
ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: CCWP on ICANN and Human Rights
Thursday, September 22, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 KUL

ANDREA GLANDON: Hi, Stephanie. We have not started yet, so that's why you're not hearing anything.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Oh, good. Thanks.

ANDREA GLANDON: You're welcome. This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hello and welcome to the CCWP and ICANN and Human Rights session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand.

When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

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

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. for example, a first name and last name or a surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Ephraim. You may begin.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Yes. I’m very excited to be here and welcome everyone. I would like to ask that we start introducing ourselves, maybe from my left. Yes. You can just say your name.

JEAN QUERALT: Hi, Jean Queralt from the IO Foundation for the record, based in Malaysia. We’ve been working on business and human rights in the tech sector in the context of Malaysia for the past four years and helping all that we could with the preparation of the National Action Plan.

MANJU CHEN: My name is Manju Chen. I’m part of NCSG. I’m also representing NCSG on the GNSO Council.

JULF HELSINGIUS: Julf Helsingius, Chair of the Non-Commercials.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Kathy Kleiman, NCUC and NCSG. And I want to thank Ephraim for really preparing and for pushing us ahead on this issue. It's really important. Thank you.

DAVID CAKE: David Cake, NCUC and NCSG.

RAOUL PLOMMER: Raoul Plommer, NPOC Chair.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Good afternoon. My name is Benjamin Akinomoyeje, NCUC Chair. Thank you.

MESUMBE TOMSLIN: Tomslin, NCSG Councilor. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good afternoon, my name is [inaudible]. I am a fellow. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, everyone. I'm [Ganina], ICANN 75 fellow from Venezuela. This is my first meeting in person in ICANN. In Venezuela I work with a lot of human rights organizations in data and security.

AVRI DORIA: I'm Avri Doria, an inactive NCSG member, currently member of the ICANN Board and long interested in seeing things like human rights impact [inaudible]. Thanks.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thank you so much. Maybe those who are far if they want to join the table, please do. You can feel free to introduce yourself. In the meantime, I'm going to start.

My name is Ephraim Percy Kenyanito for the record. I'm very excited to welcome us to the September 2020 meeting. We had a meeting earlier this year and I'm trying to make sure that we revive the group to make it more active.

Since the pandemic started or towards the end of 2019, the group has been a bit slow so we are trying to revive the momentum, so thank you so much for those who are here. I don't know if there are people who are online. Maybe they can introduce themselves. For those who are online, maybe they can introduce themselves.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes. For our online participants, if you would like to open your mic and introduce yourself.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi, this is Stephanie Perrin for the record. I don't know how to describe myself. I'm a long-time member of NCSG. Well, not long time. Nine years. My background is in data protection predominately. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Gopal, go ahead. Your line is open. Your hand is up. You can introduce yourself.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. This is Gopal. I teach computer science at Anna University, Chennai, India. I am a [inaudible] individual member of APRALO and been involved with ICANN in several forums. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. And Stephen, your hand is up. Go ahead.

STEPHEN DAKYI: I'm Stephan Dakyi from Accra, Ghana. I'm a new member of the group and I'm the founder and director of DABY Foundation, an organization that [inaudible] child protection and getting kids involved in [inaudible]. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. And before the next person introduces themselves, just a reminder for those in the room to also log into the Zoom. There is some chat there for everyone to look at. Go ahead if the next person wants to introduce themselves from the remote.

[MARIAN]: Hello, everyone. My name is [Marian]. I'm from [inaudible] Foundation. Also from Malaysia. As Jean mentioned, we worked on the business and

human rights National Action Plan in Malaysia for the tech sector.
Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. Flavio, I have your hand up.

FLAVIO WAGNER: Sorry, I was muted. Flavio Wagner from Brazil. A member of NCSG.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. And the next online participant, if you would like to introduce yourself.

DAVID LAWRENCE: Hi, it's David Lawrence, integrated architect at Salesforce and IETF participant and working group co-chair.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. And another online participant, you can go ahead and introduce yourself. I think that might be all for now if you want to continue, Ephraim.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thank you so much. Was it David from Salesforce who [inaudible] to be a co-chair? I'd be very happy, actually. It's a different working group.

DAVID LAWRENCE: It's not the HRPC Working Group, no. It's the Adapted Discovery Working Group, which has worked on the encrypted DNS lookups.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Okay. I was hoping you were going to volunteer because that's the third agenda item. But there is a [inaudible] that was going to join us sometime. The moment she joins, Andrea, feel free to add them. [inaudible] from the GAC International Human Rights [inaudible] Working Group. We're just chatting right now and she was having trouble signing in but she's trying to sign in.

