriate not to bother. But yes, they were certainly asked to do that in every case that they could.

That was really all I had on the survey. That's what's been holding us up for a few months and I'm conscious that, in order to, sort of, make some deadlines now, we need to move on while keeping in mind that we will finalize that shortly and see what comes of it.

And I also knocked together and set around a very brief outline of what I expect our final report to look like and wanted to discuss with the members of the group two particular issues that arise out of it. The draft outline itself is fairly straight forward given our charter and responsibilities, the final report will largely be based on that. So just the usual format of an executive summary and introduction which works through the scope of the working group and then getting into the deliverables that we were expected to provide.

So the first one is the overview of policies and procedures which we did so long ago, most people have probably forgotten. And that was Bart's good work and it will be included in a draft. That was just the cataloging of what our ICANN policies say about country and territory names. What it looks like in new GTLDs, IDNs-based or for CCTLDs. They're all a little bit different so we've just simply catalogued that and will expand upon that in the draft and will encourage everyone to have a look at it. There's nothing contentious or analytical. It's all pretty straight up statement of what current policies are. What I've encouraged most people to look at is whether Bart and I missed something. Whether we forgot. Whether there's somewhere in ICANN where they mentioned country and territory names that we haven't managed to catalog.

The second deliverable was to provide a comprehensive overview of the types of streams and the categories of streams associated with country territory names and, unfortunately, our scope says that a currently used or to be proposed to be used as TLDs. I spoke to Bart about this. Now when the study group was formed, we knew what was currently used and proposed to be used. We're just going to refer to the potential unlimited and unknown new GTLD space. Of course, now we've got a finite list of 1,900 which actually serves to narrow the focus and the scope of this group because the ones that are proposed are the lists that are on the table. Now Bart did say to me and, sorry he's not here because he's on another panel, but he did say well, the better wording at the time would be "potential" or "potentially new" which could be used as TLDs. That is, I'm reading out scopes not to have been limited to actually what is or what has been proposed within a finite list but we've got the luxury of being a study group so we can crystal ball those, we can extrapolate that out further and, in fact, I'd argue that we're not doing our job properly if we don't.

A lot of theoretical stuff we did, the ones we ran during Costa Rica with potential clashes and what example happens -- there were actual examples, like, with Russian Federation and how that would be treated given the (inaudible) and RDN, but we, sort of, expanded out into other examples just to simply help illustrate some of the points we might make.

And so the question I've got on the next slide was is anybody uncomfortable with that? Does anyone think that we might, sort of, face some accusations of mission creep or scope creep? Given that if we included in our final report I would contextualize this as look, this is the work that we did, this just serves as background, this is part of us being thorough as a study group. So we've postulated some examples, we've raised these only as ideas just to help illustrate some of the points that we're trying to make and, given that caveat, hopefully, unless we start hearing any objections, I'd like to include that. Because if we're really limited to what's current in RDNs and CCs and Gs and what's coming up in the first round of Gs when we're seriously limited about what we can cover and what we can't, does anyone have any concerns with that? Are you largely comfortable? (Inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: I think that's a good idea but I like the word "potentially" because if we say proposed, we kind of conclude a little too much just because we don't know the result when we are finished this work and if it is a working group afterwards, we don't know what the result will be. But it might be, potentially, in use and then have the current and what might be a result in the future, that would be a good idea in my view.

Paul Szyndler: Go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: I have a question concerning territories. In this survey we have only counties. Necessary to understand things. If possible to find out something about territories or just to say that it's impossible on this stage.

Paul Szyndler: My response to that would be we come against a definitional issue here. We intentionally used, and ICANN has used the (inaudible) country and territory for specific reasons, particularly because that translates to the GAC where the mantra of country and territories as recognized in international forum is very carefully crafted language. Yet that doesn't exist, for example, in the UNESCO family. It's member states or it's nothing. So, at this stage, I would be happiest just to explain this as part of our report so that we highlight the issue that ICANN uses this terminology because that's what we're used to and we denote that the UNESCO survey was necessarily limited to member states.

I think that some of the other theoretical examples we discussed, there were territories, and they will certainly come up in the final report. It's just that I will, yes, will draft something that highlights -- for the purposes of the UNESCO survey, it was necessarily limited to countries.

