

**Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories Telephone
Conference**
26 January 2012

ccNSO

- Martin Boyle, .uk
- Becky Burr, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
- Hiro Hotta, .jp
- Annebeth Lange, .no
- Young-Eum Lee, .kr
- Kathryn Reynolds, .ca
- Ron Sherwood, .vi
- Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)
- Maarten Simon, .nl

GAC

- Elise Lindeberg, Norway

GNSO

- Carlos Aguirre - GNSO Nominating Committee Appointee
- Iliya Bazlyankov - RrSG
- Chris Chaplow - CBUC (Observer)
- Heather Forrest, IPC

At-Large

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

Specialists

- Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg, UNESCO

Support Staff

- Jaap Akkerhuis
- Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO
- Baher Esmat
- Kristina Nordström, ccNSO
- Gabriella Schitteck, ccNSO

Apologies

Joke Beaken
Mandy Carver
Henry Chan
Keith Davidson
Sokol Haxhiu
Marika Koenings

Paul Szyndler: Sorry. Go ahead.

Gabriella Schitteck: Yeah. So, from ccNSO, we have Becky Burr, Hiro Hotta, Annebeth Lange, Kathryn Reynolds, Ron Sherwood, Paul Szyndler, Maarten Simon. From GAC, we have Elise Lindeberg. From GNSO, we have Carlos Aguirre, Iliya Bazlyankov, and Heather Forrest. From At-Large, we have Eduardo Diaz and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. From Staff, we have Bart Boswinkel, Baher Esmat, Kristina Nordström, and Gabriella Schitteck, and apologies from Joke Braeken, Mandy Carver, Henry Chan, Keith Davidson, Sokol Haxhiu, and Marika Koenings. Can I ask who just joined?

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Irmgarda from UNESCO.

Gabriella: Oh, hello. So we have Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg, as well.

Irmgarda: Yes, thank you.

Gabriella: Thank you. You're welcome. A message, Paul.

Paul: Oh, okay. Yes, okay. Thank you. I just wanted to mention that we've also got Jaap Akkerhuis on the call. He's ICANN's appointed member to the ISO-3166-MA. He's going to assist us with the obvious skills and experiences he's got with the ISO, which will come in particularly handy for the purposes of this study group. So, if everyone is happy, Jaap is on the call.

All right, now, what do I have to do to get this presentation going?

Unidentified Participant: Kristina, can you load up the Powerpoint?

Paul: Perfect. Wonderful. As you can see, the agenda for today's call and we've already covered off on the first point, was the roll call and apologies. And then I wanted to get into -- sorry -- who has joined us?

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow from BC joining.

Gabriella: Chris Chaplow. Okay, thank you. That's noted.

Paul: And I just wanted to work through today, again, the current status of the study group and just touch on our work plan and schedule, the targets that we're working towards so that we all have a common understanding as we're working towards Costa Rica, and then ultimately our goals towards the end of the year, and then spend quite a bit of time on the topology that we've talked about developing, the one that Bart had developed a straw man for -- sorry, who has joined us?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Hi, this is Jaap.

Paul: Ah, there you are.

Jaap: Yes.

Paul: I'm sorry, Jaap, I think I introduced you to the study group in absentia, but --

Jaap: Yeah, I heard a little bit (inaudible), but yes. I think it was correct.

Paul: Well, thank you. I'm glad that you could join us and help -- and assist in the work with the study group. Just covering through on the agenda again, I just want to spend quite a bit of time on the topology which, as I said, that Bart had developed a straw man earlier in the year, last year. We then shared that with UNESCO and comment was received from them; we then also received a couple of other comments on it. And this is the element of our work that we need to progress quite considerably before we can then request UNESCO go out to mend (ph) the sites. It's the key element of our work that will help us moving forward.

Then, we move on to specifically the UNESCO survey, what it would be, what it would encompass, how it will be undertaken, the methodology for it, and the sort of timings that we would need for it. That pretty much covers -- obviously, this is next steps, but beyond that they really are the next two or three steps that we need to work through, and I'm quite happy to discuss any other business at the end of the call.

