Transcript Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories Telephone Conference
23 May 2012

ccNSO

Martin Boyle, .uk
Ian Chiang, .tw
Keith Davidson, .nz
Sokol Haxhiu, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Leo Maluwa, .mw
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)

GAC

Elise Lindeberg, Norway

GNSO

George Asare-Sakyi – NCSG
Chris Chaplow - CBUC
Heather Forrest, IPC

At-Large

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

Specialists

Jaap Akkerhuis

Support Staff

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

Apologies

Joke Braeken, .eu
Baher Esmat, ICANN
Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg, UNESCO
Annebeth Lange, .no
Grigori Saghyan, .am

20120522_ccNSO_COUNTRIES _SG_ID699184

Paul Szyndler: We might as well get started. We're a couple of minutes after the hour and haven't heard any people join in the last few minutes. Welcome to the next teleconference of the Country and Territory Names Study Group, probably our third or fourth intercession or one in advance of Prague.

Just to start with, Gabby, Kristina, did we have any formal apologies? For the sake of process, did we have any apologies that were noted for this call?

Gabriella Schittek: Yes. We have four apologies from Joke Braeken, Baher Esmat, Irmgarda Kasinskaite-Buddeberg and Annebeth Lange.

Paul Szyndler: Okay. Thank you very much.

Jaap, are you on the phone line or are you just following us in the meeting room, in the Adobe Connect room at this stage?

Gabriella Schittek: Hello? Who joined?

Ian Chiang: Hi. This is --?

Jaap Akkerhuis: I actually --.

Gabriella Schittek: Yes. Jaap, you're here. I can hear you. And someone else joined.

Ian Chiang: It's Ian.

Gabriella Schittek: Hello, Ian. Welcome.

Ian Chiang: Yes. Thank you.

Paul Szyndler: Hello, Ian. It's Paul. We were just getting underway.

Jaap, I wasn't targeting you in any particular way, I just wanted to check those that had made some contributions on the list in-between times. And particularly, if I wanted to refer to people, I just wanted to check they were actually on the phone line. So, I'll just start by saying thank you to Jaap and Keith and Annebeth for making some comments in advance of this call. Very welcome.

For this particular session, I just sort of wanted to follow the standard agenda that we had in the past couple of teleconference calls. So, working through the issues, roughly broken up along the lines of the categories that were in the survey that UNESCO's currently undertaking.

While I mention that and before we start, I know that Baher was unable to get on this call and Irmgarda is not here, either. So, I was just going to throw it to Bart quickly. Have you heard any updates from UNESCO yet or through Baher at all?

Bart Boswinkel: No. I know that in the background there is an exchange going on on the translations and, once that's concluded, they will send out the survey.

Paul Szyndler: Right. And that's about organizing the translation or funding the translation, or --?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, it's --.

Paul Szyndler: Just the logistics of --.

Bart Boswinkel: A combination --.

Paul Szyndler: Making it happen?

Bart Boswinkel: It's organizing and funding the translation.

Paul Szyndler: Just for everyone that, if they're a little bit unclear, it was recommended that, as part of the survey going out, that it be translated into another -- a number of languages, which is only appropriate. And that, of course, adds a little bit of lead time in terms of the process. But hopefully, that will be finalized soon and we'll get moving. It is a little unfortunate because, as we're nearing Prague, we continue our theoretical discussions of the different issues and topics and categories without any evidence or input from the survey yet, nor from the stalled new gTLD process which -- both of which might have provided us with something to digest, but we can continue as we're going at the moment and then, hopefully, after Prague we'll have some more substance to chew on.

                      Hello, who joined?

Kristina Nordstrom: Hello, who joined?

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo Diaz.

Kristina Nordstrom: Hello, Eduardo. Welcome.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you. Hello.

Paul Szyndler: Eduardo, hi. It's Paul. We've only just gotten underway. I wasn't intending to cover off on any sort of background on this call or an update, it was just a quick check for, as much as anything, for my benefit as to whether Bart had heard anything from UNESCO. But, we can all establish the survey processes are underway. And as we all appreciate in an intergovernmental organization, these things take time. As we appreciate in a multi-stakeholder environment like ICANN, new gTLD process takes time. So, we'll put those to the side for the time being and carry on with our current analysis of issues.

                      The ones that I've proposed for today's call, we're getting lower down on the list of the UNESCO categories, and that was the way in which country and territory names are represented in the six official languages of the UN. And then, also, the next question was how survey respondents would -- how they would refer to, in their language, to the other respondents as part of the survey, so how you refer to country X and Y in your own language.

                      And then, the third one was examples of a country or territory name in nonofficial languages. That was the -- working through this process, we're looking at other representations, getting the global perspective; not your official language, not necessarily the way in which you would refer to your country in a long or short form term but, rather, how you would see others and how others would refer to you.

