ICANN

Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi
January 21, 2016
10:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay so welcome all to the first meeting of the Cross-Community Working Party on ICANN's Corporate and Social Responsibility to Respect Human Rights. We got an agenda. Marilia said she's got a small issue for all other business, namely an update on the RPM review, which is great.

We'll start off with a short overview on what has been happening in the CCWG, the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability in relation to human rights, even though I think many of you have followed it. I think it would be great if we would have a short overview.

So perhaps Tatiana, could you give a short overview of where we are in the CCWG?

Tatiana Tropina: Yes. Tatiana Tropina speaking for the record. I'm actually wondering if this really would be of any interest, because I - well, it might be for myself only. Because I know that Aarti and Marilia are following this process.

But the nevertheless just for the record, so in CCWG we yesterday -- no, the day before yesterday -- we had the second reading on human rights bylaw language and up till now, up till today, we had basically three concepts: concept A to proceed with the current bylaw language.

Concept B was to move everything to the workstream 2 and start discussing from zero, well from square one, and this option B was preferred by the board because the board submitted its comments again about human rights bylaw language and told that they preferred moving everything to the workstream 2. And option C was to make this bylaw language dormant, not operational till the framework of interpretation would be adopted.

And today we've got the e-mail from accountability legal counselors saying that they talked to the ICANN lawyers and that they also now prefer option C because option A, just proceeding with the current bylaw language, will open the door to different claims and RFPs.

So I believe that right now option C, make a nonoperational bylaw is our only option, but I'm also optimistic that since it addresses all the board concerns, we can probably push it in. They are not going to give up. I believe that we should not allow moving this issue to the workstream 2. Thanks. That was all. Thank you.

Niels Ten Oever: That's great. Marilia, please come in.

Marilia Maciel: Although I'm following the discussions, I confess that the A, B, C, D it's kind of confusing still for me. So just in practical terms, what's the difference between the 2c that is rightly the option that is chosen and just leaving it for workstream 2.

Niels Ten Oever: Tatiana do you want to answer that?

Tatiana Tropina: I will answer. Tatiana Tropina. Yes. Yes, yes, yes I will answer. Tatiana Tropina is speaking. The difference between leaving everything to the workstream 2, moving it to the workstream 2 without having any bylaw language. And adopting the bylaw language and developing the framework in the workstream 2 while bylaw language is not operational is, to me, clear.

Because in the - if everything will be moved to the workstream 2, we don't have to start the discussions again. And the board is insistent that we have to discuss again whether we need the bylaw language at all. So this is the difference.

If we will adopt the option C, we will have a bylaw language. Maybe it will not be operational, but at least it'll have the bylaw. And I strongly believe that to develop any framework for interpretation, we need to have the bylaw text. We can't just develop framework open to interpretation first and then provide the bylaw. I don't think - I think that this would be like put the cart in front of the horse.

So I believe that option C in this way is much more preferable than starting from scratch, because if we will lose and everything would be moved to the workstream 2, it would mean that all our discussions or our work is basically trashed. Thanks.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay that's - thank you very much, Tatiana. So the overview indeed is and the concerns that are options, so 3a, is that there will be a bylaw and it will be operationalized. The board comments say that there would be a problem because ICANN could be taken to court. So that risk has been countered by the independent lawyers.

But the board came up with the risk that the human rights commitment of ICANN, which would then be directly operational, could then be challenged in an IRP and that would mean that the human rights commitment of ICANN would be developed in the IRP and not in workstream 2. So that was that comment of the board on option 3a.

Three-B was optioned by the board, so that puts everything to workstream 2. There was considerable pushback against that because then we would - everything would be dependent on workstream 2 and there might be no outcome at the end of that.

And then 3c is somewhat the middle ground. It means we'll have a dormant bylaw, a bylaw that's not active until the framework of interpretation is signed. And some people see this as the ideal middle ground. Some people say this is a risky position because as long as the framework of interpretation is not developed and there is no hard deadline for that, that could drag on very long, but that doesn't mean that it's unclear when the bylaw would become operational.

