

**Transcription ICANN Dublin
Wednesday 21 October 2015
NCSG-CCWP ICANN's Corporate & Social Responsibility to Respect Human
Rights**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct>
The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

(Neil Ten Oever): Hello everyone. Welcome very much to the Working Session of the Cross Community Working Party on ICANN's Corporate and Social Responsibility for - to Respect Human Rights.

The slides are supposed to be orange, not black. So there's not come kind of making it underground or hard core or anything. It's a small glitch. It's not intentional. So next slide please.

I would like to keep this meeting A, rather informal and also B, rather short because I know that Cross Community Working Group on Accountability has also commenced at 5:00 and I know that quite a lot of you - quite a number of you want to be there. So let's keep it short, sweet and very practical. We'll start with the welcoming introduction short summary of what happened today and then we'll go into the work plan. Next slide please.

So we have a charter that's what - that's the only bounds (that we are set) but what we'll be doing here is raising awareness, mapping policies, procedures and operations that affect human rights, provide information, suggestions and recommendations, proposed procedures and mechanisms, develop and

explore CSR guidelines and product sufficient papers and statements where appropriate as we have been doing thus far. Next slide please.

And of course we're not only doing work at meetings, we're also doing very much - quite a lot of interessional work. And I hope this meeting can also be a leeway into that. So please join us on the mailing list and you can also (always) find all our work and transcripts on the Web site. Next slide please.

So that was for the welcome and introduction. A short summary of the day. We started off the day with the public session. Who of you has been to that session? If you'll raise your hand. It seems like most people have been there.

We have been giving an overview of the work done so far. We had an overview of the work done by the subgroup with (Marilia Maciel) on the awareness raising tool on illustrating a bit more which rights are impacted in ICANN. And (Motoko) gave a excellent presentation of the new report. If you haven't seen it yet, I still hard copies here if you are interesting in having one of those.

After that we went into - there was a meeting of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group with the Board where it was requested that there might be a channel with the Board to discuss human rights issues. The Board was susceptible to that and it seems that maybe even several Board members could function as a channel for our communications.

Furthermore, Fadi indicated that within staff Nora Abusitta might also be very interested in working on these issues. So we can also definitely follow up with here. And - yes. Then we went on...

(Marilia Maciel): Just a quick comment from the meeting with the Board. May be (unintelligible) as well to mention that we touched upon the change in the bylaws and this is something that we have been discussing with the Board for some time.

At first it was a feeling that maybe the discussion was not mature enough to be included in Workstream 1. But today that they mentioned that the Board has come through the process and the conclusion that it should be included in the bylaws as a high level commitment and further work should be carried forward in Workstream 2. So this is an interesting change that has been clearly stated in the meeting today. So it was a good development. Thanks.

(Neil Ten Oever): Indeed. Thank you very much (Marilia Maciel). And if I'm missing out on anything people, always feel free to correct me or add something on it.

Then we went on to a meeting with the GAC Working Group on Human Rights and International Law where we also gave a presentation of our progress. And the GAC Working Group explicitly stated they would really like to ensure collaboration with us and will keep on reaching out to us to ensure that there's no duplication of work. And will make sure that there are synergies where we can form them.

Then a meeting where I was not at but what I heard and (short) feedback from was that the ccNSO meeting approved the human rights - the currently proposed text for the bylaw commitments in the CCWG.

So that's all quite positive news. And now we are here. So now we move on from the history of the day to how we'll be going forward. And I would like to propose a model for that in the following session.

So first I would like to map everything that you think we could be doing or we should be doing. And then once we have a list of those things, we can see how we will be doing that and who might be interested in doing that work. Would that be an okay way to go ahead? No objections. Great.

So then I'm looking forward to hear from people what are issues or opportunities or concrete cases people think we should do to take this work to

the next level. What could be done? What do you think those things should be next steps?

Perhaps I can - perhaps I can give shortly the floor to (Marilia Maciel) who did not ask for it because - if you go to the next slide please and next slide please. (Marilia Maciel) has been leading the efforts together with other great groups to come up with some visualization and the work I think is not completely at the finish line.

So (Marilia Maciel), maybe you would give a short comment on that how we could take this over - would you take this forward. What do you think could be next steps to make this better?

(Marilia Maciel): Right. Thank you (Neil). This is (Marilia Maciel) speaking. For those that were not in the session in the morning, this table is the result of an effort - a discussion that we had in last ICANN meeting.

