ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
January 14, 2016
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recording has been started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much, Nancy. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome everyone to the Subgroup 2 Call on the 14th of January 2016.

On the call today we have Vidushi Marda, Alexandre Arns Gonzales, Gangesh Varma, Karel Douglas, Narine Kachatryan. And from staff we have myself, Maryam Bakoshi

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you Vidushi.

Vidushi Marda: Thanks a lot, Maryam. Welcome everyone to this call of Subgroup 2. Just to introduce myself, I am Vidushi Marda. I am a program officer at CIS. I have, as you can see here on the slide, I have a few points of discussion that I think we should cover today and we've been doing some research here at CIS and these are the points that we have come up with.

Without going into each of them, I'm just going to check if anyone had any additional points. Okay. I don't see any so I'm just going to assume that we can go on to our mandate.

So the first question that we really need to figure out is how we define our mandate. As you can see it currently leads to document cases and examples in which ICANN is potentially impacting human rights.

A couple of suggestions that we had to better understand this was to ask, because this will overlap to an extent with ST3 and 4, are we looking at narrowing down our focus are we looking at keeping it broad. That's the first point.

The second is are we looking to include only ICANN policies or even individual instances of practices and policies and do we want to extend our mandate to that. And the third is are we looking at a broad number of cases or are we looking at a few cases and explaining that. This is just like a couple of points that we wanted - we thought we should clarify and I would invite everyone's comments at this time.

I don't see any raised hands. Yes, Gangesh over to you. Yes we're not able to (unintelligible). All right. We're going to give him a minute to see if Gangesh can fix his settings. Would anyone like to speak at this time?

Gangesh Varma: Hello am I audible?

Vidushi Marda: Yes, you are, Gangesh.

Gangesh Varma: Right hi. My name is Gangesh. I work with the Center for Communication Governance at the National University Delhi. Vidushi, just on your intro

points, you wanted to clarify whether we would want a narrow or a broader focus, especially considering the possible overlaps with the other subgroups.

I personally feel that it would be better to narrow down our focus and see that there is minimal overlap with the other subgroups for two reasons. One, we would prevent overlapping the duplication of labor. Two, we would also have a tangible output that we can clearly discuss and feed into the process at Marrakech. And so in that sense, I would be very wary of what we cover with specific reference to the Whois process and the new gTLD process. Thank you.

Vidushi Marda: All right. Yes okay. I think we had brought this up I think in the last call when Gangesh had spoken about whether we wanted to actually duplicate what other subgroups might be doing. And I think he had presented a plan of action here so that he suggested that we narrow it down. So thank you for that.

Do we have any other comments at this time? I think a couple of people have lost connection. All right. If there are no comments on the mandate, thank you Gangesh, then we can move on to the next talking point, which is the proposed output.

So with just I mean less than two months to go, I think it's quite important - sorry, Gangesh, do you want to go ahead?

Gangesh Varma: Yes thank you, Vidushi. Sorry to interrupt you. So I just wanted to clarify whether we would be clarifying the mandate or we will retain the same mandate but it will simply reflect in our work that we'll be narrowing down the focus? Is there a terms of reference that you're working on?

Vidushi Marda: So I think - so as of now you can actually go back to the mandate - different mandates will talk about the answers and different examples in which ICANN is currently invested in the mandate. So I think if most of you would like to narrow down our focus and not duplicate work, and I think you agree with me.

I'm sorry if you're not speaking, could you put it on mute? So I think I'm just going to look over the chat channel and -- sorry, there's a lot of people talking in the chat window. So I guess we have quite a bit of support for the narrowed approach and especially as a number of you, again, agree I think we'll spend time on things that are already being done by other groups is simply not the best idea given our numbers. (Unintelligible)

Apologies. It's the first time I'm doing this. So if I seem a bit (unintelligible) I apologize in advance. So I think if I am going to clarify what we are thinking about now, we want to narrow down our focus and we will look at things that SG3 and 4 are not doing. Is everyone okay with this clarification and can we go ahead with that?

