ICANN
Coordinator: Maryam Bakoshi
June 17, 2016
11:00 am CT

Operator:	The recordings are now connected.

Maryam Bakoshi:	Thank you very much Anderson, Niels, over to you.

Niels ten Oever:	Perfect, perfect Maryam and all the ICANN staff for arranging the technical possibilities for this call. This a call of the cross-community working party for ICANN corporate and social responsibility to respect human rights and we're meeting at 16 hours UDC. We have a bit of a full agenda; we're getting quite close to the health and committee meetings.

We have a lot of documents to discuss, in fact (unintelligible) but I hope we can have also space for people to ask question because I see there are some people on the call we did not have on the call before so I want to be really cognizant that we're not used to many abbreviations and un-scale language so I would be very happy to explain everything when needed.

So I propose the agenda, no, that was not my dog. I proposed an agenda. I hope you are all okay with this, to anyone has got any other points for the agenda, no, if not, then I would like to go on to the next point which is a

discussion of the CGW CHR documents and I think we have been producing quite a lot of documents and I think we can be quite proud of ourselves.

To start off with document produced by Vidushi, I will see if can find the link but I'll still first hand over to Vidushi to introduce the documents and gather all the comments that people might have about it. Vidushi, can you come in? You are on the call but I am not hearing you. No Vidushi?

((Crosstalk))

Niels ten Oever: I am coming back now via my phone because my stop functioning so Vidushi could you comment and are you here now or not? No? Okay, great, can you come in and tell us about your document?

Vidushi? Oh, you're waiting for Maryam for the dial-out, okay, then let's go ahead to the last document the HR management questionnaire which has been cleaned-up by Motoko.

There has been quite a lot of work by Motoko to get this in better shape and we've been working on this document for a while. Motoko, could you come in on this and give us a short update of where we are with this?

Motoko Aizawa: Yes, thank you, Niels and apologies. I did not manage to circulate the Google docs beforehand and so as soon as I start thinking, I will send the link via the meeting space so I just populated the chart with additional ICANN documents.

And I've made a constant effort to basically stick to ICANN documents first of all because there are a lot of documents that ICANN does put out but as

soon as we go outside, we sort of lose control of the types of documents we put out there.

And it becomes very there is a very diverse range of documents that are available outside of ICANN and so I have stuck with basically ICANN documents available on ICANN Website. What strikes me is that there are certain areas in which we can put out quite a lot and analysis is possible.

And then there are other types of documents which are conspicuously missing and particularly the key regulatory measures you will see eventually when I send the link that we don't have and I certainly don't have a good sense of the applicable law that would be relevant to this purpose.

And I only mention this because (how) different we have this conversation on the frame of interpretation and the bylaw interpretation eventually and to describe exactly what are the legal obligations of ICANN in terms of respecting human rights?

There is going to be some overlap and so as far as I'm concerned, the next focus of this document will have to be on the key regulatory measures and I think this also means us working with others who are much more aware of the legal requirements that are imposed on ICANN from a technical or any other perspective and it's a little beyond my specific area of expertise at this point.

So I just wanted to point this out Niels but it is coming along and if others have more to put include in this matrix, that's always, always welcome so I will release this document shortly. It's a draft of 9 June. Thank you so much.

Niels ten Oever: Thanks, Motoko, and this is really great. Be clear, this continues to be our working document to keep our frame for a like initial scoping or scouting for

any initial human rights impact assessment here so we're making progress this and this is very good.

On that I would like to go on to the next point and there's a bit of the work of both Tatiana and Corinne so I would like to invite them both, maybe first Tatiana and then Corinne, or Corinne, Tatiana, I do not mind to talk a bit about where that document is and to present a bit about that. Would you go ahead, Tatiana or Corinne?

((Crosstalk))

Tatiana Tropina: Can you hear me well?

Corinne Cath: Yes.

Niels ten Oever: We can hear you both very well.