We identified that it would be useful to have sort of a correlation between the rights - the human rights that are impacted by different policy processes that are ongoing in the organization. That would help us to understand what's going on and get ourselves organized.

So the idea was that - and you can see I'm not going to the chart again. But we have identified some of the main human rights that are being impacted, freedom of expression, association economic and social rights, privacy and due process. And what are the specific themes and the policies that are being discussed right now that touch upon these rights?

During the session and after the session some people have approached me with ideas of things to complete. (Greg) has talked about due process with some great ideas on how to make it more comprehensive. So this is an ongoing discussion. The table is very much open to comments and suggestions.

We are trying to find a better way to visualize this table and the wheel that (Neil) showed in the slide - in the previous slide was proposed by (APC) as a form of (this validation). (Neil), if you can go back just because it will be nice to have feedback - one slide before. Yes.

So the idea behind this wheel would be first of all the circle that you see in the center would be the rights that are more touched upon by ICANN policies and procedures. And the wheel more in the outer space are rights that are impacted but not so closely.

And the idea would be to correlated the policies with these different rights around the wheel maybe using a color code. This is an idea that (APC) suggested. We found it was interesting but there is more work to be done to correlate this with the policies but of course we are open to other ideas of visualization that you may have.

So coming back to the table. Next slide. One way that we could move forward with this discussion is that we initiated a discussion in the mailing list of the Cross Community Working Party and a few group of people, five or six people were interested to work on the map.

I think that this group will likely grow after the session today. Maybe we can create a dedicated list for this to work together so we make sure that we don't miss anyone.

So if you are interested, give me your emails by the end of the session. I already have a couple of emails from people that were there this morning. And I think that we can progress with the mapping. I'm sure that there are other issues to be identified.

And it would be very useful for us when we move forward to Workstream 2 to know exactly what is going on and what are the potential points of pressure

and mechanisms that we need to create in order to include these human rights views into the policy process and into the procedures that we have in place. I believe (that is what you wanted) (Neil). Yes?

(Neil Ten Oever): Yes. That's great. Thank you (Marilia Maciel).

(Marilia Maciel): Okay.

(Neil Ten Oever): And I would like to ask four suggestions or ideas for visualization. I see Pranesh asking the floor.

Pranesh Prakash: This is Pranesh Prakash from CIS for the record. Not quite a suggestion on the visualization but just a question. So consumer rights is not something that finds place either in this table or in the previous slide, right, the visualization now.

Consumer rights obviously come about after the universal declaration and all of that. And they're relatively new and I'm not sure how universal they are. But it is part of the core mandate of ICANN, consumer protection. And I'm just curious as to how much of an overlap you see between the notion of consumer rights, consumer protection and this current exercise.

And the second question is that around whether cultural rights at all are something that we're considering because I do see in multiple places the issue of cultural rights actually coming up when considering domain - gTLD strings and cultural rights being impacted. So is that also something - and it was not mentioned either in the previous slide or in this. So that's another question.

And I may also just add that given I'm a relative newcomer to ICANN and don't really know the ICANN processes and PDPs all that well, so I'm not sure I'm the right person to be commenting on where all these impacts happen. But more on the right side I thought I'd add a little bit.

(Stephanie Perrin): Hi. (Stephanie Perrin) here. I have a question. It might be stupid but I missed part of the conversation - (their conversation). So what is the intended audience for this work? Is it internal ICANN so ICANN staff and the working party - the people who have to implement this in their next steps? For example, accountability CCWG or is it special advocates that might want to come in and monitor for example? Or is it both?

(Marilia Maciel): Thanks for the questions. This is (Marilia Maciel) speaking again. I think both. I think that that was a very interesting question and that comes over and over, raised in the session this morning. What are you talking about? Because some rights are very clear and discussed here. Is it just privacy and the way it's processed?

And I think that we have recognition that these rights have been impacted but others not that much. And it is an ongoing question and concern how are we going to address these rights and what we have to do with what we're doing here.

So the table first of all I think it's an awareness raising mechanism. And it is something that will help the community to get organized, as I said, find the rights that we need to discuss when we move forward to Workstream 2 and maybe have more clarity about what we need and of course it will be of help to staff and well and it's already of help to advocates I think. So yes, there is a broad spectrum of actors that can make use of it I think.

