

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ICANN has since its incorporation in 1998 made an effort to ensure global diversity at various levels in its staff, community and board. Diversity within ICANN is important in ensuring a comprehensive representation of the global Internet community; stakeholders, interest groups and staff and for assuring that ICANN has the right range of perspectives in skills and experience.

This report presents a discussion of diversity and identifies a number of elements by which it may be characterized. It provides a summary of diversity provisions in the new ICANN ByLaws, but is not yet informed by more detailed feedback which is being sought from ICANN SO/AC/groups through a Diversity Questionnaire. Nevertheless, the report offers the following recommendations which may need to be updated and refined in a Supplemental Report once that additional information has been received.

### Defining Diversity

**Recommendation 1:** Based on responses to the Diversity Questionnaire, the ICANN Community should agree a definition of diversity in terms of a number of agreed elements by which it is comprised.

**Recommendation 2:** Each SO/AC/group within ICANN should identify those elements of diversity that are relevant to their role and record these in their documentation or operating procedures.

### Measuring Diversity

**Recommendation 3:** Based on responses to the Diversity Questionnaire, the ICANN Community should agree appropriate measures for each element of diversity, the recommended frequency of measurement, and whether the measure is relevant to participation or leadership or both.

**Recommendation 4:** Each SO/AC/group within ICANN should identify how each element of diversity will be measured and monitored within their group.

**Recommendation 5:** ICANN staff resources should be made available to support the collection, recording, analysis and storage of diversity information related to the Board, the Organization and the Community. The CEO should determine the most cost-effective means of providing such resources, whether that be the

**Comment [1]:** This is confusing - is or isn't this report informed by the questionnaire, b/c the paragraph reads like it is not, and this recommendation reads like it is.

**Comment [2]:** I think we had discussed on the mailinglist that this wording is problematic b/c it allows groups to chose and pick which elements of diversity they think are relevant. This will undoubtedly lead to reaffirmation of existing biases and oversights.

I suggest it is rewritten to: Each SO/AC group within ICANN should understand how all elements of diversity identified by this group are relevant to their role and record these in their documentation or operating procedures.

Deleted: which

**Comment [3]:** Apologies if I misunderstood - but does this mean each SO/AC/group gets to cherry-pick what 'types' of diversity they measures and which they do not?

**Comment [4]:** I found it unclear too if it's meant to be just an initial input source or a decision base of the diversity elements . Also recommendations from 1-5 look to me more as next work plan or procedural steps more than other recommendations, but anyway the final recommendations would be clearer after the collection of and work on the survey results.

**Comment [5]:** what happens is that there was a question on the survey which asked what are the elements of diversity an SO/AC is more focused on. I think this is a consequence of that writing. But yes, would be better put "should identify how each element of diversity will be measured and monitored"

Deleted: s

Deleted: they

Deleted: intend to

establishment of an “Office of Diversity” or by integrating the role into an existing part of the organization.

**Comment [6]:** I feel this recommendation could benefit from some language of how the data will be treated, anonimized, used in the aggregate etc. To make sure any potential privacy issues are mitigated.

**Recommendation 6:** The ICANN Community, supported by ICANN staff, should publish an annual report summarizing the key diversity measures and trends.

**Supporting and Promoting Diversity**

**Recommendation 7:** The ICANN Community should engage in a bottom-up process to develop a long-term strategy for the promotion of diversity in both participation and leadership.

**Recommendation 8:** The ICANN Community should examine the appropriateness of current diversity requirements for prominent leadership roles and recommend any changes.

**Recommendation 9:** Each SO/AC/group within ICANN should identify goals or aspirations for improving and promoting diversity in both participation and leadership.

**Recommendation 10:** The ICANN Community should establish a mechanism to share diversity practice and proposals for enhancing diversity in participation and leadership.

## SCOPE

1. In Recommendation #12 of the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 report, the group assesses diversity based requirements from ICANN governance documents (Bylaws, AOC, ATRT1, ATRT2, documents from each of ICANN's SOs and ACs).

