TRANSCRIPT

Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories Meeting
Costa Rica 15 March 2012

Attendees:

ccNSO:
Martin Boyle, .uk
Joke Braeken, .eu
Becky Burr, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Keith Davidson, .nz
Sokol Haxhiu, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Annebeth Lange, .no
Anthony Lee, .tw
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)
Faik Farmanow (observer)
Joaquin Kelkboom, .aw (observer)

GAC:
Elise Lindeberg, Norway
Eyvaz Alishov, Ministry of Communications and IT of the Republic of Azerbaijan

GNSO:
Iliya Bazlyankov, RrSG (telephone)
Geoffrey Kayonga, Rwanca ICT Association

At-Large:
Hawa Diakite, AFRALO
Eduardo Diaz (NARALO)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO (liaison)
Sophie Liang (APRALO)
Andres Piazza (LACRALO)
Rudi Vansnick, EURALO
Oksaba Prykhodko, Ukraine EurALO Secretariat

Specialists:
Jaap Akkerhuis
Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg, UNESCO (phone)

Support Staff:
Baher Esmat, ICANN (telephone)

Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO
Marika Konings, GNSO
Kristina Nordström, ccNSO
Gabriella Schittek, ccNSO

Apologies:

Ian Chiang, .tw
Heather Forrest
Young-Eum Lee, .kr

Paul Szyndler: All right, good morning, everyone. Given that we're now 10 minutes past 10:00, I thought we best get started. Welcome to the Country and Territory Names Study Group, painful acronym, meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica. My name is Paul Szyndler, I'm Chair of this group, co-chairing with Becky Burr. We've got quite a lot to work through today, and we've already lost ten minutes. We may run a little bit over time, but if I could start with some administrative announcements.

And, that is, this session is being transcribed, so could everyone please introduce themselves each and every time they speak, for the purposes of the record. And, as is protocol again for the record, could we start by, perhaps with Ron, coming around the table and everyone introducing themselves?

Ron Sherwood: Ron Sherwood, I am the ccNSO liaison to ALAC (ph) and I am nick dot-vi, Virgin Islands CCTLD.

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz, representative from the NARALO and President of the Internet Society of Puerto Rico.

Oksaba Prykhodko: Oksaba Prykhodko, Ukraine, EurALO Secretariat, working group on (inaudible) and the At-Large items (ph).

Peter Von Roster: Peter Von Roster (ph) from Center.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle from Nominex (ph), the .uk domain name registry.

Faik Farmanow: Faik Farmanow, (inaudible) registry.

Eyvaz Alishov: Eyvaz Alishov, Ministry of Communications and Information Technologies of the Republic of Azerbajan.

Keith Davidson: Keith Davidson, .nz.

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, ICANN support staff.

Becky Burr: Becky Burr, NomCom appointment to the Council.

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg from UNESCO Paris.

Iliya Bazlyankov: Iliya Bazlyankov from GNSO representing core (ph).

Geoffrey Kayonga: Geoffrey Kayonga from the Rwanda ICT Association.

Sokol Haxhiu:	Sokol Haxhiu, NomCom Appointee to the Council.
Grigori Saghyan:	Grigori Saghyan, (inaudible) AM (inaudible).
Annabeth Lange:	Annabeth Lange from the .no, the Norwegian Registry.
Elise Lindeberg:	Elise Lindeberg, the Norwegian GAC representative.
Joke Braeken:	Joke Braeken, .eu (inaudible).
Marika Konings:	Marika Konings, ICANN policy staff supporting the GNSO.
Kristina Nordstrom:	Kristina Nordstrom, ccNSO Secretary.
Gabriella Schittek:	Gabriella Schittek, ccNSO Secretary.
Paul Szyndler:	I believe we have no one else on the phone. Thank you, everyone. Just wanted to start with a very quick recap, so going through as I do pretty much at every meeting, where we've gotten to and starting very briefly with our purpose and scope. It's important because we have a lot of people who are keen in the activities of this working group study group, but not necessarily following it very intimately, so I do like to run through that at every meeting.

Then, moving on to the major element of our work for today, which is the survey, the UNESCO, with the finalization of its policy (ph) which we'll use to go out to stakeholders just to try and solicit back information relating to the—that would help inform the work of this group.

And then, if we have time, and if not we might spill over to the session we have tentatively scheduled for Thursday, what next (inaudible) issues and where will the group go after we've finished this element of our work.

As you can see, the purpose of this group is broken up into three areas. I'll start (inaudible) what is currently existing in policy, how to make policy landscape of ICANN (ph) so what rules, policies, procedures are there with regards to the CCPOD (ph) new EOD (ph) process, pretty much everything else and to a large extent that's been covered and we've done some preliminary work which we'll pick up when we come towards drafting our final report.

We're now at the major stage of looking at how country and territory names are represented, within ICANN but also in other fora (ph), trying to take as broad a brush as possible to all the possible representations simply because as a study group—and this is what I often stress—we have the luxury of being expansive in our deliberation.

