CCWG ACCT PLENARY MEETING
Wednesday, August 30, 2017 - 5:00 to 6:00

>> Good morning everyone. I suggest we wait for another minute and then kick it off.

>> Okay just so that you know I'm having a network issue so I was kicked out of the Adobe room so I can't see the cue at the moment. However, that should not prevent us. So, can I ask you to start the recording, please.

>> Recording is started. Thank you.

>> Thanks very much. So good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is one of the CCWG accountability co-chairs speaking. I would like to welcome you all to this call on the 30th of August 2017 at 5:00 a.m. UTC. And as usual let's start this call with a roll call which as usual we will take from the Adobe room. I would like staff to note apologies from Leon and Jordan Carter and do we have anyone on the phone only and not in the Adobe room so we can add them to the list of attendees? That does not seem to be the case. Do we have anyone who needs to make an update to his or her statement of interest? Does not seem to be the case either. Let me then remained you of the standards of behavior which I'm sure all of you know by now. So, these are the rules we're playing by to make sure we have a friendly working environment. Now let's move to the second agenda item which is the review of the agenda and I do note that Kavouss has indicated in the chat that he would like a point to be added to the agenda. So, Kavouss we're not going to discuss your point but would you be so kind to say the subject of your request.

>> Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. Yes, it is a point that's not clear and that is the column of any subgroup. Nothing has been discussed in CCWG and sometimes there's difficulty to see whether there is a call or not and whether the decision is valid. I did not want to discuss it now but that is something [Indiscernible] subgroups need to address that issue. Maybe [Indiscernible] thank you.

>> Thanks very much Kavouss. So, the topic is quorum in subgroups and I suggest that we add this to agenda item 7 which is AOB. So that we'll get back to that point towards the end of our call. Thanks very much Kavouss for raising that. That allows us to move to the third which is the confirmation by the plenary of transfer of the responsibilities of the CEP subgroup to the IOT. As you know the chair of the sub team dealing with processes had to give up his duty as rapporteur for that sub team and IOT sub team has thankfully accepted the task of adding the CEP sub team topics to its work load and [Indiscernible] has agreed to takeover chairing that part of the work. We have however, never formally confirmed this change of our work location with the plenary which we would like to do today. And that is something that again we would do as we usually take our decisions and that is to ask whether there's any objection to merging the CEP sub team with the IOT subgroup. I was just dropped from the Adobe as well. So, can I have any hands raised on this topic?

>> There are none.

>> Thanks very much Bernie. I guess that allows us to note that plenary has accepted this change. We will however, put into the notes of this meeting that those who have concerns with this merger and who have not been able to join this call today do have time to raise any issues. They should be on the mailing list between today and the subsequent recall. Thanks very

much. The legal subcommittee update which is the fourth agenda item is sort of a standing agenda item. But since there are no pending requests we can move already to the agenda item 5 and that is an update on the schedule and status of subgroups and Bernie thankfully agreed to show us the individual statuses of the sub team. So, Bernie, over to you.

>> Thank you, Thomas, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear you all right.

>> Thank you. All right. This is the revised time line. We've seen a version of this in the past which included 3 lines. We've updated it to 2 lines now. And it shows that the dates have not changed and basically this is just a reminder that at this point we are in the single public consultation mode for my subgroup that wishes recommendations be put into our final report. And that that implies that we start preparing that public consultation for publication after the Abu Dhabi meeting. So again, this has not changed. And this means that basically if we can do that then hopefully we can get a final approval by ICANN 61 and include that in the final report. We also need to start drafting the final report sometime in December. None of these should be surprising.   This is exactly the same graphic we've had.   We just removed a line, public consultations. What's the progress of our various work groups as of the end of August 2017. Good faith is doing very well. The only remaining issue is drafting some language   or rather language has been drafted and hopefully the ASO will have a look at that and come back to us and hopefully agree it meets their expectations so we can finalize that one. Our expectations are if the ASO has some time to look at this that maybe we can finalize that one in Abu Dhabi. Ombudsman, now that we have the final report we've looked at some of the how to restructure the recommendations from the external evaluators so they fit within our context. We'll be

