Study Group on Use of Names for Countries and Territories

30 January 2013

Attendees:

ccNSO
Martin Boyle, .uk
Henry Chan, .hk
Ian Chiang, .tw
Keith Davidson, .nz
Sokol Haxhiu, NomCom Appointee to the ccNSO Council
Annebeth Lange, .no
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Leo Maluwa, .mw (in adobe only)
Grigori Saghyan, .am
Ron Sherwood, .vi
Paul Szyndler, .au (Chair)

GNSO
Chris Chaplow - CBUC (Observer)

At-Large
Eduardo Diaz (NARALO)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO (liaison)
Maureen Hilyard

Specialists
Jaap Akkerhuis, ISO

Support Staff
Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO
Kristina Nordström, ccNSO
Gabriella Schittek, ccNSO

Other ICANN Staff
Marika Konings

Apologies

Iliya Bazlyankov - RrSG
Hiro Hotta, .jp
Tony Harris- ISPCP

Kristina Nordström:	We have Martin Boyle, Henry Chan, Keith Davidson, Annebeth Lange, Leo Maluwa, but he's only in Adobe, I think, and Marika Konings is only in Adobe as well, Grigori Saghyan, Ron Sherwood, Paul Szyndler, Eduardo Diaz, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, and Jaap Akkerhuis. From support staff, we have Bart Boswinkel, Kristina Nordstrom, and Gabriella Schittek. And, also, now we have Sokol Haxhiu in the Adobe room. And apologies from Iliya Bazlyankov, Hiro Hotta, and Tony Harris.
Paul Szyndler:	Wonderful. Thank you very much. And I apologize. If somebody raises a question in the Adobe room, could you, please, point it out to me, because, apparently, I'm in a developing country when it comes to internet connectivity. I'm struggling at the moment. I'm simply on the phone. So, again, if the secretary could, please, point out to me if anybody's raised something in the Adobe room, it would be greatly appreciated.
	Look, as I mentioned-- and Kristina, thank you for teeing up the call and for organizing this from quite a way out and setting our schedule for the next few teleconferences. As I mentioned in the e-mail that I sent out a few hours ago to everyone, the purpose of today is just to bring everyone up to speed again. There has not been a lot of progress. I take the blame for it. I blame the inventor of the worldwide Web over the last couple of weeks for that in particular. There's been a little bit of distraction from the domestic end. But (unintelligible) generally for everyone. And in terms of us meeting our deliverables, this is an important call just to say-- we're ramping up from now, and there's going to be quite a few deadlines over the next two and a half months. I know that not everyone from the study group can join us on this call, but (unintelligible) recorded and shared with everyone from the group so that at least everyone is comfortable and can't say that they're surprised that our workload is sort of increasing over the next few weeks.
	Where we'd gotten to late last year was, basically, quite a bit of survey work through UNESCO. All of our internal deliberations, considerations amongst the working group and the different combinations and permutations we could have of country and territory names-- I don't need to go into that in any detail on this call at this stage.
	But, as I said in my e-mail, there was a final report outline, which I've circulated to everyone and I've resent again. And I will send it again out to everyone as a proposed structure for a draft, final report. It's important that we've somewhat crept past our preliminary, very rough sort of deadline for the end of this group, which may have been in a very optimistic world the end of last year. But, given recent comments by ICANN's CEO and given that much of our work hinged on round two of the GNSO process-- of the new gTLD process, I don't think we'll be seeing a lot of action for a while. But, that said, I don't want our deadline to slip all that much.
	That being the case, our adjusted deadline was to sort of deliver something that resembles a final report or a consensus position or a shared view-- I'm not much (inaudible) of this group in Beijing. That being the case, we sort of need to work through the draft on the next teleconference and the one after that. So, really, that's what I wanted to flag with everyone as our absolute priority over the next two and a half months.

	Late last year, in about December, Bart and I spoke to-- I don't believe (unintelligible) from UNESCO is on this call. Is that right, Bart?
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes. I haven't seen her. Kristina didn't mention her. She is not in the Adobe room.
Keith Davidson:	I didn't want to speak for her just in case she was here. But we spoke with her a while ago. And, as everyone may recall, we were using the UNESCO survey process where they were going to out to a whole bunch of member states to ask their view on country and territory names and how they're utilized. And the feedback rate, to be perfectly blunt, was really disappointing not just from our perspective but from UNESCO's. They were quite surprised that the feedback rate was quite low. It was nothing to do with how we'd crafted the survey. They didn't think it was too onerous, to difficult. But it just didn't get a lot of responses from member states. I've got a little bit of feedback. I've got some summary feedback, which I didn't send to the group because it's rather raw at this stage. But it was basically no more now than about 13 countries that came back and gave us some advice. That being the case, it's certainly not statistically significant. But, that being the case-- it's still of use. We've gone through the exercise, and I think we'll send it to other elements of the ICANN community over the next few weeks to see whether anybody else wants to provide any comments. But that's something that I'll send around in an e-mail within the next couple of weeks.

