

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
July 10, 2015
1:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings have started. Please go ahead.

Leon Sanchez: Hello everyone and welcome to these Working Party 3 Meeting Number 3 on July 10. And I sent you an agenda for this call 50 minutes before the call actually. And I apologize for the short notice.

And I also sent a copy of document that drafted, and I - of course I don't expect that you have reviewed those documents in this very short notice.

But our agenda Item Number 3 would be mainly reviewing those draft proposals and discussing them. So while as usual the roll call will be based on those who are attending the call through the Adobe Connect room.

And if there is anyone that is not in the Adobe Connect room and that is attending the call through the phone bridge at this point, could you please state your name so we can add it to the roll call?

Okay. So we have had some action items from past calls. And I believe that we have completed all action items.

The only action item from our last call I believe was uploading the document that I sent to the list to the wiki. And that has been done already.

The action items from call one were also completed. And one of the most important action items in my mind was having the subgroups populated by the different volunteers.

And as far as I can tell, we have already nine people volunteered for the different working groups. And of course I thank you for volunteering.

And we do have a group that has only two people in it, which is a diversity group. So if anyone wants to add their name to the diversity subgroup, that would be a lot of help because, of course, everybody's overwhelmed with the load of work that we need to carry in this very short time; so the more hands we have in each subgroup, the more easy it will be for us to carry out with the task we've been commanded.

So if you want to add your name to the subgroups, that would be very useful.

I see Greg's comment that staff council's group only had two - oh yes you are right. I'm sorry I was confused. It's not the diversity group. It's that is staff accountability that is - that only has two volunteers. Thank you for pointing that out, Greg.

And yes when I said diversity, I meant the staff accountability. So yes, being staff accountability a subject that has been widely discussed and that has raised so many concerns. I would have expected to have more people volunteering for the subgroup, so please don't be shy and join the subgroup.

So as I said, I sent a couple of draft proposals. The first one is the SO AC draft proposal on the inventory - based on the inventory that I sent on our last call. And I developed this two-page document, which I would very much appreciate your feedback and comments on it.

And you can see that it, of course, contains very much the same information that I sent you in the preliminary inventory of mechanisms of for system mechanisms for SO AC accountability. It also explains a little bit the scope of our work and why are we looking into these SO and AC accountability issue.

And it closes by suggesting four actions that should be taken into account by the CCWG when building their next proposal.

And the first one is to amend our current draft document to include in our next proposal the commitment to have each SO AC perform a complete review of their existing accountability mechanisms as part of Workstream 1 tasks to be implemented after the transition takes place.

The second one is to include the evaluation of the proposed mutual accountability roundtable as part of Workstream 2.

If you remember Willie suggested a mutual accountability roundtable and I believe that Jan supported that exercise.

And so, I feel that maybe having this mutual accountability roundtable option examined and reviewed in more detail would be very useful as part of the Workstream 2 work that we need to undertake on our next phase in this working group.

Point number two would be to establish a commitment to carry a detailed working plan on enhancing SO and AC accountability as part of Workstream 2.

And lastly to clarify that IRP should be applicable to SOs and ACs activities as well.

So at this point I would open the floor for comments and thoughts on this draft that we have on our screen; and, of course, welcome any comments that you may have.

I see Jan's hand is up. Jan could you please take the floor?

Jan Scholte: Jan's mind is not really working too well yet, but I will do my best. Good morning from Britain anyway.

It looks great Leon. Thank you. That's really that's really nicely put together on short notice.

One thought was whether there would also be a review in the documentation; a review of the SO AC documents themselves. The SO AC rules and procedures whether it would be part of the review that would be undertaken now.

I know we haven't done it yet but you've listed those three documents, those three sets of documents. But we also have a fourth that we should look at, at this stage.

And in the other point was simply to say and Mathieu did circulate something yesterday which had some specific provisions about SO AC accountability.

Did you look at that and decide that that was not something to incorporate here?

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Jan. I did see Mathieu's proposal. And I think as well as your proposal and I'm focusing on semantics.

It's not that I consider that they were not important; it's just that I had very little time to set this up. So the intent of course of discussing the draft in this call is to have them refined by the rest of the volunteers in each subgroup.