So that's on the introduction and setting the scene. We're going to go to the next agenda item, updates on action items. For those who have been following the meetings that we've been having, we've been trying to have as much as possible, maybe one meeting every quarter or one meeting every half a year, just to touch base and to discuss online.

Given the last two quarters, we had two big items which are following CCWP. So the first bit was doing an attempted HRIA at the SSAD recommendations and the PDP Phase 2, which we did. Maybe Andrea can open the link to that page.

So, you can see we sent this to the Board in July and you can just go until the page where the [inaudible] starts. You can just use the other side of the [inaudible]. No, just keep going. Almost around page 30 or 35. Yes, there.

So, as you can see, we tried to look at impacted groups, the type of human rights that impacts them, the severity of the impacts, the scale,

positive, negative, among others. So this was a lot of work which took so many months to work on and this report, we shared with the Board and ICANN Org and we got feedback just actually this week, two days ago, and basically agreed with us whereby they said it's important, this work that you're doing, but then beginning it at the end does not solve the problems. We need to start from the beginning. We need to solve the problems once the PDP has been conceived. That's when we need to figure out is there a need for an HRIA then and what are the issues, what is the scope? Then also when an initial report is being issued when a final report. So those three steps are very important.

So this was a test to see how the tool works and we can keep testing the tool, keep improving the tool. So for those who have done human rights impact assessment, you know that tools keep getting improved. It's not just one size fits all. You use it so many times, so many different times and you keep improving the tool.

So this is in compliance with the Framework of Interpretation on human rights. This actually talks about assessment of PDPs trying to assess themselves. So consider how ... So the language of the bylaws is consider how the interpretation and implementation of this bylaw will interact with existing and future ICANN policy and procedures.

And this Framework of Interpretation for collaborative work in the community between community members and Org and the entire community. So it's not just a one size fits all.

So what we have been trying to do is trying to come up with processes and procedures which can be helpful and can be improved by others. So that's on that.

Then the second item on updates is an ICANNLearn course. So this has been up for almost two months, just trying to get feedback. This a course ... Some of you might know. I think it's Benjamin who suggested us coming up with a course on one [inaudible] call last year. So the course is intended to be on ICANNLearn, so tried to look up so many other ICANNLearn courses and tried to look at the format, tried to look at ... So this is something which I've shared on NCSG, NCUC lists. Also shared on ALAC, CPWG list.

There's a few comments on the side which I need to resolve. Basically, it's open for comments. If you click on it, you can comment on any section you think you are not comfortable. It's been open for almost two months. So trying as much possible. You'll see there's comments from [inaudible]. I feel that people ... I just need to resolve those comments as late as August 25th. That's where I've noticed some of this. It was right before ICANN. I thought many people would comment towards this meeting. So it's still up for comment. I would just want us to maybe resolve this let's say by the end of the month these comments. In case there are comments, feel free to add. But I would want as much as possible this to reflect what we think.

It has outcomes, it has a few sections basically introducing what human rights is. Maybe you can go to the course menu. Exactly. It has four mini modules with it. So there's Introduction to ICANN, basically. It is intended to anyone who is onboarding on ICANN. That might be not

very important to this word ICANN, but it is a very ... Know the history behind it. Then Introduction to Human Rights and international human rights law mechanism and how they came aboard, which UN board is, which regional institutions, there [inaudible], African human rights, among others, [inaudible] courts, among others. Then there's the UN Guiding Principles and Basic Human Rights. That's very relevant on this edge. Introduction to how it came about and what it says. Then now the last [inaudible] up altogether. How does ICANN and the DNS and human rights all interact together?

So thanks so much for all those who have given feedback on this course. It's taken a lot of work. It's almost a year, because this course we started developing it last September, I think. So, yes.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Again, I wanted to thank you because you devoted enormous amounts of time to doing this and it's a good course and it take a long time to do these. So, thank you.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Thank you. Yeah. It's been a year of work on this course, specifically. So this course is the one that has been the longest thing that has been going on in the back burner and I would want us to tie it up and get it up now on ICANNLearn as soon as possible so that it can help others because we need to share knowledge with others. We need to be able to keep improving it and it's not their final version. We'll keep improving it. If need be, if time permits, once it's up we'll get more feedback from

people. Maybe something is not easily understandable. We'll keep improving it. That's the aim, for it to be [inaudible].