Corinne Cath: No, it's just that I really have …

((Crosstalk))

Corinne Cath: (Cierno), it's just that Tatiana actually has a lot to add whereas for me it's very short. The FRI hasn't (socially) changed since the last time I sent it around but on the other hand, Tatiana has done a lot of work trying to actually figure-out which different sort of instruments apply so I'll let her explain that.

Niels ten Oever: Excellent, thank you, Tatiana, go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Thank you, Tatiana Tropina is speaking. I am not on the audio bridge. This is the first time when I am on the floor with my microphone from my mobile

application so I hope this is going to work so I sent a short document to the (help group) for the Workstream too. I think I didn't manage to send the whole group on the applicable framework.

I think I will send it around in the next few days but anyway just a few key points in summary. I think that maybe (Neuse) can add his comments after because I think there are some points where he could possibly disagree.

So I went to the question of the applicability of the framework on (seabridge) basically international speakers or guys line to the framework authentication of the human rights bylaws.

And I came-up with two main points, well, first of all I think that maybe all international frameworks like for example universal creation of human rights will be applicable but only for defining the scope of the obligation.

There is not direct applicability of the international changes because they are for safe to protect human rights, to enforce human rights so they're only safe obligations.

So I cannot and will not (unintelligible) we can only use them to populate the obligations of human rights with some information right for example what are human rights? Which human rights they are going to be today?

The second point is different guidelines like for example (unintelligible) and yes, they are coming to the point where we have to do something with the idea that in the workings like before in the working ones in DCW the accountability we agreed, then they're not going to connect you right for an example.

Which I think is a good idea but some of them (gives you hope) because we can use them to see what it means to respect human rights, how one can operationalize this commitment.

And in the document I sent around I pointed to some (ragged) principles which we can use to determine how these trained work of interpretation can actually work but I think in the working (slide) before will give a phrase or is that some of the (ragged) principles are not only about like re-certification or affecting human rights?

They actually are a deep, involved important for example or about remedies and this way ICANN does not want to share. For example we want to be clear that we are never going to (unintelligible) concentrate down and this is why they have to treat right away. I think there would be a big (customer) how we are actually going to use these (guidance reports).

I don't think that there would be any blind commitment. I think there should be, you know, from how we are balancing on the border between clearly using certain (ragged) principles or just using the principles or interpretation of these principles or if explanations (unintelligible) to those principles.

But as our actually mentioning them and I think this is good for a bigger group to decide this (or work space) to human rights to decide how we're going to participate so it's definitely these principles are one of the most important applicable instruments in the course of the work of the (DCWG) work (instruments).

While international treaties are going on (this true) provide us with information on the human rights and what are we actually committing to in

terms of content of this region, well, this is all from me. Did you hear me well or not? I see that…

Niels, I think that there is a big fear in the group. Is it better now? I can try to speak louder. Can you guys know me on the chart if I'm too quiet or not so about implementation of guidelines, blind or non-blind commitment?

From the work (conducted for) I gather than it's really hard for many people to adhere the word (ragged) principles and I can understand that because of these uniqueness of the ICANN mission and I think that if we mention (ragged) we are going to explain very clear why we mentioned them and which principles we are mentioning.

And if the compromised solution would be just use some of the things without mentioning (ragged) to be honest I am fine with it. I am fine with these if these human rights commitments will be. I'm not going to dive in a dish over what I think our main goal is to make a piece of work of interpretation clear and sounded.

(Ragged) or not (ragged) I don't really care because they're going to use all the implements anyway. Thanks, that's all from me.

Woman: Can I ask a question?

Niels ten Oever: Of course, please come in.

Woman: This is a question of clarification Tatiana. I'm obviously not a lawyer so I was wondering if you explain to me how that works in terms of can we cherry-pick certain parts and principles like legally is that possible? Can we say we do

respect but not the rest of it because I remember you saying it has three pillars? Is it possible to say we will cover one pillar but not the others?