moving ahead and we're currently working on drafting a draft report. So, we're thinking that this one should meet the deadline also. But it's going to require work. We are working on that. The staff accountability has been   we've got a new version of the draft report and we'll be having a meeting later this week and we'll have a better idea after that meeting. So that's slowed us down just a bit. So, we're looking forward to that meeting and seeing where we go from there. SO//AC accountability I think is wrapping up, looking at their responses to the public comment. And from my following of that group we're expecting that they will submit their second version of their draft recommendations which should be fairly close to their original for the September plenary. Transparency. Everything's been held up a bit over the summer because the next step was to ensure a meeting between the rapporteur Michael Nicholas and John Jeffrey, the head of ICANN legal. That's been very difficult to organize. But, we finally managed to do that and we're looking forward to that meeting tomorrow. Jurisdiction has been what we call a tough slot. But, the last meeting created a lot of progress. At our next meeting in a few hours from now we will consider our first draft recommendation. So that's pretty exciting. We'll see how that goes. And then we'll figure out if there's something if we can actually agree on one recommendation then maybe we can actually get something in for Abu Dhabi or at least that's the hope of the rapporteur and several other people. Human Rights. There was a call this afternoon. There was some discussion around quorum. But, from the other meetings I attended things seem to be generally in agreement around this. And finally, diversity. Well, we've got the draft report for consideration at this meeting. So, before I go to the next slide I would like to take any questions. All right. Not seeing anything let's get through this. So, today's 30 August. ICANN 60, 28 October. That's in 2 months. ICANN 61 Puerto Rico, 10 March, that's 4 months from that period and ICANN 62 in Latin America is 18

June which is 3 months after that. So that's a total of 9 months left before the final report is due and we need to do a public consultation. And as we all know because we've hammered this out several times a public consultation does take a minimum of a month and a half. Because standard public consultation is 42 days. So, our schedule is as we presented as the first line of this section is type that is doable but we really need people to get their draft recommendations in by Abu Dhabi. And that concludes this part of my presentation. Are there any questions? I see a question from Kavouss. Kavouss, please.

>> Yes, thank you very much. I think maybe you have addressed this issue but I just want to be ensured that I understood it correctly. For the sub group of the election would be 1 public comment or two public comments? And then I understand that for the total [Indiscernible] one public comment. So due to the complexity of the jurisdiction I would like to know the nature [Indiscernible] of the public comments on the level or at the level of the sub group and then when it comes finally to the plenary there would be one single public comment   maybe it goes to the public comment [Indiscernible] could you clarify that? Thank you.

>> Kavouss I think I'll go back to the slide. I don't think the point is that we want to limit the number of public comments but the reality of the timing if we're going to get recommendations into a consolidated final report is that at this point if someone has not done, already done a public comment there is only time for one public comment. I guess that the plenary would then look at the results of that public comment and have to make a decision on how to go forward is what I expect. But that's why we have co-chairs on the call. So, I'll double check with Thomas on this one.

>> This is Thomas. I confirm, I agree with you on this.

>> Thank you. So Kavouss does that answer your question?

>> I'm not seeing that answer but my expectation was [Indiscernible] I'm not looking at the chart but yes there would be one public comment minimum for jurisdiction group or two public comments. That is what I asked. [Indiscernible] how many public comments at the level of the sub group for jurisdiction. One or two? Thank you.

>> I think I understand your question. Yes, originally the idea was to have one or two public consultations. At this point in time the only thing we see given the schedule and the timing of things is that if you have not produced a public comment to date there is only room for one. I believe the second part of your question that is implicit in there is can we go   can recommendations from a sub group go into the final report without going through a public consultation. Again, I don't think it's been our practice. But, on these cases which are corner cases as we called them it's up to the plenary to decide how they're going to treat them. But our reality has been so far that if we produce draft recommendations we put them out for public consultation. Thomas.

>> Thanks very much Bernie. Just to add to that, Kavouss and everyone, we would only need two public comment periods for the sub team report if there was too much push back from the community that substantial revisions need to be made that require a second public consultation. So, one public comment period should suffice entirely. However, if the sub team does not produce recommendations in time so that we can do one public consultation then it would be up to the plenary to decide how to deal with the situation. I think that would be a risk in putting recommendations into the final report without having had a consultation on the sub team's work. Because that could basically tear apart the whole report. But that is not a

decision to be taken by the co-chairs. I guess if and when the situation arises this would be something for the whole plenary to discuss and then to determine a way forward.

