

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Maryam Bakoshi**  
**March 2, 2016**  
**10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Maryam Bakoshi: Thank you so much, Jim. Niels you may continue please. Thank you.

Niels ten Oever: Thank you very much, staff, for making this meeting possible. This is the last call of the Cross Community Working Party on ICANN's Corporate and Social Responsibility to Respect Human Rights before ICANN 55 in Marrakesh.

I'm very happy to have quite some people in the call but I believe there are also some people on the phone bridge so welcome all very much. As always, I'll try to keep this call under an hour and we might be done sooner. My name is Niels ten Oever. And I have the pleasure and honor to chair this work for you.

I have uploaded an agenda to the - and first I'd like to ask if anyone has any suggestions or comments on the agenda, feel free to interrupt or raise your hand. Nothing so then we'll go ahead with the agenda as proposed.

Next slide please. We'll simply go to the second page. So that's a review of the agenda and the contributions for the Cross Community Working Party on Human Rights public session in Marrakesh. We have quite a rich session and it will be hard to squeeze this within the 70 minutes that we have. And I'm very happy that we've also received an overview of all the subgroups except Subgroup 5, about the content of their work. So having seen that on the mailing list and seeing the agenda in front of you now, does anyone have any input, comments, questions or things that we should - we might offer or think about?

Now what didn't happen on the list is that I got a confirmation from (unintelligible) Markus Kummer and Bruce Tonkin, all three board members that were engaged in human rights on the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability. And they said that even though their full schedules for the ICANN meeting are not confirmed they will three do their utmost to attend the whole session so that's why I put them in the agenda there.

And Tatiana, did we already hear back from the co-chairs on the CCWG on Accountability?

Tatiana Tropina: Tatiana Tropina speaking. No, I'm not sure. I mean, I didn't see anything in my mailbox but we have to bear in mind that they were really busy last days. So if we don't hear from them until let's say Monday evening I suggest we just try to reminder because otherwise this email will be buried, you know, under the pile of other emails.

Niels ten Oever: Great point. You're right. Matthew, I see you have a comment on the - in the chat, would you like to come in?

Matthew Shears: Can you hear me, Niels?

Niels ten Oever: I hear you perfectly, Matthew. Great to hear your voice.

Matthew Shears: Okay. No it was just a comment on the agenda. I mean, it's a huge range of great issues but I didn't know if you wanted to have any, you know, interaction or in depth discussion on some of these issues because I don't think the timing will necessarily allow for that. It just depends what your overall goal is for the session. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Thank you Matthew. And I think that is something I struggled with as well so my -- and that's something I would like to discuss here with you now and also something to think about for the next discussion point about what we will present to the GAC working group. On the one hand I would like to showcase all the great work that we've been doing to the community, but on the other hand we of course want to gather feedback. So I'm not sure how to do it. Right now we tried to do both but I'm not sure that will work so any suggestions would be very welcome.

I see Tatiana has raised her hand. Tatiana, come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Tatiana Tropina speaking. While my suggestion would be a very strict moderation. Like for example for my item I can promise to keep it short and clean and no more than four minutes and then there would be six minutes last for the questions.

I would suggest also that for the board the rather open community questions then let them speak for 10 minutes themselves, you know, what I mean, and so on. So maybe we will just give short like two, three, no more than five minutes introduction and then gather the feedback for each item.

But we will need a very strict moderation for this. Otherwise I don't know how to combine these. I mean, we cannot do discussion on it because we do have to present the progress we made and it's just a great progress. On the other hand we cannot make it (unintelligible) and just talk, talk, talk.

So if you can moderate this. And I think you can, I think it wouldn't be a big problem. Well it would be intense but still bearable, manageable. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: That's great, if the group gives me a mandate to moderate tightly I can do that. But that might then result in that we only get people to ask questions and a question we will then be fine as one sentence with a question mark at the end instead of a statement of five minutes. So I can try to do that and then we can do it like that. Anyone else any other way we can do this?

Well one thing that might help as well is that we got the working session on Wednesday so we do not need to plan our upcoming work. And I'm really happy about that so this is what we present, we can gather input from other people who are interested or that haven't followed the work closely. And then on Wednesday on our joint working session we can evaluate what we have heard and what we think would be effective to do up to the next meeting. So that should make it also a bit more efficient.

