
COLLIN KURRE: Hi, everybody, and welcome to this meeting of the Cross-Community Working Party on ICANN and Human Rights. I am Collin Kurre from Article 19 and I'm joined by my co-chair.

AKRITI BOPANNA: Hi, everyone. I'm Akriti from CIS.

COLLIN KURRE: Perfect. We've got a pretty loose agenda today, which should be on your screen now. Akriti is going to give us an update on the PIR and .org discussion because she recently authored an extensive public comment about that. We'll have a brief discussion on the open public comment about ICANN's multistakeholder model and its evolution. And then I'm going to share with you a couple developments to the human rights impact assessment tool for the policy development processes.

And then we can have a brief discussion about where to go from here with this. As you know, the first application was to the subsequent procedures PDP. And we tested it out. It seems like it was fit for purpose, so it would be great to go ahead and try to test this out on another policy development process. So we can have a conversation about which one might be applicable.

And then as always, we will open the floor up to you to see if there's anything that you would like to raise or flag or otherwise discuss that would relate to human rights. And then we'll have a minute or two for any other business.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

With that, I will turn it over to Akriti to give us a brief update on the discussion around PIR and .org.

AKRITI BOPANNA:

Hi, everyone. I'm guessing most of you are aware of one of the public comments that had come up last month was when ICANN was renewing the .org registry agreement. That's currently being handled by PIR. So if you've been following the community mailing list [inaudible]. There are a couple of reasons for that. The two main ones being the removal of the price caps that [inaudible] always existed in these contracts. And the other one pertains to the rights protection mechanisms.

So I will talk about the first one first. At least my organization in the past has questioned why there's a presumption of renewal. I'm guessing everyone knows, but in case someone doesn't, a presumption of renewal is that in every contract with a registry there's this assumption that unless there's any material breach of contract, the contract with the registry will continue beyond the standard [ten years] and things like that. And [when] this contract came out the natural assumption was that the same terms of contract would continue. But what happened was that ICANN decided to remove the price caps for [inaudible], the ceiling that usually exists for how much you can charge for every domain.

In the past, we've [inaudible] asked ICANN why they have the whole concept of a presumption of renewal in the first place, and what they said was that there's not much public benefit and the potential for disruption in changes of a registry [overweigh] any sort of competition

or benefit that it might have to open it out like a regular auction after every decade.

This was in reference to the with Verisign, but presumably this can be applied to .org as well. But [inaudible] .org is because it's one of the legacy top-level domains. And even though there's a chance [of assumption], in my opinion at least competition would only serve to further a fair market and promote competition and even more than anything else ensure that [these] registries do not become complacent.

And in a couple of PDPs which were dealing with contractual conditions the view was supported where it was seen that competition would have useful for having better pricing, operation performance, and contributions to registry infrastructure. And in fact, most service industries [have] a presumption of competence as opposed to one of renewal. So there's no particular rationale that was ever justified by ICANN why these contracts have a presumption of renewal to begin with.

But anyway coming to this current comment, the removal of price caps was [inaudible] because as it is .org can change its prices by 10% every year which is kind of generous. But giving PIR the limitless ability to increase prices would be – I mean, it sort of helps nobody except them. That's not to say that PIR would definitely increase the prices. There's no way of knowing that. But to have the option would obviously weigh in their benefit as opposed to either the end consumers or the registries or anyone else.

And because it's one of the domains that was started out right with the inception of the Internet, there are so many initiatives on .org such as domains by NGOs, nonprofit trade associations, [inaudible] member associations, tax exempt charities. So a lot of these would now find it expensive to maintain .org if such a price cap is removed and the prices are raised exorbitantly. And given that there's no guarantee of future stability as well, it puts them in a tricky position to estimate their operational costs. And just the kind of stability that so far you have with a price ceiling would be up in the air.

ICANN's justification for doing this is to say that they want to align legacy agreements with those of the newer gTLDs. But newer gTLDs, the onus on registries is higher in the sense that they know that these are being handled by private owners. But .org and owners were handed over to PIR in sort of a public interest [mode]. It wasn't a commercial transaction so much as one of public interest.