As you know, for those who conduct ... because I speak at a few schools on Internet governance. For those who speak, you keep improving your curriculum. It's not one size fits all. For example, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, if it's improved in the future to be a treaty—there are current conversations within the UN groups. Some of you have been in [New York] for these conversations, to make it a treaty and not just guiding principles. If that happens, we need to improve and analyze and figure out how it interacts. So how to tie up and add information on treaty among others. So that's on that. We can go back to the agenda.

The next agenda item, new co-chair recruitment and ideas for membership recruitment drive. So, one on membership. This group used to be very vibrant during the time the bylaw was being drafted and the time the Framework of Interpretation was being drafted. If you look at the mailing list, the archives, you'll see a lot of email threads. There was a time even meetings were twice a month, biweekly. The time these two documents were being drafted. So how do we get back momentum? The momentum has kind of slowed down. Once the bylaw was put in place and the framework ... The framework is very good. It has very, very broad ways [inaudible] can be applied. But after that, maybe the momentum died. So we need to figure how to ... Yeah.

Then, second you might know [inaudible] and Austin were co-chairs right before I took on board this beginning of last year. But basically ... Not beginning, actually May last year. So I've been a co-chair since May.

But the same time is the time Austin left because being overwhelmed with other duties. So this is something which we need. I need another co-chair. There are so many ideas.

I was just having this conversation with Kathy about the Framework of Interpretation for seeing two types of HRIAs, because people only see one type of HRIA on PDPs but then there's another ... On page 87 of workstream 2 recommendations, it foresees HRIAs on SOs, ACs, ICANN Org. Basically, it foresees a continuous improvement. It doesn't foresee only one. The language, if I may just reread the language it says, "The policies and framework, if any, that ICANN needs to develop or enhance." So enhancement is continuous improvement. Develop is an initial. And the only way to do it is to do an analysis or a GAP analysis. That's page 87. Don't forget about 87.

Then page 88 of the workstream 2 final recommendations, which the 24th of June, 2018 version, it talks about HRIAs and PDPs. So this is some [inaudible]. Yes?

JEAN QUERALT:

Jean from the IO Foundation. In relation to that recruitment, do you have details on the type of tasks that would be assigned to that co-chair, the deadlines that you have in order to find one, if there's any, and the type of time commitment? Because that will help people to try to at least self-nominate and have a better idea on what their terms of reference.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Yes. So, I foresee the group whether I am there or not as the chair to do, of course, their quarterly check-ins especially now that there's so much work going on compared to 2015 when the bylaw was being drafted, or 14 and 16 and 17 and 18 when the Framework of Interpretation was being drafted. They were meeting twice a month. I foresee maybe once a quarter just to update, but then I foresee intermittent work where the chair, the co-chairs, doing similar to the way we did the HRIA on SSAD and ODA, just shepherding members. Some of you might know that SSAD recommendations, it was done also with another lawyer who is certified in [inaudible] in Europe. Frank.

So, just shepherding members who are volunteers trying to figure out this person is working on this PDP process, which [inaudible] needed, who am I linking them up, these kinds of things. That's the intermittent work in the quarter. But then the real work is working on those assessments trying to just keep improving because the bylaw and the Framework of Interpretation says that this is both an org and an SO/AC and members community driven initiative. It's not just one party.

I've done a letter to Teresa Swineheart. I've done a letter to the Chair of the Board and they say the same thing. They are interested. They want to support. But then the community, we need to take the first step. What is the first step that we need to take? The letters are open on the ICANN correspondence page. So for the [inaudible] I think June or July of 2020. Then for Maarten Botterman is this year July with a response now. So that's the kind of work that I foresee.

The response is the same. Community driven. They want it to be community driven. The Board wants it to be community driven. ICANN

Org says it's community driven. So who in the community? Does this group, the GAC International Human Rights Law Working Group and International Law and Human Rights Working Group? I know [inaudible]. I was just chatting with her, the co-chair of that GAC group. I guess she's joined. You can just let her introduce herself.

Basically, once the bylaw was drafted in 2016, there were two groups which continued to run and continued to have conversations. There's a GAC one—GAC International Law and Human Rights whatever Working Group. It continues to run. They continue to have conversations. The biggest conversation they have been having is on diversity the last two years within themselves.