Now, this largely is a cut and paste from the presentation that I gave in Dakar, which was the back of a napkin timeline work plan schedule, which is not necessarily something we need to religiously adhere to, aside from the delivery of a final report by the end of 2012. Obviously, that timeline is set around a reasonable estimation of when we might be expecting a second round of new gTLDs.

This is a crystal ball gazing exercise; this study group was never established to provide in portal (ph) commentary to the first round of the new gTLD process, obviously, but if one were to assume that everything went perfectly smoothly and the first round went through, the best one could expect is a second round early in 2013; there are many possible delays, many quite reasonable delays that people may expect in the second round, but we must aim for delivering some sort of product to preempt that second round so that it can inform that process by the end of this year.

Therefore, everything before that on this slide is indicative, starting from one of the first elements of the group's work, which was to do a policy overview of what's been and the way that country and territory names have been handled, you know, ICANN's processes previously. A summary of that has already been developed and shared with the group, it's available on the confluence (ph) page, and then the next step is the work that we're getting onto now, developing the scope of the topology, which I mentioned previously. It's something that we need to not necessarily finalize before, but make significant advancements of before the -- on -- before the Costa Rica meeting. Then, UNESCO could go away and do some work on the topology, which is going out to their member states and consulting with them; and then us, at the same time, discussing some of the issues that are identified out of that.

What I'd like to raise, which I hadn't mentioned with the group before, which is something that we have been postulating with UNESCO, is the utility of going out with a pilot survey, which is something that UNESCO mentioned in their response, to go out, talk to 20 member states, get some feedback on the topology, and then we could, as a study group, consider that, and then the possibility of sending that out to a much broader group, perhaps all member states within UNESCO so they could provide us feedback, that's a two-stage process; it helps us get the topology right, or at least improve it. It takes longer and we would therefore need to get moving and get some sort of topology locked down as soon as possible. But it would also be a more thorough methodology; that is, if we could possibly approach all UNESCO member states, there could be no criticism or comments about which states were chosen and which were not. Rather, it would be a self-selecting exercise where all are invited, and anyone that can respond within a reasonable timeframe would give us a better field of response. And then, of course, as we get towards the end of that timeframe, a couple of rounds of community consultation beginning probably in Prague to at least deliver to the broader community what we've come up with, and then, as we move to Toronto, a second round of consultation, at least two rounds, will be

consistent with the methodologies of other study and working groups before we deliver any sort of final report.

Now, where we've gotten to so far is this explanation of a topology, and that is to go out to a group, in this case -- I'm sorry, who has joined us?

Young-Eum Lee: This is Young--Eum.

Paul: Hi, Young-Eum.

Young-Eum: Hi.

Paul: This is Paul. We're just working through where we're up to with the group at the moment and just a brief explanation of where we've been previously, and how we're developing the topology.

Young-Eum: Uh huh.

Paul: It's basically a tool to help people understand how country and territory names have been used previously, it's not meant to be a definitive list, it could never, even with the engagement with UNESCO, be an absolutely -- it's just meant to identify enough categories, enough types, enough ways in which country and territory names have been represented typically within the ICANN sphere, but also how member states of UNESCO and intergovernmental organizations might understand country and territory names, to give us an idea of the scope of the problem, or the situation, or the scenario that we are facing.

We'd received some commentary on that from UNESCO, and then also Heather Forrest, and that means that there are quite a few questions and comments relating to the straw man topology that Bart had circulated; he'd used Netherlands as an exemplar and put together a few categories and entered some responses into that, but that's only a first step. And from there, that's why in late December, I sort of sent a note out to the list asking whether anyone had any comments, or whether they had any particular criticisms or observations of the straw man topology to date.

And the document that I've just sent out to everyone, which we'll talk about in greater length hopefully later on, is a synthesis of the comments that we had received to date and just some observations, some potentially pointed questions about how we should develop it because, as with any survey process, the quality of the responses you receive is based upon the quality of the questions that you ask. So we really need to spend a lot of time identifying what sorts of -- whether we're talking about official names, historical names, short names, etc., identifying those, and describing those as really as possible in a format that will be digestible and in UNESCO's format to be able to get meaningful responses that's actually going to help our work.