So yes, I would definitely agree Mathieu's suggestions and your suggestions to this draft. But I would really appreciate if anyone could lend a hand incorporating those aspects into this document.

So of course now that you have this documents on hand, it would be great if you could help me add those considerations into the suggestions or into the body of the document itself.

And I do agree that we need to take a look at the fourth set of documents, which is the procedural documents on SOs and ACs.

And I apologize for not considering this in this draft, but yes I was just loaded with work from not only ICANN but also my day-to-day job, so I wasn't able to go through this fourth document.

So feel free to...

Jan Scholte: Yes.

Leon Sanchez: ...go through the document and incorporate any provisions that you may consider important for this draft paper.

Jan Scholte: Yes and Leon I wouldn't want you to be loaded - overloaded with all the work you're already doing so much on this. I mean I and I'm sure other people on the SO AC subgroup I'm sure would be happy to help and look through those.

I don't have access to that paperwork and I don't know whether staff have already made it available or whether we need to get it or how we get it; that is the SO AC documentation.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Jan. I believe that staff circulated or at least included in the mailing list this set of documents from each SO and AC.

It's a list as I - as far as I can tell on the different documents and papers that regulate of course each SOs and ACs procedures. And it has links to the strategic documents in this list.

So I think that maybe having staff reminding us and sending again these compilation of documents would be very helpful so we can all go through the different documents in detail.

So I would kindly asked staff to add that as the next item for staff.

And I saw Cheryl's hand was up and it only just went down, so I'm not sure if Cheryl would you want to add something to this?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. In fact, you covered it. I was just going to mention that not only were they circulated, but of course each of the ACs and SOs have a Wiki page or

Web page associated with the .icann.org space and they are all found there as well. That's all.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Are there any other comments or suggestions as to how we could refine this draft document that we have on the screen?

Okay. So the next question would be if - are there any objections on the four points that so far are being suggested as the conclusion of our work with regards to SO and AC accountability?

Of course, this would - this could vary with regards to or depending on that the review of the documents that we just discussed.

And I see Alan Greenberg's hand is up. Alan, could you please take the floor?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. The documents within ICANN are going to demonstrate to what extent we have rules, which presumably we follow governing how each part of the operation works.

You know, and that goes for the ALAC. There's RALO rules. There's - there's just a whole bunch of nested things, sometimes nested quite, quite deep.

That will show that we have rules. They don't necessarily show that we follow the rules. And they don't show how we are accountable to anything wider than the people who are actually active participants.

So as an example, there's a business constituency in GS - within part of the GNSO. That's a very, very tiny subset of the business operations in the world.

To what extent are we - do we claim and to what extent do we want to be able to claim that in each of the cases, the participants in the ICANN process actually are - embody a real - I'm not sure what the right word is - a subset that maps to the real community outside and to what extent do we want to be able to do that?

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Alan. I agree with you. We have a lot of nested regulations or rules that they are there, but that doesn't mean that they are being followed.

As a matter of fact, when we go through the next document with regards to staff accountability, I - you will see that most of the references that we find in not only the Affirmation of Commitments and bylaws and ATRT recommendations are kind of the exactly nested tools that should apply for staff, but they are not clearly stated as to be applicable to staff.

So I do agree that we might as well need to be more clear as to which rules and how they are applicable to each SO and AC.

Next in the queue I have Avri. Avri, could you please take the floor?

Avri Doria: Hi. Avri speaking. I'm just beginning to have sort of initial thinking on some of these and on your document. And one thing I guess - and what Alan said I think there were two issues. One of them is do we all have a consistent set of rules?

Now at the moment because of the relationship of the SOs and ACs, there's not only, as Alan said the accountability to the broader community, to the broader NGO community, or whichever we're proposing, you know, the registrar community, what have you.

There's - so there's in some sense how do we even determine that? In some cases it's like an easy - it was like registrars because it's a fixed body in terms of businesses or NGOs indefinitely large.

Part of that is in that whole cycle of Board reviews and the Board sort of oversight of the SOs and ACs. And so I think we have to in doing an analysis of to what degree are they accountable now and how do we determine it, we have to include that that review cycle as part of it.

