

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you, everyone, for joining today's call. It seems that Fiona has some problems to speak through the phone, so I'll chair for today.

As you can see, we have shared the agenda in the Adobe Connect, so there is not so big change compared to previous calls. We are continuing the work we started already, and hopefully we'll try to finalize at least one item in that agenda.

But first, let's start with reviewing action items to see the progress dates for them. The first action item is about giving input about the Global Account project. This is from the discussion we had with Chris in the last call. We will share again the document in the mailing list and ask people if they have any comment and maybe think how we can help for this project and try to push for data collection with regard to diversity elements.

The other action item [inaudible] that is with regard to documentation. Maybe just here I think we need to send a reminder to Chris. Nathalie, can you please handle that and send him a reminder? This is an action to follow up. Thanks.

The other action is with regard to the questionnaire. We updated it, and it was shared in the mailing list. While we have maybe some comments, I think it's really time to finalize it. We reduced the number of questions according to the last discussion. So I guess now it just needs some tweaking and share that with the rest of the Cross Community Working Group for input and also for the buy-in so we can send to the SOs and ACs. We need to have in mind that Copenhagen meeting is just a few

---

*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.*

---

weeks away, and that's usually a busy time for most of those who are going to attend the ICANN meeting. So that can impact the [inaudible] that we can get.

Another action is with regard to the discussion about the office of diversity. We should do that on the mailing list. This is with regard also to the suggestion from Sebastien about discussion with the other subgroups about [this office] and to see how we can work from this proposal. So, yes, I think we need to maybe share more details with the subgroup on the mailing list. Maybe, Sebastien, if you are willing, can you send maybe more details just as a follow up to the mailing list so we can resume the discussion there and include those who are not attending the call?

Okay. These were the action items we have. Let's move to the next agenda item. That agenda item is about the questionnaire. The basic idea is really to finalize the questionnaire and maybe tweaking and just reviewing it with regard to proofreading and if need of some rewording. I'm not sure. I think I saw that Renata raised her hand. Yes, Renata?

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO:

Hi, Rafik. Yes, I just wanted to indicate that the questionnaire was sent from the drafting team. It had some changes after that. You see some comments there. Maybe Question 1 is not there, which was about if other diversity elements are identified by the SOs and ACs. I reviewed. Apologies I couldn't be in the meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup>, but I remember a comment by Julie Hammer exactly on keeping Questions 1 and 2, so I don't know why this was removed. Maybe it should be back there

---

because it's different from the question that is there now: "What, if any, of these elements are relevant to your group?" It was asking to identify other elements that would be important.

I also see the comments here about the meeting, the questions or the phrasing. I'm not sure because the drafting team has already gone through and deleted a few questions. So I think we should just put Question 1 back there and finalize it. That would be just my comment. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Renata. I'm not sure about which question is missing because we agreed last time to keep the two questions [inaudible] comment but someone reordered the questions. So I'm trying to check the previous version for the questionnaire since we used it in the numbering there in order to keep or remove some questions. In the meantime when I am trying to check, I see that Julie wants to speak. Yes, Julie, please go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Rafik. Can you hear me?

[RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO]:

[Yes, we can hear you, Julie.]

---

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. Yes, just to clarify, Rafik, the Questions 1 and 2 that are currently there are the two that were deleted and have now been put back. So I think as presented on the screen, Questions 1 and 2 are good, and that's what I had asked to be put back. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you for confirming. Yes, I guess. I think also we updated Question 3 to add since we removed the one about geographical diversity and added that [part about which level of details]. Yes, Renata?

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Just noting that the question, what happened is that the order was changed. I see now that they're both there, so it's good.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, thanks, Renata. In fact, yes, it was reordered I think by [inaudible] double checked before. We struck three questions. We had before I think nine or ten, but we struck [two] so now we have six. I think what we can do is really just to check some comments that were I think left by Corinne if there is any concern or if we think we can accommodate them. Otherwise, just really to check the wording and if there is consensus, we can send them to the mailing list for consensus call and see if there is any objection. If there is none, I think then after that we can consider them as adopted and share them with the rest of the Cross Community Working Group.

Okay, I see that Fiona wants to speak up. Yes, Fiona? Fiona, are you speaking? Because we cannot hear you.

---

FIONA ASONGA: Sorry. I [inaudible] muted.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, we can hear you now. Please go ahead.

FIONA ASONGA: You are [completing] that we need to add in the comments from Corinne then [back later] to the larger CCWG?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Fiona. We are trying to see if we can accommodate that comment to see how we can respond to that and trying to find [alliance] for today I think. That's what may be remaining as pending for the questionnaire. And just checking the wording, I mean more proofreading. And after this call, to send to the mailing list to the rest of the participants and having a call for consensus to check if there is any objection or any other comments. After that if there is none, we can consider it as we have consensus and send it to the CCWG for review.

