

**Transcript Study Group on Names of Countries and Territories Telephone
Conference**
25 April 20012

Attendees:

ccNSO

Martin Boyle, .uk
Joke Braeken, .eu
Ian Chiang, .tw
Keith Davidson, .nz
Sokol Haxhiu, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Annebeth Lange, .no
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)

GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC

At-Large

Eduardo Diaz (NARALO)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO (liaison)

Specialists

Jaap Akkerhuis

Support Staff

Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO
Baher Esmat
Marika Konings, GNSO
Kristina Nordström, ccNSO
Gabriella Schitteck, ccNSO

Apologies

Iliya Bazlyankov - RrSG
Henry Chan, .hk
Hiro Hotta, .jp
Elise Lindeberg, Norway
Maarten Simon, .nl

20120425_CCNSO_COUNTRIES_SG_ID690535

Paul Szyndler: Hello, everyone. This is the meeting of the country and territory name study group. Thank you, all, for your time. My main intent today, as I mentioned a bit earlier, is just to summarize some of the outcomes out of Costa Rica, give an update on how the UNESCO survey process is going and then to introduce everyone -- reintroduce some people to the process of how we're going to work through the issues that were in the survey and the issues that are part of our scope and mandate as we work towards a final report later this year.

So, just to start with, the survey is the first step. Then some of the issues that we'll work through and the schedule and overall next steps.

So, currently, soon after Costa Rica, at which we all agreed upon the ten questions. There were no significant concerns expressed about the content and structures of the questions that were going to be circulated to UNESCO which they will in turn send to their member states. That went out soon after the meeting and there's been a few discussions back and forth since. What we've got has been very helpful from UNESCO in terms of translating the issues that we wanted to address, the questions we wanted to ask into UNESCO-speak and presenting in a format that is relevant and appropriate for their member states.

That is to say that there were no concerns from colleagues who have particular expertise in multilingualism. They thought the survey was extremely clear, the questions were easy to work through and they could adapt and adopt them as they were. Beyond that, they then undertook some work to identify respondents that would ideally participate in the survey and as those of you who were in Costa Rica will recall we were talking about 20, 25 -- I'm sorry. Was there an interjection? I'm getting an echo. Hello? Who joined.

Joke Braeken: Apologies for being late. My name is Joke Braeken from Europe.

Paul Szyndler: Hello. We've just gotten underway. We're not into 5, 20, or 25 as the ideal sample size for this preliminary survey for UNESCO member states and what UNESCO went away and did was divided them up amongst geographic regions which is one of the key criteria that we identified and then there additional import that was recorded at our Costa Rica meeting about the importance of capturing different languages, different script, that it would be quite possible to go out to one particular region and remain within one script. So, there was a conscious effort made to differentiate on those lines and also to go out to countries and territories that had multiple languages and scripts and in some particular cases quite unique scripts. UNESCO has discussed -- (inaudible) and I and Baher and Bart have discussed this sample group of countries that we're looking at responding to the survey and while that is not yet finalized and the reason I'm not sharing that in greater with the group at this stage is because UNESCO is still working through finalizing them. But at the

moment I can offer a great assurance that the types of countries, the languages, the scripts that are represented are very broad and that the advice of the group has been taken very seriously by UNESCO and implemented in their consideration of which countries and territories they would chose to respond to the survey. And again, I just want to reiterate that this is a pilot process. This is a trial survey so it's not completely exhaustive but they've been quite broad in terms of who they're going to get to respond and the languages and scripts that will be represented.

Part of the process, as part of the consultation process with UNESCO, they proposed to add another question and question 11 was have you consulted with non-governmental organizations or have you consulted with civil society and obviously we've readily agreed with that. I've responded back saying that sounds like a fantastic idea because by the very nature of asking the question, it encourages member states to do so or it at least it plays on their conscious that they may wish to do so. There may well be entities within their territories that can provide considerable expertise to their responses. So, I've strongly recommended that, yes, it is a great idea to include this as part of the original questionnaire. It's noted as a recommendation. It's only a bit of advice. But currently I think it's a great idea that given the multi stakeholder nature of our community that we encourage member states to think in the same way when it comes to developing their responses to the survey.