Now we also have to include, I guess, in that analysis that the effectiveness of the review cycle depends a lot on the model we've got.

If we've got a model where the Board has authority over the SOs and ACs in some sense like we do now, yes, we'll bottom up but because the review cycle we also need to respond, then that counts for one -you know, that counts in one way.

If, on the other hand, we move to a model where the Board does not oversee the SO AC because they are the members that oversee the Board, then we have possibly a different way of looking at whether the reviews that the Board does count in terms of the accountability. So that's one set of issues that I wanted to throw into it.

I personally don't think that this group -- and maybe I misunderstood -- needs to look at the issue of how good are they at doing it now?

You know, that it has to be dealt with in different ways but I don't see us doing that kind of analysis.

The other issue I thought was a question I've got is on four clarifying that IRP should be applicable. At the moment I think it's fairly clear that it isn't.

And so it seems to me that it's more than a clarification. It would be re-tasking the IRP in such a way that it would be.

Now one of the things that we have to deal with at that point is are these foundational documents that the ACs, SOs have that are the - you know, some of - they're defined in the bylaws but then they also have their own whole operating procedures.

To what extent is that sufficient for IRP? How, you know, is the same standard of injuries applicable, et cetera? So I think that clarify is probably far too a simple word.

The other issue is, is there an escalation procedure at the moment in terms of getting to IRP? There's, you know, reconsiderations and such before that.

If we're making the IRP the first level A, is that appropriate, B, is that a different work loading on an IRP. How does that change the whole issue of how do you pay for it is an issue?

So I think we have issues there. The other part that we don't have is one of the places that the ombudsman has done a lot of work and that I know we're not really talking about the ombudsman until Workstream 2 but one of the places that the ombudsman does a lot of work is in that arbitrary issues intra-SO or AC issues.

I don't know how much he does it. I know within the NCSG he has certainly been accountable sometimes. I don't know within the larger GNSO whether he ever has. But so is that an ingredient in all of this as well?

So those are just some of the questions I had on the first reading of it all.
Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Avri. These are very useful comments. And I would definitely encourage you to help me enrich the document with if not the questions themselves maybe your views on how we could address those questions and build them into our proposal document.

And with regards to for example the ombudsman role I see it and this is of course my personal understanding that while he is or his role is to mediate between different people within the ICANN structure I - I'm not sure I could interpret that his role is in itself an accountability mechanism but rather just the mediation mechanism.

But yes, I mean that's it's true that we would need to maybe refine or enhance the ombudsman role with regards to what this type of mediation.

So next in the queue I have Greg Shatan. Greg can you please take the floor?

Greg Shatan: Thank you Leon, Greg Shatan for the record. I think one other resource to consider adding to this document would be the organizational overviews since I think they at least touch on issues of accountability within the organization. And may in fact the facility mechanisms as reviews, you know, should tend to be.

So there is the for instance the GNSO review which was done by Westlake governance and which is currently in a public comment period whenever you think about how well or appropriately done that review was it seems that it should be a resource and its predecessors and it's reviews that have been done for the other organizations and structures will probably seem to be a - an essential part of this overall picture. So I would suggest that they be added as well. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Greg. Next in the queue I have Alan Greenberg. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you, just a further comment from Avri on the ombudsman. The ombudsman I think is a very large part of this because although the ombudsman does do things like mediation his formal role is really in addressing disputes often associated with fairness.

That is, is an AC or SO or staff for that matter exercising the rules they have fairly and evenly across the community or are they treating one group of people or one person differently than the others which essentially says they're not following the rules?

So I think it does come the ombudsman does come - the ombudsman does play a very large part of this. We may not be modifying, looking at modifying what the ombudsman does and enlarging the scope until Workstream 2 but from the point of view of monitoring process and making sure that we are in fact accountable and following the rules we put in place the ombudsman does play a lot of - a very large part of that. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. Okay so once we have the notes from staff sent up to the list I will definitely look into incorporating the comments that (unintelligible) kindly just made in this call.

But I will also encourage that now that you have documents in your inbox maybe you could add your comments or your views yourselves to the document.

And I don't know which would be the best way to collaborate or build this document in a collaborative manner. I don't know if you feel comfortable working on a document or maybe a Word document or let's say maybe I should set up a Google document which we all could fill in our contributions. Maybe I would call for a quick agreement.

