

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

FIONA ASONGA: Thank you everyone, good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Work stream 2 Diversity Meeting 16 call that is taking place today, Friday 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 at 19:00 UTC. So, I'll first ask that anybody who's on a number and hasn't been their names, to start to please do so. And I start to most of the attendance on the Adobe. As for call includes Cheryl who's joining Adobe in a few minutes after her update. Okay, there is nobody on the number, everyone has their name on Adobe. So we'll proceed. Review of the action items. Cheryl to publish a draft schedule of the meetings to end of June to the Diversity list for comment and publish final to complete the interpretation requests.

Okay, I thought we had agreed that I discuss with Rafiq, so we did discuss with Rafiq. And agree on the schedule, between now and June, because there is an agency now putting forward their request for interpretation and that was done, and staff have seen -- our support team to has been able to provide that to the Chairs, who have put forward a formal request to ICANN for interpretation services during the call. And possibly Bernard could have an update on where that has reached?

---

*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.*

---

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** Thank you, Fiona. Unfortunately, I don't have much of an update. The co-Chairs have signed off, it's gone into ICANN, I believe yesterday or the day before, so we will be following up next week to see where we have gotten. This should not be a surprise to ICANN. We were discussing this with all parts of the ICANN when we were in Copenhagen, so we're hoping that the ground clearing work we did in Copenhagen would have been useful and will allow us to proceed with that request quickly. Thank you.

**FIONA ASONGA:** Thanks, Bernard for that. And for purposes of just everyone being clear on the schedule, I know you had shared it during the last call, you did bring it up on the screen, if you can again bring up the schedule of meetings, between now and June, that we have presented with our request for interpretation?

**BERNARD TURCOTTE:** I'll post it in the chat. I don't want to stop the meeting, 'cause I didn't have that prepared, it'll take me a few minutes and I'll post it in the chat.

**FIONA ASONGA:** That would be great, thank you, Bernard. Then, we did have a call for volunteers and I posted the invitation for volunteers to help us with drafting of the report. And we got interest from both observers and members. And we have invited the members to form the drafting team, part of the reason is that we also need-- we are in the middle of a

---

process and we need individuals who have been involved in the discussions and have attended a few of the calls, at least have an idea and are following what is happening in that group.

And there are a few very new individuals and so, and since they were observers, we have given priority to the members and they have since received the updated document that Rafiq and I were able to put together. And they are starting to go through it and possibly in the next few days, they will be able to provide us with volume two of the draft, take into account all of the feedback in terms of the layout, the internal changes, the comments, and input from the working group.

And additional material that Rafiq and I have collected that we feel needs to be captured and report can make additional minds to look at and put it in, before we send it to the working group. And the team consists of Julie Hammer, Delilah Ramonie, Renata Aquino Akimbo and Anastasia Kimberley. So that is the drafting team that is working with the co-rapporteurs to be able to put reports together. And so we need to then, give them time to work on this so that you can be able to have it ready. And Bernard has put up the schedule of the meetings between now to end of June.

And so that's a period we have within which we are going to be able to work on analyze the report, send out questionnaire as well, and do our calls discussing all the input with interpretation. Okay. Now before we move to the next agenda item, if there is feedback on the open action item it would be good to get that at this point in time. Anyone who wants to comment on that? And that includes also the timing of the call, a lot of them tend to fall at 13:00 UTC. Sorry, Cheryl, I've tried to

---

set a bit of variation, I hope it accommodates the different times for you. Any comments? Feedback?

Okay. There being none, okay, I'm reading the chat, okay. Cheryl, Julie Hammer, thanks for the feedback. And we will proceed, now we move onto item number three, the feedback from the plenary session of the main TCWG. We've been asked by the co-Chairs to reconsider 'cause we have not prepared a report to present with the questionnaire when we discussed during the last call, we were of the opinion that we first go ahead with the questionnaire and then have it approved, then we can come back and look at the report.

And it turns out that our questionnaire is not going to out for public comment, without the report. The main challenge being the timeframe between now, when we need to have the public comments out, on both the reports and the questionnaire and the completion of our finance and also a second reconsidering that there may be budgetary implications in our recommendations and these need to come through Ali, so that they get factored in in good time.