As the slide suggests, for all that are in the Adobe room, the covering letter that will go out will be in English and French. We're moderating how much translation there will be because there are cost and time issues with grade levels of translation. The covering letter in the working languages of UNESCO, that is all member states are used to receiving documentation from UNESCO in both English and French. Therefore this is part of the usual process and this where we doff our hat to them as to what is the norm and letters will go out in English and French but there also will be translation of the survey into the six UN languages. So, that will assist in responses and in participation. But again, the advice is being provided by UNESCO and we've gone along with their typical process.

The survey will also be, as we mentioned in Costa Rica, will go out and be notified to all member states as part of the UNESCO newsletter and I will ensure that an announcement letter will go of utility to ILEC chairs at the same time as the UNESCO goes out. The only slight difference from what we discussed in Costa Rica was the possibility of opening the survey, leaving it open-ended to response by all member states. So, if you are not identified but you see the survey in the member newsletter, you are welcome to respond. That was the original situation. The advice from UNESCO is this may cause confusion and delay and it is not their usual working process. And while I acknowledge that may lessen the number of responses we get at this time, it will still be -- it is ultimately a UNESCO survey. So, we're weighing up the benefit and the cost of what they're able to do and how they're able to do it and they've advised that their usual process is to leave it completely open ended could cause significant delay and result in this study group not getting responses back shortly after but rather being delayed. So, again, that's not ideal. But that's the advice we've received from UNESCO. That said, if we can

manage to work through the second round of the survey process it would serve maybe broader to that end unlike this one, work through quite quickly.

That's all I was going to cover on the survey. It's been quite extensive. Did anyone have any questions at this stage about that? Excellent. Just so everyone's aware, the timeline is now a matter of days and weeks before it gets moving. The final survey that I sent to everyone a few minutes ago was just as a courtesy. We're not discussing it on this call. It is the same that you all saw with the addition of one last question about the NGOs. So, it will get moving soon and the best estimate we've received from UNESCO was that they would expect sort of responses coming in and being able to collate information at a round about the time of our Prague meeting. If not for Prague, then very soon after. So, that's what we're working to in terms of getting responses to that process.

Now moving on to how we identify or how we work through the issues, the survey of course has ten different parts in different groups identified as part of it. And in the Thursday meeting in Costa, Bart and I sort of worked through a few examples, taking two letter codes and historical names and future names and just sort of working through them and providing some examples to the group as to where there might be a few problems, where there might be some concerns where there were inconsistencies that we may be able to force the even historical implementation for us within the ICANN processes. And the main aim of that is to move away to the couple of examples we may all have in our minds and sort of develop a more robust structure that we can put into a draft report and then into a final report and the proposal was that we would sort of work through it. After this call, this one being rather a recap call, moving on to covering each of the categories one by one we have an aggressive schedule coming up to Prague, at least another three teleconferences and my preference would be to work through each of the criteria that we've identified one by one on the call, in the survey call by call and see how we go in terms of whether that provides enough -- is it a suitable structure to provide enough substance for us to commence working on a final or draft report?

Now, apologies to those who were at the Thursday meeting in Costa Rica but this is where Bart and I keep providing a few examples as to how we may work through the various criteria in the survey and for the final report. And we started off with -- this is a recap. We'll go through it relatively quickly. But we started talking about two letter codes. That was question one in the survey. What is your ISO3166-1-2 two letter code, alpha code. And for the purposes of the ISO fast track, there was the representation used for RF which was chosen for Russian Federation and it was selected over the direct transliteration which was DY for confusion reasons and as a result the question remains how would a more expansive representation of Russian Federation in Cyrillic -- surely that would be -- could that in any way be represented as part of the fast track process? Of course it contains non-Latin characters. It is a meaningful stream. But it doesn't qualify as an IDN ccTLD because the small print is part of this process which dictates that there will only be one string per official language or script for each country or territory.

