

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, everyone, again for joining today's call. We are just one week before Copenhagen meeting and, as you can see in the agenda, we have [inaudible] we started [a while] ago.

So, as usual, we will start with the review of action items to see if we have any [further] work left. And then we will move later to the review on draft report and try, we say, to compile out some issues. But those, I think, we need to discuss about the way to move forward and to try to make more progress.

And we have one item under the Any Other Business that we would like to get the sub-group feedback on it.

So, as a review for the action items, the first one was about sending the questionnaire and to make a call for consensus. The deadline was the Friday [inaudible] today the, let's say, 12:00 PM UTC. And I was told that we should avoid such timing to avoid any confusion. But the deadline already passed and the only comment was just to make a few – Bernie, I think it's 12:00 PM, so I'm not mistaking it should be already passed. It's now 23:59. Okay.

So, after the deadline we will have to send – okay maybe are talking about the deadline for submitting to the Plenary. I was talking about our own deadline for, to, kind of, the consensus regarding the questionnaire. So, that's good to clarify.

So, since there was no objection and just a small edit to add one element of diversity that was missing in the list. I will update 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.*

---

questionnaire and just send it again for information, and submit it for Pleanry.

I have a question for you as a term of process, Bernie. Just to whom we should send exactly as a matter of procedure?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: List or staff. If you send it to staff, we will distribute it to the list.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks for this. We'll send the paper before the deadline.

Other than that, we got the report from Chris and was distributed on the list. We can discuss that later when we have time. So, that's basically the action items we had and we got follow up for it.

So, let's move on to the draft report. On the last call, we spent some time to discuss about the section regarding diversity of skills. The document was updated with the text from Julie, and Sébastien start to adding some explanatory text there on what we call a chapeau. So, I would ask everyone to review that part and check if we are fine with what we get now or not.

Still, we also discussed last time about reference to the nondiscrimination provision that still need to be elaborated and need more text, but we have a placeholder in the document so we can go back to that later.

---

Before going into substance, I would like maybe here to raise some questions and get feedback from the sub-group members. We need to see how we can really move forward in terms of the draft and, I think, we in the last call spent some time in just really a few paragraphs, but we get, I think, kind of time constraint in term of delivering initial report as soon as possible.

And so, I would really ask here what you think is the best way to move forward. What kind of approach we can follow for that purpose? Maybe I should elaborate more. We got some comments and some suggestions, but what you think is the best way to resolve that? Should we try during the call to highlight some paragraphs as we tried before and try to work them out during the call and then just to confirm in the mailing list to see if there is consensus?

Or we just keep try to work more between the calls and remind people to give comments and input and so see how there is all kind of expectation that co-rapporteur to take the lead and to add text, resolve any comments, and so on. So, I'm trying here to see what you think is the best approach and see how we can really try to make progress in the coming weeks. And any comment would be really welcome.

Yes, Avri. Please go ahead. Avri? I think you are still muted. Sorry, Avri. We cannot hear you at all, so I'm not sure what the problem – if you are joining through Adobe Connect or phone – but we cannot hear you or I'm not sure if it's just me.

Okay.

---

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I've got it unmuted. Can I be heard?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Avri. We can hear you now.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So sorry. I called on my phone because that supposedly works, better but then I lost the screen.

I think that, in terms of...I'm trying to be clear on this because it's been so many...this is still a document that needs its first reading, correct? And this is a document that's [inaudible] for a reading in Copenhagen? Correct me if I'm wrong. Jump in.

But basically, I think my recommendation – and this is what I think is done in other groups – is, as rapporteur at this point [inaudible] 11 hours that you basically talk [through] this meeting any of the issues that are really [inaudible]; perhaps a quick walk through page to page. But then you basically render them down: "Accept," "Not Accept," "Go forward."

Perhaps include a couple notes about [inaudible] are still under discussion would benefit from wider discussion. And that you guys should basically put out a rapporteur's document that can be discussed in Copenhagen. We would get comments on it and then it would go back for discussion in terms of fixing it before a [second] reading.