So, we need to re-look at the work that we have, vis a vis the timeframe available and see how to get that done. I've not yet Rafiq and I have not yet communicated to the drafting team on a timeframe of turnaround of the report. Once we finish the version two and have another reading of the same, but it would be good for us to look at the time between now and when we need to have our work completed. We need the draft report with draft recommendations to go out for public comments with a questionnaire and the period is I'm told about 40 days? Bernard will correct me. And so we will need to see how we get that done. I can

---

see Julie has raised her hand and Bernard also has his hand up. I don't know who went first, sorry. But maybe I'll give Julie the opportunity to—

JULIE HAMMER: Bernie was first, he may well be having to say what I was-- so I'll wait for Bernie to have his say, thanks, Fiona. Julie speaking.

FIONA ASONGA: Okay, Bernard, please?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Julie. I believe the way we ended up on the questionnaire is that there was no need for it to go to public consultation, was I think the core of what we were trying to get to. And so, if you want to send it out earlier, that's fine, but I think that was part of the discussion that we had at the plenary and maybe what Julie was going to go to. So, I'll hand it over to her now.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks very much, Bernie. Yes, that's exactly what I was going to say and it was the subtle difference that I didn't understand, Bernie, until you explained it on the plenary. It doesn't need to go to public consultation, which means we don't need the community to comment on the wording of the questionnaire as such, but we can, and should put out the questionnaire for responses to be provided to us. But we still need to keep working on the report which shouldn't wait for the

---

responses to the questionnaire to come in. So, I believe that what the outcome of the plenary was not that we won't send out the questionnaire to groups to respond to. Thanks very much.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks a lot Julie and Bernard for clarifying that, 'cause at one point I lost audio and was trying to read through the chat and didn't quite finish going through the transcript, but thanks for the clarification. So, we will send out the questionnaire then, to the ACs and SOs and then continue working on the report, so that it follows, right? Julie? Bernard, your hand is still up, or you want to comment?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Fiona, yes. Julie speaking. Can I suggest that we also post it on I'm not sure exactly what public website, but Bernie would know, because as well seeking responses from the SOs and ACs, we have agreed at that we would make it available to others in the community to comment as either other groups or as individuals to provide input. So, we probably need to post it somewhere appropriate where it can be accessible to others. Thanks, Fiona.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Fiona, we're not hearing you, if you're speaking. All right, we seem to have temporarily lost Fiona. I'll carry on what she was saying, there are really two approaches to this that you're discussing, if you're requesting that the SOs and ACs respond to these questionnaires as SOs and ACs, then it's got to be formally transmitted to the SOs and ACs by the co-

---

Chairs of the CCWG. And if or you want this put up or comments by anyone there's also a process that we use for the jurisdiction questionnaire at large and we can use that, too. I believe the point that Matthieu Wale was making on the plenary is that if you send something into the SOs and ACs for a formal response from them, that you may be looking at a three month time lag before you actually get somethings from them, and I think Cheryl can testify to that from her work on the SOEC side. Fiona, are you back?

FIONA ASONGA: Yes, I should be. Can you hear me?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, we can hear you, excellent. Over to you.

FIONA ASONGA: So thanks for that clarification. So that being the case, then I think we will need to send it out to the SOs and ACs and put it on our webpage. And then, task members of the group who are part of the different ACs and SOs to work with them as well as the board representatives, and the other group was trying to get permission from staff as well. So we'll see, we'll need to see how we get that out, so that you can get the questionnaires answered as fast as possible. And back in, while we work on the recommendations. Julie, you have your hand up?

---

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Fiona. Julie speaking, and sorry for keeping to interrupt, but I just do recognize what Bernie said, that the Chairs said yesterday it could well be a few months before we get responses, but I wonder if we could actually seek responses in a shorter time than that, and if we don't get them then we just to have to live with it, but I would ask the SOs to make these for a shorter response time, and try and meet our own deadlines, a bit more quickly if possible.

