
RECORDING: This meeting is now being recorded.

FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much, so our agenda for the call is as presented in Adobe Connect, which is Diversity Meeting 17, Thursday, the 6th of April, 2017. We will start with roll call. Item number two is the review of action items. Three, we have a petition request. Four, progress of draft report. And then Five, AOB.

So to get us started on the roll call, if there is anybody who has called in and just the number, we will give you a chance to just give us your name so that we can know who you are, and confirm your attendance for this conference call. So, Brenda and Bernard can confirm the roll call. 612253025, please identify yourself.

ANDREEA BRAMBILLA: Hi, Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: Hello.

ANDREEA BRAMBILLA: Hi, it's Andreea Brambilla from the government of Canada on that number.

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.

FIONA ASONGA: Thank you.

ANDREEA BRAMBILLA: Thanks.

FIONA ASONGA: So, Review of Action Items. Let's go to the next item, Review of Action Items. Okay, thank you. So, action item one, Fiona Asonga to write to the co-chair requesting publication of the questionnaire as per the discussions we had in the previous call. And this has been communicated. The announcement of the questionnaire for the board and SOs and ACs should get approved today or tomorrow, and should be published on Monday, the 10th of April, with a closing date of the 22nd of May, which gives a total of 42 days for the SOs and ACs to respond.

Staff has looked at the questionnaire and there are challenges of drafting the questionnaire as is for the general public to respond to, because we have very specific questions regarding SOs and ACs and so the comments would be coming from an SOs and ACs point of view. If we want it to be out for the general public, we may need to do a bit of editorials on the questions, so that we welcome viewpoints from the general public who may not be any particular SO or AC, and so that is something we need to give Staff direction on. Because there is the risk that the questions are not appropriate for individuals' input and the responses may therefore not be appropriate, unless we restructure the questionnaire appropriately.

So on the issue of public interest to the questionnaire is something that needs to be discussed and agreed on. The principle of why is acceptable, but the how is a challenge. Julie Hammer, I can see your hand up. Please proceed.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Fiona. I just wanted to say, of course the primary purpose of the questionnaire is to actually seek responses from the SOs and ACs, and other groups within ICANN. I think we need to be very, very careful that we don't change the questionnaire away from that purpose, to make it suitable for individuals, but then unsuitable for the SOs and ACs. So I think it might be possible to add a note to say that individuals can answer the questions in a way that is relevant to them and to express their views, but I wouldn't like to see the focus taken away from the SOs and ACs, the board, and other groups within ICANN.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you, Julie. Bernard, you have your hand up?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Fiona. Julie, I fully understand the focus on the SOs and ACs, and I think the questionnaire is perfectly fine to go to the board and the SOs and ACs, and does the job that it should do very well. I'm the one who brought up the concern to Fiona and Rafik regarding posting this for the public. I see several challenges the way the questions are currently structured for a public posting of this to get replies. First of all, the way it's structured, I'm really uncertain people will understand what

they're supposed to be replying to, and if they think they have the appropriate knowledge to respond from an SO/AC perspective.

Secondly, as you're requesting input from the SOs and ACs officially regarding this, and then you're asking the same questions of the public, you're going to have to come up with a scheme for weighing what the input from the public is versus the official input from the SOs and ACs, and I'm just concerned that you don't get into trouble or long discussions for doing that.

My third point is that if you're asking the same questions to the public while you're asking for a tight turnaround and 42 days for SOs and ACs and the board is a tight turnaround, it may actually sort of cause those participants to question a little bit what your focus is. And so overall I'm just concerned that you may be losing more than gaining by publishing the same questionnaire.

