
DIVERSITY SUBGROUP

Thursday, August 10, 2017 - 13:00 to 14:00

Hello, everyone. I think we are now it's time to start. So can we start the recording, please?

Hello, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear you, I believe the meeting is being recorded.

>> Thanks, everyone, for joining today. So as you can see in the agenda, it's the continuation of a previous call and to continue working on the draft report. However, at this time, as you can see, the action items, we get a new, clean version. And with the help from Bernard, and we'll review it today.

So you can see it's a shorter than the previous version and the recommendation were kind of rewarded, rephrased to make them more clear (reworded)

So I guess we can move to that as part of the agenda. Is it possible to share the Google doc?

>> Coming up.

>> Okay. Okay, thanks. So what we try to do today is to solve to review the recommendation and to [inaudible] the comments. And based on some discussion in the meeting, I think we can access several of the announcements.

We got kind of, say, short time window, since we are aiming from the beginning to some meet by the plenary, which I think is the end of this month. And we have to submit one week prior

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.

to it. So we'll try to solve as much adds possible in the call. And then to make a call, in order to get that submitted into due time to the plenary. If we go to the recommendation first, I think. If the recommendation one, there were some comments regarding two diversity elements, one about physical disability, and diversity. And so I think we're calling on the discussion, the mailing list, I think we can keep those wording first from the diversity, that's what we use in the questionnaire and also for the same for physical disability. And in fact, we had kind of a back and forth discussion about this one. So we can keep this and so forth

Any comments on this or any question? [inaudible]. We can keep them as it is now. Okay. Moving to the next recommendation and addition here in the recommendation number two is in relation to mentioning the charter and the ICANN by those. Okay and, I think it's acceptable amendments here

And also we have another [inaudible] here to add a diversity criteria, okay?

Any comments on this one? Yes, Julie

>> It's pedantic, but I think it's a good amendment. The only thing I would say is we don't need the inverted or we don't need the inverted comments around diversity criteria in the brackets because we're really sort of just designing that term in that way. So I'd take out inverted comments, thanks,

>> Just to clarify what I mean, it says sorry, is that understandable what I'm suggesting?

>> I was going to ask if you could clarify a little bit by what you mean by inverted?

>> Okay, so it's saying at the moment applicable to each of the levels, including leadership, bracket, inverted comments, diversity criteria, inverted cam mas, bracket, I'm saying we don't need the inverted comments there, just the brackets, it's sort of pedantic, I know.

>> Understood. Okay. It's kind of small. Yeah, I mean... yeah. I think that's doable, no problem here. Okay. Yeah, we can do that. Maybe just to in term of efficiency, Bernie, can you kind of make the edits how do you say, in realtime? So not to lose those comments while we try and go through? If you have access to the Google doc. Okay, thanks.

Okay, any comments on the recommendation? Okay. So we can move to the next one recommendation number three. And here I think, yeah, it's also small edit just to define the diversity criteria just to putting diversity criteria only. So yeah.

Okay. Are people fine with this wording? Or this recommendation? Okay. See that we're okay with that. [inaudible] okay. Thanks, guys.

So for this one, yeah, I think we can accept those changes. Moving to recommendation number four, again, I think just replacing the diversity, yeah, diversity by let's see... the diversity criteria. Okay so adding diversity criteria here. Let me check if it's not changing the meaning or adding any one. So publish. Who should use the information from the initial assessment to find the publish the website and diversity criteria and [off microphone] and strategy and timeline for doing so.

Okay so we added here diversity criteria because before we were putting diversity objectives. And I think adding newest expectation, but I don't think that changed too much in the meaning or the intent of this recommendation.

So are we fine with this small edit? Okay.

I think we are fine with this recommendation number four.

Next, we have for recommendation number five that we need to change. And asking here if we're fine with this whole new wording of this recommendation.

Okay. Good. Um... moving to recommendation number six. So it's also a small edit here, just adding the term related. As we can I can also identify staff or community resources that can assist in [reading] and activities and strategies. Okay, just yeah. It's just immaterial. I guess we can accept this one too.

Okay. So recommendation number 7, there was no edit, but simply here, we're saying we can publish process for dealing with diversity complaints and issues. And it's kind of a newer wording for recommendation. I think to elaborate more into the implementation. But just to check here, are you okay with this one? Oh, I see, yes Julie.

>> Sorry, I meant to put a check, not my hand. Sorry.

>> It's fine. Okay, so I guess here we are just recommending that we should have a process to deal with the complaint. I think this is a good one. This is [inaudible] about adding strategies, objectives and so on and also how we handle complaints related to diversity. Okay.

