20111219_CCNSO_STUDY_GROUP_ID652973

Attendees:

ccNSO
Martin Boyle, .uk
Joke Braeken, .eu
Annebeth Lange, .no
Kathryn Reynolds. .ca
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)
Maarten Simon, .nl

GAC
Elise Lindeberg, Norway

GNSO
Carlos Aguirre - GNSO
George Asare-Sakyi – NCSG
Chris Chaplow
Avri Doria - NCSG
Heather Forrest, IPC

ALAC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO (liaison)

Staff
Bart Boswinkel
Baher Esmat
Marika Konings
Kristina Nordström
Gabriella Schittek

Apologies:

Hiro Hotta, .jp

Paul Szyndler:	Thank you, everyone, for making time to take this call. As most of us approach the festive season, I hope you all received my note and apologies again that that was relatively light, just something that gives everyone an idea of what we wanted to discuss, as you would have seen from the secretariat we've sent through, schedule for calls over the next three months or so. And I'm hoping that that's the sort of timeframe that we can start getting very active in this group. Again, apologies that there hasn't been a lot going

on. Partly, that's on me and, also, because we need to confirm the arrangements that we have with UNESCO and get them tasked with their work.

As I mentioned in my message, and I hope everyone's received it, and, please, stop me if you haven't, it was-- we'd sent out an idea of what we wanted as a typology for this group and what we wanted UNESCO to help us do. And we'd received something back many months ago now from UNESCO with some comments back.

What I wanted to discuss on this call was an update of how we're going with UNESCO. And Bart will just fill us in on the administrative details, hopefully-- just the administrative details and when we're going to speak to them and when we will engage them on their work but also to then talk about where we go from there with the typology. I see this largely as the main product of our work, the big document that we need to-- that will generate the output of this group. It will all come from what UNESCO delivers. And, therefore, as I mentioned in my e-mail, if we don't task them in a very specific way, then we run the risk of not getting a very good answer back.

I'm sorry. We've had somebody else join.

Unidentified Participant:	Maarten Simon (inaudible).
Unidentified Participant:	Thank you.
Gabriella Schittek:	I'm sorry. Could you repeat? I didn't catch that name. Sorry.
Maarten Simon:	It's Maarten Simon.
Gabriella Schittek:	Okay. Hi, Maarten. Got your name. Thank you.
Paul Szyndler:	So what I didn't want to do was gallop along with this call and just say, look, this is the next step that we want to take; rather, just to go back and say I hope everyone has seen the background materials that I've recirculated. We've sent out a straw man proposal for a typology. That represents the second stage of our-- of the study group's work. The first stage was a summary of all of the policies that ICANN had implemented, all the processes that had happened, some of which-- I think the-- sorry. I just lost my computer again. Sorry, everyone.
Unidentified Participant:	(Inaudible).
Paul Szyndler:	Very good. Look, so the first stage of our work was, of course, covering off all of the policies, processes that have gone past before and how country and territory names have been involved as part of that. And I'm relatively happy with where we've gotten to that point.

But the next stage is tasking UNESCO with undertaking a typology, developing one that will help us all with the next stage of our deliberations. And that's something that's been on the drawing board for a couple of months. Hadn't made a lot of progress yet. And I think the main job for this group is to task-- is to work out exactly what we want UNESCO to deliver.

But, if you were there, you'd heard some discussions and we talked about when we're going to speak to them next and about what. Could you just share the dates that we're looking at and the next steps that we want to take with them?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Unfortunately, Ngada (ph) was-- is on holidays as of today. Otherwise, she would have joined the call. We just had a brief idea of-- they can start filling in the details of the typology as soon as we are ready as a group to ask them to do so. It will take them about three to six months to complete it. In the meantime, the working group can progress. And we had envisioned to do so by the Costa Rica meeting that the working group itself had a clear understanding and they adopted the typology.

And Ngada will be on the calls in January and February. That's been confirmed.

Unidentified Participant: I have a question.