>> Thank you, Thomas. I think that details nicely what I was going to say. And just a final note on that, Kavouss. If you will remember in how we presented the process for completing the final recommendations, it was presented very clearly that the final public consultation would be only on the interactions or enter dependencies between the recommendations of various subgroups with the understanding that any significant issues with the recommendations of any particular sub group would have been addressed in a previous public consultation. So as such in our process to wrap up work stream 2, it's implicit in there the way we presented it that there needs to be at least one public consultation. But as Thomas has noted there may be situations that require an exception. But, that would be a pretty tough one. Any other questions?

>> I am not convinced of the reply given. By Thomas. I don't understand. Simple question. Subgroup does it have any public comment? Yes? Or no? If yes, how many. As simple as that. Don't go to the remain part. My question is [Indiscernible] might have not put it correctly. Once again, subgroup [Indiscernible] does it have public comment at the level of subgroup? If yes, how many?

>> Thomas, over here.

>> Bernie I can take that. Question one it needs one. Regarding question 2. One.

>> Who decides that it's need or not need? Sub group? They might be minority. I don't think you should push everything to the subgroup. Clearly, we should decide on the subgroup

[Indiscernible] whether they should have one public comment or two public comments but not left up to the subgroups because the conversation is so critical [Indiscernible] so please don't push it to the sub group. [Indiscernible] one public comment or two public comments. Thank you.

>> This is Thomas again. We have discussed what approach and the time plan many months back and it has been agreed by the plenary. And we have agreed that the sub teams would have public comment or would have public comment periods on the sub team reports. So, there is no way for us not to have public consultation on the sub team's report. Having said that it is not merely the work result that has been produced by the sub team that goes out for public comment but as you see on today's call sub team produces something and today's call we have the diversity sub team that has produced a report which the sub team is okay with. This goes to the plenary for acceptance and only after the plenary has chimed in and is okay with the result of the sub team's work we will then publish the report for public comment. So, I don't really understand your concern with the sub team doing work in isolation because we would never put something out for public comment that has not been analyzed and discussed by the plenary. Okay. So, Bernie I suggest that we go back to you for any remaining remarks you may have on your slides.

>> Thank you, Thomas. No, I'm done. Unless there are other questions. Not seeing any, back over to you, Thomas, for our next agenda item.

>> Thanks very much Bernie for showing us through the state of the sub teams. I think for the most part it's very encouraging and I should close my saying even with jurisdiction sub team that is the one that has least progress in this chart, me echo what Bernie said. We had a really

constructive meeting last week where discussion on issues and solutions have really taken off and I think this is very promising. So, let's not be misguided by the different color but I do think this group has really reached a breakthrough and will catch up significantly in the coming weeks. Let's now move to the sixth agenda item and that is the first reading of the draft recommendations of the diversity sub group. The report has been sent by Bernie with the draft or with the agenda for this call a couple of days back. So, I trust that all of you had an opportunity to take a look at it. And today we have two experts on the subject on the call which are July reimbursement Hammer and Karen and we have agreed that Julie would show the group through the report and Cheryl would then be given the opportunity to add to that. So, they will sort of co introduce the report. Julie, over to you. I'm sorry. There is a hand raised. Sebastian, anything you would like to raise before we move to Julie?

>> Yes, thank you Thomas. I don't know how it's come and I have no problem Julie making the report but sorry chair, but you may have all the experts in this room for this report and you are just speaking to two of them and I am sorry to say this way to introduce the debate I would have hoped you would say [Indiscernible] that the duty of the reporter to do that and I don't know where it's come from that any of us members of the sub group are taken to replace the rapporteur. But, having said that I am very happy that Julie will make the report and I would like to reserve a slot after the presentation to make my comments. Thank you very much.

>> Thanks very much Sebastien. Let me go on the record with a formal apology that this was not meant to carve out anyone contributing to the sub team's work and I know that you've been a substantial contributor to the report. So, Julie and Cheryl are certainly not the only experts on this call who can speak to the topic. I suggest that if you would like to move forward

instead of Julie presenting the report, that is perfectly fine by me. So, Julie and Sebastien and Cheryl I think it's primarily up to you to determine which is best to introduce the report.

