

Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories
20 February 2012

ccNSO

- Martin Boyle, .uk
- Joke Braeken, .eu
- Henry Chan, .hk
- Ian Chiang, .tw
- Hiro Hotta, .jp
- Annebeth Lange, .no
- Grigori Saghyan, .am
- Ron Sherwood, .vi
- Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)

GAC

- Elise Lindeberg, Norway

GNSO

- George Asare-Sakyi - NCSG
- Iliya Bazlyankov - RrSG
- Avri Doria - NCSG
- Heather Forrest, IPC

Specialists

- Jaap Akkerhuis (Guest)
- Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg, UNESCO

Support Staff

- Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO
- Marika Koenings, GNSO
- Kristina Nordström, ccNSO
- Gabriella Schitteck, ccNSO

Apologies

Chris Chaplow - CBUC (Observer)
Eduardo Diaz (NARALO)
Sokol Haxhiu, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO (liaison)
Kathryn Reynolds. .ca
Maarten Simon, .nl

Paul Szyndler: Thank you, everyone, for joining us and participating. And most notably, for everyone or quite a number of people, giving some input -- providing some input to the last document that I sent around. It's important that we get moving on the work of this study group now, given that we've got some deadlines within our

work plan that we need to meet. So I will just quickly -- I've got a slide show that I'm sharing here in the Adobe room, which is quite extensive. And I'll try to move through it quite quickly. But broadly speaking, the agenda for this call is just again roll call and apologies. Secretariat, do we have any apologies that were noted? I'd appreciate a roll call of everyone that you captured for the call, but were there any apologies in particular?

Gabriella Schittek: Yes, we have five apologies. We have apologies from Sokol Haxhiu, Eduardo Diaz, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kathryn Reynolds and Maarten Simon.

Paul Szyndler: Okay, thank you. Otherwise everybody's participation's been noted for our call and thank you for making time.

We'll very quickly, for the purposes of this call, scan through the work plan and our schedule because we've just about hit some milestones. Of course, Costa Rica is the first one. And that will just be a very, very quick summary. Beyond that, I want to spend quite a bit of time discussing on this call the UNESCO work or the proposed UNESCO work, the survey. Why we're doing it, when, the times, how long it's going to take, what it involves really with the aim of trying to narrow down the categories and aiming towards taking a decision in Costa Rica. If you look back at our original work plan, that was our deadline, so I do want to make some progress towards that end.

The agenda item I had listed there was specifically about the methodology and what is involved in running a survey through UNESCO. Irmgarda, I haven't discussed it with you previously, but I have attached the -- I did attach from a previous email the PowerPoint slide that you shared. Thank you. I might just ask you to speak to that briefly later on. Just with regards, so that everyone in the group understands what is involved in getting a survey or getting a consultation going through UNESCO.

And then, as I said, the next step is specifically the development of the topology. We really need to start getting things locked in, if not before, then particularly at Costa Rica, so that UNESCO can get their work underway. And then just briefly touching on expectations for San Jose and afterwards.

Now again, there's the work plan and schedule. Hopefully those (inaudible) everyone can see that. At the moment, the development of a policy overview, all of this stuff is historical now for the purposes of the group. We have done this, I don't want to spend too much time revisiting it.

Grigori Saghyan: Hello?

Paul Szyndler: Those two --

Grigori Saghyan: This is Grigori Saghyan from Armenia.

Paul Szyndler: Hello, thank you for joining us. We've just got underway and we're working through a summary of the work plan and schedule of the group before we get into the substance of the call.

As I was saying, the -- we're now at the point where topology needs to be getting towards finalized, UNESCO getting their work underway. And then we can move onto the subsequent issues, which include us starting to brainstorm collectively as a group the main body of our work. Some of the issues we see and the policies that ICANN has had and has at the moment, and how they may cause issues or problems or concerns, or where there are conflicts or inconsistencies or gaps in how country and territory names are treated.

But for the purposes of today's call I really wanted to make some topology and as part of that, the survey that UNESCO will be undertaking for us. We've been discussing it for a few months now. The work really does need to begin.

And for those in the Adobe room, I have put up the slide that Irmgarada had sent us. And this is not really all that complicated, but I was wondering, Irmgarada, if you could walk through any of the key elements there. It's a process flow document for how the survey might go through UNESCO. Were there any particular elements there that you wanted to flag with us to explain to the group?

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Yes, Paul, thank you. So the scheme what we shared with you, this is just kind of a temporary one, a kind of a draft scheme, which could be used. This is a proposal, it's not approved, but this is what it could describe better visually how the process may look like. And I included as well possible timeframe when we would have results. If, for example, everything goes as it was planned and all member states are replying fast enough, and if Sylvia works well as well.

So, just to let you know what, for example, if Sylvia's ready, and we have all this criteria for countries established, we would need to prepare online service, so that would be most likely in March. It again depends if survey itself is ready. So UNESCO would follow-up March, April, before official (inaudible) invitation to those 20, 25 member states. And we could follow-up as well with new (inaudible) and other means of communication to other countries and other institutions if necessary. So that's as well a question, do we want to approach our institutions or not?

And what concerns the official way we would need to get a reply from member states, from permanent delegations to national commissions. Once we had the internal consultations at home, which of the institution would be nominated. So here you see official response by April, May. Which institution will be replying would be responsible to complete the survey.

So the small number of member states, if you think about 20, 25, this would help us as well, would be quite easy for us to follow-up. So from our side, we can -- if needed, we can explain, we can add more information if needed and (inaudible). And even if needed, we can engage with those institutions at national level.

So we presume what we would be able to complete with survey during the May and June months. And the results would go to the working group, if I understand correctly, June and July. So basically we could speak what maybe the preparation of report could start even in, I don't know, depending again, June or July.

