

RAW FILE

ICANN
MAY 12, 2017
1:30 P.M. UTC
DIVERSITY SUBGROUP MEETING

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> -- and use a phone, and I don't use a phone, I just use -- I will reconnect and it's just English channel to connect. Thank you, everyone.

>> Let's see how we can proceed.

>> I'm concerned if we are kind of postponing the target to have initial report that we can share, that we may lose the momentum, and in July and August are kind of holy days, periods, and in the north hemisphere, at least, so maybe we have low activity, so but this is group discussion, so thanks for sharing your -- so we have -- we should agree on the way to move forward and how we can really work. I understand we are counting on the questionnaire to get input. We should have the constituency to respond, but there is kind of risk that we don't get that much response, so -- and we should have kind of continuous plan here in how we should proceed and how we should make progress, so this is why I'm thinking here that we should be able to get all -- thinking together and how we can agree on the plan that we follow for the coming month.

>> If I may, this is Nathalie.

>> Sure.

>> NATHALIE: Thank you. Thank you. I just wanted to say a few words to respond to question that it would be difficult to have two periods if we do it in Johannesburg before that. What this timeline is showing. It's to making it so it all fits in, it would need to be done before you would have to have the draft before the first public comment: We would have to be ready for a new ICANN 60, but I think we could make it work. The other

way to make it work is to make the public comment period a little shorter. There may be a way to rush things if we need to rush things. Thank you. Thanks, Nathalie.

>> Thank you, Nathalie. Just to be sure, you want to make sure we use the public comment period from 42 to 30, and so that means that we don't necessarily need to commit by the Plenary in Johannesburg. I'm kind of -- I would be concerned on that because the -- for instance, we also depend how many other public comments are there and part of this. This is one of the concerns I have already for the question is if you -- if you want to check the list of public comments, there are several currently in, and so different grouping to what they respond, so I guess we have also to be here when we initiate public comment period, but still depending in how quickly we can reach consensus and how -- if we can set it towards having several readings. Okay. We have to live with that and see what's the -- okay -- the least worst option if we cannot get the best anyway. So --

Any comment on this? Okay. So let's say that we -- for our internal work, then, we say that we should target Johannesburg, and so we have to send an initial report by the 18th, and so we should have probably maybe two -- two readings to get the consensus within the subgroup if that's a very short report. That will depend how much comment we get from the questionnaire, but still we can work on other parts of the report. They are not necessarily related to what we get from the questionnaire.

So we can go with this tentative plan, depending in our progress, we may adjust and say that if we cannot make it by Johannesburg, we should -- we must target by the next Plenary, so it's kind of important to -- I won't say to -- to put some discipline, but at least to keep us kind of motivated and focused because personally, if -- because after that, it will be kind of -- there are many holidays, and so we may have even harder time to get things finalized. So what do you think? Just asking everyone on the call, what do you think here, and if you are agreeing with this kind of tentative plan for now.

Okay. Please I don't see objection, so I guess it can be interpreted as -- as consensus by here. Yeah.

Okay. So let's try this approach for now, and we will adjust accordingly, and we'll focus it for the next, let's say, six weeks. Okay. Okay.

So thanks, Nathalie, for the comment. It was really helpful for us to kind of plan our work for the coming weeks. Thanks.

Okay. So let's move to the next agenda item, and -- yeah, we understand we are not making that much progress in terms of changes in the report, but we have -- we got some language to work on. In one of them it's -- I think it's about the language diversity, and Julie proposed some wording on that matter. Julie, are you on the call? Can you -- can you speak about the

changes and maybe you had some explanation about the proposal?

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. Some of these changes showing now -- oh, sorry, first of all, Julie speaking, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear you, Julie, yes.

>> JULIE: , the original document was the version that I proposed. These changes that are showing on the document in Adobe Connect are not my changes, so I can't really explain them, and I don't necessarily even -- like, for example, the first one, I'm not even sure that it would be relevant to say based responses to the diversity question there, so I really can't speak to the changes in -- that have been incorporated into this document because they're not mine.

What I did propose for the last meeting, which we ended up canceling, was some new language for Paragraph 6.2 that isn't yet incorporated, but you did circulate that by email a second time for people to consider, and noticed -- saw that in the original Paragraph 6.2, there was an error which I repeated, saying that there were seven official languages when, in fact, there are apparently six, so that might need to be corrected in my suggested new paragraph that -- I guess that's really the only thing that I could speak to in this version. Other changes have been made by other people. Thank you.

>> RENATA: Okay

>> RAFIK: Okay. Thanks, Julie. I guess we can discuss the proposed language in the chat if, perhaps, it is more convenient. I'm not sure who added to this language, so I need to double-check. Did someone on the call make those changes? If yes, can he or she speak?

Okay. So I'm not sure if Brenda can share the text.

>> Excuse me, Renata wants to speak and explain the changes, but she will speak in Spanish.

>> RAFIK: Okay.