(Stephanie Perrin): Yes. But then probably that this organization and even the content might be slightly different. I mean when you have different audiences, your target - I mean you use different narrative as well probably. Just to keep it in mind.
Yes.

(Marilia Maciel): Yes. Yes.

(Neil Ten Oever): Yes. I think...

(Monica Zalnieriute): I think this kind of thing immediately would be...

(Neil Ten Oever): Please state your name.

(Monica Zalnieriute): Oh yes. (Monica Zalnieriute) for the record. Because like even today the Board member asked what do you mean. So I think pointing something like that each time would be helpful for actually any interactions that we have with the broader community.

(Neil Ten Oever): Yes. Indeed. So I think it's as a part of the work in our charter is explicitly aimed at awareness raising and without then having to point people to a lengthy report, it's simply give a quick overview what are we talking about when we're talking about ICANN and human rights with ICANN's remit and making that really visible.

And we could see if there - we could have different versions and also different depths of understanding within one image, right. That's where we need a bit more input so one hand on the right mapping issues and then secondly on the visualization issues.

So I think that's something that we will work on further. That's definitely one thing we got now. Are there other points that people think that we should be working on going to the next meeting in Marrakech?

(Monica Zalnieriute): Yes. (Monica Zalnieriute) again. I was wondering as we were talking yesterday at the NCSG meeting I think to mention several things that - talking about the remit and the scope and the technical scope. We had this idea of perhaps naming or including - and I don't know, this is a sensitive issue.

But for example, I have many examples that I could think of where ICANN in fact acts out of its remit and infringes human rights. And then when we try to say that please respect human rights, they say this is not within our remit.

So I was wondering whether that might be of interest to make a list of what we think was actually out of the remit and - I don't know. Would that be helpful?

(Neil Ten Oever): I think this is something that has been mentioned by others as well. So if I could rephrase it a bit what you said is that if we could work on specific cases in which you would see where ICANN touches upon human rights. So go a bit further than the mapping but see then also make a bit more close analysis of specific cases where ICANN touches upon human rights. I think this would make the - our work much more concrete.

And what you mentioned could be one or two cases. But if we could come up with several cases and work them out, then we could have a deeper understanding and then subsequently but maybe I'm going too much in methodology too fast.

Then we could see how abstract principles would fit on that cases and see how these two would come together.

Pranesh Prakash: This is Pranesh for the record. I'm not very sure that would serve what (Monica Zalnieriute) raised. It would be independently be quite useful. But the way I see it it's a difficult problem of stating what is within ICANN's domain and what isn't within that.

And given that currently there are multiple processes going on including around illegal pharmacies, including for child safety and including for a number of reasons, decide better this current group has an opinion about what is part of the content aspects, which ICANN - I think most of us here

would agree should not be getting into and what of those are solely limited to the domain string.

And that I think is a slightly different question than coming up only with a list. That is something that can in turn inform the creation of list of issues. But these two aren't substitutable for one another if I made myself clear.

Ellen Strickland: Ellen Strickland, (Internetzed). I think it's a interesting point about sort of human rights when they go outside their remit. And I think it might be worth exploring but maybe not framed in that way just as an idea of how you could focus on as you've done here the human rights and examples where it is within remit and focus on that.

And then I think you're right. There are times when it's very relevant let's say just outside the sphere, outside ICANN that at times perhaps they do step over. But to avoid getting into that discussion or totally into that discussion, perhaps that is a space that the ICANN community engage in.

And so as a group could we focus on ICANN, its remit and its link to human rights? But also think about that space just outside ICANN that the ICANN community works in and ways that human rights impacts the work that they do, which you're saying sometimes ICANN might step over into, but without sort of framing it in that way as an idea. Yes.

(Neil Ten Oever): I would like to (shortly) upon that because I think we should also try to also stay within our scope and mission. And that is - and that is that we are not for nothing called the Working Group on Human Rights and the Working Group on the activities inside or outside ICANN's remit. So...

(Monica Zalnieriute): Maybe I just can clarify myself. What I'm trying to fight here I guess is the continuous language that we hear in trying to strengthen the human rights system within ICANN is that human rights is no how related to this technical organization. This is what I'm trying to say. Because in fact, ICANN does so

many things infringing human rights outside of its remit and when we try to push it back - let me give you an example.

I think that by creating RAA the whole system of data retention it's definitely out of its remit by creating this whole data retention regime. It's nothing to do with its technical remit. It still could be outside of its scope.