Grigori Saghyan: Sorry. Go ahead. I have a question. Grigori Saghyan, Armenia. Let me ask you what kind of credential has this intersectional working group on language of UNESCO. Are they need (ph) any clarification from UN staff, or it's enough for ICANN study group?

Bart Boswinkel: In the sense-- Let me put it this way. UNESCO has other avenues to, say, expertise than ICANN has or that the members of the working group have.

Grigori Saghyan: No, no. I mean, if UNESCO working group will decide that it is the last version and it's excellent, does (ph) they need to obtain some clarification from, I don't know, UN staff or--?

Bart Boswinkel: No, no. It's not in the sense of-- sorry for misunderstanding your question. We discussed it, I think, on the previous call, when Ngada explained the different processes it can go through. This will not be a full-blown, official UNESCO query.

Grigori Saghyan: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: It will be rather informal and (unintelligible).

Grigori Saghyan: Okay. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: So it will not be through the member states in the sense that the member states have to adopt or agree. Does that answer your question?

Grigori Saghyan: Yes. But maybe there will be such a problem on the next stage.

Paul Szyndler: I'm sorry. I didn't understand. Maybe there--?

Grigori Saghyan: Okay. Their decision-- is it okay for ICANN to have only their decision and that's it?

Paul Szyndler: No. I think we need to be careful here in terms of the arrangement that ICANN has with UNESCO, the agreement through which we've asked them to undertake this work. And, to the extent, so far, that they provided only as an expert opinion not as an official position, that is why I'm at such great pains to ask this group to dedicate as much time and effort as possible to tasking UNESCO with what we're asking them for, because it really is, for the most part, up to us to ensure that the scope of their work is something that we're happy with.

Grigori Saghyan: Okay.

Paul Szyndler: It's not a UNESCO official position. That's what's been made clear. We're just utilizing their resources, their skills, and the context that they have to be able to provide us with a

field of information that we wouldn't otherwise be able to reach, despite the range of skills and the contacts and the opportunities that people within this group have.

Grigori Saghyan: Okay. Thank you.

Paul Szyndler: So I'm sorry, Gabi (ph). I missed whether Heather Forrest managed to join us on this call.

Gabriella Schittek: Yes. She's here.

Heather Forrest: I'm on the call, Paul (ph). I'm here.

Paul Szyndler: Okay, Heather. Excellent. Thank you. I've just got your message, Heather. Sorry that everyone else hasn't seen that yet.

Heather Forrest: No. It's my fault for replying to you so late. I'm sorry.

Paul Szyndler: Not at all. Specifically, what I'm trying to get at-- we are now at the point of trying to refine what we have asked ICANN-- sorry-- what we've asked UNESCO. And, as I attached the straw man typology that Bart had provided a number of months ago, the way in which all of us could help fill some of the fields-- think about all of the different types of representation the country and territory names that we would like them to look at. Shortly after that, Heather got back to us, to Bart. And I've also received materials about her thoughts and some questions about how we would like to expand our thinking, how we would like the-- what other things we might like UNESCO to look at.

And I don't know, Heather, whether you can recall. I'm sorry if I put you on the spot at all. But you'd raised a few questions. You looked through the typology and asked about, look, do we need to look at official languages or other than official languages or other representations, et cetera, things that were outside of ISO-3166-1. Did you recall any of those comments that you'd provided through? Were there any thoughts you wanted to share on that?

Heather Forrest: I think it generally, let's say-- I think what Bart has developed for NL is very helpful. It's the jumping-off point, I think. You know, it really-- when one thinks about the different manifestations of country and territory names, I think we probably-- this is our opportunity to think outside the box. If part of our ambit is to gain an understanding as best we can for going forward, then I think we need to think as much expansively as we can to capture any possibilities and particularly where these might create challenges, so to speak, where there may be conflict.

So, in terms of-- I wouldn't like to see us limit our thinking to, for example, the official name as articulated in 3166. There are colloquial names. There are, oh, heck-- there's a fairly long list of possibilities, let's say.

I'm more than happy for you to circulate what I've prepared, and perhaps that will help others to think of similar sorts of things.