So that is the proposed timetable. It's for you to tell me whether this really, according to ICANN's plans and as well the whole process described is it is appropriate because you still can modify and it's only a draft proposal, so you are welcome.

Paul Szyndler:

Thank you for that. It's worth noting something that I hadn't mentioned in the introduction of that slide and that was a discussion that we'd had with Irmgarda previously. And that was about the way UNESCO -- I know it's an issue that study group members and then people in the wider ICANN community may have a concern about how can we go out and test this methodology? How do we go out and survey members when we need to pick 20 or 25? How do we do that in a fair and balanced way? And I think the conversation had come down to well, if it is a test of the process and if there is a possibility of later in this process consulting all member states, or at least sending a notification or a request for

information to all member states, it would be most expeditious to identify those states who are most likely to respond in an efficient way that have the capability in their established networks that they'll respond back in good time.

That said, dividing the 20 to 25 up amongst geographic regions so that there's a fair coverage there. That may still lead to concerns or claims of favoritism, those that have the resources to participate and respond promptly to UNESCO. But that's why I think the April steps about -- that Irmgarda mentioned about a newsletter or an official invitation, but then also advertising it in a newsletter and making all member states aware of it, such that should they choose to, should they self nominate to respond to this trial survey, that could be factored in as well.

Irmgarda, that was your understanding of the conversation we've had, wasn't it? Or have I misrepresented that?

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Exactly. We can use different channels. I mean the most easiest and fastest is newsletter. Wiki will help as well. Some other meetings and member states. And if I'm not mistaken, middle of April where we'll be as well would have opportunity to inform our member states. First of all permanent delegation, which are in Paris. And where the first (inaudible) partners in Paris will work and as well national commissions, which are at home and home countries. And we can inform them what this process will be going on.

For example, by that time I would presume with the half hour survey done already technically. And we could then advise them if someone is interested to do it, but of course we will make clear with this testing process is why not all member states are involved in this process. And we could as well inform them what once the (inaudible) the topology's kind of more or less approved. We agree that it is useful, it is finalized, we could do a second step and invite all other countries to contribute.

Having said this, and of course we don't know what kind of response will be received. But it's very clear what would indicate, but this is a test phase. So this is why all member states are not consulted.

Paul Szyndler: And specifically we're testing not only the topology nor any of the categories that we're using, but also the process.

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: Is this working? Does it make sense? And is it going out effectively and therefore drawing back appropriate responses?

Unidentified Participant: Paul?

Paul Szyndler: I'm sorry?

Unidentified Participant: Martin and Avri have --

Paul Szyndler: Yes, I've got that, sorry. I hadn't let Avri yet know that I would get to her, but Martin was on my list. Sorry, Martin, you had your hand up first.

Martin Boyle: Yes, thanks, Paul. I'm sorry for joining late. I was caught up on another call. That's actually very helpful, Irmgarda. I think that you're also sort of causing me a little bit of concern to see how we might be able to go through and get a representative selection.

My sort of question has partly been sort of dealt with as Paul has sort of talked us through this. But I'm sort of wondering how important for a survey like this will be to make sure that we've got quite a good mixture of different language types or language groups or script groups? So my concern is that unless we get a good mix, unless we get one from this sort of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, unless we get one from the different scripts that use Arabic, that we might actually find that we're missing something that is actually going to cause concern. So that's the question I'd like to sort of hear how you feel about getting that good mix. Thanks.

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: I fully agree with you that we need a good mix. And this is what (inaudible) quality in March (inaudible) preparation and we have pre-selection criteria. I would presume from my side, from personally, I think what it should be one of the criteria what we would have is good mix of different languages and scripts used. So [Evan] will be selecting from each region a few countries. Maybe these are the countries, which should be kind of taken into consideration. So it would be one of the pre-selection criteria. This is what I could propose to have it and I believe that this is a -- it's very important to reflect this diversity of scripts around the world.

Paul Szyndler: It might appear, just to back up what Irmgarda said there, it may appear as though we're trying to be expeditious with this process and move it through as quickly as possible. But it's also important to note that UNESCO has been nothing but accommodating in terms of us being able to get results that are reflective of our community. So there has never been an obstacle in this process put in front of us that the study group will be limited in terms of the countries, the scripts, the languages, et cetera, that we would survey.

The only limitation is, for the sake of our methodology, is how do you identify 20, 25 and therefore cover all of the scripts, cultures, languages, et cetera in the world, which is impossible. But we can try and get a reasonable representation. And as Irmgarda has just said, that will be the intention all the way through the process. The pre-selection, there's no reason, there is no doubt it will be discussed through the study group.

I'm not quite sure exactly like right now in terms of how that selection process would go other than we would all share it, we would all discuss trying to meet in an effective way as possible of identifying a really broad group. It's going to be hard. We will not cover everyone in 20 to 25 countries. But I think -- I'm hoping that all collectively we can discuss that. And as I said, there's been no limitations or procedural limits put on us by UNESCO. So, it's really a better case of us getting perfectly clear on what we're asking for and then they can help us deliver that.

So, I hope to an extent that answers your question, Martin. It's not the definitive answer yet, but just a general one about an acknowledgement about the need for board representation and hopefully a commitment to a process that will help us get that.

Martin Boyle: Yes, I think that's it. Irmgarda's comment was actually quite useful. Yes, I like you (inaudible) can't get everything in 20, 25. But that's the selection criteria are looking to get in at that -- get in that mix is important, so I'm feeling quite happy with that. Thank you.