And I thought that there was a comment made during the plenary that the minimum response time that we could ask for was 40 days, but my memory might be wrong there, it could have been that that was the response time for public comment. But my preference would be to ask for a reasonable but still short response time, not a few months, if possible. Thanks.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks, Julie and I can see that Cheryl agrees with you on that the minimum response time is supposed to be about 40 days? 42 days for public comment. Okay. Thanks, Bernard for that clarification, which means then thanks again, Bernard, you write in the chat that we cannot dictate response times for the SOs and ACs but we can ask them to respond by a particular date. Just out of curiosity, can that date be less than the 40 days, say we give 30 days? If we counted 30 days from today and say we wanted a response by a particular date in order for us to begin putting together our recommendations, would that be acceptable?



---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, you can ask. I see Cheryl's hand is up and she probably has some input for you on that.

FIONA ASONGA: Yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Fiona, thanks Bernie. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yeah, the reason that it's been 42 days is that a 30 day cycle means you're pretty well guaranteed to miss at least one of the SO or AC monthly meetings, and so to that end, an awful lot of trial and discussion went into coming up with the 40, 42 days proposal. You may as well go for the 42 days, 'cause otherwise you'll get 14 and 15 and 21 day extension requests, so I put my hand up because I think with the aspirational dates that Julie was suggesting for the SOs and the ACs, if that can be matched to the public comment, the 42 days, it does give you a slightly higher likelihood of getting them in on or around that date.

So, I'd recommend you put it out for the minimum, the 42 days and also make that a date for the SO80 request, knowing you will also get some in over the next 14 to 21 anyway, but not from a public comment perspective. That said, at least it'll give you some fixed timings to start working any analysis and integration of outcomes into probably the second iteration of the draft report by that stage. Thanks.

FIONA ASONGA: Thanks, Cheryl, for that. I think that's very clear and that's helped us significantly in terms of being able to plan. So, my proposal if it is

---

agreeable to the rest of the group is that we go with the minimum 42 days, it means we will begin to receive our responses around the 12<sup>th</sup> of May. And we'll see how those come in. Allowing room for others to come in a bit later but at least once you start receiving their responses at should because something to look at in terms of current status and we are able to begin to develop some draft recommendations for the report. Bernard?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Fiona. Yes, I just wanted to note as I stated earlier, it's find you're deciding that here, publication of any external things like this questionnaire have to go through the co-Chairs so if you make a decision as a group here, that's great. Then Fiona has to write it up to the co-Chairs as the rapporteur asking for this, and then we have to do some magic to get it prepped and get it distributed and write the transmittal notes, so I would just comment that once the co-Chairs approve it, staff still have to do some stuff to ensure that this can be put up and then it's got to be put up, so you may be looking at anywhere from five to ten calendar days from when you confirm to the co-Chairs that you want this up, before it actually does go up. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks for that clarification, which also raises a request that came through to Rafiq and I, on translation of the questionnaire. There has been a request from the GAC to translate the questionnaire from English it's just too many questions, but it is important that we discuss this as a group on, if you're going to give the questionnaire directly to

---

the SOs and ACs, is it really necessary for us then, to have the translation? Yes, Bernard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you Fiona. Just a comment from what I gather, you will be asking the co-Chairs is for two separate posts, one posting to the SOs and ACs and one general posting as the jurisdiction questionnaire is. For the SOs and ACs, it's fairly obvious that probably English would be fine, if you're simply asking a response from the SOs and ACs. Although the GAC may have its reasons for asking, I will simply note that the jurisdiction questionnaire which was put up, was translated before it was put up. Now, if you're asking for translation, that means staff have to write up the introduction piece, if you will, before translation and then the whole kit, including the notice and where to send the email, blah, blah, blah goes to translation.

So, it's not just translating the questionnaire, once the co-Chairs approve it and approve it for translation, then staff have to write up the instructions for filling out the questionnaire, because you don't simply post this with no context and no instruction, and then once we've got the instructions and the context, then we send that stuff off to translation. Now, if the instructions are not long, because the questionnaire is not long, so maybe what we'll end up with is a page and a half or two, and usually translation services can do this quickly. But to my estimate of five to ten days earlier, if you are adding translation to this, you maybe adding up to five days to that whole process. Thank you.