I don't know that we have to reach full consensus. We don't ever have to reach full consensus, but we have to [reach] ICANN consensus on

---

every [count]. [inaudible] will go through several consensus processes. It goes to the Plenary. It gets comments, etc. In fact, it goes to the Plenary; it comes back here; then it goes back to the Plenary; then it goes out for comments, etc.

We really just have to get an initial document from the rapporteur's perspective that lists most of the issues that are still open ones, or shows what they are. And that would get us out into wider discussion.

I really think there's a lot of rapporteur prerogatives that you should take [inaudible] final half day. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Avri. I think that's quite clear about the expectations. We can ask our co-rapporteurs list issues and try first to share them, I think, in the mailing list so everyone will be aware about them. And we can discuss them during the calls and, say, trying to see if we agree or disagree or what we maybe suggest as tweaking and change. So, I think we can go with that probably.

And I see that Bernie is raising his hand. Yes, Bernie? Please go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Just to be clear, because I was getting a flavor from Avri that this document – the main document as opposed to the questionnaire – could be going to the Plenary for comments. And currently, that's not on my list of things for the agenda of the face-to-face meeting. So, if you're planning to do that, I would need to know now so we can adjust things.

---

Currently, we are planning updates from all the groups that are not presenting anything else, and that does not include Diversity because you're presenting the questionnaire. But if you do also want to present this document for questions, I would need to know so we can advise the co-Chairs. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Bernard. Yes, what was a meeting for the Plenary for next week is the questionnaire and not what we are still working on. And I don't think we could make it anyway by that time.

[inaudible] it's not necessarily premature, Avri, but I think that give us kind of a clear indication or more pressure that we have to deliver something soon to share with the Plenary to get input and feedback.

That's why I wanted, really, to ask these questions and to [inaudible] that we kind of spent time for some time just discussing maybe an issue here and there, but not necessarily making that kind of quick progress to have something in a decent shape to share with the Plenary that we can comment. So, not necessarily really to tweak everything, but at least something that is kind of – I'm not sure to find the right word, but something presentable.

Yes, Bernie. Please go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

If you do want – right now I'm building the agenda for the Plenary, so we've got a slot for the questionnaire which you can run to. If you also want a slot for an update on your main document that you're working

---

on so you can ask some questions, we could make a 10 – 15 minute slot available for that. Just let me know.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernie. Personally, I don't want to commit because I will miss the meeting, unfortunately, next week and I should check with Fiona before since she will do the presentation.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Alright. Just let me know either way.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, sure.

Yes, Sébastien, it's a good question. I think it can be our goal to get a second version something clean and to fix the first comment we get and to do kind of quick formatting and so on. So maybe, what do you think the best kind of let's agree maybe on some target date, so that give us kind of a way to focus and to make progress.

Bernie, I see that you're still raising your hand. I'm not sure if it's an old or a new hand.

Okay. Yes, Sébastien. Please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Rafik. I have some questions that we can still have some possibility to work within this group for enhancing the document, and I

---

am [not] 15 minutes in the Plenary will help a lot in the discussion. But it's your call. My suggestion is that before next call the rapporteur publish a new version of the document – a new draft version – and that we take that as a basis for discussion during our next call. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sébastien. I think the next call after Copenhagen, it will be the 24<sup>th</sup> of March – is, I think, in three weeks. Okay, depends how much we will be busy during Copenhagen and how much we [will cover] from Copenhagen. But I guess some pressure will be really helpful [inaudible].

I see some comments with regards [inaudible] it may be useful to get feedback from the Plenary. I think it's about perfect paper for now, but a question having 15 minutes and how much, really, we can get input and so on. But, again, let's maybe discuss with Fiona. But, unfortunately, I don't think she is on the call now. She is having some connection issues. We can discuss about that and see what the best way forward to move forward.

We'll see if we should have an update for Copenhagen and also the Plenary in Copenhagen or not, and also working toward the second version of the draft. More work to come, I guess, but what we committed for from the beginning.

Back to the document. Why we spent time in the beginning at in the first part to describe the elements and description of the issues and the elements of diversity. I guess that's kind of we can hopefully fix that in the coming days based on suggestion we get and then can see if there is anything binding that they need, kind of wider group discussion and to



---

see what's the maybe the best – not the best, but where we can build consensus there.