I think the next steps-- So, for me, as far as I'm concerned, the next steps are going to be, well, okay-- I'm going to formally send around where we are with what I think a final report should look like. Bart and I will be chatting early next week and locking that in and then sending it out to members of this group. After that, we'll look-- at the same time, I also want to go to the wider ICANN community about whether they've got any comments on topics that have been raised in the UNESCO survey. And then, from there, we're sort of going through an interview process (unintelligible) doing some drafts of a final report.

The main reason I wanted to touch base with everyone today was simply because it's been a few months. We haven't had an opportunity to catch up. I just wanted to give anyone else a chance to say-- well, have you any concerns? Have you any questions? Do you want to share any views about how we're traveling (ph)? Or are you, broadly, happy enough? Any comments from anyone else, less I take up all of the airspace on this call? |
Annebeth Lange:	Hello, Paul. It's Annebeth.
Paul Szyndler:	Annebeth, I've got you. Go ahead.
Annebeth Lange:	Yes. Fine. Actually, I feel it's really good that you got caught up with us again because it's a long time since we last talked. And I think that we all need to concentrate on this once more. So we've forgotten some of the results we had. So, when you're waking us up now, we can start thinking and coming back to you.
Paul Szyndler:	Thank you for adding that, Annebeth. As I said, I take my fair share of blame for that because, as we all ended the calendar year, have gone past-- at least mentally, past the last ICANN meeting for the year. And, for those of us that had the pleasure of being entangled (unintelligible) as well, this sort of took a little bit of a back seat.

So, as I said, the real purpose today was just to say, please, let's not forget this study group is here.

There is another issue that I need to raise, and I've got to apologize to everyone that I won't actually be in Beijing in person. My aim-- and I've already spoken to Bart about this because we really, really must have some sort of product that looks like a final report or near final report for community consultation in Beijing. And, whilst I'll be very happy to teleconference in and provide as much briefing as I can over the phone, I'm actually going to be here for the birth of our next child, at home for the birth of our next child. So I apologize that I won't actually be there in person. But I don't want that to mean that we (unintelligible) at our next meeting.

So, look, I really don't have anything to add. I don't want to keep anyone any longer. It was just really-- you've seen the final report outline that I've sent in my e-mail. Please, have a look at it. Have a look at the rough notes and the timeframe (unintelligible) increment that we set. Bart and I are going to sit down and have a really, really long chat early next week to go through the next steps in more minute detail. This was just a chance to let everyone know that, hey, 20th of February, we'll be meeting for our next teleconference. By that stage, we'll already have-- I expect we'll have the outcome or some sort of shell of a final report. Bart's also mentioned that-- Bart and I also had a chat about the fact that UNESCO has an opportunity to promulgate our work and mention it throughout their network at some stage towards the end of February. Is that right, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. That's correct. There is a UNESCO meeting, and ICANN is attending that one in Paris.

Paul Szyndler: And, as Bart mentioned, that would just be a great, informal opportunity, even if we have the skeleton of a final report or something a little clearer to share with the UNESCO conference. (Unintelligible) has offered to share that. I believe Johannes (ph) will be involved in that as well. But, that being the case, I think it will be really, really great if we have something that looks like the rough outline of a final report available toward the end of February for that. That's giving us yet three weeks. It's optimistic, but I'm talking about a skeleton of a report that we will start discussing internally for our first round.

Then, another few weeks until the 13th of March, and I would love everyone to start getting really active back and forth. I'll push it very hard on the e-mail list back and forward up until our next teleconference on the 13th of March, which, by that stage, is what I'm calling our pre-Beijing teleconference. And then, in the end, people exchanging ideas fairly aggressively up until about the 25th of March or so because, if we're going to release anything to the ICANN community-- and I know I'm talking about something that's very abstract at this stage. But, if we have two or three iterations between now and then, by about the 25th of March, I think the rest of the community deserves a chance to see at least the preliminary output of our work because we'll get a whole bunch of very vague looks and sort of interest but not quite a lot of idea of what's going on unless, at Beijing-- unless we give people a clearer idea two or three weeks beforehand. So I'm sort of setting the 25th of March as a date that community members can start seeing what we've developed out of this group.

At Beijing, then, we'll brief the community more widely, again, depending upon what they say (technical difficulties) for briefing the ccNSO council.

Bart Boswinkel: Paul?

