

---

ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – Joint ALAC & NCSG Meeting: ICANN and Human Rights - a way forward  
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 – 14:00 to 15:30 CEST

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. My name is Gisella Gruber. Welcome to the joint ALAC and NCSG meeting, “ICANN and Human Rights: A Way Forward.”

Interpretation for this session will include French and Spanish languages and will be conducted using both Zoom and the remote simultaneous interpretation platform operated by Congress Rental Network. Attendees are encouraged to download the Congress Rental Network app, following the instructions in the Zoom chat or from the meeting details document available on the meeting website page.

If you do wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room. Once a session facilitator calls upon the name, you may unmute yourself. Please state your name for the record every time you take the floor—please, a kind reminder—as well as the language you will speaking if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices, including the Congress Rental Network application. Please also speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Please find the link in the chat for your reference. In the case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants.

---

**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.**

forward

EN

---

Thank you. With no further ado, I will hand the floor over to Joanna Kulesza from the ALAC, co-moderator of this session. Thank you, and over to you, Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Now I'm unmuted. Welcome to the joint session. Many thanks to our NCSG colleagues for having accepted ALAC's invitation. We have discussed human rights within ICANN for quite some time. It is a part of the accountability discussion, and the ALAC has [inaudible] enacted in that thread of policy debates here within ICANN, and so have constituencies within the NCSG. My co-host today, Ephraim, is the author of this idea of us joining forces between the ALAC and the NCSG on the discussing how to best protect individuals, their rights, human rights. We within ALAC would refer to them as end-user rights, I suppose, within the ICANN environment. This topic has proven to be quite challenging for the entire community for reasons that I am certain we will discuss as we progress through the agenda.

The purpose of this session is to offer a look back at what has been achieved in the context of accountability discussions within ICANN. For that purpose, we have speakers from both constituencies, and I've taken the liberty to invite Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Olivier Crepin-Leblond to represent ALAC, as both have been former ALAC chairs and have been actively involved in accountability discussions, also building consensus among these two specific groups, next to working on building consensus across the community. So we will hear from members of both communities on their perspectives on

forward

EN

---

the work that has been done thus far and, most significantly, on the way forward.

As I already said, I'm particularly happy to be able to co-chair/co-moderate this meeting with Ephraim, who, on one hand, is an active NCSG participant. But at the same time, he represents the EURALO ALS—this is a meeting we're hosting in Hamburg, in Europe—Article 19, which is focused on human rights, especially freedom of expression online as well.

With that, I would be happy to give the floor to Ephraim, my co-host, for a brief introduction. As you can see in the agenda, we would like to divide this time between the two experiences/narratives of the communities that have agreed to discuss human rights further and try to navigate towards a more effective [inaudible] effective consensus in the near future, as it seems that the efforts are at somewhat of a hold at this point. Ephraim, I would love to hear from you, and I would love to hand over the moderation of this session to you as well, as I know you will be providing us with Agenda Item 2, which would be a recap—a brief look—on what has been achieved. Thank you again for joining us. I'm looking forward to an interesting discussion.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Thank you so much, Joanna. Thank you, everyone, for coming to this session. I'm very excited to see the high interest—76 participants on the call. Just to echo what Joanna has said, this session is more to look back on what has been achieved, where we are now, and what we can

forward

# EN

---

do going forward. This is a topic which has been very new and very important, especially post-Work Stream 2 implementation. I will not want to preempt much. I would want, actually, before introducing Agenda Item 2, to recognize a fellow Co-Chair of the Working Party on Human rights, Austin was on the call. Feel free to chime in any time.

I would want now to take this opportunity to go to Agenda Item #2 and request Sally and Betsy [inaudible] to feel free to introduce because the [inaudible] that we want to look at is how human rights has been achieved or how we can keep achieving rights, both from ICANN Org and from SO/ACs on behalf of end users. So the main aim is the end users.

Also, I would like to recognize Herb Waye, the ombudsman, who's also on the call. I'll be referring to some communication later in the conversation regarding the important work that the ombudsman is doing also to achieve human rights.

Thank you so much. I would welcome colleagues from ICANN Org to share what they've done. Some of you might know the steps that have been taken. Some of you may not. This is a good opportunity for us to understand and for us to be able to help them where we can and help each other to ensure that end users' concerns are taken into consideration in this [inaudible].

BETSY ANDREWS:

Hi. Thank you, Ephraim. My name is Betsy Andrews, and I work under Sally Costerton with Ergys in the Public Responsibility Department.

forward

EN

---

I'm going to take you through a brief update on what we've been working on with regards to ICANN Org's impacts on human rights, so we can proceed to the next slide, please.

We'll go through the background of the project, the scope of it, the recommendations, where we are with implementations, and then what the next steps are.

Thank you. Next slide, please. ICANN Org undertook a proactive human rights assessment, or an HRIA—you're probably all familiar with this term—to assess general operations. This was done in tandem with the Work Stream 2 activities on human rights. To conduct this business assessment, we underwent a request-for-proposals process and engaged a third party. This group, [Marcus Learning] Business and Human Rights, helped us to evaluate a workable scope, and they proceeded to review our day-to-day operations to help us discover ways that we can improve what we do with regards to human rights' impacts. This is a separate exercise from any assessment that's used as a part of the policy development process impact to the end user, as Ephraim has mentioned, but it's important, not just because the framework of interpretation that was developed as part of the Work Stream 2 process, which notes that Org can consider HRIAs to help assess the Org's impacts on human rights but also because it's an opportunity to provide recommendations for us so that we can implement best practices and run the business in a way that has the most positive impacts and the fewest negative impacts on human rights.

forward

**EN**

---

Let's go on to the next slide, please. The scope of this HRIA focused on four functional areas of Org activity: human resources, procurement event planning, and security operations, with a focus on impacts to the employees of ICANN, the vendors of ICANN, and the people in the areas where we do business. So you can see here examples of the types of topics that were considered. They were addressed in each area of the assessment. This is not an exhaustive list, obviously, but these are the kinds of things that the third party looked at. So they reviewed large volumes of documents. They interviewed staff and they conducted an anonymous survey to reach their final recommendations.

Let's go onto the next slide to talk about recommendations, please. A major takeaway from this process was that ICANN has been engaged in some best practices with regards to human rights, but we had not yet put them to paper. So a large part of the recommendations to make some of our general practices formal policies so that they're stated in writing and that they're adhered to into the future. This ensures that they remain best practices as ICANN continues to do business.