Thanks, Gangesh, to that. I think the text of the mandate goals are the documentation examples in which ICANN's proposal is impacting human rights. Do we have a position for how to make it narrower or do we determine as far as that isn't in our scope or how you would propose that we do that?

Gangesh Varma: Yes hi. Am I audible now? Hi, Vidushi, can you hear me?

Vidushi Marda: Yes hi.

Gangesh Varma: Yes thank you. So I was just thinking if it necessary at the mandate stage to specify that narrow focus or is it simply reflected in our work. So I'm not very clear if you want to get into that detail at the mandate phase itself. But if there

is support for clarity at the mandate specifying that we do not want to eat into or I mean overlap into the areas of other subgroups, then we might - I can take a stab at reworking the text of the mandate, if there is support for that.

But probably if the mandate is oddly worded, we can simply reflect it in our work that we will not be focusing on X, Y, Z aspects and that will be - can clarified in our discussions and e-mail thread. So that's it. If - I'd like to hear everyone's input on that.

Vidushi Marda: Okay. Yes I think - all right, do we have any other speakers at this time to respond to Gangesh's question? I think we have a couple of people typing. But just in the meantime, I just want to say, Gangesh, that I think - I mean I would support that we reflect that in our work, because at this time we haven't really begun the actual mapping out. And so I think at this time, it would be better to recommend it as it but when we start dividing work and actually doing it, we could clarify what we will not be doing through our work. But I would like to see what others have to say.

Into the chat channel - do we have any other speakers? Okay. (Unintelligible) is speaking to that. (Unintelligible) certain the exact work that the other groups are doing in their respective groups that can define what they are doing.

All right. So are you proposing that we seek clarifications from them and then, you know, work within, if possible, in their work? (Unintelligible). Okay. Okay good. So do we have any objections to that? I don't see any yet, so I'm going to assume that everyone agrees with that particular point.

All right. I see that (unintelligible) typing something. Yes exactly. Can I assume that we have (unintelligible) suggest seek clarification from the other

subgroups and then, you know, define exactly what we will be looking into accordingly.

Yes, Gangesh, please go ahead.

Gangesh Varma: Yes, Vidushi. And I agree with the others. In that case, what we can do is we would then eliminate what the subgroup 3 and 4 are working on already, and that will reduce our workload and we might be very specific into areas. So maybe you could just write to the others on the general working party thread and clarify what the others subgroups are working on so that we will not work on those processes. But broadly if we want to eliminate, we can eliminate the Whois and the new gTLD program. Would that be the case?

Vidushi Marda: Yes. That sounds good. I mean we can eliminate those to begin with, but I think as we go ahead and look at the other topics that we can look into, we can figure out what we definitely want to do and what we will need confirmation for.

Gangesh Varma: Definitely yes. That sounds good. Yes that sounds great.

Vidushi Marda: All right. Okay. Great. So if I understand correctly, everyone's on the same page with respect to the mandate. So could we move on to the next talking point?

Okay. Great thank you. The second talking point that we thought that we'd need to discuss a bit further is the output, the potential output that we will be looking into. So I think given our time and the number of concerns, one suggestion that we had is that we can divide topics amongst ourselves and document cases of violations or potential violations. And we can spend two

weeks doing this, after which we would develop a new draft and, you know, at a call that we schedule after two weeks.

And after that, we can sort of classify things on individual headings, like you can see on the slide. I think this way what will happen is that there's no clarity as to what we're doing and, you know, given the short period of time, I think this is the best way to go about this because we will have - I mean we'll get as much done as we can.

Are there any more suggestions on how to go about this and what kind of output we're looking at? (Unintelligible). I mean this is in addition to the list. We have missed a potential topic (unintelligible) we'll add some clarity into it.

So anyway, I think that this approach will work and I think that we should go through this in return. As of now, we don't have too much of, you know, we don't have enough notes to kind of look through the whole breadth of potential violations. And so if we each choose particular topics, which I will talk us through after this, which is in the top of the slide, if we develop this at this point I think we'll get, you know, a good range of violations or potential violations in two weeks.

