
CCWG-DIVERSITY SUBGROUP

Friday, July 21, 2017 - 13:00 to 14:00

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, hi, everyone. And thanks for joining our today call. So as you can see the agenda in Adobe Connect we will try to cover basically today the new version of the updated draft report. I'm sorry that we shared late the document, but we are looking for your comment in view of it. So it's still how say in going so it's not a final version and it's a good time for everyone to jump in and put comments there.

But first let's start with the first agenda item which is the review of action items. So on the last call we discussed about continuing the interpretation and asking for an extension. So after discussions with Fiona, we agreed to make a request to get the interpretation until the end of August, having in mind that we are aiming to submit our draft report to the Plenary in that time. So after that, we will be probably kind of in [indiscernible] mode for a while, so that's why we made that decision for now. So we are looking to get more participation and more attendees to use the interpretation service.

But I think we also have an agenda item to update the interpretation, probably we should make it first before going to the review of the report.

Yes, Bernie, I see that you are in the queue. Please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Rafik. Can you hear me properly?

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you.

Note: The following is the output resulting from the RTT (Real-Time Transcription also known as CART) of a teleconference call and/or session conducted into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, captioning is okay. Good morning, good day, everyone. Following up right on that topic, I had discussions with the Co Chairs on the interpretation topic and basically the decision was made that since this was not in the budget, but we respect the request that the Co Chairs would make the request to the Plenary and see how the Plenary felt about it. Some of you may have seen the note that was sent yesterday regarding this, asking for Plenary input on this request. We're giving people a week, so basically the process of consulting the Plenary, given the next Plenary is only scheduled is, rather, scheduled for the 30th of August, it seemed a little futile to wait for the next Plenary to ask them if we could fund interpretation for this group until the end of August. So we choose the to go to the list, the question is out there, it will close next Friday, and staff will gather up the responses and provide them to the Co Chairs who will make a decision at that point. I'll be glad to take questions if there are any.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernie.

So just to clarify here, so the Plenary and the participants in the CCWG, they have until next Friday to share any comments. So I guess if there is no objection, we can assume that the question will be approved. Or if there are some objections, that means more discussion. So how do we treat work in such case?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well [laughter], I mean it's going to be based on the feedback. You're quite right, if there are no objections I would expect the Co Chairs to approve your request. And given there's no if I look at the schedule, there's no Diversity Meeting next week, so the meeting after that, the first meeting in August we would start up interpretation again. Again, that's if there's no objection.

If it's, you know, basically, I think there are probably three scenarios in all these things. There's no objections or there's massive support for it, so there's no problem. It's sort of split because we get things on both sides at which point the Co Chairs will have to make the decision. And finally, there is significant objection, at which point the Co Chairs will have to weigh that in making their decision. But regardless, what we're aiming for is to make a decision the end of next week, early the week after, so that if we are supporting interpretation, we can advise the list that we are doing that and schedule it for your next call. I hope that answers the question.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernie. I think that's quite clear, so we will wait for the decision by the end of next week.

Okay, so I guess we can move to the next agenda item and so you can see the link probably I can share also the link in the Adobe Connect chat for the draft review. I think this is the third version. We tried to get the input of coming from the SO/AC responding to our questionnaire and we tried to consolidate the response from the SO/AC and also another Google Doc so it is more easier to refer, but I have a kind request. So if you can please check if we captured it correctly the response from your SO/AC, just to avoid any kind of missing or if we dropped something or we maybe misunderstood anything, so please really how say please review and double check that we captured it correctly and accurately the input from your SO or AC.

I think we already started to get several comments and suggestions for it. So what I think we will try to do, we can work directly on the document, but maybe to have a proper discussion and involve everyone. We'll try to kind of make a list of issues, which means kind of compiling the area where there are more comments or questions or there is maybe we don't have necessarily processes and discuss them. And the remaining list, so we can have more

discussion, but also in the call, so we'll try to solve that either by proposing new wording or phrasing, so I think that's where we can how say combine both working on the mailing list and also on the call. While I encourage everyone to go through the document and put your comment in. The Google Doc is in [indiscernible] so you can propose an edit or you can delete or replace or anything, so we have the edit permission, so we can solve that later on.