Tatiana Tropina: If I can answer it by speaking well, I think (ragged) is non-binding principles. They are basically guidelines so if I say there is like one apple and one orange and one cucumber in this particular port and I take on the apple and it's apple only. I think there is no problem with this.

But I also think that this applicable of (ragged) I mean, partially they are actually for the (safe) for example they are explaining the UG of the states (unintelligible) or to protect human rights so we can basically play with them like with a piece of the puzzle and of course I am cautious legally if we are committing for example to write the principles, don't remember 22 for example.

We say something about (unintelligible) and mitigation, how it will go. I will be closest to committing some of the principles we have mitigation and/or remedy mechanisms. I think we rather have to create our totally our own document and just using some of the things for as guidance or explanation.

And of course as a lawyer yes, I am super cautious because I think there is a very cross section of opinion here that if you will meet something, it you will commit to any of the principles without actually considering what it means, it can take us to all these (unintelligible) (to main our ever).

And this is why I rather suggest that we will use the (unintelligible) see what it is in there in the obligations that we said but we will develop our own document then.

Niels ten Oever: Thank you very much Tatiana for that discussion. I there is only one thing I would really ask and that is I don't think that oh sorry, I see Motoko has her hand up. Let's Motoko go first, all right, Motoko please go ahead.

Motoko Aizawa: Actually I'm happy to come after you Niels. I'm happy to come after you Niels.

Niels ten Oever: No, no, no, please go ahead, you know much more about the guiding principles than I do so please go ahead to protect for saying things that you can say better.

Motoko Aizawa: No, no, no, I was just going to provide a very quick clarification that first of (Tatiana) has asked for the correct Pillar 1 is about safe duty and we need to think very carefully exactly what that means particular vis-a-vis the (gac) so that's a conversation that probably needs to be had.

In terms of Pillar 2 that is the gut of the guiding principles and applicable to business enterprises and Tatiana in terms of principles Number 22, you know, I think it's very difficult for ICANN to say to the extent it has caused or contributed to human rights violations.

And so this is where you know, ICANN's hand is very, very clear and the causal relationship is very clear between ICANN's action and the human rights impact. It's difficult I think for ICANN to sit and say they will do nothing. If we are saying that this is a human rights based, you know, set of principles, policy, whatever, I think it's very difficult for us not to have nothing at all on mitigation and remediation.

In terms of Pillar 3 I also wanted to say that ICANN already has a grievance mechanism, right, and it's not a human rights specific grievance mechanism

but ICANN has this ombudsman function and I don't know if (Chris) is on the line here but it is in a place to entertain.

There is complaints including human rights complaints and so I would not minimize that. Now (Chris) might say actually don't point to me and don't characterize me as a human rights grievance mechanism but I have already seen its limit and the kinds of questions that is has addressed a particularly community-based complaints about treatments of stakeholders.

And that is certainly part of what ICANN should be doing if they are already and so I just wanted to say we should not minimize that. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Tatiana is that an old hand? Tatiana?

Tatiana Tropina: Can you hear me well?

((Crosstalk))

Niels ten Oever: Oh, now I hear you.

Tatiana Tropina: And, oh, can you hear me, right?

Niels ten Oever: Yes, now we hear you.

Tatiana Tropina: Hello, okay, thanks so yes I do agree with Motoko. My point was that it's like how to say like Principle 22 or Principle 23 or Principle 11 were our principle. They can go in through each principle and see how it's applicable because if you say the word (ragged) without going through word by word through any of them, I believe that mostly they're applicable to ICANN.

But I think there is a big fear so we do have to find you and this was my point. I do think that they're the most applicable instrument but if you just come with these documents, this (ragged) (unintelligible) you'll be working to well first of all we will be (unintelligible) previously pointed to the previous discussion and these you might take as (unintelligible) that what we can do is just suggest so look, people.

Some of the (ragged) principles might help us to develop framework authentication without just saying let's commit to the (ragged) principles and then we can go to them and fine-tune and see I totally agree with Motoko that they're very useful.