So that is where we are right now in the discussion. Tuesday we will have the third reading. So it is interesting to see where opinions are converging.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you both.

Niels Ten Oever: Great. Aarti, do you - you have been following this process as well. I would be very curious to also hear your opinions, positions, see how you have seen the discussion develop.

Aarti Bhavana: Yes hi, can you hear me?

Niels Ten Oever: I hear you very well. Thank you.

Aarti Bhavana: Thank you. (Unintelligible) for the record. I have been following the process and I think there are still a lot of back and forth (unintelligible) on at least what is socially acceptable to (unintelligible). Because with a little bit more support for option B, they are clearly are doing the work (unintelligible) and that this subgroup has been working towards all these months.

But I think option C is a good option. At least the way I look at it, option A and C are pretty much the same thing, because even though - because C requires a bylaw be developed, that is why it is connected, but I don't think that the effect of A will ultimately be the same as C, unless I'm mistaken over that. But I do think that now that we have safely moved beyond B, we're in a good position.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay. Great. Great. And how do you see - that might then be interesting so when we go to the discussion of the subgroup 3. So I think this would be - I think is a quite round update on where we are on the CCWG, unless anyone else has another point, issue, comment, or question to make.

And Motoko, do you also hear us and can we hear you? I hear from Maryam that you're on mute because there is some background noise from your location. Could that be the case?

Motoko Aizawa: I turned my phone off just in case the background noise is live. But I'm on the phone, Niels Ten Oever. Thank you.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay perfect. Thank you.

So while we've been going through the progress on the CCWG and we'll probably be coming back to that when we're talking about subgroup 3, I wanted to do a quick run along subgroup 1 and 2 first. So who is here, who is active in subgroup 1?

Marilia Maciel: Hi, Niels. This is Marilia speaking for the transcript. I'm participating in subgroup 1. Actually we are quite a small group so far. People have participated in the calls. It's me, Rafik, and (Helen). And well, there hasn't been much progress in the subgroup. First of all, I have been quite busy, and I apologize for that. And I took some days off. And the second of all, we are, as I said, quite a small group. So I think that we would need reinforcement on this group.

What has progressed is that I have sent an e-mail to some people in the community: (Kathy), the ombudsmen, who have said that they would have additions to make to that table that we presented. And I'm waiting to hear back from them. And this information will be incorporated on the table, but quite frankly, we have not moved forward in terms of how to present this table in the best way.

So if you guys know of people with expertise, knowledge on design or creative people that could help out, I would be very happy to have the contact of these people and try to involve them. What I can do now is to compile the information and have an updated table for Marrakech, but I doubt that I will be able to do it alone without help having another (unintelligible) for the information that I gather from people in the community. So yes, that's it for now.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay. Thanks, Marilia. So from what I understand is that the table has become a bit bigger or a bit changed, but on the visualization front you haven't moved much forward. Am I correct?

Marilia Maciel: The table will be updated as soon as I have the responses from the people that I wrote to. I just wrote them yesterday, so there hasn't been enough time. But I can incorporate this information and make the table bigger, more complete, correct anything that we have probably done wrong or any information that is missing.

But to transform this table into an actual visualization, I think that we are not having the resources to do this in the subgroup. So we may need help. If we are going to try to do something, we may need help. We have a call next week. So we are probably going to discuss that, but I don't see with the resources that we have that we'll be able to have something ready unless we have help.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay. So I think that where we were last time is that we had the circle diagram and that we were thinking about adding a third ring to it, right?

Marilia Maciel: No, actually what we discussed in the previous calls was that there was too much information in the circle. And in order to make it more understandable and not to scare people away talking about rights that are indicated but not that much, we should focus on the inner circle, the ones that are more clearly touched upon by the policies that we have the table today such as freedom of expression, privacy, due process.

So we should focus on the inner one and leave the outer one for a later state. So we should do kind of an incremental circle or incremental diagram. So that's what we had in mind. People liked the idea of the circle. They think it's

useful. They thought we were on the right track but we needed to see how it would better represent the inner circle of - that we had before.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay. So soon you will have the knowledge but you don't have designers. Is that - if I can summarize the - your situation?