So given the longevity of these domains as well and the kind of investment that the people owning these domains have put into their online presence, cultivating their identity, their brand, it's only fair that they're entitled to protections from arbitrary pricing and having the same financial [rules] as when they originally bought their domain. If you look at the mailing list, a lot of smaller organizations have been actively pleading with ICANN to not go ahead with [this because it will] increase their operation costs.

I was also curious to have this because [we added a] nonprofit. I mean, they own ISOC and they're a nonprofit Internet Society. They're a not-for-profit, so the rationale for removing the price gap is even more

unclear given if were Verisign or any other commercial entity. [inaudible] already because this has been done for them there are also other registries that are now demanding removals from there. There's no way of saying that more wouldn't be joining them to remove, and we reach a point where price gap removal is the norm.

Lastly, the problem with this was that ICANN [had to post] that the domain would be subject to rights protection mechanisms such as uniform rapid suspension amongst others. [However], the working group is still deliberating if these sort of mechanisms should become a consensus policy. Since these discussions have been taking place the past few years and there's no decision yet, it's not in ICANN's authority to enforce [the same] in the registry agreement. It's kind of pointless to be having this conversation if they're going to go ahead with it anyhow.

Anyway, the deliberations on these PDPs were not intended to be retroactively applicable. So to do that would be just going against community discussions and the whole point of why people engage in these and spend their time deliberating these policies altogether.

So that was on the .org. If there are any questions, you can feel free to ask later, as Collin said.

The other thing that I think is important is to talk about is that ICANN has another public comment due on 4 June on its multistakeholder model. It's sort of an extensive document which already looks at all the problems that the community has been saying for years about the multistakeholder model. Collin and I thought that it would be a good

idea if people want to discuss it or go over it. I am going to paste the link in our Zoom chat if people want to look at it right now.

[It] identified about 21 issues with the multistakeholder model. Often when we go for these ICANN meetings, we hear a lot of people complaining about the model and their suggestions for it. So this would be a great place to discuss some of those suggestions that we could give or the feedback that people have or just to hear people's opinions and what they think of it.

Some of the more obvious ones are accountability, transparency, costs. But there are also other issues like volunteer burnout, the roles and responsibilities, recruitment. So if anyone wants to lead the conversation or give any sort of input they have on the multistakeholder model, that would be great.

COLLIN KURRE:

Thanks, Akriti. Thanks for teeing that up. I thought we might actually go back to the PIR discussion and just see if anyone had any comments or questions or observations related to that before we move on to the next bit. I hope you can see the screen now. I can't put it full screen, unfortunately, or else I won't be able to supply you with links. I see that David has his hand up. Please come in.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Collin. Akriti, thanks very much for that summary. I have a question about PIR, and then I also have a question on the multistakeholder process but I'll hold that until we get into that. On the

PIR subject, I haven't read your post yet but I appreciate Collin putting a link in and I will. But I understand that PIR has made a statement about price increases, and I haven't read it. So I'm wondering if that's true and if you've read it and what that would add to this discussion. I'm not entirely up to speed on the issue, but I'm interested if that's in fact the case that they've made a statement about price increases and if you could comment on it if it in fact exists. Thanks.

AKRITI BOPANNA:

Hi, David. Thanks for the question. I did read somewhere and I'm blanking out on where it was, but I think the statement said that [PIR] said that they wouldn't be raising the prices. Of course, that's something I acknowledged in the thing as well. But the fact remains that just having an option is sort of dicey. But I think, yeah, Collin posted the comment so I am just – yeah, essentially it's saying that they're not going to raise prices unreasonably and they have no specific plans for any price increases.

Like I said, even though that's something that I did acknowledge, if that is the case, then why have any price gap removal at all. Given that they have the ability to [do that for 10%]? And they do say that they have not done that for the past three years despite that ability to do the 10%. So they are going out of their way to allay our concerns on that, but that's now, right? In 10 years from now, 20 years from now you have no really idea how it plays out.