And just to be clear for Julie, I do not suggest changing the questionnaire at all for the SOs and ACs. I think it's perfect and it should go out like this, and we're progressing like that. If you do want input from the general public, I really do recommend you restructure this. Based on my experience on how these things work and how they're considered over quite a number of years on public comment, I think you may actually be setting yourself up for more problems than benefits if you simply post this one. But that's just a Staff recommendation, it's up to you to decide what you want to do. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you, Bernard, for your input. Julie Hammer?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Bernard. It's a new hand. I just wanted to briefly respond to Bernard, and I do understand where you're coming from, and your points are valid. I guess we extended the questionnaire to the general public and to other if you like less formal groups within ICANN at the request of the plenary, and I guess you thought it through a little bit further than we did in trying to make the same questions applicable.

But my personal view is that our main focus should be the SOs and ACs. We're trying to be accommodating to the suggestion of the plenary, but I accept that perhaps some different questions might be more appropriate for individuals and perhaps that can even be done to a different time scale, for public comment, I would perhaps like to suggest to keep that separate and keep them to the shorter timescale. But yeah, I understand where you're coming from. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks, Julie. Bernard, do you want to respond to that? Or is that an old hand?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

No, yes, please. I understand the point of this sort of coming out of the plenary, but I would not overly worry about it, if we can explain it as such. I believe that at the end of the plenary, really the co-chairs were asking the Diversity subgroup what the Diversity subgroup wanted to do with the questionnaire. And I think as with interpretation, as you know we've gotten a response back regarding that with some options, the co-

chairs depend on the subgroups to make their own decisions on these things. So I wouldn't be overly worried about the plenary, I think it's just a question of simply saying you've considered it and you've made a decision. But based on my experience, I did have significant concerns simply posting it the way it is.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks, Bernard. I believe that the goal of the preparing the questionnaire was the need to get input from the SOs and ACs and the key ICANN group, the board, the staff, and other groups within ICANN, and this way they can respond, that will help us substantially in putting together our draft report with draft recommendations, for them to be able to give us a level where we can now go to the general public with their feedback on the report and the other input which we have received. So unless there is anyone firmly opposed to proceeding with the SOs and ACs and groups within ICANN, I'd like to know, is anyone opposed to us not reaching out to the general plenary and the getting the input we need?

Anyone feel very strongly that we should reach out to the general public? No hands. One is opposed to us leaving them out at this stage, and incorporating their views at a later stage when we have a more fleshed out document, and recommendations. Avri has a question, "How deep into the organization that makes up the SOs and ACs are with going to go?" Sorry, Avri, I don't understand that question, but I think we are sending out the questionnaire to... okay, thanks Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah, I think I've just gotten confused. At first I thought it was – this is Avri speaking, by the way, sorry forgot to say that at the beginning. I had thought that we were going to the SOs and ACs and while I understood the reasons panflation or what have you, or putting it on further, if we were just going, but if we were looking for diversity all the way down, as it were, into the organization that were constituents, I hadn't realized we were doing that, but I'm not sure that's necessarily a bad idea.

So that's what got me thinking while I was listening, is how deep do we want to go, and as we go towards an SO and we check on its diversity, but do we want the component parts of that SO to give us input, because, you know, that may be as significant as anything else, and so on. And so I just started to get confused and decided to ask a question, that I guess was equally confusing.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks Avri for the suggestion. Bernard, you have your hand up?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes. Two points. I'll start by responding to Avri's point, which I think Julie has replied to in the chat. I don't think the GNSO has ever been shy about his component parts replying to any of those things, so from that point, I'm not concerned. The other major groups that I'm aware of that have a lot of moving parts or component parts is the ALAC, but I think if we're asking for SOs and ACs and other major groups' input, then you have to respect their own process, and the GNSO, their

process is that everyone can answer as a group, and they're not shy about doing that. So I'm not overly concerned about that.