Paul Szyndler: Yes, thanks, Martin. Look, that definitely becomes an immediate body of work for us. An offline discussion between me and Irmgarda and others about in the first instance how the selection criteria might need to be identified and then sharing with the group very, very quickly thereafter how that might manifest itself in terms of the selection of 20 to 25 countries.

I'm just going to move onto the next question. Avri, you had your hand up for a little while. Sorry it took a while to get to you.

Avri Doria:

Thank you. This is Avri. And I apologize for having been slow to get up to speed on this group, even though I must say I'm only in the server I think.

This is just a test of a fuller survey, if I'm understanding. I'm wondering, the UNESCO community is wider than just the member states. It has many institutions that it accredits as participants. And I'm just wondering about the multi-stakeholder nature of ICANN when doing a survey with UNESCO, only reaching out to UNESCO's nation state, member state. And, for example, what does that lead out? Are we aware of that? It's leaving out all consideration, for example, of indigenous group issues that may or may not come up and be relevant to the questionnaire as it's brought up.

So, I did -- I missed the discussion -- I'm sure I did if it happened -- a discussion on why the other organizations that are accredited to the UN system and UNESCO aren't also somehow part of the pre-survey and are they intended to be part of the greater full survey? Thank you.

Paul Szyndler:

Avri, thank you. And thank you for your input. You're not joining the process late at all. The commentary that we've received from you is great, and I've let you know offline personally, this is precisely the type of dialogue I was trying to get moving in this group.

With regards to UNESCO in the first instance, the methodology that we've adopted to date is just one based upon the convenience, for the lack of a more artful word, the convenience of the agreement that existed between ICANN and UNESCO regarding mutual assistance. The expertise that's embodied in UNESCO and the channels and the networks that we as a study group can exploit to try to gather as much information as possible.

That said, I acknowledge that from a methodological perspective, from an academic perspective, the work that we do is -- we aim to be as expansive as possible while at all times explaining to all stakeholders that us saying nothing is off limits, we're trying to gather as much information as possible, is I think being interpreted as a land grab by any -- by one element of the ICANN community.

We want to identify all the problems we can, all of the issues that are out there. Even just a statement of these are the policies that we have and these are the country and territory name representations that we have, map the two together and see where the gaps are. And UNESCO's been engaged simply because that avenue was readily available to us, that dialogue was one that was already in existence and it's something that we've decided to use.

That said, we wouldn't want to limit our processes. We're not necessarily going to limit ourselves to just the formal member state network. It's just going to be a case of us then moving onto other avenues of consultation.

This is step one and the most important thing to note is something that I said earlier. And that is we're not just testing the categories and the topology that we're developing, but also the process, the consultation. If we get a whole bunch of UNESCO member states coming back saying -- or providing answers that don't necessarily fit in, or that we don't understand, or coming back and saying the survey that you've developed makes no sense to us, then that's what we're testing. And that's valid feedback in and of itself.

If -- sorry, go ahead.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. And I totally appreciate that and I'm actually very, very happy to see somebody testing the test. So --

Martin Boyle: That's a good way to put it.

Avri Doria: So, and following that kind of rigor. No, and I wasn't suggesting going outside of UNESCO. I understood that this was -- but the UNESCO network is larger than just a network of its member states. It includes within itself a number of methods for reaching out to the UN system accredited, whether it's through (inaudible), through UNESCO itself, its participating IGOs, NGOs and some private sector organizations.

So I'm just wondering within the UNESCO context, not speaking of what we did next with all of ICANN's multi-stakeholders, but UNESCO itself has multi-stakeholder processes in place in many cases. So I was just wondering about the use of those. I wasn't speaking of going outside UNESCO's organizational structure.

Paul Szyndler: Avri, thank you. Go ahead.

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: This is Irmgarda. Yes, this is very relevant comment where we can reach our other networks, because UNESCO has -- it's true that we have a lot of accredited organizations, which are associated with UNESCO. And we have our other UN system organizations we work very closely. But in order to do it, it has to be a need and it has to be communicated by this working group, because what we understand, and please correct me if I'm wrong, we understand that from this working group you want to have a reliable kind of feedback.

And when it comes to country and territory names, this is something which is related to still the governmental institutions. And in this process when you see when we ask member states, we will be nominating national institutions. And most likely it will be public institutions, or in some cases could be as well an NGO working in that country, which is responsible or is capable to complete the survey. And in this case, this is how we will be reaching at least one part of our networks.

It's true what we can share to the (inaudible) UN agencies with accredited NGOs and private institutions, but that is a question do we have now to mix those several different target audiences? Because at least our impression was that the group aims to have data coming back from governmental level. Basically trying to ensure what the reply is as much as possible is official. Because if you have an institution, which is -- works in this field at country level, it may not have all the necessary kind of responsibilities and obligations to reply on behalf of the country.

So it's again a question for this working group. Do we need to do it? Because if it's needed, we could have another process consulting both other institutions or at the same time that of course becomes a much more bigger process, longer process most likely, and more complex. But if the question is what is our final objective, what we are aiming, because we are thinking about data collection, but we want to know what does data have to contribute to something else? So it's true that it's possible to do it, but this is what maybe first of all that we would like to hear is what is your opinion? Do we really need to go through other target audiences?

Unidentified Participant: I have a comment. Can I --?

Paul Szyndler: Yes, please.

Unidentified Participant: I'll put myself at the end.

Unidentified Participant: So, I think that one of the questions is who will send this survey for answers? Who will be author of this survey? ICANN or UNESCO?

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: We will be reaching out already having approval of this working group and ICANN. So we'll be referring to both institutions at the same time, but invitation will be sent from UNESCO.

Unidentified Participant: Okay, so one official organization.

