\Nathalie Peregrine: Dear all, welcome to the CWG on Country and Territory Names as TLDs meeting on the 3rd October 2016

---------- (10/03/2016 12:40) ----------

Nathalie Peregrine: Agenda page: https://community.icann.org/x/_A_4Aw

---------- (10/03/2016 13:52) ----------

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): Hello All

---------- (10/03/2016 13:57) ----------

bart boswinkel: Hello all

---------- (10/03/2016 14:01) ----------

Mirjana Tasic .rs: Hello all

Nathalie Peregrine: Welcome everyone!

---------- (10/03/2016 14:05) ----------

Nathalie Peregrine: Mzia Gogilashvili has joined the call

---------- (10/03/2016 14:06) ----------

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: pretty small print

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: can you zoon in?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: zoom in

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: this is much better

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: thanks

---------- (10/03/2016 14:10) ----------

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: It is odd

---------- (10/03/2016 14:13) ----------

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): .com ?

Annebeth Lange: I agree with you here, Alexander. There are different reasons behind this reservation (for .nic).

Steve Chan: The Reserved Names list is in section 2.2.1.2.1 of the Applicant Guidebook: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/evaluation-procedures-04jun12-en.pdf

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: but 3 letter coes are allowed

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: 3 letter words

Annebeth Lange: Today 3-letter words are allowed, but not those on the ISO 3166-1 alpha 3.

Annebeth Lange: If these are opened, .nic will still be reserverd, as I see it.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: thanks Annebeth: so it means the iso list is reserved

Alexander Schubert: But we could recommend to ICANN to overthink whether ".nic" desprately HAS to be on the protected list. But that is not really our problem I think.

Annebeth Lange: So far it has been reserved, Carlos, but what we are discussing is whether it should be opened in the next round

Alexander Schubert: There is kind of an "overlap" - but no real "conflict" in my eyes.

Annebeth Lange: Agree, Alexandaer.

Alexander Schubert: :-)

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: we should say that there is no agreement
---------- (10/03/2016 14:18) ----------
Annebeth Lange: Could you scroll the document forward

Annebeth Lange: OK

Steve Chan: Rather than "conflict" or "overlap", it would seem like an exception because of the Reserved Names list.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, Steve
---------- (10/03/2016 14:26) ----------
Carlos Raul Gutierrez: ok

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: ok

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: i see
---------- (10/03/2016 14:36) ----------
Carlos Raul Gutierrez: @Annebeth it was just to metion one of the positions on the floor

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Agree with Annebeth

---------- (10/03/2016 14:39) ----------

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): we need some kind of voting (not many people participate today)

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): at least doodle poll or e-mail

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: #2 in my view is not 100% clear or differentiated from #1

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Maxim, this is only a progress report

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: recommendations in my view would belong into the second paper

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): then it could be omited

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: but we can change it

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I tend to support your postion Maxim on #2

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: either make it clearer (CWG vs. PDP) or out

---------- (10/03/2016 14:44) ----------

Annebeth Lange: So Alexander, do you mean that those working with the subsequent round will respect the AGB on the ISO 3166 and keep it that way? My understanding has been that many wanted to change it, to remove the "protection" and open up everything

---------- (10/03/2016 14:47) ----------

Annebeth Lange: I agree, Alexander, but the problem is that the views in this WG is widely apart, and I cannot see that we manage to deliver a "solution" that we agree on

---------- (10/03/2016 14:48) ----------

Annebeth Lange: I agree with you, Susan, 2-letters are not the difficult ones

Annebeth Lange: So at least we can give that advice to the PDP

---------- (10/03/2016 14:50) ----------

Annebeth Lange: Agree, Bart, therefore the alternative for recommendation 3 takes this into consideration

---------- (10/03/2016 14:54) ----------

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): non objection whould one of the ways , after all we might write, that there was non-objection or something like ut

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): it

---------- (10/03/2016 14:58) ----------

Alexander Schubert: Do we expect to be mandated by gnSO and GAC to build another CWG? Or do we agree that if we do not come up with a solution the GNSO will take ownership of the task to develop a solution for Teritory names and ISO3166 Alpha 3 names in the next round?

---------- (10/03/2016 15:02) ----------

Mirjana Tasic .rs: I agree with Annebeth remark that our recommendation for two letter codes should be included in the progress report

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): 2100

Steve Chan: I do not see a conflict with the New gTLD group on the 17th. And this group is scheduled to meet at 2100 UTC.

Steve Chan: The New gTLD PDP WG is scheduled for 0300 on the 17th of Oct

Susan Payne: sounds good

Mirjana Tasic .rs: Bye

Alexander Schubert: bye everbody!

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID): bye all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): bye