COLLIN KURRE:

Yeah, and if I could just jump in here, I think that an interesting thing about this particular public comment is the buzz that it has generated. If you have a look at the public comment page which is on the overview page that I posted above, there were hundreds of exchanges related to this. And we had a lot of engagement from nonprofit organizations and others that usually don't engage in the ICANN space. Everything from associations of retired people to National Public Radio in the United States.

It was very interesting to see this kind of outreach by people who aren't usually involved. So it's interesting to consider this from the perspective of the impacted communities as Akriti identified or from organizations that might not have the awareness or the resources to be able to keep track of these types of developments. Here, I'll paste a link to the comments page mainly so you can just have a scroll and see the volume and diversity of people that submitted comments.

Do we have any other comments from anyone on this topic? On the .org renewal or price gaps or not? Okay, great. Then I think we can maybe jump back into the discussion on the ICANN multistakeholder model public comment which Akriti has teed up. She posted a link to the public comment overview page up above. For a little bit of context, this is relating to sessions that they have had in the past couple ICANN meetings.

This is also loosely related to other efforts to increase the effectiveness of policy development processes like the PDP 3.0, which is something that we discussed here in the CCWP in our September meeting of last year. There we had Rafik Dammak who [was] present and was telling us

about PDP 3.0 being about effectiveness but not necessarily about implementing pending recommendations such as the CCWG recommendations on accountability.

So that's a bit of background about how we as a CCWP have engaged with this issue in the past. Looking ahead, the document that Akriti posted is a great overview of the issues that have already been suggested by the community. Among these, accountability, transparency, demographics, things that might potentially be relevant for this group to discuss.

Before Akriti and I take to sharing our own thoughts or perspectives, I wanted to see if anybody in the room would have any ideas or thoughts that they would like to share. Yes, David, please.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks, Collin. I just wanted to comment on this topic. And I'll give a little background about how I participate in ICANN to give some context to the comment. First of all, I work at Verisign in the policy team, and I participate in the ICANN community fairly broadly. I participate in both the ccNSO and the GNSO and I'm leading certain [groups]. I'm the chair of the IRT implementation oversight team and the co-chair with Greg Shatan of a sub team that's at work in the RPM PDP process.

In all of those efforts, what appears to me to be a very big issue, and it's been recognized and identified obviously and I believe Brian Cute spoke about it back in Kobe when we were all over there, is volunteer burnout or exhaustion or whatever you want to call it. I remember when I

participated in the CCWG on Accountability Work Streams 1 and 2, it was exhausting. And that's an issue that we have to try and solve.

ICANN does a fairly good job on having a Fellows program, a leadership program. There's actually training for people who are taking over leadership roles in these working groups. But I would just – I've got my thinking cap on to try and figure out how to break this logjam of getting more people involved, getting new people involved, and maybe indicating to people that you can put the work into bite-sized pieces that interest you and get involved. I think if you look at the big picture, it's so overwhelming the amount of work that needs to be done that it could be daunting and perhaps off-putting. But if you try and get folks to boil things down to what interests them, where they could participate, maybe it's a little bit more manageable.

But any kind of thought process which I applaud ICANN for starting on the model is good. I've got my thinking cap on. I haven't commented yet, but I'm trying to figure out ways to help in that process to help bring new people in, energize the people who are there to take on the work. It's just a tremendous amount of work. So anyway, that's my comment and my insight. Thanks very much.

COLLIN KURRE:

Great. Thanks for getting that conversation kicked off. Indeed, burnout is something that we hear about very often, and I'm sure that all of us have experienced that at on point or another.

I just wanted to draw attention to one of the core values that I reviewed the other day. It's not my favorite core value, which is the human rights

core value, but it's another good one which is the second core value that ICANN should "[seek] and [support] broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet."

It really resonates what you said, David, about breaking up the work into bite-sized pieces. And one of the things tying back to the proliferation of comments received on the topic of the PIR renewal, I think that it would be useful for people who are more involved in the community or more familiar to be able to keep an eye on where external expertise might be useful. I know that's one of the things that we've tried to do in designing the human rights impact assessment, for example, to make it so that human rights experts or people that have a stake in the issue at play could contribute in a bite-sized portion, maybe even in a one-off, but be able to lend some of their time and expertise to the discussions. So I've made a note of that, and I think that's a really great idea. And I too have my thinking cap on.