And if we develop a new draft after that, I think we'll have more clarity in how to go about this. If you have another suggestion, I'm more than happy for your input. Yes, Gangesh?

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh. So I think that's a great approach. Maybe what will help before we start is also if we can have a basic structure or a framework within in which you would feed this data. So for example you can look at if you're collecting both past and potential violations, you would split first into two

categories and what specific right we're looking at and which process it will affect.

So if we have a matrix that is common to all, then while different groups are doing the research, when we put it all together, it's easy to assimilate and crunch the data.

Vidushi Marda: Gangesh, that's a really good suggestion, because I think if we're uniform in how we approach it, you know, collecting it and putting it together will actually be much easier. If we look at just one to three data points, first off the potential, the second, a particular right and the process that it would affect. Did I understand you accurately?

Gangesh Varma: Yes. This is Gangesh here again. So that's just indicative list. I mean this is off the top of my head, but I'd be happy to hear input from everyone and probably come up with a clearer criteria, yes.

Vidushi Marda: Okay.

Gangesh Varma: Thank you.

Vidushi Marda: Yes. Thanks for that, Gangesh. I'm just thinking possible, you know, data points that we would have in addition to the three that you suggested now. I also think it would be interesting to look at whether it's a specific ICANN policy or if it's an individual case. Because I think later on we can actually point out that these are the problems that are, you know, violations or potential violations, and these are the individual instances that we have identified.

Because I think that would mean that we'd have a broader range of issues and they're not confining ourselves to just one or the other. Do you have any comments anyone?

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. So yes I think that's a great way to go about it. I just want to clarify, so when we say as a policy instance with the ICANN policy, what do you mean by a case-by-case or an instance? Could you elaborate with an example?

Vidushi Marda: Yes. So for example, if say were calling out a specific instance within the gTLD process, right, that will be an individual instance that has an individual impact, where if we looked at a broader policy of ICANN, that's a little more, you know, sort (unintelligible). So did I clarify it at this time?

Gangesh Varma: Okay. So Gangesh here again for the record. So from what I understand, you're saying that so if we're looking at, say, a particular application instance, say for .xyz, there is a possible of potential violation or that they had a violation, that is an individual instance. But the new gTLD program would be a policy analysis. Is that right?

Vidushi Marda: Yes. Yes.

Gangesh Varma: But wouldn't that - wouldn't the instance be a part of the policy analysis anyway?

Vidushi Marda: Vidushi here. But I'm just saying in terms of just when we are, you know, individually assimilating data, maybe we could just put that in and look at how we want to classify it at a later date. Because right now I mean I'm just anticipating that we will have, you know, a wide variety of violations that everyone sort of identifies.

And so if we're looking at it at a policy level, we might be just looking at those to lead just examples. If we wanted to find that maybe individuals who could be a part of the policy, but it doesn't necessarily have to be.

Gangesh Varma: All right. Yes Gangesh here again. I think I agree. Let's - probably once the data is in, we'll make sense of that I guess. Thank you.

Vidushi Marda: Thank you. I'm just going through the comments. I think (Heather) agrees with that these are the examples of the policy edits. I see there's another comment and I'd like to read it. But it's - (Alexandria) could you elaborate on that a bit? (Unintelligible).

Sorry I missed a question earlier from (Martin). He says that we wouldn't the board just do that? At this moment, I don't think there's too much clarity in exactly what they're looking at by creating a formal report. But I think with data it would be easier to create a report and then, you know, after two weeks kind of a more clear and take stock then.

However, if the other members here think that having just data and then deciding what to do actually makes more sense, that could also be done. Gangesh, did you have a point to make with respect to that particular question?

Gangesh Varma: Hi. This is Gangesh for the record. Are you referring to the question of the output?

Vidushi Marda: Yes, because we hadn't discussed that particular part.

Gangesh Varma: Okay. I think it's fair that we wait and look at the data and then consider the output. And as well the fact that we will be - we are a small piece in the larger puzzle of the other subgroups. So we might want to consider how the other reports will be structured and probably feed into a larger one.

