DIVERSITY SUBGROUP MEETING
Thursday, July 13, 2017 - 13:00 to 14:00

 [This meeting is now being recorded]

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Hi, everyone and thanks for attending the Diversity call for today. So our last call was before the Johannesburg meeting. We tried at that time to get the report ready for the Plenary, but unfortunately we couldn't do so. So that will mean that we will have to continue working toward that until the next Plenary. And I guess we can start as the first part to review the action items to see if there is anything pending. So I cannot see the action items here. So I don't see any action items listed, so I guess we don't have anything pending for now.

So we can move to the next agenda item and this is what I wanted to discuss at the group level about a continuation of the interpretation service. Just as a context, we get some status reports about the usage of the interpretation service from English to French and from, I think, English to Spanish. And I think I can ask Bernard if he can provide this information and maybe he can show the data.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Rafik. Yes, I can. Brenda, can we put up that slide?

Everyone, you'll remember that when we started this we were in a pilot project status to the end of June and we did continue that until the end of June. And then

we said we would have a look at it. Presently if you look at your screen, you'll see the information that we gathered for each of the calls where it was used. And, also, I think, I'll have to check, I don't think these numbers include the call that was cancelled because we didn't get anyone. So actually, the numbers might actually be a little lower than what we have here.

As I was explaining to the reportures, the pilot was until the end of June. If the group wishes to continue past the -- in this new fiscal year, they will have to make a request, this will have to go to Co-Chairs and possibly to the Plenary given this was not put into the budget forecast for the coming fiscal year. The rest I think is fairly clear from the numbers. If anyone has any questions, I'll be glad to take them.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernard, for that information. Maybe a question from me, so if we want to continue, we have to make, again, the request to the Co-Chair and I think it's also related in terms of budgeting, if I'm not mistaken. No? Okay.

So any comments or questions about this? So I think it's important for us to make a case here. And I see that Sebastien has a question. Yes, Sebastien, go ahead.

>> Thank you, can you hear me okay?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, we can hear you fine.

>> Thank you, Bernard. Just a comment and a question. A question, do we know if there are any people who are listening after the call? Because here we are with a number of people listening to the call or participating in the call, but as we have a recording, do we know if there are any data for that? And the second, it's would be a pity to have to discuss that because, of course, we can imagine that Rafik, myself, and some other could have another channel and then we will have increased the number here.

   And the question is more than the number, it's, can we increase real participation or the engagement more than just the participation? Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Bernard, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Rafik. No, we don't keep statistics of the use after the fact, so I cannot speak to this. Yes, I'm certain that numbers can be increased if people just log into it, but the reality are these numbers. And I think, you know, to a certain extent it's a point of trying to provide a service that is used and not just numbers. I know that it's very nice to do this and no one argues about that, but everyone will remember that we were looking at -- when we did the original investigation for providing the service, and Cheryl can correct me, I believe some of the data we originally used was from ALAC and the baseline for providing a service was at least three users per call. And we're falling well short of that. So although I certainly, as someone who English is not his mother

tongue, support the concept, the practical -- I'm also in charge of the PCST, which is the budget reporting to the Co-Chairs, and we have to make this work within the context of the budget that has been approved. That allows us to get to June. And as I said, currently, when we built this, we had to look at these numbers and said, okay, for now we will not include that. And if it is required, we might have to cut in something else. But that is up to the group to make the request to the Co-Chairs and then the Co-Chairs can decide how they want to proceed with that. And that may be to go back to the Plenary. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Bernard. So if we do -- if we make a request, can we make it for, I mean, not at the end of, say, the fiscal year? I mean, by when the whole [indiscernible] should change the word, but can we make a request like monthly basis or for a shorter period, like for six months? And I guess maybe it's an opportunity to try to get more engagement and participation because I also see the number of attendees. We have like around half of the usual number in June. Maybe we can understand that was close to the meeting or maybe other reasons, but so we have an issue to get more attendance, more participation. So maybe we need to publicize more about the interpretation, so maybe that we can encourage those who are maybe not participating yet to join us since we will have -- we are having the interpretation service. Maybe we can see if we get some improvement in the next three months or not. If not, I guess

maybe we can assess at that time that we don't necessarily need something like that. But maybe just to give it a chance. But then at the end of the day, we have to -- we can make a request and it's up to the Co-Chairs and the Plenary to decide here.

Bernard, is that an old hand or did you want to respond to that?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Respond if you'll allow me. Listen, it's up to this group to decide what they want to request. I'm fairly certain that it's going to be a really tough sell to say you want this for the full year. So -- but as I say, that's your call.