So look, again, I flagged that issue about proposed to be used as TLDs and could potentially be used as TLDs. I flagged that issue now because we've got stakeholders from the various groups here and from across the ICANN community and I would just encourage you to keep that in mind. And the rationale that we're using and will be putting in writing in the final report in case any of your respective stakeholders have comments or concerns about it. Because we acknowledge that it's at the fringes of our mission but I think, again, it's important to include because, if we don't, our work's not that meaningful.

The third deliverable which will be covered in the final report will be what we've been doing with some of the theoretical already so what happens when we mash the policies together with some of the country names that we've come up with and, again, that's something that we did at length in Costa Rica and Prague. We will include some of the examples that we came up with that actually happened. I don't know whether it will be relevant to raise those three letter codes like .and et cetera because I still don't know if they're the ones that got withdrawn or not. It was probably an "oops" moment but, I mean --

Unidentified Participant: Yes, they are because Curt did a presentation yesterday and listed all the withdrawn ones and they were included.

Paul Szyndler: Well, thank you for that, Chris, because I was obviously not at that presentation. So that's good to know but, again, they still served as good examples so, in my mind, the way that section of the report currently looks, it's not meant to be judgmental, it's not meant to say that there is a problem here and we're certainly not going to the point of saying ICANN must change its protections for country and territory names which is an important point to get across to the GAC because that's outside the scope of this group. We will just make a series of observations. So for example, with this country name and (inaudible) used this example before; it's Russian Federation in Cyrillic, ticks all the boxes within IDN except they can't have another one. So how would that then apply? So I think examples, an example-based report of ones that we've already used and any other suggestions that we may come up with will probably be the best way to explain to ICANN or to the community where there could potentially be some issues.

And that then comes to the final point which is -- I've marked as 3B because it was optional for this group to make recommendations or to recommend further work and we haven't really discussed and want everyone to start thinking about what the recommendations might look like. As Annebeth mentioned, it could certainly be, yes, there were some issues here and we suggest that a working group be established to look into them further. This is also all pending approval and endorsement by the CCNSO

Council. So ultimately, the Council will have a say, having convened this group and chartered this group, as to what they will do with our work.

It may, on the other hand, simply be a statement of values or observations and we then release that to the ICANN community and make it available for Board and Staff to be aware of as part of all future policy development or the review of new GTLDs Round Two, for example, to keep these issues in mind as you work through them.

All policies, largely, with the exception of CCs -- I mean, even in the IDN space there's flexibility review and revision of the policies as they apply there. So it could just end up being a summary document that we encourage everyone to keep in mind and refer to when dealing with policy reviews in all those spaces. I don't have a definite view on that. I don't know whether anybody here does, particularly at this stage, but again, over the next couple of months as we start accelerating our work, that's what I'd like people to keep in mind. What's our end game here? I think, at the very least, it will be a statement of work that's been delivered to the community but, beyond that, it may recommend a working group. I don't actually know that that working group would do right now. Is there enough drive, is there enough interest in this group to recommend that a working group be convened to look into those issues and see how they should be resolved if they need to be resolved? So I don't have an answer for that. Everybody's certainly welcome to chip in their comments now but I suspect that, more likely, we'd need to go away and percolate over that for a while to see whether there's -- what we'd like our final work to look for. Certainly, in the conference calls over the next couple of months, I'll start addressing that issue and raising that issue in greater detail but I encourage you all to either say something now or to keep considering it. Heather again.

Heather Forrest: What's our timeline in terms of how long will we wait for UNESCO? Because I think until we see that data, it's very hard to say what we might conclude about that which is then very hard to say about what we might recommend as a next step.

Paul Szyndler: Very good question. Initially UNESCO came to us and said we expect that end of September -- and this is getting back to early August, we expect that we should have a good number of results by the end of September. By the way, when is your ICANN meeting, your next one? And I said this -- and then highlighted that it wasn't necessary for them to have a final report or a summary or to close off the commentary period in time for this meeting. But it is still, at this stage, open-ended. So I will be meeting with Ungarda soon but, before we do that, Bart and I will have a chat about our timelines and, most importantly, the CCNSO Council's expectations of us. So that is, if they're quite happy for us to stretch into next year because, as I said, we didn't have a hard end date, but I will get the views or, for start, try and get the views of council first because there is the issue of finite resources within the CCNSO and I'm sure the other groups represented here and the desire is to wrap up study groups and working groups when they've served their purpose so we can devote resources elsewhere. And that being the case, there is some pressure to finish up. But I've always understood there was some flexibility that, for instance, we could go as far as Beijing, given that we now know new GTLDs Round Two is not going to happen any time soon and we'd only set this theoretical end date of this year in the best case scenario which is no longer relevant.