Other recommendations include laying out a statement that demonstrates how ICANN Org will be respecting human rights. This is an important one that we're considering and determining how best to implement it within the constraints that we have with our operational planning and budget process. So this recommendation will be familiar to you all in this group as it ties in nicely with the community

forward

EN

---

recommendation in that framework of interpretation. That notion of providing a framework of how Org is going to respect a core value and the notion of providing a statement that came up in the human rights impact assessment dovetail nicely together. Other recommendations from the HRIA include awareness raising and training, along with tweaking some of our risk management strategies, to proactively accommodate human rights concerns.

We can go on to the next slide, please. When it comes to implementation, I'm happy to report to you that we have made headway. About half of the recommendations are already implemented, and this includes things like updating security policies for our physical offices, soliciting feedback from staff on human rights issues that impact them in the workplace, and increasing our focus on supporting mental awareness amongst staff. Among other things, this year we implemented a mental wellness month, which, coinciding with the pandemic, all the employees would say was very helpful. And we'll continue to do that mental wellness month into the future.

The other half of these recommendations that we're working with in the report we're either in the process of executing right now or they're under consideration as a part of this normal business planning process that involves operational plans and budgeting. So a few of the recommendations may not be implemented, either due to resource constraints or simply because things have changed in the time period since the assessment was conducted. So the shift in workplace operations for remote work, for instance, changes the perspective on

forward

**EN**

---

some of the issues and may change the priority in terms of what's implemented and which order with regards to things like physical security or travel or in-person training. However, all the recommendations in the report are being seriously considered as we look for ways to evolve the business operations and alignment with best practices.

We'll move on to the next slide, please. This current situation involves continuing the implementation process but is not just limited to that. So we're evaluating the remaining recommendations as a part of this ongoing process, but we're also applying the lessons that we learned to new practices and policies that are being developed across the Org so we can sure we're evolving in the right direct. As you're probably aware, you're never done with implementing human rights impacts improvements. There's always something that you can do to improve the business practices and the impact that you have on your staff and your vendors and the people around you. So, as a part of this commitment and some of the other changes within the Org's operational structure, we've recently [seated] the tracking of human rights impact assessment implementation with the Public Responsibility Support Team on which I work with Ergys. He and I helped facilitate that HRIA process to bring the recommendations about. So we're well-positioned to support the four functional areas as they continue their work, as well as that we will be reporting on progress. So we'll produce updates with regards to the implementation so that you're aware of the status of our work with



forward

**EN**

---

regards to this HRIA but also future work to uphold best practices with regards to how ICANN Org business practices impact human rights.

Thank you very much for your time. With that, we'll now open the floor to questions for a few minutes. I'll hand it over to Ergys and Sally to facilitate and elucidate further. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

If I may, just briefly jumping into my shoes as a moderator, we do have a devoted segment for Q&A. If you guys might want to join into that section, that might be recommendable. If there are specific questions you would like to take right now, that is also, of course, a way to approach this. But we do have a devoted section for Q&A at the end. I understand that this presentation is divided into a few sections, so I would be happy to hear from Sally and/or Ergys. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Hi, Joanna. Thanks a lot. Unless anybody urgently wants to ask any questions, I suggest we carry on and keep the flow moving, then we'll take Q&As in a group. How's that? I think your suggestion is good.

JOANNA KULESZA:

That sounds perfect, Sally. Thank you.

Am I correct in understanding that there is more coming from your team? Ephraim? Sally? Ergys?

forward

---

ERGYS RAMAJ: Hi, everyone. I think we can keep going, per Sally's suggestion, and then we can take questions at the end.

JOANNA KULESZA: Great. Perfect. Let's do that. I was expecting more in terms of that specific slide. Great.

So I understand we can move on to the next agenda item. If that is correct, I would kindly ask Cheryl to take the floor and give our At-Large/ALAC experiences when it comes to the accountability discussion that includes human rights. I remember us having a policy session around this topic, and there seems to be a lot of history, a lot of experience, and a lot of takeaways from those experiences that we would like to share during this session. Cheryl, thank you for accepting the invitation. The floor is yours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Joanna. I'm going to take you on a little tiny history tour, but before I [inaudible] not too detailed [inaudible] to add into some of the history just so we're all level-set and know where we've come from. I just wanted to compliment and thank Sally and her team, and particularly Betsy, for that excellent and very timely bringing of us up to date. I must say, from my perspective, it was a great relief to hear all of that [inaudible] be put to the [inaudible] not data captured. I think that's where most of the learnings of this experience have probably come, from both our end user perspective as well as the organizational.

forward

# EN

---

With that said, let's go to the next slide, which of course is just scrolling up to the next bit in the PDF. None of the animations work, but never mind. Just imagine this is a lot prettier and a lot more revealing, if we had our way. All right. In the beginning, there was a cross-community working group on accountability: Work Stream 1 (many, many moons ago for some of us). What was important about that cross-community working group on ICANN's accountability was that it really did engage community in ICANN that was deeply committed to seeing an ICANN that was in a stronger and better position at the end of its process. We felt we might get it done in a lot less time. We felt we might get it done in one fell swoop. We ended up taking more time than we had liked, but due to very important deadlines to do with the IANA transition, we hit a number of benchmarks, and that became our Work Stream 1 (the first phase), and then we moved on to continuing work, which was ...

Just apologizing. My Internet ... I'm on satellite collection and it gets a bit [fail-y]. My apologies. I'll stop and get someone else to run this if need be.

On Work Stream 2, that is where a lot of the drilling down the framework of interpretation for human rights that was again mentioned with what Betsy presented. All of that work was done in that phase. The At-Large community (the end users) were deeply involved in that activity. Now, no, we did not bring seven billion to the table, before you ask that question. ALAC and its community (the At-Large community) ... ALAC, remember, is just 15 people: the elected

forward

EN

---

and the selected individuals who form the At-Large Advisory Committee. That's the advisory committee in the ICANN structure. But its wider community (At-Large) is the individual members and the At-Large Structures that interact/interface with the end-user community. It's the At-Large's community's mandate and the ALAC's role to act in the best interests of end users—those that are already online and those that are yet to come online. So we were deeply engaged in these discussions in Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2.

Out of Work Stream 1 recommendations, as was mentioned, the human rights core value was added to the ICANN bylaw. That in itself was really quite a landmark moment. The result of the work in Work Stream 1—that beginning work—also mandated that something called the framework of interpretation—a set of agreed and definable terms for use of the language in the bylaws and going forward—could be structured, developed, and published. And that framework of interpretation—HR-FOI; some people do it the other way (FOI-HR)—was an output of the Work Stream 2 activity. I've given you in the presentation the links. You can go to the full documents should you have an overwhelming urge to drill down and read all the gory details. The Work Stream 2 implementation assessment—in other words, all of the things to do with the part of our work, the end-user interests in human rights, the whole Section [3] of the report—was published about twelve months ago, back in November 2019. If you haven't read that, I would firmly recommend that you do so.

forward

EN

---

Let's move to the next slide, but, as we do that, I'll just mention to you that, in the notes to previous slide, I have taken the time to pull out a couple of the particular writers, where we worked very hard to come up with language that includes things that talk about the limitations to how we need to keep within ICANN's scope and mission with this whole set of human rights issues.

