
RAFIK DAMMAK:

Please, let's start with the roll call. Okay, thanks, everyone, for joining today's call. I think it will be our last call in 2016. As you can see in the agenda, we have several items to cover for today. Please let me know if you have any objection or you want to add something to the agenda.

Okay, hearing none, I guess we can start with the first agenda item, which is about review of action items. Is it possible, please, to go to the next slide so we can see the agenda? Yes, thanks.

From the last call, we have these actions for follow up. The first one is still ongoing. As you may see in the mailing list, we got the document from the public responsibility department, and we will follow up with other related ICANN staff to get more data maybe. But I suggest that in the next call we can have them just maybe to ask some questions and for clarification.

For the second action item also there was a call for volunteers to draft the questions, and we got several, some members of the subgroup who want to participate in drafting the questions.

Which is also related to the third action item. We have a first draft of the questionnaire. We'll cover that in the fourth agenda item and try to work out the questions.

For the fourth action item, thanks to everyone for the comments in the strawman document. I think we are making some progress there, but also there are maybe some questions we need to answer.

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.

So that was about action items, so we will continue working on some of them. Just looking here, if you have any question or comment about that.

Okay, next, I guess we can move to the next agenda item, which is the second reading of the strawman document. Is it possible please to share the document in the Adobe Connect? Yes, please.

FIONA ASONGA: Correction, Rafik. This is actually the third reading of the strawman document.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. We are there, yes. Okay. So, yes, Fiona. You want to just to recall in which section we were in the last call?

FIONA ASONGA: Okay. Just for purposes of clarity, this is our third reading. For those who have not been with us, this is the third reading of the strawman document. We have gone through it two other previous times.

The issues raised in the first reading had to do with issues of dealing with physically challenged participants. We wanted the meetings staff to come in today to share with us how they deal with requests and how frequently those requests come in to just understand how diverse the participation at the ICANN meetings is.

The second issue was meeting language. Those requests to consider having alternate languages being used for the different meetings so that then all the seven languages get to be used so that it's not just English driven but you have some sessions going on in one of the other seven languages that ICANN offers translation services for.

Then third was the issue of gender and how to deal with gender diversity without having to go into details of sexual orientation so that then we stick to the binary gender groups.

Then fourth was the leadership reflections on diversity. So we also have some questions going to the Board that would have the Board answer in terms of policy within ICANN on diversity and how that has been developed and where we are at.

Fifth was ICANN's handling of public data and how the data is managed.

During the second reading, we had questions now coming through on what the SOs and ACs need to be asked in terms of feedback for diversity. What kind of mechanisms do they have in place? Where are they at? What structures have they had in place, and how do all these come into play on enhancing diversity within ICANN?

There was the question of what next steps should be taken in terms of enhancing diversity and then the challenge of how to maximize diversity when the size of the group that is being looked is also very limited. So we concluded that at the end of the day we would need to work toward developing diversity guidelines that would be relevant and also adding value to the different parts of ICANN.

There was the issue of bringing Chris Gift to the next meeting to discuss how to manage the data that they collect during registration and the data that they get in terms of what goes to the website.

Then Rafik had recommended that we talk to the DPRD department at ICANN and see what they have in terms of the data that they collect.

That puts us to where we are now where we were to have staff discuss with us data collection and how they handle the data. We asked for a call for volunteers who have started drafting the questions, and we need to address any other pending issues on the strawman.

For those who have not been with us and there are issues we may have left out, this is now where I really need you to come in and give us your views on the strawman document and what may have been left out and at the end of the day see how to be able to maximize diversity.

With that, we will go back to the main document. One of the things that occurred to me as I was preparing for this call is we talked about staff diversity within ICANN staff. We didn't go into details of how this is enhanced or implemented or what are the guiding principles of ensuring staff diversity within ICANN. That for me is one thing I think is something that we need to think about and discuss.

If we are going to be looking at diversity as an issue that needs to be reviewed periodically, then that means we cannot ignore the importance of staff diversity in serving the diverse community that ICANN makes an effort to reach out to serve.

From [inaudible] I think I will open up the floor for feedback.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Fiona, for the summary the different readings of the version two of the strawman.

If I may react at least for the data collection and the staff, I think we can organize that call with them, probably maybe the first one in the next month, and invite the different ICANN staff involved in the data collection either for ICANN meeting registration or the registration in the website itself and conference and so on. We can organize that and that's, in fact, a follow up of the previous action item.

We got already a document from Ergys from the Public Responsibility department. I see already there was a suggestion from [Matthew] on the mailing list to discuss with them and really to ask some questions on how maybe they defined this data and so on.