So before I can give you an answer on that, my undertaking will be definitely to discuss that with the Secretariat staff, try to get a feeling at Council, perhaps provide additional reporting to them about the reason why we may wish to go a little longer, and I will then take that to UNESCO and it will be a back and forward process as to what -- if we wait another two months, do we reasonably believe that they'll get a 90% response rate or are they finding it difficult already? And, once I've got that sort of import, then I will feed that back to the group. As it currently stands, end of this calendar year is an exceedingly optimistic deadline but, more realistically, it would be for final reporting in Beijing. So that's about what we're working to.

- Unidentified Participant: Has it been considered to send it to some other optional countries if they don't answer? Because this can be -- because some of the countries didn't deliver and would other countries be easier to reach?
- Paul Szyndler: Yes, that is something that UNESCO shared with us as we were developing the survey. Again, the methodology that they went through was entirely up to them with a little bit of guidance from us. And they said that they did have a list of, sort of, plan B countries. So again, that is now, given this is the deadline that they set in as friendly a way as possible, we will now go back to them and see who else that they've got on that list. The problem, of course, then is you then expand your timeframes another couple of months whilst you're engaging with another set of countries. But yes, it's a possibility. Cheryl?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Paul. If memory serves, we did discuss, and I think this is where you're coming from, doing certainly the group B but also using our own community networks to some extent in doing that and certainly the At Large Advisory Committee would have been one of those resources with their at-large structures. I think we're getting to the point in time where we've just got to damn well do that and I suggest that we could resolve at this meeting to just get on with that part of the job. But my follow-on question which I think we need to consider if we do that and I think we should, is how do we get that data integrated and analyzed?
- Paul Szyndler: I take it you're assuming we'll get a great volume of data back which will then be faced with who knows.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Plan and then be presently surprised.
- Paul Szyndler: Well, given Cheryl's suggestion which is a very good one, we're now getting to that time-point where there's not a lot of data coming back through the official channels. I would be quite happy to draft up a very short document much like we did the two-page status report in Prague which goes out to the community at large here. So with specific attention sent to the chairs of the various SOs and ACs. Certainly in the case of the GAC, it will help reinforce what I say to them verbally tomorrow which, basically, provides a couple of paragraph background on our work, noting that, as part of it, we've released this survey. These are the ten questions exactly in the way as they are -- that makes data integration easier -- with the correct representation of question 7, and would then encourage all of the SOs and ACs on an informal basis. We're not asking for a GNSO response or an ALAC response because that then creates a whole consultative process but encourage them to go out through their networks of members in the context that they may have, acknowledging that they have got particular expertise in these areas, would encourage anyone within their membership to contribute to the survey, will then leave the Secretariat, Bart and myself as contact details should they have any further questions. And then at this stage, that still gives them -- they're far more agile than UNESCO would be so that still gives us a good two months as a reasonable timeframe and I think we'd still work it out. So if there's any objections, I'm happy to resolve that here and put that to the group to see whether you're happy with that as a course of action.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd certainly support that but I think we need to make sure that we don't just -- we have to modify question 7. You can't refer to the list because there won't be one. So we either ditch it or not. Question 7 may just have to be a data set that's sacrificed.
- Paul Szyndler: I think we could compromise there. I would say the question could be made more open-ended. You simply talk about providing examples of either country and territory name. There's no reason why we can't share with them, for instance, as a starting point this list of 39 countries. For example, how in your language would you refer to the names of these countries and other examples as you see fit? That expands the data set a bit. I understand it can get a bit messy. But actually giving them this is probably quite a workable thing.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm comfortable with that, yes.

Paul Szyndler: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is that going to be then the GAC knows when the GAC rep leaves that they can report back to their government that this surveys is in their briefcase or somewhere in the virtual sense and it needs to be done before Christmas?