Okay, so also I think we have we got some kind of comments in the mailing list advising several issues, I think, regarding age and also this it happened several times a comment about the cultural diversity and maybe this is an area that's not clear. I'm not sure that everyone shares the same understanding of the cultural diversity. And if we want to if we need to add it, we have to work more clear definition of something how say common understanding among us at least and then when we share to the Plenary it should be clear and understandable.

Okay, so is there any question or comment on this? Okay, I don't see any.

So I understand that there are some kinds of [indiscernible] about the recommendation. I think that's the area where there will be more interest and I guess there should be much more discussion since that's what we will provide. The description of elements of diversity and so on, I think it starts to get more on the table, so we just need to maybe to solve a few edits there. But I guess the focus would be on the recommendations. So we can [indiscernible] the issues regarding the recommendation and kind of maybe try to work on some wording.

And, also, we added a new section regarding the response to diversity questionnaire, so the question here is to how say not question, but the request here is really to double check, again, that we are capturing accurately the input coming from the SO/ACs, but also analyze the response. It sounds, from some discussion on the mailing list, there are some kind of, say,

confusion regarding the response and maybe some concern that maybe they are kind of dismissing some elements of diversity. So this is kind of the area that we have to work on. Okay?

So yes, Bernie, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Just a note, as we had noted earlier, the staff will be ready to give your document an edit any time you are ready, so I'm just reiterating that proposal. It had been mentioned earlier in the group that you might need some editing people to go through the document when it's advanced enough. You are probably getting close, so if you feel you still need that, staff stands ready to do that and you just have to tell us and we'll be glad to go through it. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, thanks, Bernie. I think that will be definitely helpful. I mean, both of us, I mean, both Fiona and I are not native English speaking so any editing would be helpful for us. And also maybe we need kind of a second eye here as to maybe to see if everything is clear or if there is some area maybe that is confusing that we need, maybe, to rephrase. So I would welcome such support and help.

So is it possible to share the Google Doc in the Adobe Connect? And starting with maybe the recommendation. I tried to say that orally, but I guess that's not easy for everyone to follow and it's probably better to go through the Google Doc through the Adobe Connect.

Okay, sorry, Brenda, not the spreadsheet, but, yeah, the Google Doc.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, I'll get working on that. Maybe oh, there we go!

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Brenda.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks.

Let's go to the Recommendation section. Okay, so can everyone see the Recommendation section? So I think for Recommendation 1 that well, I don't see any comment on that. I think we just advise people to double check here and if they see anything that we need to change here.

The second recommendation that is in the SO/AC/group that ICANN should identify those elements of diversity and the elements of the diverse that are mandated by the ICANN bylaws and those volunteered adopted by the SO/AC/group [Reading. How it is relevant to their role? Here it's a minor change. But, again, this is one of the areas where we have discussion is how much kind of flexibility the group has with regard to identify I'm not going to say prioritizing, but what they think is more relevant to their case, so that's something to be careful here about.

The other section is measuring diversity, Recommendation Number 3 based on the response 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. That they should [indiscernible] so there was not much comment here.

Recommendation Number 4, each SO/AC/group should identify how each element of diversity will be measured and monitored within their group. So again, I think what we get here is a material proposal.

The next recommendation we went back and forth on, the ICANN staff should be made [Reading] to the Board [Reading] and the community. The comment here was with regard to the rest, which is about, I think, the role of the CEO. And the concern here as I understand is kind of too specific and is kind of getting on the detail of how it should be done. And in the previous discussion we said that we need to put the requirement. So we should here put the requirement, what we are expecting, what we want, and not kind of not advising a specific way to do so.

And I see something shared by Finn in the chat and he is suggesting to delete that part. So here he recommends to delete, to remove that one. Do we need to kind of replace it with the requirement and so not necessarily mentioning the CEO or the specific, say, the staff here and what they should do. But here maybe just clarifying what we are expecting here. Or, are we fine with the previous part that describes what is expected in terms of collection [indiscernible] recording data information. Any recommendations here? Are we fine with removing that part or not? Or do you want to that we should kind of replace it with something else?

