
RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, everyone, for joining today. Sorry for last call. There was some confusion. But for today, we have the agenda that you can see on the Adobe Connect and, basically, we are focusing for the coming weeks on the draft report and to work on that.

Let's first start with the first agenda item, which is about the review of Action items. We have three pending action items that we are waiting for them to make progress there.

For the first one about discussion about office diversity on the mailing list, I don't think we are making that much progress there. While there was some reaction to showing some support, but we still need to work on more details. That's why it's scheduled for Any Other Business at the end of the call.

The second item, which is getting documentation about the global enrollment from Chri – he couldn't send within this week and so by his last update, he is supposed to send that next week. So, hopefully we can get that before our next call.

The other one, I'm still kind of on hold which is about providing more feedback about the Global Account project. We will send, later on, the document again – to have a discussion. But I think for the time being, we can focus on the draft report instead.

That's the current state of the action items we have. I think we can move to the main topic in our agenda for today, which is about the Draft Report. First, I want to thank everyone for reviewing the

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.

document. We can see that we have a lot of comments and already some issues that we need to solve. I think we can start with [those arise] at least in the mailing list.

I think the first one is about specific text with regard to... I think there was some concern about the warning and we get several suggestions. I think it started, maybe, first who raised the concern was Mathieu. Mathieu, can you speak?

MATHIEU WEILL: I should be able to speak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Sorry?

MATHIEU WEIL: You want me to elaborate on the point I think [inaudible]. Can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. We can hear you. I have a little difficulty hearing you well but, yes, we can hear you.

MATHIEU WEIL: Do you want me to get back to the discussion that was taking place on the list?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. The idea is really to go through... We have few kind of issues – not issues, necessarily, but some areas that there are several comments about. But the point that arises is one that has ongoing discussion on the mailing list, and I think it will be a good idea to start with that so we can clear out that before we moving to the other topics.

MATHIEU WEIL: Thanks, Rafik. I think the idea was whether to – introducing the definition stage points. I think it was introduced by Elizabeth and echoed by Malcolm about a potential need for balance between diversity and skills, and diversity as a whole which I personally do not agree with. And so, we’ve had a few back and forth on some definitions and updates of the sentence itself trying to accommodate about both views.

I don’t know on which version – there’s been several versions exchanged back and forth – you want to start with. And I don’t know whether Malcolm or Elizabeth are here, but otherwise the other participants, I think, expressed some support for probably even removing the part of the sentence that was mentioned in that “rigid application of diversity” requirements would be diverse.

I don’t know how you want to continue with that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mathieu. I think Elizabeth or Malcolm are in the call [inaudible]. What I think the latest version – the last proposal – was by Avri, and I

could see some support in the mailing list for Avri. I think I can share her text, maybe, in the chat just to make it more easier to refer.

I think what in that text of hers, it's clear that, I guess, we acknowledge that about that we are looking for skills and diversity, and it's important to note that they are not mutually exclusive. I think the text – that's my reading or my interpretation – that it gives a really kind of strong commitment that we really improve diversity.

Other, I think, proposals just to make it kind of an aspirational goal, I think, that's not what we are really looking for with the sub-group. I think what we are tasked with is to really to work on how to improve the current situation.

I see that Avri is in the queue. Yes, Avri?

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Hopefully I can be heard. I know I've had problems from Iceland hotel participating.

I think one of the mistakes we've been making is seeing diversity as somehow other to skills and experience, as opposed to diversity being an essential component of those and an equivalent category. In fact, sometimes I would actually, perhaps, think it was an even more important category, but our role is here to talk about diversity – that you cannot have a complete set of skills without diversity. You cannot have a proper set of experience without diversity.

So, as opposed to getting into which is primary to the definition of others – though I would include diversity as essential for skills, essential

for experience – I would say that the three of them are at least an equivalent, and that in doing the considerations that we’re talking about, one has to basically consider diversity and skills and [experience] as kind of a set that can’t be broken up and that always need to be considered together.

That was what I was trying to achieve in the edit I offered. I think the idea of using words like “rigid application of diversity” are [incredibly] prejudicial and are something we should really work hard to avoid. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Avri, for the comment. Yeah, it seems the proposed text is quite fair. I think it’s good. As you said, [that highlights] that we see the diversity, skills, and experience as kind of what we were expecting here and, [like I say], in leadership and so on within ICANN.

I see also, in the chat, support for that text. But for now, it’s – okay, Julie. Do you want to make comment?