So this can happen. But when we try to say please respect human rights, they say this is out of our remit. So this is what I'm trying to highlight, this issue that is being - that has been used to push us back somehow. But, you know, these are the things that people don't like to hear.

So I'm sure if we should somehow mention this. But this is my answer that I currently sort of realize that each time we try to raise this topic, people say that this is outside of remit of ICANN.

So this can happen. But when we try to say please respect human rights, they say this is out of our remit. So this is what I'm trying to highlight. This issue that is being - that has been used to push us back somehow. But, you know, these are the things that people don't like to hear.

So I'm not sure if we should somehow mention this. But this is my answer that I currently sort of realize that each time we try to raise this topic, people say that this is outside of remit of ICANN. So this is what I'm unhappy about.

(Neil Ten Oever): This is (Neil Ten Oever). Is - I am actually not completely sure if the image you are painting is the one I would also directly recognize. I think that might have been the case when we - when these issues were brought up earlier.

But I think as seen through the sessions of today and the meetings that we're having and also the progress we've been making in the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability is that there will be an explicit commitment

to human rights in the bylaws. The Board is also saying that they want to commit to human rights.

So I do not know whether there is a very big need to counter that argument since there seems to be sufficient sensitizing and awareness raising and increasing of common understanding within the community.

Having said that, I would love to see - I would love if we could do a further analysis of RAA and how that - and the relation between RAA and human rights.

So if we could agree on making RAA one of the cases under that mapping and working that out, then I think we would - that could be one of the things on the list. Does that sound like something doable? Great.

(Monica Zalnieriute): May I just jump back? So that's what you mean exactly having the deeper case studies on each of several main issues that at least to start with the main ones that we have, RAA, UDRP and all that and Whois and just produce a deeper analysis of the issues involved. That's what you mean?

(Neil Ten Oever): That was the loose thinking where I was going. But of course we're a group and I want to channel the ideas and the work of the group.

(Marilia Maciel): Thank you (Neil). This is (Marilia Maciel) speaking. I think that actually maybe we have to show ways forward. I don't know how you see the progressing of the reports that you are making, which have been extremely useful and the last one was very well presented today.

Maybe considering that we are starting discussions on Workstream 2 and as it was explained to us in the GNSO it's not like we are finishing Workstream 1 to start thinking about Workstream 2. There will be kind of overlapping initiatives that will take place in parallel.

And if this is the case, then it is urgent that we get, you know, up to speed to be able to make inputs on Workstream 2 that will require internal knowledge of the processes of the organization.

So maybe one of the avenues that we could pursue is not to discuss - to move on from identifying the issues that has been extremely important but now dive into the procedural aspect in terms of how we will make this general agreement that will be included in the bylaws concrete. How are we going to put mechanisms in place?

I think that it will be really useful for those in the CWG to have this input coming from the (CCW) (unintelligible) on human rights. So that is one avenue.

Another potential avenue is that we have, speaking from the GNSO as a GNSO Councilor, we have two very important policy development processes that we'll start early next year.

One of them is related exactly with the Whois review and you can see the policies on the screen so that next generation gTLD registration is a massive PDP that we'll start probably in January next year we will be starting to compose the working group.

And we will definitely need expert help to support discussions in this PDP. So maybe something that's if others - people here with expertise in privacy want to work substantively and put together a report that could help us or even participate in some capacity in the working group. That would be really useful.

Another PDP that we have will be the subsequent - the review of subsequent procedures for new gTLD applications. And there are aspects that need to be reviewed for just community-based applications for instance. And what they are going to do with the resources from the auctions. So we have the developmental aspect involved too.

So this - maybe it's a little less focused specifically on one right. But I think that there are several rights that will be touched upon. And we will need the capacity to do that too. So substantively these I think are two issues that will be in our agenda and procedurally speaking, I think that we should provide input for Workstream 2.

And if this group can start to work in this direction and even with the reports that you have been producing and supporting, that would be a great thing. Thanks.

(Neil Ten Oever): Thank you very much for these very concrete suggestions (Marilia Maciel). This already sounds like we got quite some work to do before Marrakech. But is there anything else someone else would like to add to the wish list of things that we should be doing? So right now we're still listing so more is more. More is good.

Chris LaHatte: At the risk of repeating what other speakers have said, for the record, Chris LaHatte. I think it's incredibly important that we have a clear scope of where these principles are going to apply because I think there are going to be one lot of principles that will apply within the ICANN community -- and I don't just mean staff. I mean the entire community -- and one set of principles that applies when we look outside of that.