We're not bound by, we're not limited by, sticking to a particular set of rules or what currently is in ICANN, because the more that we research the better our outcomes will be. Then once we've finished this, we'll map the two against each other, so check the policies, look at all the types of country names that we find, and what happens when we plug those names into the policies that we have. Are there any problems? Are there any inconsistencies? Are there gaps where things can fall through?

And also obviously, at this stage, we are now starting to brief other stakeholders, and their representatives, good representation from across the community here, but we will also continue. I intend to sort of release a progress report of where

group's up to, to the community, not necessarily soliciting comment but if they choose to provide it, excellent. But just so, again, everyone's aware of what we're doing and where we're up to, because if they're not following the group so very closely, it's quite easy to be confused about our purposes and progress.

Then of course, finally at the end of the year, the intention is to report to the ccNSO council. That's just an administrative necessity. It was the council that convened this study group, hence that's the one we report to, and then of course the report will be made public, so community dissemination as well.

Just again this is probably my favorite slide, because I talk about what we don't do, and I bring this one up every meeting and I'll continue to do so. We're not here to define what is, and isn't, a CCTLD (ph). We're not here to intervene in the first round of new GTLD (ph), that comment's becoming increasingly redundant as time goes by. But, because our work commenced before ICANN launched the first round, there was some concern early on that we were supposed to intervene. Again, country and territory names have been regulated from, or put aside, set aside, from the first round of new GTLDs. It was specifically the work of this group to try and deliver something before the second round. Hence, I set the date of roughly December or the last meeting of this year, seeing on how we're going.

It could, best estimates in a best-world environment second round could start early next year. Nobody really expects it would, but we can't be unfinished at that time. We're not judging or assessing previous policy approaches. There will be an element of just assessing what is, and just stating it as a statement of fact rather than saying, well, because this is how we treated CCTLDs before, this is how we treat the GTLDs.

There's a failing, but we just assess what is, and it's also outside the scope of this group, very much so, to make any recommendations about additional protections for country and territory names. Because we are talking about a lot of representations, doesn't necessarily lead to the assumption that there will be an expansion of protections. That's not within our scope. There may be recommendations that come out of this group that would discuss possible additional work, maybe, and what that would be. It would be the scope of sort of the next group, or working group, that might come out of this and of course we can't develop the definitive recommendation for how country and territory names should be treated. That sort of recommendation can't come out until after, until the work's been undertaken.

Again, that's our work plan and schedule, just a brief timeline of—we've developed a policy overview, we're working on a typology, and getting that survey out now. We would then move to a discussion of issues, so this is starting to get into step 3. We all know of these problems throughout, there are particular examples which don't fit in the rules and we talked about them in the hallways and at the bar, etc., and how these won't necessarily work given the current framework. But, we need to start discussing it and putting some substance to that.

Then there will probably be, I've called it an Issues Paper, but it's suggested to me that that has a specific meaning within ICANN, so it's a Progress Report and I'll get that out as soon as possible, and some consultation leading into Prague and far more community consultation there.

And then, if possible, I'd like to do a second round of survey work but this will be a case of if time allows, heading towards final consultations at the end of the year.

Bart, are you in the Adobe Room or do we have another—do we have an Adobe room for this session? No? Then I don't have to worry about not logging on to it.

So again, there's agreement by UNESCO to assist us back in September 2011 and getting onto the survey element now, very specifically, it's proposed to be at least a sampling of 20 to 25 member states with an intention that all of the questions and what goes into it will be developed by this group. There is some input from UNESCO about the process and how it would work most effectively through that organization, but really it's up to us as to what we ask them, and then also those that are respondents would be selected with geographic diversity in mind by we wouldn't be soliciting 15 responses from Europe. Obviously, that would be unsustainable.

There are some issues about how the member states are selected, and there are some administrative and sort of logistical issues associated with that. Those that UNESCO, and – Irmgarda, please jump in at any stage if I need to be corrected, but those would largely be self-identified and those that UNESCO knows are efficient and effective and where they've got good linkages. So, going out to those, I expect to get a good response from, but keeping in mind the whole geographic diversity issue as well. Once the survey gets started, it's about an eight to twelve week process. Is that right, Irmgarda?

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Yes, it's approximately, the schedule what we are proposing.

Paul Szyndler: Okay thanks, Irmgarda, we can barely hear you so if you do have something to add, could you speak up a little bit, please? Again, further about the survey, this is not just about gathering information but we're about testing the process. So, whatever we come up with, does that make sense to respondents? If we get a whole bunch of confused responses back, which don't necessarily equate with what we expected to receive, then that tells us we're doing something wrong and we could go back and refine the process after that.

What I've done in the draft that I've worked through now is repeatedly asked for respondents for just about every question, to provide examples or references or citations of their claims. So, whether that's a national statute or because it's a name or an abbreviation or what have you, that's used, an international (inaudible), etc., we put the onus on them given their local expertise, given it's based on their country name, to identify where they use it in that way. That helps validate our work, as well.

The question has been, how do we validate the responses we get back? The best way we can do that is ask for a citation. If there are no references provided, that immediately means we have to undertake more research work, but also brings into question the substance of the responses.