That is to say there may be other meaningful non-Latin characters -- non-Latin strings that would be representative as country and territory names but because of the way the rules have been established for the fast track process, you can't double dip. You can't have two. You must have one only at this stage. So, what does happen, what could happen with other meaningful representations for a territory. As it would currently stand, if the next round of new gTLD process and currently forecasting about 2017 the way we're going, but the way it would go currently is that if country and territory names were allowed as part of the process in round two, well it's quite likely that the names could end up as part of that because they cannot fit in the fast track and is that a problem? Is that a concern? Is that an inconsistency? Well, that's probably not this group to work through to that extent, but it's just a flag. It is an issue. And it will come up on a few occasions. Many other countries and territories, the reason I use Russian Federation example is because the two letter code was chosen as opposed to those that chose more lengthy representations or the full representation of their country in their local script.

Bart Boswinkel: Paul, maybe in addition, the savings through say for the short name of the Russian Federation which is Russia which is probably more -- it would be preferred. Say, if you look at the two complex rule systems, that's a new gTLD process and the identification and actually the ccTLD or ASCII ccTLD process, then it's a bit in limbo and unclear what the status of something like dot Russia in Cyrillic or dot Russian Federation will be in future.

Paul Szyndler: That's right. It's a very pertinent example. And the reason Bart and I work through these examples in Costa Rica in this way and why we're reiterating it on this call is because this is exactly the sort of stuff this group should be thinking about. You should be aware that this is the situation as it currently is and collectively thinking about whether that is an issue of concern, are there any other examples that we might be able to think of and if we can come up with a thorough body of evidence with regard to some of the inconsistencies, it would be very useful for our reporting process. That is precisely what we're supposed to report. And as a study group raise the collective awareness primarily to the ccNSO council because they convened this group but also to other stakeholders and so everyone fully realizes the complexity of these issues before we all go barging on with taking up around the various processes.

I'll move on quickly because this is familiar to those who were at this time the later meeting in Costa Rica. But over to you, Bart. This is one that was near and dear to you.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I think the second example is the working group or the study group discussed already is how to treat future names. Say, one of the issues that we have at hand the dynamic character of the ISO3166 list itself. In order to understand future names, we used the example of the Netherlands Antilles. It is part of the Kingdom of The Netherlands, the Netherland Antilles, but it was dissolved. The Netherlands Antilles themselves were dissolved in October 2010. That was a constitutional change in the kingdom. What you see now, you have two new countries

and three islands that are considered as municipalities. One of the new countries, in the ICANN terminology is Curaçao and the second one is Sint Maarten. And both of them have been granted an ISO3166 code. But it took some time between the dissolution of the Netherlands Antilles and before the ISO3166 assigned two letter codes to the two new entities.

So, the question becomes if you have this grey area between the one hand side, the recognition and the constitutional changes and on the other hand as a starting point and as a second point in time the inclusion of the two letter code and the assignment of the two letter code to that new territory or that new country, what could happen then say if you run them through the processes? It's very clear that until the two letter codes are entered into the ISO3166, Curaçao and Sint Maarten were not eligible as a ccTLD or an ASCII ccTLD in case of some other countries and it is unclear what the status would've been under the new gTLD process. Would they have been treated as a geographic name in the sense of a region or township or whatsoever? Or should they have government support as a country in future? Or not be eligible because they are a country or territory? And say the dynamic nature of the ISO3166 list is probably one of the more -- it's more dynamic than people would think. Lately you've got the South Sudan entered as well and as a good example probably you will have some more in the near future. That's one thing.