Moving on to the more exciting bit, which of course is the implementation assessment report, which, as you've also mentioned ... Two quotes I thought I might bring out to your attention as we wet our whistles for this discussion today. That was, I think, something we forgot quite often. That is, with all of these rights—I suspect nobody in this particular session today would be arguing against the importance of human rights—what we do need to remember, particularly from the end users' perspective, is that with these rights also comes responsibilities. So, to that end, I thought it was worthy of quoting something from the Board in the Work Stream 2 implementation assessment report regarding Section 3 on the human rights framework of interpretation. “The Board cannot be the sole arbiter of human rights. There is an obligation across the community to consider human rights as they provide advice and policy recommendations. In this regard, the community will need to establish mechanisms for checking that recommendations advise [that] all policies do not violate the core values of human rights.” Of course, we now have core values of human rights in our ICANN bylaw.

forward

EN

---

It was estimated in that report that it was going to take at least an additional twelve months to move further through implementation of that recommendation. And, in that report—I do recommend you do read this section (Section 3 of that report)—I’ve included it not-quite-but-almost-verbatim in the speaker’s notes on this presentation. We’ve got it as a [ready reckoning] tool. It does go into the prioritization/the assessment of costs assessment of how much time, energy, and commitment is going to be required to fully implement what Work Stream 2 was suggesting.

Also—this is where you’ve had a little introduction already from Betsy (thank Heavens because I don’t have to go into it now)— in May 2019— this is something that was not required/did not have to be done but was an adjunct—there was a clear indication of the commitment that the organization has to this very important work. The human rights impact assessment report was, of course, published. Betsy has taken you through some of the high points of that.

I’ll now go to my very last slide because what we need to do is get on to conversation. This is a question of, where does this leave us now? Well, where it leaves us now is to consider what Sally’s group has just presented us with [inaudible] where we’re up to. From the end users’ perspective, we now need to analyze that to look at how we can contribute and help to value and ensure that the trust we put in the organization to do the updating, to the do the implementation, and to do the reporting. We’ve heard there will be regular reporting. All of that. It’s incumbent on us, as those who are looking after the interests

forward

EN

---

and acting in the best interest of the end-user communities, both online and yet-to-be online, in the matter of human rights—well, there are other things, of course, but just human rights for now---that we make sure we're called to account that this does stay as a priority and it is managed within the bounds of the scope and mission of ICANN.

With that, I want to thank you all for your time in listening to me prattle on about what has happened. I wanted to also mention to remember what is to come. Every one of the advisory committees and component parts of ICANN—specifically however the councils and the areas that look at policy development ... It's incumbent on all of us to ensure that human rights is a lens that is applied to all our work going forward, and we have a commitment, as the ICANN community, as part of our ACs and SOs (our support organization and advisory committees), to work our how we will articulate, report, and record our own good practices with regards to human rights in ICANN.

Thank you. Back to you, Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. That was a lot of food for thought. I'm going to refrain from summarizing at this point, but I believe that was a wonderful introduction into further discussion.

I am noting we have questions, and we have comments in the chat. I encourage Ephraim to join me in moderating. If there's anything you would like to add at this point, if there's anything you would like to suggest, that would be most welcome. My suggestion would be for us

forward

EN

---

to collect those comments and leave appropriate time for discussion at the end of this session.

I see Ergys replying to Rafik, which is great, but I would also ask Ergys to take the floor in the Q&A section to provide us with a more comprehensive or comprehensive answer.

I welcome comments from Stephanie. I also encourage Stephanie to share those in the Q&A session.

Before we move there, however, Ephraim, I would love to hear from you on the steps forward. I believe Cheryl was quite comprehensive in giving the background for certain, one could say, challenges or delays in implementing the human rights framework. I would love to hear from you, as someone who has experience with both communities, on the way forward. Then Olivier, I believe, will be able to join us just in time to also provide constructive feedback on how to move forward for our two communities. Ephraim, the floor is yours. Alberto, your question is noted. Thank you.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Thank you so much. Just to note that we are ahead of time, which is a really good thing, in terms of that we'll have good time to have Q&A at the end.

Just to chime in on the lessons and the way forward, building on to what Cheryl has just presented regarding end users and putting responsibility beyond just these rights being there but also



forward

EN

---

responsibilities, if you may recall, and if may just cite the framework of interpretation on Page 8, you'll note that the framework of interpretation is a request for SO/ACs to take the take the core value into consideration, to develop their own policies to fulfill this core value of human rights, to do their own assessments, and also in the implementation assessment report. So this is a suggested way forward, which we have been contemplating. Some of you may know this from the last ICANN meeting that we had in June—the virtual meeting. We've been trying to develop a question, some sort of assessment, for our SO/ACs as one of the recommendations under the Work Stream 2 implementation towards SO/ACs for them to do assessments on themselves to ensure they themselves, we ourselves, being both a member of At-Large, NCSG, NCUC, and all the other SO/ACs, be it GAC and others, have their mechanism very inclusive and respect human rights. Just to point out and just to build on to what Sally, Betsy, and Cheryl have said, this recommendation and amendment to the bylaw was not jut directed to ICANN Org. It was directed to the entire community. So there is also a level of responsibility that SO/ACs have to ensure that also their frameworks respect human rights—be it, for example, dispute resolution, the engagement with the ombudsman and others, and also internally before escalating to those levels. So this is a concern that we need to work on and maybe take the steps and not only just put the burden only on ICANN Org but also on ourselves.

One way that we have been trying to develop is a tool, which I'm going to share here, which has been shared before. Various volunteers have

forward

EN

---

worked on this tool a lot of times since May to try to come up with some suggestions on SO/ACs can respect human rights, looking at for, example, dispute resolution mechanisms and joining mechanisms. So basically these are building onto the recommendations—the 42 recommendations—which are geared toward SO/ACs. So it's trying to ensure that these ... because those recommendations are human rights recommendations to some extent.