Paul Szyndler: Thanks, Heather. What I'm-- I apologize that the rest of the participants on this call haven't had the opportunity to see it. But it wasn't something I was going to share without Heather's permission, and that is questions about how we may want to expand the scope of the typology. It's not an area that I claim any particular expertise in, but it's-- as I mentioned before, the official names of countries in all official languages or other languages-- it's historical names. What are the clear definitions of that?

And one of the sensitive topics that I mentioned in my e-mail-- how we approach the issue of the definition of country and territory-- I well appreciate that that's a sensitive area for anyone within ICANN or anyone who's been involved in any of the policy processes involving country and territory names today to approach. But it's one of the luxuries we have, being a study group rather than a working group or a dedicated policy development process that has to arrive at an answer. We can ask the hard questions without necessarily having to provide all of the answers.

What I really wanted to try and raise on this call to see if anyone had any comments. And, if not, I'll circulate Heather's material, as well as the few questions and comments that I had about how we can expand upon what UNESCO had come back to us with to settle down the scope of the work that we wanted from them by sort of mid to late January, because, as Bart mentioned, we will speak to them. Ngada's on holidays at the moment. But, just before our next teleconference call, we will speak to them. We will try and get that work scoped and locked in. So I was sort of hoping that by about the 20th of January or thereabouts, allowing for everybody's holiday commitments, that we could get some feedback and some agreement as to what the scope of their work would look like.

Was there anyone that had any questions or comments on where we're trying to get at with this next piece of work?

Heather Forrest: Paul, this is Heather. I do have a question.

Paul Szyndler: Sure.

Heather Forrest: If it within the scope-- to the extent that we as a working group are advising on future policy relating to country and territory names, is it--? I don't recall that it's precisely articulated this way in our ambit. But are we in a position to draft a definition of country and territory names?

Paul Szyndler: In short, no.

Heather Forrest: Yeah.

Paul Szyndler: It is within our ambit to raise that question.

Heather Forrest: -- to point out that there isn't currently a definition and that this ought to be sorted out because it puts our working group in a bit of an awkward position. Our very title has to do with a term that is undefined.

Paul Szyndler: I agree 100%, and there's probably quite a lot of people on this call nodding their heads profusely at this stage. But-- And, Bart, you can stop me at any stage. But undertaking that sort of work is potentially lethal-- a very dangerous space for us to get into. But it is an issue that-- it wouldn't be inappropriate for the group to raise. Again, I sort of lean back on the - we can ask the questions but need not provide the answers - defense. And that is we may need to make some sort of definition and a shared understanding of what we mean by those terms for the purposes of this study group. But we need to be very cautious as we work around that. Does that make sense?

Heather Forrest: Yeah. No. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Paul Szyndler: Even if the outcome of the study group is to say that the ambiguity that surrounded the treatment of and the definition of country and territory names within disparate ICANN processes over the course of the last decade has been a point of confusion and that there

needs to be some better refinement or-- well, even that's a difficult recommendation-- but some sort of identification of that as an issue would be an adequate outcome of the group possibly. But it's not within our ambit to make that definition.

Is that in agreement with what you understand, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: We can't do that.

Bart Boswinkel: No. It's going back to say, before you were Chair (ph). On the first one or two meetings, we had a discussion on - does this study group need to address what is a gTLD or what is a ccTLD. I would say that's almost in the same area. As soon as you start defining what is a country and territory in the context of ICANN, you're almost on the path of that (ph) definition. This study group is too lightweight in that sense to do it because it has quite some ramification.

Paul Szyndler: And I'm entirely comfortable to, at least, try to commence drafting materials that say we realize that we're hamstrung or bound by the fact that we are a study group with those very terms in our name, but we're not in a position to actually define them.

Heather Forrest: Understood.

Paul Szyndler: That in and of itself leads to part of the problem.

Heather Forrest: Surely it's not controversial, given that the first exercise that we've undertaken is a survey of existing policy, as you pointed out. And the existing policy does, really, nothing to help us in this regard. So surely that can't be-- I mean, I understand that it's fraught with attempting to answer the question. But raising the question is surely a natural outcome of the first thing, the first task that we've been given.