Would anybody else like to comment? Does anybody else have ideas or thoughts to share?

AKRITI BOPANNA:

Something that I've experienced at least with [filing] a couple of [inaudible] is the problems that ICANN has with transparency. [inaudible] because they don't want to give the information but maybe there is so much information that it is buried everywhere and it's kind of difficult. But I [inaudible] a lot of times that I've asked them for some information and – for example, if it was a simple question that I asked

them if they'll breakdown their employees by race and nationality, and they replied saying this is under employment law and we can't tell you.

But I only asked for a percentage. So if you anonymize the data and then you just say it's 20% [inaudible] 50%, that's still not breaking confidentiality. It's still a number and it gives us information to see how ICANN is doing on a metric like diversity. So I think at least some of the Work Stream 2 suggestions and there were a couple of them regarding the [inaudible] itself, they were implemented with this problem.

Other things I've noticed is, for example, say Fellowships. A lot of Fellowships are – I am not sure how much of it comes back to the community in that I've seen a lot of Fellows get the Fellowship who are not really engaged in this area but they have just attended a couple of ICANNs or IGFs. So they are known faces as opposed to people who are very, I mean, even writing anything whether it's even in the community or just commenting. But they are not people who have done that.

Fellowships are not supposed to be given more than three times, but I have found at least two or three people and then later someone from the community had e-mailed me and he found a lot more people who had gotten the Fellowship more than three times. And things like that which [inaudible] about as well. And then but when we asked ICANN for the information, they were like, we don't keep a record of this stuff. But then if you have a rule like you can't give it more than twice and you're not recording it in the first place, again, it comes back to then the process outside not foolproof. So things like that.

I mean, there's always accountability and transparency, but I think a lot of them are addressed in Work Stream 2 so when those come around then the situation will be better than what it is now. But these are at least off the top of my head some of the thought that I had. [inaudible] drafting my response to comment. So as the next few weeks go on, I'll probably flesh them out more in detail. But for now, that's [inaudible] what I was thinking.

COLLIN KURRE:

Okay, thanks. I see that Nigel is looking for a link to the webinar on the multistakeholder process that is happening at 23:00 UTC today. So thank you for sharing that, Nigel.

One other thing that I noticed in this public comment was the observation that ICANN reached a level of maturity where there is perhaps some bureaucratic overload I believe was the description. So that might be something to keep in mind as well. Naturally, we have a lot of policies in place to enforce consistency and predictability in the development and enforcement of policies. And then we have a lot of extra things in place for accountability measures or to help engineer this type of diversity. But it might be useful for us to reflect as a community about what type of things should be formally implemented and what type of things might be able to be perhaps less formal initiatives.

So that was my segue actually into the next block on the agenda which is a presentation of the updated version of the human rights impact assessment model. So if anybody thinks about anything regarding the multistakeholder model or ICANN processes in general that they would

like to share, then hold on to that thought and we will come back to it in the next part of the agenda on the open community discussion.

As another reminder, we have talked quite a bit about the evolution of these human rights impact assessment models. This was carried out within a small team of volunteers that was drawn from across the community and was active between October and March. The evolution of these models is something that we've presented on in the past. You can find links to those presentations on our website, which is icannhumanrights.net.

I'm just going to jump straight into showing you what's new now. I will post a link in the chat, here we go, to our handy-dandy spreadsheet which was the trial HRIA that we conducted on the subsequent procedures PDP. I'd like to draw your attention to the Guidance tab at the bottom.

When we were in Kobe, one of the recommendations made by one of our members was that we should develop some sort of explainer tab and try to give some normative standards so that individuals regardless of whether or not they are familiar or experts in human rights would be able to have a stab at completing this type of assessment. Again, this could potentially be, these types of maybe not formalized but hopefully widely adopted tools might be a great way to channel in – lots of background noise. I'm afraid I'm in an open office, so there's not a whole lot I can do if it's me. As I was saying, these types of tools might be a great way to channel expertise from beyond the community into the specific processes where they could be useful.