Some of the recommendations, for example, around SO/AC accountability in terms of joining: when someone is joining a community or being kicked out, they're given reasons, they're given a chance to defend themselves—those kinds of things. Those are the human rights right-to-due-process, for those who've studied human rights law. So we translated the first two recommendations into that with the various volunteers—very many of you. Thanks so much, for those who contributed. But this is an open process. It's not closed. We want to keep improving this tool. So if we can have some baseline, each community can start working towards doing an assessment of themselves—not just ICANN Org but also SO/ACs—so as one of the recommendations under the Work Stream 2 recommendations that SO/ACs should do an assessment of themselves, an HRIA on themselves to ensure that they comply with human rights and they are in compliance with the core value and the bylaws.

So this in a suggestion and we'd want also to get feedback as a way forward. So beyond just waiting to hear back from ICANN Org or from others— putting only the burden on others—we also need to assess

forward

EN

---

ourselves and see how we respect human rights ourselves, whether at a leadership or a community level at various SOs and ACs. Just to echo that this tool—it's the second time I'm presenting it. We presented it at the last ICANN meeting at the GAC session. We received a lot of feedback on how to keep improving the tool, and we want more communities to keep providing feedback so that we can soon start doing a self-assessment, similar to the way we do self-reflections once in a while, be it financial or otherwise, in terms of human rights of our systems to ensure that our systems respect human rights internally as SO/ACs there's a way forward, not only at the ICANN Org level. So that's on that.

You might have noted there's a blog which we released a month ago. I worked on it at least a month ago. It's targeted towards just echoing what Betsy mentioned—that it's good that these steps are being taken but then we need to move forward beyond just that and ensure that, if possible, there's a suggested way forward. A suggested way forward is trying to ensure that there's a log on the website which points to each and every recommendation for human rights—for example, in those HRIA specifically for the Org, how the recommendations are being implemented at each stage, beyond just saying half of them are being implemented and half of them are being considered being implemented. So it's having some clear clarity and transparency on that. That would be very, very helpful as a way forward.

I think that's it. Just to continue saving time to ensure that we have a lot of time for open Q&A questions, I will hand over to the next

forward

EN

---

person—Olivier—for Agenda [Item] 5 through Joanna. Joanna, you can take over. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Ephraim. That was very informative. My understanding is that Olivier is still on his way to join us, which might give us an opportunity to look into the questions. There's already a discussion going on in the chat. So, while we wait for Olivier to join us and to provide his feedback, it might make sense for us to look into those questions. Some of those are quite substantial, I would argue. There seems to be a certain divergence between the very specific work that was done by the working party and that is focused on the human rights impact assessment that you wonderfully just described, Ephraim, and the more overall narrative that Cheryl introduced with the entire narrative of human rights being weaved into the work that we do here within ICANN, in a sense, not directly linked to the human rights assessments, which themselves bring certain challenges. So I would encourage us to look into the questions in the Q&A pod. I've noted down a few of those questions.

The first one came from Rafik and focused on the presentation coming from our wonderful Org staff. Ergys was kind enough to give a response in the chat box. If it were possible, Ergys, to elaborate on the question coming from Rafik: "What about staff to have labor union and organize themselves in different offices?" I sense a certain entertaining flair to that question, but I understand, Ergys, you have a very serious response. So I'd love to hear from you on that very

forward

**EN**

---

specific question, and then we will move to questions that have more of a general narrative behind them. Thank you.

ERGYS RAMAJ:

Thank you, Joanna and everyone. I'm happy to elaborate. The third party that carried out the human rights impact assessment did a few things that are worth mentioning as part of the methodology, and those were document reviews, face-to-face interviews, site visits—in our cases, these are our regional and engagement centers—as well as staff-wide surveys. My point was that, in all of this, the issue of labor unions simply did not come up as a consideration.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Ergys. That is a comprehensive answer. I would assume it answers Rafik's query.

I see a discussion going on in the chat with questions and replies or counter-questions, so to speak. I will try to take these one by one. Stephanie Perrin, thank you for your input and for joining us. I'm curious if you might want to rephrase that question or repeat it. Or would you rather I read it out, Stephanie. If you had access to a mic, it would be wonderful if you had the opportunity to reply.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much, Joanna. Can you hear me?

forward

---

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, of course. Go ahead. Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, of course, I have a lot to say on this particular topic. Unfortunately, I haven't had the time over the past two years to join the working group, although I do follow it. So please forgive me if I'm speaking out of turn.

It does seem to me [inaudible]. The most important area that we have to apply human rights impact assessments is on the policy work. It does seem to me that much of what ICANN is doing, while it's laudable, comes under general corporate responsibility. So the actual human rights issues that they need to tackle are the very pointy and awkward ones. We have a lot of people in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group who represent political groups and the downtrodden and those who are disenfranchised, who are basically human rights defenders. They have difficulties traveling to countries where human rights are not respected. They may be on a watch list because they believe in free speech and they have spoken out against certain practices. So there is a really thorny question to throw at ICANN. We have listed countries where human rights are not necessarily respected and where our members, at least, might be at risk of even imprisonment if they were bold enough to get into the country. So that's a really difficult one. I'm just throwing that to you because general corporate responsibility and worker rights and those kinds of issues is the easy stuff. This is a hard question.

forward

EN

---

The other thing, of course, is applying the human rights impact assessments to the PDPs. I use the example of the EPDP, where we couldn't even get a privacy impact assessment, which would certainly have made our work a lot quicker and shorter, had we done that assessment. But a human rights impact assessment would also be useful because, of course, when any of these complaints against the handling of personal information under the GDPR go to court, the court will, of course, look at the charter of rights—the European charter. So a human rights impact assessment will ferret out those issues. Of course, we have the recent Schrems II decision, which was largely based on the human rights and not so much the GDPR.

So those are two things. The first question that I asked was, why is it so hard for us to get a plenary topic on human rights? We submitted this topic, and it was very kind of you to invite us to join your panel today. We really appreciate that. It's a great opportunity to work together. But we had proposed these human rights as a plenary, and there was no support. What are we doing wrong? It's clear there's a lot of interest in it. So that was my first question.

So that's quite a bundle to plop on to the discussion, but there you go. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Stephanie. That's very helpful. That's exactly why we welcome your willingness to come and meet with us and try and

forward

EN

---

discuss individuals—whatever we call them; non-commercial users or end users—and their interests.

A note from staff that I should remind everyone to state their name, and I haven't—it's Joanna Kulesza for the transcript record—and to speak at a reasonable pace. The emotions are running high, so that might be challenging. But thank you, Stephanie. Those are very welcome comments.

I also note, later on in the chat, with Austin emphasizing the human rights impact assessment to bring a certain cost to those who are willing to implement them, which might partially answer your question.