Again, just a brief mention there, that this is about refinement and possibly getting out a broader secondary survey, and as is being mentioned by some working group, study group members previously, although this will be tailored for member states of UNESCO to respond to, it will only take slight adjustment and given all the contextualization material we've attached to it, it's quite workable for it to go out to other members of the community. So, particularly as I've said through the (inaudible), it could certainly get into sort of NGOs, etc.

I don't want to limit—UNESCO has been chosen because they've offered, and because there's a certain level of expertise and gravitas that comes from having them participate. I'm conscious of not limiting it just to sovereign states. Their responses are very valid and will be very important as part of this process, but if I can get the survey out more broadly, it'll also be interesting to see what we can get out from those that are inclined to fill it in. Of course, we can look at everything we receive subjectively and make an assessment on what we receive when it comes in.

The following slide is a little bit hard to read, but just very briefly, this is the administrative stuff that UNESCO helped us with. This is exactly how it would work, the mechanisms it needs to go through. I won't cover it in too much detail, but basically UNESCO having a responsibility for developing and circulating an official letter of invitation, putting it in their newsletter, so that other countries can self-identify and institutions that have relevant expertise can self-identify.

We won't say no to anyone. If, through the newsletter, we get a greater number of respondents back than the 20-25 originally foreseen, that's fine. That's a great outcome. Then of course, a survey will be designed based upon what we, the questionnaire we come up with. In some cases, there will be a formal process of a nomination of the institution that will be responsible for doing it, and then they'll complete the survey. There's various mechanisms obviously within countries that they have to go through, for instance in Australia there is an organization, that looks after the Council for Geographic Names of Australasia, for instance. It has nothing to do directly (inaudible) CGNA, it's got nothing to do with UNESCO directly, but one part of government will find them, that'll take a bit of time.

Now, this is the main bit of work. I'll just pause there, if anyone had any comments or questions about where I've covered off, that's again all coverage of what I've discussed previously. But, the next step of mine would be to get into the very much the detail of the survey. Were there any comments or questions now?

Good. Now, the topology obviously, this dates back to a straw man (ph) that Bart first developed which was there was some—a basis of costs in ISO 3166-1. There was reference to UNGGN titles and headings, etc., and it's since been refined five or six times to try and narrow it down based on everyone's comments. It's a delicate balancing exercise because we want to be precise with our questions, but the more precise and specific and prescriptive you are, the narrower a field of responses you get.

So, you try to be broad as possible without being vague, and that's the delicate line that we've tried to work through in the drafting of this. I'll start with the first question. There are ten, and I really would like to get through them all.

So, the first one was the easy one, to an extent, ISO 3166-1, alpha two codes (ph), it is the basis currently upon which CCTLDs get their codes. It is commonly used within this community and others, and yes, we essentially know the answers to everyone who will fill in this survey already, but in Australia we call it a Dorothy Dixer (ph). It's the easy question that warms everybody up and juts starts the process. So, that's question one, and again, hands up or comments or interjections please at any stage, if there's any concern, otherwise I'll keep moving.

Then we get into alpha three codes. Now, this is an area where some people have expressed some concern. Again, there is no particular desire for expansionism of protections here. I've explained in greater detail in the document that I circulated, that yes, everybody knows dot-com is a well-established, incredibly well known GTLD and it is also a three-letter country code. That fact, and the fact that they coexist harmoniously and have done for however many years it is, is something it's worthwhile of us probably noting in our final report. It is just what it is.

There is of course reference, I sort of mistakenly said, "Oh, look, it doesn't actually have an official status in ICANN." Well, I didn't forget about the African guide with where the first point, you know, either the country or territory refers to ISO 3166-1 alpha three codes, so yes it is used in ICANN, and again this is codes like AUS, NZ, or DEU (ph) and they're commonly used in a range of activities. So, I note—yes, including airports, and not necessarily used consistently.

Again, this is a fairly straight forward question, and the fact that respondents if—if a respondent from Comoros happens to submit that .com is their three-letter code, or something that might clash with another, propose a new GTLD, that is not a problem. That is just a statement of fact, and something that we would factor into our deliberations.

The third one might need a little bit of work. this is other common abbreviations. This was, it stemmed from a little bit of research I did into other lists, so I thank Jaap for pointing out that there are web-based resources which compare and contrast various (inaudible). This might be anything from ISO to the International Olympic Committee, the IOC, and (inaudible) etc., you will for instance see runners in London from Barbados under the code BAR, not BRB as it is in ISO list.

So, the intention of this question is just to capture some of those. I could see somebody applying for .BAR actually. I couldn't see them applying for .BRB, but irrespective of that, again, if there are—if there is confusion there, if there is some sort of compliments of uses, that is fine. That is what I'm trying to ascertain from this one.

Again, this is the first example where we start talking about, please provide us with examples and cite your references. Which list are you referring to? Where is this being used? We did get a response from Heather Forrest yesterday which I'm only starting to digest, but she talked about are we talking about just abbreviations or acronyms. Well, yes, possibly. Would we narrow it down to a list of standardized codes, three-letter standardized codes, and specifically you must refer to that list?