What I'd like to do right now is do a brief walkthrough of this Guidance tab. And I would very much like your feedback on what is clear, useful, superfluous, too much. I might have gone a little bit overboard in trying to be thorough here. So if that is the case, then please let me know. Again, this is meant to explain each one of the columns in the more operational side of the tool so that ideally anyone could come along, have a look, read through it and understand what is going on here and how it's meant to be applied.

So Topic, Short Description, and Description were things that should be obvious. The Negative Impact Scenarios, one of the explanations that I thought could be useful was looking at these types of considerations that we might want to take into account when we're considering impact.

So that would be the content of the rights in question. If we're talking about privacy or security or education and how that might be related to the specific policy discussion. The nature of ICANN or the contracted parties business interactions. Causality is a big factor here. And of course, the experience and views of rightsholders in question.

The last bit about data and evidence collection is something that would potentially be something useful but maybe not obligatory because it's rather difficult to collect data and evidence about the experience and views of rightsholders, particularly when the rightsholders are Internet users at large. And I'm sure that members of the At-Large community can tell us all about the challenges that they face in lassoing those impacts.

I will be keeping an eye on the chat and if you have any kind of feedback at any time, either raise your hand or just go ahead and interrupt me.

Looking at the Impacted Groups, some of the feedback that we got from our last face-to-face session was to replace the word vulnerable which was the previously used word. It's a bit of a standard term in human rights assessment practitioners. But we changed this to impacted groups. However, I have noted that particular attention should be paid to groups that might be vulnerable to cumulative impacts, and these are the kinds of groups that might be susceptible to multiple human rights violations.

I've listed here a lot of the groups that receive special protections both in international treaties and national legal frameworks. These include different ethnic or religious minorities; indigenous peoples; women, children, or elderly; refugees or migrant workers; human rights defenders; or persons with disabilities.

I see that I've got a comment. "It would be good to add a link to the bylaw core value and also a link to the framework of interpretation." Absolutely. Thank you for that, David.

Moving down to Severity of Impact, this was one of the gray zone indicators because it's unclear that my logic of evaluating severity of impact would be the same as yours or anyone else's. So we've tried to [inaudible] this out and look at Scale/Scope/Irremediability (which I think might be a made-up word, but it hopefully gets the point across). This is just meant to be just general guidance on what it would look like

for an impact to be High, Medium, or Low, which are the three options that you can select from on the tool.

And then I've made this note here that this is not meant to translate this into some sort of quantitative assessment because it's very important in these exercises to keep track of the narrative description of impacts and never lose sight of the proposed mitigation measures. From the very beginning, the innovative part of this particular model, Version 3, was that it's geared toward recommendations. So these are meant to feed back into the ICANN policy development processes in the form of either interventions during meetings or in robust and informed public comments. So it's always good to keep your eyes on the prize in that way.

Moving down, Positive Impact Scenarios were an addition that was suggested by a community member very early on in this process. I think at the end of 2017 even. So we have included this, however it's important to note that the identification of positive human rights impacts is not the primary objective of this exercise as this is more an exercise in identifying potential violations, identifying risks, and then moving to mitigate them.

So moving on, this is where it gets dense. One of the things that people were wondering was what are the types of Salient Human Rights that we might be talking about. It's difficult to tell you right away which ones will be salient or not just given the diversity of policy development processes ongoing in ICANN. So I've attempted to list the different internationally recognized and freedoms and parse them into individual rights and collective rights.

And then below, the Applicable Human Rights Instruments is another addition that came out of Kobe. This is where I've identified a few of the international treaties, declarations, regional instruments that might be potentially relevant. The reason why this particular tab is important is because as you recall the wording of the bylaw is that ICANN will respect internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law.

I'm going to pause and take a sip of water. Okay, sorry. I've been ill and all this speaking is making it come back and rear its ugly head.