JULIE HAMMER:

Yes. Thank you, Rafik. Can you hear me?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes. We can hear you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to make the comment that in this section, what the section is titled is, “The Elements of Diversity,” and we’re actually listing Skills as one of the elements of diversity that we are seeking. And to me, what we’re trying to say is that we’re actually seeking diversity in skill sets as well as diversity in age, diversity in gender, diversity in language.

So, I’m just wondering whether the problem that we’re discussing now is created by the way in which we’ve expressed what we mean under that Skills. My thinking is that what we want to be saying is – and what we start saying – is that we’re actually seeking a whole diverse range of skills to contribute to our work in ICANN. I just feel that the way in which it’s currently expressed may have perhaps confused that intent. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Julie.

So, because that’s under item Skills and we’re adding that as an Element of diversity – so, okay.

I think the added text [inaudible] to the previous comment about that maybe created the whole discussion about that diversity should not prevail over experience of, or requirement – but if we are replacing that with the second text describing that we are talking about diversity, skills, and experience, as the range that we need for leadership – I think [it may]. Okay.

I see that Avri wants to comment. Yes, Avri. You can go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes. I can certainly see Julie's point in terms of how this has been structured in the writing, but I think that avoids the questions that people are always and forever putting diversity up in opposition to skills and experience. So, I would certainly be in favor of moving this sentence to a different – and not subordinating it to “this is an element of diversity” because I think that does become the harder discussion. Is diversity part of skills? Are skills and experience part of diversity? Or do they have to be seen as a set of things that are linked in a more complex manner?

The problem I was having, and what I reacted to, is partially what Rafik said – that we were, perhaps, subordinating skills and experience to diversity from a paragraph sense. But the content of that paragraph was subordinating diversity to some optimized notion of skills and experience that was said about diversity.

So, I think it may be important to bring that discussion out somewhere [that] maybe skills and experience is not a subordinate of diversity in that sense, and that basically it is part of a, aggregate set that needs to be met equally.

So, I would argue that, yes, diversity is more important and comes before skills and experience because you can't have the skills or the experience without the diversity. But we know that for many, that would be read differently and that we need the skills. We need the experience. And then if there's a little bit of energy left over, let's make sure that it's kind of diverse as well.

And in fact, looking at the experience we have in ICANN today, first we work on this optimistic view of skills and experience – we want law; we want this; we want that – and diversity always comes in second unless it’s been indicated by a quota.

So, we do get a little geographical diversity on the Board because there’s the Bylaw that requires us to think about it. We do get a little bit in some of the GNSO stakeholder groups because they have put it in their Charters, and you can’t have everybody from one country or one [inaudible].

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Avri? I’m not sure if we lost Avri, or I cannot hear.

Hello? Can you hear me?

Okay. Not sure [inaudible]. I think we lost Avri.

If I understand Avri correctly, she was suggesting that we may move that proposed text. So, we need maybe to think where to put it. And I’m thinking here maybe that we put skills as “element of diversity” but maybe it’s not... It needs, maybe, some more elaboration to clarify and avoid any confusion.

I see that Avri is back. Avri, can you hear me?

AVRI DORIA:

Yes, I can. I see I was talking away and got lost, and I have no idea at what point my connection dropped. So, apologies.

RAFIK DAMMAK: No problem I think just it was in the last minute or two. You were explaining, so...

AVRI DORIA: I had [inaudible] on for a while. The last thing I said is, basically, I think the problem is that we're trying to subordinate one thing in a set to the other things in the set. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Avri.

Yes, Julie. Please go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Rafik. I guess I just wanted to expand on why, say, in the SSAC context, it's logical to regard skills – or diversity of skills – as an element we consider in our [inaudible] diversity. So for example, in SSAC, to be able to fulfill the role of providing technical advice to the Board and to the community, the SSAC seeks to have diversity in the skill sets of its members – diversity in the background; diversity in the experience. So if, say for example, SSAC were looking at the various elements of diversity that were important to it, then the diversity of its skills of its members is an important aspect to consider there.

That's why, in my mind, it's quite logical to argue that skills is an important element of diversity, and I [don't] see it as one being subordinate to the other, but rather being hand-in-glove.

I guess I just wanted to explain that sort of thinking – just as having diversity in gender and having diversity in languages is also important to be able to fulfill that role. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Julie.