I'm inclined to try to leave it broad. This is one where I'm trying to be a little bit vague on purpose, to see what comes back, specifically because we have the protection of please provide your examples and references. So, somebody can't come up with, I don't want somebody to tell me that sometimes you may use AUST, AUST for Australia, unless there's a commonly used context and a reference which they can tell me that that's where it's used.

So, I am inclined, unless others feel strongly otherwise, this will capture other lists of three-letter codes, in case we haven't thought of something. Are there other abbreviations, and I may change it to abbreviations and acronyms, that we haven't picked up? So, that's the purpose of that one.

	Are there any comments on the phone at the moment? No? Thank you.
	I'm sorry, I think I just ignored Keith.
Keith Davidson:	Keith Davidson, .nz. While we're at this point, and I noticed the wording in the paper you circulated, Paul, about the ISO 3166-1 alpha three codes have no formal status in the ICANN process. I'm just not quite sure that that's absolutely accurate.
Paul Szyndler:	Didn't I just correct myself about that?
Keith Davidson:	But actually, I understand yaps (ph) on the line, and I sort of seek a clarification in greater detail (inaudible) that Iana (ph) has a specific three-letter country code, or—
Paul Szyndler:	Yeah, I agree. Yeah. And Jaap, are you actually on the line?
Jaap Akkerhuis:	Yes, I'm back on the line. The line is kind of flaky so it goes up and down. I didn't hear the question.
Paul Szyndler:	Keith (inaudible) I'd made earlier that I'd (inaudible).
Jaap Akkerhuis:	I'm sorry, this is fading here and I don't hear anything.
Paul Szyndler:	I'm sorry, Jaap.
Jaap Akkerhuis:	You—the line is fading, I didn't hear what you are saying.
Paul Szyndler:	Can you (inaudible)? (Inaudible) iterations (inaudible) as I said (inaudible) already identified, yes, it does have status in the applicant guidebook, for instance, and then beyond that yes, you could be quite right. I'm just not certain of the specificities there, but certainly within Iana (ph) processes as well. So, I will change the contextualization there to refer to those.
Jaap Akkerhuis:	(inaudible)
Keith Davidson:	Keith Davidson, .nz, I think it goes a little bit deeper than that and I'm looking at for example, IRC 4350 which is from the New Zealand government, which just sort of requests an IGF (ph) to reserve NZL as being specifically a three-letter country code for delegation in the Iana database. Now, whether or not, I don't know the status of that any more but notwithstanding, there are some moves by some governments to ratify the Iana database listing of a three-letter country code, that goes back historically more than five years. I know Jaap has some information about (inaudible) country codes in the Iana database, too. So, I think it's more than just the (inaudible) guidebook.
Paul Szyndler:	Oh yes, of course. Acknowledged, and I'll—we'll expand upon that in subsequent iterations making reference to the more references we provide of examples, the more it actually validates the reason for us asking because it is used.
Unidentified Participant:	We'll send the question to Jaap so everybody can see it, and—
Paul Szyndler:	Thank you. Respond on the UNO (ph) list.

Jaap Akkerhuis:	Looks like the line is destroyed again, so.
Paul Szyndler:	Did you manage to catch any of what was just said? The question—
Jaap Akkerhuis:	No, just, just the last few sentences.
Paul Szyndler:	(inaudible) identified that there wasn't an official status of alpha three codes, ISO alpha three codes within ICANN processes, (inaudible) the applicant guidebook and Keith clarified that Iana also has (inaudible) relationship with that element of the ISO list and (inaudible).
Jaap Akkerhuis:	Better ask Iana directly but as far as I know it's only filed two letter code that there is no official relationship.
Paul Szyndler:	(inaudible) and as a, as a subject for further explanation and extrapolation later in our process, thank you. (inaudible) this is where we start asking for either the official or the formal long form names of countries.
	Now, (inaudible) because to a lot of states, it does mean something. So, I am acknowledging that to some, it does not. But, it in as few words as possible conveys as much meaning in the sense and the purpose of the question. I'd remove the term "conventional long form name," because in many lists that means your name in English. The official long form name of Poland, apologies for the accent, Rzeczpopopolita Polska, or something like that. Almost, I know. But, to say that it's Poland or whatever, it would be the representation in English. So, that's why that has been removed.
	Other examples are put in for the sake of clarity. It may be that the term "formal name" or "principal name" or "name used for administrative purposes," which is very specific and does have meaning to governments, are all included in there.
	The (inaudible) is with being a little more specific about how we ask for this. Is this in multiple, and the reference to official languages was removed, because that is problematic and a little limiting. And, I currently put in the term "designated languages" simply because that's consistent with the terminology that was used by the IDM CCPDP working group one, that's the term they came up with and they had a definition of designated languages.
	In the response received from Heather Forrest overnight, she questioned whether that would cause as much confusion, or as anything else or possibly place a limitation on the number of responses we received. So, there are a few options there. I still don't quite have the answer because I'm still thinking about it myself. I mean, Bart has talked about languages used for administrative purposes, because again, that's got meaning but we've talked about that previously, that that can also confuse—
Unidentified Participant:	If you look at say the term, "designated languages" in the IDNCCPDP (ph) is, has been included to get away from official languages, but if you really look into it, there is a definition in the PDP and even in the fast track of what is an official language. That definition, I would advise to include the definition here instead of say what we understand on a designated languages is—
Paul Szyndler:	(inaudible) designated, you said official languages. You mean there's a definition of designated languages?
Unidentified Participant:	Yeah.