With regard to the part that I think still really needs a lot of recommendation in here – it kind of, maybe we need to think of how we've made [adaptation] which is about the recommendation. That's, I think, what's kind of expected from us.

So, what we get for now is just few really small set of basic recommendations. The first one was about having an Office of Diversity and start some suggestion there. That's something we have to discuss. There is also some – maybe if, I'm not sure if everyone saw that. That's at the end of the document and there was some few recommendation and there was no comment or discussion yet. So, I think maybe it's can be the opportunity to have a look at them and to discuss to see to get some feedback on that.

And so, if I will share them in the Adobe Connect just for reference. Sorry for the formatting. That's the problem with Adobe Connect.

The first suggestion is to establish a minimum diversity requirement for panel during the events organized or funded by ICANN, and saying that [inaudible] four participants should include speaker from only one ICANN region. No panel of more than four participants should include speaker from only one gender. Inclusion of three to five diversity enhancement target metrics. That's something maybe to be elaborated.

In the five-year Strategic Plan as one of the Key Strategic Initiatives, such five-year targets could be, for instance, Asia, Africa, ALAC –each represent at least [15] percent of ICANN community leadership. Gender

---

balance within [ICANN org] leadership should be aligned with [ICANN org] staff gender balance overall. Aim for more gender balance at ICANN Board. Include the enhancement of diversity within this [corporate structure reviews] of SOs and ACs. Include the enhancement of diversity within the scope of HRT[inaudible].

I can understand this is kind of, I think – how to say. I think this is really, let's see them as kind of a straw man, if I can calling them a kind of straw man proposal. And they need probably a lot of discussion and tweaking. But just I think is to be shared with all of you so you are aware about that's were added in the recommendation lately.

So, as you can see, there's still a lot to be done at the recommendation. This may be a question here is how we should develop or elaborate the recommendation – what's the best approach, and to link that to what we described before in the document.

Any comments or questions about this?

Okay. Thanks, Louisewies. We can add that, I think, to the document. We should put all the kind of writes that refer to what we get from ICANN staff previously and also add other source of information.

Okay. Seeing no one in the queue and since we are still in the recommendation section, [and shared] the new part that was added so everyone should be aware about that and so she or he can [inaudible] later. But maybe to go back to the first recommendation about the Diversity Office, and maybe here to put Sébastien on the spot. [inaudible] Sébastien, but I think maybe because you shared in the wider CCWG about your paper regarding all the suggestion of offices

---

and [you] suggest one of them, [I think], Community Office. So, how you see that related to the Diversity Office or something separate or just so we can try maybe to see how would that fit with the current suggestion.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Rafik. The paper was sent to the Plenary [Occupant] and Observer list, and the idea was to discuss this issue what is the current situation with the Ombuds Office with the future [Complaints] Office? And what about a third office I call, for the sake of conversation, a Community Office – but it could be another word.

And why I came with this suggestion is that, in fact, we were trying within the Ombuds Group to see what can fit in the new request from Work Stream 2 within the Ombuds Office. And some of the requests we were able to put them easily with the Ombuds Office, but some other are quite problematic with question with the way of the Ombuds is working about confidentiality, when it can intervene in the process, and so on.

And some other action [or more] – a place where we need to follow what is happening. And it's not too much the role of the Ombuds to look into detail what are the statistic about gender equity, about diversity, about other possible topics. Some can be done there if we decide, but I had the impression that maybe shared office with specific duties could be one way forward to be taken into account.

One of the proposals is to have – in some cases, it's difficult to know who will take care of something or if it needs to be taking care by one and after, the other and after the third one... And we can have some

---

coordination between the three. And the third office – if we decide to create one – could be under the leadership of the [inaudible] community. The Ombuds is under the Board decision and the Complaints Office is within legal staff and within staff.

But really, I am not going to say that's the solution. I would like to have this kind of discussion to see maybe if somebody else will have a good idea on how to solve the various issue, but at least I wanted to put on the table this proposal.