---

FIONA ASONGA: Thanks, Bernard for that clarification. And so best on our work that means, do we still need to proceed with translation of the questionnaire? And that is a question to the rest of the group. Are these comments in the chat? The question came from the [inaudible] region in the GAC, one of the GAC representatives from the last region proposed to translate the questionnaire in Spanish. Okay, there's another request to have again translation in French. This is getting interesting.

The SOs and ACs I take it already transact at ICANN in English, I'm putting this forward because of the need for us to save time. Seems like we want to see if we can reduce the delay as much as possible. And so, because again, if we agree to translate it into one or two languages, it's going to be everything, in all the languages that ICANN is able to translate into, I don't think it will make sense for us to do only French and Spanish for a document we are putting in the public domain on the website?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: So we need to put all the UN languages, yes, Bernard?

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: If I may? Yes, if you're doing translations it's probably a good idea to do it in all the official ICANN languages. And so, that [inaudible] change too much, you just [inaudible]. Now, since the questionnaire you're outsourcing, some really bad echo, someone should mute. Since you're proposing to send the questionnaire on two different tracks, I would say that maybe what you can do is send it to the SOs and ACs or request that the co-Chairs send it to the SOs and ACs in English, original form. And then you request that it be published for general comments in the translated versions, maybe that would be a nice in between?

FIONA ASONGA: I think that makes sense, Bernard and I can see every agrees with you, there are a few greens, Avri, Julie.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you just note my agreement? I'm just away from the computer, it's Cheryl.

FIONA ASONGA: Thanks, Cheryl. So I think that should be a way to go about it. And a show of agreement, those if you are near your machine you should indicate green for agreement, that should help me, or that we have a consensus on moving in that direction. So, anyone who objects? Thanks for those who are in agreement. Anyone who objects to us moving in the proposed direction? I assume Avri doesn't object, because she was in agreement earlier and probably she's far away from her machine. Or are you, yes. Yeah. So, any objections?

---

None, so I think Bernard, that is how we are going to work, moving forward, following the two tracks. Send it to the SOs and ACs in English and then have translation for the one we put on the website. Okay, thank you on that. And so, thinking about five or so days, say seven days for the co-Chairs to be able to approve the questionnaire so that is where does that leave us, in terms of timings and how long do we give ourselves on the report?

So that puts us into May, both [inaudible] then we have another five or so weeks, in five or so weeks will we be able to have our draft report ready for at least [inaudible]. We will not be able to make Johannesburg, unless we do the drafting very fast. So, suggestions? How long do we give ourselves to do the drafting of the report? The second version with some recommendations? This should be a third version with some recommendations to go out to the main CCWG and then for the ACs and SOs. Bernard is your hand still up? New hand? Old hand?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: New hand.

FIONA ASONGA: Okay.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: On your timing I think you're a bit off on this thing, let's be realistic here. It may take two or three weeks to get this up for public consideration. For the SOs and ACs, I'm hoping that with no translation

---

and co-Chair approval five to ten days worst case. Now, that puts us at the end of May to get responses. And maybe even the first week of June, so if you're waiting on input from that, then let's be optimistic, you get it the first week of June, and we're traveling the third week of June.

So, basically you will have one, maybe two meetings to look at some of the input you've gotten in that. And I think to a certain extent that's what Matthieu was referring to, in that if you say, "Well, let's think about this for a sec, we have a pretty good idea of some of the things, we'd love the questionnaire to confirm these things." So, I believe what Matthieu was trying to propose, and I'm trying to channel Matthieu here, when he listens to the call and I do know that he listens to the Adobe recordings, after the fact.

Let's all understand that it's Friday night in Paris right now, that he was saying maybe if you have a good enough idea of your recommendations, you can put everything together and then when that goes out, that will get that much more attention. And I'm not trying to push this agenda, I'm trying to simply present the point of view that Matthieu was making, he was saying if you just send this questionnaire, yes you will get some input. Okay. But if you actually come up with some draft recommendations and include the questionnaire with that, as part of that say you're asking for input on those things, you may get a lot more attention.