The last one, examples of names in nonofficial languages, was largely a catchall category. If you recall, that's at the end of the survey so it may look a little strange here. And it's not intended to include things like common names. We had (inaudible) another example, another category, not indigenous or minority group languages. I thought we'd sort of put that aside. We'd bite off more than we could chew if we tried to cover five collectively on one teleconference call.

But, I noted that there were a lot of overlaps between them. And it may, for the purpose of this call, so we have a decent conversation going, put them aside -- put aside the categories. Still highlight some examples, but just consider them together and then in the context of how they're used in current or future ICANN policies and processes.

Just because I had nothing better to do today, I just quickly knocked together, which still hasn't quite presented properly on the next slide, that if you were to pick -- and I only picked Poland because I knew most of them anyway. But, when you look at a country name in the six official UN languages, it will necessarily overlap with other categories that we'd established as part of the survey. The name in nonofficial languages would also overlap with the way other respondents might consider your country name. So, again, I've got the Russian, French, Chinese, English, Arabic and Spanish representations of the country name of Poland; none of which, of course, are the name of the country in the official language. So then, all of them become nonofficial language representations of it.

And then, other respondents, in the case of a German response or a Czech response, may or may not be part of how the other respondents in the survey may or may not refer to your country. So, I'm just highlighting that there's a lot of overlap here. And I appreciate the categories that we set up for the purposes of the survey, what part of the methodology as there actually is a lot of overlap here and that we're kind of artificially dividing these into different categories and addressing them in separate chunks, intentionally for the sake of getting through our work, but today we might want to vary from that just a little bit.

Thanks to Jaap's important -- also, the consideration that Keith had given to sources and lists and what we might use or what has been used to refer to country and territory names before, and the reason I've tried to flip this around the conversation today this way, is because you could see that any of the sources we might use would cover off in all likelihood the categories we were talking about, the name of a country in the UN languages or the way you may refer to another country, etc., etc. It would be covered off in these sources, some of which were covered off with the UNGEGN manual and also a working paper that I'd come across, which was working paper number 54 of one of their studies groups or it might have been a plenary-type session from Vienna in 2011, so it's actually relatively current.

And they -- well, and Jaap, as I know you've noted in the chat room, this was not meant to be an exhaustive list. There are -- you're absolutely right. There are many more sources around and I just thought I'd identify a few. Jaap, do you have any others off the top of your head or was there a particular observation you wanted to make about some of these lists or their potential shortcomings?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well, there's actually a list of lists and I will actually pause to -- it's called Statoids, which is a list of -- I mean, they have about eight different sources next to each other and references to all the lists like the STANOC (ph), the Europe Community List for Economical Affairs and, I mean, there are way more. But so, if anybody's interested in what's around, I mean, that is a good source to start as well.

Paul Szyndler: I think what's particularly useful about digging all these up -- and rest assured, I'm definitely becoming increasingly familiar with them and archiving them for future reference is because it just goes to illustrate the point as to how many lists are out there, many of which have some official status for one or more intergovernmental organization. And therefore, by the various definitions that have been used in past or current ICANN processes, they would all or some be eligible for consideration or could be used as a reference point to determine eligibility, etc., in a given process.

So, in this case, I'd just again flag -- distinguishing the UNGEGN working paper from the manual because the particular working paper that I referred to from Vienna was actually listed in all six languages of the UN. So, it kind of ties it back. It is based on the manual, hence, 193 names like in the manual, but it actually outlines the representations of all those country codes in all of those countries in the six official languages.

And then the other lists that we've referred to -- Keith are you on the phone or just in the chat room? I'll take that as just in the chat room.

Keith Davidson: (Inaudible) I'm --.

Paul Szyndler: Ah, there you are.

Keith Davidson: I'm also in -- I'm not on the phone, but I'm in Adobe Connect.

Paul Szyndler: I can actually hear you quite well. You've done that little bit of research work on the -- as part of your working group's activities, another UN list and how that compares to ISO.

Keith Davidson: Yes. Well, we've looked at ISO-3166 versus other things, but I guess it's all a bit academic. There are as many lists as there are countries and the longest list (inaudible).

Paul Szyndler: Yeah. Well, all of them have a different definition or basis. Obviously, where you start from, you would assume a lot of the UN ones, as Jaap pointed out, are working off a basis of member state and, therefore, they may not necessarily be inclusive of territories or those on the periphery. I threw in a WIPO standard list just because it fits in terms of total numbers. The WIPO standard that I referred to there also allocated codes or use codes or recognize various intellectual property, national or regional intellectual property organizations, so the list is actually quite a bit longer. But, once you take those out, they're down to sort of 221 names. And then the UN standards group had a list of names as well and that's based on a terminology bulletin that ICANN has referred to in the past in previous processes and that's getting up to 240 names, so we're getting close to ISO-3166, which sort of sits at the top of the list with 249.