If I may comment also, I am hearing about the gender diversity. I'm not sure that we can really restrict ourselves to a binary meaning of gender. My understanding is that several countries even acknowledge that there are more than two, and so I think this is maybe a topic for discussion. Sorry, I didn't attend the call when there was this discussion, but I think this may be something that should be discussed more further.

Okay, let's see if those on the call want to ask questions or other comments. Also, there were several comments added lately to the document, so we may try to go through them and answer. Nobody in the queue? Okay.

We received I see a comment from Amal, and I think she's on the call. She was asking if diversity elements should be in PTI and Review Teams and [inaudible] the new entities have [been] affiliated to ICANN after the transition.

I think we may already be covering the Review Teams, but I think it's a [fair] question about the PTI. Maybe if anybody wants to respond to that or have any comment about this. Should we also cover the PTI too in terms of diversity? Yes, Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Rafik. Can you hear me okay?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you well.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. I wanted to take this opportunity. When we discussed this issue on Work Stream 1, one of the important points was to have the question of diversity taken into account by all the new groups. Not just PTI, but all the groups around, the CSC, whatever groups are created need to take that into account.

I guess it was on the document made by the Work Stream 1. I don't know if it's on the strawman. But when we talk about ICANN, we need to talk about ICANN as a whole, including PTI as a subsidiary, including all the groups around the IANA transition who were set up for that

purpose, but also all the groups we will be creating in the future, if any, and of course the Review Teams and so on and so forth.

That needs to be added if it's not already, but it was in the mind of Work Stream 1 for sure. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sebastien. Yes, the Work Stream 1 document is referred to in the strawman, and I think there was even some quoting from there. I guess it's probably good to list the different structures and entities just to maybe not necessarily be exhaustive but at least to highlight the different areas we want to cover. Thanks again for reminding us about that document. I think it's important to refer to it when needed so we are not reinventing the wheel here.

Just as a reminder, the strawman is really a document trying to elicit your comments and input. That's why we call it a strawman. It's not the final document. It's really to get your feedback.

I am seeing some comments about the language and multilingualism in the chat. Maybe those who are making them, maybe if they want to elaborate more or what they are suggesting that we add to the document. Okay, thanks, Finn. I think you cannot speak. I'm trying to read quickly. Yes, Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA:

I just want to [ask] from Rachel Pollack when she says that we need to mention ICANN's commitment to multilingualism. Does she mean that

we refer to the specific Bylaws on multilingualism or what exactly is she referring to?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks, Fiona. I'm not sure if Rachel can speak up or if she will try to respond in the chat. In the meantime, I think we can go to Sebastien since he's in the queue. Yes, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you very much, Rafik. There are some comments on the chat, and I think they need to be discussed [and] answered. Where Lito asked about do we need to consider privacy. Yes, definitely. We were planning to have staff coming to tell us how they gather information or not and if they gather the information, what is the way the privacy is taken into account.

It's something we need to discuss and find the best solution because we can't act if we don't have the data, but at the same time we don't want that data to be linked with one person that everybody knows about.

I'll just give an example. If you try to find the age of the Board member, good luck and tell me what you found. For myself, I just found because it was a [field] publication the age of Steve Crocker but nobody else.

If we want to act, yeah, we can say, yes, we want younger people, but what is the current age of all the Board members? I don't know, and I don't know if somebody has it. If ICANN has this information, then it would be interesting to have the data aggregated and delivered to say

that you are 32 or 43, but for example [inaudible] age and so on. It's something we need to take into account in our work.

Regarding the question of the language, there are two things we need to take into account. It's how we interact within the community and that maybe we can stick with the seven languages even if I know that there are people who would like to add, but it will be very, very expensive. It is expensive for ICANN, but it will be very expensive. That's one thing we need to look to language.

But the other, I think, is to look at how ICANN the organization and the staff is dealing with the customer, with end users. That's of course, for example, if you have a ccTLD with a specific [inaudible] language, it's better if at least someone within ICANN has both the knowledge of the business and the knowledge of the language.

That's I would say two different topics we have to take into account. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sebastien. I think again with regard to the data collection for [within] ICANN, I think what we are trying to do is to see what we have already within ICANN and what are the efforts in terms of data collection. So kind of knowing the current state of how [inaudible]. Knowing what we have, and then maybe we think at a later stage what we may need to collect, what kind of information and for which purpose.

For that one reason, maybe we have to really check and to be careful in terms of privacy and so on. It's not just about privacy because I think data collection may raise some legal question, depending what kind of information we are looking for, how we are going to use them, and so on. So this may be something we need to care about in the future.