Vidushi Marda: Okay. So on the question of how we're going to go about this after two weeks, I guess the consensus as of now is just to collect all the information that we can and then take stock after two weeks. Is that an accurate assessment that everyone things at this point?

For those (unintelligible) at least the suggestion that we had was that each of us look into particular topics, which is, as you can see on the slide, it's our next talking point, which are basically what we would want to do next. And so in that sense, it would be quite clear (unintelligible) topic. Do we have consensus on at least the output at the end of two weeks? And then we can (unintelligible).

Yes I'm not sure how we go about (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. Could I make a quick suggestion regarding the topic list, if it's okay?

Vidushi Marda: Yes go ahead.

Gangesh Varma: Yes, so right now there is quite a bit of Whois related and new gTLD program. How about we rework this list, removing the other subgroup works which is Whois and the new gTLD program? If that's the case, then we can look at a revised list where we do not look at the other subgroup's work. And until we get clarification on that, we don't go into that. So we have a list of

work that we can confidently go ahead with and wait for the other groups to get back on the possible areas of overlap.

Vidushi Marda: Yes thanks, Gangesh. I actually agree because I think if we want to go ahead and not get into what the other groups are doing, we should definitely do work we will have to do eventually. I think that's a way to go about it.

Do you think it's better we wait for confirmation or just take the ones that we have to do anyways? Because I think after the subgroups have a little bit of time and - Gangesh, did you have a comment on this particular issue?

Gangesh Varma: Hi Gangesh here. Can I quickly jump in?

Vidushi Marda: Yes.

Gangesh Varma: Yes. So I agree. So what we can do is we can get started on the other PDPs and the topics which are likely to overlap with any other groups, which I see there are quite a few. So my - just my suggestion was we will take off the ones that are clearly areas of the other subgroup and then look at what remains and start work on that.

Vidushi Marda: Okay I agree. So if we just - if we quickly wrap up on the output part of it, maybe we could then move on to looking at potential topics that we will definitely have to cover and we can spend time dividing work like that.

So just for the sake of clarity, before we get into which topics each of us will pick, as of now we have decided that the output at the end of two weeks, so in time for our next call, will be data - just a collection of data and we'll just, you know, discuss the research that we have done for the last two weeks, and then

we decide what to do with it. So we're not going to do it in a report or anything like that in the two weeks but just (unintelligible).

If that is clear, then we can actually move on to dividing topics and all decide what we're doing to do, okay? Okay. So I see that we have agreement for the end of two weeks.

So Gangesh if you could just go through potential topics that are according to your suggestions and talk as to which ones, you know, you think we should definitely focus on and maybe everyone else can also give us their comments. And then we can proceed to divide it up.

So as of now, Gangesh, (unintelligible) - as of now we have a couple of closed PDPs with potential violations. But these are the ones that we think have potential violations. But these are the ones that we think have potential violations and we should be looking into first. But it is also open to (unintelligible). Not sure how you should immediately - would it help if I just send the presentation over to our mailing list if you give me the list? Yes (unintelligible) if you could (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Thank you this is Gangesh for the record. So I think just quickly going through the list so mentally I have eliminated anything which has got to do with new gTLD's and Whois because the other groups are working on it.

We will of course clarify with them and see where we can (edit) and where we should not. But from what remains I think we can consider topics eight, nine, three and two.

These are definitely ones that we can take on without any fear of conflict or overlap with the other organizations. I'm sorry the other subgroups. So if that's okay maybe we can start providing these amongst ourselves.

I haven't looked at the closed PDP's. I'm open to hearing comments on that. So eight is the other regions review.

Vidushi Marda: Please go ahead. Thank you.

Gangesh Varma: Yes I think I'm done. So I was just thinking page 8, 9, 11, 3 and 2 were something I found appealing. I'd love to share inputs from the other participants.

Vidushi Marda: I think maybe (unintelligible) make sure the (unintelligible) divisions will be ICANN procedure. The Whois (unintelligible). Do you think that we can go ahead and fix, you know, with (unintelligible)?