From my point of view, yes, if we create this third office one of the targets of this office could be the Diversity Office. But once again, it's really for discussion. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sébastien. Since it's discussed now at the level of the CCWG and it's still up to us at the level of sub-group to think if we just maybe we kind of work on the requirement for a Diversity Office role or a mission. And then how it's implemented within such Community Office or any other formal structure, it should be okay. I guess that's what we have to clarify in our recommendation what are the requirement and the expectation in term of mission and role for that office.

I see Lousewies in the queue and she asked me a question. Yes, Lousewies. Please go ahead.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Hi. Can you hear me?

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. We can hear you.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Okay. Good. Sorry, I didn't know if I was still on mute.

I got some questions also in the Board call that we had yesterday about what exactly the role of such an office would be. Of course, I couldn't answer it because I think it's still trying to crystalize out. But it would be extremely helpful to get an idea from the group of whether this would be about just measuring and identifying or – to say it less diplomatically – naming and shaming, to say that, "These guys have done it, but these guys haven't."

And also, how...this person's, I guess, authority would need to be accepted by every single SOAC – by the whole community – to do this. So that, I think, is a key question – what would be the added value or is this something that the different parts of the community could be doing by themselves?

And I think the concern that some have is that if this is something which has to be pushed by one person or by an office when it is, of course, something that hits every single part of the community – also, it's hard to have people in leadership positions if you're not already making sure that your own meetings are inclusive and diverse. So, it really starts at the bottom. How do we make sure that it works?

We fill up our pipeline with diverse talents when this person will only be, or this office will only be looking at the very concrete ICANN context

---

when so much, of course, is happening in the community itself. I think that's one question.

And the other one, of course, that people are concerned about is what would be the budgetary implications, especially if it would be a staff member who needs resources, etc.? And where would that money be coming from? So, the usual question then is if we add something to the budget, are we either cutting something away or are we moving another position somewhere?

These are, I think, really fundamental questions that will also keep coming up also, I think, in the CCWG, if this is the path that the group wants to go on. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Lousewies. And thanks for the feedback from the Board. It's quite interesting that they are already aware about this recommendation because it's still under discussion. And, as you raised several points, it still needs a lot of work and clarification because it's now still at the level of straw man because it needs tweaking.

I understand that at least such office will gather and publish the data because, as it was raised before, there was difficulty to find and to consolidate and compile all data regarding diversity. So, it can be a first step for that because we need to collect the data. And that's why we had that input from the public responsibility division [regarding this]. And also asking Chris about how data are collected in the different space within ICANN and to see how we can improve that.

---

There is also the suggestion about maybe the office to take the kind of lead to diversity criteria or establishing diversity audit and so on. This is maybe also raise a question about its relation to our roles because we start to think about the element of diversity and so on.

So, I think they are all legitimate questions and how that can be implemented and what's the role of the community or the staff or the org in all parts in such structure, how they can participate and so on. So, I think that we really need a lot of working here and that's why we need such comments.

So, I think we should take note of this and try to think how we can clarify that. That's just me speaking. That's from my understanding from the recommendation, so it was not coming from the co-rapporteur but just [inaudible].

Lousewies, you wanted to make a further comment. So, that's an old hand?

Yes, Sébastien. Please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much. The question about what will this office be doing, how it will be done, is something we need to discuss further. But the first step was to gather data and if there is no data, how we can improve the data collection and what are the results and then what we can do with those data to enhance diversity within the full organization, the full system – the ICANN.

---

Lousewies, you are the messenger and don't take for you, but it's not time to discuss what [it will] cost. Or, if you want to start the discussion and if the Board wants to talk about that, I would like to be sure that somebody takes the same care of discussion for the creation of the Complaints Office.

Yes, there will be a question of budget. Yes. But I am not sure that the creation of the Complaints Office was scrutinized like it is now for this. And it's not the first time I heard about that what is done in Work Stream 2 – what is the budget, where it will come from. I guess we will have to discuss that, but it's not the right time.

For the moment, we are trying to find what is the need for the organization, for ICANN, to enhance accountability, and here to enhance diversity. And then when we will have all the requests, then we will agree on what to organize for Work Stream 2 work.