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Yes, but of course we will be referring immediately to a working group and ICANN. We will not act alone.

Unidentified Participant: Wait a minute. UNESCO headquarters will send this survey to national commissions. Am I right?

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Yes, and permanent delegations, yes.

Unidentified Participant: And permanent delegations.

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: So, it means official UNESCO headquarters will ask for answers or affirm UNESCO national commissions.

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: You see with April and May --

Unidentified Participant: That or to identify --

Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg: We have to help us to reach out to those institutions which will have a right to reply. So internally members still have to decide which institution will be responsible to come back, because this is what we say April-May 2012, you see there is an official response. So we would expect with permanent delegations and national commissions would come back to us and say this is a title, this is an institution. We agreed internally what one institution will be responsible to response -- to provide the response officially.

Unidentified Participant: Wait a minute. It means that UNESCO can send its requests only to national commissions.

Paul Szyndler: (Inaudible), sorry it --

Unidentified Participant: Because UNESCO has not enough power to send its requests to let's say the prime minister or president.

Paul Szyndler: I'm sorry, it's Paul here. I think at this stage we're getting a little too deep into the specificities of the how -- the mechanisms of how this will go out. I actually meant to stop that conversation just a little bit further back and that was with -- at the point where Avri had made her valid observations about will it be UNESCO, will it be associated organizations? Will it be networks that are connected to UNESCO? At which point I was going to say that is a good discussion and one we will have. And I suspect the issue that we're getting to right now is another one that we need to get into in-depth in Costa Rica, given that we're already past the halfway point of this call.

So I want to flag both of those. That is, the extent -- part of what Irmgarda had covered was we need to know exactly what we're asking and from whom we are asking that, and how we want it to go out. And they are quite willing to facilitate that. So that's a discussion that this study group needs to have first or needs to continue before we take that back to UNESCO further.

And specifically to whom the survey is going out and how it is communicated is again a more in-depth discussion that we should just put aside temporarily to have -- if I can park that, given that we're more than 30 minutes in, to have for a very few hours in Costa Rica.

I do need to move on because I've got many slides to cover, so I'm sorry about that. Avri, you are back first again. And then Annebeth. Avri, did you have something?

Avri Doria: I guess yes, just one quick point and then I guess that saves it for the discussion. Is that if we're only looking for official languages, yes the governments would be the only one with the expertise and authority. But if this survey goes way beyond that, I think we have to go way beyond that.

Paul Szyndler: Yes, look, I'll get to that later on in the methodology, so thanks for that. Annebeth, you had your hand up. Was there something that you wanted to add at this moment?

Annebeth Lange: Just to add what you said actually. You said most of it. But since UNESCO will be sending out something, it will be natural to get the GAC into this process. But I'm sure you already thought of that, so we can discuss that in Costa Rica.

Paul Szyndler: Yes, absolutely. Just to address that point very quickly. We have for the ccNSO session, with GAC, that is an agenda item and again it's for the -- and I know this is a group of participants from all constituencies, but ccNSO, given we convene this group, will be meeting with GAC. This will be on the agenda for that session. I'll give a quick briefing. I've already spoken to some members of the GAC and I've sent an email to Heather Dryden the chair of the GAC about this issue. So really yes, it is something that we're discussing with the GAC, so that they are aware and not surprised that we are then going back to their capitals through a different mechanism, through a different avenue to raise these issues. So in brief, yes.

Now look, I'm sorry, I do need to move forward just a little more quickly because we do have quite a bit to cover. That was the process. That was roughly speaking the process diagram of how this would go through UNESCO. And I've noted the extra things that we need to take care of in terms of who does that involve engaging and how will we do it, et cetera. That will be a discussion that we can continue on with.

Annebeth Lange: Paul, would it be possible just to reply to the question which came from the last gentleman? I didn't notice his name.

Paul Szyndler: Sure.

Unidentified Participant: UNESCO will of course reach presidents and ministries and prime ministries and ministry of culture, technology and so on. That is it has to be a purpose why we are contacting them. And with server like this I would doubt that we really need to go to the president of the country. But when there is a specific need to do it, we always do it, so just to make clear but of course we have access to those people at national level.

Paul Szyndler: Noted and again, if we need to have a more detailed discussion about established protocol, diplomatic protocol within the UNESCO protocol, happy to devote a little bit of time in Costa Rica. Avril, I've taken your note online that yes, absolutely I will attempt to brief the ALAC about this in Costa Rica, if not verbally and in person, then certainly by briefing night so that all constituencies are aware of what it going on in this group.

Annebeth, did you still have a further question or is your hand still up from before?

Annebeth Lange: No, it's fine. I'm, no, nothing further. Not so far.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you. Look, now I'm going to try to move on a little bit more quickly, because this is the meat of what I really wanted to cover as soon as possible in -- as extensively as possible in this conversation. The next slide talks about the development of topology and this is largely covering what we've discussed already. This is a tool, this is a research project, this is what we're using to try to get a decent understanding of how complex the idea of country and territory names is.

People have already -- in this group have already commented. We received feedback from UNESCO about how we would go about developing a topology. And we really need, in order to meet our deadlines, to arrive at some sort of agreement and some sort of mutual understanding by Costa Rica because UNESCO has to go away and do their work.

Whether that means that there needs to be additional briefings to sectors of the community or for the group to discuss to greater length the fact that this is a test of a test and that hopefully that provides enough comfort to everyone that we can get moving forward. I hope we can achieve that at Costa Rica. If we do not, we are starting to fall behind our established timelines.