All right so moving on, this is partly attempting to speak to your previous suggestion, David, about including a link to the human rights core value and the framework of interpretation. I will definitely work on hunting down those resources and adding them in where appropriate. But what I've tried to do here is identify the different parts of the bylaws that could potentially be relevant to human rights related issues.

I've indicated in red both the human rights core value and another interesting bit that I found regarding the GAC's role in participating in these policy development processes which said that "the GAC should consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN's policies and various laws and international agreements."

So looking above, there are lots of laws and international agreements that have to do with human rights. So it seems like this might be a potential avenue for engagement with the GAC. And I'm hoping that as the GAC international human rights law working group has become

more active in trying to determine the GAC's role in upholding the new bylaw and that the other accountability recommendations coming out of Work Stream 2, this might be a good opportunity for GAC representatives or different people within governments to contribute to the ICANN policy processes by identifying different human rights instruments that might be relevant.

Finally, this is a brief little overview about the eyes on the prize, the Recommendation. It's just a reminder to people that recommendations should be geared toward mitigating negative human rights impacts, but they should also be clear, concise, and realistic. Ideally, this is something that someone would be able to convey in, let's say, 30 seconds or a minute what the recommendation would be.

If you look back on the Sub Pros tab, you can see that a lot of the recommendations didn't go into details of implementation, for example, because naturally any questions about creating and appeals mechanism, for example, would have to be something that would be developed and collaborated on by different members of the community. So it's kind of jumping the gun to really go into the nitty-gritty with these types of recommendations. But hopefully, in making an informed recommendation it would be able to get people more engaged and interested in the types of accountability mechanisms or procedural additions that we might be suggesting on behalf of human rights.

So that was my overview of this new tab. I want to ask you again, is there anything that is particularly useful or perhaps superfluous? And the big question is, do you think that this is something that people could

use? Now that we've got this guidance, is it something that can grow legs and hit the ground running?

I see that David has said that the tab is very useful. Great. Thank you for that feedback. Have we got any other comments maybe if I could pick on Dessalegn or even Akriti? What do you think?

AKRITI BOPANNA:

I think it's super useful so far. I don't have any specific comments. Maybe if I look at it and I can mail the list later on, but this looks great.

COLLIN KURRE:

Okay, wonderful. We had a comment that the [UNCHR] and its [optional] protocol is missing. Please, I don't want to butcher your name, Desara, I invite you to add it. You should all have edit access to this spreadsheet, and this is absolutely not meant to be something that is owned by any one person or organization. The intention for this is that it belong to the multistakeholder community and be a kind of living and evolving document. So please feel free to make any kind of corrections or additions or modifications. Maybe not subtractions, but if you see something that's particularly superfluous, then take it out.

All right, great. Oh, we've got a hand. Yes, David, please come in.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks, Collin. I just want to, before I make a comment, reiterate what I said in the chat about the Guidance tab. I think it's outstanding and very good work done by you. Thank you.

With respect to the bylaw core value of this human rights I just wanted to mention the background of that is those words, the magic words, the standard if you will that this is all judged by is as you said. ICANN's core value to "respect internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law." Those are words that were hard fought in CCWG accountability both in Work Stream 1 and then in Work Stream 2 when Niels led the effort to do the framework of interpretation that a number of us worked on.

And the core values themselves recognize that even though the Guidance tab there was a comment that you shouldn't be doing balancing negative against positive in an HRIA, in amongst the core values there is some balancing being done. But the internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law is really where the rub is going to be as these are attempted to be applied in the future.

I just wanted to state that that's a very important standard. It was well discussed. Board members were involved. And I expect that when the board gets around to approving the work recommendations from Work Stream 2, I would assume – I'm just making a guess here – that the human rights bylaw part of that, the framework of interpretation, won't encounter that much difficulty. I have a feeling the board will simply approve it because it was so thoroughly discussed. The board was involved from time to time, not continuously.

But it's a demanding standard, and I think that is where the rub is going to be in the future. But thanks for all the work on this. And that's it.