Do you want me to set up a Google documents so that we can all collaborate and make our contributions into that document?

Please signal me with a green ticket if you agree or with a red cross if you don't and you would feel more comfortable working on a Word document?

Okay so far I have three green ticks and one red cross. Okay, well I have a majority of green ticks so I will definitely set up the Google documents and circulate link to all of you on the list so we can contribute our thoughts and contributions in a collaborative manner.

Now I would ask staff to please display the document on the staff accountability.

Thanks. So the staff accountability draft paper that we have in the screen also reflects some of the comments made in discussion started that Mathieu drafted.

And I have incorporated some of the views, of course tweaked some of the words and made an initial or an initial assessment of the different existing mechanisms and inventory.

And this of course might be incomplete since I didn't go through the fourth set of documents that relate to the different SOs and ACs that staff circulated.

And while I wouldn't expect to find a lot of mechanisms in those documents I would definitely or we would definitely need to go through those documents as well to see if there is any reference with regards to how staff would be - or could be held accountable to the different SOs and ACs.

And so the documents reviewed were as well the ICANN bylaws, the affirmation of commitments, and the ATRT 1 and ATRT 2 final recommendations.

And with regards to the affirmation of commitments what I'm commenting here is that although the affirmation of commitments include these key commitments for ICANN the organization these commitments are centered being commitments that must be undertaken by the Board of directors and not necessarily by staff.

And this is where we can see the issue that Alan was raising that we have met the regulations or enacted rules that while applicable directly or explicitly to Board they should also be applicable to staff. But however we don't have the explicit wording as to whether these commitments would be applicable to staff.

We only have or as far as I could find we only have a Paragraph 9.1E from Affirmation of Commitments in which it refers directly to staff and how it

could - it would be held accountable to the Board of directors and the community.

And in the ATRT recommendations I did not find any particular recommendation that refers or relates directly to staff accountability but rather only to Board actions that need to be undertaken by staff.

And while to my understanding it doesn't exactly mean that staff could be held accountable to either staff or the larger community.

And within the bylaws I found some articles which are listed here Article 4 Section 2.28, 2.3 F Article 5 Section 2 and Article 13 Section 4.

And while they do establishes certain aspects of accountability with regards to staffing these articles and sections and but of course I think they don't address the concerns raised by the larger community and also our working group.

So the three steps that I am suggesting that the CCWG takes is of course review our current document so we can for example maybe extend those mechanisms that we are proposing for the staff where applicable.

And also include a work plan as part of Workstream 2 that considers the creation for example of a code of conduct, the establishment of a transparency criteria to be followed by staff in relation to the interactions with all stakeholders and the establishment of regular independent either internal cross community surveys or audits to track progress, identified the areas where we could improve and establish appropriate processes to escalate issues that enable both community and staff members to raise issues.

And lastly establish a commitment to carry out the operating plan on enhancing staff accountability as part of Workstream 2.

So now I would like to again open the floor for comments and thoughts on these suggestions. So Avri your hand up?

Avri Doria: Yes. Yes thank you. This is Avri speaking. One thing on staff accountability which I think that but I'm not positive, one of the things with staff accountability is they are very often the only ones who actually know what's going on inside the staff and inside the operations of ICANN.

Now because staff is, you know, generally beholden to their bosses and trying to hold onto their jobs, you know, they are in one sense obligated to reveal what they know about what's going on especially in accountability structure.

But in another part they cannot do that unless there is extremely good, you know, call it whistle blowing, call it something else if that name is bothersome that basically puts them in a position to actually safely and securely report what they know about what's going on.

Now ATRT 2 and previous, you know, accountability documents that ICANN dealt with had success the whistle blowing.

The whistle blowing was part of the ATRT recommending and is something that is within that pending pile for ATRT 2 implementation.

In this case it was just a review. So let's just whether the methods they've got is a workable one.

But I think that how, you know, whistle blowing aspects for the staff I think it should be part of our accountability package but I want to make sure that other people think so too because it's slightly different sounding but I do think it's an integral part. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Avri. This is in fact a very good idea. Maybe we should be thinking on adding to the suggestions this plan on whistle blowing as you suggest I think it's a great idea so thank you for bringing it up.