With regard to the language, it's [sounds] that we have different dimension for the language. Either it's what is used as a language to communicate, but also I see people are highlighting about IDNs and so on. So maybe we need to elaborate more. But still, it's really about understanding the current state, always remembering that we should not [inaudible] to specific recommendation so to not miss something. It's really to understand what's the current situation.

I see Renata in the queue. Yes, Renata, please go ahead.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO:

Thank you, Rafik [and Nathalie]. Yes, I was just trying to clarify a few things. I've sent another link. [Perhaps this] strawman [version] has a few more additions. I'm not sure if they're not there. Maybe they have not been in yet or just [inaudible].

Also, two observations. Actually, on the leadership stats sent over in that very comprehensive material, there was also a comment on a breakdown of statistics for SOs and ACs. I think this would be very interesting. For instance, leadership in the technical community, in gender, leadership in the end users, in non-commercials will be very different.

Also, the data collection thing, indeed, looking at the data we already have, there are some factors that were not counted in this data, but there are some that may [impact] specific groups. For instance, how many people need physically special assistance, accessibility in ICANN meetings. I was just wondering if there is something that we should look into to maybe reference right now.

Yes, I guess that would be it for now. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Renata. I think what you are trying to do is to see what exists already as data and also understand how those data are collected. I'm not sure there is a standard way within ICANN and a systematic way to collect the data. When we understand that, I think we can really figure out how things can be improved. But still, we need to understand why we are collecting all these data and what we are trying to achieve with it.

Okay. With regard to leadership, I think it's also important maybe as we tried to do for the ICANN structure is kind of to be more specific and try maybe to list, not necessarily be exhaustive, but list of them as you said like maybe officers, and the SOs and ACs, stakeholder groups, constituency, maybe leadership within I'm not sure if the Board and so on is to go more specifics in terms of what we are defining as leadership.

The concern is that we may use the same wording or term to mean different things, depending on the group. So maybe we need to agree on some definition here when we use those terms.

Okay. Any comment or question? Okay, so I'm trying to go through the comments in the document. I just see that Rachel added some comment about the geographical diversity and how it's defined probably for the ICANN Board.

Also, there are some comments about people with disabilities. Since we have to use a specific term and to agree on it and to be consistent because it's sounds that we are using different terminology here: physically challenged persons and so on. So it [sounds] that this suggestion is to use people with disabilities since it's an acceptable legal term and also to clarify that with regard to accessibility.

I think accessibility is to say what's needed as a condition to make the meetings or the ICANN environment in general accessible to people with disabilities. So they are two related concepts.

But I'm looking for further comments here. Yes, Fiona, please go ahead.

FIONA ASONGA:

The feedback, I'm not quite getting who had suggested, but there was a proposal to consider breaking down geographical representation to geographic and then regional. For me, from where I sit, I'm not quite understanding the difference because if [inaudible] geographical diversity and you say that we will look at it in terms of the region one lives in and the region one was born in, because sometimes [people] are born in one region and end up living in another.

So then if we want to achieve a balance of geographical diversity, we would have to look at a combination of factors within the geographical

diversity which include the region you live in, you reside in, and the region you call your home region where you, for example, me being from Africa. I live in Africa right now. I could get a job that puts me in Europe. How do I then get positioned if we're looking at geographical diversity within ICANN? Am I going to be as a resident of Europe? Do I get counted as Europe or do I get counted as African?

[inaudible] very important, and I've been able to achieve a balance in diversity. So my understanding is that geographical representation is the holistic term that would cover several facets that need to be considered when looking at geographical diversity. But when we start breaking it down to having geographic and then separately again having regional diversity, it brings a bit of confusion in the elements of diversity that needs a bit more effort in providing clarity in.

I want to suggest if we can have that conversation. Think about it and at one point have that conversation and realize within each of the elements of diversity, we are going to have to have some key pointers on what makes that element important. For geographical, for example, we'd be looking at a region and regional issues and how these two regional aspects of where you live and where you were born interplay to achieve geographical diversity. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes, thanks. It sounds, in fact I see the comments about this geographical and regional diversity in both document, the strawman, and I think the questionnaire. So I guess we may need to clarify that.