And just before I moved on, I know there was a comment in the chat room by Cheryl about instances of overlap between them and the most commonly used lists and what's considered to be authoritative. Well, in terms of what's authoritative, these are all put out with the informata (ph) is at least one agency or one intergovernmental organization or one particular organ of the UN. So, to that extent, they all are, with their particular expertise and their particular focus, authoritative.

The next slide is a -- took a bit of time putting together, but it's just showing -- this is where there is overlap and there isn't overlap between the different lists, moving from the UNGEGN manual. And I'm sorry, not that we're presenting it in the room like this, it's been cut off a little bit from the way I had it originally set up. But, Keith had raised the issue of, well, there was Bolivia and it appeared on some lists represented as Bolivia or the pure national state of Bolivia on other lists or, actually, in the case of some lists, as

both. Then, when you come to -- but that, to an extent, is splitting hairs. It's quite an interesting difference to note.

And then you come through to other entities. You look at islands that appear on any of the UNGEGN lists, but then on quite a few of the others. It's not as though ISO-3166 is out there on the extreme. Serbia and Montenegro, another interesting case. You'll see Serbia, Montenegro as separate entries on most of these lists. And then, of course, as Keith noted, I've sort of wrapped that up as a yes and no because it's divided separately, identified separately on the ISO list. Likewise with other entities like whether we're talking about Hong Kong or Puerto Rico or Palestinian territories. Some appear on some lists and not on others.

The point I'm trying to get at here is that there are either failings or inconsistencies or -- okay, failings may be too strong a word. There are differences between the lists given what their scope and purpose and what their definitions are, some of which aren't necessarily trying to capture territories, but this is where you can get into a problem, into a trap with having a heavy reliance on lists.

I'm conscious -- Martin, you had your hand up in the Adobe room. Would you like to make a comment?

Martin Boyle: Yeah, please. I'm a bit confused about what the reds and what the greens are. I'm assuming reds -- or sorry, I assumed reds meant that it wasn't on a particular list.

Paul Szyndler: That's correct.

Martin Boyle: And the greens if it was. But in fact, Lithia is certainly on the ISO-3166 list because it's the O and it's listed under that list as Bolivia pluri-national state of --.

Paul Szyndler: Yeah, I appreciate that, yes. I did take some liberties, but with the -- how I've defined that. And I think more particularly the point was that on the UNTERM list it actually appears twice. It's listed as both. So, I do take your point and, yes, Bolivia is on the 3166 list and it's identified in bracketed terms.

Yes, sorry -- oh, sorry, man, I didn't mean to cut you off.

Martin Boyle: That's alright because it was a question and as you sort of deal with it. But, I'd say I think I would actually argue that Bolivia does exist on the ISO-3166 list, but --.

Paul Szyndler: (Inaudible) cares about the representation of --.

Martin Boyle: Yeah. I haven't gotten to that sort of level of detail. But certainly, a little bit like the -- way down there is the United Kingdom but, in fact, our code is GB. But in fact, actually, it's the same entity and we just actually have two codes depending on what is being done with them.

The other one, though, is Serbia and Montenegro.

Paul Szyndler: Yeah.

Martin Boyle: And you list that both as being on and being off. It's on because it's transitionally reserved, because the country doesn't --.

Paul Szyndler: That's (inaudible) --.