2. The following is excerpted directly from the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 report:

*“Comments received on the Second Draft Proposal revealed that incorporating the diversity component into Accountability and Transparency Reviews may overburden Review Teams. Therefore, the CCWG-Accountability recommends the following actions with the view to further enhancing ICANN's effectiveness in promoting diversity:*

- *Including diversity as an important element for the creation of any new structure, such as the Independent Review Process (IRP) – for diversity requirements for the panel – and the ICANN Community Forum.*
- *Adding Accountability, Transparency, and Diversity reviews of SOs and ACs to structural reviews as part of Work Stream 2.*
- *Performing, as part of Work Stream 2, a more detailed review to establish a full inventory of the existing mechanisms related to diversity for each and every ICANN group (including Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies, Regional At-Large Organizations, the Fellowship program, and other ICANN outreach programs). After an initial review of the current documents, it became clear that they do not address the full concerns raised by the wider community on the issue of diversity.*
- *Identifying the possible structures that could follow, promote and support the strengthening of diversity within ICANN.*
- *Carrying out a detailed working plan on enhancing ICANN diversity as part of Work Stream 2.*

*Strengthening commitments to outreach and engagement in order to create a more diverse pool of ICANN participants, so that diversity is better reflected in the overall community and thus more naturally reflected in ICANN structures and leadership positions.”*

3. The scope of the Diversity SubGroup Task has been to focus on actions 3 to 5 identified in the CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1 report above.

## BACKGROUND AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

4. Background and supporting information is contained in Annexes as follows:

- Annex A: Lightning Talks on Diversity

- Annex B: Information and Resources from ICANN Staff on Diversity

## DESCRIPTION OF ISSUES

### 5. Definition of Diversity:

The working group began by agreeing on the meaning of diversity and identifying elements of diversity they considered important across ICANN as a whole. It was agreed that Diversity within ICANN refers to: 'the creation/existence of an inclusive environment in various aspects of stakeholder representation and engagement throughout all levels of the staff, community and board'.

### 6. The Elements of Diversity:

During the discussion, a number of elements of diversity were identified and these are presented and discussed below in no particular order:

- Geographic/regional representation
- Language
- Gender
- Age
- Physical Disability
- Diverse Skills
- Stakeholder group or constituency

In considering the following discussion, the Sub-Group recognizes that this list may not be exhaustive. However, all identified elements of diversity are relevant and may have varying importance in different contexts, situations or groups within ICANN. Furthermore, the discussion of diversity is appropriate to general participation in ICANN and not just to leadership positions.

**6.1 Geographic/regional representation:** Ensures that there is a balanced geographical representation throughout the organization. While already applied to the selection of ICANN board members, discussions have indicated that this criterion should be extended to all levels within ICANN.

**6.2 Language:** All languages should be possible to be represented in ICANN for the organization to position itself as a fully global multi-stakeholder entity. There is a need to improve the balance between the seven official languages at ICANN: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish. However, ICANN manages the IANA functions that offer IDN services to entities who do not use any of the seven official languages that ICANN supports, and it is especially important that ICANN improves its communication with this group of stakeholders so that they can be better engaged.

**6.3 Gender:** Equitable gender representation should be sought at all levels of

**Comment [7]:** Of course it's preferable if all languages are represented, but is it fine and reasonable to state it like this? maybe it can be said that all languages should be possible to be represented in ICANN in need i.e. when there's a group of participants or stakeholders who needs certain language not from the 7 official languages, like in IDN working groups . And hopefully this may lead to broaden the languages used in ICANN beyond the 7 official ones.

**Comment [8]:** All languagues should be possible to be represented sounds good to me

**Comment [9]:** Julie's comment on the list: I think Amal has raised a very good point in his comment on our paragraph discussing language in Section 6.2. I think the point the report is trying to make is not really clear and the terminology not yet quite right. I will try in the next couple of days to come up with some suggested new words for this paragraph and get your feedback on them

ICANN. Currently, ICANN's approach to gender is binary: male or female. The representation of women in all areas of ICANN remains a challenge. It is critical that in all official community roles, equality between genders be achieved. It is no longer acceptable that there be a gender difference of more than 10% in the makeup of any leadership group with regard to the community from which it is drawn. It is also important for ICANN to note for the future the evolving issue of equitable consideration of more complex gender identification.

Deleted: Yet  
Deleted: t

**6.3.1 Gender expression:** Given societal changes and the acceptance of variance in gender that goes beyond the binary classifications, the subgroup considers it is important to create a welcoming environment for persons who don't conform to binary gender. There should also be further work done to ensure that there are no obstacles to inclusion or to the participation of those with gender variance in the various leadership roles. ICANN should accept the voluntary open identification of those who are gender variant while at the same time respect those for whom such identification is a private matter. Consideration should be given to adding 'do not wish to disclose', 'other', or something similar, in the gender portion of forms.