We can probably explain in the group that some of them that we don't need to commit to them blindly, that this commitment can be fine-tuned and whatever so I don't think we actually disagree here.

I'm just talking rather process and approach than content, you know, so I'm careful about the process and the approach of this development. (Point) wise I think they are very applicable manual (stem) let's say, thanks.

Niels ten Oever: That is great. That is great, thank you very much for that. I see I'm having a bit of issues with my audio, sorry about that. Motoko had her hand up. Please, Motoko.

Motoko Aizawa: Sorry, Niels, to take-up the floor again. I just wanted to mention there is a distinction if we know that the - sorry, I'm having a hoarse voice here so I'm going to try to ignore it, there is a distinction between what ICANN does as a company as a corporate entity and undertaking business activities.

And then there are and so there are human rights impacts associated with that versus that ICANN does through policy, right, and the policies themselves create impacts but they're far more diffused and so if you just keep that distinction.

There are things that ICANN does that are very direct that has human rights impacts through their footprint shall we say, yes, and the most obvious things like, you know, just to pick a very ridiculous example, ICANN hiring child labor or slave labor which of course isn't the case but let's just say to make it very clear.

Those footprints, operational issues, I think the (ragged) principles apply directly particularly Pillar 2 so let's say ICANN found child labor in one of its offices somewhere very far. You know, can they not remediate that? Can they just sit there and say oh, we made a mistake.

We shouldn't have had it, we're not going to do anything about it. Of course not, right, and that's subject to remediation whereas what ICANN does through the policy, that domain is a totally different thing and I think that we're going to have to be very careful about the applicability of (ragged) principles with respect to those things.

And so I think that this bears further conversation and analysis and I'm also noting that (Chris LeHat) is doing a human rights reports. It's something that would be very, very useful for us to have and so, you know, let us continue to have this discussion but I agree. We're going to need a very, very nuanced interpretation on various applicable instruments. Thank you.

Niels ten Oever: That's great and I think that the opinion on this is converging and I'm very happy about that. That is great so with that do we think we can drop this point and continue to the next one? Would that be okay?

In that case, I would like to ask Vidushi to shorten present her report on the GTLD subsequent round.

Vidushi Marda: I, thank you, can you hear me now?

Niels ten Oever: I can hear you very well, thank you.

Vidushi Marda: Okay, good, so the document on (presented) human rights issues arising from (the only subsequent) procedure has been so committed on the mailing list twice, actually thrice, and so we've taken into account the (diffused) the aspects of the (rest) of you have gotten so as of now the document I'm just going to say the length of the document in the chat where (unintelligible).

Right now it's six pages and we have some multi-back that was given to us today like (unintelligible) whether (I see them) so basically what we've done is we've looked at the heads of freedom of expression, consumer welfare and privacy between (unintelligible) and diversity and this is based on the final issue report of the (unintelligible).

And one of the issues that I'm having right now with this particular job is that there's a map on the lead, that leads to human rights within the framework of the (unintelligible) or other such instruments.

So I'm working towards that so for example a consumer will say (unintelligible) exactly right and the (unintelligible) and so although we

(unintelligible) back or revisit how we articulate that and that is one overarching issue that (lands in this adjustment).

But it's also less it has gone through (fertilization) and this is actually quite (unintelligible) some work we had circulated on (unintelligible) and so I really appreciate any sort of feedback that anyone may have based on the link in the cap. This is a very short update but I am happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Okay, much (unintelligible) Vidushi for presenting the report but also for writing it. I think it's really quite good work. I've seen a comment by Corinne. I've also had a quick analysis, a quick reading of it myself.

Have other people also been able to read the report produced by Vidushi that I would be interested in and Vidushi I also would be interested to hear how you would like to take this part? Would you like to present this in Helsinki or how would you like to take this part?

Vidushi Marda: So I'm thinking what I should be interesting to presenting in Helsinki for the main reason that this is kind of what we wanted it to be (unintelligible) which is a shock movement of what a particular policy or a particular process looks like and based on feedback that I've gotten from Monika and other people on the list from Kathy, I think there are different views that could potentially work well together based on how we want to talk about human rights interest in ICANN.