Gangesh Varma: Yes this is Gangesh for the record. I think we might have a big of problem when we consider Whois and privacy laws because this will definitely be an integral part of the discussions on the subgroup which is doing Whois which I think is subgroup five.

Actually I think five is working on - yes.

Vidushi Marda: Yes five is working on it.

Gangesh Varma: Sub-group five is working on the new Whois. So we would - make sense to clarify with them if they would map previous instances about privacy violations and specifically Whois conflicts.

And if they are going to then we do not want to duplicate that effort.

Vidushi Marda: Thank you. Yes I agree for (unintelligible) to be (unintelligible) when looking at 2, 3, 8, 9 and 11. So (Sue) is the new UDRP name commission management (unintelligible) geographically working group H. Preliminary issues (Unintelligible) to be working with (unintelligible) policy and development process.

(Unintelligible) that actually mechanisms is all gTLD's is nine. And the last one is the (unintelligible) assessment of the (unintelligible) effects associated with the new gTLD analysis.

Are you sure 11 will be overlapping Gangesh?

Gangesh Varma: I think I have missed that yes it might be overlapping with the new gTLD analysis. So we'd have to knock that off too.

Vidushi Marda: Okay, (Carol) is asking about 10. The reason that we're having - we're not looking at 10 as of now is because it has to be (unintelligible). Do you think that we could however go ahead with it today?

Yes (unintelligible) for confirmation for that (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) comment we (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: I'm sorry Vidushi I couldn't hear you could you come again please?

Vidushi Marda: No I was just asking if you had a comment with respect to this (unintelligible)?

Gangesh Varma: Well Gangesh here for the record. So I do recall that it will definitely be within our mandate. I don't dispute that it's just that we would want to avoid any possible overlaps with the other subgroup.

And correct just as (Carol) has suggested we will further information from the other subgroup and where we do not overlap we will definitely address the certain PDP or the program that we want to look at.

Vidushi Marda: Okay, good. That leaves us with four as of now. That's two, three, eight and nine. That's UDRP management division, geographic regions (unintelligible) issue report in the policy and development.

Do we have any volunteers for any specific topic or how do you want to divide this?

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. I wouldn't mind volunteering for two or eight. Okay, so it looks like eight has been taken so I'm okay with two.

Vidushi Marda: Okay thanks Gangesh. That leaves us with nine and three. So (unintelligible) would be happy to volunteer for nine. Do we have another (unintelligible)?

I think we have more people than we have topics so maybe we could split a couple that would (unintelligible) bigger than the others. I see (Alexander) has volunteered for nine (unintelligible).

I'm not sure that we - do we have any suggestions on how we go about dividing this for the (unintelligible) topic because I think now we have six possible topics that we could take up and we only have four.

So do we have suggestions how to divide that going forward?

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. I just wanted to clarify (unintelligible) two, three, nine and (eight) (unintelligible).

Vidushi Marda: We had - we also - no I'm thinking we're (unintelligible) potentially volunteer. But we have (unintelligible) open. So in case we have - I think (unintelligible) and now I think he's gotten three.

(Unintelligible) has volunteered for eight Gangesh and (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) and me and (Alexander) has (unintelligible) nine and (unintelligible) which is three right.

Do we have any other suggestions on how to go about this? Gangesh do you have a comment on how we go about this? (Unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. So I was just thinking if we have a situation where one topic is not being addressed is that not the case? Is no one up for three?

Vidushi Marda: Yes I think (unintelligible) but maybe - okay good. So you will take three. To clarify (Alexander) and I have volunteered for (nine). Gangesh volunteered for two and (Maryam) volunteered for eight and (unintelligible) has volunteered for three.

Okay so I guess we now have to figure out how we're going to divide work and we can then touch (unintelligible). But for the time being if everyone is clear about this topic (division) and I think that kind of settles of (unintelligible) are good at least.

(Unintelligible) the topic and we'll take stock on our next call and see how far we've gotten and what we want to do with the data that we collected. Is that (unintelligible) effective?

So I don't know if there will be a need to coordinate until the next call because I think if we decide a particular standard format that we are going to follow on this call then we can just take a call (unintelligible) after that.