Okay, yes, Bernie, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Rafik. Just not a comment if this should be replaced or not, that's for the group to decide, more from whatever shape the recommendation finally takes. Just to give you a view from the other side, the ICANN side, when they get that and if it gets approved to actually be implemented through all the processes that we have here, what staff are going to need to actually put this in place is a clear understanding of what is required so that they can measure if they have been successful in implementing it, in implementing what you're requesting. So always keep that in mind in that, you know, in the

recommendations that you make, are they clear? Will what, and this is a very important part, within the clarity of that recommendation, if you have suggestions about how staff should measure that it has met the requirements of the recommendation, that's really useful because sometimes staff will, you know, struggle with trying to find elements to measure if they have done a good job in implementing this. And so and then the community feels sometimes a little lost when they go back to it a few years later and say, well, that's not what we were expecting. So just trying to set the stage for what staff needs to do once you get all of this approved. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernie. I think that's the point we tried to make several times is really to describe here requirements, what we like, but not how that should be done. And I recall on the last call you mentioned that we will get some guidelines regarding, I think, the recommendation. I'm not sure if I understood correctly at that time, but I think that's how we should write our recommendation. So is it going to be okay, so do you want to comment here, Bernie?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Just to say, yes, I've drafted a version of that document before Johannesburg and it sort of got lost in the shuffle of face to face meeting and ICANN meeting and summer time in the northern hemisphere. The document is drafted, working through the various levels trying to get the okay so we can distribute it to the groups.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. I guess when we have that document it will help us, probably giving us some guidance, but what we can do in terms of reviewing the recommendation in the future is we try to see if the recommendation is clear in terms of requirements, that it indicates what we are requesting to avoid any confusion, and also to see if we are giving any kind of, say,

target, metrics and so on so that's something we can measure against later on and the time of implementation. So I guess the requirement should be enough self explanatory on what we want to achieve and so the staff can look at the implementation and see the feasibility of such recommendation. And, yeah, so we need maybe to think about this kind of to see if we can put some I'm not sure of the correct wording, but regarding the acceptance here that we will check the implementation if it's matching the requirement or not.

I'm not sure, Bernie, is this an old or new hand? I guess it's an old hand.

Okay, so I guess for now, for Recommendation 5, we can remove that section and try to, maybe to add more to the requirement. And so here, I guess, this part was providing resources. We are expecting that the resources will be provided here, so it's not necessarily needed. But maybe what we need to emphasize is what we are expecting here while we for which purpose we are asking those resources. So why we need those resources. And I see that we are trying to describe the different tasks, so maybe we need to check if that's enough.

With regard to [indiscernible] since we are talking about the collection and storage of diversity information, I heard from some and I think there was a comment previously with regard to the privacy policy and data protection here. Since we are asking to get more kind of personal information here, and some of them may be sensitive, so we have to kind of maybe, we need to add more here, at least a mention. I think we added about data protection in another section in the report, but I think here we maybe need to reiterate this. I think this is quite important. And more with the current context in ICANN when we talk about GDBR and so on. So I think it's important if we are asking for collection of data, we need to explain the purpose and why and also see maybe kind of to assess the risks here and also if the current privacy

policy enough or not. So this is maybe something we should have in mind. And maybe add some notes here if it's possible so we can cover that later on.

Okay, any comments on this? On this recommendation? Any suggestions?

Okay. So Recommendation Number 6, ICANN community support by ICANN staff should publish an annual report summarizing the key diversity measures and trends. Okay, I don't see any comment here, but I guess maybe since we are asking for key diversity measures and trends, maybe we should give guidance by what we mean by diversity measure. Since also I think we are describing diversity element, probably we maybe should probably apply that to the measures.

Any comment on this recommendation? Any questions? Okay.

Next, Recommendation Number 7, ICANN community should engage in bottom up process to develop a long term strategy for the promotion of diversity in both participation and leadership. I think maybe it's too general. It doesn't indicate something kind of specific. Yeah, it's quite general, that we need to engage, but maybe this needs more clarification.