Going to recommendation number 8. And this is more the most elaborated one, and it's related really to let's say, the previous idea of having a diversity office. And here to be more kind of detailed among the different requirement and the expectation of the [inaudible]. So what it says, [off microphone] for communication of diversity information in the following ways. Create a diversity in the ICANN website. And maintain all diversity information in all place. [off microphone] [reading] for ICANN and the annual information and provide a global an analysis of trends and we have recommendation for improvements, where appropriate. And this should also include some form of reporting of diversity complaints, and include diversity information from annual diversity report in the ICANN annual report. Okay.

So... let's check one thing. So here we have an addition. With regard to the annual report, it's not just to provide a recommendation or an ANSIs or improvement, where appropriate. And this comes from the [inaudible], and I want to double check if you are fine with this suggestion, knowing how sometimes it can be sensitive in that regard for some part of the community that kind of let's say the staff will tell the community what to do in terms of diversity

I think there are support for this maybe recommendation in general, and okay I see that Julie is in the cue. Go ahead.

>> You raise add good point when I initially looked at this site, this aspect hasn't a cured to me. So what you're questioning with this last change by adding and recommendations for improvement where appropriate is whether since this is a staff section, whether that's really an appropriate thing for staff to be doing. Tats really more the community that should be developing the recommendations. I guess is that the concern you're expressing, rad, in which

case, I think you made a good point that that's perhaps not an appropriate thing for staff to be doing.

>> Thanks, Julie, I want to check if anyone is in the cue, I want to check if there's a concern that the community may work with the staff in terms of recommendation and maybe before elaborating more on this, let's go to Bernie, I think he wants to comment here.

>> Thank you, if you think about it, the previous recommendations, we got the [inaudible] AC's taking on that job of making recommendations for improvements. And so maybe what this could be and I fully understand your comment. And actually if I'm thinking about it while you're talking about it, I think that's very applicable. Maybe a slight change, which would make this actually okay is of trend. So is provide information on the recommendations from the SO's and AC's as opposed to staff making recommendations? Because this is a section on capturing and analyzing information on diversity. And we're asking the SO's and AC's in the previous recommendations to make recommendations to improve their stuff. So if we do this slight wording tweak here with respect to the recommendations, then it's about capturing and reporting of the recommendations coming from the SO's and AC's, if that would solve people's problems with this.

>> Thanks, Bernie, can you [inaudible] and see Julie is in the cue. Go ahead.

>> Thanks, Rafik, I put suggested text in the chat. My suggestion is we say and provide a global analysis of trends and summarize community recommendation for improvements where appropriate. Does that work?

>> Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie, here the staff will help to summarize the recommendation, and to be sure, where the community is how I say, I'm trying to double check the community is providing the recommendation. So we need to be sure we have a recommendation that the community is providing a recommendation. Okay. I see that [inaudible] is disagreeing here. Maybe if you want to explain what are your concern? yes, please go ahead.

>> Please go ahead, I'm not sure if you are muted but we cannot hear you. Okay um... okay so um...

>> Okay, [inaudible] wishing to take the floor on the French channel.

>> Okay, yes, please go ahead.

>> I think I'm sorry, I need you to say [inaudible] I definitely disagree with the proposal that's been made. But last week, we discussed this in writing, and I think it would be useful to have some kind of definition. I know there's people on holiday, so it's hard to reach a consensus. As regards to the role of diversity, I think we should ensure that recommendations are made independently. And I'm not entirely sure... that this proposal comes from the right people. So I think... I know I'm late on reading the proposal and [inaudible] made this proposal but she's on holiday. And I'm late in commenting the proposal she made. But I would still like to suggest that we implement more in independent role in making this recommendations. I think we should make sure we're following her original proposal. Thank you.

>> Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. Okay so... I'm trying to understand here. I think the point is making is I think he's let's say, coming back to the idea of diversity office. And I think he was talking about [off microphone] here, so this is kind of my interpretation. So I'm not sure either

if I understood correctly. Maybe just to clarify here that we had discussion back and forth and with regard to this recommendation. And I think what many had concerns that we are kind of jumping into a specific solution or a specific implementation while we should more elaborate [audio out] the requirement. And so we tried here, as we put the points, is to describe a different kind of, let's say, a role not role, but a requirement for [inaudible] with regard to the capture analysis on the communication regarding diversity so the implementation can be different. Let's say, other than having a specific office but to satisfy this kind of requirement. And this is why we are trying to elaborate. So this is my understanding here.

Okay I think let's move on to commenting, yes, please go ahead.