Then there's now CCWP which is open to the entire community. It's not only to ... It's chartered by NCSG. It is open to all members. So it's not ... There are people on the mailing list from private sector among others. So that's the case. So I foresee that kind of work going on. And [inaudible] based with the other group. But all of us who are part of the team that were really working a lot on the bylaw and the Framework of Interpretation when they were being drafted, the two groups. Now they are two different mailing lists but there's that. That's on the co-chair. [inaudible] answered and if we have any volunteers who would ... Feel free. It's not so much work. It's more administrative. But the various human rights development in terms of human rights. So you would not be the one to do the HRIA on everything. There are people who are experts on data protection. Let's say we got Frank who is a data protection certified expert. There are people who are experts on free speech, people who are experts on diversity questions, people who are

experts on due process questions, people who are experts on [inaudible] association questions. So basically, the work of the co-chair is not to do all that heavy lifting but to shepherd and get the right nudge, help members be like, “Hey, you are the expert on gender and diversity questions. Would you do analysis on this from a gender diversity question? You are the expert on privacy or the expert on civil liberties, would you help look at this document from that angle? Then yeah. So your work is more administrative.

So I really need a co-chair. Maybe not to push on this item right now, maybe at the end of this, if someone is interested feel free to talk to me and I can explain more.

And then also more members. We need to add and figure a way in which we involve more people and more people feel free that they can join. As I’ve mentioned, this group is not designed only for NCSG people only. It’s chartered by NCSG but it is open to the rest of the community. The charter specifically says it’s open to the rest of the community. The charter talks about it’s open to—the work is to do research, to inform the community. So if you read the charter, the [inaudible] this to be ongoing improvements which are led by the CCWP. So there’s that.

Then on the next agenda item. So, discussion [inaudible] implementation. So I think I’ve mentioned this a bit whereby workstream 2 implementation have really been pushing. In the letter that I wrote in June of 2020, I asked ICANN Org to set up a central page which updates workstream 2 implementation. Basically, workstream 2, if you look at some of those questions on diversity, on jurisdiction, some of those are human rights questions. They are questions on due

process. They are questions on diversity. [inaudible] implementation of full implementation of workstream 2 would assist in fulfilment of the human rights bylaw. So that is happening but then which are the opportunities. I'm just curious. Maybe we can think about at the end of this, [inaudible]. I'm almost done with the agenda. Just going through the agenda. But how do we ensure workstream 2 implementation. [inaudible] on human rights.

There are eight sections of workstream 2 recommendations. How do we ensure that they are fully implemented in a way that is respectful of human rights?

Then the other question, the next bit is there are various ongoing PDPs. So this one ties us with the other agenda, whereby potential [inaudible] various ongoing PDPs. So there are four which are out for public comments. So, one universal acceptance roadmap, two pilot holistic review, three proposed amendment to the base gTLD, RAA to add RDAP contract obligations, four registration data consensus policy for gTLDs.

So I'm curious if there's appetite or there would be volunteers. You don't have to say it at this meeting. We can still keep that conversation on the list of people looking at those documents from a human rights perspective and us submitting comments as CCWP. So this is a bit of a light ...

So, some of the deadlines ... The first deadline is on 17th October. I've just done a quick analysis of the document. It doesn't have so many impacts. The other one is 20th or similar. But then the ones which have more impact are the last two. RDAP contract obligations and

registration data consensus. So those two, I would be curious if there are volunteers who would want to work on this analysis, similar to the way we did from February to June on the other document on EPDP Phase 2 and [ODA]. Yes. So there's that.

Lastly, on the strategy, we need to figure out future work. We need to figure out how to continue improving our strategy as a group, which kinds of things. So I've mapped out. So this document, you can click on the document. It maps out each workstream 2 topic to a human rights issue.

So, for example, diversity. It's a [inaudible] diversity issue. [inaudible] for good faith. They are issues that are on right to due process. ICANN due process, the board, among others. Questions of gender human rights. They are the ones that talks about Framework of Interpretation.

Jurisdiction of [inaudible] of dispute, it's a due process and participation issue. There are questions around some countries and jurisdiction. So resolving some of those concerns. Office of the ombudsman, gender human rights concern and also due process. Some of these are due process. Increase SO/AC accountability recommendations. So there are various recommendations. Each of these have between 10 to around 15 recommendations. Yeah, around 15 or sometimes 20 recommendations, these sections, workstream 2 topic.

There are issues around rights to due process, freedom of information. There are freedom of information questions on those

recommendations. Staff accountability, freedom of information questions, due process questions.

ICANN transparency, similar. Freedom of Information, due process. More than many others. So this is some of the potential things that I see us doing and linking human rights. Basically, ICANN does a lot of human rights work but it's not called human rights. Workstream 2, if we link every workstream 2 recommendation and analyze it from a human rights perspective or civil liberties perspective, it is in a way similar to some of them who are geared towards improvement of human rights. So basically, how do we translate this language to the rest of the community? So I think we're going to open up for conversation.