Going through the questions list we already have there in the chat, you will see that there are also more general questions looking into human rights and the very substance of the work that we're trying to address.

Ephraim, would you be willing to pick up Alberto's questions that are focused on the human rights as they stand or the universal declaration of human rights that Jonathan is referring to in his question? We have a question from Alberto Soto: "Human rights involve many rights which are considered." Then we have a follow-up Jonathan: "When we look at the universal declaration of human rights, many of them deal with the rights that would apply to non-registrant humans, and these include a vast variety of issues." So I think we're talking from two different perspectives—a very specific one focused on the human rights impact assessment, and a more general one that is focused on



forward

EN

---

the very substance of human rights and how they apply to policies. I'm curious, Ephraim, if you or other members of the NCSG might have feedback on that specific question, because I think that would bring us forward. There seems to be two different understandings on where we're coming from in terms of understanding human rights. I'm going to stop here. Ephraim, if you would like to take the floor and lead us, that would be wonderful. Thank you.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

Thank you so much, Joanna. Thank you so much, Jonathan and Alberto, for the question. It's good to have this back-and-forth conversation so that we ensure that everyone is on the same page.

Just to re-echo the framework of interpretation, I've just reshared the link to the framework of interpretation in the chat. So this clearly was very helpful in ensuring that this is limited. If I may quote the framework of interpretation—the exact section ... If you go to the last page, Annex 1, it anchors this framework of interpretation to the mission. So it reminds that the framework of interpretation is within the mission and its scope. So it says that it should not act outside its mission. That's Page 13 of the document that I just shared. You can note that this interpretation does not leave it open in terms of the human rights that are to be respected or are to be considered as part of the human rights work. Those are just to echo that ICANN is an [non state party] entity, so ICANN does not [inaudible] before the Human Rights Council in Geneva. ICANN does not present before the Human Rights Council in Geneva, obviously, because [it's not a state] party

forward

EN

---

but it's more of a private entity. So the UN guiding principles on business and human rights applies. Some of you might be following that conversation around the guiding principles and the current conversation on whether to convert the guiding principles into a treaty. So maybe when this happens and it becomes a treaty, that might change.

But just to answer those questions, the limit is within of interpretation is within the framework of interpretation. That's why, despite the bylaw being agreed upon a few years ago, this bylaw did not take effect until last November, when the framework of interpretation was accepted as part of Work Stream 2 recommendations during the ICANN Montreal meeting. So just to answer that. I know the questions sometimes might show, that, does this leave open ICANN to every human rights work and to consider every human right and that question about [non-registrant humans.

So just to point out that the limit is within the framework of interpretation—so limiting it to SO/ACs; how we conduct and make sure that we bring into the consideration of human rights, which has been happening informally. I think the recommendations have [affirmed] that. The Work Stream 2 recommendations [affirmed] that because some communities have been ... whether you know you've been doing human rights work or not, but [to some extent]-- for example, if you have been participating in PDP processes, trying to ensure that they are complying with privacy before even the Board acceptance of the framework of interpretation last November. That

forward

EN

---

was you ensuring that that is human rights being complied with within the PDP process.

But then trying to ensure if, for example, I've seen another question about labor unions or labor rights. If you've been working even, for example, with ICANN Org as staff, trying to push for equal pay, for maternity leave and other things, that is human rights, even if you didn't know that you were working on human rights compliance. So this framework of interpretation limits it to within the limits. I know [Farzaneh said this] as a joke about ICANN, despite the universal declaration of human rights, talking about that everyone has the right to food, ICANN does not work on the right to food, so ICANN cannot start being compelled to ensure that everyone has the right against hunger in the world or solving world hunger or the right to help across the world, despite them being human rights. So these human rights are within the remit of the framework of interpretation.

Thanks. I've just been told I've been rushing through. I hope I'm not too fast for the interpreters. I'm going to be a bit slow. Thanks for that.

Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Ephraim. Yeah, I'm happy to put on my moderator's hat. Thank you for attempting to reply.

We seem to have a lot of replies also in the chat. I see Olivier just joined us, which is very convenient. I'm curious if you're ready to take

forward

EN

---

the floor, Olivier, because we're stalling the discussions here for you. [inaudible] recommendation. I apologize. We're ahead of time. Thank you for making it a little bit earlier than provided on the agenda. If you are able to take the floor, we would love to hear your feedback on the way forward. But we have covered/focused on issues that I'm certain you are well aware of—thank you for joining us, Olivier—that focus on a bit of a different perspective on the general context of human rights and a more focused approach that is presented within the human rights impact assessment. So there seemed to be a certain divergence with one of the communities more focused on the human rights impact assessment and trying to get it implemented because it is a lens through which we'll look at human rights within ICANN. And Cheryl emphasized a need to weave human rights into everything we do, as comprehensive as they are. I take the liberty to reiterate. I would be eager to give you the floor, Olivier, just to guide us into this discussion, and then we can open up the floor to those of you who would like to take it. I would encourage you to raise your hands.

I see Jonathan's hand is up. I would love to hear first from Olivier and then I will give you the floor, Jonathan, if that is okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Joanna. I really apologize very much for being late. Unfortunately, I had a face-to-face meeting for February this year, and we finally managed to have it. So you guys are too early. You're too efficient in my absence. Thank you for the opportunity to chime in a little bit on these issues.

forward

EN

---

As you know, I've followed this group from a certain distance due to being busy elsewhere but was there doing its important moments when it was created. It's great to see it has had the impact on ICANN that it has had, bearing in mind that it is a group that is a working party. It's not an officially chartered group. I think that ultimately one of the great things of not being chartered is that you don't have all these problems of politics that seem to often poison relation, certainly in cross-community activities, in this organization. It's a pity that we have to go through such lengths to end up with results and with being able to deal with issues which often could not be seen as ICANN core issues, per se, but are indeed issues that are very important that ICANN has to abide by. Human rights is a topic which I'm sure many have already said ... There used to be a time in ICANN where you used to say, "Oh, I want to speak about human rights, and we need to discuss this topic, and we need to find out if ICANN abides by human rights." Or, speaking about a human rights impact assessment, there are many people in ICANN just rolling their eyes backwards, going, "Oh, my God. What are we going to talk about human rights for? This is all rubbish. We just deal with the Internet's identifiers. It is completely outside the remit of ICANN." As we know and as we've seen in history, human rights as been a key component part of governance as a whole these days, as a backstop to methods that are used by some governing bodies that operate completely outside the internationally expected standards of ethics and various aspects, which I think human rights describe in much better detail. In fact, I'm not an expert in the topic, but certainly the work that has been done by this group in being able

forward

EN

---

to engrain a number of points relating to human rights in the ICANN bylaws is really, really exceptional.