Martin Boyle:	Exist anymore. And I think that when we're actually sort of looking at the country names and the crosslinks of the country names, it starts becoming a little bit academic if we start sort of taking countries that ceased to exist whenever it was, was it 10 years ago, 12 years ago now and it confuses, I'm not sure, with any sort of great advantage. So, really, my question to you is why do you think that we would need to consider what lists Serbia and Montenegro still exist on?
Paul Szyndler:	Thanks, Martin, a point well taken. And Sokol, I know that you made the same comment as well. Yes, it is -- the list of names I tried to throw together there were an attempt to cover some of the different -- the reasons why there might be inconsistencies between the lists. So, something being explicitly -- Bolivia being referred to on a particular list as Bolivia and Bolivia only, as it happens on some of them, versus the more expansive title just means that it is represented in a slightly different way on a particular list. That may or may not end up being a problem, but it is slightly different on one and another.
	Cook Islands was just an example of something that does appear on some and not on others. Serbia and Montenegro was an attempt at recent history, perhaps, highlighting recently historical names and how lists are changing to evolve and they -- some evolve faster than others. South Sudan is then the counterpoint of that as a recent name, a recent change and that's why I've thrown it on there. I'm not particularly highlighting any of these as being worth of further exploration, but it was rather to highlight a point, hence, putting it in a table. And then, when you come through, for obvious reasons you'll see Hong Kong and Puerto Rica and Palestinian Territories is as -- again, different examples treated in different ways on different lists. And we all understand the political sensitivities thereof.
	So again, no particular desire to draw attention to Serbia or Montenegro, it's just that -- well, it still does exist on certain lists. And I did try to couch that or a reason -- and try to clarify that as a particular status on the ISO list. But again, not trying to make an overly big deal about that one.
	Jaap, you hand your hand up for a while. Did you want to add in --?
Jaap Akkerhuis:	Yeah. Yeah, I can actually explain some of the differences and -- I mean, Bolivia actually change their name pretty recently and some of these sources are old; actually, from before that time. And also, lately there's better publication between the UN term and statistical office and ISO. And sometimes, I mean, states had to -- I mean, by changing their name, but only -- they didn't bother to tell ISO or didn't bother to tell (inaudible) and so that's why sometimes with some differences. But actually, lately things are much more synchronized and -- but, there's so much -- I mean, the date of the lists are old.
	If you want to see what is changing record over time, you can find on the ISO website the complete list of what changed since the last official standard as well and find the reasons. So, there are quite a reasons why -- I mean, a lot of them are more trivialities than anything else. And I don't know why Serbia and Montenegro is still -- I mean, why your view to them is not up to date, but it's older than that the communication has been improved, so it might just be an error. People do make mistakes.
Paul Szyndler:	And I also can't quite recall having gone through certainly any lists yet today, but I suspect that list may well have also had Serbia and Montenegro separately, so I'm not quite sure. But again, it was just an attempt to -- this isn't particularly trying to -- a whole bunch of red lights doesn't mean that the UNGEGN manual is completely irrelevant because, for its particular purposes, it does what it does. And the other entities' particular reasons do not appear on it because, according to the categories for that particular

reference, they don't get in there as part of that list. Really, this was just an attempt to highlight some of the differences.

I note there's a queue of hands again. So, Bart Boswinkel, I'm sorry. You had something to chime in with --?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, maybe. As a result from this discussion, what is probably noteworthy is that we've got this whole array of lists that some of them they're not synchronized of dates, say some are very old, and that the working group or the study group notes this because that will impact the use of lists in future as well.

Paul Szyndler: Yeah. Look, thanks, Bart. I mean, I'm very much getting towards that point as part of this discussion and as part of the interaction on this call. Because I've been conscious that we'd avoided this discussion of lists and how ICANN uses them. But, just because of the three sort of categories we're looking at today, they all nicely sort of mesh into the one sort of discussion I'd tried it today. So, in a few slides' time you'll see that there's a couple of points that I made about what you do with those lists and what this study group might like to observe as to the general phenomenon of using lists.

Jaap, did you have another comment? Your hand was still up. Or, otherwise, I'll go to Martin.

Martin, I think the floor is yours.

Martin Boyle: Okay. Thanks, Keith -- sorry, thanks, Paul. Sorry about that. Yeah, so (inaudible).

The example of Serbia and Montenegro, it stays on the list because there is a rule under the ISO lists that allows any code that falls out of use to be transitionally reserved so that the -- you end up with a sort of clear separation. And my understanding was, because of some of the problems that have arisen in the past, mainly on the Internet sector, that transition be reserved is now a very, very long reservation. It's something like 50 years -- .

Paul Szyndler: Yep.

Martin Boyle: Quite eccentric. But, transitioning reserve just simply means that you should no longer be using it, but nobody else can take the code. So, it is on the list, but really, in effect, it is no longer on the list.

More fundamentally, really, it comes down to what we're looking for are the names of the countries and how they are used. And I think you're firstly right. New countries certainly get creative, like Sainte-Suzanne, and none of us has got any ability to assess what new names of countries might appear in the forthcoming and near future, which I think then is -- so quite fundamentally the reason why when we've looked at two lesser codes it's always been, well, all two-letter combinations have been reserved by ICANN, yet we can't actually touch the two-letter codes for anything else quite simply because any new country that comes along has to get slotted into that and could then lead to a problem on something that was otherwise allocated.

The other point I think I've made, exactly echoing a comment that Annebeth made on lists and it was the fact that the ISO list has got prior form in the ICANN space. And I think probably -- so, whatever other things we take into account, we probably always need to refer finally back to the ISO-3166 list to which then we might need to have addenda because we've had a sort of a new name or a new country name coming in.

	And then the third point, going back to Bolivia, whatever else happens, I can imagine Bolivia, in spite of whatever complex name it's country decides to (inaudible), it will still be as the country formerly known as Bolivia.
Paul Szyndler:	Yeah, agreed. And certainly no issues when it comes to BO. But, your points are all well taken, Marin. And certainly, the relative primacy of the ISO list is something that I was working through later on in the slide show, so certainly don't seek to diverge from that view at all. I was conscious that --.
Martin Boyle:	Sorry to steal your thunder there.
Paul Szyndler:	Yeah, no, no, no; not at all, not at all. Just -- I'm glad people agree with me before I say something. It saves me the work. But, I'm conscious that Jaap had his hand up as well and he wanted to say something in response to your comments, Martin.