The other thing I will say is, as you will have seen, we've published the Plenary schedule for the remainder of fiscal year 18, so one year from now, and we're going to monthly calls. So the next Plenary call is scheduled for the last Wednesday of August. And we'll be talking to the Co-Chairs the week prior to that, preparing things.

So one possible approach, I mean, basically we had the service for three months, maybe what you can do is ask for a three month extension and after that if the numbers haven't picked up, automatically agree that it's not worth carrying on. But as I said, it's up to you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernard. I think that is a more straightforward way for now, maybe to ask for the extension of three months and try to increase the numbers. And as you said, I think it's to get more participation and engagement

in general, not just because the language interpretation, so it's an opportunity to get more people participating. I think it will be tough somehow since it would be the summer holiday period in the north hemisphere, so it's a little bit complicated, but I guess we can try at least for three months to give it a chance so we can assess for a longer period. So I guess it will be around six months that we provide the interpretation service and then we can make a decision based on the information for longer period than just three months.

   Okay, I guess we can ask for an extension for three months if people are fine with that. And understanding that we have really to get the number up.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Rafik?

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: One real practical consideration here is how many meetings do you think you need to get the first draft of the report done? Because it's going to be sort of unfortunate if we ask for a three month extension, you get the draft report done in two or three weeks, and then basically we're going to go dormant for two months as we prepare -- as it goes to the Plenary and then if it passes the Plenary, it will go to public consultation. So actually, we're looking at a three month gap where probably you might not need meetings while the report is going through the machinery to get the public comment and then the analysis of the public comment. I think if we look at it from a practical point of view, what

we may want to do is if you can get an estimate of the number of meetings that you're going to need to wrap this up, I mean, is it between two and four? Do you think you're going to be between six and eight, something like that, to get this done? Then, you know, we can try and adjust accordingly the request of the Co-Chairs. So maybe that's a more practical way forward because there's going to be this huge gap in the middle, so maybe -- there are two options here, is what I'm trying to say. Sorry if I'm confusing everyone, but I'm just trying to look at the practical implications of where we are. Right before Joburg, we almost had this document completed. If we have one or two meetings left to do that, meaning complete the document and send it to the Plenary for first reading, is it really worth it to restart it? And then once that process starts, we're going to stop for three months ago. Or is it worth it to say, we're going to complete the document for sending it to a first reading of the Plenary and let's not forget, they are monthly now, and then work through with the Plenary to start another three month round of services for when the public consultation ends and this group has to start its work again. Because we've seen this in all the other groups. Basically once the work goes to the Plenary for a first reading, and if it's accepted or generally accepted with minor modifications at the Plenary, the group will essentially go dormant for three months. So that may be an option I'm offering the group, just thinking strategically. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Bernie. Thank you. Yes, we have to be aligned with the schedule for the Plenary.

Yes, we have almost the draft ready, but in that time also we were expecting the input from the [indiscernible]. Still we have yet to finish reviewing and updating the draft. But I guess the target for us is the next Plenary, which is the end of August. I think it is around one month and a half. [Indiscernible] and myself, we kind of put a placeholder, a call every week, but I think maybe that will be a little overkill. We can maybe have the weekly call and we are working to provide an updated draft based on the SO/AC comments.

So I can work on the schedule for the next call, July and August, going to the next Plenary and I guess we have to deliver one week before. That means the 18th of August. I think it's almost one month. So it's worth the question, we can ask for a monthly basis or it should be by a number of meetings? So this is the question, by a number of meetings or by, like, timeframe? Maybe we can think more easily in terms of timeframe than the numbers because we don't know how much meetings we will need to kind of firm up things.

Okay, maybe we cannot have a response for now, but you can -- okay, yes, Bernard, go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, thank you. So the next Plenary is, as I typed in the chat, the 30th of August, so documents are due for the 23rd. So basically you've

got almost six weeks in there.

Now listening to the conversation, it sounds like you would like to continue at this point until you deliver the document and then we will see. So what I can tell you is the following, is I have no problem making an offline request to the Co-Chairs to extend until the 23rd of August. We'll see what they say, but what I will tell you is that if we extend for those six weeks and the numbers don't change, it's going to be a really hard sell to sell live interpretation after the public consultation ends. But that's your call. I am here to provide you advice and to make sure the requests get made properly and that's what I will do.