So as you can see, we'd started with, originally, ISO-3166-1A2 Code, and some UNG GN (ph) headings, and some of the other examples. And these are all in Bart's example, short names, simplex (ph) versions, names in UN languages, indigenous names, historical names, etc. This is just really a first cut of trying to give one an idea of the sorts of representations of names that we're looking for. Actually, I think I've gone a bit far there, but, look, the next step was we would go to UNESCO and the proposal that we received back from them -- and Irmgarda, please step in at any stage if you wish -- but the response that was received not only provided some observations and some comments on the headings that were there, and where they may be problematic, and where they may need a little bit of refinement, but also suggested that it might be methodologically appropriate to go out and survey 20, 25 member states to start with just to make sure we've got the right sorts of headings, the right sorts of groupings in the topology, to see whether it makes sense for these survey groups and whether the responses we receive were meaningful.

That would be a relatively quick exercise, something that's quite expeditious, quite effective, so that we can all as a group get some feedback and see where we need to adjust that. It could potentially raise some sensitive issues -- how do you select the member states that participate in the survey -- and then discussion that we have with Irmgarda, it seems that we could be quite pragmatic about that, and you could deposit 20, 25 respondents amongst five regions, and then identify member states that could -- are known to respond in good time. Irmgarda, am I representing that correctly?

Irmgarda: Yes, that's right. One thing we discussed was that maybe the working group would like to -- if we decide to go for 20, 25 countries, we could define, as well, the major -- the selection criteria of country, and one criteria I proposed during our discussion was would we select one or two countries, one UN region. That would be one of the criteria which could be applicable when we approach the member states. We could have other criteria defined by the group, which countries we are interested in. So that is one of the elements that could be shared, as well, with working group.

Paul: Hmm. And what I'm trying to be very clear with the group about there is that we're trying to be as methodologically sound as possible, but we'd also like to get responses back as effectively as possible. Effectively, what we're trying to work towards is a two-stage process, that we as a group look at the topology that's been developed, the document that has been sent to everyone which I'll touch upon shortly, which will try to refine that further.

And then, once we're all happy, broadly speaking, with some of the heading, the topology, that will be the basis for the survey and that will go out to a few UNESCO members, but it need not be comprehensive, nor very -- we shouldn't be too labored in terms of how we select which member states respond because if we can get a meaningful response from them, we can then refine the process and go out to all member states, and therefore our process can't be criticized for being selective. If we can move rapidly and actually get to a second stage of the process where everyone has the opportunity to respond, that would be a little more representative.

I'm just very conscious of having spoken a lot. Does anyone have any questions about where we're going to -- where we're headed with the topology, or what the purpose of it is, or what the intention of our work is at this stage?

Annebeth Lange: Paul, it's Annebeth here.

Paul: Go ahead.

Annebeth: One question. If we have the final in the end of 2012, after the meeting, Northwest (ph.) (inaudible) meeting --

Paul: Yes.

Annebeth: So then the result of the study group should be delivered to the ccNSO, to the Council. Am I right on that?

Paul: That's correct.

Annebeth: Yes --

Paul: That's correct, yes.

Annebeth: Yeah, and they should decide whether it should be an established working group going further on the work we have started out?

Paul: That is correct. Now, that means that we both -- we --

Annebeth: If you say that second round of the new gTLDs in the best -- or it could be in the end of 2013. And as the applicant guidebook today is saying kind of an out for -- or a special solution for the country and territory, names they have to change -- that. And if the Council should decide that we should establish a working group to go further on with this work --

Paul: Uh huh.

Annebeth: -- when do they need to decide it?

Paul: Uh, sorry, when does the Council need to decide that there will be another working group? Or, when does the working group need to deliver its results?

Annebeth: Yeah, because if the study group delivers their report in the end of 2012 --

Paul: Yes.

Annebeth: -- and possible it will be in a new round of new gTLDs in the beginning of 2013, then we need to either say that we can't do anything, so they have to -- ICANN make their own rules, or we have to find a suggestion for having them out of the second round, as well, while the working group give their recommendations.

