
DIVERSITY SUBGROUP

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

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

Hello, can you hear me?

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

>> Rafik Dammak: Thanks, everyone, for joining today's call. 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 with the help from Bernard and we'll review it today.

So you can see that it's shorter than the previous version and the recommendation were kind of re-worded, rephrased to make them more clear.

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

>> Coming up.

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

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.

We got kind of, say, short time window since we are aiming from the beginning to submit by the coming plenary, which I think is the end of this month. And we have to submit one week prior to it. So we'll try to solve as much as possible in the call, hopefully, and then to make a call for consensus in order to get that submitted in due time to the plenary. Let's go to the recommendation first, I think. In recommendation 1, there were some comments regarding two diversity elements, one about physical disability and diversity. And so I think recalling on the discussion, the mailing list, I think we can keep those wording first, for example, from diversity, that's what we use in the questionnaire and also the same for physical disability. And in fact, we had kind of a back and forth discussion about this one. So if I'm not mistaken, we can keep this and so forth.

Any comments on this or any question? [inaudible] agreeing with that. We can keep them as it is now. Okay.

Moving to the next recommendation and addition here in recommendation number 2 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 edit here to add diversity criteria, okay?

Any comments on this one? Yes, Julie, please go ahead.

>> It's very, very 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 commas around diversity criteria in the brackets because we're really sort of just designing that term in that way. So I'd take out the inverted commas, thanks.

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

>> Rafik Dammak: 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 its levels, including leadership, bracket, inverted comments [or commas, hard to hear], diversity criteria, inverted commas, bracket. I'm saying we don't need the inverted commas there, just the brackets. It's very pedantic, I know.

>> Rafik Dammak: 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 in, how do you say, realtime? So not to lose those comments while we try to go through? If you have access to the Google doc. Okay, thanks.

Okay, any comments on that recommendation? Okay. So we can move to the next one, recommendation number 3. And here, I think, yeah, it's also small edit just to define the diversity criteria and just putting diversity criteria only. So yeah.

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

So for this one, yeah, I think we can accept those changes. Moving to recommendation number 4, again, I think just replacing 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 one. So publish. Each SO, AC group should use the information from the initial assessment to

define and publish the [efficient?] website and the diversity criteria, objectives, and strategy for achieving as well as the 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's 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 4.

Next, for recommendation number 5 that just review to change. But asking here if we're fine with the whole new wording of this recommendation?

Okay. Good. Um... moving now to recommendation number 6. So it's also a small edit here, just adding the term related. If we can I can also identify staff or community resources that can assist in AC or other component of community diversity-related activities and strategies. Okay, just yeah. It's kind of 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 ICANN staff publish process for dealing with diversity-related 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 that, yes, Julie, please go ahead.

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

>> Rafik Dammak: 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 not just about

adding strategies, objectives, and so on, but also how we handle complaints related to diversity. Okay.

Going to recommendation number 8. And this is more, I think, the most elaborated one. And it's related really to, let's say, the previous idea of having diversity office. But here to be more kind of detailed among the different requirement and the expectation of [inaudible]. So what it saying, [off microphone] should support [inaudible] communication of diversity information in the following way. Create a diversity section in the ICANN website. The other, and maintain all different diversity information in all place.

Reduce annual diversity reports for ICANN [inaudible] the annual information and provide a global analysis of trends. And we have recommendation for improvements, where appropriate. This should also include some form of reporting of diversity complaints, include diversity information provided 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 an analysis but also a recommendation 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 should do in terms of diversity.

I think I will [lend?] support for this recommendation, in general. And okay, I see that Julie is in the queue. Yeah, Julie, please go ahead.

>> Thanks, actually, you raised a good point, but when I initially looked at this site, that aspect of it hadn't occurred to me. So what you're questioning with this last change by adding in recommendations for improvement where appropriate is whether, since this is a staff action, whether that's really an appropriate thing for staff to be doing. It's really more the community that should be developing the recommendations. I guess, is that the concern you're expressing, Rafik? In which case, I think you made a very good point. That, perhaps, is not an appropriate thing for staff to be doing.

>> Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie. Okay, I see that no one is in the queue, but before that, I want to say, maybe we can [inaudible] toward any concern here is that the community may be work with the staff in term of recommendation. But, okay, maybe before elaborating more on this, let's go to Bernard. I think he wants to comment here. Please go ahead.

>> Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Rafik. If you think about it, technically in the previous recommendations, we got the SO's and AC's actually 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 about 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 on the recommendations coming out of the SO's and AC's, if that would solve people's problems with this.

>> Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Bernie. Can you [inaudible] and see that Julie is in the queue. Please go ahead.

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

>> Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Julie, here, the staff will help the community to summarize the recommendation. Just to be sure, where the community is, how I say, I'm trying to double check that the community is providing the recommendation. So we need to be sure we have a recommendation that the community is providing 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, Sebastien wishes 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 don't entirely 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 independent role in making this recommendation. I think we should make sure we're following her original proposal. Thank you.

>> Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks, Sebastien. Okay, so... I'm trying to understand here. I think Sebastien, the point he's making is I think, let's say, coming back to the idea of a 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 [inaudible] the requirement. And so we tried here, as we put the different bullet 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 that's why we are trying to elaborate. So this is my understanding here.

Okay. I think let's move on to commenting, yes, Sebastien, 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 real 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, 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 the issue. I think there is a solution. And I remain convinced the solution should be an independent approach. Thank you very much.

>> Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Sebastien. Importantly, you are going here through an interpreter, I think I could understand 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 independent from the staff to do all these tasks. And okay, so when we say independent, I mean, this is kind of really, let's say, different thing. We try first to describe different role or requirement while expecting, but here you talk about independent, which is kind of the nature of whatever structure or I'm not sure who will handle this.