So if you are asking me to put in a request until the end of August for two or three meetings, I'll see what I can do to get that started as soon as possible. And then hopefully the document will be completed and will be on a cycle of Plenary approvals and public consultation and then we can start again after that. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Bernard.

Okay, so let me discuss with Fiona on this since I think she is still not on the call. Let's see if we -- how we can move on with this. I think, also, we need input and comments from the subgroup. So we need their support and we need the understanding that we need to increase the number of those using the service or otherwise it will be hard to -- I was going to say hard to sell, but hard to get

support for a longer time.

Okay, I guess we spent some time on this issue, but anyway, it needed to be done.

Maybe we can move to the next agenda item. So I understand in the previous calls, prior to the Johannesburg meeting, you had a chance to go through the documents prepared by Fiona to summarize the input from the SO/AC. And so I think it still needs to be reviewed and also confirmed from the SO/AC, but the summary has captured correctly the input. I recall an e-mail from [indiscernible] just asking for the corrections, so please, if you have any for that document.

What I shared in the other Adobe Connect is the latest version, the Google Doc, but as you can see the last date it was done was the 25th of May and that's prior to the deadline for receiving input from SO/AC.

We are working on the new version and hopefully we can share it in the coming days. It can be tricky if you work on the latest version you have now because we are working on a different version, another document. So we will try to share that in Google Docs as soon as possible. Okay?

Okay, I see a comment from Finn with regard to Recommendation number 5. Okay, so, okay, Finn, regarding that Recommendation, I think we had some discussion before about that and I forget who was suggesting this, but with regard to the role of the CEO in terms of supporting the diversity office and I

recall that we had a long discussion that we need to focus on the requirements of what, say, the role of such office, but not on the detail of -- regarding how the office should be implemented. So I guess we can maybe, instead of deleting, maybe amending that to emphasize what we are expecting from the Diversity Office. And also clarify if we have any other expectation from the ICANN organization, the CEO and the staff, with regard to the -- how say -- with regard to the --.

Okay, so any comment on this? I see there's some discussion on the chat, but if anyone wants to speak up about this, yeah.

So Finn, you are suggesting -- yes, Bernard, go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Rafik. Just a note, we're preparing a guideline for SO/ACs regarding recommendations and in there what you will find is exactly what Finn has said, in that we are encouraging subgroups to be very clear in their requirements and try to be as flexible as possible versus how these should be implemented. And we detail that. So this will be coming up shortly, I hope, and will help guide you. But I am certain what you will find in there is exactly that. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernard. And looking forward to those guidelines. I think we have this discussion about the what and how and the requirements and the implementations several times, so maybe kind of to move forward, can we put

as an action item that we should amend Recommendation number 5 and to elaborate their requirements and replace the current wording? So as to respond to Finn's concerns. And, Finn, if you have any wording or suggestions, that would be really helpful on that.

Okay, Bernard, I see your hand is up. Do you want to say something?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Old hand, sorry.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Old hand. Okay.

Okay, so we kind of already jumped on the recommendation. So any other comments on the current Recommendations we have? And if you have any suggestions, now would be a good time so we can include that on the next version.

Okay, I don't see anyone in the queue. Yes, since we are resuming the discussion after a while it may take a while to recall the details we have in the draft, so it's a good opportunity to kind of get familiar again with the latest version we have. And so, I guess, if you have any comments in the coming days, they will be really, really welcome so we can add them directly to the new version to try to clear up and resolve the comment that we have already in there in the current document.

Sorry, is it possible to share the link of the -- how I say -- the document summarizing the input from AC/SO? I couldn't find it easily. I want to share that

in Adobe Connect so people can have a chance to review it.

Yes, Marques, go ahead. No? I'm not sure. Sorry, I see, Marques. Yes, please go ahead. Can you speak? Oh, okay. [Laughter]. Okay, so I saw your hand, but if you want, you can write in the chat directly.

Okay, anyway, I will send the spreadsheet to the mailing list.

Yes, Bernard, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Rafik. For purposes of the record of the call, we have one person on the phone only who is listed as "anonymous." If this is you, could you please identify yourself? Thank you.

Thank you, Dalila.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernard. Thanks, Dalila.

I see that the question is to Herb and it's related to the link he shared yesterday with regard to Diversity in Canada. Herb, if you want to say -- okay, I see that Herb is in the queue already. Yes, Herb, go ahead.