Paul Szyndler: Well, that it will be in their survey. It will be in their virtual briefcases and will need to be done, yes.

Unidentified Participant: Do you know why there is such a delay with responses for UNESCO survey? Maybe they do not give an answer.

Paul Szyndler: I believe it's entirely likely. The feedback that we got from UNESCO was that the survey, in comparison to the usual consultative mechanisms that they use, were very straight forward and simple. That the language was barely modified from what we discussed in draft and that they thought that it was quite understandable. They also felt that going out to this subset of countries, they would actually get a good response rate and the term 100% response rate was used a couple of times.

Now that's obviously turned out to be exceedingly optimistic but, that being the case, yes, I think it's quite likely that, after more than two months, having had this for more than two months, I understand why many of the Europeans may not have responded in July, August and into early September. But if it hasn't been addressed now, it may just be one that has slipped. But I will certainly be discussing that with UNESCO as well. Quite honestly, how do you think it's going? And is there a reasonable likelihood of you getting many more responses? Is it time to activate Plan B (inaudible)? I would strongly encourage them that it is and then notify them, as well, of what we're going to go do and consult within ICANN. But to be perfectly honest, I would be surprised if we suddenly had a much greater response rate than what we've already got because most of these came in quite early on. And it's slowed.

Unidentified Participant: Maybe they don't want to send answers.

Paul Szyndler: It is entirely National Administration's prerogative. It could just be, simply, a function of bureaucracy that the correct person was not able to be identified within a national administration. It may be that it is incredibly bureaucratic and that they're actually going through -- we don't know whether they're going through a process of domestic consultation. Some stakeholders responded -- we had a question, was civil society consulted and, in a number of cases, they said no simply because they didn't need to be. We knew all their answers. Because, again, it wasn't largely -- it was pretty objective in most cases. But that in some cases they may be going through the full process of somebody's delegated the responsibility. They provide a response. They then consult with stakeholders. Back and forth. And it takes three or four months to do. But again, I will get more briefing from UNESCO as to the feeling, the sense that they're getting there and be able to report back.

Basically, it would be foolish of us to sit and wait any longer than we have is essentially what I'm saying. I don't think we'll get many more. And it's quite likely if they choose not to respond, that's their prerogative. Heather, had a question?

Heather Forrest: Just quickly, two things. One is just an awareness -- we should all be aware by opening this up, even just by alerting the GAC that we get duplicative conflicting responses. That's the nature, you pointed out yourself, Paul, that there are different government departments that deal with these things and we might then get -- this is of course the problem that's appearing in GTLDs with this notion of relevant governments and who is a relevant government for the purpose of GTLD application. So we need to be aware of that and perhaps all have our diplomatic hats on as to how we deal with that.

And number two is the point about methodology. I think that's a very important aspect of our report. It seems that we can get -- and hopefully UNESCO is willing -- a contribution from UNESCO to clearly explain their own methodology. At this point I think we referred to it as UNESCO has their methodology. We will need to capture that in our report and to the extent that we open this up, as Cheryl has suggested, to our own networks. That in of itself subjects us to scrutiny so far we're only a handful of people here and, really, then it starts to take on the look of a club that went to its friends and not to others. So I think, before we open that up, I'm not suggesting we shouldn't do, we need to have it very clear amongst ourselves as to what we're doing and how we plan to articulate that. Let's then follow through with that articulation.

Paul Szyndler:

And I won't respond to that in great length at the moment but, again, it gets back to something I said before about the luxury of us being a study group in as much as we're not doing our job properly if we aren't expansive in our consultations and our thinking and this is why we've got such a broad scope. And, therefore, we can manage inconsistencies in data that's received in a more flexible way than anyone could with anything associated with the new GTLD process where everything is very black and white -- black or white.

And within our case I expect all that we would find is, probably, not necessarily conflicting responses but more expansive responses. We may have got something back from government that was very brief that may not have necessarily taken -- may not have necessarily acknowledged minority or native languages, for example. Now if some of the responses we got back have, but that just may not be included in the government response and, provided that we attribute everything that we refer to in the final report, so again, if we get a flood of data, there's no reason to refer to all of it in the final report. It would be inelegant to do so but if we do make specific references, we just attribute that to the respondent and, yes, there may well be one or two diplomatic cases where, although the response is a good one to use and provides us a really great case study for our report, from a diplomatic perspective it might just be better to avoid it because the government didn't tell us. But again, we'll know that when we come to it and we have the luxury to be able to make that decision then. But your point is well taken.