Are there any other comments or thoughts with regards to this first draft on the staff accountability?

Okay I see no one raising their hand so I will do the same thing with this paper as that for SO and AC accountability.

I will set up a Google docs so those who are volunteering for staff accountability can provide their input. And we can build our proposal in a collaborative manner.

I also remind you and of course you to join this subgroup of staff accountability. We only had two people know so the more hands we have the easier that'll it'll be for us to have a better Word doc.

Our next agenda item is the discussion on diversity. I was unable to set up a paper on diversity. I went through Sebastien's comment which I find very useful.

I don't know if all of you were able to go through Sebastien's comment. So I see we have Sebastien on the call. and I don't know Sebastien if you would like to begin the discussion on diversity?

I'm sorry to put you on the spot like that - this but since you were the author of the comment I thought that you might be willing to kick start this discussion with explaining us your comment to the larger group.

Okay so he's telling me that he can't talk. Okay, no problem. So well, Sebastien's comment covers pretty much the aspect of diversity with regards not only to regional aspects but also to some other different criteria such as for example gender balance which I think it's very important.

Also age for example. I remember seeing also - okay so it was age, gender region and of course the different stakeholder groups or stakeholders from the larger ICANN community.

So I also recall seeing an email from Jan. And this issue - and it was circulated to the list. And he recommended to make explicit commitments regarding diversity that would address of course these issue or the concerns raised by the public comment with regards to for example the new proposed accountability bodies and to indicate also how SOs and ACs in holding the Board accountable to the (implement) and power mechanism are themselves also substantially accountable in the exercise of these powers.

So this would be the suggestion for Workstream 1 made by Jan. And also he suggested that in Workstream 2 we can include in the CCWG report an itemized list of specific issues and objectives regarding diversity on SO and AC accountability.

So I see Greg Shatan's hand is up. Greg could you please take the floor?

Greg Shatan: Thank you Leon, Greg Shatan again. Touching on the diversity group I think one remark that was made and I think it was in the open forum in the public forum and in was Buenos Aires with regard to diversity has to do with, you know, disabilities and accessibility to those with various disabilities in terms of keeping things diverse.

And so I think that's another diverse community or community that needs to be acknowledged. There is an accessibility group in the ALAC or that's been started by ALAC, other folks or members working to some extent on accessibility issues by which we - accessibility to people with various disabilities.

So I think that in addition to everything else we have to keep track of or should be looking at is the ability and of those with various disabilities.

And as we all get older whether we think of them as disabilities or not we're all becoming a little less able in the sense of physical capacity.

I would also remark oh maybe this is just a random remark at this time but the - at 2:41 in the morning I'm starting to think a little bit randomly that diversity is an issue that really needs to be dealt with at its root and, you know, with bringing people into the community not necessarily trying to make diverse choices from those already in the community that kind of is dealing with a symptom rather than root causes.

So and I think another issue with diversity is balancing diversity with other needs such as availability and expertise and a willingness to work and issues of diversity especially geographic diversity in groups that aren't organized geographically can sometimes create unintended consequences so just a few thoughts there, some less random than others. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much for your comments Greg. We also have some comments from Mathieu which were sent in reply to Jan's email.

And he said that he would propose maybe to set ICANN into a continuous improvement that regarding diversity and maybe expand the ATRT into accountability transparency and diversity reviews.

And of course this proposal would encompass that the Review Team would be tasked to assess and make recommendations regarding diversity across all ICANN bodies.

And this would be of course a simple step that wouldn't require a lot of effort nor complexity to incorporate into our proposal.

And he also suggests that to protect ICANN's undue influence from one region in the groups instead of imposing the strict one vote, one region rule he's proposing that we could set a limit that each SO or AC could appoint to the community council review teams no more than 1/3 of its representatives from a single region.

This would ensure in the community council that no region which is by itself the 1/3 threshold with its - which is would be sufficient to block certain votes. So these are the comments from Mathieu with regards to Workstream 1 and diversity.

And I see Jan's hand is up. So Jan could you please take the floor?