So I see Fiona and Julie. Fiona, it's an old hand, or you want to add something? Okay, Julie, please go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Rafik. One of the comments that Corinne had made I thought was a very good one. It was in relation to Question 4, "Are diverse interests and viewpoints proportionally represented within your

---

SO/AC group and its leadership?” She made the comment that you could actually have diverse interests and viewpoints in a completely homogenous group based on other diversity aspects. So she was really questioning whether that question would really provide any information of value. I think perhaps she’s correct that maybe that question isn’t going to provide us anything that is really of great use to us. So I’d just be interested to see what others thought about that.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Julie. I’m trying to recall how we [arrived at] this question because it was not really in the first draft. I think it was when we had a discussion about the cultural diversity and that it is not necessarily in alliance with the geographical diversity. I think that was maybe [inaudible] as a context here.

I see the suggestion from Corinne says if we maybe want to avoid any kind of misunderstanding, we can remove the wording “proportionally” if we are not really explaining what it means. Then the question would be just, “Are diverse interests and viewpoints represented within your SO/AC group and its leadership?” And, yes, that’s the question then. By removing that, does it still have any added value. So that’s maybe the question here: either we strike the word “proportionally” or we just strike the whole question if we don’t think that it can have any added value for us to get input.

Yes, Renata?

---

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I left a note that I think the question is clear enough. I do not really understand the relationship with diverse interests and viewpoints relating to a non-diverse group. It's about interests and viewpoints not group composition. "Proportionally represented," I understand it as mathematically represented. So you would have to have some understanding, for example, stakeholder groups views proportionally, geographic regions proportionally. So, yes, that comment, I think only complicates the question. I think it's clear enough, but it's just my opinion. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Renata. Maybe I'm not sure to understand your comment. Are you agreeing that we should remove the question or just reword it? Can you clarify please? Let's see what others think because we get here two different points of view: either just to keep as it is or just remove it because [inaudible] Corinne was suggesting to remove the word "proportionally" at least. What do others think about this? Again, we are just asking, should we keep the question? Let's see if people agree or object to that. Okay, I'm really looking forward to hear others to get a sense of if we have a consensus on this or not. It's hard to make any decision if we have two different points of view here. Yes, Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Rafik. I am not sure that we need to be so proscriptive in our question. The first point is to be aware if there are different interests and viewpoints represented in your SO/AC group and so on. The term

---

“proportionally” I guess will be a nightmare to describe and to be sure how it will be answered. Maybe I suggest that we add the following at the end of the question, “Are diverse interests and viewpoints represented within your SO/AC group and its leadership?” and “How is it done?” If there is a way it’s done proportionally or it’s done each viewpoint is well represented or whatever way it is done, it will be a more open question than just to ask if it’s proportional. Thank you.

Rafik, you seem to be muted because we can’t hear you and I guess you were supposed to be the one to take the floor after me.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sebastien. Yes, I was speaking but you didn’t hear me [inaudible]. I was saying, yes, adding that part maybe can help because, otherwise, just asking if “are diverse interests and viewpoints represented within the group,” I assume everyone will say yes. But asking how it’s done, that’s another matter.

Okay, so I see that we are rewording here the question. I understand that Julie was more for removing it, but I’m looking forward to hear from her if she would be fine with this rewording and to make maybe more trying to get some specific input here. Julie, can you speak or do you want to intervene here?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Rafik. I can live with that. If that’s what the majority or people think is appropriate, that’s fine.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Julie. We are trying to work here in a collegial manner and trying to see how we can find consensus. At the end by this question we are looking to get input that can help us with our role. I guess we need to be strategic in some way to make sure that we get a response, so thanks again.

Okay, so I think we took note about the suggestion from Sebastien and we will reflect that in the Google Doc. Other than that, is there any suggestion or comment for other questions? Okay, since we have only that suggested amendment, we can do that quickly and share within the next hours the final version for the whole subgroup review to make a consensus call, let's say in the end of this week to give opportunity to everyone to weigh in on the questionnaire or share their comments. after that, we can consider it as adopted and has a consensus within the subgroup and send it to CCWG.

Okay, thanks again, everyone, for this. I think it took some time more than expected, but at least it's a way for us to ensure that we tweak it in the way that we hope to get more input from the SOs and ACs. Thanks again.