And when we frame these, I think we're going to have to be very careful as to what is going to apply because once we start looking outside, then we start getting into the difficult issue of mission creep.

Like it or not we've already achieved quite a lot of mission creep because of some of the things we do. And (Monica Zalnieriute) I think has raised some very valid points particularly with regard to the document retention policies.

And I'm not saying I am for or against any of these ideas. But I think we just have to have that scope so particularly clear when we're doing this drafting work that we have to say this is something that's going to apply within or that these are principles that we want to apply to the world.

(Neil Ten Oever): I don't think this Cross Community Working Party on ICANN's Responsibility to Respect Human Rights is trying to draft any principles for the world as far as I'm understanding. And that - even though I have a lot of ambitions, that's currently not the (fore) effort.

That's why I deeply sympathize with your point and I think we should really stay focused on ICANN's work and see where we can take other principles that are applied or are applicable to the rest of the world to see if they fit on ICANN. So yes, completely agree.

Pranesh Prakash: I have one question. If - I have seen certain communities pushing forward an agenda that falls outside in my opinion of ICANN's scope using human rights language. Now my question and let me -- the answer to this may well be known -- is is this CCWP concerned with that? Is addressing that part of our scope and mandate? Or if it isn't, it isn't. And we'll deal with those kinds of issues as they - as and when they arise.

But if - but just to lay it on the table that there is a possibility of human rights and including some of the principles we may have all heard, not just particular case studies but more larger broader principles, being used outside of the scope of ICANN within ICANN if that makes sense. Does that make sense? Sorry.

(Monica Zalnieriute): What exactly do you mean? Can you maybe give an example because it's difficult to understand? You're saying that what, certain principles might extend to other operations rather than just ICANN or what?

Pranesh Prakash: So - and this is Pranesh for the record. So I do see for instance human rights language sometimes being used to push for content based restrictions to say that certain kinds of, you know, domain strings should not be allowed or should be frozen if content based - based on the content that they have.

Now my question is that could well be analysis done using human rights as a basis for that analysis. So I just want to be clear about the scope of this working party whether preventing that or addressing that is part of our concern or not because I'm fine either way. But just to put it out there.

(Marilia Maciel): Thank you Pranesh. This is (Marilia Maciel) speaking. If I understand your question correctly, you are concerned that ICANN may be moving to the layer of content and maybe acting as a police like removing.

There has been pressure on that. That's for sure. And coming from - basically from different factors but from law enforcement. But I see this mechanism is being included kind of partially inside different policies.

So maybe okay, we could keep track of that. And I think that some rights such as copyright have been used as a reason to extend sometimes ICANN's mandate to a layer that in my view is too much on content.

But I think that our work here would be more related to monitor the places in which this is taking place. But to address this problem I think that you do that in the police development process because these are mechanisms included in the PDP.

So if you say for instance something that we have a map - I don't know if we included it in this table. I think it was the former one. But that discussion on public interest for instance has been used to kind of move into content I believe.

So we need to take a look at this particular process. And I think that the new gTLD review and this PDP that is start now subsequent procedures will be a moment in which we will look into several of these things we have as specific requests from the Board to look into potentially developing a policy development process to deal with strings that are of public interest. This was a request coming from the GAC.

So this is for instance something that may be captured to be applied to content. So yes, I would do that. I would keep track of the different problems, yes.

(Neil Ten Oever): Okay. So if everyone is okay with it, I have a list of four things to be worked on and then I would like to go to the next point to see how we're going to do a division of labor. So is there any - would that be okay with the group if we move on to the next part?

So I got four different points. One is the visualization. The second is a bit closer study of cases and examples. Three, I've listed as input for Workstream 2 and then especially how to operationalize the work that we have just been doing and especially the things that we've been working on in the report. And the fourth point is providing input for the two PDPs on next general gTLDs and community based applications. Did I summarize that correctly?

(Marilia Maciel): The PDP we'll touch upon community based applications but actually the PDP on new gTLDs subsequent to (the) round. So the mandate is much broader. We're going to review all the process of applying for new gTLDs.

(Neil Ten Oever): So it's actually one PDP on the new gTLDs. Right?

(Marilia Maciel): Yes. There is one PDP on Whois and there's another PDP on new gTLDs that is going to review the program and propose changes to the next round. And I'm sorry, the PDP on Whois is also considering the new registry system.