**6.4 Age:** This element refers to variations that facilitate inclusion of the range of age groups across ICANN, from older generations through to the next generations. Moreover, youth engagement should be taken into consideration whenever possible in the activities of the ICANN community, fostering the exchange of experience between generations.

**6.5 Physical Disability:** This element refers to the consideration of individuals across a range of different physical disabilities to participate in ICANN activities at various levels.

Deleted: Ability?  
 Comment [10]: Why not call it physical ability?  
 Comment [11]: because Physically Able do not need inclusion policies. Physically Disabled or Persons with Disabilities do.  
 Comment [12]: Yes - but not everyone who needs or might make use of a 'disability' policy will feel comfortable with that term. But if nobody else feels strongly about this I shall drop it.  
 Comment [13]: Found this reference. It can be uncomfortable the language to describe the specific disability but doesn't say it is so for the category <http://ucp.org/media/tools-for-reporters/>  
 Comment [14]: Julie's comment on the list: In Section 6.5 Physical Disability, to respond to Corrine's suggestion that we use the term Physical Ability, Physical Ability was the term we originally used in this report and in the Questionnaire when it was submitted to the CCWG-A Plenary in Copenhagen. Feedback in the plenary was that this was over-doing "policial correctness" and that we should actually say what we mean ie this is about accommodating people with physical disabilities. The text in both documents was changed as a result of that feedback. I agree with changes Renata has done.

**6.6 Diverse Skills:** Diversity in skills contributes to the quality of ICANN policy formulation, decision-making and outreach. It is important to highlight and advocate the advantages of individuals bringing different and diverse skills sets into ICANN's many activities. All activities and groups within ICANN will benefit from having a diverse range of skills available. Outcomes formulated from diverse skills and knowledge will have higher probability of being accepted by a diverse community. Increased diversity would help expand the diversity of skills within ICANN. Thus, achieving diversity in skills should not be seen as a choice between skills and diversity which excludes participation, but rather one which values many skills sets and facilitates inclusion and broad participation.

**6.7 Stakeholder group or Constituency:** Diversity of stakeholder group or constituency participation in ICANN is important in meeting the multi-stakeholder goals of ICANN. This may or may not require a designated representative of a stakeholder group to participate in the various activities. However, attention needs to be paid to the selection process to ensure participation by both declared stakeholder groups with direct interests as well as minorities and under-

represented groups.

6.7.1 Related to, but broader than, stakeholder group diversity is the requirement that all relevant views, opinions and perspectives are appropriately taken into account in decision-making. ICANN will not be a truly diverse organization if it merely conforms to diversity relating to the fixed characteristics of participants, while systematically marginalizing minority viewpoints or beliefs from consideration in decision-making.

**7. Measuring elements of diversity:** Of importance to the working group is *which of* and *how* the various elements of diversity can be successfully measured. When measuring diversity, it is not sufficient to use a static approach or 'head-count'. Rather, a more dynamic approach should be considered. There are elements of diversity that are important to observe but difficult to measure by 'head count'. For example to determine 'active diverse participation' will require a combination of quantitative (statistics) and qualitative (the quality of engagement that is whether they take the floor, make contributions, participate in email exchanges). From the discussions the following indicators of diversity has been identified, which are based on the definitions provided above:

**7.1 Geographic/regional representation:** This is currently being applied to the selection of ICANN board members appointed through the NomCom. The data shared by AFNIC and Dalila Rahmouni indicated the need for the statistics to be based on both a regional analysis and country-by-country analysis. The geographic diversity being considered in three forms: 1. the region in which one lives, 2. the region in which one was born, and 3. the region with which one identifies culturally. This data could be collected using the best-practices identified by the NomCom process, adding the granular approach suggested by AFNIC and Dalila Rahmouni.

**7.2 Language:** The ability of ICANN stakeholders, staff and board to communicate in the 7 official languages should be measured and consideration should be given to assessing the ability to communicate in selected other languages. The extent to which translation and interpretation services are requested by, available and used by the various parts of ICANN should also be measured and documented.

**7.3 Gender:** Currently, gender equality at ICANN is limited. Within the community, women represent 26% of community leaders, although the overall percentage of women within the community is not accurately known. There are no statistics available on the overall gender diversity (beyond the female-male binary) in ICANN. There are studies that show that when gender equality is hard to achieve in representation or leadership, extra effort needs to be made, and positions often need to be left open until a proper balance can be achieved.