Paul Szyndler:	Yes.
Unidentified Participant:	It's the same definition. The only thing is we got rid of the term, "official languages," because in countries like Sweden it creates a lot of confusion, and you can start in using a term which is very vague, but then include the definition of what you really mean. Then people start looking at the definition instead of having this, this idea of what is an official language.
Paul Szyndler:	And at this point, I prefer the more detailed notes that I sent out actually had a footnote that provides a link, and of course that means that somebody has to go dig it up. So, I can certainly make it more prominent than that, but it is a link to pages five and six of the November 2010 report, of that working group where the definition is contained.
Unidentified Participant:	One of the nice things of that definition, in fact it could refer it back to the UNGEGN (ph) because this definition has been developed by the UNGEGN (ph), so the United Nations and Geographic Experts etc. on geographic names. So.
Unidentified Participant:	(inaudible)
Unidentified Participant:	And so, it's not a definition out of the blue, and it's used in OACD (ph) material as well.
Paul Szyndler:	And that's probably why I think it, currently the best language and particularly if we can define what we mean, it might be the best language to use. The only reasonable alternative is to omit reference to languages all together, and then you just see what you get back, but that's us going from being broad to being vague. So, to get meaningful responses, I think this is probably the best that we have. That's still an open issue for discussion. We don't need to, we need to decide it very soon, but at this stage what I would welcome is (inaudible).
Unidentified Participant:	There is another reason for including it, especially say the official languages, or say the designated languages, because that's one of the fundamental criteria in one of the policy processes. So, it's a bit goal-seeking definition, but otherwise if you include everything then we have to sort out what any of your designated language or official language. So, that's why it's very important to make that distinction.
Paul Szyndler:	Absolutely. So currently, at this stage moving forward, (inaudible).
Unidentified Participant:	(inaudible) somebody (inaudible) some because otherwise, that would be the language for the reasons we've just discussed, that's—the language—the wording that we leave in for the reasons that we've discussed, and unless somebody comes up with a solid proposal for another one rather than, "Hm, don't know if this works," that would probably be the best way to move this forward.
Paul Szyndler:	(Inaudible) again using its unconventional name, at (inaudible) this is, yeah, I don't think there's anything further to discuss about that one. It's exactly the same as question 4, except short form rather than long.

(inaudible) staff broaden the responses that we receive, it would certainly be possible for respondents to limit themselves to the characters and languages and scripts that (inaudible) familiar, and particularly for our bureaucrats to retard their official or administrative languages. This starts conveying the message that the Internet is of course stating the bleeding obvious, multi-national and borderless, |

and that respondents need to start thinking about representations of their names in non-official language, languages that may not be official for them. And of course, this is just a starting point, the easiest one to go to—and again, something we could gather the response from a document I already have, that lists the official languages of the UN and then provides the country names in those languages. That is what we would ask respondents to provide here.

It is as specified there, so it's Arabic, and it is Chinese, Mandarin, specifically. English, French, Russian and Spanish. One (inaudible) was raised was would respondents with no familiarity particularly with for instance, Cyrillic or Arabic or what-have-you, have difficulties with responding to this? I mean, they would presumably be experts in their field anyway, but I have included a reference and the extended explanation which provides a link, which I'll expand out to a UNGEGN (ph) list which is basically the answer list anyway, but provides examples of languages in those scripts. So, if they are stuck, there is a reference that they can go to.

It's supplemented by question seven, which then becomes a little bit broader and we start thinking about other languages and subsequent questions do this, too.

(Inaudible) in and this might need to be changed to designated languages or what have you, providing the short and long form names of the other parties dispensing the survey in your designated language. So, although a number of examples already would have been captured, this means that if we end up with a list of the 20 and 25 respondents we're covering going on 16 languages, depending on how it goes. Again, diversity with that regard is probably a good idea. They would in their own language identify how they refer to the other countries. So, again, I would probably, I should have included a reference and will that again, citational references to where they get this information from would be a good idea.

But, this is, looking at it from the other way, not how you describe yourself but how you would describe the others that are participating, and because it's not a confidential process, and—Irmgarda, this is where I'm possibly going to put my foot in my mouth. We discussed this previously, it was a suggestion that arose from you. I take it that there's no perceived difficulties with providing the respondents of the survey the full (inaudible) of who's responding to a survey, to the UNESCO members when it goes out?

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: The administrative exercise of do you step on any toes if you mention everyone that's proposed to a respond to a particular survey to everyone else that's participating. If there is a problem there, then of course this question becomes redundant, but it was something that Irmgarda suggested as a way of limiting the scope. Please don't tell us the names of all the other countries of the world in other languages, it's providing some scope. At least the 20 to 25 that respond to this survey.