Jaap, the floor is yours. |
| Jaap Akkerhuis: | Yes. I want to comment on what is the ISO list and what is not. The ISO list is the official standard. Reserved names is not part of the standard, so you should not really confuse them. And this -- and Serbia and Montenegro, I mean, the names are off the standards. I mean, that's what it is. And that there is still some -- the ISO will be served because actually Serbia is issued twice. And it's actually separate from that. I mean, that -- so, for proper understanding, I mean, it will -- if already reserved to the ISO list, I only mean the official standard list and not anything of the reserved list or the things which are connected to it, I mean, because that's not part of the standard.

And if you actually go to the 3166 home page, it is explained there, I mean, what is reserved and what is the official list. And those about Bolivia, I -- at the same place you find the official change of the name of Bolivia. I mean, if you look at the tracking of the home page, you'll see that there are a lot of changes of names which a lot of people are not aware of, but what do happen on a regular base. |
Paul Szyndler:	No, your point's certainly well taken, Jaap. I think in the case of the way these things have played out in ICANN processes in the past, you'll note some will make reference to ISO-3166-1 and then there will be additional references to -- or if you're on a transitionally served list, or if, etc., etc. So, definitionally speaking, I think it's generally appreciated, though probably worth this study group noting separately, that there is a distinction from what is the standard and what are the provisionally or transitionally reserved names sitting on the side of it and that there needs to be clarity in terms of what you mean when you are reserving certain ones or including certain terms and not others.
Jaap Akkerhuis:	Yeah. Yeah, the basic rule for transitionally reserved is now that they should not be used within 50 years when possible, but there's no guarantee that they will be reallocated -- that they won't be reallocated. It might always happen when there's a real shortage of codes.
Paul Szyndler:	Oh, absolutely. I think we also, just tracking off -- picking up some of the commentary that we're also getting on the chat room at the moment, again, the purpose in highlighting some of these lists is -- and I'd only plucked up the courage to go into the depth of lists now that the working group's well progressed, is that these have been used and referred to in particular instances in the past and none of this is to be deemed to be a proposition on my part that ICANN should use them. It's just an attempt to illustrate that there are different lists out there.

And when we get on to the conversation about, for example, the new gTLDs' process, where you talk about country names as part of -- and I'm just actually taking the wording that I'd noted down further on the list -- commonly known names was included as part of the applicant guidebook, but the qualifying criteria as part of that was that is used by intergovernmental organizations. That would necessarily qualify any of these lists as part of the new gTLDs' process because they could be used or they could be, at somebody's discretion, used as a reference point as part of the current first round of new gTLDs. So, yeah. Again, it's not a particular attempt to say these lists are definitively important particular. It fits the purpose for what we're discussing, but just to note that there are a number out there.

I'll just try and move on a little bit quickly now to get to the point that I was trying to get at. And look, basically, that there are -- there is some inconsistent -- and I apologize for this, typographical errors throughout the slide show, but we all know, hopefully, what I'm talking about, that there are inconsistencies between some of the lists. And generally speaking, the ISO list has been most frequently used within ICANN. ICANN is part of the maintenance agency or they have a participation role there. It is the most comprehensive list because it's the most expansive and, therefore, there's some certain reasoning as to why we would continue using that and why it's the logical first starting point for future activities.

I just noted, and it was only a question mark as it currently stands -- Jaap, feel free to correct me, but the ISO list is currently published in English and French. Is that correct?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. The ISO? Hello?

Paul Szyndler: Yes, go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: The ISO only published the names in French and English.

Paul Szyndler: Yeah. And again, that's not necessarily a criticism, but just an observation, that there are other lists out there, such as the working group document that I referred to, there is the names of fewer countries on that, mainly because it doesn't include territories, as Keith identified in the breakup that he did, and some of which are extremely politically sensitive and could probably be considered. But, at least it was published and put out there in all official six languages of the UN. That doesn't necessarily mean it's a problem, but it just means the source that we're referring to, is there a natural translation to it in Spanish or Russian or etc., etc.?

Jaap Akkerhuis: It's the UN will adjust this translation. I mean, what you will find in the full standard, part one, is actually information, which is non-normative lists with other names in other languages, but that's completely -- but that's not really part of the official standard.

Paul Szyndler: No, it's just a point to note. And again, not a criticism, but just an observation that it is published in three languages and two of the six official languages, but not all.

Now, what I wanted to then move on to was how -- this is the flip side, looking at it from the other side, that -- the way in which ICANN has now used these lists or sources in the past. And with the idea in fast tracking, this is where Bart's going to cut me down very quickly if I've misinterpreted or misrepresented something. But, the ISO list was used to determine eligibility. If you were eligible for the process -- to be eligible for the process, you had to be represented on that list. And yet then, as part of the meaningfulness case, if I recall correctly, there was a reference to the UNGEGN manual.