Paul: That may well be an outcome of the study group. One of the recommendations -- not the [inaudible] recommendations, but one of the findings of the study group may well be that country and territory names should be, could be, excluded from the second round, but based on a far more broader and well established evidentiary base than it was for the first round.

Annebeth: Yes, right.

Paul: The first round was largely based, of course, on the objection of governments and others, etc.

Annebeth: Yeah.

Paul: And that this had not been well thought out. I'm conscious of both the need to get this moving and the timing, but if this study group were to come back with a vast range of questions regarding country and territory names, which we do not have to provide the answers for, and it also comes back with the info matter (ph) of UNESCO and a survey of their member states, the involvement of ISO, etc., then that would carry far more weight in terms of the validity of asking for an extension, or for an exclusion, for the second round. It's much like developing a policy process for IDNs; it's not something that could necessarily happen within six months or less, as much as we all might like it to, and I will try to keep it moving as quickly as we can and hopefully timeframes will be kept as tight as possible.

But it's a shame this was not started sooner, but it has been, and it is entirely possible that the outcome of this study group would be something that may be a strong recommendation to the ccNSO Council that further work needs to be done and, therefore, the country and territory names should be excluded from the second round. On the other hand, I don't know what we're going to find and I shouldn't preempt that as an outcome because there would be many stakeholders that would feel otherwise. So I hope you understand the bureaucracy of my response that we don't know what we'll find until we do, but we're aiming as reasonably as we can for the end of this year and we'll see how we go.

Annebeth: Yeah. I think that's a good idea. But the main thing, then, would be to keep contact with ICANN, as well, that they don't develop a new solution for country and territory names in a revised Applicant Guidebook for the next round.

Paul: Well, the -- of course, and the advantage that we have is that this group is genuinely cross constituency and though I may occasionally use the term "only" a study group, that also grants us a certain degree of liberty and scope to cover any range of issues within our mission statement, but it allows us to be quite open and to raise issues and questions without necessarily having to provide answers, but we do have engagement from across the ICANN community. So, yes, it would certainly be my intent that we would keep ICANN briefed on what we're doing.

Annebeth: Yes.

Paul: And dare I suggest that they appear to not consider what this group is working on. That's why it's also imperative on all of us to be as comprehensive in this work as possible because we know that country and territory names can be potentially problematic, and the whole idea is we're spending 12 months finding out exactly why, and in what ways, and the range of examples which may or may not fall within the policy scope that we've had previously, and hopefully will fall within policy frameworks that we develop in the future. Early days, but that's the best answer I can give at this stage.

Annebeth: No, I think that's a good answer.

Paul: Excellent. And now, as I've said, look, the whole idea of the UNESCO survey, and I broadly covered all of that already, was the purpose of a preliminary survey is to test the topology. It should always be considered by everyone here outside of the group as a pilot, as a test; that's why it cannot possibly go out to all member states at once. That is, as Irmgarda would affirm, that's a very broad, difficult exercise, and also to guarantee 100 percent response rate from all member states is an incredibly onerous effort. But to go out to a few, to a selected -- across a range -- across regions -- but also based on a knowledge that they are very responsive and they'll get back to us in good time is a good first sample size, and then (inaudible) member states avoid certain sensitivities in terms of who has been asked and who has not.

And they can then self-select as to how they reply. But then, of course, as anyone who has been involved in intergovernmental exercises in the past would acknowledge, it takes a really long time often to go to capitols, identify the various agencies that need to provide responses, and get back. It may slow our progress, but as I've mentioned on a previous slide, we can start talking, we can start deliberating on our preliminary ideas while this work is out there. But I really wanted to concentrate on the UNESCO work as something we need to help us both narrow down, identify, and get moving as soon as possible.

Bart said in this other slide in here about the possibility of collecting data from other sources. There are a number that are out there publicly available starting with ISO-3166 and others. But because we're doing -- we're undertaking study work, we're trying to scope the best we can evidence that's out there -- I'm sorry, material that is out there to date -- a model (ph) should be prudent for us to identify all of those sources and sort of put them into a database as we move forward to see what we can find. Martin, did you want to talk to that at all? Or is this fine for a quick overview like that?