Paul Szyndler: And I'm entirely comfortable and will be happy to discuss that with other group members. Raising the question is precisely the point of our existence-- to raise the matter of the ambiguity to raise the fact that there may or may not be a consistency with how we use the terms, we being ICANN and the policy processes under it collectively, that we don't have a clear definition. And that may well be point one. That may be our first point of difficulty. And I don't want to get too far away from where we're trying to get with our work.

But I think what UNESCO may be able to help us do because of their expertise, not as an official body, is to help illustrate the very many different examples of how there have been or could possibly be inconsistencies as a result of the development or the implementation of ICANN policy today.

Now, sorry. At the risk of having lost everyone, were there any other questions at this point in time? I'm conscious of monopolizing the discussion.

Annabeth Lange: Paul, this is Annabeth.

Paul Szyndler: Please.

Annabeth Lange: We talked last time about what UNESCO should do. They suggested to make a (unintelligible) with 20 countries from different regions.

Paul Szyndler:	That's right.
Annabeth Lange:	Is that idea still on? And, if so, which countries, and who is to decide which countries to choose?
Paul Szyndler:	I appreciate that's a sensitive issue. I think they said at least 20, and that offer was made in good faith just based upon-- and it wasn't a random number, but it was something based upon-- again, Bart, correct me if I'm wrong-- Ngada's best guess of what would be achievable within a reasonable timeframe. There could be consultation with the broader membership over a longer timeframe, but I believe that she was referring to tending towards countries and certain economies that they knew that they could get useful information back from. This is not trying to be exclusive. The process wasn't trying to limit certain-- limit the membership that would respond but trying to get a meaningful and a useful and a timely response. And so her suggestion was somewhere around 20 countries.
	We had hoped by the time we'd scheduled this call that we could have had a preliminary discussion with them, but, as Bart mentioned, that's not been possible. And it will only happen just before our next teleconference. But, Bart, is that your understanding? It was just a suggestion, and that's all it's been at this stage.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes.
Paul Szyndler:	I'm not aware of any further (inaudible).
Annabeth Lange:	I think it's a really good suggestion actually, and it's a very good starting point to get a kind of illustration of what we are planning to do.
Bart Boswinkel:	It is more about an illustration than having, say, a complete overview. It's this tradeoff between effectiveness and efficiency.
Annabeth Lange:	Yes. I see that, and I think it's a good idea. And, also, because it's much easier to see after doing that exercise to illustrate for other countries what we are after.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah. And that could say-- so whatever comes out of it. But it provides some handsome-- yeah. It grounds the work of the study group in real, live examples.
Annabeth Lange:	Yes. I agree.
Bart Boswinkel:	I noted Maarten has his hand up. Maarten?
Maarten Simon:	Yeah. Thanks. Yes, I did have my hand up. I've got a question about (inaudible) not included in the UNESCO (inaudible). And I wonder how we're going to deal with (inaudible), where it will come in with a different script or in a different language. (Inaudible) perhaps, because I think there is a real risk ph that we might actually just focus on the one (inaudible) to identify. And I recognize that, if you start playing with (inaudible) all scripts in all languages, you end up with (inaudible). So, then, my underlying question is: What will we do about those? Do we just ignore the fact that (inaudible)? We wouldn't then have any way of challenging (inaudible) to make it look as if they (inaudible) a large proportion of the world ph population.
Paul Szyndler:	Maarten, if I can have a go of that in the first instance, this is precisely-- you've touched on precisely the point that I'm trying to drive home for the purposes of this call. That is exactly what we need to address. That's what we need to consider in the scope of what we

are asking UNESCO to do. It is not-- It hasn't been a prescriptive response. It's been a consultative process with them, and we'll continue-- we'll have another discussion with them and then try to get as much feedback as possible about what they will do for us.