The second thing is countries change their names -- some countries change their names regularly and so that's the starting point. And then you have the issues about the three letter codes. What will happen then with them? And the IDN, like for instance Curaçao in an old writing form was with the C tilde, it would've been eligible as an IDN ccTLD in case it would've been listed as such on the ISO3166 list. And then you have Curaçao as a generic term for liquor. So, you see, especially with these future names, there is on the one side, we need to check whether they are taken into consideration in the different -- and how they are taken into consideration in the different rule sets. And secondly, because their future names -- it's impossible to include them in the survey. So, this is already an additional question and an additional case for analysis for the study group because it's not included in the survey at all.

Paul Szyndler:

Thank you. That's precisely why we chose to address historical and future names in that first session in Costa Rica because they aren't part of the survey and they can be relatively and neatly addressed in a quick example. It is difficult to put this in the scope of the survey because as we all agree through our discussion, what timeframe do you put on historical names? How can you possibly gauge into the future as to what might happen with future names? It is very difficult to do with both of them. So, that's why it was agreed that it wasn't part of the survey. But that's why I've provided these examples because it is still relatively difficult. There are a few examples that we've provided there that show that there's potential there for a few issues. With the example, Bart, it was a constitutional change that was well forecast and it went through ISO processes within a matter of months. But the reason I included South Sudan as everyone would appreciate, that's not nearly as clear nor clean a process and it is entirely likely that there would be quite a bit of

contention between the declaration of a sovereign state and the addition of that state to the ISO list. I don't know what the most lengthy delay has been but if one could imagine that a new gTLD were to open and close in between those two events happening, it would be quite contentious, just simply because the sets of rules would change throughout that timeframe.

There was one more example that we worked through and that was historical names and obviously as I forecast earlier and mentioned earlier, how do you protect them and there's a degree of unpredictability with how far back you go in time, what is the authority source. Who's going to set rights with regards to particular names? For example as part of the new gTLD process -- and again we only use this as an example because it is very current, historical names aren't included as part of the definition. So, therefore it would be reliant upon governments to express an objection and quite reasonably they may well do so with regard to a particular name. It's not a set process. It's untested. There's no way to know what's going to happen, what governments will pick up, what rights GAC members or governments will assert. And the reason that becomes a relevant example is because as you can see on the slide that I've put up there, historically you could refer to terms such as cafe. Bart had he rather artful example of Republic of the Seven Provinces for The Netherlands which is a good example but I can't exactly imagine that to the right of the dot.

But there are other terms like café or Siam for Thailand, a certain member of the ICANN Board might have concerns about a former French protectorate called Tonkin. And Siam for Sri Lanka. There are any number of -- Sri Lanka most be one of the countries with one of the most historical linguistic -- or the greatest number of historical linguistic representations of their country name. But Siam is one that is particularly pertinent because it will relate to quite a legitimate history and you could imagine there would be those that may wish to register that for example as a new ccTLD. How would that be treated? How would that be considered as part of various processes? Obviously it is not the purpose of this group to answer those questions. We are only raising these as part of -- to stimulate everyone's consideration. Did anyone have any comments? I'm conscious that Bart and I have monopolized for awhile. I wonder if anyone has any comments or questions at this point?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe, Paul, just to clarify why we've included the Republic of the Seven United Provinces as it's called? It shows one of the real difficulties of including historical names. The Republic, it wasn't named for part of the Netherlands from the 1588 to 1795 and it did not cover the current geographic region, what is referred to as The Netherlands. This shows that depending on first of all it depends on how far back in time do you go? Secondly, do you still refer to the same geographic region? And thirdly, yes, it might be a name that people are hardly aware of. So, in the survey, historical names was one of a couple of reasons why we did not include historical names in the survey in the first place because nobody knows where to stop.