>> HERB WAYE OMBUDS: Yes, good morning, everybody. Herb Waye here. There was no purpose to the e-mail I sent yesterday, I just thought it was interesting that diversity was brought up as an issue. I guess I think what brought it up was the -- during the election campaign or something, I can't recall exactly why. But the Canadian media contacted Canadian tech companies and asked them, okay, if diversity is an issue for you, well, what are you doing about

it? And we received a very kind of interesting response, you know, a lot of the company [indiscernible] about answering for -- I'm not sure if that noise is coming from me. [Typing noise very loud]

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Someone is typing very heavily. If you have not speaking, could you please mute your mic? Thank you.

>> HERB WAYE OMBUDS: Okay, sorry. So it was just kind of to share the information that a lot of people are talking diversity, but only very few of these high-tech companies are actually doing something about it and reporting on it. But the article does go into great length about some of the diversity issue that is are facing some of these companies and some of the best practices that some of them are performing. So I just saw it, read it, and thought it would be something that would be interesting to share.

And, yes, I agree with you that there is a lack of measurement and I don't know if there's a lack of willingness to proceed, but I know there seems to be clearly a lack of interest in reporting on it. Maybe because the media was involved. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Herb, for sharing the link and also explaining it.

I see that Fiona is in the queue, too. Fiona, please go ahead.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you, Rafik. Hello, everyone. Sorry I was late, I had a bit of a technical challenge.

Now when I have gone through the different responses from the different groups that have responded to our questionnaire so far, I don't think there's a lack of willingness to go with diversity. As a result, a lot of the groups have made an effort to start a geographic and regional diversity to the level that they are. However, entity that is are contractual to ICANN, that have contractual arrangements to ICANN, are challenged by addressing that particular element of diversity, likely because it's dependent on representation and the ability of representatives from the region, the respective different geographical reasons. However, the element of diversities again have been varied to the different groups based on their role within ICANN. And in as much as other groups are going out and [indiscernible] other elements that they think ICANN should pay attention to, when it comes down to measurement, they are all coming back to look at what elements are relevant to the role they play. And based on the role of the different groups that have responded, and this is also part of the input from the Board that looks at [indiscernible] to answer the question [loud typing] that [indiscernible] of the Board and secondly looking at the ICANN [loud typing] it is [indiscernible] there is a general interest in diverse it and to ensure diversity particularly for ICANN [indiscernible] and within ICANN [loud typing] and positioning a global organization that is addressing the global public good.

And this is something that has been discussed in CCWG,

Workstream one and Workstream two. [Indiscernible] of ICANN to address diversity concerns in ensuring it is meeting and addressing the global good has had to change. And that is where we are at. That is really my personal view based on the responses. So diversity is becoming an important issue within our Ecosystem. We have a [indiscernible] organization being the one that has been given the responsibility of handling some of the Internet's co-functions. And that said and done, each of the groups have had [loud typing] [indiscernible] questionnaire have had to rethink and re-evaluate how they handle diversity issues. And you can also see the responses [loud typing] of some of the [indiscernible] that the responses are much clearer and much more to the point. For example, the NCC -- sorry, the NS -- NCSG and the VC have [indiscernible] and trying to address diversity issues and as a result have developed such a system and activities to [indiscernible] and promote diversity.

And these are important roles because of the [indiscernible] of the groups. A group like the registry that is [indiscernible] would like to address diversity requirements, but they are restrained by being able to only invite contractual parties to their sessions and to their activities and their discussions because that is what brings them together.

So then the measurement of diversity that they would do is very limited to how they are constituent and the role they play. The role of the non-commercial group

is very different and they are able to then measure very differently. And we find then another different and more complex group like the [indiscernible] advisory council, they are very broad in terms of what issues they can cover because they can easily cover what we have highlighted as the seven elements we have listed and even more. So for them, they would like to have a matrix developed [indiscernible] [loud typing] and how they come to play in the role and the activities of ICANN.

So the desire to measure diversity is there. [Indiscernible] [loud typing] enough in ICANN's bylaws, policies, procedures to address those. So I'm looking at our report, our draft report, and looking at the recommendations and I just want to [indiscernible] strongly [indiscernible] for the recommendations asked of each group to see the element that is are important and [indiscernible] ICANN. And I'm seeing our approach may have to be a bit open in terms of we may not be able to detect all of the elements of diversity that the groups would like, but there are within each groups elements of diversity that are in each group. We find groups of constituency and looking at their role within ICANN and [indiscernible] of the roots of our businesses, structuring of those business, so they are looking at very differently and it is important to their role in ICANN. And when we put all those together, I think we may need to be a bit open and this is really my personal view, a bit open on the elements of diversity and be careful about giving very

strict restrictions of what the elements of diversity are, but being able to list those that have been identified and still be able to recommend to groups to work with elements of diversity that has relevance to their activities and their role. And that is for me the observation from the review and I hope that you will be able to capture it in the report.