COLLIN KURRE:

Okay, thank you for that feedback. I tried to source an update to the CCWG work ahead of this call, but it seems like things might not have moved very much since March. So hopefully there will be progress on that front very soon because, well, I think that the original deadline has already passed. If memory serves, I think it was 7 May. So we've left that in the past now, but hopefully we'll be able to have some sort of resolution perhaps by the end of the year. And at that point in time, we'll have our tool already [inaudible] deployed.

Great. Okay, so the question I wanted to pose to all of you, particularly the people who are more engaged in the policy development side of the ICANN community, is which PDP do we think would be a good potential candidate for the next application. If you'll recall, when we were discussing the first trial HRIA in November, the different PDPs that were mentioned were the subsequent procedures. Check, done. And then I believe that the rights protection mechanisms PDP was one that came up. And then the expedited policy development process on the registration data or WHOIS data.

So I wanted to throw the question out to you guys. Do we think that perhaps rights protection mechanisms or the EPDP or another PDP altogether might be a good place where this type of analysis could be useful? Feel free to add your comments either in the chat or to take the floor. Yes, David, please come in.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thanks, Collin. I'm not going to suggest one because I'm involved in several and I just can't see the forest for the trees. But I do want to

suggesting that one thing we might think of is when we discussed RPM and SubPro in the past as to which might go first, I think there was a focus sensibly on which one started first. And it might be more pertinent to ask which of the PDPs is likely to end soonest as one standard or one thing among others to look at when we decide. And that's my comment. Thanks.

COLLIN KURRE: Okay. I think that's a perfect criteria for evaluation. So maybe what we can do is....

AKRITI BOPANNA: Hi, Collin. Could you repeat that? Actually, I didn't get David's comment.

COLLIN KURRE: Oh, just looking at which PDP started or will end first. So trying to ensure working from the back to the front. So starting with the older PDPs and then working our way through to the newer ones.

AKRITI BOPANNA: Yeah, that makes sense.

COLLIN KURRE: Great. So that will just require a little bit of digging on our part to see which one is the most ancient PDP. Which might reveal some insights into evolving the multistakeholder model because I know that one of

the criticisms was that PDPs can kind of go around in circles for years. So perhaps we will shortly identify the PDP that they are talking about.

All right, great. Well, I will share this Guidance tab and these updates on the list as well for our members who were unable to join to have a look. And if you have any other feedback or comments, then please feel free to share with the group there.

So now maybe we can turn it over to open community discussion. If anybody has anything that they'd like to share that might be relevant to human rights. I see we've got lots of people in the room who haven't spoken up yet. So if you haven't yet said anything, then now is your chance.

All right, seeing and hearing none, I will just very quickly, any other business? Does anybody have any type of procedural comments that they would like to add? No? Okay.

All right, so I think that with that we can give you back 12 minutes of your life. Akriti, is there anything you'd like to say before we sign off? Oh, right. Of course. Preparation for the next meeting. Is anybody – go ahead.

AKRITI BOPANNA:

Collin, [inaudible] at ICANN 65 but I'll be attending and we'll be trying to see if we can use this human – we're going to come up with human [rights] impact assessment report [inaudible]. So we're going to see if we can talk about that and [inaudible] various PDPs to see which will work best. But if anyone wants to talk to us about any of these things,

please feel free to e-mail me or meet me at ICANN 65. We won't be having a session there, but I'll be [inaudible].

COLLIN KURRE:

Yeah, exactly. No session. And maybe one thing that Akriti and I could do ahead of the next policy meeting is just prepare a series of blank HRIA tools so that if any of you or anyone else is sitting in on a policy development process and says, hey, that might be an issue that's potentially relevant for the CCWP, then you can go ahead and just log it in the tool or the tools as it were.

And just a clarification there, there's absolutely no obligation to complete the whole row at the first go. This is an iterative and collaborative process. So if you see something like applicant support program. That might be something worth investigating. Then you can just add it to the sheet and move on along, and then we can review it as a group. So we can prepare that, and we will share information about how these tools might be deployed at the next meeting on the list.

With that, I thank you for joining us. Apologies for my coughing up a lung over here. I hope that you guys have a nice evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]