Yes, Bernie, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. I was going to state exactly that. These are the kind of recommendations that, you know, can sometimes be termed as fluffy because it's hard to grasp them in any way to implement them. And it's almost impossible to figure out metrics to see if we implemented them properly. So this is a classical example of a recommendation that will, A, cause ulcers and headaches for staff to understand what they should be doing with this,

and, B, can cause heartache for the community who worked on creating them because they may not get what they want out of it.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernie. So that's why so I guess we can put a note here, put a note here about Recommendation Number 7, I think it needs reworded to make it more specific on what we are expecting. And the same, I think, for Recommendation Number 5.

Okay, any comment or suggestion here? So I think this needs some work, it would be really helpful to put some comments and proposals in terms of what you are suggestions in process, to go into some details and in terms of the requirement, what we are expecting here from such process.

Okay, Recommendation Number 8, the ICANN committee should examine the appropriateness of current diversity requirements for prominent leadership roles and recommend and document any changes. Okay, I'm not sure using the word "appropriateness" here, the term "appropriateness" is kind of appropriate [laughter]. And, yeah, I think probably what we are asking is that the community should do a review regarding the legal basis of the diversity requirement and make a recommendation. So I guess this is kind of we are suggesting here a review process, which I think it is somehow thinking through it in the [indiscernible], so that can maybe be reworded and we can use the existing process or are we asking here for a separate process regarding diversity?

Yes, Bernie, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: To notes here. First, "the" community, very hard for staff to understand exactly what you are referring to on that. And, two, referring to the ATRT, I will

simply note that in the SO/AC accountability that recently completed its public comment, they were looking to put in some additional verifications for SO/AC accountability in the ATRT and a comment came back from the Board on that specific point, that the ATRT recommendations were already pretty loaded and that it would be difficult to add in other dimensions to an ATRT process at this point. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, thanks, Bernie. I think the first step here is to maybe reword the recommendation to make it about reviewing diversity requirements, make a recommendation. But I guess to be covered by ATRT or maybe suggesting it to be done within a new process to be defined, maybe that's something we can discuss. So I think we should discuss that there should be a regular review regarding the diversity.

And I see Renata is in the queue. Yes, Renata, go ahead.

>> RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I see this as prominent leadership roles and what I see actually in this recommendation is the idea of diversity for leadership roles, so perhaps that's why I [indiscernible] is there because there's a need to have a balance in all SO/AC as leadership roles as well, so we just had a conversation on the list about leadership group not being diverse enough, so it could probably be reviewing diversity strategies and initiatives and whether they come back to [indiscernible] indicative of processes that lead to diversity in leadership roles. That seems to be quite an important element of this recommendation and it's not that straightforward really. Bernard, it's a very important comment that Bernard made about what the [indiscernible] community is, so for example the [indiscernible] leadership has to come from SO/ACs to have this one [indiscernible]. So I'm not sure here how to go further other than

to say review and ascertain perhaps diversity in the leadership roles. Just that comment. Thanks.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Renata. I think in the one recommendation we are asking explicitly the SO/AC/group. So I think maybe, yeah, I think the comment from Bernie was right here, we need to be careful about choosing this kind of vague ICANN community and probably we are asking the SO/ACs and the groups if they have chartered operating procedures and so on that can that say enforce any diversity requirement instead of asking kind of this community. So maybe we can clarify on this to replace ICANN community with something more specific.

I think maybe, I'm not sure we should talk just about leadership roles because I think what we are trying to see first in diversity in terms of participation and I think also that includes the diversity in the leadership, but I guess the recommendation is kind of more general as to review the whole requirement and not just for something maybe specific. And also I think using the term "prominent." I think when we talk about leadership, leadership roles, that is important and we are expecting volunteers to spend time on doing a lot of work for the community here, so I guess sometimes this kind of wording can be kind of controversial, I guess.

So I guess this is one that probably a recommendation that needs some rework. Yes, Renata, please go ahead.

>> RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I agree, it talks about the participation, but there is, like, the percentage is lower in leadership participation than in participation as a member, for instance. So this is perhaps why the expression for leadership role is needed here. Just to clarify, so maybe conducive to conduct the leadership roles diversity as well, so [indiscernible] for members participation and for leadership to [indiscernible] just that comment.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks. What I'm thinking, Recommendation 8, what I think you are trying to say is some review process that can cover many areas regarding diversity. So we can try to make here maybe a list of several areas that should be covered in review process, like diversity in terms of participation, diversity within the leadership, and so on. Because I don't think we can just focus in one area. I think this is something we discussed before, when we are trying here to talk about diversity, it's not just about leadership, we need to be careful here. We need diversity at all levels. So we can say that if we can try to reword this recommendation, that it's not the community, maybe the SO/ACs and groups should have community review process for the diversity requirement, for the different areas including like the diversity on participation, diversity on leadership, and, I mean, diversity on the policymaking process and so on. Something like that that maybe can be more kind of exhaustive somehow.

Yes, Bernie, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Rafik. I'll go back to my SO/AC accountability example. Some of the discussions with respect to the comment about the ATRT reviews already being full enough, the SO/AC accountability group was then as an alternative considering making some recommendations that the SO/AC specific reviews be tasked at looking at certain points. And that's a mechanism that is well understood, that's in place, that probably has a little room to add in some things. So if that's of interest to this group, you probably could craft some of your recommendations so that they could be suggesting to the SOs and ACs in the reviews, or suggesting to the organization that the SO/AC reviews could include certain elements of reviewing diversity and reporting on that. Thank you.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernie. I think what you are talking about, kind of the structural of the different SO/ACs. Personally my only experience is the review for the [indiscernible] and I do recall that, I mean, their recommendation was about this kind of diversity, maybe not specifically about it, but there was something around diversity. I guess that's one option is to maybe emphasize that we should have the diversity issue in the current review process, but maybe also we can check if we need something something for discussion, if we need something more specific and not included on existing issues, this is something we have to discuss and see and weigh the pros and cons.

So Bernie, I have a request, is it possible to kind of maybe to share in the mailing list the draft from the SO/AC accountability subgroup? I understand that maybe there are some kind of, not necessarily overlap, but maybe there are some areas where we can have some common ground and we can [indiscernible] on what they did already. Yes, Bernie, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, like all other working groups, all their meetings and all their materials are up on the Wiki, so I'll post that in the chat here and you can find the latest documents of everything, the transcripts and everything else. And I would say it's not a mountain of information because they've only had two meetings so far. So really if you just go to the Wiki and find the most recent entries, you probably can go through all of this stuff very quickly and get an understanding of where they have things that could be of interest to this group. And I agree with you, I think there are probably several ideas that the SO/AC accountability group are working with that could be very relevant to this group.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Bernie. I think we have at this point the [indiscernible] from the SO/AC accountability subgroup in our subgroup, too, so I think we can use her as a resource, too.

Okay, let's see what they did already and see if we can build on that.

And I see some comments also in the chat regarding the metrics. Okay, so please know that we need to work on this recommendation. It needs some, maybe, work to see how we should do this not how to do, but what we are expecting from such review.

Okay. Bernie, is it old or new hand? Okay, old hand.

So the next recommendation, number 9, is that [indiscernible] ICANN should interpret goals or aspirations [indiscernible] in both participation and leadership. So I guess this is regarding setting maybe some objectives. Probably just identifying goals and aspirations, maybe that can be generic, not necessarily something that can be easy to measure, but probably can ask them to have kind of maybe specific target date that they need to reach and so we can kind of benchmark against it. I don't see any comment on that one. I think we can maybe make a small change to the wording here regarding any targets. Any comments on this one?

The next Recommendation, it's a totally new one and I think it was added by today, I think it was added by I'm not sure. Yeah, it was added by Renata. So each So/AC/group within ICANN should identify goals or aspirations for improving and promoting diversity in both participation and leadership, either formal or informal according to priority. If there is consideration [Reading].

Okay, in the previous recommendation we are talking about setting goals, maybe targets, and here is about identifying gaps. So I'm not sure if there is maybe some overlap between the both, but I'm curious here to hear what the difference is and what we are trying to achieve with this recommendation.