And so I think as we present again (an ultimate) out on the floor, get comments and feedback, I think that we worked really well. Of course that, I mean, I'm happy to discuss how that will fit into the larger scheme for the (unintelligible) but yes, I would be interested in presenting this work.

Niels ten Oever: That is great and it's really great as well to hear that you have been having comments from Kathy, Monika and Corinne and have you been able to integrate the comments into the document so it's really integrated, really nice, yes.

Then I'm really happy that we can present this at some work in Helsinki. I see Kathy has her hand up so Kathy, please come in.

Kathy Kleiman: H, Niels. Hi, everybody, can you hear me?

Niels ten Oever: We can hear you very well.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, there appears to be an echo from my side so I'll do my best. First, thank you to Vidushi this is and to everyone it's amazing to join you on this call and hear more about the work that's taking place.

I'm coming-in purely for the purpose that there is some discussion about the trademark clearinghouse which goes to of course more that the subsequent procedures working group.

It goes to the right protection mechanism working group so I'd really like to urge Vidushi will you be in Helsinki? I'd really like to urge you and everyone else to come and talk about the concerns, the issues about the trademark clearinghouse in Helsinki.

We're going to have a meeting on Monday afternoon, a meeting, the (craft) community meeting is Monday afternoon after the privacy one, after the registration directory services working group in the same room, the rights protection mechanism working group will follow almost immediately.

We'll take a short break and then start again and so we're in the data gathering mode about the trademark clearinghouse so to the extent that you've got questions about what you'd like to know which is a secret database.

It drives me crazy, it's a secret database. We don't know how to make (generic) work or in it.

We don't know about some of the procedures that are taking place so please come and input and, you know, let us know things that you're interested, concerns and also data that you're interested in so that we can kind of add it to what the working group is doing. I can assure you your input will be very important. I think that's it Niels.

Niels ten Oever: Hey, thank you very much and we will - thank you very much Kathy - and we'll be sure to be present there and I might have been one of the people who have not got anything right so it will be a great learning moment.

Thank you so much for your experienced input here because we know how present one with your knowledge is really appreciated so it's really great to see that we also have a …

((Crosstalk))

Niels ten Oever: … so it's really great that we are one step ahead with one document, that's great. We'll present it in Helsinki and that leaves us for one more document to discuss and it is the visualization. I saw (Marilia) has already uploaded it and has it ready there so if you could put it up on the screen again, thank you very much.

This is work that has been brought forward by APC by (Marilia) by so many great people here on the list like and we have been trying to (with) the great knowledge from Kathy, from (Avery), from well I'm definitely missing people but I think what we really try to do here is contain a lot of knowledge in the process that we've been in here into this.

I've even integrate - I was to integrate - Kathy's latest comments into this so I'd be very curious to hear from people what you think about this document and do you think this is okay to present in Helsinki as a CCWP document? I see Kathy's hand is up. Or is that an old hand, Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: I'm sorry, Niels, it's an old hand.

Niels ten Oever: Okay, so I think we'll also really (mature) and show that this work is as is noted in the bottom corner that it's a work in progress. We continue making this better and it's pending a full human rights impact assessment.

But I do think it makes the issue much more tangible and related to much more concrete things so I really hope this can help.

How do other people feel about this document? Yes, there is some positive feedback in the chat from Motoko, Corinne, Vidushi, that's great so we'll go ahead, we'll discuss it in Helsinki as well, present it to the crowd. I'll make sure I'll print a lot of copies in A3 because in A4 it's not readable.

So I'll print a lot of copies and make it available and I hope we can use this to (raise) people up. What is the relation between ICANN policies and operations and human rights? We can show this and let people have a way in so that's great. Nice, so back to the agenda, Maryam, if we can.

And that leaves us already halfway to agenda, that's great and planning for Helsinki so unfortunately we are not able to we were informed we were not able to have our own session in Helsinki which I think is very sad because it is supposed to be an outreach which we outreach to local communities.