Heather Forrest:

It's not well taken; I think it is if we get that sort of data then it still is useful data. It just needs to be managed differently in the reporting.

Paul Szyndler:

(Inaudible).

Unidentified Participant:

A little follow up the (inaudible) the relations within the GAC. They have been interested in this field from the beginning so they are occupied with that happens to the country and territory names because they feel that has to do with their nationality and these kinds of things. So now UNESCO is the entity taking these countries. They chose them, not we. So if we find out which countries have not answered and then, perhaps, we could consult with a GAC representative of that country if we have one here and make them push a little. And perhaps it's ended up in some office that it shouldn't be so it might be a way to get more out of this list.

Paul Szyndler:

And I will note that -- thank you for joining us, Bart -- that Bart and I had that discussion about tomorrow's joint CCNSO-GAC session where we will brief them as we usually do on the big three or four issues so this will be -- about various working groups. And I will simply say to them that we've already spoken to the GAC on two occasions and have briefed them at length, much to Lesley's chagrin, on our activities and our scope and what we're doing so that I don't need to do that again but rather will call their attention to one particular element of our work which is this survey so that they are aware that agencies within their capital may well have received this already if their name is on that list. And that they should be aware that someone may come to them and ask them what's this all about? And that way they can feel informed and then also go ahead and

encourage them to, if they feel appropriate, engage with those that they feel are the appropriate agencies within their country to respond.

And of course, now that we've resolved to actually go out to the ICANN community, I can finish that up by saying and the GAC will receive something in writing in the next few days which will outline that so that you've got something written with which to go back domestically with. So yes, originally tomorrow was going to be a "heads up this has gone to your countries, you may wish to help us," but now at least I can wrap that up with any GAC and the formal assistance of GAC members as opposed to seeking a position statement from the GAC because we don't have three years -- will at least help explain that for them a little bit better. So I'm confident that will be covered off. Martin.

Martin Boyle:

Thanks. Could I go back quickly to the notion of territories because I'm feeling a little bit nervous? If we're just getting back from countries then we would be forced into assuming that territories fit into exactly the same category as countries and, therefore, you could extend from country into territory. And we've got no justification for saying that although I suspect it's probably not too far from the truth. However, territories are subject to a jurisdiction of different countries and I wondered whether UNESCO might be able to indicate any of their members which did have a number of territories. So I'm thinking of countries like Australia or New Zealand which have got territories in the South Pacific which could then be perhaps asked to fill in the supplementary questionnaire for its own territories rather than just let's assume that without having at least having tested it once. So from the list there, the Asia-Pacific, we have New Zealand which I know does have territories. I think that looks like almost the (inaudible) also has territories doesn't it? So it's probably just worth asking the question as to whether they can identify some that they could extend it to.

Paul Szyndler:

Certainly happy to do that and, again, I'll -- unfortunately, for better or for worse, have to take UNESCO's guidance on that without having gone back with what was essentially a supplementary questions or clarification with question 7 whether they then feel, as a follow up, they will get some respondents or meaningful buy-in if we expand that to territories. So that's obviously, it's a good observation and omission from our original survey. How do you refer to the man of your country and/or any territories that you claim sovereignty over? So I will do that in our discussions with UNESCO.

Bart, one of the issues we raised earlier and an idea that Cheryl raised was, given the limited number of responses we've received from UNESCO and the fact that they've slowed and it's looking increasingly less likely that we'll get a strong response rate, is it timely and open and transparent for us to now go out to the ICANN community more broadly so that we put out a brief statement for an update like we've done before, but also specifically write to the chairs of the various SOs and ACs to encourage their members, on an individual basis, if they have a competence in this area, to make their contributions. Couldn't hurt. We've acknowledged -- you weren't here -- we've acknowledged exactly what we're going to get and as long as we make it clear that we're not seeking a formal GAC, GNSO or et cetera, et cetera, position on something, that we open it up to their members if they have expertise in this particular area.