**7.4 Age:** Data on the age range of ICANN participants, staff and community leaders is not currently held but potentially can be collected and documented

**Comment [15]:** Julie's comments on the list: I think the discussion on language in Section 7.2 is mostly fine, but on reflection, I suggest we might make one further change to this text (red):

"The extent to which translation and interpretation services are requested by, and available to and used by various parts of ICANN should also be measured and documented."

I think the usage, especially in the case of interpretation, is an important measure because it is a very expensive service and I have on occasion been on calls where the number of interpreters is almost as large as the number of participants.

~~Deleted: and~~

~~Deleted: to~~

through a voluntary process.

**7.5 Physical Disability:** Some data on the number of requests to ICANN staff to respond to various disability challenges experienced by participants at various levels may be available for analysis but this data can be gathered more systematically in the future.

**7.6 Diverse Skills:** Consideration of the various skills sets relevant to different groups within ICANN (eg Board, SO/ACs, NomCom, etc) and the current representation of those skills within those groups would be worthy of data collection and analysis.

**7.7 Stakeholder group:** Within some groups (eg GNSO Constituencies, ccNSO, etc), it would be expected that individuals may well come from similar backgrounds and hold similar interests. However, within other groups (eg Board, NomCom, etc), the presence of individuals with diverse stakeholder backgrounds and interests is a key contributor to the quality of policy or decision making. Data on the diversity of stakeholder participation in relevant groups can be collected, recorded and analyzed to identify any gaps where specific stakeholders are not yet represented.

**8. Data Collection:** Data collection focused on the diversity elements identified in this paper should include the following:

- Participation/Representation in:
  - ICANN Meetings
  - ICANN SO/ACs and Stakeholder Constituencies
  - ICANN Board
  - ICANN Staff
  - Cross-Community Fora (eg CCWGs, PDP WGs)
  
- Leadership Roles/Positions in:
  - ICANN SO/ACs and Stakeholder Constituencies
  - ICANN Board
  - ICANN Staff
  - Cross-Community Fora (eg CCWGs, PDP WGs)

A reliable and stable data collection and storage framework should be determined which notes the methodology by which data will be sourced, and the frequency with which the data needs to be updated. The methodology may include:

- Self-declaration
- From ICANN SO/AC/group
- From ICANN Staff

**Comment [16]:** Do you think we should add:  
 - PTI & CSC as affiliated to ICANN, or is it considered out of ICANN because it's contracted with.  
 - Community review teams or WGs.. or this to be added within cross- community fora point

**Comment [17]:** The problem w/ affiliated w/ ICANN is that that is a universe too big. Some affiliated w/ ICANN may not share the view that diversity is important.

**Comment [18]:** Julie's comment: In Section 8, Amal has suggested specific inclusion of PTI and CSC. I'm not really sure that this is necessary. In the case of PTI, they could be considered to be part of ICANN Staff (although a subsidiary organisation) and CSC is just another example of a Cross-Community Forum.

- Research
- A combination of the above

[Maybe a short disclaimed about privacy here?](#)

## CURRENT STATE OF PLAY

**9. Diversity Provisions in ICANN Bylaws:** The following summary is informed by a previous working party on diversity in WS1 which reviewed the status of diversity within ICANN groups and by examination of the new ICANN Bylaws dated 1 October 2016. The new Bylaws reflect ICANN's commitment to diversity as a Core Value in Section 1.2 (b):

*"(ii) Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making to ensure that the bottom-up, multistakeholder policy development process is used to ascertain the global public interest and that those processes are accountable and transparent;"*

Additionally, there are specific provisions regarding regional diversity for some ICANN groups, but no references to other elements of diversity identified in this report. Relevant extracts from the ICANN Bylaws are provided in Annex C.

**9.1 ICANN Board:** Requirements for diversity in the ICANN Board are contained in Sections 7.2, 7.3, 7.5 and 8.5 of the ICANN Bylaws. Relevant extracts are provided in Annex C. Essentially, Section 7.2 (b) of the ICANN Bylaws requires that:

*"the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth..."*

while Section 7.5 goes on to state:

*"One intent of these diversity provisions is to ensure that at all times each Geographic Region shall have at least one Director, and at all times no region shall have more than five Directors on the Board (not including the President). As used in these Bylaws, each of the following is considered to be a "Geographic Region": Europe; Asia/Australia/Pacific; Latin America/Caribbean islands; Africa; and North America."*

**9.2 NomCom:** There are no Bylaws provisions for the diversity of the Nominating Committee itself, other than that resulting from the fact that members are appointed from the diverse groups within ICANN. However, in relation to the



selection of Board Members, Section 8.5 of ICANN Bylaws state:

*“In carrying out its responsibilities to select members of the ICANN Board (and selections to any other ICANN bodies as the Nominating Committee is responsible for under these Bylaws), the Nominating Committee shall take into account the continuing membership of the ICANN Board (and such other bodies), and seek to ensure that the persons selected to fill vacancies on the ICANN Board (and each such other body) shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with the other criteria required to be applied by Section 4 of this Article, make selections guided by Core Value 4 in Article I, Section 2.”*

**9.3 ccNSO Council:** Section 10.3 (a) of the ICANN Bylaws provides for some geographic considerations in the selection of ccNSO Council members:

*“The ccNSO Council shall consist of three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each of ICANN’s Geographic Regions in the manner described in Section 10.4(g) through Section 10.4(i); (ii) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee; (iii) liaisons as described in Section 10.3(b); and (iv) observers as described in Section 10.3(c).”*

**9.4 ASO:** Section 9.1 (b) of the ICANN Bylaws recognizes that under the terms of the MoU signed between ICANN and the RIRs in October 2004, the NRO Number Council performs the role of the Address Council for the ASO. Geographic diversity on the Address Council is afforded by each RIR appointing its members.

**9.5 gNSO Council:** Section 11.3 of the ICANN Bylaws describes the selection of gNSO Council members. While there are no specific provisions for some aspects of diversity, stakeholder diversity is afforded by appointments from each Stakeholder Group.

**9.6 GAC:** No reference to diversity in ICANN Bylaws.

**9.7 SSAC:** No reference to diversity in ICANN Bylaws.

**9.8 RSSAC:** No reference to diversity in ICANN Bylaws.

**9.9 ALAC:** Section 12.2 (d) (ii) of the ICANN Bylaws describes the selection of the 15 members of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). While there are no specific provisions for some aspects of diversity, geographic diversity is afforded by the requirement for 3 members to be appointed from each of the five geographic regions.

## **10. Diversity Provisions in Other ICANN Documents**

**10.1 ATRT:** Section 4.6 (b) of the ICANN Bylaws makes no explicit requirements

for diversity to be addressed as an issue in Accountability and Transparency Reviews. There have been some references to diversity in past Reviews, but no specific recommendation with regard to Board/SO/AC diversity has been made by the ATRT.

**10.2 ICANN Staff:** No reference to diversity within ICANN documentation.

10.3 In summary, while there are a number of existing mechanisms related to Board/NomCom/SO/AC diversity, these provisions are primarily related to geographic/regional or stakeholder elements of diversity. While some diversity arrangements exist within ICANN documents, diversity does not appear as one of the areas where ICANN continuously strives to improve.

## SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

11. The Diversity SubGroup has issued a questionnaire seeking information about diversity from SO/AC/groups within ICANN and is yet to collect and collate that feedback. It is likely that the recommendations of this report may need to be updated and refined in a Supplemental Report once that additional information has been received.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Defining Diversity

**Recommendation 1:** Based on responses to the Diversity Questionnaire, the ICANN Community should agree a definition of diversity in terms of a number of agreed elements by which it is comprised.

**Recommendation 2:** Each SO/AC/group within ICANN should identify how each element of diversity is relevant to their role and record these in their documentation or operating procedures.

### Measuring Diversity

**Recommendation 3:** Based on responses to the Diversity Questionnaire, the ICANN Community should agree appropriate measures for each element of diversity, the recommended frequency of measurement, and whether the measure is relevant to participation or leadership or both.

**Recommendation 4:** Each SO/AC/group within ICANN should identify how each element of diversity will be measured and monitored within their group.

Deleted: those

Comment [19]: See above. How do you ensure this not introduce a bias towards certain groups?

Comment [20]: suggested the change to "each element"

Deleted: s

Deleted: that are

Comment [21]: Julie's comment: I can accept these suggested changes as long as it is recognised that in some cases, an acceptable answer is "Not relevant" or "Of limited relevance" and that "No measurement" will be undertaken. The recommendations need to accommodate the incredible diversity ( ) of the groups we are talking about. If we accept Renata's changed wording, then I would also suggest adding the words "relevant to their role" after "diversity" in Recommendation 4.

Comment [22]: OK, the problem is that when you add "relevance", you open the door for folks to just say there is no element of diversity relevant, so how to solve that?