>> Sure. I'm perfectly happy to have Sebastian read us through this report. Julie and I can defend the views of the group if any biases come into play. Go ahead.

>> Okay. So, Julie indicated in the chat she's fine with that too. So, Sebastian there was no intention whatsoever to bypass you so if you are okay with being put on the spot, let's hand it over to you for the introduction of the report. Sebastian indicating Julie should go.

>> I am not ready for that. You can't ask me something on the spot like that. First of all, I am rapporteur and I don't want to miss match and I would have referred to have the rapporteur making the report as it's supposed to be but it seems they are not here and once again I am perfectly okay with Julie doing it but [Indiscernible] thank you.

>> Thanks very much Sebastian. So, I think now that we've sorted this, let's move to Julie and have her do the presentation. Then Cheryl and Sebastian can go after that. Over to you Julie.

>> Thank you. I'll just check you can hear me, please, Thomas.

>> You can be heard, all right.

>> Thank you. And Sebastian yeah very much welcome your input after I made the presentation and I was asked to do this at a very, very late stage too because I did not know the rapporteurs would not be present for the call. So please do forgive me if I'm not as eloquent as I should be. So, the diversity team has produced its report which we present for your comment and feedback. I would just like to give you an overview of what it contains and

perhaps go through the recommendations briefly. And I would like to start by saying one of the things that is very difficult is to actually define diversity. So, we felt that the most useful way in the ICANN context to do this was to identify a number of elements of diversity that could be considered as relevant within ICANN and we find 7 elements there. And we also recognize that these 7 elements are not a complete set but there could be other elements that are relevant to different groups. And indeed oh, thank you Bernie. The 7 elements identified are now showing on the screen. And indeed, in different parts of ICANN some of these elements have greater or lesser relevance within the groups. So, this is how we've tried to approach diversity. And we also recognize that within ICANN some of the SO/ACs and group and by groups we mean the staff, could be various community working groups, that some of these don't fit how [Indiscernible] may lack diversity almost by definition or by design. Of course, the stakeholder representation from which they are drawn. So, with that as background we actually went out to all of the groups and sought their feedback in a questionnaire and that questionnaire helped us to inform our views and come up with the recommendations. The recommendations as an overview, what we sought to do in the recommendation is ask the SO/and ACs which of the elements of diversity that we've identified are actually relevant to their groups which sought that they establish a baseline of how they [Indiscernible] diversity within their groups and sought to encourage them to measure various elements of diversity that they've identified as relevant. And, following on from that process where it's appropriate to try to improve. And finally, to consider what sort of staff support and resources may be required to support this effort. It's very much the recommendations are actually designed to be quite conservative because we recognize that what we are proposing is a staffing point upon which ICANN should aim to build improvements in diversity across the community and within

the SO's and AC's and we're looking for something widely accepted and not rejected and [Indiscernible] back of the there's one particular aspect that we were not able to reach consensus on within the group and that is the idea of the need for an office for diversity. There are a number of members of the group that feel very strongly that this is a necessary part of the proposal and there are other members who do not agree with that suggestion. And this is something that we discussed at length and really weren't able to come to a decision or at least a consensus. So that's something that we mentioned in the report and we very much encourage in the public comment feedback on that and any feedback from the plenary is most welcome as well. So, at that point I would just like to ask you Thomas, would you like me to step through the recommendations one by one?

>> Let me just   let us just pause briefly to see whether there are any questions thus far from the plenary. I see Kavouss' hand is up. I responded to him. We'll move to him later. But there don't seem to be any other questions at the moment. So, Julie, I think it's best for you to just continue going through the recommendations briefly one by one. Then we should pause after the presentation to see if there are questions and basically take them up one by one to get approval from the plenary, hopefully.

>> Sure. Thank you. So, recommendation 1 is SO/AC groups agree the following 7 key elements of diversity should be used as a common starting point of all diversity considerations with ICANN, geographic regional representation, language, gender, age, physical disability, diverse skills and stakeholder group or constituency. So, I ask if there's any questions or comments on that recommendation. David McAuley you had a question.