Bart Boswinkel:

As far as I recall, say, from one of the conference calls just post Prague or post Costa Rica, this was one of the options we discussed anyway and there was no -- I would say there was more or less a dissent of the people on the call at the time that would be a good idea.

Heather Forrest:

(Inaudible).

Paul Szyndler:

Yes, good to reconfirm. The secondary issue was the question of our timeline to deliver a final report. It was an appropriate question that I've been struggling with for a while and Heather raised now. And obviously we've always had a rather rubbery, flexible end date with the aim ultimately being before the second round of new GTLDs. We all know we're not pushing that. Do you have a sense or do you believe you'll be able to get a

sense of the Council or is it indeed important that we get that? Or just simply provide a briefing note as I periodically do to let them know that we may be stretching our deadlines and may go, say, towards Beijing to allow us now to get a more comprehensive response from UNESCO and to get meaningful input from the broader community.

Bart Boswinkel: I think, say, from what my experience with the council is, if you just brief them and say this is the issue, then it's a non-issue for the council. As long as it doesn't prolong too long and you say we would maintain the working group that's not active et cetera. But say, given that the survey is underway and they're well aware of this, this is prolonging until Beijing and producing the final report by then and discussing it with the community is probably a reasonable timeline.

Paul Szyndler: Alright, in that case we'll adjust the resolution there to me actually briefing the council and we'll take it as a given and to give them a finite timeline and I did highlight the pressures of you don't want multiple study groups and working groups going beyond their use by date, simply because we have finite member resources. I will propose an end date of Beijing so that it's not an infinite extension but rather, with the explanation that by the end of this calendar year, we'll then have had a more meaningful opportunity to gather information and then we can really dedicate the first few months of next year to analyzing that and finalizing the report. Okay.

Well that's it for today unless there were any other questions or comments. That, in my mind, at least helps me map out how we're going to go but.

Cintra Soonknanan: Hi. (Inaudible) and it's really a pleasure to be at this meeting and to contribute. I was part of the GNSO who has technical requirements to the drafting team and (inaudible). I was wondering, I was taking a look at some of these documents but before the performance of this survey, it's not an online survey, right? So my suggestion to the working group is perhaps to have a review of that survey. It's on ICANN line survey. I could send the link to you and it makes it very easy to capture data as well as with a summary of data in term of charts and that kind of thing. So it would cut down your work quite substantially.

Paul Szyndler: How could I possibly argue with that? No, thank you. Please, please do send that on. That would be very useful. That will mean a bit of ac hat with Secretariat staff and probably put the hard word on Christina, in particular, just to see whether this is something that's readily doable but, if you've got a template for that which I haven't seen, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Just to explain why UNESCO didn't use an electronic survey is because, if you do it especially in a UNESCO environment, they had a particular issue with certifying that the person who answered was indeed the person that should answer the questions. And to ensure this it's far easier to send out the paper survey than just an electronic survey.

That's particularly UNESCO circumstances with their members.

Cintra Soonknanan: Yes so, this is Cintra again. For the purpose of SOs and ACs responses, it needs relevance and a lot easier to distribute and to collect data.

Paul Szyndler: And, of course, as Bart said, we're not going to be bound by the, "are you the right person to be responding," because we're welcoming and accepting all input. We may just have a contextualizing question at the front that asks people to explain who do you think you are? On what grounds are you responding and why do you relate -- articulating in a considerably more polite way than that but adding that to the survey.

Unidentified Participant: I think to get back to question we just had, we just handle the data we get from this type of input as opposed to the data we're getting from the UNESCO and, whilst we're getting a little bit into the weeds and we'll have to do that later, I think we do need to be aware that I would be arguing strongly for handling those data sets totally differently because

the trust of the data you get in the generic, sort of, anybody and their grandmother can respond versus the other. We cannot muddle those. At least in my totally biased view.