I think that idea in what's proposed as kind of additional text is really to, I think, highlight or emphasize that we are trying to broaden the range of skill sets that we should look for even, for example, for the SSAC. I guess, even you are looking for technical profiles. There are so many profiles in different experiences between a software engineer, a network engineer, someone who is working in infrastructure, someone who is working in security, and so on. And so, you may be trying to get different profiles. It's not just the same technical profile again and over again.

I think that may be what the text is trying to highlight. And also that to, I guess, to emphasize that we are looking for a diverse skill set, but also that it's not against any other element of diversity. They are not mutually exclusive, and to stress that we should put real effort and commitment to find those diverse profiles. This is my interpretation.

I'm trying here to see how we can move forward here because what you are saying may be in the pdf. It's just not necessarily the latest version in

terms of text. So, we have the one proposal by Avri. I don't see any issue to present, so I want, really, to see if we have the consensus or agreement so we can put that and to see if there are any comments later on – maybe in the mailing list if others review the document later on.

Okay, let's put that for now and see if there is maybe a further comment later by those who are not on the call. But maybe just kind of action ahead with regard to skills, maybe if we can... I think if we can maybe elaborate more on that element to clarify what's the intent. I don't want to volunteer anybody, but just maybe thinking since Julie talked about the SSAC experience, if she can maybe put some wording from her experience and understanding here can be really helpful.

Okay. Saying that, maybe just we'll have to come back again to this topic, but we have the text for now.

Another issue that I think was raised and I think maybe we need some clarification here – it's about the approach to gender, and I think one text maybe raised a concern for different people, so it's alright that we are approaching gender as a binary.

I think, here, maybe what we should try to do is to kind of we are not trying to categorize people or try to put them on kind of specific boxes but to allow them to self-define how they see their gender.

I'm trying to see what was proposed as a comment in the document. If you can also look at that, it would be helpful.

Yes, Avri. Please go ahead.

AVRI DOARIA:

My essential recommendation is that that last sentence about a decision being made to maintain the binary approach be dropped. I think that, at this point, the world is very much in a transition on the issue of binary gender versus there being a greater diversity in gender. And perhaps we don't want to commit ICANN, already, to dealing with that issue and to deciding whether they just list "other" as some did or whether they go the way Facebook and others have and list a whole chain of possible things.

But I do think it's something that we should at least leave open and recommend further investigation on, further view of what is becoming the standard of usage in the more modern, the more enlightened, parts of society looking at what's happening with these things in Silicon Valley and in other places, and not necessarily deciding today that, "No. ICANN is a place where men are men and women are women and that's it. There is nothing else," but that we basically leave ourselves open to continuing that discussion as the world adjusts to the notion of greater diversity in the LGBTQ/Y, etc. world. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Avri. So, if I understand you correctly we can just maybe state for now that the ICANN approach was kind of binary, but what we are suggesting for now is to investigate and see the kind of Best Practices and what's kind of going on in other area. I recall that when we had the presentation for [inaudible], he mentioned the case of Facebook who, I think, they listed over 50 categories for gender. So we just, I guess,

leave it open and highlight that it's up to the people to self-define, for sure. I guess, maybe, we can develop this later and, I guess, in terms of recommendations with regard to Best Practices and other and how we can kind of include – I mean [in term to] encourage, to improve diversity.

So, we can maybe just highlight that [in term about the investigation] Best Practices in Recommendation 2.

Okay. I guess, let's try that part [inaudible] just formally put the idea of investigation.

Any further comment here?

I see some discussion going on in Adobe Connect. I think there was some proposal for text there from Avri, too, so we can use that for the time being and see if we can do some words [we think] to make it more clear.

Yes, Fiona. Please go ahead.

FIONA ASONGA:

I just want to clarify. I think when we were discussing this the first time around in the document, we had earlier it was to generate discussion. And the discussion wasn't completed. But at the end of the day, we can define the elements of diversity clearly. It will help us be able to come up with an appropriate recommendation.

Now, having sat down and gone through all the previous discussions – the notes of the meetings, the input and feedback to the straw man

document – and tried to put it together, English is not my first language. I'd really appreciate support in terms of being able to get the right wording so that it sounds correct because the intent is not to lock out anybody, but to be able to [met] when we discuss it [we wanted] everybody to feel comfortable.

And at the same time, not to infringe on their private activities (their sexual orientation and maybe, really, their private life. Being able to give that respect – that and still be able to accommodate the diversity with gender Avri has mentioned that is happening the world over.

So, being able to get that worded properly, I think, is important because then it helps as a recommendation to clearly word what the recommendation should be and what ICANN really needs to do in as far as gender diversity is concerned.