Again, just to go back to an earlier slide, we're looking at a delivery deadline of somewhere around this study group delivering some sort of report at the end of this year. We didn't have a definite deadline, but it was basically before the second round of new gTLDs is launched. None of us knows when that will be. The ICANN board has recently made a commitment to there being a second round, but we have to assume that if all the stars align and miracles occur, that it could be just over a year's time. So we have to aggressively aim for the end of this year so that our input could be meaningfully considered.

This will of course be an import to the ccNSO council in the first instance having to lean the group. But then whatever they then recommend out of this process to get moving as soon as possible, given the timelines we're working to.

Now just moving on, the following two slides are about the specific headings and the categories that I had in the survey document that I had sent to everyone a couple of days ago. There are a few things that are not in there that were in the previous draft and I'll address that at the end. But I did want to devote an entire slide to each one because there were people that raised issues about a number of them and I wanted to work through them rather than to just dismiss the comments we've received.

We've proposed to start with the ISO 3166-1 alpha 2 and possibly alpha 3 codes. And the survey basically being set as a questionnaire, asking questions rather than a simple table, because that allows us to actually explain what we're asking for and what we'd like to receive back in a little more detail. So therefore, what

are your country's or territory's 2 and 3 letter representations on said ISO list would be the starting point.

Now, I notice the comments that we received from Avril and Jaap about how relevant is that, this is starting to sound a little expensive. I'm sorry, I'm paraphrasing. This can again certainly sound like a land grab or a lean towards county codes, towards CCs, because well by the very nature of the survey, we are starting from the ISO list, which is the basis upon which all of us exist. So, I'm just noting that that's acknowledged and it will always seem to be leaning this way for the start of the process.

The reason I proposed to -- and we've discussed -- a number of us have discussed why three letter codes might be in there because look, it's a political terminology here in Australia and a number of other countries, it's a Dorothy Dixier, it's the easy, straight-up question, the loaded question, the straight-up question, which just requires a check of a form and a response or a check of an existing data source and a response. So it's a factual statement. We could go and look these up ourselves, but we want them to answer this question.

I can understand how there would be some concerns that the fact that we're asking about three letter codes and the fact that they already exist as gtLDs. And that's never been an issue in the past. It doesn't matter. We're just trying to establish the various usages of these country and territory representations. It doesn't matter whether it's in an official sense or whether it's in a cultural or a social sense, how dot co is used versus how dot com is used and how neither of them represents more doesn't matter. It's just to try to gain as much information as possible. And that's why I wanted to use that a starting point.

Were there any particular comments? Sorry, I was going to move on as quickly as possible, but were there any comments about that one as our starting point in particular? I'm conscious of not rushing through it.

Thank you. As I said, the comments we've received to date have been noted and we'll work through them further. I hope we can provide enough assurance to everyone that -- for the sake of being expansive for a survey, then hopefully that's an acceptable basis for us to start our work.

Question two was about official and conventional long form names. This is one where I admit I am struggling. I don't have a definitive answer and the commentary that I'd received back from a number of people, admitted that they didn't have a definitive answer either. And I fully acknowledge that official name means nothing in some cases. Doesn't mean anything to particular administrations to particular countries. And that the term name use for administrative purposes might be a bit verbose or a bit obscure and not mean anything to other responders, which is why I'm trying to stick a few together -- stick a few of these terms together in one question.

What is your country or territory's official name or conventional long form name? Or name used for administrative purposes? And that we would then include a UNGGN definition or something else. This is something I want everyone to really devote a bit of thought to. Is there any other way that we could refer to it that means something? I don't want to limit ourselves and I've already thrown in two or three descriptions of if this term doesn't mean anything to you, does this?

Are there any -- this relates to question two -- I'm sorry -- survey question three as well as proposed, which was about the short form name, Commonwealth of Australia is the long form, Australia is the short form. Unfortunately in my particular example, that might actually mean something, but are there any other

ways, which could be described that would be meaningful? Jaap, I'm sorry, I see you have your hand up. Would you like to comment?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I would like to -- I mean I don't know how you will pose the question, but seeing regularly the long form of the names being changed, I mean as of two weeks ago, Hungary changed it's long name and by -- of course they have a new constitution. And this happens really quite often and more often than you think. And so you might -- I don't know how to formulate it, but you might want to get some idea about stability of the long name because if it really changes with every president, as it did by -- with Bolivia, I mean might wonder whether it's -- you probably want to have some feeling about it. I mean (inaudible) I don't know.

Paul Szyndler: All right, thank you for that observation. I think that relates to both these questions and also some of the other points that I've raised later in the survey about the relevance of historical names and also about the difficulty of capturing - - well, the impossibility of capturing future names, even if they are immediate future and ones we can see that are imminent for the purposes of this sort of survey.

Broadly speaking, and not to make it sound dismissive, but given our time limits and the limitations of resources and time that we have now, we'd necessarily focus on the here and now, what -- the responses that we receive immediately. A methodology or a survey is always limited by the timeframe in which it's undertaken. It becomes outdated the instant it's finished and the instant it's published. The best we can aim for is something that's a current snapshot of the way things are now and hopefully the questions we ask provide us a thorough enough response so that our methodology sort of stands sound for a while.

The whole idea is we would take the feedback that we get from this process and acknowledging that we could get really, really buried in the process for a long time, take what we get from this process and then put that into a more academic document that we work together as an issues paper, that we identify as a group, which may simply have headings that say there is great volatility in the official long form, short form, et cetera, names of countries. And just due to the obvious nature of political instability and changes and the way the world does change, that is something that needs to be factored in or something that should be considered. When we weigh that up against ICANN policy processes, that flexibility needs to be there.

That's just something that I'll pass for the time being, but just note, yes, obviously that's a concern, obviously that's an issue. But for the purposes of question two and three, I am really struggling for us to try to find a word, a term, a description or something for how was your country named? If I ask you what the name of your country is, what will you provide and how do we word that in a way that is widely understood?