The second point on getting public input, let's all be clear as we're aiming to have a public consultation in the June timeframe on this, that you will obviously get public input on that, because that public consultation will be structured to gather input from everyone. And so I think if we think about it that way, we will be providing if we have some draft recommendations and some results of the survey from the SOs and ACs, we'll be providing a much better background for general public input if we go to public consultation. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Sorry, my call dropped, but I'm back on. Okay. Bernard, I think missed the last part of your comment, but from what I gather, is we should not be too worried about the public participation.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I was just saying that your draft recommendations and some of the results of the SO/AC survey will be going to public comment anyways, and I think that's much better to gather public comment, because you will be framing it much better, explaining the details of everything much better, than you know, just this questionnaire, which, if you're a little bit novice to this, may not understand all the ramifications. So I was thinking it might actually, for gathering public input, it might be a better tool. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thanks for that clarification. So then, in this case, moving forward, we will focus on the SOs and ACs, board, and key groups within ICANN and move forward at this point in time on the questionnaire. Anyone opposed to that approach? None. So we will proceed with the questionnaire to the SOs and ACs, and allowing for the groups within respective SOs and ACs to also give their views and get feedback by the 22nd of May. Okay.

Action Item Number Two. Fiona Asonga to write to the drafting group to clean up the current drafts to begin work with the objective of completing a first draft for public comments by ICANN59. We have shared with you the link on the notes and on the agenda there. I also sent out an email earlier of a clean draft of where the work has reached with the drafting team. We know that it may not be possible for you to critique all that now, but a clean document has been circulated to the working group for input and comment. So I think a brief look at that report, so can all, any comments? So, Item Number Four, discussion on agenda item number four.

The center of our interpretation request, Staff has come back to us with a proposal, actually two options on how we can address the interpretation issue, and so the first option that we need to consider is where we have interpretation in three languages during the calls between now and June. However, the cost for this is much more, because it depends on the time of the call and the time zone of the interpreters.

The second option that has been proposed for us to consider is to have captioning happening during the call in three different languages, and

this serves as an alternate to ensuring that there is interpretation happening during the call, and this option is considered to be much more affordable. I'm not so sure that the last time we had captioning, we actually had the translation and the three languages happening, but I would like, maybe Bernard, to provide some clarity on option number two.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Thank you, Fiona. Yes, that is correct, we only had English language, I think there was a slight mistake in the Staff response. So the options are full standard interpretation, which is thus vocal. We will have, as you know from the plenary, English captioning going on, regardless of your decision here. So that's probably an important thing. So if you're considering what's on the table, what's been asked back to the Diversity group, are two options, and they're very simple, really. It's just interpretation which means vocal real time, and you can choose the stream you want in Adobe to listen to the proceedings in the language that you want, which what has been requested right now is English, French, or Spanish.

The second option which is proposed is not only to have English captioning, but to have translated captioning in Spanish and in French. This is less expensive than real time interpretation, and provides sort of a different service in that the advantage of captioning, if you will, is that it remains on the record. We get something written that saves. The calls are recorded and if we have interpretation, there will be recording of the three languages, so it's not that we're not keeping it, but it's interesting to my mind on the captioning, is that you actually get a

written record of the proceedings in the three languages. I hope that clarifies things. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Thank you, Bernard, for that clarification. Any comments on which option we should go with? Suggestions, input? Okay, Dalila has responded in the chat, and she suggests that we send the two options out to the group. We should be pretty clear. Because in option 1 we have the interpreter with us, interpreting real time, as we are having the conversation.

In option 2, there is interpretation but it is on the transcripts, and so we continue the meeting and everyone follows the transcript in the language of their preference, and Bernard is going to have to explain the benefits of the second option. In response to that last question, "With regard to captioning, can people speak their native language during the call?" I think that's an interesting question, I think we agreed to use three languages, and Bernard responded that you would have to confirm, but it should be possible for the captioning to be done in any one of the three languages, for you to speak in one of those three languages that we have requested. Yes, Bernard.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Just simply a note. All of this has to be -- let me back up a bit. Ask for an update on the English language captioning this week, and basically it's been approved everywhere, but now we're doing the administration in the ICANN machine. Which means the supplier has to provide a

quote according to a certain format, ICANN purchasing services have to issue a PO and a contract, and the contract has to be reviewed by Legal.