Yes, the question in the discussion about budget will need to happen, but it's too early from my point of view. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Sébastien. Yes, Avri. Please go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. I very much appreciate the comments Lousewies made. And perhaps when we're talking about "office," we've moved slightly too far into implementation. We're really talking about diversity function. But one thing that also [could stall] talking is that there is a certain [duality] in this – the functions. We're talking about it. When you say [Diversity]



---

Office to a corporation, especially a regular vanilla corporation – which sometimes I think the “org” part of ICANN is trying to conceive itself a – but [inaudible] vanilla [inaudible] operation, the Diversity Office is about employment diversity of opportunity and promotion and so on. And that is an important thing in ICANN.

But by and large, I think the look we took was when it comes to the staff of ICANN organization, [we got] pretty good at it. We see figures; we need to know more. But [inaudible] the Diversity [inaudible] community participants, the community leadership and that [truly is] more a function of our work than our work as ICANN the community, ICANN the trinity of the Board, but ICANN the [community] in terms of how do we get that together.

In terms of organizing things like that, we then come back to the ICANN org or staff notion of them having groups that enable and support us. They have functions that enable and support us to achieve. And I’d expect that in each of the people or groups that have a function to help the community [achieve] things. They have the goals they are measured on and their success rate.

So, perhaps when we’re discussing this policy function, we need to break out duality and start looking at that function in terms of our need [something goes into perhaps] [inaudible] group or some such group that works with us to help us achieve our goal and start looking at [inaudible]. I think it’s critical that we have a recommendation for a policy function within the staff – perhaps [to the] staff [inaudible], but certainly for helping the community that is involved within policy to achieve the diversity goals. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Avri. Just to quick comment, we had I think most of us had hard time to hear you correctly. It sounds that the line quite bad. But if we try also to refer to the notes we have from your comments. If you want to add also in the chat would be really helpful just to avoid any misunderstanding.

Yes, Lousewies. Please go ahead.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Sorry, I tried to put it in the chat but I wanted to make sure that I was understanding it correctly. I think that there are a lot of corporations, businesses, etc., who have a Diversity Office or a Diversity Policy or a Diversity Officer, but that pertains to staff members and to employees. That, of course, is something that we can already easily take care of when it comes to the ICANN staff.

And if I understood Avri correctly – and there was a sound challenge – I think the question is how do we get the community to become more diverse? And I think that if it would be an ICANN staff member, there is no way that SOs and ACs would say, “Oh, yes. Please come give us a speech about diversity or tell us how to improve it.” Maybe to exchange expertise as partners, but I thought that the idea was that it has to be coming from the community and for the community rather than from the organization, from the staff, in order for this to work.

I think that’s really a key distinction to make. So, the examples that there are from businesses or corporations who have a Diversity Officer –

---

I think we should be very careful with using those as an analogy because when you have a Board, a CEO, staff members, employees, that's quite an easy model to work with. Our model is unique because no part of the community is going to accept that another part of the community [lectures] it.

I think it has to come from inside. You have got to want it. And this is where I think we're going to be doing a lot more evangelizing and persuading and bringing people on board. And I think the key question is, how do we achieve that? And then once we know how we're going to achieve that, then the question is, do we need to hire extra people in one way or another in order to do that?

But I think it's important to focus really hard on how to actually get there. And I think it was Mathieu who said – yeah. I agree with Mathieu. I think people are interested in enhancing diversity, and structural reviews are one way of doing that, of course. But from my experience – and I worked with this for a really long time – you have to really internalize diversity thinking into all parts of your organization.

So, it has to be part of the leadership. It has to be part of the pipeline. It's how you develop young talent. It's creating an inclusive atmosphere. It has many, many, different aspects, and it only works successfully if people actually believe in it and there's a lot of support.

That's why I think one of the key questions to ask is, is creating an extra position or making an office or an officer – is that really the way forward looking at the uniqueness of our community and the uniqueness of our

---

structure? That's really the key question I would like us to keep thinking about because it's the result that matters in the end. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Lousewies. Just maybe a small comment. As a software engineer, I always doubt that the problems we are fixing are unique. We are not reinventing every time, but we are trying to learn from previous experience. But I think we have to get all this, maybe, kind of difference and to have that to mind in term of what we suggest as solution. I guess maybe we need to think what kind of function. We can list all possible function and then we can go through and see what it [really kind of respond to the needs] of the community.