The question really is, where do we go from here? This is where there is a concern because, of course, there are many challenges for a group that is not chartered and that is faced with the real politick of ICANN, as one would say.

The human rights impact assessment is not something which I think our community was very much aware—community of end users. I know that many of the organizations—At-Large Structures—that totally knew what this was about, but some did not. So it's not something that was like a letter in the post and [they] said, "Okay, we're going to proceed forward with this and it's going to happen." We're dealing with a fine line with concerns that some have that human rights at ICANN might just be looking at freedom of speech, when really we're also looking at, in a bigger way, the protection of people when it comes down to crime, etc. So it's a more fuller picture than this.

At the same time, we have to recognize that ICANN is not just a standard organization or a standard company, where you could say, "Well, let's follow the Ruggie Principles," for example, and therefore it will make sure that only organizations and countries and so on that follow human rights should be dealing with ICANN, and it will put pressure on others to change. ICANN is not in a position to be able to do that. It has to serve every single TLD out there regardless of whether they even run by governments that don't respect human

forward

# EN

---

rights. This is a real difficulty. So we have to find, somehow, a middle-of-the-road solution here.

The position, I think, that we're down with human rights is something that is probably past an ICANN. We're not down with human rights. We're not done with human rights. There's always more to be done. But, at the same time, we really have to put our heads together into thinking, "Well, okay. We've reached a point of human rights impact assessment." Maybe there needs to be a lot of explanation to those parts of ICANN that don't quite understand what that [entails], that might not have the actual knowledge or the ability to do such things. So there's a big communication part that is important in this, so that's why I think part of our work is going to have to be education around ICANN and to make sure that we still keep this as being more of something that ICANN wants to do and the ICANN communities want to do, rather than the ICANN communities needing to do by being pushed into it. They have to be willing to do it, very much like if you'd look at what happened at the World Conference on International Telecommunications in 2012, when Tunisia insisted that human rights should be included in the first paragraphs of the treaty. Some countries were up in arms and really pushed back so hard. It was made quite clear that actually it's a good thing to have. I think that we need to make sure that we also change that culture in ICANN so not we're just an organization that looks purely at the commercial side of things and how much it costs but also the human side of things. Certainly, from an At-Large perspective, when it comes to end users, human rights are a key component parts. It needs to be engrained not

forward

EN

---

only there but maybe even engrained in contracts. I'm pushing the bar a little far here, but the accreditation agreement, etc., might be one direction that one could look at.

Anyway, I think I've already spoken a bit too much, and I see I'm rambling now. But I think we still have much to do, and education is one of the sizeable things that we need to do. The rest of it is stuff that we need to work on.

I hope I wasn't too messy in my intervention.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Thank you so much. I hope you can hear me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible].

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: We can hear you. Yeah, thank you so much, Olivier. Olivier [inaudible]. [inaudible] so I will continue the moderation. [inaudible]. We've addressed Alberto's question and—Jonathan, did you have—

YESIM NAZLAR: Ephraim, I'm sorry for interrupting. but your audio is breaking up, and our interpreters are not able to interpret at this time. I just wanted to check if Joanna is maybe able to take over if we have better audio for her.



forward

EN

---

JOANNA KULESZA: Let's try that. I'm assuming my audio is okay.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes. Thank you, Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Olivier. I see the discussion heating up. I'm curious if we just might want to go through the queue. I see Jonathan's hand is up. Jonathan, the floor is yours. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Joanna. I know it's a broader and much longer conversation, but I think, within the At-Large, we're tasked to look at the interests of individual Internet users, which goes beyond those that are registering for domains, so we have to be careful that we don't sculpt any human rights impact assessment just to look at the impact that ICANN policy has on registrants. We need to look at the impact that will be felt by non-registrants—the people that are just trying to use the Internet as well. Obviously, I'm not talking about famine, necessarily, but, given that we're talking about an impact assessment, it seems reasonable that we would look at the impact of our policies on a broader spectrum of rights that incorporated the rights of those that are outside of the registrant community of ICANN. So that's really what I was trying to get to with looking up some of those examples, not that we need to look at every right, but we need to look at things where

forward

EN

---

ICANN policy may in fact have an impact on the rest of the humans.  
Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. I'm curious if any of the participants in the chat would like to take the floor. I have the notes. I'm happy to go through the questions and the comments. But, if you're here and you're able to use your audio, I would be happy to give you the floor. I'm curious if there is anyone who would like to take the floor and ask questions.

If that is not the case, I'm just going to go through the comments. We've had a comment coming from Austin. Austin is the Co-Chair of the cross-community working party on ICANN using the third-party service for human rights impact assessment, which might [attend to the] concern regarding the costs. Austin, I see you commenting here. Would you be willing to take the floor—willing and able? I know those are two different things.

AUSTIN RUCKSTUHL:

Yeah. Hi. Thank you, Joanna and Ephraim and Betsy and everyone who has made interventions. It's quite early for me here in California, so I'm trying to keep up with the conversation in chat and add some comments.

I guess the point I wanted to emphasize is that a lot of the questions can be addressed that are showing up in the chat or in these

---

conversations on a case-by-case basis. I think Jonathan’s comment about opening it up a little bit wider because it is At-Large or ALAC to more issues within an HRIA scope is very possible. But the work has to start somewhere. I think that’s the biggest takeaway that I’ve learned: the first requirement ... Scope is almost not as important as volunteer time. I know we’re all burnt out and there’s just so many other things to do, so many issues within ICANN’s space. But, if we can get a core group of really just six volunteers to ban together and have a discussion with CCWP members, then we can scope out the work. Then we can start with a few rows in an HRIA tool or a few discussion points for examination. That tool really can feed into documents, like papers that we’ve written after we used the tool to crowdsource all of the ideas of the HRIA. Then it can lead to an output document. But all that requires a small group of people willing to look at scope. Then, like I said, once you make the community aware ... When we joined the SubPro’s PDP to do an HRIA, many people who joined the SubPro’s PDP—it was very late in the game ... But we didn’t really have a lot of substantive knowledge of that PDP. But we created a group and we kept sharing our tool with them, with everybody that was already in that PDP for years, and we were saying, “What do you think you could add?” or, “What can you think of over the years that’s come up as something we should add in our HRIA consideration?”

So it’s definitely a team effort. It definitely requires collaboration. But once it gets started, once it gets kicked off, then it’s a lot easier to just send the link to the people. We had an explainer document that said, “This is how we’re using this—what looks like an Excel spreadsheet—

forward

EN

---

but we're using it as a tool. Here's how you can collaborate. Anybody can drop in a row in there." So we presented this to the GAC and it kind of didn't really go anywhere, not surprisingly in a way, but I think ALAC could be a much better target for this.