Paul Szyndler: That's right. And what timeframes do you draw in? What geographic or geopolitical boundaries do you put in place in terms of a survey process

to make something so broad and complicated means we will get, use the term -- garbage in, garbage out. It's hard if you don't define what you are after. You don't know what responses you will get. But by the same token I think just from the very exercise of working through some of these you can see that there are very relevant examples that potential cause concern. And they aren't part of the survey for the reasons we discussed but I think that there's something that we can all collectively think about as we're drafting an issues paper and draft report and we can work through as we head towards our final report and make sure that we mention things appropriately.

Now, that was essentially the material that we covered in Costa Rica. So, for those that were there I think it was a relatively useful session and that's what Bart and Baher tried to write up here, that once you start thinking about each of these categories, you start coming up with fantastic examples of how will these be treated? And how will this be treated? And that is what we wanted to use as the methodology for working through the rest of the activities of this group. As we do that, we come up with more and more examples, people think more naturally, more openly about -- What about this name? And at the risk of offending a certain senior official at UNESCO I just don't propose that we would necessarily head towards proposing that we have a definitive list of country and territory names that should ever be taken. We can never establish a finite list. But by coming up with enough adherent examples, relevant examples that make people collectively scratch their heads and say -- Oh, yes, that is a very good idea. We never thought of that. Then this study group will have successfully done its job. I can't predict now whether that means that we will get towards making recommendations that say this area requires further work. We possibly recommend, we strongly recommend, we expressed some concern about inconsistencies between various processes and we really think that everyone needs to stop and think about it collectively -- everyone being the whole ICANN community, i.e. turning this study group into a working group. I cannot present that. But this is the process that we're proposing to work through.

And the next slide that I've got up there is using the topology that we'd sent to UNESCO, there are a number of categories that we've got to work through there. We partly talked about three letter codes, the ISO three letter codes and what questions, inconsistencies there might be between them in various ICANN processes, official long and short form names. I won't read through all of them. Because everyone can see them there and is familiar with them from the previous parts of the development of the survey but what I'd proposed is that we -- Bart and I and others sort of knocked together a couple of the categories in advance of the teleconferences over the next three weeks and so we might address one or two on each call and send materials through well in advance so that we can collectively discuss the examples that we come up with and concerns we might have and see where we go from there. Are there any immediate concerns with that sort of process?

Bart Boswinkel:

Just one addition. I think we will resend it in order to prepare to go through and use the typology, I would advise the members of the study group to have a look at the consolidated overview of the different rule sets

in order to understand where all these -- as we just did, how do these different categories fit in the different rules and what will happen if they would be applied for or if you have multiple names?

Paul Szyndler: By the different rule sets you mean the rules that currently are in use?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. And future rules for the IDN ccTLD fast track, the ASCII ccTLD and the new gTLD processes. So, that was the first part of the first activity of the working group and now these two bits come together.

Paul Szyndler: That's right. We are now heading into the more open ended part of our work as Bart correctly pointed out. Number one, go out there and map the policies, the frameworks, the processes that current exist by together as many representations of country and territory names as we can and of course we're trying to delver into that before we get a response from UNESCO because we have a few months to do that and, yes, map whatever examples we can come up with against the current policy frameworks and see if there are any inconsistencies. Again, it's important to reiterate and I'll do that on every call and every meeting and every opportunity that I get that we're not passing judgment, we're not to assess whether there's a policy failing. It's just to identify whether there are any inconsistencies. If we plug term X or Y into a particular policy framework, what happens? Will it be treated one way and then another way? And could it possibly be treated inconsistently? That's precisely the responsibility of this study group to be able to give everyone within the community a better understanding. It's asking the questions and asking informed questions rather than providing answers. I think that's about right, Bart.

Now, I just want to wrap up and I apologize that it's been for the most part a lecture style call but I was conscious that we have sort of taken a month or so since Costa Rica. There have been a few developments behind the scenes but not many. Not everyone was there and not everyone was able to participate in the session where we tried to introduce this methodology of how we start thinking about the different bits of our work. This is very much a scene-setting call. I thank everyone for their patience with that, the intention being that the next three calls are quite different. We will have the issues that we want to discuss for each one identified well in advance and would aggressively encourage everyone to come forward with their ideas and observations.