We can define the role and to see also how the community will be involved with this, not just maybe...Maybe the word "Office" can be misleading here and we don't know how many staff and so on, but to think how maybe just structure whatever will end up, how it will work, including the organization and the community in term to advocate and improve the diversity within ICANN. So, it's a lot of challenging question to respond. Kind of positive and optimistic here if we find out how to do that.

Yes, Mathieu. Please go ahead.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much, Rafik. Thanks, Lousewies, for bringing this very interesting feedback from the Board members' group. I think that's extremely valuable in actually helping refining.

---

I think the proposal for an office is suffering from the fact that it appears as the first proposal while it should only be conceived as one step of the whole general approach. And if Rafik will certainly circulate again the section about the various recommendations, but it cannot start with an office, obviously.

I fully understand the reaction from the Board members on that. It starts with a goal. It starts with diversity being officially a goal, a part of the Strategic Plan with specific initiatives – such as the ones you mentioned, Lousewies, which I fully support – specific targets. And then there are tasks in order to track progress, in order to share Best Practice, that will need to be filled by the ICANN staff because it's not going to be filled by the volunteers in a sustainable way.

And I think that's where what we've been calling the "Office" so far and probably needs to change it's name, is going to fit.

My suggestion would be that we look at the whole set of recommendations, probably put on top the ones that are more inspirational, and make sure we explain that the idea of an Office or a function or whatever we call it, is only part of the system we're putting in place in order for ICANN's diversity to be enhanced, and that we are tackling several aspects at a time and this function is only there to support the initiative.

And, obviously, the leadership of this initiative needs to come from the community, needs to come from the Board, needs to come from the Executive leadership of ICANN. Thank you.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Mathieu. I understand we can start probably with the objectives and then move to the recommendation – how the recommendation will achieve those objectives and probably, as you’re saying, changing the order, and that we just don’t focus on the Office. The Office will be maybe a mean or a tool to carry the recommendation or to achieve the objectives that we set in the document.

Thanks, Mathieu, for getting us back on track. And we have five minutes left in the call.

So, seeing all these comments and back to the discussion about getting a second version; I think that the challenge and the task for us [inaudible] to get that and try to work out those details in the document and get a new version soon. But in the meantime, any direct input or comment in the document will be really helpful. So it can be challenging to go back and forth between the notes, transcript, and the document.

Since we have really short time left, also we have under Any Other Business an item to discuss with the sub-group. So, a few days ago we got a request – I mean the co-rapporteur – about asking for interpretation service for our calls. So I think it’s for us as a group working on diversity to live up to that, and also because there was some comment that since we are only using English it’s a barrier for many participants or people who want to join us.

And so, what we’re discussing here as to make kind of formal request to be sent to the Plenary and the CCWG at the wide level to ask them to discuss and approve this request.

---

So, if we want to get this under discussion, we should do this by today by the deadline. So, I'm looking forward about your comment here for so if we can get quick buy-in so we can move forward to share this with for the Plenary.

Nobody in the queue and no comment in the chat.

Sorry, Louisewies. I'm not sure I understand your comment here. Yes, please go ahead.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: I think the important thing is that...Let's say we do interpretation in whatever – French, Arabic, Chinese. Then, because normally we don't have it, I think a lot of people who would like to participate if they knew there was interpretation may not be aware of the fact that there's interpretation. So then, if we just have the interpretation and no one uses it, it's a waste.

So, I think the parallel, the [inaudible] to actually having the interpretation is to also advertise quite widely in those languages that we are having it and to encourage people from those languages to join because, otherwise, we're just going to have the interpretation and not have anybody actually benefit from it.

I think it has to be a package, and I don't know how that's been done in the past. But otherwise, it's almost like we have an experiment that is doomed to fail because if I'm whatever – an Arabic speaker and I would love to join this call and I don't know that they're actually doing it in Arabic, then how will I know?