I think human rights is a very relevant topic but unfortunately we didn't get a meeting but luckily we were able to have a joint session with the CCW BHR and the doc working group on human rights and international law so we will be able to present some work and our process there so we have there a visualization to present.

We have the document produced by Vidushi to present. What are other things we would like to discuss or bring-up during this joint session? This session is not very long, it's 45 minutes.

It's together with the (gac) so we also do not have huge enormous amount of discussion time but what are issues people would like to bring up with or would you prefer to have more discussion time?

So can I suggest these two are enough as is also pretty much the work that we've been doing so that would be overall relation to reality and it also gives us a bit of time to discuss with the (gac) and amongst ourselves but I'm a bit worried about what I really like were the working sessions that we had in previous meetings.

We would really set our agenda for next time. I will try to set an evening to get us all together to do a working session to decide what we're going to do for the coming time. Okay, great, we'll do that.

Then there is also the cross-community working group meeting on the start of Work Team 2. This will be dedicated to whole Sunday.

There will be lightning (costs). I have submitted a proposal for our lightning (costs) about human rights and currently writing some (secs) for that which I will also share here on the list which I also like to use the visualization to see if a bit what we have been doing, what we have been working on.

I would definitely urge if people are in Helsinki then already to join that meeting or join remotely and also sign-up for that as a volunteer for that work because there is a lot of work on human rights to be done there.

I think one of the main messages is there to keep the framework of interpretation limited as a really explanation of the bylaw, not as a human rights policy in itself to really try to dig into the words, what they mean, what they explain word by word very much in line with the discussion on the instrument we had earlier.

So do people think we should have other messaging there or a strategy? We've been talking about this quite a lot but it would be great to hear more voices on this. People seem okay with the (policy) going forward?

That's okay, that's nice and then finally and I wanted to create some space for this for Kathy and other people who are actively engaged in PDPs.

To tell us to which meetings we really should go that we try to learn and understand what is going on and what is happening. Has anyone got (complete suggestions) of what we should going - where we should go - (detail the) subsequent working group (right) protection mechanisms, what are other PDPs we should definitely follow or ensure that were present?

Kathy, please come in. I was already silently hoping for you, please come in. Kathy, please come in.

Kathy Kleiman: Sorry, was I muted during all of that?

Niels ten Oever: Yes, you were. I'm very sorry to say but please go ahead.

Kathy Kleiman: My apologies to everybody. In addition to the rights protection mechanism working group on Monday afternoon, there's the registration directory services working group and so I see the privacy is within your ambit.

Have you already talked about the registration directory services working group does? Would it make sense, you know, to summarize it briefly? Oh, okay.

Niels ten Oever: Go ahead, Kathy, that's very relevant.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, so the registration director services working group is rethinking the (Suez). The (Suez) is a directory services database - set of databases, many databases - that ICANN inherited back when the Internet was really in assessment and kind of, you know, old education networks under the National Science Foundation's mandate.

Whoever was in charge of a university put their name, their address, their business, you know, office, their business phone. In those days there were no cellphones and their e-mail address.

So you had (Scott Bradner) at Harvard information technology and he'd put his name in the directory for Harvard.edu and this just kind of kept scaling

and it's wound-up being the biggest database of speakers in the world and people are using the who-is and you can tell I'm biased on this one.

People are using the who-is to track-down and harass speakers who they don't agree with all over the world and businesses are using it to track-down and intimidate small businesses that are coming-in and competition with them and but of course there is illegal activity and people are using domain names to do illegal things.

And so law enforcement of intellectual property like having all the registrant data out there so that they can do their policing activities whether it's intellectual property enforcement or law enforcement but then the rules are different across borders.

What may be completely legal in the United States on pro-democracy Websites is completely illegal in China so this is what the registration directory services working group is wrestling with is what types of data elements to collect.