>> Thank you, Julie. This is David for the record. I have a question about diverse skills. And it struck me as something that sounded a bit odd when you consider things like SSAC and RSAC and I'm wondering if you can speak   and I actually read the report but very quickly so I may have missed it later on in the report. But I'm just wondering if you can speak to diverse skills and how important that may be. Is that really something that's key to diversity? It struck me as odd anyway. So, I would be interested in what your thoughts are. Thank you.

>> Yes. And, thank you, David. Certainly, from the perspective of SSAC for example the diversity of skills in the membership has been in the past identity by the SSAC as the most important element of diversity. Because if we had for example a whole lot of members in a very narrow technical skills area that [Indiscernible] to the board on a very narrow perspective [Indiscernible] so the diversity of skills for groups like SSAC and RSAC really comes down to technical skills having different expertise in their technical skills but also sometimes in having people there who might bring a legal perspective or some other type of perspective. Diverse skills is also identified as important to the board. They perceive having a range of skills on the board was absolutely essential to then making sensible decisions for ICANN's well-informed decisions. So, they saw they needed financial skills, technical skills, legal skills, you know, and so on. So, that was where our thinking about diverse skills came   well it didn't come from there but those two groups in particular probably RSAC as well. Does that answer your question, David?

>> Yes it does, thanks very much. I'm just thinking through it. I think [Indiscernible] thank you.

>> Thanks.

>> Julie before you move to the next recommendation let us just pause for a second. Kavouss still has his hand raised. Kavouss I'm not sure whether you want to speak to recommendation 1. If this were the case, please indicate so in the chat. Other than that, since you claim your request was ignored, with that opinion I have written to you in the chat that I saw your hand raised only after I had given the floor to Julie and I have indicated to you that as mentioned earlier after Julie made her report we will have Cheryl and Sebastian give the opportunity to add to that and after that there is space for the cue from the plenary. So, I will move to you afterwards and I trust your comment is more general in nature since you raised your hand earlier. So, let's now move to the second recommendation, Julie, please.

>> Thank you Bernie. I wonder if you could move the slide. Thank you. So, recommendation 2 is defining diversity and basically this is the SO/AC group should identify which elements of diversity are mandated in their charters or in the ICANN Bylaws. And any other elements that are relevant and applicable to each of its levels including leadership in accordance with the diversity criteria and to publish the results of the exercise on their official websites. So, this is about groups taking some time to actually look inwardly and consider which of these diversity elements are relevant to them, especially those where there are some mandates in the charter, in their charters or in the ICANN Bylaws. Any questions? Okay. We'll go on   oh, sorry. David. Please, David.

>> Thank you very much. So, because recommendation 1 talks about a common starting point. When you say in rem days 2 that each SAC should identify which elements of diversity are mandated. Are you saying those 7 in recommendation 1 are mandated? Is that the way it reads? Thank you.

>> No, David, it's definitely not. Some SO/AC groups have no diversity elements mandated in their charters or Bylaws. Some have geographic or regional type elements mandated. So, what this is just saying is that for those groups that do have mandated elements that   well clearly, they're relevant, that they should identify them and publish the results of how that diversity is characterized in their groups on their websites. For the other SO and AC's and that's where we come into any other elements that are relevant, they may not have any mandated elements but they might identify that there are quite a few elements of diversity that are relevant to their work and they should identify them and publish that information on their websites. Does that answer your question?

>> Yes, thank you very much.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. [Indiscernible] speaking. Just want to ask   use the word each of its levels. I presume that means things like for the GNSO the global GNSO or the GNSO council or the sub groups within the GNSO. Is that a correct interpretation?

>> That's right. We were thinking of levels as leadership and its membership.

>> Okay. But for things like the at large and the ALAC which are two different levels or the GNSO or GNSO council are two different levels. I assume it's also across those.

>> Yes. That's correct.

>> You may want to elaborate in a footnote or something. That may not be intuitively obvious to people reading it.

>> Okay. Thanks for that.

>> Julie, Kavouss mentioned he has a question on this recommendation.

>> My apologies Kavouss. Please, go ahead. Sorry about that.