>> RENATA: Renata speaking. I've sent some links over there related to the Google Doc. I introduced some changes based on some comments made by Amal and Corrine. I think there were some comments of Julius as well, but in the recommendation 4, for instance, we included a comment that is necessary. The group has to make a decision in that respect because the Recommendation 4 says that within -- each group within ICANN should identify how each element of diversity will be measured and monitored within their group, and I added a comment because in the initial version, it says what is the initial element that should be monitored, and Corrine said that -- as well as Amal made a comment, so I made a change. I introduced a change suggesting that it would be -- how this new element would be measured and monitored, and I think that Julie has agreed to that. Also, I shared the observation, the comments if there is any agreement in that respect, so that is it, and thank you very much.

>> RAFIK: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, Renata. Okay. I see, for example, for a change, the proposal that (Inaudible) should

be possible to be representing ICANN. The question here, what do you mean by possible to be represented? So we have --

>> Excuse me, Rafik.

>> RAFIK: Sorry. Oh, Julie, please go ahead.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. I'm sorry, Rafik, I didn't mean to interrupt. I just want to say I don't quite agree with the change that's proposed because my view is that not all elements of diversity are necessarily relevant to all groups, and, therefore, I don't -- I'll only agree to this recommendation in the context that some elements of diversity a group may choose not to measure. I don't really agree with the implication that all groups must measure every element, so I think there's -- I agree with the suggestion that elements that are relevant be measured, but I think our recommendation ought to allow for the situation where a group says that is not relevant to our group, so I'm not -- I'm not really agreeing to the change of wording. Thank you.

>> RAFIK: Okay. Thanks, Julie. Point taken.

Okay. So here (Audio breaking up) so -- okay. Okay. So what -- I was asking, for example, the language, what do we mean by all languages should be possible to be represented at ICANN. We should have all -- I mean, speakers of all the language to be represented in ICANN? I mean, how we can say that, what do you mean "all languages," and there are 13,000 language, depending on how many speakers per each, so maybe this kind of language can be more clear here.

Okay. So back to Julie. So you want me to share your -- your wording in the chat, so if you want, we can get that?

Okay. Oh, we have it on the screen. That would be correct?

>> JULIE HAMMER: I'm sorry, reflected -- it's Julie speaking. Did you want me to speak to this?

>> RAFIK: Yes, if you want. We have on the screen the old and new paragraph that you proposed, so if you want to present it.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Yes. I proposed this because when we were discussing this two meetings ago, we noted that the -- the way it was currently expressed was -- at least for me it was confusing, and I think that some other people may have felt the same. I really wasn't sure what this paragraph was trying to say, and so what I tried to do with the new words is tried to rephrase it to express what I believed it was intended to say, but I'm not 100% sure because I wasn't sure what the original draft was intended, so I'm really relying on other people to look at the new revised wording and say, is this the meaning that was intended for this paragraph.

>> Rafik, Fiona is speaking and willing to make a comment. Can she proceed?

>> Here.

>> Can we let her speak?

>> FIONA: This is Fiona speaking, not Rafik.

>> Go ahead, Fiona, because Rafik has disconnected. Go ahead, Fiona, please.

>> FIONA: Okay in view of the proposal that Julie has presented, I think it should provide clarity to the paragraph because the way it was before, the fast path, it's not what we say that all languages should be possible to be represented in ICANN, so if we add in the issue of ICANN to be able to accommodate individuals who speak the different languages, it puts context to that sentence. I think it's difficult to explain or mean say all languages, but I'm thinking, I remember, when we first had this as -- what was it -- the first draft of the paragraph meant for discussion, we meant that individuals of all languages should be able to come in and be able to participate within ICANN. It's not technically possible for ICANN to address all the languages, but by virtue of the fact that there is translation into the key languages, then that should be able to make it possible for them to engage and to participate, and then that ties to the next part of the paragraph that talks of ICANN being able to support speakers of the different languages and bringing in IDN TLDs and ICANN being able to bring in -- supporting services for them in languages that they can understand, so I am in favor of the proposed change Julie has given us because it gives more context to the whole introductory sentence. Okay, any other comments on that?

>> Okay. Thanks, Fiona.

>> May Renata speak now?

>> Thanks, Fiona. Yes, Renata, please go ahead.

>> RENATA: Renata speaking. Thank you. I would like to say the text mentions an idea, so it may have lots of languages. Some people may disagree with that. The point is that -- the text may read that ICANN strives for or is willing that individuals in any language may engage and participate, but it may be reduced to the seven languages, the seven languages most commonly spoken by the community, and these are the seven mentioned there. It was not that they are official languages, international level, but are the languages most spoken in our community, so I would take out the reference to UN Official languages, and I would just read the -- the languages that are mostly spoken in the ICANN community are seven, and I would -- our seven, and I would delete because in an ideal world, it would be all languages. Somebody may think in an ideal world, only English is spoken. Thank you. Thank you very much.