Yes, Avri?

AVRI DORIA:

Is conversation now? Okay. In terms of the bullet before the ongoing PDP ... So there's a lot to talk about in the ongoing PDPs but I wanted to mention something. The discussion of implementation and you mentioned the SOs and the ACs. Because of ATRT3, there was a recommendation that all of the SOs and ACs, as opposed to doing the reviews the way we've been doing them, that they're going to go on to a continuous improvement cycle. So that work is going to start over the next year and go on from there, as ATRT3 is implemented.

So that discussion point of WS2 may fit in and map into some of that self-improvement work, and if that's the case, this would be a good year to start thinking about it because it would happen at the same time, at the beginning of the "how do we do self-improvement" if human rights

is part of that equation, then this is the beginning of that process and it's a good time. Thanks.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thank you so much. Yeah. Feel free to also online [inaudible] questions. I don't know. [inaudible] manage to join or not, Stephanie, because she is

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, I think she is online. She just raised her hand. You may go ahead and speak.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Sorry. Introduce yourself. I think you're on mute or something. I don't know if your connection is having issues.

ANDREA GLANDON: You're not muted on our side, so maybe check your line to see if you're muted on your side.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Because we can't hear you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Please try to speak.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: I think she's speaking but we can't hear. Okay. Yeah, maybe as you fix that—

ANDREA GLANDON: She said she's having problems with her mic.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Yeah. I don't know. Maybe as you fix that, maybe there's someone else who is online maybe who wants to contribute. Feel free. It's open for conversation. Yes, Kathy.

KATHY KLEIMAN: So I have a question for people in the room. I know there are people in this room who were part of the organization of this working group, and go back to the beginning, Avri in particular but I think maybe others. Is this the right direction? Ephraim has done a lot of work. He's putting a lot of things together. Is this consistent with the vision for this working group and also accountability, workstream 2? Is this what you're seeing? Does that correspond with some of the original visions? Is there more to be done? Just beginning to looking at now, is this the right track? We probably are but is there anything you want to push us on and encourage us to do based on where this all started?

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Yes, Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

First of all, I wasn't part of putting together this group. I think I was part of putting together a grandparent group, one that [failed] a decade ago.

Yes. Part of it—and this is something that Ephraim alluded to when he brought it to the Board and asked the Board: can you do the Board answers bottom up? You've got to come from you. We worked very hard during WS2 to make it not top-down, to make it not the Board directing how to do but for the bottom-up to do it. So this whole idea of getting more of the SOs and ACs involved in the process is very important because when it does get to the Board, they sort of look at the breadth of acceptance.

Certainly doing the human rights impact assessments on PDPs makes sense. A long, long time ago—and I think you were part of that long, long time ago—we talked about the fact that when issues reports came out, they should include human rights, the beginnings of. Should there be a human rights impact assessment? If there is, what should it include? And then some discussion.

Now, at the time, the Org quite rightly said, hey, that's not a talent we've got in the house. But when the issues report draft comes out, speak up. If you see a draft issues report, because they're all ... Part of the PDP process includes the publication and review of a draft, that is the time to put a stake in the ground and say this PDP, this issues report, needs a human rights impact assessment because ABCD. And then at that point follow it all through.

When you do it at the end, it's useful as that said, but then the argument you have to deal with: well, you guys kind of argued that all the way

through sort of maybe and how do we differentiate a human rights impact assessment from second and third bites of apples? You know how people worry about second and third bites of apples here.

So, basically, by having it framed all the way through from issues report through drafts, through discussions, however it gets structured, it loses that character. And then if it has the character of—and lots of people worked on it from lots of constituencies, etc. and there was back and forth. You know all that stuff that a PDP final report needs to discuss. Then you've got something that starts to be

So this is really good. It frames it, it opens it, but it's still sort of tantalizing as opposed to delivering. I don't know if that makes sense. Thanks.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thank you so much, Avri. I don't know if the online participants and if anybody is going to fix their mic issue or not.

ANDREA GLANDON: Stephanie Perrin has her hand up.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Stephanie, okay.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I take what Avri has just said seriously. The problem I think is getting that need for a human rights issues report or human rights impacts

assessment into an issues report. I have been trying on scoping teams, on charter teams. Not in this round of council but a couple of rounds ago when we were starting off the EPDP. People are getting away with putting their fingers in their ears and saying, “La, la, la, la, la, can’t hear you, can’t hear you.”