So are there any other points on this? Oh yeah, that's also very good the point that Tatiana is making in the chat that if people want to have specific discussions on a particular issue we can also pick those up in the working session. Yeah, very true. And of course one on one after the session.

Jeremy is indeed coming to Marrakesh, Robin, and he is presenting the intermediary liability work there.

And this is - this was also an experiment for the intermediary liability work. And we might also see whether we want to do a larger session on that on the Manila principles, but it might also be interesting to do that with the registries and registrars and/or ISPs. So I hope that with Jeremy we can look into that and see if we have - if we can get that discussion going with Michele and others. And this is then like a bit of a trial to see if this works. Yeah, no, yeah, the registries and registrars. So I think we should try to ping Michele and get them. Very good.

So I hope that we can then - because it's too soon for Markus but let's sit with a small group together with Jeremy in Marrakesh and try to then or make a deal with the registries and registrars, maybe even ISPs, to do something for that for the next meeting, what about that? Okay so that is my first to do. I will initiate a thread on that - on the list.

Great. So if there are no extra points for this agenda - oh yeah, what I forgot to tell that Marilia Maciel and Stefania Milan told me they couldn't make it unfortunately. Marilia is of course at the NETmundial initiative meeting. But she of course sent her overview and I'm greatly - we can expect new visualizations to appear before the Marrakesh meeting so I'm quite thrilled about that.

So let's go to the third point and that's the discussion about agenda and presentation for the GAC Human - Working Group on Human Rights and International Law and the Cross Community Working Party and Human Rights joint session.

Because we probably do not want to present all the work we've done in such depth as we're doing in our own session because we want space for

discussion. So I would like to hear from you how you think we should go about the session, what we should present and in what format. Matthew, come in.

Matthew Shears: Yeah, Niels, thanks. To what degree - I'm sorry if I - I just don't know this - to what degree is this group in communication or apprised of the work of the GAC group? Is there an ongoing conversation or do we know what they're working on at the moment, for example? Because that might shape some of the - at least some of the initial parts of that meeting kind of updating and understanding where the two parties are and then figuring out if there are any areas of commonality we can work on. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Thanks, Matthew. So Tatiana, come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Hi. Tatiana Tropina speaking. Actually I also had a question rather than like (unintelligible) question rather than any suggestion. What is the format of this meeting? Is it kind of more discussion or more update, presentation? And how many of us, of this group, are going to be there, I mean, to present this kind of panel discussion. So what is the format? Because I'm looking at this blank page and honestly I have no idea. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Yeah, so what the - the GAC working group has done up to now is that - is that they just organized a - came up with the terms of reference for their work and that's what they agreed on. And that's been the activity they've been engaged in thus far. And so as far as I know that's the work that they have been doing and they have been looking with great interest to the work that we've been doing.

And especially of course (Toncio) has been very active on this list as well so he's following but we cannot expect everyone on the GAC working group to

be following that closely. So we'll need to give an overview but what I would like to do is show the diversity and the richness of our group instead of just having me talking to that group. So to make it perhaps a bit more concrete, is that I would like to ask perhaps some of you to join me on stage and - at the panel so that we can show that we're a diverse group of people doing diverse work and showcase that shortly but to the GAC working group. And if so who of you would be interested in doing so?

Right, Tatiana.

Tatiana Tropina: Hi. Tatiana Tropina speaking again. That's what I thought so maybe if there is a panel just yet instead of one person speaking like you, you would just give the floor to three or four of us to show what we have done, where we are now, what we are planning like the work of the subgroups, CCWG Accountability process and so on. So no more than one or two minutes of overview but they will get an idea maybe. And we will also show how great we are and maybe that we are faster and more broad in our work, you know, like an incentive to join us. Thanks .

Niels ten Oever: Yeah, that's indeed great. So I think also if we can show that we have a good gender balance and geographical diversity in the group I think it would be great if we maybe I should just call out some volunteers and see if people would be willing and interested to join me on stage? People be okay with that? Yeah, Tatiana, would you join? It would be great to have Marilia as well, maybe Motoko can join and Aarti.

I do not hear any complaints. Motoko, would you also be okay with that?

Motoko Aizawa: Yes, Niels, thanks. This is Motoko. I would be happy to do that.