So this is different than the discussion, but I don't think we let's see how we can proceed, let's discuss anyway. Yes, Julie, please go ahead.

>> Thanks, Rafik. I think I partly agree with Sebastien and partly disagree. I certainly agree with him saying that the recommendation needs to be independent and that is coming from community. And I think that's what the amended words suggested intended to capture all that staff are doing is gathering up the recommendations that the community have already made.

And since they're summarizing the staff, certainly not making recommendations. However, you won't be surprised to hear that I do disagree with the proposed diversity office. I think that's not a proposal that is going to be well-received in the community. It's recently intensive. I'm simply proposing that the staff role has put in recommendation is the way to go. And I guess a number of people support the idea of a diversity office. And a number don't.

So I'm not sure how we resolve it. But I think we have to head in the direction of a recommendation that we think is going to receive community support and the plenary and then, more broadly, in the SO's and AC's. Thanks.

>> Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Julie. Okay, maybe just trying to divide the issues here. I think, if we talk a lot about diversity, office has become kind of a contentious point. And there is a lot of concern that we are talking about a specific solution. So let's put that aside for now.

When I hear that it should be an independent [role?], I think that's something we can really [omit?] is that we need something independence from the staff, which was one that whoever kind of maybe -- I'm not sure how we can call them, if it's independent and not staff, we need to find the new wording without talking about office because that imply a specific solution. Maybe we can say an independent role. Not sure even we can use the word [instruction?] because that can imply the office somehow.

So kind of find this independent entity that will handle all those task independently and [superlatively?] from the staff. If that's the concern, that we want this to be done in the way that does not involve the staff, it that's the concern. Yes, Julie, please go ahead.

>> Thanks. Yeah, I wasn't agreeing with that concept. I think what we're trying to do is define the way in which we see staff supporting the [inaudible] activities. It is a staff role, I don't agree it's an independent role. I think it's the way we want staff to help us. And I think that's how it should be presented using this wording. So I don't agree with the concept of independent.

>> Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Julie. I understand there is disagreement about how an independent role office or anything else that were asking that should be the staff doing this role. Trying to think here how we can solve this. I am kind of concerned because we are in a situation that we kind of all have a rough consensus would be really complicated to put this recommendation.

So we need to find a way how we can find a common ground and understanding the concern from each side. So let's again try to think about, so for example, let's try to think about the [inaudible] on the ICANN side, something to really be done by staff anyway. So and also, for example, [inaudible], in fact, is the staff doing that already? So are we kind of to ask to duplicate the work? So kind of try to think. And then in the meantime, I see that Cheryl raises her hand and she was in the queue. Cheryl, do you want to comment?

>> Thanks, Rafik, it's Cheryl for the record. Look, I really must reiterate that we've heard the proposals for independent outfits, et cetera, it is in many of our views, mine included, not a proposal but will gain sufficient traction in the either the plenary or, of course, when we take this to the chair in an organized fashion.

And I also, one, would rather get a whole lot of very good recommendations through and was remembering this was part of a continuous improvement program and whether there were outfits that could continue on and, who knows, could get sufficient traction to be implemented later. I think the independence of the recommendations being clearly those from community is annotated accurately or, should I say, with the new text that Julie supplied earlier on in chat, which, if you add the plus one means the support for, go up considerable traction as [inaudible].

If we go back to try and rediscuss how we can wedge in a concept in of an office at this point in time, I personally suggest it is a rabbit hole that could very well delay some aspects of the rest of our work and that worries me deeply. Thank you.

>> Rafik Dammak: Go ahead, Bernard.

>> Unfortunante we're still discussing this. When I started this, when I starting writing, I thought we had gone through this a number of times and enough times. But I guess I was wrong. The other thing I can simply remind people are, one, given where we are in the timeline, the reality is that we can only do public consultation on this. And, therefore, we should try to aim for things that will get traction, as discussed by Julie and Cheryl because anything that gets seriously rejected will cause a problem and will come back to the group, and you're going to have to decide some very hard decisions when this comes out.

It is my estimate these things, as Julie and Cheryl have said, that these things will not -- the idea of diversity office will not make it through at some point and that is just a reality of the thing. And as far as independence is concerned, it's only the So's and AC's themselves that decide what strategies and objectives they are creating to increase diversity that are supported

by staff. So I really don't understand the notion of the fact that staff's only job specifically in this recommendation is to gather up all that information and publish it in a workable fashion.

That is a direct reflection of what has been proposed by the SO's and AC's removes independence. I'm sorry, I don't see it.

>> Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Bernie. Sebastien, go ahead.

>> Thank you, Sebastien speaking. Well, I think there is disagreement at this point. I don't think we understand each other, so we need to work on that. But what I would suggest is that you move forward with the text as you have it.

I would like to reiterate that there are a certain number of people within the community who also agree with it, but so be it. If there are things that you don't understand as to why we are trying to put forward some proposals, it means we need to continue to debate on this, but I think it will be for later. It will be at the time when we move to a future ICANN. Thank you very much.

>> Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Sebastien. So I find [inaudible] working here. So I understand you are disagreeing, but I guess we can continue with this text and also adding the changes for the proposals by Julie to clarify that new part. Is there part of the community that is supporting such office, I think they would have a chance [inaudible] at the plenary and then other consultation to express. And then a subgroup, we can respond to that. We are trying to find a common ground of that concerns us. We are trying to make a progress 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 the 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 exactly the same recommendations as the first half.

>> Rafik Dammak: 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 this 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 roll 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.

>> Rafik Dammak: 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 disagreements. So to see if we are agreeing 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, 59-DC

>> Rafik Dammak: 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].