It is not limited. We shouldn't try to-- We shouldn't assume-- We're trying to balance what we can do in a feasible amount of time with something that will be expansive as possible. I agree that, if we had two years, we could go away and cover all representations in all scripts in all languages of all variations of all country and territory codes by whatever definition you may wish to take. We can't reasonably do that. We can't expect this group to cover that in, probably, not even two years, let alone one. But we need to provide a reasonable sample size, a reasonable cross-section as to exactly what Bart and Annabeth were just discussing a moment ago. It's not limited, and we need the input of members to come back to the group and point out the different types of representations that they believe are important to raise as part of the typology.

The discussion I want to have with UNESCO at the end of January is more a pragmatic one. It's a practical one about the exercise of what can they do, and what can they deliver within a reasonable period of time. And I would much rather throw a whole bunch of ideas at them than not be clear about what this group would like them to do. As it currently stands, we have the initial straw man proposal that went to them and the responses they've come back with. But we're not limited to anything within either of those two documents but, rather, a reasonable-- the group having a reasonable grasp of what we do within the timeframe and try to get a reasonable response back from UNESCO on a good cross-section of topics.

So does that make sense? We're not-- Everything you've raised, yes, absolutely, that could well be within the scope of the typology, but it's going to be balanced up against what we can and can't do within a reasonable timeframe.

Maarten Simon: Yeah. I think that's certainly-- I understood all of that. I guess where I was (inaudible).

And a second thing is just-- it becomes very quickly an enormous numbers game. And so I was actually wondering whether-- okay, (inaudible) UNESCO work and see where that leads us to. (Inaudible), it would be impossible to compile-- (inaudible) if we compile a complete list of every country and territory and in every language and every script, in which case it's perhaps an easier option or perhaps a useful backstop option to be able to have an appeals process, with which we then have to do (inaudible). That is the name of our country (inaudible) in that particular country.

Paul Szyndler: I completely understand what you're saying there, Maarten. Firstly, the issue of a proper definition is one that I'm still wrestling with and that I think the group may collectively need to wrestle with and may accept that it is not our place, however many inter-government organizations there are globally that have tried to define what is and what is not a country or a territory. And, if we were to go into that space, we will be trying to answer a question for ICANN that it has been dealing with for the last decade. So it's problematic, and that's one that we probably need to put aside for the time being.

But, when it comes to the work that we're asking UNESCO to do, it's about getting a truly representative field of types of categories that we can ask them to get feedback on. It is never going to be a comprehensive body of work. We cannot cover, and it will not be something that anyone within ICANN or outside will rely upon as being a guide as to what is and is not a representation of a country or territory. It is simply meant to be a table that we can look at and say here are the problems that-- We've looked at the policy processes that have been already. Here is some evidence from UNESCO of the different

ways that country and territory names are represented. And we as a study group will only be able to take that next step once we see what they come back with.

But I would hope that it would help illuminate our thinking and show us that, yeah, there are indeed a lot of problems with the way current and previous policy processes have treated these names. There may be inconsistencies. Bart's thrown out some examples, probably, most recently at our Dakar meeting-- examples that haven't been captured but that have been omitted. It doesn't need to be comprehensive, and it's not going to be a table or a guide or an absolute template for how anyone would have to deal with those names in the future. But we just want it to be as broad as possible, acknowledging that it will not go beyond a certain number of countries.

Unidentified Participant: I have a question.

Paul Szyndler: And I'm also acknowledging that, yes, that's still the discussion that we have to have with UNESCO, how those are selected. Who will be the 20-something participants?

Annabeth Lange: Paul, it's Annabeth again.

Unidentified Participant: I have a question (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: Sorry. I didn't catch the names, but one after the other, please.

Unidentified Participant: Hello?

Annabeth Lange: Okay. This is Annabeth. It was one more there. I can wait.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. (Inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: Okay, (inaudible) the other person in, Annabeth, please.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Annabeth Lange: So me first? Okay.

Paul Szyndler: All yours, Annabeth. Sorry.