Niels ten Oever: That's great. I'm really happy with that. What I then propose is that I'm going to ask for all the subgroups to send me their presentations for the CCWPHR open session. And then we'll try to make a bit of a condensed version of that for the GAC human rights and international law joint session. And then we'll present that together and we'll divide the slides. Would that be okay? Does that seem like a useful approach?

And then let's try to keep our presentation within 10 minutes so perhaps Tatiana can talk a bit about (unintelligible) CCWG, and Motoko can talk about the human rights impact assessment of Subgroup 3. Marilia can talk about the PDP and individualization. And Aarti can talk about some specific cases to make it really concrete, would that work?

Motoko Aizawa: Niels, this is Motoko. May I come in?

Niels ten Oever: Please, come in.

Motoko Aizawa: Thank you. It would be really helpful if we - if (unintelligible) information about our - few points of our presentation so that we complement each other and we don't overlap. And possibly streamline some of the things that we would be saying. I think I would benefit from that (unintelligible). Thank you.

Niels ten Oever: That's great. I will do that. So I will - so we will use this - I will put out two requests. One is for every subgroup to come up with a presentation which is a bit longer, and also with a shorter one for the specific cases that we can then jointly present at the GAC working group. And I'll (unintelligible) all for your own little sub part to prepare that and then we'll merge it in a separate email. So I propose we go at it like that.



And if there are no objections to that then we also have that part covered. So we can move on to point 4. And that is a bit broader discussion about the strategy and tactics that we can follow and work on during ICANN 55 in working on human rights.

I thought about different approaches like working on the board position. I just also suggested in for the meeting of the NCSG with the board we ask some questions to the board about the human rights statements that they signaled that they would come out with. But what are other things we could do?

Oh, Tatiana asked me if there are updates on the board statements? After we send the suggestions language and apart from a thank you from the board we did not hear back from them. So that's still to be seen.

Aarti, come in.

Aarti Bhavana: Hi, Niels. Can you hear me?

Niels ten Oever: Yes, we hear you loud and clear.

Aarti Bhavana: Okay. I was just wondering that a couple of issues were raised during CCWG Accountability Work Stream 1 so apart from the board concerns also some people did raise concerns about, you know, whether human rights should be included within the bylaws or whether they belong in some other part of the ICANN document. So I was just wondering whether, you know, we could even address those concerns so that we're approaching it from the (unintelligible) just focusing on the board's concerns we are focusing on everyone's concerns.

Niels ten Oever: Good point, Aarti. Tatiana, come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh yes. Thank you, Aarti. I think it's a very good point and I was going to also highlight this in this presentation in this public session because I think that we have to understand that we are addressing not only board concern in Work Stream 1 or Work Stream 2 we are trying to address everyone's concerns.

And (unintelligible) have a comment about discussion and possible strategies about CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 but I don't know, is it too early to talk about this now? Shall I talk about later point or have a discussion this now already?

Niels ten Oever: Yes, we're discussing this now already so that...

((Crosstalk))

Tatiana Tropina: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Niels ten Oever: ...want to ensure maybe to have a bit more framing for this discussion is that I would like us not only to work together during the sessions that we have but also outside of that that we coordinate our work and that we work as effectively as we can. So it would be interesting to hear what different approaches people think we should include and also learn from the people who have been ICANN veterans like Robin and Matthew that coach us on approaches that could be effective as well as (unintelligible).

Tatiana Tropina: Well should I then - I will leave my intervention for a later point. I think it might be better at a later point. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: No, go ahead. Go ahead.

Tatiana Tropina: Well now, I was just thinking that the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 item in future the possible strategies requires really great attention because I don't believe that we can do it in a CCWT all the work, you know, to be credible in this really we have to engage the broader community and we will have to work at the CCWG Accountability at the Work Stream 2.

And one of my points I think, I discussed it already with several people were somewhere on the mailing list, I don't remember, is that we have to make sure that we will not get additional group for this. I would really like to highlight that this human rights work of Work Stream 2 should be a part of broader group because I'm just afraid that otherwise we will get marginalized and it wouldn't be great if we just have something additional. We have to work with the broader community and in a broader context.

And in this sense if we are discussing a possible strategy we will always have to think about this engagement and awareness (unintelligible). Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: That's great, Tatiana. And to give a bit of context for people who haven't followed it very closely this is about Work Stream 2 which is the following part of Cross Community Working Group on Accountability. And there was the option to set up a separate workgroup for human rights or we could integrate it with the whole Work Stream 2. And Tatiana is opting for it to integrate it - to have it integrated in the whole package so the interest in the work on it remains. So that's a good point.