(inaudible) particularly want to speak for Bart because it's an example of dear to your heart, but examples that are but commonly used or local names. Holland wouldn't be kept anywhere else. And again, because the questions are becoming increasingly open-ended and may draw a bigger field of responses, this is where it's important for the identification of references and citations and where and how this name is used. (inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: (inaudible) probably important is that Holland, say in Dutch, is a commonly-used name for the Netherlands, include that as an example. Otherwise, I know in some countries they refer to the Netherlands as Holland.

Paul Szyndler: Yeah, so just for the sake of clarity. (inaudible) now gets to the very, very specific topic of country and territory names in either minority or indigenous languages, for a wide range of obvious cultural reasons it's prudent for us to try to capture as much as possible indigenous languages—some of which, in the case of New Zealand for instance, would have official language status. (inaudible) New Zealand, and maybe (inaudible), but it is, it is an official language. So, that would be captured in an earlier answer. They may not be recognized—I'm sorry, I'm using official language again here, but (inaudible) language, that may not necessarily capture indigenous languages in other countries. So, we're specifically asking for it here.

Again, this is where citations and references are incredibly important. I have, although there was a question about I think this came from Avery (ph) at some stage, about the relevance of including significant migrant populations and how they may refer to the—in all the previous examples, unless both Australia and Greece are responding to the survey, you would not pick up the Greek reference to Australia, or the way in the Greek language it would be pronounced. But of course, we have a significant migrant population, for example, and many others, that would be captured as a significant part of the population.

This may not draw many responses. Countries may choose not to respond with a very expansive list, but it is, I mean—some countries are very, one or two significant migrant populations that make up a significant part of the community, and that's what we would attempt to catch here. I am disinclined to remove it, because this is simply part of the expansive nature of the survey.

Again, with the citations and references provided, that would quite simply be well, here's a breakdown, CIA (ph) (inaudible) local resource of his (inaudible) breakdown is, and 12% of our community is this such-and-such a migrant population, and identifies as such and here's how they use our country name.

So mainly, it's two things here, as I said, Minority languages, local minority languages, migrant languages, and those old indigenous communities.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (inaudible) transcript record. Okay, there is, good. For the transcript record, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm just a little bit nervous here that we need to have the word written, here, because there are oral indigenous representations, and that'll come up in the (inaudible) references, and we want to make it really clear that we're not interested in those. So, just maybe a little wordsmithing there, to be sure we're talking about written, and that saves 487 representations coming from the indigenous language groups in Australia, which we really don't want to know about in the survey.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you, Cheryl. (inaudible) question came up the last one, which I have described as horribly broad. This is the catch-all question. I'm more comfortable including it at the end because we have included many other examples of language representations, and there may have been, and I don't know how, something that might have fallen through the cracks that is not captured somehow under any of the other headings. Therefore, the respondents to this survey as they've worked through it have started from the very simple, very clearly defined ISO lists, and then started getting more broad, and then started thinking about other countries and in other languages, and by this stage hopefully

they're thinking quite expansively about—and it may trigger something in their mind to realize, "Oh, well, yes, I've actually, there is this other representation that hasn't been captured."

And again, in this case, again wordsmithing from Heather quite correctly pointed out, let's remove in this case the "if possible" provide explanation, in this one particularly, citations of where these other names have been used because this is probably, possibly the most obscure area and we would need references for our work here as well.

(inaudible) their patience with this many anyway, so I, unless there were significant suggestions that would need to be added in, I would propose to leave it at about that number, but please treat this very much as a final call, because we are looking at UNESCO commencing their work imminently. So, we need the finalization of this. I will send something along those lines to the list say either later today or tomorrow, saying, "This is where we've gotten to, here are the few requirements that we discussed, are there any final concerns?"

So, very much this is pretty much it. We will then continue discussions with UNESCO, and I know Irmgarda is on the phone and again she can interject if she can hear us, but the document that I sent around that had a lot of the explanatory notes, the proposal is that those explanatory notes go out as part of the survey because it's taken that to explain it to all of ourselves. It would very much need to be included to make sense to the respondents.

There may be a little bit of working with regards to format and something that's standardized as part of UNESCO, but to date they've shown nothing but flexibility in terms of what they can accommodate, and it's largely been up to what we can come up with.

So, that's where that one is up to now.

Martin Boyle:	Martin Boyle from .uk. Just a little question about UNESCO processes putting out the survey. The time scale is, according to your first slide, quite tight, and UNESCO limiting the numbers that they're going to be sending it out to. Have they given you any reasonably clear idea of how they expect the responses to come back? Will they get them back from everybody they go out to, or it's just a sort of couple of percent or whatever? It'd be just nice to have that, ahead, so that we have set our expectations correctly.
Paul Szyndler:	Yeah. (inaudible) you want to speak to that if you heard Martin's question in the first instance, before I have a go? There's some difficulties. My best recollection is, we've had a number of discussions about this from UNESCO's perspective. They suggested that 20 to 25 was very manageable, and that part of that process means that they can follow up and chase up with respondents very effectively, and try to deliver—and can't guarantee 100% return rate, but that would very complement—this is a number that they can keep their finger on and chase, and get a good response rate.