Heather, you had your hand up?

Unidentified Participant: If I could quickly ask you. I really do --

Paul Szyndler: Oh, sorry (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: I do think so that when in documents describing the survey it is probably a better place to notice. And I might actually probably call to the archives of 3166 and I mean compile a list of all the long names, which have been changed.

Paul Szyndler: That would certainly be very useful. Thanks for that. Heather, you were -- are you there? Sorry, in Heather's absence, Martin, I think you had your hand up next.

Martin Boyle: Yes, thanks, Paul. Certainly I can see your problem of exactly how people might define what their name actually is. I think one thought that just went across my mind was whether you've used examples in the paper. Maybe you refer to conventional long form name or may use (inaudible) purpose. To which I guess actually if you added or name used for other purposes, and actually seek -- give people an opportunity to say where a particular form of their name might be used. And that I think then gives sort of an opportunity for us to move forward for people to put their hands up and say well, actually there is a special case here rather than ask for us to spend the (inaudible) where there might be special cases related to that. Otherwise I fear you might never, to your point, get out of this (inaudible).

And the other little question I had was your reference to the official language in the paper, not on the slide, for question two and also (inaudible) on question three. And I actually wondered whether that was actually relevant to you there and it doesn't (inaudible). Like some other countries, I don't think England is (inaudible) United Kingdom, but in this particular case, you're actually not (inaudible) about what languages that they are using, but rather actually saying, yes, here is an official (inaudible) or a conventional long form name or short form name. And therefore the official language reference perhaps is best on the (inaudible) from (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: Yes, Martin, absolutely noted. I'm sorry, I'm getting a bit of cross chatter. I don't know if everybody else is, so if those who are speaking could possibly mute. I know that Heather's having a bit of difficulty getting online at the moment, but we can take that discussion afterwards. But from what I picked up from your comments, Martin, yes, absolutely agreed. This is always the problem with the survey. How do you ask a question as open-endedly as possible so as it makes sense to all respondents? Do you have special examples, do you have special exceptions, et cetera without them making it so verbose that the thing doesn't actually -- it isn't 42 pages and doesn't actually make sense to anyone who receives it. So we are just trying to find a descriptor that would -- we're not trying to make this complicated, but just a simple term that will -- and this is again something that I'll part for Costa Rica and we can come back to. But it -- how we describe it in that sort of official language, the long form name, the -- I'm sorry, the official name, the long form name. Something along those lines that means something.

I'll need to move on, conscious of time, so I look -- Heather, thank you. I notice your comment and it is -- I know that it's problematic to try to convey this in the chat room. Heather's noted that in international law her experience suggests that official name has two meanings internal and external. They're the sorts of feedback that I would greatly -- Heather, I welcome that and we need to discuss that as much as we can so that we get an understanding of it, all of us collectively as a group and then only once we're clear can we make sense to other people. So certainly, if we can share that as much as possible amongst ourselves and get an answer there.

Yes, by the way, Martin, on the second point that you raised, you're absolutely right. For the purposes as I'm bringing it up now, for the document that I sent around yesterday, issue of official language is one that I'd left in there from a previous document. Not immediately relevant here, we're talking about official name. But yes, it is relevant, later on about some countries would not have an official language and that may be problematic, but that's noted as well.

Just to quickly move on, conscious of time, and I have too many windows open. The fourth survey question was about your country and territory name in the six

official languages of the UN. This is not meant to be comprehensive. We list them, even though at the risk of insulting the intelligence of respondents, we list all the languages of the UN. Again, this is meant to be a relatively simple question and these -- it's hopefully one that will give us at least import. It's not comprehensive, but it's something that at least gives us a little bit of information and our hope isn't contentious.

Everybody understands the six official languages of the UN and that's meant to just be a starting point. Hopefully at least we get something gathered there. That would then move onto question five, which again we tried to build a barrier around an open -- completely open ended question, and that is what is the name of your country or -- I'm sorry, what is the name that you use for the other participants in this survey? And they could be identified to each other when the survey goes out. How do you refer to them in your language or languages?

Again, that's just an attempt to not limit it completely, but at least give them something they can have a go at. Here are the other 19 or possibly 24 respondents. We hit other problems. How is the respondent going to know what the official -- there are other potential difficulties, but hopefully at least we can say these are -- please describe in your language the other -- the country and territory name of the other participants. That should give us something interesting. It's not meant to be all encompassing. We get to that in some later questions.

And I am hurrying now, but question six was about examples of other commonly used or local names. This was included as a catchall, as I've identified in the next slide. It's intentionally open. You would not capture Holland under the categories that we'd mentioned previously, but please, could you provide some other examples?

Again, this isn't comprehensive, but you would hopefully solicit some more responses. And again, the thing I would note here is that we ask for examples or citations that responded to maybe I would provide. I believe that that may address the issue that was identified by a number of respondents within our study group. Where does the authority come from? Where is the reference? Where is the -- who's the authoritative source? At least whoever responds to this can say well, we say so or we provide this information based upon X because we've asked them.

And I'm sorry, I just changed to another phone because I drained the battery on the last one.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Paul Szyndler: I'm sorry, was that a comment or just a bit of background noise? I'm sorry, Martin, you had another question?

Martin Boyle: Yes, thanks, Paul. It's for question six. I wondered whether it would make sense to also repeat question five for them so that they say what the common name I would use for the difference on the list, rather than just the more efficient forms? And the obvious one here, it's many people around the world will call my country England and (inaudible). So actually giving an opportunity to capture where there is this sort of variation. It might actually be quite useful.