And there is a specific session allocated on Thursday from 9:00 to 12:00 about the formatting of Work Stream 2. I think Friday we will - at the pre-meeting

for the face-to-face for the CCWG we will also already be talking about that and that's definitely a good point to take with us. And also to reinforce in our meeting with the cchairs when we come to our session. That's great.

I would also like to stress the importance and also the point of convergence on the human rights impact assessment. Motoko has been doing some great work on that with (Lucy) and also input from others. And maybe Motoko can talk a bit about it and how it concretely will help us forward because then it builds on the report that we have been doing in the past and also gives us a very clear structure for the future. So, Motoko, could you also please help us a bit what argument and tactic we might follow to push for that and to what greater gain.

Motoko Aizawa: Thank you, Niels. This is Motoko for the record. As Niels mentioned what we are doing is to build on the work that was already done for Dublin which looks at only the process of ICANN's (unintelligible) development but it became very clear that there are multiple other areas that need scoping. And as a result, there has been a more willingness I think from different stakeholders to look at the process of ICANN's corporate level human rights impact though an HRIA or human rights impact assessment process.

So I do have a paper on that. It is with Niels at the moment. It's (unintelligible) all of you shortly. You will see that (unintelligible) propose including the process of collecting data. And some of you have already seen the questionnaire that has been circulating. And there is a Google doc that (Lucy) has started to populate with some of the documents that are already available on ICANN's Website.

And the more we can populate that questionnaire so that we have a fuller understanding of ICANN's operations that would help with the subsequent phases of the human rights impact assessment. So the first phase obviously is

the scoping and preparation. The second phase would be to look at the information that got collected and to actually contract out with international human rights standards and principles, interview some experts so that we have a proper human rights context of issues that are going to be raised by the questionnaire.

The next phase would be impacts analysis followed by impacts management so that's where we get to sync hopefully with management - ICANN management and the board about what specifically they can do about some of our identified impacts.

I also propose that we build in a phase of building our human rights policy for ICANN. This is something that was proposed in the Dublin paper. And considering that discussion with the bylaws for the human rights statement, which is a good one, essentially ICANN is going to be ready for a fuller human rights policy.

So that stuff is built in and the final phase is about reporting and monitoring our progress of ICANN management, and the board's incorporating the results of the human rights impact assessments and incorporating the respondents in various functional areas of their management.

So that is the process going forward that we are proposing and because it's involved it has to involve ICANN management. It has to involve the board. We have to have iterative conversations.

I think that the Marrakech meeting will give us an opportunity to explore where exactly that works and fits within ICANN and the community as a whole.

And there have been some suggestions about potentially the management owning it, potentially the board owning it, potentially the community owning it and obviously the other option is for the Cross Community Working Parties to continue to push the work.

And so there are these different scenarios that are - that should be discussed in an open way with a - lots of stakeholder inputs in the process. Thank you (Niels).

Niels ten Oever: That's a great overview Motoko and I just forwarded the work that we've done in Subgroup 3 to the list, and I will also print that for - in Buenos Aires and we'll have something nice to show to people that work from the Cross Community Working Party and I also - my end it's also on the screen right now.

While that's loading on the screen I also see that Matthew had some comments, and even though I greatly value the discussion in the chat I would love to have discussions in voice. So Matthew come in and voice your concerns and maybe let's get together. We can devise a good strategy for this.

Matthew Shears: Hi Niels. Okay so this is just a general note of caution I guess. We have to be - there was already I think a little bit of concern about the degree to which workstreams is going to be undertaken and there's a lot riding on Workstream 2 for us in terms of human rights, particularly things like board commitments and getting the rest of the - keeping the rest of the community on board.

We just have to be really careful that we don't - how should I say this - that we don't get too far ahead of ourselves without bringing the rest of the community along.

If we show that there is significant scope and scale to the way human rights impact assessments and other things can be implemented in ICANN I wouldn't want to see that - and hopefully it wouldn't be the case.

But I wouldn't want to see that in any way deter or get in the way of bringing the rest of the community along. So I just think we need to be careful about how much we communicate the potential demands that this - that the work that the working - the subgroups are doing and the potential demands on ICANN the Corporation, ICANN staff, et cetera, et cetera.