So, if anyone is interested, I'd just encourage you to reach out to Ephraim or myself, and we'll help you lead it.

That's all I got for right now. Thank you, everybody.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Austin. I see also a comment ... I still don't see any hands up. I see a lively chat. I know there are many positions represented in this group, but I don't see any hands up. I see a comment from Greg, who's on the SubPro PDP. He [inaudible] substantial discussion on the human rights impact assessment.

I'm curious also to see if there are any thoughts on collaboration. I see the opening, the welcome, coming from the cross-community working party. I have been looking into the work that's provided there. I'm curious if there are any other ideas on how to get this work going. I understand that there's a history behind this group, and I'm curious if there is some way for us to overcome it and provide effective input at this point.

I see Olivier and Gangesh. Thank you raising your hands. Olivier, go first, and then the floor goes to Gangesh. Thank you.

forward

EN

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Joanna. I'll try and stick to my two-minute time limit on this. I mentioned earlier that ICANN isn't a standard organization. It's a private-sector organization that has a worldwide mandate to coordinate some resources around the world and has to deal with the both the private sector but also with governments. If one applies a standard commercial framework to ICANN, it's not exactly correct to apply a standard commercial framework to ICANN. If one applies a governmental framework to ICANN, like the United Nations, for example, that's not correct either.

So this is why it's a little bit of a tricky animal, but certainly I think human rights at ICANN is particularly important because it assumes functions which are sometimes assumed by governments. Things like coordinating the root is something that ... We will see a lot of governments saying, "Oh, well, that's a critical resource. We are doing this thing. We are running the critical infrastructure in our country." We are seeing here ICANN performing this in a very successful way. I'm not advocating any change at all—far from that—but what I am saying though is that ICANN also needs to behave in a way which is not just a purely private sector way—in fact, US private sector way—because it is very much like an international organization. It just doesn't have the same legal framework to it. But its functions are very much like that. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Olivier. Gangesh?

forward

EN

---

GANGESH VARMA:

Hi. Thank you. I want to thank everyone who spoke today and made their presentations, and especially the lively discussion on the chat. I'm sharing my perspective from having engaged very briefly on this issue at very different stages of the discussion, some of it closer to the transition and the Work Stream 2 accountability and now more close to the tool that has been developed by the cross-community working party as well.

I agree with some of the comments that have been said—that there's enough to get started on—and I believe, if we focus our energies on the SO/AC-level interventions or the self-assessments, that would be a very useful start. I understand that it may not be enough, and it might be an inefficient way to do it, given that there might be some overlaps, but, given that it's difficult to get enough critical mass to get it at a very coordinated level, if we have these separate SO/ACs working on these issues and identifying their areas of human rights impact and specific issues, one, it becomes more relatable to stakeholders to really understand what it is that we speak about when we speak about human rights because, even within a single stakeholder group, there might be very diverse areas or issues that we're talking about under this very single umbrella. So that's one of the ways I was thinking we could go.

But one of the things I think the ALAC did very well with the DNS abuse approach was that two-pronged approach. One is to look at the policy imperatives and investing in trying to see how policies develop within

forward

EN

---

ICANN. The other is to inform and educate the end user. I was thinking, what if the ALAC could adopt the same approach with human rights? Have the end-user education and have the end-user interaction. That will feed into developing more capacity or understanding how human rights could be more precisely defined and used for HRIA at the organization.

So that's my short comment. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Gangesh. I apologize for mispronouncing your name.

I see a hand from Gregory, and the discussion on DNS abuse and human rights as policy [theme] falls right into Olivier's and Jonathan's remit, I believe. But I would like Gregory to take the floor first and then possibly hear from our At-Large policy leads. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Following a little bit on Olivier's last intervention—perhaps I didn't quite understand what Ephraim was saying earlier—the guiding principles on human rights was something that was discussed extensively within the group preparing the work for interpretation, and it's reflected in the framework of interpretation that, given ICANN's unique nature, the guiding principles are not supposed to just be applied in whole-cloth to ICANN and, in fact, there would be some unintended consequences and problems that would arise if that were

forward

EN

---

to be done. So therefore I hope I wasn't hearing that it was just applied completely ... It sounded rather definitely as if that part of the framework of interpretation hadn't really been taken into account. But I could be wrong.

Separately, I think, in terms of a way to move forward, perhaps moving this out of a completely unchartered group or a group that is really in fact a subcommittee of the NCSG and something that's more truly cross-community in its founding in nature might be useful in getting broader, more balanced participation and, therefore, results. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Greg. That is very constructive, and that is exactly the kind of feedback, I believe, we're looking for.

I'm curious if Olivier or Jonathan might want to—I see Olivier's hand is up. So I believe there was a proposal for the At-Large to pick up human rights as a theme. I'm curious what your take on that would be, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Joanna ... I'm going with the wrong thing. Okay. Thanks very much, Joanna. I think it's certainly something that At-Large and the ALAC should pick up. Maybe we haven't done enough on that. I feel guilty because there's so many things that one has to do at ICANN, so many different topics. We have several people who follow



forward

# EN

---

the working group but perhaps [we] haven't been proactive enough about human rights—proactive enough about the topic in—our policy development.

You've heard from Jonathan. When it comes down to protection of end users, protection from harm, this is something which I think there definitely is an interest in within our community. We just have to stick with it and maybe even put some people in charge to drive it through our weekly Consolidated Policy Working Group calls.

The thing that I really find frustrating at ICANN often is that you start a great working group that is dealing with a really important topic, and then you just have only a handful of people that push it. And ICANN does this second thing—I have this experience through the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance—in that you certainly receive criticism and you're told, "Well, it's not truly cross-community because some people are not at the table." And this is irrespective of how many times you have invited those people to come to the table. But, because they're not interested, they're not coming. And because they're not coming, then they criticize you for not having a balanced group. I think that's ... I would even employ the word "shameful" because it's one of these of saying, "Well, we're not going to take part, and because we're not taking part, it's not cross-community. And because it's not cross-community, then the value of what it produces is greatly diminished." I think that's a real problem.