Martin Boyle: It's fine for a quick overview. I think we should start focusing on the topology first. But this is just to mention and say there are sources out there, and they're noteworthy and complete (ph), but it's good to note.

Paul: All right. Thank you. And as the slide says, the next steps for where we go from here: collectively review the topology, suggest appropriate headings, get this moving online as soon as we can, get UNESCO moving on their work that they've kindly agreed to participate in, and then develop some materials from that that will help start briefing the community because there's certainly a great degree, near as I can tell, of not concern, but possibly misunderstanding of what this group is doing and what its goals and intentions are. And we need to start briefing everyone on that as soon as we can.

But does that now take us -- and Kristina -- to some of the details on the paper about the topology?

Martin: Yeah. Kristina, could you upload it?

Paul: While this is being uploaded, I'll just explain that this is something that's just been developed in the last couple of days and it was not meant to be something that would -- that everyone needs to consider right now, but it's a thought piece. And this is something that I wanted everyone to take away over the next couple of weeks and provide some commentary on. Ah, we're back to front, excellent. Hopefully, everyone has received this and, if not, it will be on the confluence page shortly, if not already. But this is just something that synthesizes the comments that we've received to date, it covers what I've said in the background about we talked about the utility of the topology, Bart had sent an example around that he'd worked on as a straw man with the Netherlands as an example, and we'd communicated to UNESCO, asked for comments, and now what we're doing is trying to work out precisely what we wish to put in the topology.

So these are the questions, these are the headings, possibly with explanations behind them, that we might send out to UNESCO and member states, that we would ask them for their views on all of these and the quality of what we receive back will be based largely upon the quality of what we ask them. And the first heading that we talked about was how we use ISO-3166-1, specifically that Bart had talked about how the two codes, (inaudible) as the example, and some of the commentary we received. Bart also talked about other short versions, or abbreviations such as (dot) .USA that may not be captured in that, but then .USA would be captured in alpha-3 codes.

You can see that, within this document -- and all I want to do is briefly present to everyone to think about some of the questions that are proposed and provide their comments online -- but we could obviously ask about alpha-2, and then alpha-3 codes, but are there other fields? Can anyone think of other fields that should be added that we could perhaps add at the heading, short versions of abbreviations of country and territory names?

The next heading was official names of countries and one question raised was how could these be substantiated, would a response that comes back need to have the imprimatur (ph) or the authority based on some domestic law, or something based on something in the UN, or another international body? At this stage, what I'm very conscious of is us not getting so worried about the substantiation of claims, this will never be an authoritative list.

It would be ideal if we received responses that said, "Well, we use this particular name and this is the official name based upon X," which that source will provide us a degree of authority to cover in our final report; but what we're looking for is a whole scope of representations. And that's what would be the most important thing just because they've all -- certain member states might put their hands up to make certain claims, then that need not be authority for our work. And, I'm sorry, there was just a message for me up there, "I would be very happy for you to explain as to how ISO get their names."

Jaap: I'll make it very short. The names -- there are actually two ways how to get there and when the country is a UN member, the names are actually combed (ph) directly from representatives at the UN in New York, so -- and that's also when the name changes, so the Ambassador at the UN tells UN the name of Bolivia changed into something else; actually, last week Hungary changed its name, and -- and (inaudible) taken over by the -- that's put in the United Nations terminology database and that is what the ISO does and will use in its list. So, and that's the most normal way how that happens. One, it's not a full UN member, but it's a territory or a dependency, then it often comes (inaudible) from the country that actually takes care of it, for instance, as to how McDonald's Island, that big island, actually being taken care of by Australia, if I am not -- and they actually call the names, things like that.

Unidentified Speaker: (Inaudible) we stake claim to that.