Marilia Maciel: That's it.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay. I can get you into contact with some data visualization for good people. I could do that. The people from DataKind on this. And if I'm not mistaken, I know the director of DataKind U.K. So I will make this a to-do for me to get her into contact with you. And if you could then come back with just a simple table that you need to be visualized, then I think should not be something difficult to happen.

Marilia Maciel: Okay, that would be wonderful, Niels. Thank you very much.

Niels Ten Oever: Okay. I'll do that. If you don't hear from me by end of today, then please remind me, okay?

Marilia Maciel: Okay.

Niels Ten Oever: That's great. Okay. So the next thing is subgroup 2. Is there anyone here from subgroup 2?

Marilia Maciel: What's the topic? Sorry.

Niels Ten Oever: Going back, going to subgroup 2.

Marilia Maciel: We have Vidushi on the call. Maybe she...

Vidushi Marda: Vidushi's on...

Niels Ten Oever: It's documenting cases and expose in which ICANN is potentially impacting human rights. So the example were RAA, UDRP, Whois. I have the link to subgroup 2 and the terms of reference and the member there. So this is supposed to be led by Pranesh.

Oh okay that's great, Vidushi. Oh if you have problems with your audio, can you provide your - do you have your - can you provide your telephone number to Maryam and then she can call you in? Is that okay? Okay. So try to connect and also please provide your telephone number to Maryam.

Okay. So then we'll continue with subgroup 3, which is - which has tasked itself with providing relevant inputs to Workstream 3, Workstream 2 of the CCWG. We have been discussing and thinking and quite some time of the work of subgroup 3 has been going up into actually participating in the CCWG. But in discussions with Motoko and others, we have been analyzing what would be the best thing that we could contribute to Workstream 2 without us having actually having the final bylaw language already in place.

And the conclusion of that discussion might be that actually in any case moving forward, a human rights impact assessment and a methodology for that is crucial. So we're now playing with the idea what is needed to make that happen and what can we do before Marrakech. And I would like to invite Motoko to give a short overview of that. Would that be possible Motoko?

Motoko Aizawa: Yes. You know, thank you very much for giving some space to discuss this brief paper that I hope everybody had a chance to at least take a quick look at. So the background leading to this is that we were initially tasked in Dublin to

look at one aspect of ICANN operations. That was policy development process.

But the discussion quickly turned into what about other aspects of ICANN operations beyond policy development that are areas in which they can affect human rights as evident from the work of subgroup 1 in putting together these - the table and the visualization and also documenting their cases where human rights impacts are evident, whether it's RAA, UDRP, Whois.

So the idea came to some of us that perhaps we do need a more comprehensive and systematic approach after all, and where does that take us. That's basically the instrument of human rights impact assessment. And this is a little different than looking at a segment of ICANN, but it's about looking at ICANN's activity in its totality.

And this way we have a systematic data of putting - that we can debate among us within the working group, working Party, but also we can build consensus across different working groups and also with ICANN management and the board.

And so from that point of view, it's a large undertaking that - but it might be something that would illuminate us. And it would definitely take - can benefit from the work that is already ongoing in subgroup 1 and subgroup 2. So there are different steps that are involved. And the problem, as well as the benefit, to a human rights impact assessment, that is - that it actually requires an engagement of management.

And in this case, it might be a challenge to satisfy all these different steps of engaging management. But it's actually a way to understand what the key functions are, whether, A, a corporate entity, and to have the functions

explained to the people who are running the impact assessment. What are the potential concerns and risk area and to have a back and forth so that there's a complete understanding of what the corporate entity is perceiving as human rights risks, what are the mechanisms that are already in there to address those risks, and what are things that can be proposed further to address those risks.

And so it will spit out a lot of data. Now how would this data then input would be beneficial to other things that are ongoing. Well first and foremost, because it engages different stakeholders, it's an opportunity to create consensus within different diverse stakeholder groups within ICANN.