So, by the ALAC picking this up as well and working hand-in-hand with the NCSG and maybe even having its own regular discussions on the

forward

# EN

---

topic and perhaps even agenda on some of these points, at least that's a little widening of the area. But I have no idea how we can convince the others who are reticent to come to the table to even part in those discussions. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Olivier. I see there is also a discussion going on in chat. I see the hands that are up from Gangesh and Gregory. Oh, Stephanie's hand seems to be new. If I'm assuming correctly, Gangesh's hand is also an old hand, so, Stephanie, if you would like to take the floor, go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. I just wanted to thank Olivier very much for that last comment. I think we had trouble interesting people in this topic. Just as I earlier raised the question, we have difficulty getting cross-community support for a plenary on it at this meeting. So it is irritating when people complain afterwards that we didn't include everybody. Whose responsibility is it when you have open meetings and a cross-community working party that is open to all to include people, really? I think that's a responsibility we all take on when we participate in ICANN: to know what's going on and to join if we're interested.

I think it would be great, going forward, if we could work together on this. It would be a great example of ALAC/NCSG participation. But I will give you caveat. I think we will be pushing back strenuously every time you suggest that protection from criminal activity is a human right

forward

EN

---

that ICANN ought to be focusing on. It is certainly true that we're not in favor of criminal activity going unchecked, but we have enough fora to deal with the topic of abuse without importing it into human rights. So, if you're prepared to live with us arguing with on that particular topic, I think this would be a great joint venture. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Stephanie. I think that's a very productive comment. I think you hit the nail on the head, so to speak. The discussion around DNS abuse needs to be counterweighted, if you will, by the discussion around privacy, security, and other human rights as we understand them. But that makes it even more challenging, [is that all of a sudden turns us] into a small UN that has to decide on all the world's issues.

I would be curious to see if we have comments coming live. I see the comments in the chat. Jonathan is supporting a compromise. I believe, Stephanie, also that the comment coming from Greg was not so much about us not being aware [as the very constitution] of that group, but I believe we are beyond that point and we should agree that there is a will to move forward.

We have a few more minutes. I'm curious if my co-moderator, Ephraim, has any thoughts he would be willing to share, because I feel like I'm grabbing the floor. Ephraim?

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:

No. Thank you. I hope my network is much better now.

forward

EN

---

I just want to maybe flag something that is interesting which maybe has not been discussed in detail much before: something from Gangesh Varma about if it's possible or does it make sense to use Work Stream 2 budget allocation for human rights impact assessment for SO/ACs? So this is a really good question because, as you are aware, this is a question that ... At the beginning of the chat, you'll note that this was a question that was raised: why is it difficult to do human rights impact assessments for SO/ACs at the moment? It was something that was argued. It's something which is important to do, and we've noted from Betsy's comment and the other position from ICANN Org that this was done by a third party. So I'd be curious to see what others think about that.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Ephraim. I'm curious if our panelists have anything to add here or if there's anything coming from Cheryl. I see your discussion. We're slowly moving into [inaudible] summary. I would be happy to share the floor with Ephraim to provide one. I'm just curious if Cheryl or Olivier or our guests from the Org have any comments here on the discussion we had. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Joanna, hi. If you don't mind, I will jump in more on the chat that is coming through at the moment. It is a common problem when we look at what our cultural differences between many of us are. We are a global organization, and there are parts of the world that would rather

forward

EN

---

than, as I often refer to it, a fight than a feed. In other words, strong debate and discussion can tend towards even an aggressive tone at times, certainly [fast action], certainly abrasive in some ways. And in no way does anyone in those circumstances leave the room sulking, offended, and upset.

But that is not the norm across, and I think in this case we have to be hugely respectful of the differences between how people expect to have discussion conducted. Sometimes stepping out of one's comfort zone and having to use ... Even things as simple as the queueing in our remote participation often gives a different flavor and tone to things. I think we also need to experiment in the best methodologies for discussion and discourse that are also open and inclusive, and [therefore] do not bring in new barriers to inclusion because I think, after all, that's what we're all about. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Cheryl. Sally, I apologize. Your hand is up. Please go ahead.

SALLY COSTERON:

Please don't apologize. I just wanted to summarize. Thank you very much for facilitating this dialogue and inviting us to participate. It's much appreciated.

From the Org's perspective, as has been mentioned multiple times in this discussion, we're obviously running two separate but related tracks here with the Org-focused HRIA, which we're ongoing on the

forward

EN

---

implementation, and this very much wider discussion about human rights inside the policy-making process and inside ICANN and inside of the community—the volunteer community. Please keep us engaged, keep us connected to this. We will commit to share any insight that we generate from best practice or that might contribute to best practice or just new learnings that we make as we go through this. This is new territory for lots of us, and I'm very conscious that it's not an easy problem to solve, as this discussion is illustrating. I think it's very healthy that we stay connected and we stay talking to each other and sharing what we established and really being able to prioritize the best use of resources for the maximum outcome that benefits the most people whilst not tripping over our own feet in terms of our own processes. So thank you again. More to come, I think.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Sally. That is a wonderful summary. I welcome the opportunity to see this consensus-building, even though we're working remotely. As Olivier emphasized, it's easier to overcome those challenges when we do meet after a long day's ICANN meeting. But that's what we're left with, just a Zoom room and little pictures from cameras.

I would be inclined to summarize on this. Ephraim, you have any famous last words to share?

forward

EN

---

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Nothing. Just thankful that this first step is happening. I'm looking forward to more collaboration between the two communities. You can summarize.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Ephraim. Thank you, everyone, for participating. I believe this was—Alberto, your hand is up. Please, sir, go ahead. A summary from Alberto. And just briefly. We're one minute ahead of time.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. I'll speak in Spanish. I would feel more comfortable not talking about human rights in general. I made a comment. Jonathan supported my comment. They are very specific things—specific rights—that should be discussed. Actually, I don't quite understand. If we're not talking specifically, what policies can be considered, such as privacy and so on? [is] what Jonathan has said. I think we should act that way because, if we talk about human rights at large, it's very hard to reach a conclusion. If we consider all the human rights of the UN, we will rule out ours—very silly—and we will focus on specific rights within ICANN's remit. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: A challenge with translation, but that is At-Large for you. We are truly universal, speaking all the ICANN languages at once.

forward

**EN**

---

Everyone, thank you. I believe it is time to summarize. Thank you for taking the invitation. Thank you for joining us. Thank you to the ICANN Org staff for giving us a good example. I believe there's joint work to do be done. I believe there are difficult questions to be answered, but at the same time, I foremost welcome this collegial atmosphere we've managed to build despite the challenges of working remotely. Thank you for taking the time. A particular thanks for Olivier for rushing in. Thank you so much for doing that. Thank you, everyone, for being supportive and open-minded. I look forward to more discussion around security and individual rights within the ICANN community. Thank you to our staff. Thank you to our translation services and tech services. I will see you around ICANN69. Thanks, everyone. The session is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**