If there is very preliminarily (inaudible) no response, not even an acknowledgement, then obviously we could perhaps move to if it's someone else.

The nick—and this would be good because I mean, 20 to 25 is a logical first step, because it will get us some responses and we can work out how far off or far out we are, and the time frame again was something that was proposed by

UNESCO, and they can, they're quite confident they can do this in eight to 12 weeks.

Not our time frame, that was theirs. Also, the going out to then in the newsletter starts leading to the self-identification. No one's excluded, if somebody wishes to participate in the survey they can.

Now, as I've mentioned before, in an ideal world, these responses come back in good time. We may not have them analyzed, but we've got them around the time of Prague, it would be great if it's refined and then sent out as a general notice again, or a newsletter or to member states. This is where your response rate becomes poor, because it could not be followed up. You need to spend six months chasing all member states for responses for this sort of thing, but as a secondary step that would just add to the comprehensive nature of our work. So, that would be a great second round, if we get to a sort of—there is that option, self-identification in this round.

So, the details off of the selection process and who it goes out to, will be something that will have further discussions with UNESCO about like in the next week or two, and we'll brief the group about that as it's resolved. Largely (inaudible) decision but an important one, and we want to convey how that decision is taken to everyone.

Unidentified Participant: (inaudible) We can't have (inaudible) this one.

Unidentified Participant: We did.

Paul Szyndler: We did, yes. I'm just referring to my notes so I make sure I get the language correct here, but there were a couple of categories that had been omitted following a few discussions and comments from those present in the group. (Inaudible) difficult. It's politically sensitive, it's timeline-dependent. We would need—do we ask for historical names within the last 100 years, or the last 1000 years, or do we go back further than that? As we dig further into that, we dig ourselves into a deeper hole of detail and difficulty, and it becomes more problematic and possibly questionable for the purposes of this survey.

We are looking at what is now, and how that works now. There has been a proposal, and as such that's why it was taken out of this survey, because it becomes really hard. We would spend a whole day trying to work out how we ask that question carefully and articulately, and may still hit upon considerable political sensitivities. I could think of half a dozen examples off the top of my head, even given the survey process.

So, what (inaudible) while it wouldn't be a question in the survey, collectively, generally speaking, the matter of historical names would be acknowledged in our report. We talk about it in general terms, that there is of course always, and countries may well choose to assert their rights with regard to historical names, but not provide that as a question. No, no, (inaudible) because that becomes very difficult.

Unidentified Participant: (inaudible)

Paul Szyndler: (inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: (inaudible) definition?

Paul Szyndler:	(inaudible)
Unidentified Participant:	Not historical name, but other definition of country and territory name?
Paul Szyndler:	Well, then that could be the broader heading it comes under. There will also be—there'll be historical, and—
Unidentified Participant:	Or (inaudible) yes?
Paul Szyndler:	Yes, yes. And also future names.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	As you catch on a number of (inaudible) especially if we did (inaudible) – Cheryl, transcript record. I'm just saying especially if we end up ditching number seven, a catch-all, which is either a new ten or eleven for remarks and other inclusive alls, could be a nice, you know. It's an addition. Well yeah, the reference (inaudible) issue, yeah, you're right, uh-huh.
Paul Szyndler:	Happy to agree to that just for the purposes of being comprehensive, but I wouldn't necessarily be, I would be inclined to be again, in that case, like because whoever wants to nominate whatever can there, but again beyond that—so yes, I'm fine to add that as other remarks or comments, observations. But again, for the purposes of final report at the end and you, if we get something back there we can cover historical names and then future names. We don't have a crystal ball but there's a few country processes being formed now. So, that's something that has (inaudible) although an obvious statement, it's worth saying that current policies would necessarily be limited by what is now the application of it, and future names just need to be observed as something that happens.
	As I said, that survey and a re-drop hasn't quite happened because well, it was kind of pointless until that version was finalized. But, once this is all locked in, the language will be gone through to see whether it needs to be less bureaucratic, or whether the definitions and the language within it are perfectly acceptable for all stakeholders, and then I would propose that it's part of a progress update, progress report, on where this group is at. We let everyone know, and I'll be letting governments know later this week at the GAC because this is a matter for just at least, reference.
	This is happening through UNESCO and everybody's aware of that, and then also the survey will be made available. This is just part of self-identified respondents that I don't mind if we get the insensitive garbage, but if somebody for some reason decides to fill it in and they have no knowledge and expertise, no authority or status to respond, there's no reason why we wouldn't welcome it. We would identify it as such as soon as it comes in but it's just important that other elements in this community particularly for those where they feel the expertise may lie in a non-government organization or unlikely, but if there's some channel through the context that are here within ICANN that—and I'm thinking about the (inaudible) Cheryl.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Of course you're not.
Paul Szyndler:	If there are people with considerable expertise there, they see the survey and don't feel excluded that they don't have the right to send it on to colleagues and/or respond themselves. So, that would be attached to a progress report which would go out at about the same time, just let everyone know where we're at.