I think Avri's willing to help and I'll be looking out for her to send in some lines to help us word that correctly. I think one of the things that is very clear from this discussion is what I'm seeing of the recommendation is really to make notes on the recommendations for ICANN to figure out a mechanism that accommodates the global trend in gender diversity, if that makes sense I think. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Fiona. At this level it's about really defining the element of diversity. In regard to gender, I think, the point here is to avoid a binary approach. So, I don't think we are going to settle out at the list of possible gender because it's something really evolving all the time.

The idea is, I think, we provide that flexibility to show that there are different genders and how people define themselves. It's just I want also to highlight something. I heard this several times – gender is not necessarily correlated to the sexual orientation. We need to maybe be careful about that. It's not our point here. It's just how maybe people define themselves. It's not we are...I mean, we want to categorize them, but just allow them how they declare.

I think what we also maybe need to think later, in regard to the correlation, is how maybe, with regard to, in some cases when it's about appointment in ICANN at the NomCom or in the case of election, how that kind of diversity in terms of gender – other than the classic binary approach – how that should be handled, how the case – [on] those contacted – how they need to be worked out. And so we can maybe develop later in the recommendation maybe suggesting some ways to do so.

I guess just maybe we have that some proposed text to kind of try concern about minority and so on. I don't think that the right place for that, but just to clarify that we are maybe acknowledging that we need further investigation there and something that's kind of evolving and that we want a classical – if I can say so – a classical approach, a binary approach for gender.

I see that they have a comment about minority and majority view and so on. I think those cases about the clarifying the level of consensus is really where we have a kind of minority point of view. I don't think it should be in this area, but it's really more if there is some kind of maybe

opposition and some recommendational – some area that we didn't find clear consensus.

Let's do the changes for now on that part and kind of elaborate more in term of [inaudible] and Best Practices and to have kind of placeholder in term of recommendation how we can kind of really cope with that.

Please, any further comment or question on this part?

I hope that we have the note about those areas so we can do the changes later after the call.

Another, I think, area that was some kind of discussion and comment is with regard to the age because we are talking about millennial and next generation.

Okay, Avri. Yes.

AVRI DORIA:

Yes. I wanted to comment on that, but I was willing to wait until you finished the overview, certainly. So if you want, I will back off until you finish the overview.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

No, Avri. You can go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. The one thing, I took the comment that Mathieu had said as, "Hey, but what about the older people?" And then I started thinking

about it with some of the people that I hang out with, talk to. Millennials are already among the older people. So, I'm offering sort of a phrase that says, "older generations including millennials *and* the next generation."

Now that may seem funny at first, but the millennials are older now and the next generation is already coming in behind them and they're no longer the youngest generation. But I do think that Mathieu had a good point, that if we're having diversity of age, diversity doesn't just mean "pack it with the young." It means having a full range.

Perhaps if including millennials among the older generations is too cutesy by a half, we could find another way of saying it. But it just struck me now that when I look at millennials, I think of them as among us older generations already.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Avri. Maybe we talk about millennial, but it's kind of maybe they are already an old generation like Generation X and Y and so on. So, probably a more, I think, neutral wording here that we always have to ensure that we are including all group ages and having in mind about next generation. But just to be sure, when we talk about age groups, is there a kind of same understanding here what we talk about? There is kind of clear categorization or just because – I'm not sure. It's like from 20 to 30, 30 to 40, and so on. Or it can be kind of arbitrary, so...

Because while we are defining all these elements, I think what we want is some recommendation and to provide suggesting some guidelines or principles, maybe we need kind of to move further on the details how

we define that because, to be honest, that's my personal experience. Even after 30s or close to 40, some people still see that person as young. So, seems kind of really a little bit subjective. So, maybe just we can clarify maybe thinking about how we can clarify about the age groups and so on. If there is anything standardized, I'm not sure if there is something like that.

Okay. No comment here, so we can just maybe... That, I think, [quite] is the easy one. Okay. Trying to see other area.

There were other, maybe, suggestions about moving the part, I think. That's a good comment [inaudible] and we can go with that. I don't see any problem with them.

There are several comments.

While we working on the kind of, maybe, initial part with regard to the elements and so on, which is more kind of an introduction to [inaudible] or to set the scene for our...