Paul Szyndler:	Go ahead, Bart.
Bart Boswinkel:	Ron has his hand up. He has a question, I guess, or a comment.
Paul Szyndler:	Sorry, Ron. Go ahead.
Ron Sherwood:	Paul, you mentioned earlier that UNESCO was dissatisfied with the response to the survey. Do you have any numbers to explain that?
Paul Szyndler:	Perhaps my wording was not so artful. I apologize. I failed as a diplomat earlier in my career. Thanks, Cheryl.
	What had happened with the UNESCO survey was that they felt that engaging a subset of member states, approximately 30, and then tweaking the numbers a little bit, adding a few more if they needed to, if they felt the response rate was a little low-- they were originally confident that they could get close to perhaps 100% return. So, if they weren't doing so well, they would take the member states, ask them again if there was something that was unclear about the survey. And then, if they weren't getting a good response, add a couple more member states. As it happened-- perhaps the term dissatisfied is a little strong, but they were at least-- I think I can put words in (unintelligible)'s mouth and say she was a little surprised at how many states didn't respond.
	The survey wasn't so difficult. Question seven that was part of it, which was, of course, the one where we ask how you would refer to the name of the other survey respondents in your language or languages-- that one took a little more work, and they did get a few responses on that.
	But, overall, it was just that they-- I didn't-- Bart, do you recall that teleconference we had in December? I was in Dubai at the time; so, in a completely jet-lagged time zone. But my feeling was that it was equally surprising to the UNESCO staff as it was to us. And it wasn't because the survey was too hard.
Bart Boswinkel:	No. The real issue there, I think, that they encountered is that UNESCO has to act through its members. And they have representatives. But these are not the people who feel comfortable in responding to a survey from UNESCO. So it's going up and down the food chain in the respective governments and to different departments and even ministries. And this is-- there is no high priority there. So this is probably where they got lost.
Paul Szyndler:	Yeah. I think that's a good explanation.
Unidentified Participant:	That makes sense, Bart.
Bart Boswinkel:	And, in that sense-- the way we treated it, and maybe that's something to report as well-- it's nothing to do with, say-- it's just a fact of life that matters that are important to us on the working group is not perceived as such in some of the outside world--
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Surely not.
Bart Boswinkel:	-- (inaudible) into this because it's getting a very low priority.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Shocking.

Paul Szyndler:	And, if I could relate some of the raw data that we received back, it basically included (unintelligible) of the raw survey that was sent out with a few penned in answers from certain member states as opposed to-- (unintelligible) significant (unintelligible) which had gone into great detail that explained the responses from other member states. So it was something that UNESCO certainly made best efforts. But, as Bart said, perhaps of not great priority as it is to the members of this study group.

That said, when UNESCO proposed doing-- would we like to recraft the survey? Would we like to extend the project? I think we can all agree that we spent a good amount of time on that. We don't look at whatever responses we got back as representative (unintelligible) anymore but, rather, it's just, well, what we got back we got back. Bart and I will try and, probably, with (unintelligible) help try and tidy that up a little bit so that it's in some digestible format to send out to everyone else. But it is still only a dozen or thirteen or so responses. It would only be useful from a-- hey, there are some interesting responses here perspective, rather than absolute sort of logistical things. But, otherwise, I think there's going to be a few responses there that we can use.

We can't extend the schedule any longer. I think we've got what we're going to get from the exercise, and we should leave it at that. |
| Bart Boswinkel: | Paul, you can look at it this way as well. The responses we received-- there were no questions with regard to the questions in the survey or reaction to the survey itself. So that means that, in principle, the categorization or typology itself is self-explanatory and validated. |
| Paul Szyndler: | Oh, absolutely. Nobody-- in other words, nobody came back and said we do not understand what you're asking. They just simply said we don't care what you're asking. It's not our priority to understand what you're asking. So I know that's not been immediately transparent to members of the study group. But there have been no answers, no responses along those lines, nothing that UNESCO has conveyed to us along those lines at all.

So, look, that's basically where we're at. I think we've wrapped up what was fairly good progress that headed along towards the end of the year and until Toronto. We've been in a period (unintelligible) since. I'd refer everyone to the e-mail that I sent around about the timeframe. We've got some fairly tight dates in there.

Our next teleconference is locked in, the 20th of February. What I'd ask everyone to look forward to is-- or at least look out for if not look forward to-- is the communication from Bart and myself about what we think a draft report might look like. We'll flesh that out in the next few days. Also, we'll see if we can get any sort of other community input so that we start getting some preliminary engagement from the rest of ICANN about this, even though they're very distracted by other matters. And that should be done as soon as possible because it's only three weeks until our next call.