Paul Szyndler: Are we also adding -- so just to be clear here, Martin, it's not just examples of your country or territory or the other commonly used or local names you might have for your country or territory, but the common or local -- the common names

you in your language might use for the other respondents, countries and territories.

Martin Boyle: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: Starts getting a bit confusing there, doesn't it?

Martin Boyle: Yes, but essentially it would allow the -- some of those historical names that are actually still quite firmly in use to be captured. So, if we'd like to talk about Congo, we could talk about Burma. And it doesn't matter how often the country names are changed by the governments in power, those names (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: This is where we start treading that very fine line. Avri, if you wish by all means look, your concern about this particular case is noted, if you wish to chip in, by all means. This is where we start toeing that very delicate line and where I need to be most adamant about -- we're not looking for a definitive response, we're not looking for a comprehensive response, and we also don't want to raise any expectations on the part of respondents, and especially cause any disappointment amongst those who were not asked regarding the descriptions of particular names.

We don't want to make it too political, but we don't want to then be so sensitive that this process has no meaning. And I acknowledge this where we start getting into that gray area where it could get potentially sensitive, not just from a political perspective, but also within ICANN. Why are you asking about such broad examples, et cetera?

The general response I give is well, if Holland or England is not captured anywhere else under any other sort of heading, that's fine. We can ignore it for the purposes of our survey. We can determine that that's too contentious. When that creature comes up as something that we have to face as part of round two of new gTLDs, and how is that handled, it'll be handled somehow. I imagine there'll be a big collective hand going up from GAC with objections, but then we haven't really done our job in terms of scoping the field and identifying all the potential issues that are out there. We should find this a really liberating exercise that we can actually work through all these issues and not be limited because we have to be sensitive or find a response. But that said, acknowledged, this is where we start getting into that sort of gray space.

I'm sorry, I am going to move -- Avri, did you want to chip in any more on that right now or we'll take into Costa Rica?

Avri Doria: No, I was mute. That's why I really just put my note in the chat to have made it, but not take up time.

Paul Szyndler: Yes, sure. Look, I'm sorry, we've already hit an hour but I was just --

Avri Doria: No, I didn't raise my hand.

Paul Szyndler: No worries. Look, I'll move on quickly. Speaking of contentious territory, what I'd then put in as section seven was minority indigenous languages. So, it's sensitive, but it's also important. We're looking for examples, this is not meant to be comprehensive, but to not raise the question of commonly used minority or local community languages. If you don't identify the specific category, it may not necessarily be identified. And I also acknowledge that going to -- through an inter governmental organization to member states may not necessarily reflect the full range of examples and input that we might gather. But by the same token, that's quite so important that we actually ask the question.

So that's why I've put the two in terms of indigenous languages, but then also a minority, so migrant populations that may have significant presence in a particular country that may refer to it in a particular way.

Again, a governmental authority is not going to be the definitive source necessarily for all of these responses. It's a difficult one and we need to ask a lot of people that question. So, Avri, again, noted that others may have -- may actually provide us a lot more input. And for the sake of our -- as I keep banging on, our process needs to be sound. So to do that, we might need to get this survey locked down and then also once it makes sense to UNESCO member states, maybe it's generic enough to send out to others.

Just quickly, question eight, not seven. Example of their name in non-official languages. This is a really difficult one. This is the catchall. This is the one at the end, which says and will give rise to concerns. Are there any other examples of your country name, not in your own languages? And I think there are any number of examples. How would anyone else in the world who is not -- who does not use the six official languages of the UN, how would they describe your country name Australia in Polish?

I've got -- it's difficult, it's open ended. It will not necessarily derive -- deliver a comprehensive response. But again, it's intended to be a catchall. We've already raised some examples there about Georgia and Armenia and they wouldn't have necessarily -- their mutual descriptions wouldn't have slotted into any other category. That's what that one is intended to try to capture.

And then finally, what I dropped from this topology and that was historical names because it's hard and the relevance is -- I understand the relevance, but if we're limited by time and what resources should we focus on the here and now.

Primary and simplex names because they're difficult to explain and largely for the most part, but not exactly, if you can describe conventional short form names, it might cover most of it. Composite names, these were things like Mount Cook, were a bit difficult. So they were a little bit complicated to explain. And exonyms again would mostly be picked up I suspect from most survey respondents under name in nonofficial languages. I did zoom through them very quickly; everyone can see the document and provide their own thoughts about that. So, I greatly appreciate that.

Sorry, Annebeth, Henry, I'm not sure who was first. Annebeth, do you have your hand up?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, just a question. When you talked about the examples of -- do you hear me?

Paul Szyndler: Yes, I do.

Annebeth Lange: Examples of name in nonofficial languages. Will that cover, for example, in a lot of countries a language is not an official language, it's not an administrative language, but it's spoken by a large population in the country. Like in Norway, we have a big -- or a large population speaking Urdu and I suppose they could wish to have Norway in Urdu. But it's not official language, it's not administrative language. (Inaudible)

Paul Szyndler: For example, yes, that would be the intent, yes.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, well, that's --

Paul Szyndler: But -- sorry, go ahead.

Annebeth Lange: What do we mean with that example? Okay.

Paul Szyndler: Yes, it is the intent to cover that, but then of course that gets back to the issues of who we are asking this question of and would we necessarily expect a responsible -- relevant agencies within national administrations? Or even if they are NGOs, nominated by a national -- by member states of UNESCO to necessarily provide that response.

Yes, we're intending to capture all of that. The more that we can gather and the -- if I had a list of 150 representations of Australia, then my process is all the more thorough than if I have two or three. So gathering all of these with the common understanding of everyone that's asked and everyone participating in this survey that this is not a reservation list, nor raising expectations, but we're just trying to gather as much data as possible, then that's what I would be very happy with.