Is that right, Bart? Did I recall that correctly?

Bart Boswinkel: It -- say, first of all, I think the reason for including the ISO-3166 is not just for the past records, but it's probably far more important, it is the basis for ccs as well.

Paul Szyndler: Of course.

Bart Boswinkel: And that's what (inaudible). We have to be very careful not to forget this, as Keith correctly noted in, say, his e-mail. See, I -- that's why it was included in the IDN fast track. You had to be -- say, a country or a territory name had to be listed on the ISO-3166 in order to be eligible, in order to reflect the same as ccTLDs.

As to country or territory name as listed, this was just an initial -- this is part of that rule or clause. If you are listed, then further proof was not needed, but there is a whole mechanism in the fast track and will probably be included in the overall policy as well that, at the end of the day, it's a matter of the country or territory itself to determine what is a meaningful representation of the name of the country or territory.

Paul Szyndler: That's right. So, as I'd referred to on the slide, there was a catchall there in terms of if there could be any verification or confirmation from national naming authorities; and again, within the UN process as they've long lists of recognized -- I think as part of the process, they went through 43 member states to identify national naming authorities. And I know there's certainly a council for geographic names for Australasia here in Australia. So, there are entities within certain countries, or there could be linguistical authorities who had the experience to take and make those determinations. Or, someone else, if you're in a country or region that didn't have one of those authorities in it, then someone else by mutual agreement between themselves and ICANN.

Bart Boswinkel: Paul, this is just to document it is a meaningful representation. At the end of the day, it's a matter of, say, the government and all other significantly interested parties to determine what is a meaningful representation.

Paul Szyndler: Oh, absolutely, and I agree and I note that subtlety. The only purpose of my including it on here is trying to capture where different mechanisms and different -- the way we do things and the reasons we do them, how they've all been included in different ICANN processes. UNGEGN manual was brought in as part of the IDN process for a particular reason, all sitting under the umbrella of ISO-3166 at the top, understood. And then there were different purposes. And the concept of actually using national naming or linguistical authorities or someone else was subservient to that, but it was still brought in as a concept as part of the process, wasn't it?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Paul Szyndler: So, it's not in any way meant to suggest that that's affecting the primacy of the ISO-3166. It's just noting that that's the way it is.

I then also noted with the overall policy -- Bart, has this changed at all? As it currently stands, it is -- the working group status is that it refers --.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah --.

Paul Szyndler: To 3166 and then exceptional cases, etc., etc.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, this is still the same.

Paul Szyndler: Yeah. So, in a way, officially, the way it's working through these, the board of policy process is a reference to 3166 and I've got some notes there. But -- and also, exceptionally reserved terms. So, again, this is an example of getting back to what Jaap was talking about, where you must be cautious in terms of referring to the standards because, if you also mean exceptionally reserved or transitionally reserved cases, you should be clear and you should make mention of that. In the case of the IDN process as it currently stands it does make reference to that.

That, then, brings me onto the new gTLDs' process, which is probably -- well, I don't think anyone would argue, probably the most expansive in terms of protections or possible protections, some that I didn't even get to throw into this slide show. But, obviously, there is the ISO list and the long-form name or short-form name of the country in any language. That whole concept of in any language is something I've always had some difficulty with dealing with because that -- with someone with more expertise than me, would think that either would just blow their mind in terms of how expansive that could possibly be.

And then, of course, it also included the exceptionally reserved terms, etc. There was, of course, the annex -- well, sorry, there was an annex that was thrown in as separable country names. So, if it was an X and Y state, then the separate parts can be reserved as well, of course. And then permutations of the country name, putting the "The" at the end or taking the "The" out, etc.

And then, of course, the reference to commonly known names. And I raised this before. It's not common names, as Bart raised. And we've included the criteria as part of our questionnaire for UNESCO, the survey for UNESCO, commonly known names as this was categorized in terms of that is has been used by intergovernmental organizations. And therefore, theoretically, at least, in brings in all those other lists that we were talking about.

Jaap, sorry, you raised a question there just in the chat room. I wasn't sure. Long-form name in any language according to ISO.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yeah --.

Paul Szyndler: (Inaudible.)

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay. Yeah, I wonder what it mean because, as far as I know, it doesn't exist in -- as an ISO standard or whatever. So --.

Paul Szyndler: And then, of course --.

Jaap Akkerhuis: But, I don't know. I'm not aware that it exists. That's all I am saying.