What is the purpose that we're collecting it for which is frankly domain name registration and then to what secondary purposes can we put this data like directory services and in which case how much data do you put in and how do you put it in and is it all available or do you put-up gates? These are all the questions that are being asked.

So that's the registration directory services working group which is going to be meeting forever probably for the next two or three years but making headway along the way so right now we're looking at what are the privacy frameworks? Actually I should say we're looking at three big elements. One is user - I'll give you the kind of big overview - one is users and purposes.

One is data elements and one is privacy frameworks so I'll start with privacy frameworks which is ICANN is kind of a U.S.-based corporation but yet the registries and registrars and frankly half the world as of last year half the world is under comprehensive data protection laws so when we're looking at a new directory possibly even one great centralized directory of who-is or registration directory information.

For the world, should it be under U.S. privacy laws or should it be under comprehensive data protection privacy law principles like what we see in the EU? That's one question that's being asked. Data elements, what do we need to collect for domain name registration purposes?

That is certainly we need a lot of technical information. What's the name server? Who's the registrar? Who's the registry? What date was it created? What date does it expire?

Those are basic kind of operational technical pieces of data but when it comes to PII personally-identifiable information, do we really need someone's physical address, where they're located?

Do we need their personal phone number? Does this create do we need all of that and then do we need to put it into a separate directory so that it's available for everyone or for some people under certain circumstances?

That's data elements and then uses and purposes so what uses and purposes do we want to make this data available and frankly some of that depends on your privacy laws. If you have privacy laws that are as lax as the United States, oh great, you know, create any type of users and purposes.

Other types of data protection laws might be a little more strict so those are the big three things we're looking at in Helsinki and I just wanted to share that the format of the working group discussion is a little different in Helsinki than we've seen it anywhere else.

This new type of B working group, this new type of B meeting where we're focusing on policy, each working group actually has two meetings. One is a cross-community meeting specifically to reach-out to all the voices they don't normally hear in the working group.

And then the next day or in some cases two days later, the working group has its own meeting where all the usual suspects are there, all the people who normally come on the phone call.

But the meeting's also open to the public and if people want to participate in the discussion, they can do that but the first meeting which for each of these is at least three hours is really designed to hear what you think, what people think from outside the working group.

So that's kind of a new format for us and it will get really boring if people don't come and talk to us. Niels I think that was way too long but thank you very much.

Niels ten Oever: Thanks Kathy and that was exactly the kind of response I was hoping for so we'll definitely know what we need to go to so especially the (how) we think it would be great to follow a lot of work and we'll definitely also follow the RPN there, it was found very relevant, very interesting, we'll definitely flock to you for advice and questions if you allow us.

So I think this pretty much brings us to Point 4 and that is we do not know how this meeting will develop so if people have specific ideas outside of the joint session, the joint session we have that (GWG) did have engaging in the PDPs and of course in our constituency day, it would be great to hear how you think (Roy) can take this forward.

I think we also have a pretty busy agenda but if people have creative ideas how we can bring particular things forward, I'd be very happy to hear them. I would really like to see how the visualization is perceived and then maybe for next time we can print it even a bit larger and sometimes it's sent outside in the public halls have a bit of discussion (we for) about it so that is a bit approachable.

We may see this topic a bit more that is definitely something we could do as well so that brings me to the any other business, AOB. Do we have any other business to discuss? Kathy, I think that's an old hand.

Kathy Kleiman: Oh, that's my worst habit, sorry, Niels.

Niels ten Oever: Well, I wish old hands was one of my worst habits. That would be great so thank you all very much on this call. If you have any other questions, feel free to do it now or reach-out to me after the call directly via mail or Skype telephone, e-mail or otherwise.

Always feel free to ask questions to the group. I'm very happy to say that we remain again under an hour so we're a very efficient working party.

I would like to thank you all for you very active engagement and I'm looking forward to working with you in Helsinki, before and beyond and thanks again for all this work and have a great weekend. Bye, all.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you very much. Anderson, you may now stop the recording, please.

Thank you.

END