Jan Scholte: Yes this is Jan Scholte. The - I was going to say the same Leon just remind about Mathieu's suggestions which seem to be quite sensible.

One point is a little bit on the diversity provisions that one would make for the SO AC empowerments mechanism.

It's still a little bit hard to speak precisely diversity arrangements because we don't actually know at least I'm not yet aware how precisely that SO AC accountability mechanism, empowerment mechanism is going to be constituted.

So it's not - I'm not sure exactly what we're talking about. Is it the 29 members or is it each consistency has a one member? As long as we don't know that I'm not quite sure what diversity exactly would look like there.

The other question is that Mathieu has restricted as I - the minimum one could look at the regional diversity. And Mathieu's suggestion addresses the regional diversity. Are - is the group happy that we would limit the diversity provisions at this stage to a region so not actually addressing gender or age or language or culture, et cetera?

I don't have a particular view but it's just to say maybe one needs to have an explicit decision on how far we're pushing diversity at this stage.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Jan. I believe that when Mathieu refers to the community council he's referring to the 29 people body.

And I do agree that so far we has been looking at diversity as a regional matter and in this way I think that the comment from Sebastien is very useful and very constructive as it also considers factors as a gender, age and of course language in regards to diversity.

And I think that what Greg also said with regards to people with some kind of disability would also be important to be taken into account with regards to diversity.

So in any case I think our document or our suggestions should at least if not establish a fixed set of criteria at least point these criteria to have - that we have so far discussed as guidelines for criteria that it be taken into account when trying to address diversity.

I note (Jonathan)'s comment on the chat box there could be another cycle of diversity that don't substantially increase overall expertise.

And sometimes gender diversity would provide a greater enhancement of expertise and geographic diversity.

I do think that we need to set a balance into all factors. And I see (Jonathan)'s hand is up. So Jonathan could you please take the floor?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes I'm sorry I don't mean to make typing a substitute for talking. I'm sort of thinking out loud in the chat I guess.

I guess what I would love to see is as opposed to coming up with a framework for diversity in a generic way to look at it as a problem facing, look at through the lens of the problem being addressed and make sufficient diversity for the problem at hand a requirement so that there's a diversity analysis something -- I'm just thinking out loud here again - that's specific to the issue and then so that a kind of diversity requirement gets created on the fly specific to the discussion at hand. Does that make sense to folks?

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jonathan. I know don't know if there's any reaction to your comments. And I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next in the queue so Cheryl could you please take the floor?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Jonathan I like your idea of some sort of well measurement I guess if that wouldn't be too loud of word.

I always get very concerned when one is becoming too dogmatic about diversity if it starts to become diversity at all costs.

Particularly when we have a - there is models and constructs which are enumerative in size. So whether we've got a 25 or 29 person council for example you are hard pushed to meet all possible diversity inclusion or desirability I suspect rather than inclusion in that number.

I think what we need to do is look at diversity in both aspirational and in some cases more hardcoded requirements.

And so to that end the hardcoded requirements may be different depending on what we're looking at in terms of the desirability for the diversity in the accountability whether or not it's an AC or SO or a particular counselor activity.

I get very concerned when one is so slavish to a diversity rule that you put in for example a balanced geographic diversity at the cost of actual talent, inclination and people who are motivated to turn up and do the work.

And so I think what this is constantly a balancing act. So part of the accountability framework could look at a role of continual improvement regarding all of our diversity measures whereby we have some aspirational

goals and of course in terms of gender one should look at in all things possible as close to the balance in human kind which is somewhere around the 50-50 mark.

But that's not to say that there has to be a mandated 50-50. So whenever anything gets too far out of balance we should try and have a mechanism that can redress that.

In terms of bringing in newer here our accessibility work from our ICANN perspective is probably seen as fairly newer aspects of diversity.

They should still be seen as important. And they need to be worked on. But we do I think need to take them as sort of staged implementation roles.

So in some cases we have advisory committees which are by design very geographically balanced. And so the geographic diversity is brought in quite easily. The ccNSO council for example and the At-Large Advisory Committee is two examples there.

In other situations we don't have such even geographically valid diversity modeling. And we certainly don't have enough done in the other diversity (unintelligible).