Deleted: which

Deleted: s

Deleted: they intend to

**Recommendation 5:** ICANN staff resources should be made available to support the collection, recording, analysis and storage of diversity information related to the Board, the Organization and the Community. The CEO should determine the most cost-effective means of providing such resources, whether that be the establishment of an “Office of Diversity” or by integrating the role into an existing part of the organization.

**Recommendation 6:** The ICANN Community, supported by ICANN staff, should publish an annual report summarizing the key diversity measures and trends.

#### **Supporting and Promoting Diversity**

**Recommendation 7:** The ICANN Community should engage in a bottom-up process to develop a long-term strategy for the promotion of diversity in both participation and leadership.

**Recommendation 8:** The ICANN Community should examine the appropriateness of current diversity requirements for prominent leadership roles and recommend any changes.

**Recommendation 9:** Each SO/AC/group within ICANN should identify goals or aspirations for improving and promoting diversity in both participation and leadership.

**Recommendation 10:** The ICANN Community should establish a mechanism to share diversity practice and proposals for enhancing diversity in participation and leadership.

**LIGHTNING PAPERS ON DIVERSITY  
(Presented at ICANN 56 in Helsinki)**

At the onset of Work Stream 2 various lightning talks were presented to the CCWG members highlighting the importance of diversity to ICANN. Of the lightning talks presented, two provided statistics from ICANN on diversity that have provided a starting point for discussions on diversity. The highlights of the reports are as follows:

**1. AFNIC:**

Presented results of a pilot research on the extent of diversity within ICANN. Through the provision of a data collection framework, and a snapshot of ICANN's current diversity metrics, the pursued goal of the publication was to enable:

- In the short term, a quick and fact-based assessment of the current situation:
- In the medium to long term, provide a clear baseline for tracking progress.

The initial effort focused on 190 "ICANN community leaders". These 190 individuals, had at least one of the following roles within ICANN at the time of collection (April 2016):

- Board Director
- Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee member of the Council or equivalent
- gNSO Constituency Executive Committee or Bureau member
- Nominating Committee member
- CCWG-Accountability members

This analysis had led to the following early findings:

- ICANN community largely remains North American Region centric. Close to 40% of the 190 leaders considered in this study are from the North American Region. This is by far the largest delegation of the "ICANN leaders" population. On the other hand, Africa, Latin America and Asia are under-represented.
- The dominance of native English speakers within ICANN is very strong. Close to two-thirds of the "ICANN Leaders" speak English as their mother tongue. The repartition of languages within ICANN is in stark difference with the global population. It is unclear, of course, whether the fact that English is

the working language is an outcome or a cause for this situation.

- 26% of “ICANN leaders” are women. While this is obviously far from gender balance, it remains difficult to assess whether this ratio is representative of the population of ICANN participants in general. This ratio was not available at the time of writing. It is hard to find a reason for the very limited representation of women within the ICANN Board (4 out of 16) and Nomcom (2 out of 20). It would be useful to assess whether the gap in the Board is related to the gender imbalance in the Nominating Committee.
- Across the population of 190 “ICANN leaders”, the business sector and academic / technical community are most prominently represented. They represent about 80% of the individuals in the study. On the other hand, Civil Society and Government represent only 10% each approximately.

## **2. DALILA RAHMOUNI:**

Dalila Rahmouni presented a paper stating the importance of diversity to ICANN and proceeded to define diversity based on various elements. She observed that ICANN is not as diverse as it should be based on the following statistics from her paper:

- 40% of ICANN community leaders come from North America and more than 63% are native English speakers.
- Women represent only 26% of ICANN community leaders.
- 80% of ICANN community leaders come from the technical community and the private sector, while civil society and government representatives each account for only 10%.

She provided various recommendations on how this diversity imbalance can be addressed, and her recommendations have been considered in this report.

## ANNEX B

## INFORMATION AND RESOURCES FROM ICANN STAFF ON DIVERSITY

**Information**

The WS2 – Diversity SubGroup also invited various ICANN staff to share their observations and experiences from the data they have collected over time on diversity. DRDP staff were able to provide details on the sources of gender and geographic data across ICANN that was provided as input into WS2 on Diversity. They also outlined some of the challenges and opportunities that could help inform the community's discussion on next steps. The challenges can be summarized as follows:

1. Gender:
  - Gender is not always self-selected. Best practice would be to have all individuals self-select their gender.
  - Gender selection is often presented as a binary. Best practice would be to include male/female/other fields.
  - Gender data compiled from salutations in meeting registration data is self-selected. However, titles, such as Dr. or Professor, are aggregated into the 'other' category along with blank or non-selected entries. Best practice would be to offer a gender field in registration forms that provides male/female/do not wish to disclose/other options; this field could either be required or optional.
2. Region:
  - Human Resources uses 3 regional categories and Meetings uses 8 regional categories. Best-practice would be to identify a benchmark (i.e. ICANN regions), so that data collected is consistent across the ICANN community.
  - Most ICANN groups collect regional information only, if the regions change, that data would become unhelpful. If raw data were collected instead – such as the country – the data can be reprocessed as necessary to align with any potential changes in ICANN's regional categories.