And this would inform the board, this would inform the management about what the more immediate human rights issues are that are within ICANN's control to address and what are things that are perhaps more of a long-term nature that requires a lot of debate, perhaps involving GAC and others.

And so it also helps with the prioritization. And in any event, it's a very internally focused thing that would give ICANN management an insight into what to do. Now depending on the timing of the bylaw language, this could feed into the refinement of the bylaws language, but we might be in a very happy position where the bylaw language goes ahead of the completion of the human rights impact assessment.

So there are some timing considerations that perhaps some of you who are much more involved in the bylaw side would be far better positioned to advise us on. Niels, I'm about to finish, except I'm going to try and answer your question on what we can do prior to Marrakech.

I think we should be able to definitely start to engage ICANN's management. And it would be nice if we could complete the questionnaire process so that

we can have some analysis and reflection of the management responses on what their view of the human rights, potential human rights impacts. And it would be wonderful if we could also have some analysis and some reflection that's written down from this group that could then be presented to the management by the time we get to Marrakech.

But I think we should be quite realistic that we're not going to be able to do everything leading to Marrakech. Let me stop here. I'm sorry. I talked for a very long time.

Niels Ten Oever: That is great, Motoko. And I that would be achievable. So you think that - so concretely, summarizing what you said, but you it can be achieved before Marrakech would be a picture and a questionnaire is what you're saying?

Motoko Aizawa: So step two is the issuance of the questionnaire. Step three is analysis. And step four is going back to the management to confirm the analysis and to have further engagement. I would be delighted if we could get to step three so that at Marrakech we could actually have this interaction with management face to face.

Niels Ten Oever: And if we would not get - because I'm a bit afraid that we are quite dependent on the information from the questionnaire. So if the staff will not respond, we will not have a deliverable.

Motoko Aizawa: So we obviously can try and obtain some of the information based on working party's knowledge of ICANN's operation. In any event, it's good to have that background which will actually feed into the drafting of the questionnaire.

So the fallback would be that we propose some observations and answers to management. That's the fallback. But that would be second-best. It's clearly better if we can have ICANN's management responses.

And so in order to do that, I think Niels, maybe there is a way to get to the president. Maybe there is a way to get to the board to explain what it is that we would like to do and get them to reinforce the message that the functional area heads really need to engage with us and respond to the questionnaire.

Niels Ten Oever: I see the hand that Tatiana has up. Please, Tatiana, come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Thanks a lot, Niels. Tatiana Tropina speaking for the record. I would like to thank Matthew for - like, it was a really great presentation and I think that if you're thinking about the subgroup three, human rights assessment - (NPOC) assessment should be either a part of framework of interpretation or at least (methodology) for these human rights - assessments should be applied to the framework of interpretation of the bylaws.

I mean, I will urge us all to understand that we will have to consider also other factors and we will have to work in a wider community, so that's very nice, as (Matthew) suggests, to come up with something to the community for the development of the framework or for the interpretation.

I - about concerns, ICANN management and ICANN board, I think we have Nigel Hickson on this call. I don't know if we will be able to engage them somehow in this exercise.

And also, I think that we have at least two or three board members participating in that CCWG human rights discussion regularly like (Marcus Comer), for example.

I mean, it won't hurt to try but I also think that maybe, in addition, we will focus our efforts on providing methodology because I know how the community would react because it's not the - the CCWP is not (tasked) to do everything for the work stream two. It would be the wider community exercise.

And sorry for repeating myself. And I think that it would be nice that we will come up with something which will fit into the work stream two. So that should be (a genuinely dear) concern and what we're doing.

And in this regard, not only certain human rights (NPOC) assessments, but also may be thinking about methodology - designing methodology and how we are going to do this.

It's going to people how, why - and why it should be a part of work stream two and how it will fit into the work stream two. This is just - honestly, this is just (me using) right now because I'm - I have not had time to look into this deeply. Thanks.

Niels Ten Oever: That's great. Thank you very much for that, Tatiana. So a structure and a - at these we have a document and a framework with which we could show how we go forward and we could try to engage staff and management.