I realize I have a reputation for being a wet blanket that never shuts up on this but that doesn’t make it any less true. If you were in government and you were bringing forth these initiatives as some kind of regulatory action, you would have to do a human rights assessment in any western democracy through the justice department. So people know this but we’re not doing it. I should say anybody who’s familiar with the process knows this, possibly not sales managers and folks from registrars and registries.

We don’t have a trigger to get this thing recognized, so even right now as we are building the WHOIS request system—the SSAD light, the proof of concept—folks are trying to get this all off the ground informally without doing a human rights impact assessment and it’s very, very clear, to me at least, that if you are going to be gathering information about the disclosure rate, for instance on law enforcement criminal investigations, that you’ve got some sensitive activity there. Even if you don’t have the PI gathered, you have basically traced investigations and that should get an assessment to make sure that we are not actually exposing people to allegations and restricting their freedom.

How do you get this inserted at the beginning? We can put it in public comments if we’ve got the bandwidth to actually get the public comments done. As you can see, I don’t have the bandwidth to

comment on this education thing, although I hope to rather soon. I've been spending quite a lot of time working on AI impact assessment in the context of human rights and civil liberties.

I think you need that in here—or more of it—on the educational piece, so I'll try to get that in. But boy oh boy, we're overloaded at the coalface for those of us who are on PDPs. Thanks.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thank you, Stephanie. I think Manju has a hand up.

MANJU CHEN: Yes. Thank you. This is actually a response I guess to both Avri and Stephanie. I am on the CCOICI. I looked at the text, what's the full name of the ... It's Council Committee for Overseeing Continuous Improvement. Anyways, it's a group that decides whether there's improvement to be done in terms of Council operation and stuff. So we are actually reviewing the WS2 recommendations and we in this committee are actually planning to recommend to the Council that we have to do a basic checklist of human rights and impact assessment before we are doing an issue report. So it's not done yet.

We are still drafting the checklist. We are consulting Ephraim of course when we're doing this and we hope to I guess by next meeting or by October we have this checklist, because what Ephraim was suggesting was that in drafting issue reports we have basic questions of whether this has human rights impact, and if those questions are checked then we consider whether we will do an impact assessment. So that's why

we are going to recommend to the Council of course whether to include [it to the] initial report in the end. It's still up to Council to decide but we are hoping ... Well, I think we are quite optimistic about Council accepting this recommendation. So yeah, that's just a report of what we are going to do. Thank you.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Thank you so much, Manju. Yeah, CCOCI—a very long acronym. Very good work and it's good that you [inaudible] on this specific issue in the last couple of months. Looking forward to that. Yes, Avri?

AVRI DORIA:

Sorry for speaking so often. That sounds great. And in fact, that fits the model that I view that it's kind of like different people taking different pieces. No one ever has enough bandwidth and persistence to do it all. But if you almost think of it as a relay race of what little piece can we get here, what little piece can we get there, it's really the building of all these models. If you don't get it in one, don't worry. Work on the next and such.

I'm actually excited about that little bit of news that you just gave because that is the kind of piece, because once it's in something like that, you've got to think about it each and every time and it's not always the same person being the one to speak of it. Even if it misses a few times, it starts to grow. So I think that's wonderful. Thanks for talking about it.

ANDREA GLANDON Ephraim, before we continue, you have 12 minutes left just to let you know. And Stephanie Perrin does have her hand up in the Zoom.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Okay. We've had a very interesting conversation with Suada.. She's the co-chair of the GAC International Law and Human Rights Working Group. Please, maybe send something on the chat in case your mic is still having issues and that can be the [inaudible] in case you're still on. We've been working very closely with Suada and [Liana] just coordinating and having back and forth the backend on what they are doing and what you are doing. Because there's a lot of work that some GAC members are just trying to figure out on human rights also. Yes, Kathy. Then, Manju, do you have a second hand or no? Then Stephanie. Sorry. Claudia, then Stephanie.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Great. So, following up on what Manju said—and it sounds like she's been in consultation with you—the idea of putting human rights questions into the issues report makes a lot of sense to me. Could we go farther and if we identify human rights issues in something that we're working on—say data accuracy—can we go further and put it into the charter?

I can tell you as a co-chair of a working group, if a question goes into a charter, at least my policy development process working group made sure we looked at every question and viewed it as a mandate from council to look at every question. So if we can pass ... If they are identified in the issues report and then we can put those human rights

questions into the charter, I think that builds on that pipeline that Avri was talking about. So, thank you.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Stephanie. I think there's another second participant who also raised their hand.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah. Suada has her hand up. We'll go ahead with Stephanie first.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. This is kind of a distraction but I feel like I have to say it anyway. I find the transcript to be super annoying. I've been on about this for the last couple of meetings. I know that we're doing our best to manage on Zoom and I really, really appreciate all the efforts of staff to look after us. But people seem to forget that if someone is hard of hearing and they are relying on the recording and the chat and the transcript to get the feel for what is happening—and this applies even to scholars who are looking at our material after the fact—God help them if they're trying to figure out what's going on from the transcript because people speak quickly, they don't identify themselves, very few people actually identify themselves when they're speaking now.

