

# 2022-08-31 CCOICI - Meeting #26

The call will take place on **Wednesday, 31 August 2022 at 12:00 UTC for 60 minutes.**

For other places see: <https://tinyurl.com/ycy3azth>



## PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Working Group Self-Assessment Recommendations Report & Public Comment (see attached)
  - a. Any further comments / suggestions?
  - b. Proposed date to launch public comment 7 September (with sufficient time to accommodate ICANN75)
3. WS2 Recommendation #3 - Recommendation for a Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights– Continue Deliberations(see <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zuQVN4zbz4zBYIZM4Mtfac7lj2j2dlNa/edit#docs.google.com>] and <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/202703211/Decision%20tree%20-%20WS2%20Rec%20%233%20-%202%20Augustus%202022.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1660596360882&api=v2>)
  - a. Review input on "Initial Deliberations – Draft findings / possible recommendations[docs.google.com]"
  - b. CCOICI input
  - c. Confirm next steps
4. Confirm next steps & next meeting

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

[CCOICI Proposed Updates WGS - 7 February 2021.docx](#)

[GNSO Operating Procedures - public-comment-open-proceeding-template-26 Aug 2022.docx](#)



## PARTICIPATION

**Apologies:** Antonia Chu

[CRM Attendance](#)



## RECORDINGS

[Audio Recording](#)

[Zoom Recording](#) (including audio, visual, rough transcript and chat)

GNSO transcripts are located on the [GNSO Calendar](#)



## Notes/ Action Items

### HOMEWORK/ACTION ITEMS:

1. Staff will cancel the meeting on 14 September and send out a Doodle poll to schedule an informal meeting with Ephraim Percy Kenyanito at ICANN75 in Kuala Lumpur.
2. Staff will schedule the usual meeting two weeks after ICANN75.

### Notes:

1. Welcome
2. Working Group Self-Assessment Recommendations Report & Public Comment (see attached)
  - a. Any further comments / suggestions?
  - b. Proposed date to launch public comment 7 September (with sufficient time to accommodate ICANN75)
    - Reminder that we are ready to launch the public comment forum on the proposed changes to the WG Self-Assessment. We were waiting to combine the changes for those proposed by the SOI TF. Also includes minor corrections and reference updates.
    - Publish before ICANN75 to allow people to discuss with their groups and share their feedback.
    - Allow sufficient time after ICANN75 to allow time for travel before closing the public comment period.
    - Used the Self-Assessment for a recently closed group and asked for feedback – will incorporate that with the comments received in the forum for the CCOICI to review once the forum is closed.
    - The CCOICI previously reviewed these documents, but if Group members have any further comments, they may provide then no later than the end of this week.

3. WS2 Recommendation #3 - Recommendation for a Framework of Interpretation for Human Rights – Continue Deliberations (see <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zuQVN4zbz4zBYIZM4Mtfac7lj2j2dlNa/edit#> [docs.google.com] and <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/202703211/Decision%20tree%20-%20WS2%20Rec%20%233%20-%202%20Augustus%202022.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1660596360882&api=v2>)

a. Review input on “Initial Deliberations – Draft findings / possible recommendations [docs.google.com]”

- Should be an early check when a PDP is requested/Issue Report – as well as asking in the subsequent steps of the PDP.
- Questions for the group: what does that analysis look like in practice? How detailed should that assessment be? Would this analysis be done at each point in the PDP reporting process? Who makes that decision and how much resource to devote to this analysis?

b. CCOICI input

Information from Thomas Rickert: I was connected to Ephraim Kenyanito, the chair of the ICANN Cross-Community Working Party on Human Rights (CCWP-HR), which has been working to develop HRIAs for ICANN PDPs and SOs/ACs. The analysis sent by Bruno Santos (attached) also contains an impact assessment starting on p29. That sheet can also be found at the link copied below. <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1WRHPWPtaK8Xc2IXtfA3MVOcprHsVVA9M6J8eUQH5UyA/edit#gid=8463347> [docs.google.com]). Ephraim was also kind enough to outline the process:

Hi Thomas.

Just to follow up on the process, I will be happy to set up a one on one call to explain further but in brief, when it comes to the HRIAs for PDPs/ODPs this is the procedure that we followed:

The CCWP-HR identified the PDP for analysis.

The team was assembled.

The team cross checked the excel template to see its fitness for purpose.

The volunteer HRIA team primarily analysed the recommendations and compared it with ICANN By Law on Human Rights and FOI-HR, shared spreadsheet aimed at simplifying the process.

Please let me know your availability for a quick call and we can then use the session for me to answer any questions and explore collaboration opportunities. (Additionally, I will be at ICANN 75 and we can also plan a face to face discussion then).

I look forward to further engagements with you.

Best Regards,

Ephraim Percy Kenyanito

Discussion:

- Re: Timing – look at other assessments that may need to be conducted.
- May not be required for some PDPs, such as Transfer Policy, that are purely operational.
- Could include results of an assessment in the Final Report.
- The question of whether Council has to decide which PDP might impact HR, wonder if the Council has the expertise to make this evaluation. If Council has to do this it could develop a working party to be consulted – perhaps like a standing committee.
- Thomas Rickert: Suggest we could ask Ephraim to speak to us.
- Consider with taking a staggered approach with some lean questions to begin, and ask for comment in the public comment forum on the Initial Report. Then go into a more in-depth analysis if warranted by the input in the forum.
- The request for an Issue Report already asked for the submitter to provide information on various impacts. Could start with that. Could have a question as to whether the PDP/Issue is linked to a list of human rights to be answered as part of the Initial Report.
- Staff researched how other organizations do these assessments – looked at the EU Commission and there was analysis only when it was anticipated to be an impact at a macro or micro level – that is, significant impact that might require further work. See: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/file\\_import/better-regulation-toolbox-9\\_en\\_0.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/file_import/better-regulation-toolbox-9_en_0.pdf)
- Could try to set up meeting at KL. Note however that the sign up rooms do not have any services—so those that are not in-person would not be able to participate. We can definitely put the CCOICI request on our list! Sign-up room availability is not posted yet.

c. Confirm next steps (see below)

4. Confirm next steps & next meeting

- Next meeting is scheduled for 14 September.
- Instead try to schedule an informal in KL. Note however that the sign up rooms do not have any services—so those that are not in-person would not be able to participate. We can definitely put the CCOICI request on our list! Sign-up room availability is not posted yet.
- Staff to share the draft CCOICI report and add the discussions on the HRIA later.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

1. Staff will cancel the meeting on 14 September and send out a Doodle poll to schedule an informal meeting with Ephraim Percy Kenyanito at ICANN75 in Kuala Lumpur.
2. Staff will schedule the usual meeting two weeks after ICANN75.