**Resources**

GNSO Review - The second independent Review of the GNSO, part of the Organizational Reviews mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, addressed diversity. Final Report issued by the Independent Examiner - <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gnsso-review-final-15sep15-en.pdf>  
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gnsso-review-final-15sep15-en.pdf>

Section 9.4 of the Final Report deals with Diversity. Recommendations relating to diversity were #6, 7, 32 - 36. GNSO has established a GNSO Review Working Group to develop

an implementation plan for Board-approved GNSO Review recommendations, in July 2016. The work of this group can be seen at:

<https://community.icann.org/display/GRWG/GNSO+Review+Working+Group+Home>  
<https://community.icann.org/display/GRWG/GNSO+Review+Working+Group+Home>  
<https://community.icann.org/display/GRWG/GNSO+Review+Working+Group+Home>

For statistics on diversity of past AoC Review Teams, please see AoC and Organizational Review presentation in Dublin at ICANN54:

<https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/wed-aoc-org-reviews/presentation-aoc-org-reviews-21oct15-en>; slide 8.

ICANN 51 Los Angeles – Showcasing Positive Trends and Business Diversity:

<https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-51-los-angeles-showcasing-positive-trends-and-business-diversity-at-icann-public-meetings>  
<https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-51-los-angeles-showcasing-positive-trends-and-business-diversity-at-icann-public-meetings>

<https://www.icann.org/news/blog/icann-51-los-angeles-showcasing-positive-trends-and-business-diversity-at-icann-public-meetings>

Afnic report on ICANN diversity

- Article about the report:  
[http://www.circleid.com/posts/20160620\\_diversity\\_is\\_neither\\_an\\_option\\_nor\\_secondary\\_requirement\\_for\\_icann/](http://www.circleid.com/posts/20160620_diversity_is_neither_an_option_nor_secondary_requirement_for_icann/)  
[http://www.circleid.com/posts/20160620\\_diversity\\_is\\_neither\\_an\\_option\\_nor\\_secondary\\_requirement\\_for\\_icann/](http://www.circleid.com/posts/20160620_diversity_is_neither_an_option_nor_secondary_requirement_for_icann/)
- The report in English:  
[https://www.afnic.fr/medias/documents/Dossiers\\_pour\\_actualites/2016\\_Icann\\_Diversity\\_Data.pdf](https://www.afnic.fr/medias/documents/Dossiers_pour_actualites/2016_Icann_Diversity_Data.pdf)  
[https://www.afnic.fr/medias/documents/Dossiers\\_pour\\_actualites/2016\\_Icann\\_Diversity\\_Data.pdf](https://www.afnic.fr/medias/documents/Dossiers_pour_actualites/2016_Icann_Diversity_Data.pdf)
- The report in French  
[https://www.afnic.fr/medias/documents/Dossiers\\_pour\\_actualites/2016\\_Donnees\\_Diversite\\_ICANN.pdf](https://www.afnic.fr/medias/documents/Dossiers_pour_actualites/2016_Donnees_Diversite_ICANN.pdf)

On 26 June at ICANN56 in Helsinki, Dalila Rahmouni and Mathieu Weill presented lightning talks to the CCWG-Accountability on this topic. To view the presentations, please see: <https://community.icann.org/x/rBWOAw>.

Quarterly Stakeholder Call Presentation includes data on Global Stakeholder Engagement by region: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/quarterly-report-18aug16-en.pdf>, slide 27

#### **WS1 WP3 Subgroup materials**

- <https://community.icann.org/display/acctcrosscomm/Diversity>  
<https://community.icann.org/display/acctcrosscomm/Diversity>
- <https://community.icann.org/display/acctcrosscomm/Diversity>
- [https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/Diversity\\_PC2.docx?](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/Diversity_PC2.docx?)