We just need to bear that in mind as we're kind of unrolling - strategically unrolling and talking about and eventually hopefully implementing the work that this working party needs to do.

We need to make sure that we - it's fully in sync and works to our advantage vis-à-vis the Workstream 2 work. I hope that was not too cryptic. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Great point Matthew. Words of wisdom. Tatiana come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh I would like to thank Matt for this intervention because I have been talking exactly about this in the Subgroup 3 of this working group. I don't think that we have to get that far ahead without including the broader community.

They always have to keep in mind that Workstream 2 would be community exercise, not CCWP HR exercise. And while we still contribute as much as we can we always have to bear in mind that each step we have to verify with the community, and we have to see the demands and we have to get more broader community involved in everything we are developing for the Workstream 2.

And I fully support Matthew that we shouldn't go too much ahead of ourselves or we might shoot ourselves in our own foot I think so thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Very good point. And how do you - then (Jason) let me ask the question back. How do you think that we can best input this to the board and to Workstream 2, because what will happen in Workstream 2 is the development of a framework of interpretation?

But first I imagine we'll have a discussion about what the framework of interpretation will be. The board is also thinking about what it should do so what do you think our message should be?

Is it like we got here beautiful input for Workstream 2 or this is how you can think of it? Or how do you think - what would be the best angle and the best frame?

Vidushi Marda: Niels I'm not sure you can hear me.

Niels ten Oever: Yes we hear you loud and clear. Come in Vidushi.

Vidushi Marda: Hi. Hi. This is Vidushi Marda for the record. Sorry I haven't been able to say anything because I do not have any (unintelligible) on my phone. So I can continue with the chat - anything.

But before asking a question it is - I think it might be a good idea for us to come up with maybe a document together, you know, from our meetings to give an idea of what we can work through and it should look like.

And I see in terms of, you know, the commitment from the board and the framework of interpretation I think it might be useful at the end of all our



meetings to come up with just one document with these are the things that we think should happen, and these are also the things for how you can think about it and how you can implement them.

And - because I think that would give a much clearer sense than anything else. So maybe just a framework that we think will work well and also an input on how to achieve it.

Niels ten Oever: Very good. Very good Vidushi. Thanks. Thanks. Thanks a lot indeed. So I think there are now what I see in the chat and what Vidushi is saying is that we - that we need to map out how - what Workstream 2 will look like, how out inputs into that will shape.

Would it then perhaps help if we framed a document that's now on the screen as a possible working model for Workstream 2? Would that make sense?  
Tatiana come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Well I really think that we are going too far ahead now. I think we do have to wait till the third discussion for the Workstream 2. And my idea was in addition to what Matt wrote in the chat about mapping the activities and seeing how they're matching, I also think that in terms of what we already have and what we are doing we can always build it into the discussions of the Workstream 2 like saying, "Well look we have this knowledge already."

Or we can suggest this and that. I mean, they can always do some work but adjust it Workstream 2 according to their discussion if you know what I mean.

It's not necessary for us just to come like, "Oh, you know, we have just done that. Just take it." No. We have to listen to what people say. We have to adjust ourselves and we have to propose in kind of timely manner, you know.

So this is just my idea. In addition to strategical planning we can always adjust ourselves and what we have to the discussions of the Workstream 2, because we don't know how the things will go there, who will join, who would be interested, what would be the voices, what they would be up for, how they will interpret what framework interpretation is as you already pointed out.

So let's wait and see. I know that we are impatient but in this case we do have to be patient somehow. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Great. Great. Yes that's a good point and that - that's indeed a better thing just like - I see Matthew hands is up. Matthew come in.

Matthew Shears: Yes just to reinforce what Tatiana is saying I think what - we need to do the work and we need to break it down into almost, you know, like chapter by chapter bite size pieces so that when there is an opportunity for those pieces of work to be inserted then we need to do so.

At the end of the day as we found out in the CCWG its whoever has the pen and whoever is ready to come forward with proposal tends to win the day or at least in the beginning.

But I think that putting too much out there could be counterproductive, but being ready with all the various pieces of our puzzle to insert them at the right time I think would be strategically wise.

James Gannon: Sorry Neils can I jump in as well? I'm already on the phone bridge.

((Crosstalk))

Niels ten Oever: Oh sorry. James how - yes of course you can always come in.