Yes so I'm going to repeat what everyone will do. So three which is the (unintelligible) within UDRP will be done by Gangesh. (Carol) will be doing (unintelligible) just three.

And then we will be doing demographic regions (unintelligible) group and (Alexander) and I will both be doing (unintelligible) issue report and GNSO policy developing (unintelligible).

Okay thanks Gangesh for taking that other one. Okay so now (unintelligible) I think we can start work but I just saw one other question that (unintelligible) is how we are going to (unintelligible).

Now earlier in the call Gangesh had suggested that we look at whether (unintelligible) potential violations. So that's one level of the (petition) is what's right.

The third is the process that will be affected and the fourth which we still don't really have complete clarity on is whether we'll be looking at our policies or individual instances.

So if we could firstly clarify whether we want the last sentence in policies on the regional (instances) and how we want to go about that. And also, you

know, decide what additional (unintelligible) we would like to classify on that that would be (unintelligible).

I'm just (skyping) it out in the chat box because I think it will be clearer on (unintelligible). First will be (unintelligible) will be (page 8). Okay yes so I was just saying that if we all know exactly what the topics are going to be dealing with I guess the next important step we need to decide on is how we want to structure the data that we do collect.

Earlier on the call Gangesh said we look at three (unintelligible) potential. So we define whether the instance is (unintelligible) is it a potential incident. The second thing is we talk about the (rights).

The third we talk about the process that will be affected. And the fourth one that we have to clearly decide is whether we're going to be looking at policy only or are we going to be looking at policies and (unintelligible).

The third will be the process that's affected and we can also decide whether we're going ahead with the fourth (unintelligible) and also any other things that you think that we might need to (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. Vidushi may I ask a question please?

Vidushi Marda: Sure.

Gangesh Varma: Yes so what do you mean exactly by the process that is affected?

Vidushi Marda: Now I was quoting you because I think earlier in the call you had suggested that we (unintelligible). This is why I think (unintelligible) needs to just

actually define what (unintelligible) my suggestion for the policy and the individual (answers) and we could talk about.

(Unintelligible) earlier in the call (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Okay so I think I was probably referring to which particular topic we were working on. So I think when I meant process I meant whether we were talking about the new gTLD program or we are talking about UDRP.

So which ICANN process. So it's essentially what topic?

Vidushi Marda: Okay so then that leaves us with (unintelligible) two for now. If we are going to follow exactly which topic I want to (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Just a quick clarification. This is Gangesh for the record. So when we say about the past instances of looking at it are we talking about a past process? I believe you said past it will automatically become an instance and not a policy related one. Would that not be the case?

Vidushi Marda: Well possibly. Honestly I haven't - I didn't think about it in that sense I was just looking at that as part of the (unintelligible) we're looking at violations that have occurred and violations that we think might occur.

And so that's the clarification I mean that's the sort of clarification that I was looking at. But again because we don't have the (unintelligible). But that will (unintelligible).

That is if you go back to - I'm just wondering if there is (unintelligible) the chat box. If you go back to the output when we're talking about violations we have to include what violations we mean. So that was what I meant.

(Unintelligible). I don't think that information is readily available. (Unintelligible) the recent output that we could have. Maybe if we (unintelligible) usually get that information.

Maybe we could take this offline because I (unintelligible) in the minutes and (unintelligible) before we've actually (unintelligible). But if you think that that might be a (unintelligible).

But that's really - I don't think that (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. I agree the (unintelligible) may not easily available and that's where our digging in and searching will really help. But maybe at the end of two weeks we will all have an idea of where to look and what we find.

So give it an attempt and we can all get in touch on the email thread if we have found something or we are not able to find. So probably at the end of one week we can - excuse me - if we can get back and find out if anyone has been able to find resources on past violations.

Some of them might have made (unintelligible) might be easily available while others will probably need to speak to stakeholders and find out.

Vidushi Marda: So I know (unintelligible) having them (unintelligible) but I (unintelligible). Do we have any suggestions as to how to go about this?