And now, after Tatiana said, I'd like to go to Nigel to what Nigel thinks, how we could engage management and staff in this process and how we - he thinks we could or should go about with that. Nigel?

Oh, sorry, Nigel, that was just a short overview of a human rights impact (unintelligible) that we could prepare as part of subgroup three but for that, we

would need to prepare a questionnaire to understand the human rights impact of ICANN, so we would need to map certain things.

So with that, we would need to have a collaboration of staff and management to map that. What you think is the best way to go about that? Nigel is in listening mode but he thinks it can be done. Nigel, could you then perhaps type in the chat the way you think we should be contacting - should we send you the questionnaires in the set up or should be contact you first about who we would be that you could do a short assessment internally?

Who would be the right people we can reach out to and how we could set this up? Could you help us with that? That's great, Nigel. That's great. So subgroup three will continue with - and working on this in but then go through this on the sub-list (motor call) and see what we can do before Marrakesh.

I see Tatiana and Aarti 's hands are up. Tatiana, is that an old hand or new hand?

Tatiana Tropina: This is my very old hand. Sorry, forgot to lower it.

Niels Ten Oever: No problem. Aarti Bhavana, please come in.

Aarti Bhavana: Hi. This is Aarti . I was just wondering what are we doing about the framework of interpretation because on our last call the (unintelligible) put in creating the - in developing the framework of interpretation, but then with the recent - the board comments about how they would like to take on the process, I was just wondering how we're going about it.

Niels Ten Oever: Well, I think that, as far as I understand, work stream two is still a bit of a mystery, how it's going to be formed.

Some people say you will be the same form as the CCWG. Some people say - people have said, oh, they should have started before the Marrakesh. Some people say it's going to start at Marrakesh.

I don't know if that will be the same group of people but it will probably also be open for new people. So I am - I have no information about how work stream two is going to take place.

So it's hard to understand how that will happen. If anyone else has a deeper or better insight on how it will happen, it would be great if that person could answer - could answer Aarti 's question. Marilia, Tatiana, do you have a bit of more of an idea and insight on what works stream two will look like? I guess not. No?

Tatiana Tropina: Well, yes, I do. I mean, it wasn't the bylaw. It wasn't the interim bylaw that the group would be established and it would be CCWG-like group. So it would become a (unique) exercise.

But, yes, actually, other than that I think it was - it was already discussed several times that they should be CCWG kind of group but maybe involved in more community representatives who are connected to human rights issues. So I believe that this would be the case. Thanks. So we...

((Crosstalk))

Niels Ten Oever: Yes, that's what I have as well. So we'll be following the developments and then we'll definitely put a call on the list here for people to engage with that process as soon as it's - as it's clear.

So being mindful of time, if there are no more questions or comments on subgroup three, I'm going to continue to subgroup four. Who is here from - or maybe is Vidushi's audio now working? Vidushi, are you there? Vidushi?

Okay, so Vidushi's audio does not seem to be working or if Vidushi's is not on the call, I'm going to continue to subgroup four. Who is here from subgroup four?

Subgroup four is the - providing input on - no, Vidushi, we can't hear you. Subgroup four is providing input to PDP on new gTLDs from a human rights perspective.

I have Marilia down for that as well as Pranesh, Alexandra, Peter Kimpian and Aarti, Narine, Sana Ali, Alexandre Gonzalez, Rafik and Tapani.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you, Niels. Sorry for not jumping in sooner. We have news at the GNSO. Actually, in tonight's call we're going to examine the charter that will guide the work of this policy development process.

It's very likely that the charter is going to be approved today. Next up will be a call for volunteers to join the working group. So I think that this is the moment in which this group will start putting on the pressure to actually do the work.

If you take a look at the charter, it has been - the topics have been aggregated inside buckets. This is the root of a previous discussion group that was created inside the GNSO.

And I think that, looking at the charter, there are five different clusters but three are applied to important (unintelligible) from a human rights

perspective. The first of them will deal with important issues such as application fees and support for applicants in developing countries.