So all I'm trying to say here is there is a buffer time before this thing actually starts, and so depending on a few considerations, we do have contracts with interpreters and I do not know at this point if those contracts with those interpreters will cover this. That's the question that we're trying to get a response to. But I would urge you that if we want to get this going, given that we're already in early April, that you make the call as soon as possible. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA: Thanks Bernard. And also to respond to Avri's query comment in the chat, she thought the captions of the translation.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'm uncertain what you're asking, maybe I'm just not awake enough this morning. Avri, can you clarify for me, please?

FIONA ASONGA: Avri Doria?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: If what you mean, if there is only, if everything is being said in English, there will only be English captioning, and that there will be no French translation and no English translation captioning, I do not believe that it what is being offered. What is being offered is if people speak in

English, then there will be a translation and that will be captioned in French and Spanish at the same time, is my understanding of what's being offered.

FIONA ASONGA:

Okay, in view of timeframe that we have to be able to close on the interpretation issue, and have Staff implement, what would be the second option on moving forward on this? Bernard, I have a question, if we go with option one of having live interpretation during the call, how fast can that be put in set? Or will it take the same amount of time with both options, take the same amount of time to contract the supplier?

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

As I said, we have interpreters on staff. Now I don't know if that was considered when making that offer, and I do not believe that we do have multilingual captioning on staff. So there is a possibility that interpretation may actually be able to be provided more quickly. I do not have an answer on that. I will enquire about this and return a response to the group as soon as I get one, and I will make this an urgent request. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA:

Okay, forward. Can we agree that once you have the details of the lead time to get an interpreter, vis a viz the time to engage captioning translation, you will share information and we will be able, and then Rafik and I will make a call on behalf of the group, if the group is comfortable with that, so that we can get the interpretation on board as

fast as possible. If there is anyone opposed to that action, please let us know. Avri? Share with us your thoughts. Oh she's not opposed, she's just away, okay, fine.

Anyone opposed? Okay, so we will work with Staff, and will find the lead time it takes to get aid of the services on board, and then Rafik and I will make a decision on what option of service we will go for so that you can have interpretation begin as well as we possibly can. Thank you. Moving on to the next agenda item.

The progress of the draft report. This is a draft report that our drafting team has worked on and managed to put together for us. I am just going to go through the overall layout, because the layout has changed significantly, based on input that was given after the first draft, and we also added in some comments. Okay, Julie tells me she doesn't think this is the latest version. Okay. I know that it was on the mailing list and a few people have started looking at it already.

So in this second draft, we have changed the layout of the document. In the Executive Summary, we have been quite concise on the production and focused on areas where we will be developing recommendation further. So we're looking at recommendations of defining diversity and again, it's based on the questionnaire that we sent out and the input that we shall be getting for the questions that we have sent out to the different SOs and ACs, so they are recommendation defining diversity and supporting and promoting diversity within ICANN. And so then, that forms the Executive Summary.

Then we move on to the background and scope of the document. That would refer to the Workstream I report and the mandate that we have from Workstream I. Then we'll refer to the background and supporting information that has been put in the annexes, so we've got the (inaudible) Annex A, and we've got information and resources from ICANN Staff on the (inaudible) Annex B. Then we begin the description of the issues with our definition of diversity and elements of diversity, describing them, looking at how these can be measured.

And then moving on to data collection, when we look at the current set which looks into diversity provisions within various ICANN documents and structures, and we go through the different SOs and ACs, the different ICANN documents. Then our supplemental report which will be based on the responses from the questionnaire, and this is a place holder, because it will be based on the responses we get, and again, we are expecting to have recommendations in those areas.