>> Thank you, Sebastien speaking, I don't know if it's the issue of the language. When you are in a different language channel that you have, you know, the interpreter and I know they do their jobs really well. But I don't quite understand what has not been understood in my message. I understand what is working, I understand that Cheryl says it didn't have any traction, but yes, yes, I agree. But those who proposed it still consider it could be a good solution. This is the interpreter, I'm not hearing Sebastien, I wonder if he dropped. So we need to make sure that we gather data, that we make proposals and what we are saying is the staff is going to do this. So I understand that some people think it is the staff's job, however, others do consider that this element is important enough that it should be part of the things that are organized independently from the ICANN staff with their help, their support, but independently. That is why we have this diversity office. That is the main idea. So again, if there are issues, understanding each other, I can speak in English, but I don't believe that's the issue, I don't believe understanding is a issue. I believe there is a solution. And I remain convinced the solution should be an independent approach. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you, Sebastien, importantly you are going through an interpreter, I think I understood you directly if you would speak in French. Anyway. Okay so if I understand correctly, you are really emphasizing we should have an independent structure here for diversity office and independent from staff introduced you will this tasks. And okay so when we say independent, I mean this is kind of really let's say, different thing because we are try first to describe different role or requirement while expecting, but here you talk about independent is just kind of the nature of whatever is structure or I'm not sure who will handle this. So this is different discussion I don't think we let's see how we can [off microphone] but let's discuss anyway. Yes, Julie, please go ahead.

[connection lost for captioner]

>> I understand that you are disagreeing but I guess we can continue with this and also adding the changes for the proposals to clarify that new part. And then a subgroup we can respond to that, and we are trying to find a common ground of that consent, consent, and let's see how things can go.

Okay, sorry, Julie, can you write down again your proposal, I think that was kind of lost because we have this discussion again about the office. And in just to not lose that and trying to clarify here if we are fine with this proposal. Okay so I think that's [off mic] and for a recommendation for improvement, okay? So that's one. Are we okay with this edit? Okay. And [inaudible] before we make the changes in the document.

Moving through the next... okay. So... and to ask you here again because myself was confused because we have the executive summary and we tried to go through that quickly for if recommendation and also we put in a new section to put this in the recommendation section. Can you clarify, it sounds like it's community case somehow.

>> Yes, it is. It was trying to get ahead of it, the group felt it was worth including these recommendations in the report. But the second half is has exactly the same recommendations a the first half.

>> Okay, so as a reminder, in the document, we have to remove a lot of the staff in the document, and we really reduce to the least of the recommendations. So we are [inaudible] about spreading the element of dis and so on. So this kind of that's maybe a concise draft

>> Rafik?

>> Yes, Julie.

>> Sorry to interrupt. My understanding of this document is it is simply proposing new texts for the executive summary and new text for the final section of the report. But it's not suggesting that it delete all of the rest of the report. This is just the new text that we need now to role into the report that we've we have by replacing the executive summary and replacing what was call it had recommendation section, where the section called conclusions and recommendations. That is my interpretation of this document. Is that correct, Bernie? It's not deleting that other stuff we worked on for such a long time? Thanks.

>> No, as I spoke a few minutes ago, this is as agreed last week, I only worked on the recommendations and this is just to show what it could look like from the recommendations

point of view. If this is accepted by the group, then this needs to be integrated into the full document. This is not a replacement for the full document in any way, shape, or form.

>> Thanks, thanks Bernie for the clarification. I was almost puzzled myself. But okay so what we should do, so we have 15 minutes. We went through the recommendations and we made the edits. We'll take those this new version of the recommendation and add them to the previous draft, probably creating a new version, the version number 5. And to we have a kind of to create a clean version and to share it with the group for review. And asking to make a call record regarding the recommendations. I think that's where we'll have all the [inaudible] of agreements. So to see if we are (disagreements) and we are agrees on the recommendations, yeah, questions? So what's the exact date now for submitting documents?

>> One moment, I'll confirm exactly. The plenary is being held on 30, August, 0500. And therefore, documents are due on the 23 of August. 23, 59DC

>> Okay, thanks. Around 14 days to work through that. So if we can get a new clean version by Monday and we have consensus and things go smoothly, I guess we can make it, otherwise, we will have to work on any area of disagreements, before submitting to the plenary. So guys, do you think that's doable? So we can try. I mean, we could kind of [off mic] deadline that we should submit something by [inaudible] meeting, we submitted that, but this we spend time during summer in the [inaudible] this year, and we have holidays to work on this. So we should keep the momentum and try to submit by August. So okay, let me check with [audio out] and ask because she's feeling sick, and work with her in the clean version. And we'll prepare the clean version we shared with Bernie with him first to work on recommendations and we can work on that and replace with the new version of the recommendation, and check the new

draft on Monday. Okay. I think there is a [off mic]. Okay? Any other suggestions? I want to be sure that we are following the process and then letting everyone expressing either endorsement of not or the draft that we want to submit to the plenary.so...

Okay I think that's it for the recommendations. So any other business? Anything else that you want to raise or discuss? So before [off mic] for approving we get back the interpretation so that will be available at the end of this month. And we have this... this service. From the next in this that's the call for today. Thanks, everyone, for awe tending and attending and thanks for your discussion.

>> Thanks, Rafik. Thanks, Bernie.

>> Thanks, everyone, bye.

>> Bye.

[end of call].