My understanding, Renata, you said regional diversity, but it doesn't mean necessarily like talking about the [UN] region like Africa or Latin American and the Caribbean but even to be really more specific like calling as a region I think Amazon and so on. So maybe she can [inaudible] that and maybe elaborate the comment she made previously. It's a fair point the maybe we need to agree on that to avoid confusion. Yes, Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Rafik. Yes, I wanted to follow on this discussion. Two points. The first one is that within ICANN, we have five regions. Those five regions are organized differently than the ones from the RIRs or other international organizations. It's still under review by a working group that is taking care of reviewing the situation. I guess a report is somewhere between the working group and the Board, maybe [on to] the Board and [then] they have to discuss that and decide about any evolution.

Yes, we know that half of a country could be called a region or part of a continent could be called a region, and the word "region" in itself can have different meanings. It's why we have a little trouble to discuss that. But for ICANN, it's just five different regions.

The other point is that, in fact, you could belong to one region. If you were born and you live in the same region, you have just one region. But if you live in one region differently than the one you were born, then you have possibly two regions.

Today, the situation is that it's I would say [inaudible] and the best choice when people are elected or selected to one position. But it gives some quite interesting situations where if you take a Board member, they live since just after they were born in another region but they are still belonging to the region where they were born.

Maybe we need to discuss a little bit more about how we can deal with those two regions. Because if you take, for example, the current Board, if I am not mistaken, you have at least three current members of the Board who live in another region than the one they belong to as a Board member. Is it a problem? I don't know. But it's something we need to have in mind and maybe make some suggestions on that.

I took the Board because it's easy information. It's quite simple to get. But it's the same thing for other. I recall one ALAC member who was [inaudible] by the NomCom in ALAC were living in Japan and were considered as a European because [she] was born in Europe. It's something not just for the Board, but we have to take that into account I think. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sebastien. I may have a [inaudible] here because it applies to myself too. It's really complicated. And even when I was in the NomCom it's something we discussed because at the end there is no specific definition within ICANN. Is it the country of residence? Is it the country of birth? Even some people say it's who you pay tax or not and so on. So it's kind of not defined.

Being myself a Tunisian living in Japan, it's the question: can I really pretend to be someone from Asia-Pac because I live there, or can I say that I'm from Africa because I still have ties with my country and being involved in several projects there. So it's always complicated and tends to be more kind of self-declaration, how the person feels about his ties to wherever he lives or works where he comes from.

I guess maybe here we need to elaborate more in terms of what does it mean exactly in terms of geographical diversity. I don't have an answer yet, but definitely it is a topic for discussion. I think it was raised several times in different spaces. Maybe it's the kind of question we can the SOs and ACs group how they thought about [this] in their own kind of internal discussions.

Okay. We have 20 minutes left in this call, and we still have to cover the questionnaire. I see that we raised several topics we need to discuss and follow up. I really appreciate all those comments, and I encourage everyone to put as much as possible your comments in the strawman. It will help us to resolve and [inaudible] so we can create a new document. Hopefully, it won't be a strawman but it's really to go to the next step [as to work] and following the template of our report.

If there is no further comment regarding the strawman, I guess we can move to the next agenda item, which is about the questionnaire. Yvette, can you please? Yes, thanks. Oh, Yvette, I think that's the first draft before the comment I did today.

First, I want to give credit to [Julie] who provided [help to us] to draft those initial questions, so kind of to start the discussion. We have this

start set of questions, but let me share the current document in the Adobe Connect.

So maybe we'll just remind the purpose here is we are trying to get feedback from the SOs and ACs and maybe the RALOs stakeholder group and constituency within GNSO in regard to their understanding of diversity and sharing with them the elements we all think about diversity and also to ask them what they are implementing as a policy or procedure and a practice in terms of diversity. So to collect information about the current state on how the different groups are implementing diversity mechanisms.

So the first question, as you see, we listed different elements of diversity and we are asking here maybe which of these elements of diversity are important to these groups. I'm not sure if we're asking them here about some ranking or just to choose the top three or top five or whatever of these elements. Then we are asking them if they are having any other additional elements of diversity that we can add to our list.

There was a third question suggested by [inaudible], and I think maybe we need to [inaudible] your comment here. The third question is: Do you believe interests and viewpoints from Africa, Asia/Pacific and the Latin American/Caribbean regions are proportionally represented within your SO/AC/group and its leadership? I'm not sure what's the meaning about "are proportionally represented. Okay, yes, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much for all these proposals. I would like first to suggest that we try not to have too many questions because when we start to discuss that, I was not thinking about a questionnaire but more a series of questions that we as members of this group and participants in whatever SOs and ACs and subgroups, we can bring some of this information on some answers. Here, we are starting to be more official and to have a point of view. That's something we need time. It will take time for SOs and ACs to answer and it will take time for us to review those answers. That's the first point.