As we currently stand now, the distribution of the survey is happening. UNESCO is undertaking this work. They are finalizing a letter for Jannes to send out to member states and the survey is, I can assure everyone, as part of -- and the reason it's simply not been shared is a document with the study group now is because it's an internal UNESCO working document and therefore it's not appropriate to do so. But it's exactly the same as the survey that everyone agreed to with the additional of a very valid question about have you consulted with civil society and NGOs. So, that's happening now and we aim to continue identifying issues between now and Prague. So, that is the schedule for the next three calls. I mentioned in Costa Rica the idea of developing a progress report that could be circulated to its ICANN constituencies whilst I provide a briefing

as part of the ccNSO, GNSO, and ccNSO GAC sessions. I am very conscious that there wasn't the opportunity to do that formally as part of a ccNSO ILEC interaction. There are many folks within the ILEC that may have certain expertise and import in this area.

The intention currently is to finalize progress reports and send it out through all stakeholders. Sorry, I'll take this back a step. All SO and AC Chairs will be made aware of when UNESCO is consulted about the survey. So, therefore, all constituencies within ICANN will be covered. Beyond that, the very detailed progress report, everything where we are up to will be shared with the community. I would expect a couple of weeks before the ICANN meeting, whatever is best practiced with regards to everyone being up to speed, therefore when we then provide additional briefing in Prague, face to face, everyone will be well advised of where we at. It won't be contentious. It won't be draft positions or anything like that. It will be strictly speaking a progress report and I think that's very important. It will save me having to explain nearly as much as I did in Costa Rica if everyone is aware of where we're up to.

Beyond that, analysis of new gTLD applications, I as much as everyone else would love to do that as soon as possible. We shall see when that is. Because that will provide a fascinating and factual and evidential base for us to -- upon which to base our deliberations. We will actually be able to see where issues arise or where issues do not arise. And that will be something that hopefully happens over the coming months and we can start actually applying the theoretical that we've been discussing to the actual situation. Survey responses, I am quite -- the UNESCO survey, I'm expecting responses back in about August. That is intentionally a pessimistic timeframe. And responses may come in sooner than that. The optimism -- I optimistically -- my optimism comes from hoping that we can of out with a secondary process to a broader number of UNESCO states depending upon what comes back from the first survey. That is, do they collectively say we don't understand what you are asking. Then we have a problem. But if we get very meaningful feedback, it's quite clear and it provides us a lot of great evidence, then why not send it out to all member states? It may take a little longer. It may be towards the end of our deliberations. But it would help validate our work that much more.

And then beyond that, a draft report around about the time of Toronto and a final report towards the end of this year, just noting although this is a group that has participants from across the ICANN community, it has been chartered to respond to the ccNSO council. With that said, again, our deliberations will be circulated to all and the timeframe is simply set as we should provide some important advice before what could possibly, what could conceivably be the earliest date for a second round of new gTLDs acknowledging the country and territory names as being reserved or excluded for the first round as everyone well appreciates. It will not happen in the first couple of weeks of 2013. But we needed to be within that timeframe. So, there is the possibility of us, if our work is -- if we collectively agreed that more in-depth work is appropriate and we're getting some good results and we need to talk about it more, we could stretch the timeframes a little bit. But we have to be cautious of getting

feedback in as soon as possible, especially if recommendations are some sort of working group.