Annabeth Lange: All right. I think it doesn't matter so much which 20 countries we use because it's an illustration. But in my mind, it's more like as study group, it's a starting point for-- wanting to catch the interest of others concerned and to show that it is a reason why we started this. And then, afterwards, perhaps it might be possible to have a real working group working more (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: I couldn't agree more. It's Paul here again. I just-- That's precisely what I'm trying to convey-- that it is actually our responsibility. We have the opportunity to be a little out there, a little dangerous in terms of the issues we raise. It's not for us to have to answer all of the concerns. It would be an appropriate outcome for the study group to come back and say there actually are a great deal of-- there is actually a great deal of inconsistency in the way policies have been applied before, by accident, not by construction, or that there's possibilities for certain representations, country and territory names, that we hadn't foreseen or ICANN hadn't foreseen. It's for us to raise those issues. So I completely agree that it's not for us to be limited and that that's the work the UNESCO comes back with should just be illustrative.

Bart Boswinkel:	Paul, may I add to this?
Paul Szyndler:	Please, do.
Bart Boswinkel:	Two examples. Unfortunately, this is for examples for those of you who have been dealing with some of the ccNSO working and study groups. There we have-- this is called a study group precisely to have-- to make it a bit more loosely and just identify-- excuse me-- identifying issues. A good example of why we (unintelligible) model was, say, the wild card in study group. What it did is identify issues and come up with very broad-brush recommendations just to move the process forward. That's one example. That's the wild card.
	A second example, I would say was, although that was far more strict toward the delegation and re-delegation working group. That working group identified issues based on, say, a very extensive analysis of what was going on and then went back to the council and recommended the creation of the framework of interpretation to start resolving and recommended the initiation and launching of a PDP.
	So it's between very loose and lightweight recommendations and even recommending the PDP is necessary. That is how the outcome and output of this working group was envisioned, based on analysis of the issues or analysis of the overview typology and identifying issues and a recommendation of direction how to resolve them and not coming up with a resolution per se.
	Does that clarify your question, Annabeth?
Annabeth Lange:	Yes. Yes, it does. It's my opinion as well.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah.
Unidentified Participant:	I want to ask my question (inaudible) again.
Paul Szyndler:	Please, do.
Unidentified Participant:	Okay. I think it's a rather simple question. What--? Is it possible to have any recommendation which will be acceptable by all countries in general?
Paul Szyndler:	I have to break that question down into parts. But, in terms of recommendations, it's not likely that this study group would come up with such strong recommendations that would need-- it's been our mandate to raise a range of issues for the ccNSO council. We may make some recommendations regarding further work. As Bart has outlined, it may head towards the working group process. It may head towards PDP. That would probably be the strength of our-- the extent of our recommendations. It wouldn't be-- it's not within the mandate of this work-- this study group to make solid recommendations about how country and territory names are treated in the future across ICANN. It may only be a recommendation of ours that the issue needs to be looked at in greater depth, and this is where we recommend that that next step of work (inaudible).
	I hope that answers your question. But it's not something that-- this group will not come out and say this is a country, this is a territory, this is the definitions that we believe that ICANN should apply, and that's what we believe. It's, rather, for us to gather evidence, to do the academic-- largely academic work, and then present that and then maybe make recommendations about future work.

Is that relatively clear?

Unidentified Participant: No. For me, it's not clear, because, if we say that it is not a recommendation which will be accepted by all countries, we must decide which is a percentage of countries who cannot accept these recommendations. If 5% of countries-- Okay. (Unintelligible). Okay. It's necessary to-- I think it would be better to have some kind of percentage. As I say, 5% of countries, if they will not accept our recommendation, it's okay for a working group.

Paul Szyndler: Absolutely. And I completely agree that, as a study group and as a cross-constituency study group within ICANN, our processes will be subject to public commentary to feedback from the community on at least two occasions. That's what I'm hoping for as part of the schedule that I outlined in Dakar so that there will be that opportunity for community feedback. The group would not plow on towards some sort of recommendation without the acknowledgement that certain recommendations may or may not be contentious. As with all ICANN processes, there will be that opportunity for feedback, and that will be factored in as part of our final comments.