Paul Szyndler: Yeah. Well, you're quite right. I mean, again, I'm paraphrasing the 2. -- 2.1.4. something, I can't remember, of the applicant guidebook which refers to -- yeah, one of the criteria I think they say is, is the long-form name listed in the ISO standard or a translation of that in any language. That's the wording of the applicant guidebook as it currently stands, I believe. Just -- again, just an observation. So, your perspective that it doesn't exist in that form is a valuable one anyway.

And then again, on the next slide, look, I very just quickly just -- and this is just very rough because I had the same table of a certain amount of lists. Most of these lists as part of a particular processes aren't referred to, aren't used by ICANN at all. But, the main purpose was to say that the new gTLDs' process does refer to ISO-3166. But going back

a step, when you talk about the commonly known names used in other intergovernmental organizations or -- I'd have to check the precise wording and, again, I don't have it in front of me, but that would certainly allow or allow the potential for other lists to be used as references. They could be used as an example.

Sokol, I'm sorry. Yellow is just -- I'm sorry, I'm using the traffic light system and I should have explained that before I started, green being that, yes, they are officially used as they are formally referred to as part of the process; yellowing meaning that they're not officially referred to, but alluded to. So, it's a yes, but no. It's not either a red light nor a green; it's somewhere in the middle. And as I said, as it currently stands with the applicant guidebook, the final criteria when it comes to a definition of a country name is the name by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization. So therefore, you could be using that as a form of evidence that this is a legitimate use, this is a current or commonly known use of the name. Therefore, surely any of those lists, a particular applicant or of course a complainant or someone voicing an objection could be citing any one of those other documents, so they -- why it had been brought into play without being explicitly mentioned by the fact that there's a catchall clause in there. And then, that's what I've tried to capture by referring to the (inaudible).

I can certainly refer to other lists and other processes that I'm aware of that have gone on in previous ICANN process. Dot.info, of course, had a long and laborious process in terms of the definition and the identification of what was not a country name and some of the protections of geographic identifiers. Dot.info was -- there may have been earlier ones, but it's probably my earliest interaction with ICANN where I came across that in about 2002. So, it's a not a new phenomenon. There was also dot.travel was a fascinating example from an Australian perspective because the flow through dot.travel was so keen to secure that quantity at that stage that they've gone to member states through GAC and through other formal approaches and asked for names to be reserved. And again, we went to our national names or authority and they gave us an almost endless list of all geographic identifiers in Australia. That was 300,000 names for Australia alone. So, it just serves to show they're not particularly relevant in this process because they're almost ancient history now. But, it just goes to show that there's some inconsistency between how they've been handled. It might have evolved a little bit over time, but no one's going to suggest that it's absolutely right at this stage.

And that gets me to the point and, really, the questions that I had. Does anyone on the call have a view as to how the study group's going to note this? This is getting down to the big questions that we had to face. Yes, we know there are different lists out there. That's part of the acknowledgment and probably would help to prove our point that there no definitive lists out there and various purposes.

And as Heather noted earlier with various histories, and some are more dated than others and they've got certain processes. So, the fact that they've got fewer names on them shouldn't be deemed to be a shortcoming, but they're not tailored to this purpose. We know that they all exist, their inconsistencies. Some might suggest, well, you pick a list and stick to it. That would obviously -- I guess I'm being a bit presumptuous there, be ISO-3166. But, could you do ISO plus in terms of making some other qualifications in terms of -- much like the new gTLDs' process or making reference to lists used in other intergovernmental organizations?

Did anyone have any views -- and this is a big deal, it's a big call. And I know that -- I'm just trying to throw it out there because we will soon get down to the pointy end of our work. So, I just wanted to see whether anyone had any comments about how we should attack that from here.

Martin, you had your hand up? Are you there, Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yeah, sorry about that. I managed to lose my mute button on my desktop.

Paul Szyndler: Go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Yeah. Thanks for this final slide, which I think is actually quite an important one because it does give us a basis to try and work out how we think we should be moving forward.

It's not a mutually exclusive list, though, in that I think we do actually have to recognize that different lists exist. They get used for different purposes. For example, Keith helpfully pointed out the postal union, agreements on the codes that are put at the back of motorcars, the sort of denominal numbers and denominal numbers of lists. And they're not always in coherence.

But, I thought that one of the directions that we had in mind was that the -- we're trying to identify a basis frame work whereby a country could put his hand up reasonably and say you can't use that because it is the name of our country. And I think if we try and hold that in mind, it seems to me that we've got some sort of quite fundamental ideas that we've just got to capture. And really, to me, the fundamental idea is that you don't end up with people being confused when they see a string that is at the end of a domain name into thinking that, ah, therefore, that is my country. And so, yes, noting that different lists exist; yes to the basic concept of using ISO. But, I certainly agree with you the need to be other qualifications.