I don't know the name exactly but that's what they're doing to replace Whois.
No?

Woman: (Yes).

(Marilia Maciel): Okay. Yes.

(Neil Ten Oever): Great. So we got four very concrete points to work on. And I think if you don't mind, I'll split the last one into two. So that's input to the PDP on new gTLDs in input on the PDP on Whois.

So that then brings me to Point 1. Who is interested in working on the visualization and bringing that work forward? I see there is a - there is a volunteer. So (Stefania Milan) for the record put up her finger and (unintelligible).

(Stefania Milan): No, I like to contribute. Doesn't mean I'm going to do it myself, right.

(Monica Zalnieriute): Is (APC) going to contribute to that or continue doing visualization work or not?

(Neil Ten Oever): I cannot speak on behalf of others but let's see. And I'm sure if we find a motivated group of people to not leave (Stephanya) alone out there, it'll be definitely attractive to work for the (APC) on that. And I see Marilia Maciel Maciel also said she is continuing her work on that. That's really good. And Ellen Strickland is also very interesting in working on that. Are there more people? This looks like a nice group. Thank you.

So that comes to Point 2, working out specific cases and examples. I see Chris LaHatte, Pranesh Prakash. I see Stephanie Perrin Perrin. I see (Monica Zalnieriute Sanluchee). And I would - do not know how to pronounce your name. So I don't want to insult you. Could you please?

(Carelle): (Carelle).

(Neil Ten Oever): (Carelle), exactly. (Douglas). Perfect. That's great.

Ellen Strickland: Can I comment?

(Neil Ten Oever): Oh, please comment.

Ellen Strickland: Enter Ellen Strickland for the record. In terms of the visualization, I was just thinking it would be good to link with that second group as you do the in depth and looking at good examples and thinking about doing visualizations perhaps around some specific examples as well as the overall picture. Yes.

(Neil Ten Oever): Yes. Let's do coordination on the general list and where need to make sub lists and then report back regularly. And I can already promise that we'll also have regular but not too frequent calls to update each other and tell us what exciting work we've been doing. (Bastian), go ahead.

(Bastian Hosink): Yes. (Bastian Hosink). Just wondering. I do have the feeling, you know, that I would like to do something in that area, you know, working on specific examples. Have we already agreed upon which examples? There were a couple of them we refer to but which ones we're going to look at or...

(Neil Ten Oever): No. I would - so as Ellen mentioned, I think we'll continue with the mapping of the cases and then the mapping visualization group and the cases group will discuss what cases are there and what they will work on.

(Bastian Hosink): Okay. But as I mention it anyway, I would like to volunteer for that group then as well, the cases group.

(Neil Ten Oever): Excellent. (Bastian Hosink)'s added to the case group. This is going really well people. I'm happy. Then we're coming to Point 3. That is the input to Workstream 2, select how to operationalize the work we've been doing. And I

see a hand going up from Tatiana Tropina. I see Chris LaHatte there as well.
(Peter), the last name.

(Peter): (Peter) (unintelligible) but (Peter) (unintelligible). Of course I have to have a mandate also from my people that (unintelligible) for that. I would be happy to contribute on that.

(Neil Ten Oever): That's great. That's great. And did (Rafik) also put up his hand?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Neil Ten Oever): Okay. Great. (Rafik) is also volunteering and I, for the record, (Neil Ten Oever) will also be volunteering for this group.

Woman: Sorry for (stupid question) I'm asking for clarification. Stupid question. Is Workstream 2 in accountability, right?

(Neil Ten Oever): Exactly.

Woman: Okay.

(Neil Ten Oever): Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Neil Ten Oever): And then we're looking to Point 4, which is the input to the PDP on new gTLDs. Pranesh, (Marilia Maciel), (Stephanya), (RT), (Monica Zalnieriute), (Peter). Great. Great. So many volunteers. That's really good.

And then to Point 5, the input to PDP on the new Whois. Who are the people who - so that's (Peter), (Monica Zalnieriute), (Stephanya), Jeremy Malcolm, (Bastian Hosink), Pranesh Prakash and a bit of Ellen Strickland and (RT).

So people, I think we have come up with some great work. I think we have also divided that work. I think we have also said to ourselves what our timeline will be. So we'll try to come back with results before next meeting.