If we can move to the next agenda item, which is discussion about the strawman. We [inaudible] discuss that for a while and I think, Fiona, if you can take over this for this part.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you, Rafik. [inaudible] meeting that you have invited different ICANN staff to share with us on the data they have on diversity. We had already started compiling the report as per the template provided by

---

the CCWG co-chairs. We have used the discussion of the strawman as [the main] part of that report.

We are also compiling from the data we collected from the [lightning] document for [inaudible] and the one for [inaudible] as forming part of the report because we have to present to the community what we have found as the current status. In some of those documents, there are recommendations, some comments that go into recommendations [inaudible] ICANN should be able to do to improve diversity. We have not discussed all of them. We have discussed some of them, but even then the discussion has not been quite detailed. So we are hoping that in the next meeting we'll be able to have sent it out.

We are also [taking] the feedback from ICANN staff data and trying to put it together so that it forms part of the status of what we found out in terms of diversity from all the different [angles we have discussed] for the last couple of calls. But [inaudible] the strawman that we started discussing toward the end of last year and all the calls we've had to date and the document that has been circulated, we are getting all that data together into the report as part of the status reports. Then we should be able to have that go out I think [to] the questionnaire, and I need to clarify that process.

So if we can get more feedback on the strawman, it would be helpful because [that goes into] providing input for the report. It's almost done. [inaudible] finalizing of the executive summary and should be able to send out a first draft once we as the co-rapporteurs have read through it. But [I know] that should be again by before our next call we should

---

be able to send out the first draft of the report so that we begin to have review internally on the report.

But a lot of this is what you have already seen on the strawman, what you have already seen in terms of the [lightning] document. That is shared by Ergys and Chris Gift. So that is where we are at.

If there's anyone who has any queries on the strawman document or any areas of [inaudible] because [inaudible] a lot of time looking at the elements, if anyone has comments on the rest of this, any of the other areas [inaudible].

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: Yes?

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I think there are lots of comments on the diversity strawman. There's also a comment on adapting it to a template. Can I ask please, do we have deadlines for this or a drafting team? How is the process going? Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA: The process is a deadline for this as per the CCWG's schedule we should be able to begin discussions on the report as from 1 February. So we are really on the deadline period of finalizing on the first, initial draft. We

---

have put together the views of that first draft based on the discussions we've already had. So the first draft of the report is based on the discussions we've had in terms of the different views, different perceptions of what we need to address.

Like I mentioned at the beginning, some of the [lightning] documents that were circulated had recommendations in them which we have [inaudible] discussed. When we put that into the report, we will then begin to see how everything [inaudible] together and begin our discussion on [inaudible] recommendations building on some of those that have already been shared and agreeing on which ones we will carry forward as recommendations from the full group and which ones we don't.

So timewise, we are just on time. If I can get it circulated by tomorrow, we're within the timeframe which has been provided. Does that help you, Renata and everybody else?

I'm seeing your other comment about the drafting team, we did not manage to put together a drafting team for this, so Rafik and I have been working on putting this together. But I think it would be helpful if we can have a drafting team that looks at this before it's circulated to the group. That would be great. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Fiona. Maybe just to clarify again about the timing. In terms of about the timing, I think what you are trying to do is to work within the next month, which is just starting from tomorrow, and that to get the first reading by Copenhagen meeting, if I'm not mistaken. So maybe

---

Nathalie or Karen can clarify that in terms of about the timeline. As a subgroup, we have to work within those constraints to be able to deliver our first, initial draft. But I think we are not [inaudible] I guess clarify about deadlines for the comments, but it depends on when we can get the draft shared with the subgroup. So just I want [inaudible] just in terms of clarification so everyone has the same understanding on what you want to achieve.

FIONA ASONGA:

Okay, thanks, Rafik. Nathalie does confirm that it should be ready for a first reading in Copenhagen. So as a subgroup, we have the month of February to discuss the report, at least a minimum of three readings before we present it to the larger CCWG in Copenhagen. For that to happen, it means that I think we may need to get out the first draft by latest Friday.

Previous comments that have come [through on] the diversity strawman have been incorporated into the report. In case anyone is wondering about the comments of our previous discussions, all those have been collected from the previous notes of the meetings and been incorporated into the report in their respective areas.

Other questions? I hope that puts Dalila at ease. I remember one of the previous calls you asked me about the recommendations and all the other input that is in the document, and I just want to assure you that, yes, we are capturing everything. Until the group makes a decision on what we are moving forward, it is now going to be more visible in the

---

report. As opposed to the strawman that is a document that we're [posting as just to] [inaudible] [organization].

Any comments? Sorry. I'm told on the chat that I was not audible. Let me repeat. I was letting Dalila know that a few calls back she did ask about whether or not the recommendations that have been shared in previous documents like the [lightning] paper she shared would be considered, and I'm letting her know that, yes, we have considered them. We are putting them into the report because the report is a more detailed document than the strawman.