I want to highlight here that the recommendation part is really the area that need your input and suggestion. So for now, we just put the idea of diversity and we will discuss this in a few minutes. But really, for what I'm suggesting is that, please, you can add any suggestion or recommendation you are thinking for now and we can work out that later. It will be good if you can share it in the mailing list, so we can have a discussion there and try to elaborate it.

But we really need to think about – we start kind of, [for instance], [talking about] several recommendations, but please have in mind to

link that to what we did before in the document – like what we defined are elements of diversity and so on, so to always make a link between that and the recommendation. So really, I encourage all of you to work on that.

We have 30 minutes left in the call and I would like that we move to the next agenda item because, at least, I would like to finalize one item that kind of gets – it's [on] hold – which is about the questionnaire. In the last call, we agreed to have a call for consensus and to –

Since I think we [thought] that we finalized the document, but Mathieu raised a comment and he asked for clarifying two questions. So, to help to that we can get input from SOs and ACs. I asked them on the mailing list if we have specific wording, and I just add if there was any objection or comment about that. But there was none. So, the question we're getting kind of a state of limbo, but we have to move forward.

What I'm suggesting – Mathieu, since you are here (I'm not going to put you on the spot), but if you can go back to that discussion and suggest a specific wording, then we can, after that, with the revised questionnaire, put it for call for consensus so we can have that item finalized.

And I see that, Mathieu, you want to speak. Yes, please go ahead.

MATHIEU WEIL:

Thank you, Rafik. Apologies for starting the discussion late. I realize I wasn't part of some of the calls and it might have felt sort of as a late comment. But before trying to do an alternate wording of this, I would

need to better understand what distinction the sub-group was trying to make between elements of diversity that are relevant versus the elements of diversity that are important. That's the distinction I was struggling with, and I would really need to better understand that if you want me to try and provide some wording somewhere.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mathieu. I think [inaudible] if you can really maybe [it said think] part of it comes from the discussion that we suggest that we put some wording to be sure that we can get input from the SOs and ACs. So, I'm trying to find your comment. A little bit hard to do so on the fly, but if you can really propose some wording, I think that would be really had to move forward for that discussion.

I think because you write the kind of...you ask a ton of questions, but just I think there was no kind of clarity how that we can find something satisfactory or responding to the concern.

So, what I can do? I think I can maybe send...thanks...

So, you put the two questions.

Sorry, Mathieu. Again, I'm asking so what are you suggesting, exactly, here?

MATHIEU WEIL:

What I'm saying is, because it seems to be difficult to make a distinction between the first question which is asking, "What do you think is relevant to your SO/AC or group?" and the second which says, "If there

are any other things that are important?” Maybe we could merge both into one question which would be, “Which elements of diversity are relevant and/or important to your SO/AC group? And please explain why.”

And then we have another question later which says, “What are you tracking and do you think it’s proportionately represented?” and probably it would be easier to read for an SOAC. If that’s the orientation, then certainly I can suggest a wording.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I see, first of all, one suggestion that we can merge the questions and maybe use the term “important.”

I see Mathieu and Julie. I’m not sure if, Mathieu – that’s an old or new hand.

MATHIEU WEIL: Old hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Old hand. Let’s go with Julie. Yes, Julie. Please go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Rafik. I think the questions can be merged. There would still be two parts to it. The first part is we’ve just given a list of elements of diversity, and the question is, “Which of these elements are important to your group?” I see no problem in changing the wording from

“relevant” to “important,” but the second aspect is asking if there’s anything additional to those elements that is important to your group. So I think, provided those two aspects of the question retained, there’s no problem in having it as one question or two. It really doesn’t matter. But there are two aspects to it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julie. Yes, Mathieu.

MATHIEU WEIL: This is a follow-up for Julie. I’m not sure I fully understand the second aspect that you’re describing – the additional element. Can you maybe elaborate with an example [inaudible]?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Mathieu. I’m just trying to remember. SSAC had identified additional elements of diversity, and I’m just trying to go back to my SSAC notes to give you an example. I’ll look it up and I’ll put it in the chat. But it’s just saying, “Here’s a list of –” however many, six; there could be more than six – “elements of diversity that could be important to a particular group.” I’ll go back and check my list and put perhaps an additional example in the chat. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Julie.

It seems that, Mathieu, you understand, I think, that intent. We got the element of diversity. We saw that what we are trying to cover, but the SOs and ACs have, maybe, their additional elements that we are not covering. We hope that they can text that to us and hopefully we can include them. I think that's the intent. Just keeping the questions separate ensures that we get that.

I saw Mathieu added the text to the Google doc. Okay.