We have a clear indication on (unintelligible) and social rights, for instance. Bucket two, among other things, will look at the global public interest and how this concept will apply to the new gTLD program.

And there's a window of opportunity for us to discuss human rights. And bucket 2, they have included, as well, the rights protection mechanisms that have an interplay with freedom of expression and also with due process.

And bucket three, which is the last one, very important to us, there will be a question that we will examine specifically applicants' freedom of expression in the new gTLD program.

So at least, when human rights was clearly expressed in the charter of the group and community applications, which also has an application to freedom of expression and freedom of association.

Groups four and five are important but, to my view, not that much from a human rights standpoint. So these are the next steps. We're waiting for the charter to be approved and the working group to be created to start the work.

I have asked Maryam to started Doodle for next week, so next week we will have a call of this subgroup (in which) I will be in the position to update them on the approval of the (charter) and I hope that we will also be in the position to assess which are the topics that we're going to be more closely devoted two because when I expect is that this working group will be divided into subgroups and sublists because it's a massive topic.

So we will need, for sure, several people following at least this - the three clusters that I mentioned and I hope that we will be able to share (tasks) in the next call that will take place next week. Thanks.

Niels Ten Oever: That's great, Marilia. That's really good work and thanks for that. I would like to give you - if people have - so this is really good work and I think we're also calling for people who want to be on that committee. I think it was open, right? At least I saw the call for that. Is that still open for people to join?

Marilia Maciel: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely, both the working group - the call is not (listed) yet and our - the CCWG Group, help will be very welcome.

Niels Ten Oever: Perfect. So now I'm going to check if Vidushi is actually on the call and we've got an audio connection.

Vidushi Marda: Can you hear me now?

Niels Ten Oever: Yes, we hear you now. Great to hear you.

Vidushi Marda: Oh, wow. Oh, I'm so sorry but - the unnecessary delay. I'm not sure what the problem was. But - so basically subgroup two had a call on the 14th that was (unintelligible).

And so basically spoke about the mandate of our group and we divided work for the next couple of weeks to see (where we want to take the doc forward). In the update that I had sent to the (list earlier) today, I had indicated a list of potential topics that we wanted to explore.

(Unintelligible) I could possibly share it on the chat (channel) if that works. So basically there was a list of eleven potential (topics) and we were hoping to start work on documenting cases and on...

Niels Ten Oever: Did we lose you? I really hope we haven't lost Vidushi because the work sounded very good.

Vidushi Marda: Hello?

Niels Ten Oever: Yes, you're back. Here you are.

Vidushi Marda: Okay. Yes, so we have a list of eleven potential topics that we wanted to look at and we decided that most of them seem to be overlapping some of the work that the other subgroups are doing.

And so - and (I'm going to send across just) that list so that it is (available to you). I could do it now if that (works). I (can do) an update and send it later. I think I will do the latter.

And so we have basically four topics that are going to be (unintelligible) focus on and we've divided work and (unintelligible) potential (violations) that I (can't list) and (unintelligible) working group.

In fact, (unintelligible) policy development process. The thought is the UDRC and (unintelligible) management (teamwork). And so we're going to have a call next - for next Thursday or Friday. We've agreed to discuss how much data we've managed to collect and (unintelligible).

Niels Ten Oever: You're dropping again. Vidushi, you dropped, at least for me.

Vidushi Marda: Call on (work)...

Niels Ten Oever: Aye yai yai, you're coming in and out. But if I can summarize the end of your call is that you've listed eleven different cases. The different people that you divided the work among the people in your subgroup and they'll have a call again to discuss these cases.

And from what I see - what I can interpret from your trajectory is that you'll be finished working on that and you'll be able to present that (unintelligible) work. Hello? That was Adobe Connect going down for me for second.

So I think this subgroup 2 work would be done by Marrakesh and they will be able to present it there. I hope that is the case and perhaps Vidushi could correct me if I'm wrong in the chat.