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh. (Carol) I think that's a great idea if we can look at the documents provided within the SO's, AC's and the comments to PDP processes.

Some of them might talk about potential human rights violations. In fact it's a resource for both past and potential human rights violations. But the other thing is there are a couple of the reports that were written by Article 19 and there was a (unintelligible) for - on ICANN and human rights.

These are a little old but if we can share that I mean I believe (Neil) has already shared this on the larger group. We can actually go through them and find ideas of where to find further resources and where to look.

Vidushi Marda: (Unintelligible) essentially (unintelligible) out there. So thanks a lot that is really very useful. So if we clarified the (unintelligible) I don't think we have. So if I'm to understand correctly I would now (unintelligible) which will be classified (unintelligible) potential talk about the rights that is being violated.

And (unintelligible) issues (unintelligible) will be looking at. Does anyone have comments for additional (unintelligible) that we could assimilate? (Unintelligible).

Okay this (unintelligible) when the team at - if we've decided - another (unintelligible) thank you Gangesh. If we've decided as to the structure of the data that we collect then (unintelligible) topics that I had in mind.

The (unintelligible) other clarification or issue that needs to be discussed? Okay (unintelligible) so thank you for being with us and we will be in touch with (unintelligible) what that looks like.

But thank you so much for the call and (unintelligible). All right, so is there anything to discuss before we end the call?

Gangesh Varma: Hi this is Gangesh for the record. So I was just thinking maybe we could just quickly summarize what needs to be done. Firstly, we could if one - (Weber) I think we do see you had made this presentation.

If you can circulate this to the other groups probably actually if it would be convenient you could make a list of topics which are related to the Whois and the new gTLD program and circulate it with the other subgroup and clarify what they will be working on and what they will not be addressing which would leave us with other topics that they could address in that particular (sphere) particularly Whois and new gTLD program.

So one would be to contact the other subgroups for clarity and two, once we can - what we could do is at the end of one week if we can have an email thread going about taking stock of where people have reached with the research and if they are hitting any roadblocks and if we can share resources that would be great.

I think that's just a few points that I thought we could - yes.

Vidushi Marda: Okay thanks. I'm sorry if I'm cut off this lag is a bit unpredictable so I'm trying to find myself to not interrupt you but I guess I am (unintelligible). Yes so just to recap everything that we've decided through this call.

The first that was amended is that we're going to wait for clarification from the other groups to see what they're working on and then we're going to (unintelligible). So that's the first thing that we're going to do.

The second thing was we narrowed down exactly who will be working on what. So Gangesh is going to be working on the second topic. (Carol) will be

working on the third. (Unintelligible) is going to be working on the eighth and (Alexander) and I will be working on number nine.

(Alexander) I want to put you on the email on the (unintelligible) decide how we're going to go about this. Gangesh (unintelligible) two articles to get us started with (unintelligible) and the past violations or violations that have occurred.
And we also have a rough structure which is to classify it in terms of possible potential violations with a particular right and then we're going to be (unintelligible) or their policy.

And so I hope - everything will be discussed for (unintelligible) and if we have any other comments at this time please (unintelligible).

Gangesh Varma: Hi can I make a quick suggestion?

Vidushi Marda: Sure.

Gangesh Varma: So now that we have divided the topics between ourselves if we do find information on other topics or we find time to look into the other topics please don't hold yourselves back because somebody else has taken the topic.

Go ahead and share whatever input you have on each of these topics that are open for work right now.

Vidushi Marda: That's also good for those who want to (unintelligible). Thank you for that. And Gangesh I think that we can actually end this call unless you have other comments in the chat box.

All right, okay I don't see anything else in the chat box and (unintelligible) happy with the progress (unintelligible). So thank you so much everyone for joining this call and hooking up with me and you all have a good day.

(Unintelligible) so thank you and let's get in the tune and let's keep each other in the loop as to the progress and (unintelligible). All right thank you everyone.

Gangesh Varma: Thank you all for attending the meeting. (Nancy) you may now stop the recording please. Thank you very much.

END