The second, I think we need to send that to each SOs and ACs and if they consider that they need to get it to their other groups. It was done like that for the SOs and ACs accountability. I think we need to give that decision to SOs and ACs.

The third point, I don't think that this questionnaire could be a way to rank something. If we want to do that, then we need to have much broader people responding than just one leader in SOs and ACs. It could be a study, a review more thorough about those. But I am not sure that asking what are the main topics for the future, what is currently taken into account [inaudible]. But if it's important or unimportant is another question, once again from my point of view.

Then it's my feedback, and I'm sorry to be a little bit [inaudible] on that. But I think 11 questions will be too much. I think we need to target on what we consider the more important questions for asking to SOs and ACs leaders. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes, thanks, Sebastien. I think for now people are suggesting different questions, but at the end we have to do trimming to really reduce the number and to see what really we are trying to get.

I noticed that one of the issues when we are asking input from SOs and ACs and any group within ICANN, it's that they are already receiving a lot of requests for input. So we have to be mindful and also strategic on that matter. Reducing the number is one approach and also to maybe be more clear what you are asking them exactly.

Now I think people are just digesting, and then we can work later on maybe reducing the number and picking maybe the top five or top four questions that we think we need to get a response.

I also see comments from Jorge about what are the aspects you are asking the SOs and ACs? Again, it's just really we are trying to figure out what is the kind of information we are collecting from them. At this level, we are trying to understand what the SOs and ACs understand in terms of diversity and what they are doing at their level.

But, yes, we can ask them what they think about enhancing diversity across ICANN. So we can cover both. This also means that we need to balance the questions if [inaudible] because at the end there is only one question about diversity in general for ICANN. Most of what we have is really about how the SOs and ACs are working on diversity at their level.

The thing is now we have this question, this is really again a kind of strawman. Any suggestion for wording or what you think if you want to highlight specific questions. It would be really helpful. We are at really the initial phase for the questionnaire.

No, Avri, we don't need more than five. This is, I think, why we maybe need to agree what are the top five questions we need to respond. As a matter of fact, the initial draft included I think five or six questions. But it became 11 after several suggestions. Yes, Avri?

AVRI DORIA:

Hi. This is Avri speaking. No, I was referring to if we're trying to collect information and such, it would seem to me that questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 are the ones that we need to ask: What practices do you have? What do you measure? What are your measures? and Do you have informal practices? The rest of it somehow seems to go into the work that this group is supposed to be doing of figuring out the various forms and various importances. So I wasn't saying, do we need more than five questions? I'm saying, do we need more than questions 5 through 8? Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Avri. So you're saying from 5 to 8 it's more what we should ask the SOs and ACs, which is basically about their current policy and practice in terms of diversity. Okay. Yes, Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA:

When I read through all the questions, I think there were some that are repeating themselves. There's quite a bit of repetition in terms of the information we're looking for, but you're just asking for it differently. I think what would help us is the group of volunteers that agreed to come and help [out] on the questionnaire, on the questions going out, if they

could begin to just look at this and fine-tune it so that we have at least as you say for example not more than four or five questions that are most relevant to the SOs and ACs to give us feedback so that we can be able to then put together our recommendations and put together whatever suggestions we may have on what needs to be done to enhance diversity.

If it is going to be something for Review Teams to do, then that would be information we shall get out of the questions because I'm seeing some being repeated but just in different words.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, so I think now we have this document and the group volunteers, but the whole subgroup can work directly there. I guess we can try to see the overlap and reduce the number. Also, maybe working with the suggestion from Avri about the questions from 5 to 8 or at least we can maybe separate different parts of what we should keep.

Probably based on the different comments I am seeing in the chat and I'm hearing, we can try to work on a second version, something more clean maybe, to get more comments and/or to do some polling on that.

Avri, I see your hand is raised. Okay, it's an old hand. Okay, so we'll try to rework these questions based on your comments and hopefully provide a new version within this week. I understand that many among us will be in holidays. I think for some of us also the holidays are a good opportunity to catch up for some work. We will try to come with a new version, something more clean. Please add your comments or

suggestions for wording and so on in the document. It will be really helpful for us in terms of editing.

Okay, so we have three minutes left in the call. If there is no further comment about this, I guess we can move to the next agenda item which is any other business. Is there any topic that you would like to ask or to share? Okay, there is none. I assume that that's it for today's call.

I want to thank everyone for joining and for helping to move forward with the strawman and the questionnaire. We will try to make some progress before the beginning of the holidays. Also, we will start planning for the next call next year and also probably to do some planning.

Thanks, everyone. Happy holidays, and see you soon. The call is adjourned. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]