That was pretty much all that I had by way of presentation materials for this call. Were there any questions or comments at this stage? Eduardo, I note your comments in the chat room about the copy of the survey that's going to be distributed. The survey is currently precisely as per what I have just circulated to the study group, just today, and that is exactly the same as what I sent on March 14 plus one extra question about NGOs. You specifically mentioned a cover letter that would be sent. Yes, all members of the study group will receive a cover letter. But it's something that's being approved internally by them so they won't send a draft around to us. As ever, in each government organization, the art is in getting a cover letter that adequately describes the range of issues yet does not extend over one page because a lot of people tend not to flip over in these organizations, over to page two or page three. So, it is a very short cover letter as it currently stands, the document that I've sent around had over two pages of explanation on what ICANN is, why country and territory names are a sensitive issue within our community and how they've been treated in the past, how that's led to the development of this study group and what the scope of this group is and therefore here's the survey and here are the questions. What I've asked UNESCO to do is consider how much of that they could possibly include as part of the survey -- i.e. all of it so that any respondents get the best possible idea of what we are asking and why. That is a process that's in negotiation in the moment and, yes, as soon as we get a clearer picture of that, we will be sharing that with the study group.

Thank you, Eduardo. Annebeth, just to note with your question, we have some idea of the countries that are looking to -- that will be -- this survey will go out to. I apologize. I'm just juggling through my emails now. There were a few ideas. But to give you an example, linguistically we're looking at ensuring that Europe would cover Cyrillic groups, et cetera. And there are a few language groups that we would like to cover there. The possibility of including countries such as Sweden that don't identify the concept of an official language but rather designated languages -- a country like that, what sort of responses that might get back. There are a number of African states there which have unique languages and scripts - languages and scripts that are unique to them as well as having a very large number of official languages. Not yet been finalized, but yes, as we're working through that process -- and I mean in a matter of days, not months, I would like to share that with the working group.

And just finally, I am conscious on responding collectively to the questions being asking in the Adobe room. Eduardo, the reason why going out to 20, 25 countries as a preliminary sample size, the reason why we've done that and giving UNESCO some -- I'm sorry. That's a misrepresentation. We're not giving UNESCO latitude. They are using their expertise and their experience to identify certain groups of countries. They've taken all the feedback that we've given them. We've said geographically -- you must be geographically diverse. You must be linguistically diverse. As many scripts as possible and including countries that have many, many scripts and as the example as with Sweden,

different definitional issues as to what is an official language and what is not, being as diverse as possible -- they are aiming to go out and get pretty much 100% response rate to the survey. They believe that 20 to 25 gives them the opportunity to follow-up these countries closely, to give them any sort of additional support they need and aggressively pursue them so that we get 100% hit rate. If we were to go out to all member states that acknowledge, to try to get a good response rate would take six to nine months and there would be no guarantee of 100%. They can certainly do that with a manageable size.

And because we don't have any -- we're curious about the responses we're going to get but also we are testing the process. Does this make sense to what we send out to people and if it does, UNESCO can follow this up and they believe that they should be able to get close to 100% response rate. It's a two stage process. They will go out, they will send a letter. It will go out and say which organization within your country or government agency or whatever it may be is responsible for these issues, they will be identified within the short-term and then the survey will be formally sent out to those agencies or followed up through those agencies and they expect that whole process should be able to take six to eight weeks which is something I've very happy with, possibly a little bit surprised within a government organization but it's very positive and I think it should be close to about 100%.

So, any other questions? I'm conscious that Bart and I have monopolized the line, mainly me over the course of the last hour. But I just wanted to get everyone up to speed. The main focus of the call was that middle bit where we're talking about -- Hey, these are the issues. Has everyone thought about what would happen with this representation of the country code or this representation of the country territory code? And that's sort of the way I've like with more interaction for the future calls over the next -- the four calls we have over the next few months to go. We'll knock something out and try to identify and breakdown one or two of the issues that were in the survey and propose that that's what we discuss over the next couple of calls, get that out to people very early so that they can collectively think over it and we've got some ideas back and forth on each call, less discussion about process and just sort of more open discussion about what happens with this name and what happens with that one. So, unless there any particular concerns about it, I'd probably like to leave it there. Unless there are final comments, I'll look forward to catching up with everyone over the next couple of weeks.

Thank you, everyone. We'll leave it at that.