Paul Szyndler: I would agree. (Inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: It's a really important point we use the order of the survey. I have participated in completion in our country. Formerly, the situation was following. The UNESCO commission has always controlled of Ministry of -- Foreign Affairs Ministry. And they posted this question to the Ministry of Transport and Communications and after that, after completing of this report from the ministry, they also, they submitted these completed part of report and university initially (inaudible). During this there were some minor changes but at the end the person who had put this information in the system was not responsible person. Just technical worker and I think here it's a very big problem. Necessary to have the answer with signature of responsible person. Like Minister or Deputy Minister because, in general, they don't have right to provide such information. Just the formal part. Of course, they have had permission from ministers to complete the survey but there is something with signature it would be more powerful.

Paul Szyndler: It would but, basically, what we've relied on, again, is the UNESCO process and UNESCO protocols where we, as outsiders, have to make an assumption that anybody that's providing a response is suitably authorized. The assumption is that the response that comes back has got the (inaudible) signatures or not of the appropriate minister or government agency or whomever is responsible. Even if that is someone in the not-for-profit sector because they've been delegate by government in their country to have the responsibility that, irrespective of who responds, they are the appropriate person. They wouldn't have got the survey in the first place. That's why it was limited, specifically to a UNESCO channel. So I'm actually quite confident that we don't physically need the signature of someone but rather that we make the assumption that it is as good as if it had being signed off. And the member states would full well know that if they complete something like this, irrespective of its purpose, it goes on the record and that they're speaking to their national administration. So I am -- I take that point but I am confident that that's inferred. It's not actually physically in front of us. Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Mine's a follow up on this actually that, in my view, what we are doing here is not to make an authorized report or what's the truth. What we do is to illustrate what can be the problem, how it is used, and different places in the world so and it's only a few countries and territories of the whole bunch. So if it is to illustrate for ICANN or the CNSO Council that we are having some problems. That we will try to find a solution so we don't have that problem in our lap if we open up for GTLDs without thinking it through. So the next step might have another approach. More (inaudible) to be really sure what we are doing but this stage is more an illustration.

Paul Szyndler: And I'll certainly be more careful that in any final reporting that we do, we perhaps might not be so explicit as to say well, before we do the next round of GTLDs, yes that is obviously a very significant component for us but that applies in all future policy development and review and revisions of policies we have now and ones that ICANN may have in the future. What we come up with may just serve to show this is really, really complicated and, if the conclusion the community draws from that is making lists is something that you do at your peril because you'll always miss something, we don't necessarily have to tell them don't make lists. Our mandate stops at saying this is rather complicated and here are examples of that.

Bart Boswinkel: Just to add to this, if you recall, say, when this survey was started, it was not sent out to create a list; it was done in order to validate the typology that the working of the study group had developed. And if it serves that purpose, then you're already well ahead and then you can say what we've done in between Prague or Costa Rica and Prague going through the issues, these issues are validated as well.

Paul Szyndler:

That's an important point because we made the typology up as we went along. It was just a tool we were using to break down our discussions. Okay, we use these headings and then you'd put some examples into that and we were able to identify two or three under each heading.

By looking at the raw data that comes back, it would be very, very useful for me if, in a particularly obscure combination of country name A, in a minority language from country B actually comes up with a very common term. That would be great. But it's unlikely -- it wouldn't be great for them but it would provide very strong evidence that there are all these things we haven't thought of. But as it currently stands, the stuff that's coming back largely just serves to show how complicated it is and that you would never be able to capture all of the permutations of all of the X number of official languages multiplied by 193 UNESCO member states at the very minimum. It just gives rise to a huge number of possibilities. So you're right, I think it's very useful. Does anybody else have anything else to add?

Good, alright, as I said the action item on me would be to draft up that summary statement about work to date and then an engagement letter that will go out to the community and various SOs and ACs within the next week or so to proceed with the UNESCO process and, Bart, for us to chair up a call with Ungarda and Bahir and find out how it's going and realistically, how many more they expect to get, what they would then see as a good stop date and whether they've got a back-up list of countries to go to whether they think that's feasible and then also a very brief briefing note to the CCNSO Council that asks for -- that we will be concluding our work by Beijing and this is why.

Alright, excellent. And when we get the (inaudible) we'll schedule a call for about three weeks' time or so, so we can report back on those because they're very short term goals. Then, hopefully, we'll also have some more data and we can discuss how we're going to start crafting this into just the idea of a final report so that we've all got the same structure in our heads. Probably about three weeks' time but we'll poll everyone with that.