James Gannon: Thanks. So it's James Gannon. I just wanted to put in the additional points and support what Matt is saying. So the way that I expect Workstream 2 to be run is going to be very, very tight from a cost management and a project management point of view because ICANN is very worried about how expensive Workstream 2 is going to be.

So following up on what Matt was saying is if you guys can have, you know, packets essentially ready to go that can be inserted and deliberated on quickly and close out quickly I think that would be very, very welcome from a - an organizational point of view for the way that Workstream 2 is likely to run.

Niels ten Oever: So I think what - you people are saying that we should not go big on the printing. We present this right now as work that we've been working on in our public session in the working group.

And if - and we can use the document in informal conversations, and then later as a specific document during the process of decision-making and deliberation in Workstream 2. Does that summarize your thoughts and comments a bit? Tatiana come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh well I suggest that as far - it is recent then adjust weekly if it doesn't work.

Niels ten Oever: Perfect. Motoko you are the person who is most experienced with implementing and developing human rights policies for organizations. Do you also think this sounds like a wiser pose, or are we conservative or are we too offensive or are we making an important part of the puzzle?

Motoko Aizawa: Thanks Neils. I think we don't have enough information about other parts of the creative work on human rights. And I do agree that we should not get ahead of ourselves and somehow end up shooting ourselves in the foot in the process.

So I am perfectly happy to - for us to take a more conservative approach and to offer what we have and not impose I guess our work output and knowledge on others.

So I'm happy to go along with the efforts suggested by James and Matthew and others. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Great. So we seem to have achieved consensus on that. Thanks so much to all for that great input. Maryam can you put the previous slides on again? So now we've had some strategizing on the board position, on the CCWG too and the human rights impact assessment.

I think we will use a lot of our material for awareness raising. I think the visibility of the human rights discussion is very important. Are there things that we have missed or that other people might think we should be looking at?

I was very happy to see for instance attention for the law enforcement sessions. I think those are definitely relevant and I think we really should try to be there as well. Tatiana come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh isn't law enforcement's session overriding with the - with our session?

Niels ten Oever: Yes that is true.

Tatiana Tropina: I would like to go there because it's exactly my neck of woods, you know, but I think I cannot.

Niels ten Oever: Yes. Yes.

Tatiana Tropina: We have to have someone there but how it's going to work in practice I have no idea. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Yes that's - yes. No I agree. That really was indeed saddening to see that happening. Do people think that it would be interesting or wise or unwise to have some attention for the human rights situation in Morocco where it's - currently people are under investigations or work on Internet freedom, or should we rather leave this to another forum? James come in.

James Gannon: Need to unmute myself. Sorry. Okay my two cents and this is from somebody who is not really involved in human rights work. I would think that it would probably be counterproductive.

And supporting that issue around the meeting I think is very good, and it's certainly something that can be leveraged due to the fact that we as ICANN participants, you know, are aware of the issue and, you know, we do not agree with it.

Or bringing it inside into ICANN workstreams and even into, you know, specifically targeted ICANN meeting agendas I think may end up being counterproductive.

And that's not to say that it's not a valid issue and it's not to say that it's not the issue that we shouldn't be discussing. But I would wonder whether we

would actually devalue more that issue by bringing it into something like the working sessions.

Niels ten Oever: Okay that's very clear. Thanks. Thanks James. Matthew?

Matthew Shears: Yes kind of along the same lines I would - I wouldn't mix the two. But that being said it's incredibly important that we do in some form or another highlight human rights issues in Morocco.

And preferably that would be led by local human rights activists with our support but I think the two - this work that we're talking about now and that issue should be distinct, but we definitely do need to support and work with local human rights activists. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: That's very clear Matthew. Tatiana?

Tatiana Tropina: Oh well two points. First of all I think there was already a discussion about this on the NCSG list, and I think the conclusion was exactly what James and Matthew have just voiced.

And secondly, I do think that we are the Cross Community Working Party on human rights for the ICANN and not Cross Community Working Party advocacy for human rights and freedom wherever.

And while we are all advocating for human rights and we all have this in our agenda I agree that let's not mix these two. If human rights advocates in Morocco can contribute to the work of the ICANN and human rights here welcome.

But politicize our own agenda - I think it's the way to get marginalized in the ICANN so I don't find it's really good idea. Let's keep the balance. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Okay so also the Cross Community Working Party will stay with its own narrow scope and missions. Very good. And I just wanted to flag this because this might be something that come up and I would like to have us - a - have - develop a statement about this that we all share.