And then the third one, which for me is particularly of concern, is the how to capture all languages. And one of the thoughts that went across my mind is that all countries -- well, not actually all countries, but most countries, have permanent diplomatic missions in quite a large range of countries around the globe. And they use -- outside their building they have a plaque that says in their national language what the name of the mission is, but that will also have its in the language or the script or scripts of the country in which they're in. And I wonder whether that might be the right clue in that, if a country can turn around and say, yes, not only is this -- it is not in the scripts that we use normally in our own borders, but in India this is the way we represent the name of our country. And so, they have an opportunity to show that they are using that particular script combination to represent their country. And I just wonder whether that might be a way through what otherwise starts becoming an incredibly complex subject as we represent all countries in all languages in all scripts.

Paul Szyndler: Well, thanks for your observations there, Martin. Yeah, you're absolutely right that -- and others have observed, that all scripts, all languages, etc., etc., is the million dollar question and how could we possibly acknowledge that. The way that you talked about that, that proposal's very valid. I'm conscious that there's been an attempt to capture that previously in policy and processes by deferring that to a relevant national authority. And even if that -- and specifically because those authorities would be recognized generally under or other UN or other IGO processes. They exist, they've been authoritatively recognized. And even if they are the ones that say, yes, this is what we put on the plaques outside of our missions in our countries -- and I'll remind everyone I live in Canberra, so I do drive past quite a few of those missions here, the Australian missions. But, you need some entity that can make that authoritative statement. Perhaps that's -- there will be a role to be played in terms of identifying who asserts that authority or genuine claim for it.

Some of the other observations you made there, Martin, I also wanted to pick up on was, as part of our process we were trying to get towards at the end, you asserted you -- to say to someone, well, you can't go for that name, you can't get that name because that's the name of my country. Yes and no, broadly speaking. That -- the way I've paraphrased that may sound somewhat defensive and singularly focused on what is my country and what is not and, therefore, asserting the rights of countries. You then followed up by talking about not ending up in a state of confusion where people think, oh, therefore that is my country.

I think the purpose of this group is to also avoid, attempt to avoid -- start laying the frame work for some sort of system or the way ICANN approaches this process that will also avoid confusion from businesses' perspective, from potential new gTLD applicants' perspective, from whoever else's perspective, not just -- it's very easy for us to be stuck in the prism of country codes and looking at everything through that perspective, but it's not just that. It's also that everyone else in the community to have clarity around the rules of what you can and can't apply for. There are very few people out there who will deny the rights of states to assert their authority over their country's name. Some may not be satisfied with anything short of a completely open and liberal marketplace, but most will acknowledge that there is a role and representation for country names and they should be protected. How we do that needs to be really clear for the benefit of all.

And as I've just -- as Bart's just noted in the chat room, yes, there is a list that indicates that there's over 7,500 languages and that everything grows exponentially in terms of when you start overlapping all country names, multiplied by all of those languages you end up with an absolutely huge number.

I'm conscious that we've now hit the hour mark. And rather than putting out a tempting teaser in terms of the last slide, this is the question that I just wanted to flag here, to raise here. We've largely gone through most of the categories. There are a few ideas there, that if anybody wants to chip in on or feels strongly about or wants to offer some commentary, I'd very much encourage you to do that to the list now as it will inform our discussions and deliberations in Prague. This is where we get down to the (inaudible) of our work and staff trying to address some of the difficult questions. The all languages one being a particular one.

I'm cautious that when we get to Prague I'll probably reiterate the scope of this group just one more time, just because we will be talking about very pertinent and very current examples in terms of the IDN and ccTLD policy process and new gTLDs in anticipation of round two in 2020 at the rate we're going. But, that we are not offering direct recommendations or input there or proposing changes of policy, but rather making observations. And they can get quite pointed and we can say that there are different lists out there; there are inconsistencies between them. ICANN and the community may be best off by sticking to ISO with qualifications, etc., if we can get agreement amongst ourselves that that's the reasonable approach; maybe not. And then, delve into those deeper areas of how the heck we're going to actually capture all of this in all languages. It will end up reading like a critique of the current processes, but that's not to say we'll be making recommendations to how we change them. It's a fine line and point of differentiation, but one that I'll keep making every time we meet anyway.

Anyone else have any other comments to make? I'm sorry to wrap it up, but I do realize most people allocate an hour and we've gone a little bit over that.

Well, thank you, everyone. I think the way we work through that and the way that people are thinking about and wrapping their heads around these issues is very useful. On our next call in a couple of weeks' time we've just got a couple of issues that were left over in

terms of indigenous and minority languages and common names. And I was hoping that we'd sort of wrap up those up relatively quickly and then just get into this in-depth discussion about some of these trickier items a bit more.

So, I'll eave it at that. Thank you, everyone, for your time. Comments, interjections, criticisms, etc., very much welcome on the lists and look forward to catching up with you in a couple of weeks. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, Paul.

Unidentified Participant: Bye-bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you very much.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks, Paul.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Bye-bye.