- Jaap: But that's basically how these names are, so in the end they come from the countries, themselves, most of the time. I mean, there are sometimes problems about the names and an example, for instance, Taiwan, and since they are not a UN member and, uh, and despite (ph) conflict between China and the island, itself, it's difficult to find a name, what the new name is. However, if you look closely in the UN Terminology Database, its official name is, uh -- uh -- Taiwan Former Province of China. So that's why the ISO is using that. And --
- Paul: So, go ahead.
- Jaap: And both names are as one, English as in France, normally.
- Paul: I think what I'm getting at, I certainly observed the sensitivities around -- where there are any number of potentially politically sensitive names that we can come up with at the moment, recently, currently, and some potentially in the near future, for the purpose of this study group, it would almost be acceptable to identify in our final report a separate chapter about changing or sensitive names. I won't go into it in too much detail at the moment, but certainly, thank you for the explanation about ISO and how the names are derived there. One would hope that that category would be potentially the least contentious of any that we then work into after this, but I'm sure there's a potential connection there, anyway. But --
- Unidentified Speaker: I have one --
- Paul: Sorry, go ahead.
- Unidentified Speaker: -- (inaudible) and it's not -- the process is still going on of recognition in UN, so how ISO use in this case (inaudible).
- Paul: Sorry, that was a question about -- I missed half of that.
- Unidentified Speaker: Uh (inaudible), for example, UNESCO has the new member state, which was recognized last year, and this -- I'm speaking about Palestine and, as we know, still the process of recognition at UN, it takes some time, so in this case, how ISO uses in this specific case?
- Jaap: Palestine, it actually came up again and it's one of contentious names. Uh, Palestine, which the official name for you is Palestine Authority, Occupied, if I remember correctly. They got the name because the M49 list, which is a list of, uh, UN list for Econo -- for statistics. And basically when a country's territories appear on that list, they ask the ISO to come up with the codes and also with names with that. And this name is taken from the UN term (ph) database and that's where it says. Basically, if you look at the UN term (ph) database and look up for Palestine, you find the Palestinian Authority, Occupied as the country name.
- Unidentified Speaker: Okay, thank you.
- Jaap: So that's how, I mean, how ISO got it. And I think that is, on the moment it was -- it comes from -- there's some more documentation -- if you grind through the database, you find all this stuff, as well, and what I vaguely remember is that this was the name used in the UN after the Oslo Accords.
- Paul: Yeah, it's -- I'm sorry, go ahead.
- Jaap: That's as far as I know, but that's how the Interim Council meet (ph). They go this way, so I shall take it over (ph).

Paul: I think, again, this gets down to a very specific discussion that we'll need to have at some stage about -- I don't know how to broadly group them -- as contentious new changing, etc. etc., names, which I think collectively the study group could identify as an issue that should be considered --

Jaap: Right.

Paul: -- but then, again, we're far from being in a position to identify a response. But, having UNESCO participating and a representative of ISO, just being able to share perspectives, will assist us, in informing us in having -- being able to list out some of these complexities. We're not supposed to provide a response, and we could end up spending the vast majority of our time delving into those, but I hope it would end up being sufficient for us to just identify those issues as a chapter, or a particular issue, and leave it at that. I will -- we'll only know as we progress our work.

Now, I just wanted to move on conscious that we've probably only got around about 15 minutes left. I just want to cover off on a few -- oh, Chris' maintenance agency. I just wanted to cover off on a few of the other headings here, briefly. One of the most complex issues that I wanted to get into was -- top of the next page -- we can cover official languages, and even that can be a little bit difficult to identify, or administrative languages for particular territories, but how do we then get to the next step and cover non-officially recognized languages? That is, and the example I gave there, the name of a particular country or territory in language other than its official one. Poland in German or English, for that matter, or French, none of which are official languages there, but how would you cover all of those? And I have no doubt that the government of that country would have certain concern about representations of that country name in new gTLDs, or whatever it may be; it's an incredibly complicated exercise and it becomes how long is a piece of string? How could you go out to a member state of UNESCO and say, "What are all of the representations of your language -- sorry -- of your country name, but not in your language?" And that could be incredibly complex. I think I summarized it at the end of this document by saying, perhaps the heading could be "Examples of," we're not asking them to be comprehensive, but they could provide examples.