Unlike the translators when you're at a meeting, like say at the OECD, the transcript doesn't have a bunch of words fed into it or a bunch of names so it guesses and it's all over the map. You have no clue who is speaking half the time after the fact. And there's a lot of people who are hard of hearing. This is a human rights issue. If we had someone in real

time correcting the transcript, which I was doing it myself but I don't have access to the transcript to edit, but I was listening to something I had missed the other night. I could do it in real time because I knew the voices and I could interpret how they were messing it up. After the fact it's much harder. You have to have the recording there.

But this is a task that could be staffed. There's lots of staff at the meeting. You could take it in turns. I'm sorry, staff, but unless we hire a specific person to do this or a facility, it's doable. Maybe organize volunteers if we're too poor and we have to get volunteers to do it. People are always saying, "How do we help?" Well, this is a job that needs to be done and it has a very profound human rights implication because you're cutting anybody with hearing disability out of participating or understanding what's going on at ICANN. Thank you.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thank you, Stephanie. Suada?

ANDREA GLANDON: Suada, I do see that your line is open if you'd like to try and speak.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: We can't hear you.

ANDREA GLANDON: She's having a problem again. She did put in the chat earlier, though, something that I'll read.

“I would like to update you on future GAC HRILWG activities. Discussing the potential project for a first test experiment of sign language interpretation at an ICANN meeting. Discussing the feasibility of implementing UNESCO’s Internet Universality Indicators Measurement Tool in measuring GAC diversity. Then she has a link there.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Thank you so much. Yes. Basically, that work on diversity, basically they’re doing an HRIA but then it’s not entire human rights. Specifically on diversity which is very interesting. That’s what I was proposing basically as doing something similar to ourselves and test something similar that is a bit more comprehensive and push it to others that they can adopt because they’ve been working on a test tool which they want to test themselves. It is best on the initial tool that we had started working on together in summer of 2020, then hopefully we can keep improving and making it [inaudible] and see what other tools are there.

For example, she’s mentioned about UNESCO tool. Maybe that can be a tool we can borrow and see how we can adapt ours. It’s a bit lightweight, but we can see maybe limit to a few human rights questions. But I think a broader one would be good. We can just look at the tool and see if it’s still relevant from the way it was drafted in 2020 and thanks for those who contributed towards it. Then test it.

I think if NCUC volunteers. I think that’s a very lightweight. NCUC is small. We can start at NCUC level and then see if we can improve it before sharing it to other people.

Time is almost up. There are five minutes remaining. I would want maybe a few other questions, a few comments, maybe David Cake.

DAVID CAKE:

Just a very brief comment that if we want to work on disability, we'd also be worth looking at the accessibility group of the Internet Society has some members here that are involved with ALAC, particularly Gunella and Judith and there are other people from ALAC who we could talk to that would be very willing I'm sure to look at any issues around accessibility including sign language.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Thanks so much. Suada, do you have anything or no? Okay. Yeah. So, Suada, as you are on the call please share that link on the course. Please share to your group as well. I would want as much feedback as possible because your group specifically focuses on human rights and you've really been working on a lot of research the last two years. If you can get more comments. Just feel free.

I'm going to figure out if [inaudible] someone can comment anonymously. But I think there is a way you can comment anonymously on that cause. Just someone doesn't have to sign in with their username. You can comment anonymous and I don't have to know who it is. So, in case maybe ... Yeah. It's open for comments as much as possible. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is [inaudible]. ICANN75 fellow. And to the point that you just did with the course, I think it would be a great tool, because as fellows, we have a capacity building pre the meeting which we are introduced to a lot of the working groups. So I think if we can add your course to the package, to the curriculum, that will be a great way to that engagement that you are looking with new members, since when we saw the list of the groups, we say I am really interested in human rights or universal acceptance and stuff like that. So that's the first introduction we have to ICANN, and then in the meetings we can actually go.