So, in a nutshell, the structure of the report has changed and we hope that this is a better presentation. We also have the drafting team ready to capture your views, input, and will keep editing it as we move along. So it's important that we at least present where we are at. We are done with this draft for now. It is out, circulated to the mailing list for input and so you can begin to give your feedback and your input on the different areas. And let us have substantive conversation on the content in the next call. But for now, we are happy to receive input and feedback. So, Rafik? Your hand is up, you can add to what I have so far said. Rafik? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay. Can the rest of you hear me? Okay. Rafik? Can you hear me? Rafik, please check if you have connected your audio. Okay, anyone from the draft team who has something else to add? As Rafik connects his audio, I'll open the floor, anyone from the drafting team? Something to add? Thanks Brenda. Julie is there anything else that we need to present at this point in time?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Fiona. The only thing I think that we will eventually need to add in to the report, and it only just occurred to me, is to attach the questionnaire that is being sent out to the NICs at the server annex, but that's pretty a simple thing to add in. That would be my only additional comment there. Thank you.

FIONA ASONGA: Thanks, Julie. Okay, we can now hear, I got you there. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Hello, can you hear me? Yes. This is Rafik speaking.

FIONA ASONGA: We can hear you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, just I wanted to add a few comments. So the questionnaire, we are planning to suggest our recommendations the result – [AUDIO BREAK]

FIONA ASONGA: I can't hear you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Oh, okay, sorry. So I think we will adjust the recommendations depending on the outcome of the questionnaire. On the other hand, there may be issues, we were contacted by ICANN Staff about the agenda of the Diversity and (inaudible) and we were contacted about the survey itself, the design, so we can make comments. And then afterwards, we will get the results of the (inaudible). So we have another source in addition of previous data we got from ICANN Staff. And maybe you can add this to our (inaudible).

FIONA ASONGA: Thanks Rafik, for that. I actually had almost forgotten. We will be getting additional data on the Executive, I have forgotten the title of the detachment, Edges Detachment, I'll not even try, because I can't remember the department, maybe Bernard or Brenda will help me with that. But yes, they do have a survey, and therefore they'll be reaching out to us, and have requested we consider their input in our recommendations. So anyone else who has comments or feedback on the report as presented?

Okay. Seeing none, then I take it that you will now go in and read through it. Yes, bearing in mind that we will have a more substantive discussion in our next call on the contents, and bearing in mind that the recommendations therein are place holders, and therefore subject to

change, based on the responses that we get from the questionnaire that we are sending out. And so we move to our final agenda item, which is AOB.

On the AOB, if you will allow me to just quickly mention that there is also a questionnaire going out from the GAC (inaudible) the Under-Served region questionnaire, and they would like us to also consider the input from the WAC in our recommendations on diversity. What I'm not clear on is the timeframe of when we should like it to be ready. I'm sure that from the GAC representatives within the group it will be possible to be advised when it is likely to be ready and then can look over it and go through it, and determine to what extent we are able to accommodate the responses of the AWAC into our recommendation.

And I think we need to ask Staff, if Bernard, you could reach out to Julie who is working with the Under-Served area to give us an update on where they are at, as well as timeframes on how that will impact AWAC and our report, so that we can be able to plan appropriately in terms of to what extent we could accommodate their input in our report. Is there any other person? Any AOBs? We've got 10 minutes to the end of the hour.

Oh, thank you, Pua, I did not miss you on the call, but I'm sure you will be able to discuss and get back to us on Under-Served areas. So, I'm seeing the chat discussion on our next call, and Bernard has indicated our next call is Saturday the 13th. And I'm seeing a request to clarify what Pua is going to do. Pua and Julie of the Under-Served regions working group of the GAC are to get back to us on where the AWAC is at, so that we can determine to what extent we can accommodate them

in our current timeframe and the input they will have received from their questionnaire on the Under-Served region.

Is there any other business that we need to pay attention to? Okay, there being none, I would like to just thank everybody for their time and participation in this call, and just being able to attend, and yeah, take time off to get this done. And to wish you a good day, good morning, good night, good evening. Enjoy the rest of your day. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]