And therefore, you're maybe able to meet sort of a June deadline for an initial publication. And public consultation, even if we finalize it in Jo'burg and then you will get the input probably end of July, beginning

---

of August and then you've got comments on your recommendations, you've got feedback on your questionnaire. Just an option I'm presenting. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA: Any feedback on taking this approach? Yes, Avri, that means we would have to work in parallel. Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Sure, this is Avri speaking. It sounds like, if I understand it, which is of course always a good question, a good approach. In other words, we've got the questionnaire, it's going out, it's going to take the amount of time it takes, but in the meantime we're working on the report, we may see some initial results that we can put in. But we get the initial report out while waiting still for the rest of the responses, is that what I understood? If that's what I understood, it seems like a very clear way to go ahead.

FIONA ASONGA: Yes, Avri, that is—

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, certainly.

FIONA ASONGA: So anyone else with comments? 'Cause you now have two options: one go through the questionnaire, give it the time it takes, and then we



---

draft the report, but that means then that we miss out on opportunities that would benefit from our input, within the normal routine of ICANN. The other option being that we do the two parallel, that means that the drafting team is going to have their hands full, the members who volunteered, will have their hands really full and we shall begin to put together recommendations, as we basically discuss whatever we identify as possible recommendations and put it into the document that we hope to be able to submit soon. If this is the way we will go, then that's out for the public comments alongside the questionnaire. Julie Hammer?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Fiona. This is Julie speaking. I think working in parallel is what we did submit to at the last plenary and probably before that, so I think as Bernie described it, that's what we've undertaken to do.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks, Julie. So, anyone opposed to this approach of working in parallel? So there's none opposed that means then, we are going to take the parallel approach, and so the co-rapporteurs are going to work with the drafting team over the next four or so days, to just clean up the document. And have it circulated hopefully in good time for us to be able to have a read through, first reading of the revised document, hopefully at our next call.

And then we can do another two readings, that means three readings of the document, then we should be good to go in terms of how to proceed with the [inaudible] group if read and filled, changes need to be

---

done, you know we have a good team to help with the drafting, we will update the document as we move along. So that after every three or so sessions, two to three sessions of reading, we adjust the document and have it reviewed by the group, so that we are updating it as we move along and we can then get to a point where we feel it's comfortable for us to go out with it to the ACs and SOs and present it to the CCWG. And if we can get some approval in terms of comfort from the rest of the CCWG, of the particulars of the report, then we shall be able to go out, send it out with the questionnaire and work on those parallel as feedback comes in. We keep updating the draft report. Bernard, I can see your hand is up, new hand? Old hand?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, new hand. Just a few comments. I know that at some point, Fiona, if I remember correctly you were looking.

FIONA ASONGA: Can you hear me?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?

FIONA ASONGA: Okay. Yes I can hear you now.

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay. So, I remember you asking if there could be some support with English for your report, maybe to for editing, etcetera. And staff can certainly do that, once you've reached the point where you're happy with the document. And I also wanted to note—

FIONA ASONGA: Some of them for that—

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That for those who were not at the plenary meeting this week, there was an announcement that English captioning will be provided for all work stream 2 meetings, so we're hoping that will come online within a week or two. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much, Bernard, for that clarification and additional input from the plenary discussion. Is there for those who are on the plenary call, is there anything else that I've left out? There are about 12 minutes to the hour and we need to move to the next item. There being none, then we move to AOB. Is there anyone else who has an AOB? Anyone with an AOB to raise? No hands. Neither do I, Bernard, is there anything from staff?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: No, I think staff have spoken way enough on this meeting, thank you very much.

FIONA ASONGA:                   Okay. There being no other business, and I'd just like to thank you all for your time I know it's a Friday evening for many of you. Friday night. And guys want to go out and party, but thanks for giving us the time. And have a nice evening, a nice day and bye bye. Thank you all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:       Thanks, it's Saturday here in Australia.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS:       Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**