>> RAFIK: Thanks, Renata. Okay. And we are using the language because that's one of the organizations that tend to provide translation and interpretations in several language, and probably for some historical reason, they selected those languages. I'm not sure about other organizations, but what I -- maybe I have in mind it's like the European Union, they have all their state member language, but, I mean, they have their own reason to do that. So how we can make a selection or -- like restricting to some kind of subset of language? I think

that can be not necessarily straightforward because what kind of criteria we want to select here to make such decisions, so it's -- and also I see here the discussion of the chart is what we mean. We mean this is the most spoken -- I mean the most spoken language in the community, but it can also be -- we are -- how say -- they're referring here because those were already present, they can -- so they may be overrepresented. We are trying to make it -- the space more inclusive and to bring others that maybe are not presented here, so I guess it's going to be a little bit tricky, but let's see how we can work on that.

And Fiona, please go ahead. Fiona, can you speak? Is it only me that is not -- who cannot hear Fiona or -- Fiona, can you speak or -- unmute your mic?

Okay. I'm not sure what's the issue here. Okay. So maybe if we can move a little bit backwards here and not just focusing on which language would be represented -- represented or that we provide support, I think maybe we kind of try to rethink what we are trying to achieve here. The language that was proposed in the beginning by Julie says ICANN (Inaudible) speak any language for the organization, so we may think first in how we can accommodate as much as possible maybe to the limit of feasible, and I think that from what we are trying to see if there is some minimum requirement, that may be what we -- what we should have in mind, that still we are kind of maybe putting by default the United Nations languages is probably a minimum requirement. Maybe we can go beyond that. I see Julie is in in the queue. Maybe she wants to comment here. Yes, Julie, please go ahead.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Rafik. Julie speaking. Yeah. Exactly what you just expressed is what the paragraph is trying to say. In an ideal world, it's the phrase leading into, well, wouldn't it be wonderful if we could support people who spoke any language within ICANN, but clearly, that's not practical. I haven't said -- expressed that idea in those words, but the paragraph then goes on to say in reality, this is the minimum that we should be striving for, so exactly as you said is what I've tried to say in that paragraph. I mistakenly inserted the UN in there, and I agree that that should come out, and I agree with the concept that we should be focusing on the most commonly used languages within ICANN, so -- but I -- I do think that without that leading phrase, in an ideal world, I think that's -- ideal world, I think that sentence becomes open to misinterpretation. Thanks.

>> RAFIK OKAY: Okay. Thanks, Julie. I see that's a minimum requirement, and that's a good example, we need to have some flexibility depending on the case and where it makes sense, so just as a minimum, this is kind of describing the issue here. Maybe we are kind of moving a little bit in the term of recommendation that we -- we think which language would be provided and how -- maybe how we decide which language should be provided or not, so we can take note about this and try to

reflect that in the related recommendation, but we could agree maybe, at least, that the inspirational goal is to accommodate as much as possible any languages, and -- but at least we can ensure a subset. Here by default we are putting the united nation languages. Maybe we can extend a little bit here based on other criteria, like which are the most spoken language in the world so we can extend that at least, and we can add language about -- to provide the flexibility and responding to case-by-case probably when we work on the recommendation, that we can add some language about being flexible and responding to the needs, so -- okay. Thanks. Avri, I think you are proposing possible adjustments for any specific -- yeah. We really highlight that we have an aspirational goal to accommodate everyone. We are trying at least at a minimum think that, also we are trying to provide more and to take care of the different cases and needs. Okay.

So we can work on this and add those -- those kind of new edits. So, Julie, are you -- are you kind of, I would say, fine with this -- oh, and we are reaching the top of the hour, so we may have one or two minutes before dropping the call. Yeah. Julie, please go ahead.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, Rafik, are you asking me to amend it again? Is that what you're asking?

>> RAFIK: No, no, I was not asking to amend.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Oh, sorry.

>> RAFIK: I was asking if you were fine with those adjustments?

>> JULIE HAMMER: Yes, that's fine. I think you were talking about recommendations. I'm really only talking about Paragraph 6.2. I'm not sure -- I haven't seen any specific wording for recommendations, so I can't really -- I think we need to look carefully at anything that -- actually that becomes a recommendation when we have exact wording.

>> RAFIK: Thanks, Julie. What I was trying to say, that maybe if we go into specifics, like how -- how we will accommodate and so on, I think that is more recommendation -- it's more relevant to recommendation than to the paragraph 6.2, so that's what I was trying to say. I was not talking about specific revisions --

>> JULIE HAMMER: Oh, I see.

>> RAFIK: Just saying that if we elaborate more, we should put that recommendation. We can start by using the suggestions by Avri in the suggestions, and that idea of being flexible.. So I will try maybe to propose some amendments in the coming days, hopefully, so we can continue the discussion in the -- in the remaining issues on that matter and hopefully to move on.

Okay. So I should not keep you guys more in the call, so we will go with that to kind of finalize the text for 6.2 and putting the discussions, and also would like to again ask you if you can really putting your SO/ACs regarding the questionnaire. We need all inputs.

So I want to say thanks, everyone, for attending the call and participating, and see you soon. Have a nice day. Bye-bye. The call is (Inaudible) thanks.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Rafik. Bye.

>> Thanks. Bye.

(Session concluded at 2:00 p.m. UCT)

This text is being provided in realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