But I guess my plea is to see it as a set of both aspirational and occasionally hardcoded requirements but to not be so slavishly devoted to them that we put in diversity for diversity sake as opposed to highly motivated and willing volunteers.

For example in other organizations I'm involved in we've had particular difficulty in getting the under 25 engaged in some of the work.

And that's simply because the relevance to that group of the work we're doing is just not seen all that strongly by that age group.

So just a cautionary tale I guess whereby we need to keep working on it. Keep making it highly aspirational and occasionally hard coding if it is needed.

Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Cheryl. Those are very useful comments indeed. And next in the queue I have Alan Greenberg. Alan could you please take the floor?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I strongly support what Cheryl was saying. I, you know, anything we come anywhere near having quotas we invariably end up suffering from it.

And remember the largest probably the largest single problem we have in ICANN is not a rogue Board it's getting enough volunteers to actually do the work.

And we struggle in all parts of ICANN with that and in some cases really severely struggle with it. And we have to keep on remembering that that's why we want people here to actually do work not just to be able to tick off boxes.

And we want to make sure we don't have barriers to participation and to allowing people from different backgrounds to participate.

The longest - the largest single - largest single disability that people have with regard to ICANN is not speaking English.

And, you know, we're not going to fix that. We're never going to have the kind of translation and interpretation facilities that the EU has or the United Nations have. There just isn't going to be enough money for that.

And so we're going to have to keep on working on it. But as soon as you start putting, you know, anything close to quotas in we have real problems. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. Next in the queue we have Jonathan. Jonathan?

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks for having me back again. It's always good to come back to the stage. The - I guess there's two points I'd like to make.

One is that for example I'm part of a workgroup right now which is trying to somewhat systematically evolve the culture of policy development inside of ICANN to make more use of data and metrics in policy development.

And we're doing that by building language into the templates that are used for issue reports, workgroup chartering, final reports and then also, you know plans for continuous improvement.

And in each and every case it's something along the lines of, you know, look at the availability and feasibility of incorporating data into the analysis of this issue, et cetera, so that it again it becomes an explicit aspiration as opposed to just an implicit one that we deal with in the abstract.

I think I'm supportive of that notion of looking at it on a case by case basis and seeing are there sufficient voices being heard for this particular issue being discussed.

And that's sort of becomes the duty of the group to look at that issue to make sure there's enough voices being heard.

I'm inclined to agree with both Alan and Cheryl on anything that looks like a quota or anything else. And I think in some ways where this aspiration is best expressed is in our efforts to increase overall participation in ICANN and its policy development processes.

And I think that's a much bigger issue we need to look at as Alan suggested it's about the availability of volunteers.

But I'm not opposed to having a dedicated effort to getting more women involved, you know, in ICANN or getting more folks from Asia involved in ICANN generally which will have a natural effect of greater involvement in a particular SO or AC.

And that maybe that some of this needs to happen at the participation level generally as opposed to any kind of requirements that could be too dogmatic in a particular policy development process. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jonathan. Next in the queue I have Jan. Jan could you please take the floor?

Jan Scholte: Thank you. Yes thank you Leon. I want - I think all the points being made about certainly one doesn't want to have quotas, one doesn't want to have slavish adherence to certain criteria.

And there may indeed be struggle to get volunteers. So the struggle to get volunteers is probably not purely a function of the willingness of people to be involved.

As Alan said language issues can be an issue, the fact that the staff is predominantly Euro-American, that the location of ICANN is in the United States a number of these things will also inhibit wider participation.

One has to look at the participation. I certainly have no, you know, (unintelligible) with the motivation, the goodwill, the talent, et cetera, of those who are involved in ICANN at the moment. And it's not a comment about that.

It's just to say I'm quite sure I would imagine that there can be found talent, inclination, motivation, et cetera, in other circles if it is more actively cultivated.

At the moment I just look at a list of Internet users by country. The list of countries goes China first, USA second, India third, Japan fourth, Brazil fifth, Russia sixth, Germany seventh Nigeria eighth.

And I look around the room in ICANN proceedings and it's nowhere close to that kind of distribution at all. And surely there must be something possible to move a bit more in those kinds of directions.