So - and it seems we have pretty much consensus about this so if everyone is okay with that then I'll continue to the next point, but not without going to Matthew because he had his hand up and that was an old hand.

Perfect. So we'll go to our almost final point and that is a short review of the proposed agenda for the Cross Community Working Party on human rights working session.

We'll do welcome and introductions, evaluate the output and other so are we satisfied in what we came up with? Did we use enough - the outputs that we already have had?

And then the next point I would like to evaluate - working message is the mailing list the call - the confluence wiki supporting your work sufficiently or do you think we could help you become more effective in other ways?

And 4 is set up a work plan for the coming weary periods. What do we want to do? Where should our attention be and then the decision of work that they do?

We ask the people to do the work. Who needs support and what can we do and what is - what's realistic? And then finally a planning of the calls to

ensure that we're in the right time zones and the right dates and everyone can participate. Is there something missing? James come in.

James Gannon: Thanks Neils. James Gannon. Not something missing but I want to make an observation as somebody who is actually quite interested in the work that you guys are doing, but I haven't had the bandwidth to get involved.

I don't think you're selling yourself enough to the larger crowd. And I think something like a monthly or a, you know, once every two months update on what you guys are doing as to the larger community would actually be a good thing, because any time I've had the time to look in on what you are doing it's really, really amazing work and it's possibly some of the most professional and organized work that I've seen in ICANN in two or three years I've been around.

But I don't think that that is being noticed by the broader ICANN community and I think that you really should look at trying - communicating the work that you're doing on a broader platform to maybe not just the people who have, you know, looked in and have started getting interested in this but the, you know, the people who might not even know that the CCWP is going and doing the work that you guys are doing.

So a bit of a salesmanship ego mightn't go astray because I think you guys are actually doing really, really good work.

Niels ten Oever: Thanks James and can I quickly ask where do you think - what would you think would be the ideal channel for this? Where do you think we should advertise this?



James Gannon: Well from looking at the makeup of the CCWP I think you guys have, you know, not representatives but, you know, input from most if not all of the constituencies and SOs and ACs.

So even if you produce a, you know, a half page or a one page, "Here's what we're doing. Look at the work we've done," I'd ask people in the various constituencies and communities to circulate that on their lists and their discussion areas. I think even something as simple as that could be really, really valuable.

Niels ten Oever: I'm going - ask that already as a point for the work plan for the upcoming period for the - because I think it's a great idea. Thank you very much James. Really good stuff.

Yes because by that way we can leverage the work more that we've been doing so it's good. Tatiana come in.

Tatiana Tropina: Oh I would like to thank James for pointing this out because I totally agree with him. I talked to several people who I thought could really contribute to the work of this group at the ICANN and they all told me, "Oh, you know, what?

Human rights? Oh this narrow - this was the narrow approach of Cross Community Working Party. Oh what are you actually doing?" We are trying to stay away from narrow focus groups, so we do have to explain people that we are actually quite broad focus group and that we are doing things here and there.

And also I think that it's not only about advertising and selling ourselves, you know, kind of with carpet bomber, you know, targeted advertisement. I think

we have to talk to people and I think we have to identify whom we can talk to, whom we can convince to join or whom we can convince to spread information so a kind of targeted sell, you know. Thanks.

Niels ten Oever: Great. This all sounds like music to my ears to I think we'll have a whole point of discussion about communications on our - as part of our - the work discussion at the working sessions. Just added them. That's great.

So that leaves me to - only to our last point on any other business. Does anyone else have a point? I have a point and my point is I would like to thank (Stacy Wolf) for improving the forms of the roadmap. That's great.

Does anyone else have a point they would like to bring up? If not then hereby I'd like to end and remind everyone it will be great to engage in their subgroup to create the presentations for the meeting.

As soon as possible I'd like to stimulate Aarti, Marilia, Tatiana, Motoko and myself to work on the presentation for the GAC's Working Group when we're writing international law and CCWP HR joint sessions.

And I'll initiate a discussion on the list about intermediary liability of the Registries and Registrars. I would like to thank you all for participating in this call.

I wish you a very joyful weekend and as always I'd like to thank the staff for their excellent support. And hereby I'd like to end the recording. Bye all.

END