Also, with NextGen fellows, they also have the same/similar curriculum that we can put that course there, as far as an introduction to the work that you do.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thanks so much. We have three minutes. I would want as many comments as possible that can be allowed in three minutes. From Myanmar. I don't know if you have any comments because you guys have been doing amazing work on human rights assessment, the Facebook one. The colleagues from Myanmar.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Malaysia.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Malaysia, sorry. For some reason I thought Myanmar. Is there someone else who has any comments? Sorry. I was confusing another institution

that presented a report on Myanmar and Facebook. A human resources impact assessment.

Anyway, then the co-chair as we close, is there any person in this room or online who maybe is volunteering who wants to ... As you know, I don't want it to be myself [inaudible] as much as possible. Some of you know I've been on the list. I've been coming to these meetings but I have been at the forefront. I had to take just a forefront the moment Austin was leaving. I would want to continue supporting but I would want someone else. I don't want it to be only me [driven]. Yes. As much as possible. Yes, Benjamin?

BENJAMIN:

I just want to call your attention to Avri's suggestions for getting more engagement for the ... Maybe we should schedule more Zoom meetings for the sessions.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Okay. That's doable.

AVRI DORIA:

What I was trying to suggest is if you want to get people to comment on the course in detail is to schedule times where you walk through them slide by slide. People talk about them. And it would probably be good for all of us to self-educate ourselves on the pieces we don't know because there's probably ... Other than you, Ephraim, there's probably nobody that knows everything that's in that course.

So if you had sessions that basically, “Today, we’re doing slides one through ten.” And people would comment, “That seem ambiguous. I don’t understand what you mean by that. If you added this word, it might be clear.”

So kind of like a walkthrough editing session that is self-educating. It’s just a thought. It’s just an idea, but because I know that spending three hours doing it as an editor is tough.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Yeah. I’m going to try and change that after this on the list. Because there are four sections. We can go through the four sections, one section per week. That can be helpful.

Then there’s the list. Some of you have mentioned that you had trouble signing into the list. I think it was Tuesday I had a meeting with Olga—actually I was with Manju. And she tried to sign onto the list. I think you were there. No, you were not there. Thomas was there. Yeah, Thomas was there. Tried to sign onto the list and we got an error. I don’t know if there’s something we just flag to staff.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Yeah, I’m going to have a look at that.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Yeah. People were having trouble signing. They just get this error page. Actually, we even made a joke asking ourselves: is there a secret? People are not able to sign onto this. So there’s that.

And then some people are not getting messages. In case you are having trouble, just reach out to me directly. I think someone from Verisign and someone from Tucows reached out to me. They are on the list. They have been on the list for so many years but they're not getting messages. Yes, Benjamin? Sorry, Manju. Yes?

MANJU CHEN:

There is a person who has raised their hand online first.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you. It's me, [Maryam]. Thank you, Manju; and thank you, everyone. This is [Maryam] speaking. In the interest of time, I'll just make this very quick. The past four years, because we've been working on the UNGP business and human rights in Malaysia, we talked to a lot of technologies and how best to form a strategy around convincing technologies to also be involved in human rights work. Essentially, one thing that stood out is the material and inherent link of data to [inaudible] and there is the language of rights that they can understand.

I wish we had more time to explore further, but I just wanted to put this in on record. We have identified this linking as the principle of IMI data. So perhaps maybe we can discuss more on that.

Secondly, on the [inaudible] volunteer for the co-chair. I would like to express my openness to it.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Yeah!

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I am in Kuala Lumpur, but I cannot [inaudible] right now. My colleague and CEO actually will reach out to you for your contact details and I'll be in touch. Thank you so much. I am done speaking.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Awesome. Thank you so much. That really is very welcome. I'll get your contact from your CEO and we can have more conversations. Any other comment? Just because I just have two extra minutes.

BENJAMIN: I just wanted to say—Benjamin speaking—we could also use ... In NCUC ... Those meetings—Zoom sessions—could be something of interest to us. We could use that as content to keep our engagement on, so in case you're looking for platforms or a place to schedule those meetings, it could be good sessions that could get us more active.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thanks so much, Benjamin. I think that's it. Thank you so much for coming. Thank you for your time. I really appreciate, especially this being the last day. Maybe next time we'll try and work with Andrea and Tim to push it maybe to a bit earlier. I had a conversation with a few people [inaudible] airport. So we'll try and push it to a few earlier days, if possible, on earlier slots.

But thank you so much. Thank you for those online who have made it and those physically here and I look forward to us engaging on this,

especially complete the course and get it up in the next couple of weeks on ICANNLearn, and then pushing on the next post PDPs that I mentioned. In case there are those who are interested, feel free to reach out to me on the side after this. Thank you so much. See you in Cancun, God willing.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]