So we are putting into the report all the comments from previous discussions and engagements that we've had. That means all the recommendations that have come through, some of which Dalila had mentioned such as the office which we are in discussion with the Ombudsman group, we are putting them still into the document. Until the discussion is complete and we agree on how we're moving forward, [inaudible].

Renata, you have a comment?

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Yes. Thank you, Fiona. Okay, can you hear me now? Yes? Okay, about the recommendations and the comments, I see that the recommendations from Work Stream 1 are there to be discussed. As I understand, we still have some time to discuss the strawman document during this month before Copenhagen meeting, right?

---

About the Ombudsman office, the office proposal, I think we should definitely discuss it more. I would support that proposal, and I agree on trying to gather references, including ICANN [current] Ombudsman policy, the working groups, and try and read through that material and maybe incorporate in some of the language at least or refer to this in this document. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you, Renata. We will [inaudible] as we proceed. Thank you, Herb. We will definitely let you know [inaudible] welcome your assistance because I think you will be of assistance like you've been with the Ombudsman group [inaudible] because of the role the Ombudsman office plays and how then we can build on that.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Fiona, maybe some clarification about the diversity office. We had a discussion before about the proposal that came from Dalila and the document was shared in the mailing list for discussion. But in the last call, there was a proposal from Sebastien because a discussion in the other subgroup regarding the Ombudsman office, and we had a discussion to see how we can liaise with them and discuss about if we think that the diversity office can be [inaudible] the Ombudsman office.

As a subgroup, we didn't really discuss in length about that, and it's just kind of an item for discussion now. So it's one proposal among others, and we will see how we can do that. I think because, for example, Dalila has just joined the call and she missed the other, maybe I think she was asking to understand what we covered. That's what we did before but,

---

again, it is still under discussion and we didn't really go in depth in the mailing list. That's why in an action item if you asked or kind of volunteered Sebastien if he can follow up in the mailing list to get more input and feedback about this.

So I think as a subgroup we have to see all the options. We started with this idea of diversity office. This is not supposed to overlap with our work but to have it in [inaudible] so we can also see the possible option in how it can be implemented and so on. So for now we are not agreeing on one option, but all of them are open for discussion and evaluation. That's what I want to clarify just to avoid any confusion here. Thanks.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you, Rafik, for that and, yes, that is accurate. So we will look at the discussion [inaudible] both on the list and in the call as we try to finalize on the report.

Any other comments? Renata?

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO:

Thank you, Fiona. I want to comment on something very new that's very [worrying], which is the visa problems in the U.S. I think the diversity subgroup should have in mind that this is an area in which we definitely need to worry about how to reach out to people who cannot participate in ICANN for arbitrary reasons. We already had a call with captioning on the 13<sup>th</sup>, and we discussed a bit about accessibility and remote participation. But somehow we must think of this. We must have this in

---

mind when discussing the document moving on because we certainly will have to intensify remote participation and strategies for inclusion given the current context that this brought up. Thanks.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you, Renata. I think we will need to consult between Rafik and I and the co-chairs and see how to incorporate all these new changes into our mandate and agenda, but we appreciate the feedback and we will see how to best move forward.

Any other comments? Okay, I guess in that case we have two more minutes until the end of the hour. I would suggest if there is anyone who has any AOB, was there any AOB that has been tabled? Or anyone who has anything to raise as an AOB, please do so.

I'm seeing [inaudible] agenda today and it [inaudible] co-chair [inaudible] from the underserved areas working group. They held their first meeting, training session in Nairobi last week from the 23<sup>rd</sup> to the 24<sup>th</sup>. This brought together representatives from different governments within the continent and GAC officials as well as ICANN staff. From the discussion or from the report of their meeting, we may need to look out for it and see how to address issues of access, issues of engagement within ICANN, especially for the underserved regions because those have an impact in enhancing ICANN's diversity. So when the report is out, I will circulate it. For your information just so that you have that in mind as we discuss on improving ICANN's diversity moving forward.

---

Is there anyone else with any other issues to raise or to report. I think, Rafik, with that you can end the call unless there's something you have that I may have missed.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Fiona. No, nothing. Just I think as you said we will send the new version of the strawman following the template, and it will be our focus for the next [inaudible] call. We are scheduling the next call for February, and hopefully we'll send the invitation soon. So that's it from my side. Thanks.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you. [inaudible] for being part of the group and for your time. We really appreciate. Have a good night, good day, good evening, good morning, depending on where you are, and look forward to hearing from you, especially online once we circulate the first draft of the report. Thank you. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**