Yes, Renata, please go ahead.

>> RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I was just explaining why I entered that recommendation is because when reviewing the consolidated input, it's quite clear there are some elements of diversity that are pointed out and they are not mentioned at all in the input responses. So it's either something non-existent or not addressed or there's just a lack of, perhaps, understanding or even knowledge about such a need for or such element for such diversity such as age diversity. I can have the next [indiscernible] program which [indiscernible] 18 year old to 40 year old participation and you have none of the [indiscernible] came back with any specific program or addressing the age diversity elements. So given we have the [indiscernible] points out elements of diversity, I think it is important to have a recommendation that says if an SO/AC has considerable [indiscernible] or gaps [lost audio]

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: I think we lost Renata here. Renata, can you hear us?

>> RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Hello?

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Hello. Yes.

>> RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Now can you hear me?

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, we can hear you now.

>> RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Okay, sorry. So I was just mentioning that I've entered that recommendation because there are some elements of diversity indicated that aren't even mentioned about some of the SO/AC because either they don't have any way to deal with that or no knowledge of how to do an initiative that would address that. And I think it there are important priority gaps to be addressed for specific strategies. And that would be my comment regarding that. Thanks.

>> RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Renata.

So I think we are asking the SO/ACs to kind of, let's say, identify an element of diversity for them in the beginning. So they can identify some and then like in the previous recommendation, we kind of set some targets for those elements on diversity. So I guess that will be cover somehow, but when they see they have targets, that maybe they identify new elements of diversity, that it implicitly means there's some gap they want to fill. But I guess maybe what you are trying to do here is that they should develop some strategy initiative or efforts to cover those cuts so that they will [indiscernible] that will be clear from their targets. Okay, so maybe we can reword on that, that they need to develop some strategies to kind of maybe, kind of just asking them to so we are asking the SOs to set a target [indiscernible] and to build some strategies to fill any gap they can find.

Yeah, I mean if they identify the initiatives or strategies, they will have to prioritizing anyway because it depends on the resources yeah, the resources and the kind of time they have. Yeah, I guess we can reword this on that and to emphasize about building strategies.

Okay, so let's put a note here that we should maybe rework. Thanks, Renata, for the explanation. I think everyone here is discovering this recommendation for the first time, so I guess we need some time to digest and think about the wording.

Okay. Any comment on this? And we have four minutes left in the call, so probably we need to wrap up soon. Thanks, Renata.

Let's put a quick note here that we need to work on the wording for Recommendation Number 10. So I think we have to work on for number 7, 8, 9, 5 and 10. So these are the Recommendations that need some work.

The [Reading] participation and leadership. I guess we can replace ICANN community by SO/AC/groups, so the different groups they have, they have their own practice regarding diversity or their own experiences and they can share that among themselves. So this is just maybe a minor change here to indicate which group will do that.

Okay, and I think that's it in terms of Recommendations.

So we have now kind of several Recommendations that need some rework and probably to add more explanation. And, again, as we discussed, it's important to think about this recommendation in terms of requirements. So to kind of explain what we are expecting, what we want to do, without going into the how or the way or the manner it should be implemented. And also it's important to put some kind of targets or objective and metrics that we can evaluate against it. And another point is really that we need to be more specific. Like Recommendation Number 7, it's kind of too generic that it cannot really be implemented easily and it can be interpreted in too many ways.

Okay, so we will try to reword those in the coming days and we will try to make an issue list of maybe from the document on the area where we have several comments and we need to solve them. So we should continue the discussion in the mailing list until the next call, I think next week, and also on Friday.

So any comments, questions? All right. Hearing none, seeing no one in the queue, I guess we can adjourn the call for today with just one minute left. [Laughter]. So we made it. Thanks, everyone, for attending the call. And for your comments. Please, if you review the document, put your suggestions, your comments, we will try to compile that and continue the discussion within the mailing list so we can include as much as possible the participants from the mailing list and we'll try to solve the edits as much as possible.

So thanks, again, and see you soon. Bye bye.