Unidentified Participant: We (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: We could (inaudible). (Inaudible).

Ron Sherwood: Yes, Ron Sherwood. Is there attached to any of these documents a definition of country and territory? (Inaudible) Borneo a country, is England a country?

Paul Szyndler: I will, I'll first say that obviously for the purposes of a survey going out through UNESCO you have your definition of what those respondents are going to think a country and territory is in the first instance, but to expand on that?

Unidentified Participant: I think that's why the importance of including ISO3166 (ph) and a reference because that's why, that's the definition for country and territory. That's again one of those distinguishing factors. Only say in the ICANN complex, only if you're on that list, it matters. If you're not on that list, it doesn't matter.

Paul Szyndler: That's right.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: No, you cited, you're citing ISO3166 (ph).

Paul Szyndler: Absolutely.

Unidentified Participant: And it's because say that's why we use the term country and territories, see, there is no official list of what is a country and that is the UN list. This has been the basis with the ISO3166, with some additions for special purposes. In this environment, ISO3166, is—it is in fact a starting point.

Paul Szyndler: (inaudible) point that Bart makes because we, from there, we step off into completely different territory. We start getting much broader, and the important thing there is, that's again why we will note all the way throughout this process that this is a study group, we're trying to find as many meaningful responses as possible, please provide us with whatever you think is appropriate, and that will be (inaudible) work. We're not doing our job properly if we don't seek as much input as possible, and to then convey back to the community that this is not an attempt to expand the definition of country and territory names. We can't do that, that is not within our scope. Again, it's just helping us identify what is and what may be.

What I'm specifically thinking of is the second round of new GGLDs (ph) in come all these applications, early warning, get governments to put up their hands and say, "Well, that actually means something to us." Trying to foresee—examples of where this might happen because we know the problem when we get to it. If we can foresee some of them now, then we've done our work as a study group.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible). My question is I still am not clear on the process of selection of 20 to 25 countries you said, from UNESCO. Is this going to be a random selection, or is it already an idea of what countries are going to be in the list?

Paul Szyndler: Other than from a definitive commitment from UNESCO there will be geographic diversity, and that's important because if you're simply to look at those countries that UNESCO knows, who are administratively expedient with this and could answer it quickly, that would probably narrow your geographic diversity very quickly. So, it will be broken down. I'm definitely not getting into a discussion about regions here now, but, looking at Ron.

But, it will be broken down and I still have to have further discussions with them, and it won't go out, and I mentioned this earlier that they would provide final advice as to the best way to do this, and then that would be relayed to this group. Because, aside from the diversity, there hasn't been any clarity there. As I said, the desire for language diversity is important as well, and it would be fantastic, if you get 25 countries with 25 languages, or multiples of that.

So, other than those specifics that I haven't answered yet, but we'll circulate it in terms of how they are selected.

Unidentified Participant: So the selection process is exclusively the right to UNESCO, or we get also?

Paul Szyndler: They're going to provide us advice about from an administrative perspective. They've done this before, they send surveys out all the time, and this is how they would propose to select 25. And yes, then very much for our, our final input.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) It's not an exclusive choice, anyway.

Paul Szyndler: No, no.

Unidentified Participant: So, even if they choose 25 countries and we find that somebody else choose (inaudible) we could do that, or do it on a monetary basis as well?

Paul Szyndler: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: And the—there are representatives at this table and the broader ICANN community who feel that it is in their best interest, or their government's best interest, and they have links back there, there is absolutely nothing stopping every GAC member, for instance, from sending it back to aside from if (inaudible) inclination, to send it back to capitol and have it circulated that way, making it aware that it is—and again, this is why we use UNESCO as well, because it has that certain informata (ph) that it's not meant to be a limiting factor by any means. So, I can certainly see that certain people within our community may be disappointed, if their country is not represented, and they can help facilitate that by all means. Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: And what is important to keep in the back of your mind, especially for this first round, it is a test. It is a test both of the psychology itself, or the categories we've identified, but also of the process. So, you want to have, you want to be able to manage that process if you do some testing. Otherwise, you just do a dry run and it's very difficult to get back to countries if they've done it for one (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: And then of course, an iterative process for the finalization our work, put out a draft report, send it out, start getting some comments on that, with the aim of finalization towards the end of the year, and we're done. Thank you everyone. Any comments, etc., please—oh, Leslie has some?

Leslie: Sorry. Um, no, I'm not meant to be in this meeting, I kind of gate-crashed. So, there's a request for (inaudible) from this working group on some of the future NSO joint meetings with other parts of the community, just to encourage you and remind you about that.

Paul Szyndler:	Yes indeed, I have identified. I've identified GAC at the very local, at least, but.
Leslie:	Thank you.
Paul Szyndler:	But yes, them and—
Leslie:	Wonderful job as always, thank you.
Paul Szyndler:	Thank you Leslie, thank you everyone.