Just to go back to what I said before, the responsibility of this group is to provide a final report to the ccNSO council because it was the ccNSO council that convened the group, although it is multi-stakeholder. And that report may contain no recommendations whatsoever. It may just be an observational report. I don't expect that will be the case. But all of it will be subject to public commentary, and, depending upon inputs as those that we flag that may or might not be contentious, that will certainly be factored into what the group comes back with. So we will have to see what the public comment period provides us back with.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. So it's possible to be flexible.

Paul Szyndler: Absolutely. We're a study group. We can almost do what we want.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Also, one other question. Is it possible to send more messages in (unintelligible), because it's easier to read and think on these questions but not (inaudible) during conference.

Paul Szyndler: I agree.

Unidentified Participant: More material is in the mailing list. Yes. I ask-- it will be easier for me to work as (unintelligible) will be more convenient for me.

Paul Szyndler: Yes. I agree. And I apologize to collective because it was my responsibility that these materials arrived just before this teleconference call. The only-- the main reason I wanted to convene it was so that we could have this discussion about issues so that we can clarify that what we all need to do together next is go back and look at those couple of attachments that are provided in the e-mail. We've got some feedback from UNESCO. We've got some comments from Heather, which I will, now that I've got her permission, share with the group. So that will actually quite illuminate everybody's thinking. And I'll set a deadline for somewhere around about the 20th of January-- I apologize for the time of year that we're doing this-- to receive some comments back because I will have a teleconference with UNESCO just to preliminary scope-- preliminarily scope their engagement and share that with the group on our next teleconference.

So, yes, absolutely. I'll send something around from-- in addition to the materials within the next 24 hours that will outline my thinking. And we can all-- the purpose of this call

was to just (unintelligible) this is where we're at. And this is a comment that we would like to receive. We need to think about what we are asking UNESCO to do. And I imagine we'll aim for about 20th of January. So, yes, absolutely, I'll follow that procedure from here on out.

Bart Boswinkel: Paul, this is Bart. Maybe share the-- I could do that as well. Share the PowerPoint with the schedule, et cetera, the purpose as well.

Paul Szyndler: Bart, I'm going to be sending an e-mail to the entire group tomorrow, so I'm happy to include that as part of it. For those that either weren't present or weren't able to participate remotely, I put up a PowerPoint presentation that shared this study group's activities to date, what we foresaw as a rough working schedule, basically, grouped around the three meetings of next year, and where we're looking to get at. And that is mainly, once we get to Costa Rica, to actually have UNESCO undertaking the work by that stage. If we can get them going earlier, excellent. But I'll share that with the group as well.

Were there any other questions or comments or issues to be raised at this stage? Excellent.

In absence of that, I will send you all a message through tomorrow that will cover through what we've discussed to date, what my expectations or my hopes are over the course of the next month, which was, basically, for the group to put our collective heads together and make some comments. I'll share Heather's thoughts that she's already shared about what-- how we might wish to expand the typology. I'll expand upon that again in my e-mail exactly what we're looking for. And hopefully we can then share a bit of a discussion, and would encourage everyone in the group to share their comments amongst the whole mailing list, not individually. And, that way, we can have something really (unintelligible) UNESCO. I'll speak to UNESCO just in advance of our next teleconference. And then, hopefully, we'll have quite a bit to report on about the 26th of January, I believe. Was it?

Unidentified Participant: I think it is.

Paul Szyndler: The 26th.

Unidentified Participant: (Unintelligible), Paul. Well done.

Paul Szyndler: I didn't do that. That was Bart. You know that.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: That's our national holiday, for anyone in Australia.

Unidentified Participant: Just to make sure you're available.

Paul Szyndler: Ty. Look, thank you, everyone. Thanks for your time. We've just about hit the hour mark. I had hoped initially that we would be able to share a little bit more information if we had a discussion with UNESCO at this point. We haven't. Hopefully, I'll focus what we want over the next month or so in my e-mail tomorrow.

Otherwise, I wish you all all the best for the festive season for those of you who celebrate it. And, if not, we'll see you in January.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Thanks, Paul.

Paul Szyndler: Thanks, everyone.

People: Bye-bye, everyone.