And I would really like that the subgroups come back to the main group so that we can have as much products of the Cross Community Working Party so we can all agree on the work.

I will commit to organizing at least four conference calls to evaluate, plan, implement and then prepare for the next meeting. I will also apply together with (Rafik) for a next public session and next working session for the meeting in Marrakech.

And I think that leaves us with not much more on the to list unless Lee Hibbard will add something to that right now.

Lee Hibbard: For the record Lee Hibbard from Council of Europe. I'm sort of acting as sort of a liaison with the GAC Working Group too. So I think it will be very important to think about whether they can be a joint - I mean I'm speaking without having any information on the GAC Working Group but could be good to explore a joint meeting between the two groups because there's a need to ensure synergy and avoid duplication.

So I hope that in terms of reference will be agreed by of course before Marrakech. So it'd be great to come together and see who's going to do what so we can join forces sort of. Thank you.

(Neil Ten Oever): Excellent idea. And I think I'll take upon the - take that burden upon me to go to discuss with GAC chair of that working group and see if we can coordinate something like that.

So with that, if there is no other business to discuss, I would like to thank you all very much for so many volunteers, so much energy and contributing to this

great process. I'm very thankful. And I would like to especially mention also the great support we have been getting from (Maryam) because she in organizing the calls all the time. It's was really great. That often gets forgotten and it's really crucial for getting us going. So thank you very much. (Marilia Maciel).

(Marilia Maciel): Just a quick point on any other business. One of the issues that we are proposing to follow because it's somehow relates to human rights is a discussion on law enforcement and GAC Working Group on Public Safety.

And it came to our knowledge that some of these meetings were closed this week. They were not being shown (on schedule) as closed meetings. But we have not been able to participate. So maybe try to find out if we can participate and how because this is not really the procedure that ICANN meetings follow usually. Thanks.

Tatiana Tropina: I have been following this workshop with law enforcement at the ICANN and I do believe that there is a need to keep a closer look on these. I know because the meetings are closed. Actually the level of discussion is - I mean I know that closed meetings are more about kind of (preparation) and how to say rather coordination.

But the problem is that the procedures of enforcement and especially (prior) enforcement framework that (unintelligible) especially it was (unintelligible) private enforcement session based - I think it was like in the morning or late morning.

I believe that they're lacking safeguards and it's a shame that we are talking about human rights. We are talking that for example in (NCSG) not supporting content regulation and so on. And at the same time right in front of our nose they this is happening and these discussions are taking place.

(Monica Zalnieriute): And just (to top up) - (Monica Zalnieriute) for the record - (to top up) earlier. Even the open session we could not attend. So I don't know whether that would be strategic maybe to complain to the ombudsman officially on behalf of the working group or working party.

Tatiana Tropina: I - sorry. Tatiana Tropina. I - we tried to complain. I was attending these sessions from the beginning. They were closed. Then they opened it. But there was no remote participation. Now the policy was that ICANN had to get law enforcement involved somehow and they (unintelligible) closed meetings sometimes for coordination.

So I mean I was trying to do something like two years ago. Now it didn't work, so. And I believe that I wasn't the only one who was trying to complain.

Stephanie Perrin Perrin: Stephanie Perrin Perrin for the record. I'd like to propose that we find some way of tracking activities so that we put a human rights lens on it because there's so much going on and some of us may hear of things. We need kind of like a memo board that says okay, this group is meeting, this group is talking. They're holding a Webinar, whatever.

And then if we can't get in the room, the RSSAC goes to the - sometimes goes to the meetings between the registrars and law enforcement because it has RSSAC implications if there's some kind of, you know, easy access. So there may be other ways to get folks that are on our Cross Community Working Group to weigh in here.

The other thing is it speaks to the need to find registrars who care about human rights to join this group and start, you know, focusing with our perspectives if that's possible. There must be some somewhere. And that would be a good thing. If there are human rights registrars out there that don't come to ICANN, it's time we got them engaged. Thanks.

(Neil Ten Oever): I think...

Tatiana Tropina: No. Just a quick note to add. I believe that what (Marilia Maciel) already did for this ICANN meeting like putting together the list of the session and so on, we can just continue with this and share information like this at least or we would - it was really nice if you already do something like this. So we can just follow the same format maybe.

(Neil Ten Oever): That sounds like a great approach. Super. Okay. On that note, I would like to finish the meeting. And again, thank you all very much for your attention and your time. See you in Marrakech and on the list.

END