I have shared with the drafting team my input into the report. I don't know that this is the report that is out on the link, but I know the drafting teams are working on it and trying to capture all the elements of diversity and the responses from the different working groups. And that is what I have to -- as an observation with regard to input from the different AC/SOs and the report on diversity.

Thank you, Rafik.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, Fiona, for those comments.

Yes, definitely I don't think we can have a recommendation like kind of one-size-fits-all and maybe we have to think of how we can -- I'm not sure if it's the right word, customize the recommendation to address the diversities of the different groups we have, so that's something we need to have in mind.

And when we talk about measurements, it means we need some targets or benchmarks we can measure against. So we need to measure against something to see if we are making progress or not, so this is something we should work on. But definitely we have to take into account the comment we got from the AC/SO

with regard to the element of diversity and see what matters to them.

   Okay, I see that Herb is in the queue. Yes, please go ahead.

>> HERB WAYE OMBUDS: Yes, thank you, Rafik. Herb Waye. I just want to mention while we're on this call that communication is going to be a critical component to any advancement of the diversity issues. And I raise this point because at Joburg, ICANN 59, there were people registering for registration for Abergabi opened and there was a diversity question on the application, on the registration for the upcoming ICANN meeting about gender that was received negatively by certain people that were applying for registration. And the question was ultimately removed.

   So I think if it had been accompanied by a proper, well-articulated communication piece about why the question was being asked, it would have been more positively received. So I believe moving forward for the Diversity Group, communication is going to be a very important component in any attempt at incorporating diversity into things like registrations or surveys or any other attempt at collecting data. So I just wanted to share that with you, issues that pop up in my domain regarding diversity from those that are offending or feel that it's inappropriate. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Herb. Thanks for sharing this. I was not aware about that, some people being offended with regard to --

>> HERB WAYE OMBUDS: If I could address Lousewies is asking a question about clarification. I think the question was, male, female, or other, or something along that lines. And it was brought up, it was addressed, not by myself, but it was addressed by the administration of the registration team and it's something that is going to be discussed with them on my next trip to LA, so there will be follow-up.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Herb. I think just to recall, I think there was the gender diversity survey by ICANN staff and we should probably get the results soon. Maybe we can have also some insight of what people think, you know, about that matter. So maybe we can clarify what the issue is exactly because, I mean, the registration profile gave only three choices and there was concern about the "other" choice. I'm not sure what the problem is exactly here. I guess there's some practice here with regard to how people list.

>> HERB WAYE OMBUDS: Yes, and Herb Waye again here. As I mentioned, it wasn't my office that dealt with it, but it was brought to my attention and resolved rather than create an issue, they simply pulled the question. And I have not had a chance to sit down with the reservation -- registration team to discuss it yet to see if there's an opportunity, but this may be something that if anybody that is listening in is interested, they can bring it up with, I believe it was Louis Dunkin and his team that dealt with that.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Herb. If you find out more information and share the details with us, I think that would be really helpful. And we can see how we can make a recommendation based on that.

I recall that we had a previous discussion worked in the first draft with regard to the gender and we got input from ICANN staff from the Responsibility Division. So I guess that's something that we have to work on again. I think we will count all this input.

Okay, Herb, I see that your hand is still up. Is that an old or new hand? Okay, that's an old hand.

Okay, so we have six minutes left in the call. And I guess maybe we can just discuss quickly how we can move from here. As Fiona indicated, we are working on the new draft for the report, the new version. So if you have any comments, please do it as soon as possible so we can include that in the new version. And the input from the SO/AC, I will share the consolidated information, it was on the spreadsheet, but [indiscernible] from the Wiki, so maybe we can add it to the Google Docs so it's more easy to come by for everyone. Yeah, so we'll distribute the list when it's ready.

Okay, and any other questions or comments on this? Okay, I don't see any. So, okay, hopefully we can send a new version, version number three, in the coming days. And we'll see with regard to the scheduling for the next call, having in mind

about the interpretation service. So our objective is to get a draft to be submitted by the next meeting and by the end of August. So we have to work on that and hopefully we can get all of your participation to get that done. Okay?

I don't see anyone in the queue and I don't see any comments, so I guess we can adjourn the call for today. Thanks, everyone, for attending. And see you soon! Bye-bye.