So I don't have anything further for this one. It was more of a call to arms and a plead to lock in the dates. Please, be aware of what's coming up because it's going to start getting a little bit heavy (ph) for us.

Does anyone have any sort of final comments to make (unintelligible)? |
| Ian Chiang: | Paul, this is Ian. I have a few comments or, maybe, questions. |

Paul Szyndler:	Go ahead.
Ian Chiang:	Regarding the report, I think we should take the best interest of all countries and territories into account, including all the names of the countries or territories in the future without any limited. And, secondly, I think probably I kind of-- we need to clarify the role of UNESCO in the study group because some countries or territories are not a UN member. So I think, for their best interest, I think they should be taken into account. And that is my comment for the draft report.
Paul Szyndler:	Ian, thank you. Your comments are very much noted. We'll certainly take those into account. And you will see that-- precisely the role of UNESCO, et cetera, reflected in the output of this group. And you will certainly have a chance to see that (technical difficulties) that we do before we go (unintelligible).
Bart Boswinkel:	Paul, Henry raised his hand. He has a question or comment as well. Henry Chan.
Paul Szyndler:	Henry, go ahead.
Henry Chan:	Yes. Looking at the draft (unintelligible) outline and the status update (unintelligible) about UNESCO (unintelligible), I was wondering also-- I lost track of how this UNESCO survey was (unintelligible). Could you please remind us a bit about how that should fit into the report, please?
Paul Szyndler:	Henry, absolutely. When we first engaged UNESCO, as study group members may recall, the whole idea was we were taking advantage of a standing engagement or a standing agreement between UNESCO and ICANN. That's a mutually collaborative agreement that was in place. It is certainly very useful from ICANN and from a ccNSO constituency perspective because we were able to tap into the resources of a UN organization to help us with our work.

And, although it had been a largely theoretical, hypothetical arrangement and promise and agreement in-- we were able to tap in and actually get some value out of it. In the first instance, the whole idea was to go out to UNESCO and get them to survey a subset of member states. It wasn't every one. It wasn't (technical difficulties) complete, absolute survey of member states at UNESCO. It was just an exercise that would help inform our deliberation. If it went well, if it went quickly, we could expand it to more member states. But that's not been the case. It was just, again, initial priorities and timing (unintelligible).

The best guess I can make at this stage is that the survey will be contextualized as an element that contributed to the deliberations of this study group and not anything more than that. As I made clear before, it was only ever a survey that we'd have of a subset of UN member states. And, even then, we only got a small survey response. It's not anything that can be and won't be represented as a view of UNESCO. I certainly wouldn't do that to our colleagues at UNESCO because that would be misrepresenting their work. They helped us out. They gave us some responses. It was a very small response rate, and that is fine. It's just a small detail that's helped inform our work. And I'll be very cautious to make sure that it's contextualized as that. It was very useful, but it's only one element of our work.

So, Henry, I hope that helps make it clear. It's something we'll discuss. If working group members-- or study group members aren't happy with it-- we'll discuss it before we finalize it. But that's roughly how I see it being represented. |

Henry Chan: Thank you, Paul. So far, my suggestions or comment would be, if the UNESCO survey is not representative enough due to the low response rate, I would pretty much like Bart's idea about (unintelligible) quality. At least we can sort of (unintelligible) makes sense and can be used to (unintelligible). That's my suggestion.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you very much for your suggestion. I very much agree with it. I didn't mean to downplay in any way the importance of the typology. It's been the tool that we've used throughout the whole time. It's just that, simply, the survey hasn't delivered the broad range of responses that we may have expected. That being the case, I think the typology is still sound.

I'm very conscious that we're talking about the very high-level issues at this stage. We need to start seeing some words on pages and things to start making sense in a draft report. But, otherwise, I take your point and completely agree. The validity and the soundness of the typology is something that we'll reiterate (unintelligible) reiterate in a draft version of the final report.

That said, I'm acknowledging that we're getting close to the half hour mark. Were there any other comments that folk wanted to make? Or, given that this is really just to catch up for the new year, is everyone relatively happy until you see something from us in the next couple of weeks?

Unidentified Participant: I'm good.

Paul Szyndler: That being the case, thank you, everyone. Thank you for your time. It's relatively late at night. I'll send something out. Bart and I will talk early next week. We'll start crafting something. And we will start aiming towards our first date, being 20th of February and the 13th of March for our subsequent teleconference calls. But, otherwise, thank you for your time, and look forward to catching up with you a lot more actively online on the list over the next couple of weeks.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, everyone.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Bye-bye.

Paul Szyndler: Thank you, all.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, Paul.

Unidentified Participant: Bye.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you. Bye.