It's not a question that there isn't talent, inclination, and motivation in China, India, et cetera, I'm sure there is. One has to find it, and cultivate it and bring it in.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Jan. Next in the queue I have Greg Shatan. Greg could you please take the floor?

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I think that Jan's remarks are very helpful in that in the point to the relationship between the desires for diversity and the needs for outreach and engagement.

Indeed I think any discussion about diversity without talking about how we expand the pool of people involved is troubling to me because it indicates that we may try to artificially massage the pool that we have so that the distribution is dealt with other than by general self-selection as most of our processes tend to be involved in other words the glutton for punishment that will be up past their bedtime to do such things.

So I think that we really need to include - I'd rather see us talk about making explicit commitments to outreach and engagement.

I think maybe explicit commitments regarding diversity with regard to withdrawing from the pool we have are - should be avoided.

We can have goals. We can have aspirations. We can strive to achieve certain things. But have unless we have a balanced pool attempt to create some sort of diversity balance, you know, run into exclusionary rather than inclusionary efforts and concerns.

So I think that we really do need to figure out how we draw people in. And let's also keep in mind that ICANN is not (unintelligible), it's not a general Internet club it relates to domain names, policy primarily certainly and to name member policy and, you know, in specific technical, you know,

technical and technically policy related matters. So those interests aren't necessarily evenly distributed where Internet users are distributed.

But that also has to do with education, outreach and the like. And I think, you know, in my group we've made some efforts at that.

And I note that our most recent members come from Serbia, Macedonia, Ukraine and India. So that is a different look to the intellectual property constituency that hopefully over time will bear fruit.

But that's without any huge, huge effort but taking advantage of several small opportunities through fellowships, through crop, through relationships with some of our membership organizations that have very diverse memberships.

But without outreach and engagement discussions about diversity become troubling rather than empowering or they risk that. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Greg. Next in the queue I have Alan. Alan could you please take the floor?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I just realized as we were talking that one of the issues that ALAC has suffered most from in terms of having difficulty getting people to be active participants is something that we haven't mentioned at all.

And it's curiously related to the first half of this call about talking about documenting all of our rules and procedures.

Our rules and procedures in fact are one of the impediments because when you're looking at people from different parts of the world -- and I'm echoing

what Cheryl normally the speech Cheryl normally gives -- we have cultures that do not work the way ICANN works.

They do not feel comfortable talking in certain environments. They do not necessarily feel comfortable putting everything in writing. They do not feel comfortable in confrontational situations where people are debating and, you know, trying to see whose position wins.

So we can't forget that as we go forward. The very things that we were pushing in the first half of this meeting as justifying our accountability in some cases are the impediments which stop participation from certain cultures. It's a complex world we're living in. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Alan. I see Greg's hand is up. I don't know if that's an old hand or a new hand? Okay so that was an old hand.

Okay. So we've discussed the diversity issue on this call as part of our agenda items. And now I would like to call for a volunteer a very brave volunteer to kick off a document with regards to diversity.

Is there anyone brave enough volunteer to set up our first draft on how we could address the diversity issue? No volunteers for this?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, not before the Paris meeting; put it that way.

Leon Sanchez: I see Sebastien's hand is up. And since he said that he wasn't able to speak, I assume that he is volunteering for this. Could you please confirm in the chat box or with a green tick Sebastien?

Excellent so we have a volunteer. And I really thank you for volunteering Sebastien. And we will be expecting your draft so we could of course help you in a collaborative manner as usual.

So with this we've pretty much covered our agenda. And now I would open the floor for any other business.

And if there's anyone who wants to bring up any other business at this point you are most welcome to raise your hand and voice out your concerns.

And I note that Sebastien is telling us that it will not be ready for the next call as he will be on a plane but nevertheless we do or at least I do thank you for volunteering.

So are there any other business that anyone wants to raise at this point? Okay so seeing no one raised their hand for any other business I would like to thank you all for your attendance to the call.

It was scheduled for 90 minutes. We're just six minutes past the hour. So I think many of us will be grateful that we will have at least 20 minutes more for sleep and some of us 20 minutes back of their time for doing anything you want. So we can have this call adjourned at this point. Thank you everyone and talk to you soon. Bye-bye.

END