So, yes, if we could get that conveyance of nonofficial names, acknowledging that asking UNESCO will get some response, but we may need to go out to other stakeholders.

Henry, I think you're next.

Henry Chan: Thank you, Paul. I would like to recognize support for the current [pouch] and would like to point out that precisely because some names are sensitive and controversial, and some languages is then even controversial, that we need to include them in this study. We are not now making any policy yet, but to present an objective picture of the current situation of country and territory names.

So, I would like to recognize support for the current pouch. Thank you.

Paul Szyndler: Henry, thank you. Greatly appreciate it. When I'm standing up there sweating about the fact that we very courageously raised some very pointed and very controversial examples, it will be good to have the backing of the study group because that's exactly what we're trying to do here. It's not our purpose to answer the questions, just to raise them and identify the possible concerns.

Martin, you had your hand up.

Martin Boyle: Yes, thanks. And yes, we support you. We'll be right behind you, Paul.

Paul Szyndler: (Inaudible) Thanks. Yes, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: On question eight, just a flag that that can be in the long list. Just a simple example, the national health service for the UK, in addition to English New Wales has 12 languages which it regularly provides information in. And when we did the census a couple of years back, then there were guidance books in 56 different languages. Just trying to pick out the most common immigrant communities that were still using a lot of their own paternal languages. That's not to say we shouldn't put it in, it's just that in some cases I think it could actually be quite a long list. Thanks.

Paul Szyndler: Yes, look, I just -- I acknowledge that asking a question like that could potentially cause problems. I'll use an example of personal experience. When dot travel was established, they asked all national administrations to reserve all their geographic names. I worked for the Australian government at that stage, we took a very defensive position and we provided dot travel with a list of 300,000 names,

including 3-Mile Stump, that we would like to have reserved for the purposes of dot travel. They wish they had never asked that question.

So, it's hard asking open-ended ones, but the purpose of this survey, I'm quite comfortable to (inaudible) or will be amused to see what we could get back.

Look, now that we're quite a few minutes over, I think we're about to lose the link, so all I wanted to finish off with was just a flag that (inaudible).

Is everybody still hearing me? Bart, are you still there?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I'm still here.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Paul Szyndler: Sorry, I was just getting a lot of beeping there on the line, so --

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I think we all got it.

Paul Szyndler: Excellent, I'm glad I'm not alone otherwise I'm talking to myself. Look, just the next step, there was a whole bunch of stuff there that was in that last version of the document. I'm really making an effort to cut things hard and leave things out on purpose so that people can scream no, that should still be in there. The things that are included, again that gives people, and I've noted all the comments that have been made today, about well, that's going to lead to problems in these various ways.

What I'll make an undertaking to do is summarize what we've discussed and then send a document out to the group that's not too different to what I sent out a couple of days ago. But just to say, look, this is where our thinking is at and we're getting to the point where we need to decide what we're asking UNESCO to, as a survey, by Costa Rica. That's really the deadline I'm setting.

As I mentioned to people on the mailing, we're having two meetings. One official, one at one sort of after meeting. Originally the session was scheduled for Thursday, but I realized that given that the ccNSO finishes Wednesday and other constituencies finish their core work Wednesday, some people will be on the road or departing Thursday. Therefore, our session's on Monday. This will have full teleconference facilities, et cetera, and you'll be able to get remote access.

The idea then is because you do most of the work on this sort of stuff while you're in an ICANN meeting, let's face it, we can then take it away and get two bites of the cherry, so to speak, and then circulate some things amongst ourselves over the couple of days while we're there. And we have the facility reserved for us on Thursday if we deem necessary to meet again and just have an informal discussion for those that happen to be, without all of the external participation facilities, just for people to have another chat for those of us that are in Costa Rica. But as I've made the undertaking, all of that will then be conveyed by me back to all members of the study group. It's just an attempt to having two goes at this at one meeting instead of just one.

So again, look, that's really the goal. We've got to get through the finalization of this survey, identifying these categories, locking them down so that they make some sense so that we can get it out to UNESCO. And then as step two, part of that, out to who else? Who else can we go out to effectively at the same time? If this is a questionnaire, there's no reason that it needs to go out to one entity. Avri's made some great suggestions about well, hey, this should go out to others.

If we've got three months to do that, have we got the resources and the mechanisms and the means by which to get it out to them? Or even, more importantly, to ask our good colleagues at ALAC can see well, do you have the resources by which to -- all the communities, by which to get this out? The more times we do that, I think the better sort of response we'll get and a bit more confident we can feel that we've done a good job consulting with everyone.

Again, sorry to wrap it up so quickly and sorry also for running about 15 minutes overtime. Very briefly, again once we've locked everything down, we'll then start having a chat as we head towards Prague about the issues that we see. It'll be hard to start that conversation before we start getting any sort of evidence back, but that will be our next step. And given that that's going to take us quite a while, and we'll already be heading to mid-year by that point, that's why I'm keen to get this survey sort of finalized and out to whomever we should choose to send it to.

Thanks, everyone, for your time today. I'll send a note out in the next sort of 48 hours summarizing all of this, trying to make it really clear what we want to cover in Costa Rica. We won't be as time limited there, so hopefully we can have a really in-depth discussion. And speak to you all soon. Safe travel when you come to San Jose, and see you there.

Martin Boyle: Okay, thank you, Paul. Bye-bye, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, Paul.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, Paul.

Unidentified Participant: Bye-bye.

Unidentified Participant: Bye-bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, bye.

Unidentified Participant: Bye-bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.