And something that we discussed was, would it be possible that, if you go out to 20 UNESCO member states, if the 20 are made aware of who the other 19 are, could they possibly provide in their language, in the official name and the short name, or any common usage name, of the other countries that are part of that survey. We need to scope it somehow, we need to limit it somehow, and that way we could ask them and say, "Well, how would you represent those other countries?"

Bart: Paul?

Paul: I'm sorry, go ahead.

Bart: Paul, Marin has his hand up. He wants to ask -- he wants to raise a question.

Paul: Please go ahead, Martin.

Martin: Thanks, Paul and Bart. And my apologies for arriving late on this call. For me, actually, this one is quite -- quite an important issue because all those other languages, the countries -- it includes the languages that use upper (ph) script, rather than English. And it seems to me that, well, certainly I would have a bit of a concern if, for example, there was not some way of preventing country ABC that you did, say the Chinese, the script, registering under that script, and then blocking any ability to get beyond the end for the country's relevance. And in England, the United Kingdom, doesn't have many languages (inaudible) official language, and we certainly don't have any language that uses a script other than the Latin script, but it does seem to me that we have to be very careful on this one. You say that this actually gets very long and complicated to try and do, and I liked your approach that you go through, and try and do the comparison over (inaudible) 29 (inaudible), but I think when we've sort of gone through this before, you've made mention about the idea of, well, what we're really doing is looking for a methodology whereby

you can validate a claim as a country in making (ph) to (inaudible) that particular string. So, I'm just putting my hand up and saying, you know, this is for me actually a very very important issue and I don't need solutions, but wonder whether actually it needs some sort of validation approach.

Paul: And I completely agree and, if you've read through that particular section of the text, I think I might have used the word "complex" about 12 times because this is where we are getting into incredibly complex territory. The -- for example, if we were to go to your government, Martin, and then also, if the Chinese were approached, you may well end up getting the very precise answer to the question that you're asking, or whoa (ph), given it's an informal UNESCO survey process that carries no particular weight, you may not get the answer to the question that you're looking for.

I think we're just trying to identify at this stage just how complicated this might be and the more effort that we can devote to this, the better because that may go towards allaying your concerns. There will be no comprehensive database, unfortunately, that comes out of this exercise, that covers all representations of -- the holy grail of all representations of country and territory names, in all languages and scripts. That is simply not going to happen. But if we can be as thorough as we can be, hopefully that will go some way to addressing the issue, or at least of informing the unfortunate working group that may be tasked with coming up with more recommendations and solutions. I noticed Annebeth had her hand up and --

Annebeth: Yeah, just a comment. Just a comment. So I agree on the complexity here, but it's a very important question, and what we do in this exercise in the study group, in my view, we establish what -- what it is, the complexity, what is the (inaudible) name --

Paul: That's right.

Annebeth: -- how far should we go. We are not in this group, uh, have a mandate to decide what to do with them, so who shall have them, and that will be a question for later, if I have understood this right.

Paul: That's right, and there's -- and I'm sorry that my -- if I've given everyone vertigo as I'm trying to scroll through, but my mouse had locked in -- this is a trial topology and that's what I've said, we're a study group and our findings aren't binding. The comment there was particularly about substantiation and how does someone substantiate whether this is official within local law, or through the UN, or other international body. That comment applies to the overall work of the group, as well.

Annebeth: Uh huh.

Paul: We're just trying to identify the scope of the problem, not provide solutions to the issues. The more problems that people come up with, that's not actually going to frustrate us, that's going to make our work all the more sound. A report from us that says, "Here's 200 examples of potential problems" is all the better a result than the one that says, "Here's 10 problems." That actually shows that we've been diligent in our work and identified as many issues as possible. But, Annebeth, I agree with you completely, we're not trying to provide that solution, nor can we. But that also gets back to your issue, or possible frustration about the pace at which we work because, yes, we will only at the end of -- possibly at the end of this year -- come out with the issues all identified. Now, that may well be enough to inform another working group, but that takes another certain length of time. But I certainly agree with you that that is the scope of our work, to identify the issues, not to resolve them.

Annebeth: Yeah.