So, what we can do is...no problem...It's better to really clarify at this stage before sending to the SOs and ACs. We have to go through the Plenary before, anyway, but to ensure that they can understand our question so we can get a meaningful response.

We can send later, hopefully, a revised version to the list and ask for a call for consensus so we can...I think we missed the deadline for the next Plenary, but hopefully we can target the one after.

So, I think that's all. We get that action item. Yes..."The one after is Copenhagen." Okay.

Yes, Fiona. Please go ahead.

FIONA ASONGA:

Just for the purposes of clarity, I just want to be clear. So, we have now agreed that this is what our final questionnaire looks like? After we make the changes, we will share it with the rest of the CCWG? [inaudible].

RAFIK DAMMAK: To share it with the sub-group first. Just, we call for consensus to make sure that those even who didn't attend the call...If there is no objection – let's say after we initiate the call and after three or four days – we can state that it was agreed and we can send it to the CCWG.

So first step, we are have agreed here, but how to proceed in terms of the revised text. We send it to the list to see if there is any objection or comment. If there is none, we can consider it as agreed and send it to CCWG. And, I think, at CCWG level, there will be further discussion.

Let's move on to the next item. I'm sorry, we will get a few minutes extra if you don't mind. I'm sorry for that. And this because we have this discussion about the Diversity Office. And maybe just to highlight that there was some suggestion from Sébastien that we have discussion with Ombudsman Sub-group about if that office should be also among the role of the Ombudsman or not. But we didn't really grow further on that matter.

I see Fiona and Sébastien. Yes, Fiona. Please go ahead.

Yes, Fiona? Can you speak.

FIONA ASONGA: Sorry, it was an old hand.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. No problem.

I see Sébastien in the queue. Yes, Sébastien. Please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Rafik. It's to apologize because I was supposed to send something to this group, but in trying to write something specific for this group I went to the conclusion that I need to write a broader document and I am still working on. Therefore, it's why I didn't send specific things here.

I hope to be able at the beginning of next week to send to the full Work Stream 2 participant maybe to have this as a discussion item during Copenhagen. And inside this document, I am talking about the question raised in the Diversity Sub-group; [but are] questions raised in other sub-group link with Ombudsman and with a Complaint Officer and so on. And I wanted to apologize for that once again. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Sébastien. Just to understand what you are saying, that you are going to work on document, but it's more about the general kind of discussion – the other Ombudsman Sub-group. So, just about this...only about Diversity Office topic.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Rafik. It's not just, but it's part of the Diversity Office. It's one of the elements. It's a new request. We have new request from other sub-groups and I am trying to see if the proposal kept within the Ombuds Office or eventually for some in the Complaint Office (the Complaint [Offices] within the ICANN staff), or if we need something else or organize all that differently.

It's a more broader discussion, but I will be happy when this will be produced to have a specific discussion with you on that issue. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sébastien. But maybe just to clarify for the sub-group, we have this suggestion and it's also – [I can find it in] the recommendation – about the Diversity Office. But we didn't really discuss in which, if I can say, where it should be located exactly and which may be division or office or whoever will handle that. It was not really discussed. So, I think that will be under discussion soon.

I see that Dalila wrote some comment. Yes, that the recommendation received some support, I think, in the mailing list. Okay, so it's permanent structure. Just maybe to highlight, since we are talking about the office. There was a comment about that from Finn. And I think Finn is in the call if I'm not mistaken. Yeah, Finn is in the call.

Maybe just clarification that it's...the recommendation is kind of...it's really...we are making a recommendation about that. We're having an office. I don't think we really moved it to the area of implementation.

Okay. Thanks, Karen [inaudible].

So, we are not really talking about the implementation and how it will be set up and so on, and so I think we will leave that to the staff and ICANN how it will be implemented. So, we are suggesting that we have a kind of structure with regard to the diversity and I think what we need also to elaborate what can be its role and what it should do or what not

and so on, and give all this kind of requirement. But we are not really going into the specific implementation and how it should be executed.

Okay, [inaudible] it will be implemented.

Since I'm getting all the reminder that we should finish soon, any further comment or question. Any other item that you want to raise or to discuss quickly?

Okay. Seeing none, I think we should not keep you more on the call. I want to thank you again for attending, and also for all the comments on the document. And please, please, continue to review the document and add your comments, suggestions for wording, and, in particular, the recommendations. We need to work further on that area.

Okay. Thanks again and see you soon, and have a nice weekend. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]