[https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/Diversity\\_PC2.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1444735192000&api=v2](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/Diversity_PC2.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1444735192000&api=v2)

- [https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/Diversity\\_PC2.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1444735192000&api=v2](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/Diversity_PC2.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1444735192000&api=v2)
- <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/WP3%20Diversity.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1444293034000&api=v2>

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56141553/WP3Diversity.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1444293034000&api=v2>

WS2 – Diversity Working Group materials



## ANNEX C

**EXTRACTS FROM ICANN BYLAWS RELATED TO DIVERSITY****Section 7.2 DIRECTORS AND THEIR SELECTION; ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

(b) In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate the Directors for Seats 1 through 8 for designation by the EC, the Nominating Committee shall ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in [Section 7.3](#), [Section 7.4](#) and [Section 7.5](#). At no time when it makes its nomination shall the Nominating Committee nominate a Director to fill any vacancy or expired term whose designation would cause the total number of Directors (not including the President) from countries in any one Geographic Region to exceed five; and the Nominating Committee shall ensure when it makes its nominations that the Board includes at least one Director who is from a country in each ICANN Geographic Region ("**Diversity Calculation**").

(c) In carrying out their responsibilities to nominate Directors for Seats 9 through 15 for designation by the EC, the Supporting Organizations and the At-Large Community shall seek to ensure that the Board is composed of Directors who, in the aggregate, display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective, by applying the criteria set forth in [Section 7.3](#), [Section 7.4](#) and [Section 7.5](#). The Supporting Organizations shall ensure that, at any given time, no two Directors nominated by a Supporting Organization are citizens from the same country or of countries located in the same Geographic Region.

**Section 7.3 CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION OF DIRECTORS**

(c) Persons who will produce the broadest cultural and geographic diversity on the Board consistent with meeting the other criteria set forth in this [Section 7.3](#).

**Section 7.5. INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATION**

In order to ensure broad international representation on the Board, the nomination of Directors by the Nominating Committee, each Supporting Organization and the At-Large Community shall comply with all applicable diversity provisions of these Bylaws or of any memorandum of understanding referred to in these Bylaws concerning the Supporting Organization. One intent of these diversity provisions is to ensure that at all times each Geographic Region shall have at least one Director, and at all times no Geographic Region shall have more than five Directors on the Board (not including the President). As used in these Bylaws, each of the following is considered to be a "**Geographic Region**": (a) Europe; (b) Asia/Australia/Pacific;

(c) Latin America/Caribbean islands; (d) Africa; and (e) North America. The specific countries included in each Geographic Region shall be determined by the Board, and this [Section 7.5](#) shall be reviewed by the Board from time to time (and in any event at least once every three years) to determine whether any change is appropriate, taking account of the evolution of the Internet.

**Section 8.5. DIVERSITY**

In carrying out its responsibilities to nominate Directors to fill Seats 1 through 8 (and selections to any other ICANN bodies as the Nominating Committee is responsible for under these Bylaws), the Nominating Committee shall take into account the continuing membership of the Board (and such other bodies), and seek to ensure that the persons it nominates to serve as Director and selects shall, to the extent feasible and consistent with the other criteria required to be applied by [Section 8.4](#), be guided by [Section 1.2\(b\)\(ii\)](#).

**Section 10.3. ccNSO COUNCIL**

(a) The ccNSO Council shall consist of three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each of ICANN's Geographic Regions in the manner described in [Section 10.4\(g\)](#) through [Section 10.4\(i\)](#); (ii) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee; (iii) liaisons as described in [Section 10.3\(b\)](#); and (iv) observers as described in [Section 10.3\(c\)](#).

**Section 11.3. GNSO COUNCIL**

(a) Subject to [Section 11.5](#), the GNSO Council shall consist of:

- (i) three representatives selected from the Registries Stakeholder Group;
- (ii) three representatives selected from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;
- (iii) six representatives selected from the Commercial Stakeholder Group;
- (iv) six representatives selected from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group; and
- (v) three representatives selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee, one of which shall be non-voting, but otherwise entitled to participate on equal footing with other members of the GNSO Council including, e.g. the making and seconding of motions and of serving as Chair if elected. One Nominating Committee appointee voting representative shall be assigned to each House (as described in [Section 11.3\(h\)](#)) by the Nominating Committee.

**Section 12.2 (d) At-Large Advisory Committee**

(ii) The ALAC shall consist of (A) two members selected by each of the Regional At-Large Organizations ("RALOs") established according to Section 12.2(d)(vii), and (B) five members selected by the Nominating Committee. The five members selected by the Nominating Committee shall include one citizen of a country within each of the five Geographic Regions established according to Section 7.5.