---

And then we say, “Nobody used it,” and it will be discredited even though it didn’t have a fair chance. How is that going to work in practice?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Lousewies. It’s a fair point. We need to promote that if we get that service, and probably maybe making it official and so on and to share it widely.

Yes, Bernie. I saw your hand. So please go ahead.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you. Sorry. I just want to be clear on this. I think we’re early days on this. It has to be discussed by the Plenary. And it would be good to specify what you’re asking for. I know we’re asking for interpretation. Are you asking for interpretation of all the languages? Part of the reality here is that cost will be a consideration. If you’re asking for five languages at every meeting, that has an impact on the cost. And that will have an impact on what the Plenary will consider.

And I would just like to add in there that right now there is no budget on this. So, if there is an idea that we are going to go for this, we would – and the Plenary approves it – then that has to be a request which further has to be approved by ICANN because that’s under the ICANN responsibilities.

Please, if you’re making this request, please be specific so we can actually wrap some kind of framework of what is being asked and then look at if it can be provided. Thank you.



---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Bernie. I guess we can make maybe a quick [inaudible] later on to ask what language. But my understanding from what the person who sent the request suggestion was to get French and Spanish at least. [inaudible], but I assume if we are trying to provide that, [inaudible] the sub-group people may feel that should be include other language.

I see also Avri, you are mentioning about that experiment that we did, which was, I think, in a pilot project for the ALAC to have that captioning. So, that's an experiment but I hope that kind of pilot become kind of existing service. I think it depends on the outcome of that what ALAC tried, but I'm not sure if we can benefit or not for in the future.

Yes, Lousewies. I see that your hand is raised. So, I'm not sure if it's an old or new hand but please go ahead.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN:

Sorry. I was muted.

I think, obviously, the point about the cost is very, very, important. But at the same time, if we don't start to experiment with the languages, then we will not really know if it's worth it or not. So, I think it needs to be presented very carefully, very thoughtfully.

We need to make sure that everyone is fully aware of the cost and the resource implications. But if any group is going to start trying to see if we can increase diversity by having more languages, I think the obvious place to start would be this group.

If, as Renata put in the chat, having Spanish would help people participate more, then that is something we could experiment with. And of course, the French GAC member would ask for French, right Sébastien? That's tradition. But then let's actually see how many more French speakers join.

And I think with all of this, if we don't experiment, if we don't try to make our meetings and our calls more accessible, we will never know. This, I think could be one of the things where our experience we could then share with other parts of not only of Work Stream 2 but obviously other parts altogether. Just making a very personal comment because I'm a Board member, I'm a member of the finance Committee, but I can't pledge anything in that regard but personally, I would definitely take it upon myself to try to explain that the costs are something that we need to start to deal with if we really want to take this seriously. And if we don't experiment, we will never know whether it's worth the money or not.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Lousewies. The question if we don't start the interpretation so we don't get people to join and should we wait for people to join to start the interpretation, but let's first maybe having a poll within the sub-group to see what language people are asking for. Maybe it's just really a small set of language at the end. [It depending] of the current composition. We make the request with those language and [to] that will be discussed anyway at the CCWG level and to see with regard the budget and so on. And if we get that, we need to publicize a lot and encourage people to join the sub-group, highlighting that we have this

---

---

new service, and see how that will impact the participation so we have better [start] and maybe we can ask people when they join about what are their native language [one and] see if they are using or not the interpretation. So we can do that.

Reminder that we are really over the call and myself I have another call to join. Thanks everyone.

Okay, Bernie. I'm not sure, you want to say something? [Go ahead].

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes. Just a quick one. Since the ask is fairly simple, if you want to take a few more days past the deadline for Plenary stuff, I think that would be okay if it will allow you to shape your request better. So if you can get us something for early next week – Monday or Tuesday – that is a better defined request than just, “We request interpretation,” then I think the co-Chairs will probably look on it favorably to go to the meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup>. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks for the clarification, Bernie. I think we can do that and [see quickly] a quick polling and [what are] the reaction.

Thanks everyone. I don't want to keep you more in the call. Thanks for all those comments, and let's continue the work in the mailing list and the Google doc, and we take all your comments and try to respond to them in the document. That's all.

So, thanks everyone [inaudible]. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]