I can give you a short update on operational issues that we've been requesting a meeting together with the GAC working group on human rights and international law.

From what I've gathered, they haven't agreed on a term of reference yet. Two meetings for our group have been decided. One, a presentation session, in which we would present the work on the workgroups and one working session in which we would decide on how we're going forward with the work.

There'll also be cross community working group session on Friday, so participants in CCWG can join in that as well. And I think that will try to, with Marilia, to make an agenda for the human rights relevant issues before meeting and Marrakesh.

But we will have several calls before that. I would urge everyone to also get work from your working groups soon to the central list so that we can adopt work as (work) from the CCWP. The more work we have done together before ICANN meeting and Marrakesh, the better.

So that was my short update on operational issues. I also want to put on an agenda for Marrakesh, a short evaluation. We would like how we see this going with the CCWP and with the subgroups, whether they should keep the subgroups or bring it all (better) to a centralized list or whether you like this approach, I'll leave that to a face-to-face with connection support in Marrakesh. So in all other business I have and point (to Mariela) on RPM. Marilia, come in.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Niels. This is Marilia speaking. Before that, I just would like to remind everyone that the call for volunteers for the working group on (WHOIS 2) has been issued.

So if you are interested on privacy, as far as I know, and maybe we need to discuss this a bit and (Stephania) has had some difficulties, some problems lately, and I don't know, maybe we should reach out to her to know if she wants to have the facilitation of the working group on privacy because we will really need this working group to start moving forward now.

If you are interested, the call is open and I think it will be open until the January. You can join the working group either as a full member -- and as a full member you are entitled to send emails to the list and participate vocally in the calls -- or you can join as an observer. You can join the calls and participate in the mailing list only as an observer, not sending messages.

I have joined as an observer and many of our people have joined as active group members, Stephanie, Kathy and many others. So I think we're - this will be a large PDP.

We always need more people that we have some people there already. As far as I know, maybe the Counsel of Europe will also volunteer to be part of this working group so we have people there.

But we need to make sure that we have our subgroup activated to give support to the work that is going to be taking place in the GNSO. With regards to RPMs, the Rights Protection Mechanisms, in our GNSO call tonight, we will examine a motion to start a policy development process to review all RPMs in gTLDs.

This policy development process will be divided into two phases. On the first phase, we will focus on the Rights Protection Mechanisms for the new gTLDs. On the second phase, we will focus on UDRP.

So this is something, as if we did not have already two much work, this is something that will be in our place very soon so the charter should be approved today.

I will keep you updated on that. And then we will have a working group to work on Rights Protection Mechanisms. And of course, (unintelligible) expression and due process for us. So that's it for me, Niels, thanks.

Niels Ten Oever: Thanks - thanks a lot, Marilia, a lot of useful work. I have reached out to Stephania. Stephania is also me that she is - that she's very sorry she cannot join in that they haven't - she hasn't been as active as she wanted to but she promised me that it will get better.

So I hope it will be actually the case and I'll - I'm sure we can work to also get always clear - good on the map here in - the CCWP. So I think that would be all for now, someone else has (a point). I see Aarti has her hand up. Aarti , come in, or is that an old hand?

Aarti is not able to speak for some reason. Yes, there have been some connection issues. Yes, unfortunately we don't hear Aarti and we also did not hear Vidushi before so it might also be a problem with the connection to the Indian subcontinent which I would greatly - would be quite sad about.

So Aarti, just wanted to say that subgroup five (had started) work soon, a member of the PDP as well. We just had our first call - we have our first: Tuesday and (he)'s expecting to see some work after that.

That's really great. That's really great to hear that, Aarti. Indeed, I've skipped over subgroup five. So we have had updates from all subgroups. Thank you very much. I will relay the (needs) from subgroup one to (data kind).

And I'm looking forward to seeing you all on the next call and I really hope that we can have some clear production contents that we can discuss by then. For now, I like to all thank you very much and close the call within an hour of starting it, less people have any other business they would like to bring forward.

I don't see anything so I'd like to thank you all very much for attending and looking forward to the next call. Bye all.

END