Paul: So what -- and, again, I will now move rather quickly through the document. There were a series of headings where we talked about the official names, the listing of names under ISO-3166-1, primary and simplex (ph) names, so my local example would be, official name, Commonwealth of

Australia, primary and simplex name would be Australia. There's Netherland in the example that Bart had provided, again, you know, do they differ? And would it be in all official languages? And then it led to the question, feedback that we got about historical names, and I realize that this is going to be of incredible sensitivity for many countries and territories, particularly regarding entities that no longer exist. But -- but I'm conscious that we're talking about the here and now and the use of current country and territory names, I'm not suggesting that we shouldn't delve into historical names, it's going to be very important, and particularly those historical names that still represent regions, etc., or states within countries. But we have to draw a line somewhere in terms of how we refer to historical names.

We can tie ourselves in knots going back 100 years -- sorry -- one war, two wars, possibly three wars, 100 years, 500 years, and it's going to become incredibly complicated, and we can all write a thesis on it, but I suspect of most relevance will be current country and territory names, with the opportunity for respondents to our survey, and respondents to Apology, to identify historical names with relatively open boundaries as to what they self-identify as important as historical names. So that was another heading that we had covered. I didn't want to go into that in too much detail. But that was that one.

And there was also sort of local names that could become potentially confused. Sorry, was there a question? Annebeth, did you have a question? Or was your hand still up from before?

Annebeth:

No, no, I'm sorry, it's still, yeah, from the last time. So I should take it down again.

Paul:

I don't want to work through all the headings, but there are a few questions there and minority names can be potentially difficult, again. What I want to convey -- and my page doesn't want to scroll through properly -- but what I wanted to convey was that it would be very very useful for everyone to work through this document that I've circulated to the group in the last 24 hours and, please, especially read through the italicized text which raises questions; it's not a position that we're trying to press through, it's just questions that we have about how should we think about this, what sort of questions should we be asking UNESCO to go out to their member states with?

We're conducting a survey, and the saying we have in Australia is "garbage in, garbage out," if you're not precise in the material and the questions that you ask, then you can't rely on getting great responses back. When it's quite clear, and hopefully has questions and categories that go out that translates all the languages readily, and aren't necessarily complicated -- we're not going to catch everything, but what I'd really love everyone to do is to have a good read of this document and make some comments about -- provide feedback on one through the mailing list, probably no later than about the 10th of February.

We've got our next conference call scheduled for the 20th and I realize everyone is only starting to read through this document now -- very happy to have an exchange by the email list -- but if people could think about some of the questions that are being raised there, we would be (inaudible) and the Secretary is sort of compiling a summary and having another version ready to go before our 20th of February call, that would be wonderful, but we'll probably need about a week or so before that. So if I could sort of set the 10th of February as a deadline for comments on this, really what we're looking at now is let's get a document together that will make good sense for UNESCO -- and we will continue to talk with Irmgarda, and this will continue to be an iterative process -- to develop something that could go out as a meaningful survey to a selection of member states in as near future as possible, so that we can start getting responses back from them.

We're all talking in the theoretical at the moment, we're talking about what we don't know, or what we're going to get back, this is where we'd love to see examples, we've thrown a few of them in this document in various scripts and languages, but it would be great to start getting some materials back. And if they are of any use, or likely more useful, we all need to refine that and start creating (ph) some draft papers and some ideas about where we might start going with the group. We really need to get this moving.

I'm conscious that we're sort of very close to the hour mark. Was there anyone that had any questions or comments at this stage that they want to share before we sign off? All right, that being the case, I'll send a note out to everyone tomorrow just to briefly summarize what we've discussed today, but really just to say, please, read through that topology document that we've got up there at the moment, consider some of those questions, and the ultimate would be if everyone came back and said, "This is what I would like to see as the list of headings." Bart, a number of months ago, developed a straw man; what would others like to see as potential headings? Be quite bold with that. And if there are any particular questions or they are uncertain, please do share them with the group, that will help us develop something that we can get to UNESCO as soon as possible. We're certainly aiming by the time of the Costa Rica meeting, but let's see how we go with timeframe.

If there were no further questions or comments, I'd like to wrap it up there. Excellent. Thank you, everyone.

Jaap: Thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Bye-bye.

Paul: Bye-bye.