>> Yes, thank you very much for the presentation. My question is the entire recommendations. It seems that very good piece of work has been done but purely theoretical. It is very difficult to implement that. Any of these 7 elements are very, very difficult to implement. Anal, language, [Indiscernible] ability to attend or so on. It is very, very difficult. And you ask SO and AC to do some impossible [Indiscernible] and create considerable [Indiscernible] discussions which may be the petitions of what one has done at the level of the group [Indiscernible] and may have difficulty. So, it is very difficult to implement any of these [Indiscernible] don't have that experience at all but other people have. This issue of diversity is very, very controversial to implement. It's difficult to do that. At the end [Indiscernible] maybe one or two is dominating or prevailing. It's difficult to go [Indiscernible]. Very theoretical and very I would say emotional. Please put [Indiscernible] participant as a participant to this group the implementation of any of these recommendations would be extremely difficult based on the experience that the entire world has in relation with implementation of diversity.

>> So, just to respond to your points first of all Kavouss, as you know the group is not suggesting that all elements of diversity are relevant across all types of ICANN within its various groups of the it's actually suggesting that the groups themselves identify which may be relevant and which are not. And to consider how that relevance might be built upon to improve diversity in the future. So, it's certainly not saying all 7 elements are relevant across the organization. And, it's also   the recommendations were reviewed and tried to be as practical

as possible. And, some of them in earlier days were probably quite a bit less practical than this version. So, you know, I take on board that it may be difficult. But, the group has tried to make the recommendations as implementable as we possibly could. So, thank you for your observation.

>> A follow up question, please, if you allow me.

>> Sure.

>> Go ahead Kavouss.

>> Yes, could you give kindly an example that the group has considered. Take any of them. Take age. Or take language. How you want to implement that? Do you not consider the people that don't speak one or two languages correctly? Like some of the native people or what is the issue of language? What do you want to say about language? Even to communicate to each other, that's all. What is English or Spanish or Portuguese or so on and so forth. I don't know what language is. Is all of them just more or less I would say political. It's totally political. Thank you.

>> I guess my answer to that Kavouss is that it is up to each SO or AC group within ICANN to determine the relevance of that almost to their group. It may or may not be of relevance. It is relevant to some groups. It may be of minimal relevance to other groups.

>> Thank you Julie and thank you for your question Kavouss. I guess what we are talking for the moment, it's how we can take that into account. At least to draw a design or a picture of the current situation. And, do we need to change that situation or not will be subject to discussions. And before we are implementing or asking for implementing something we need

to know. And one of the elements in our group who came to our [Indiscernible] were done by [Indiscernible] with analyzing data. And I think the first step [Indiscernible] came from the finding of this first rough study made [Indiscernible]. And I guess if we start by that we will see, maybe some patterns and say, okay, now we need to change thoughts patterns because we want to add more diversity in each group. And that will be the way I guess we can do. Can we do more? I am all for it but I don't think because it is difficult that we don't need to take that into account and try to find solutions. Thank you.

>> Thanks Sebastian. That was very helpful. So, I would like to move on to recommendation 3 if I may.

>> [Indiscernible]

>> Great. Thank you. Okay. So, these next couple of recommendations about measuring and promoting diversity. Each SO/AC group supported by ICANN staff should undertake an initial assessment of their diversity for all of their struck structures including leadership based on their diversity criteria and to publish the results on their official websites. So, this is building on the previous two recommendations to basically set baseline. I might just cover recommendation 4 because they're connected. Each SO/AC group should use the information from their initial assessment to define ran publish on their official website their diversity criteria objectives and strategies for achieving these, as well as a time line for doing so. So, if a group as part of their initial assessment believes that they actually need greater diversity in one or more of the elements then we're recommending they put in place some objectives and strategies for achieving that. Kavouss, you have a question.

>> Please I apologize. I think you are too close to the microphone or the line has distortion. It's difficult to understand exactly the whole thing that you have said. This is very valuable. And technical [Indiscernible]. It's difficult to understand. So please can you either distance yourself from the microphone or maybe the line is not better in quality. I'm sorry. I'm interested to hear what you said. It seems invaluable. Thank you.

>> Thank you Kavouss and I'll try to work with the microphone. I do have a flakey connection and all that I have been saying in the last couple minutes is basically reading these recommendations. Alan, you had your hand up and put it down.

>> I'm curious about the phrase supported by ICANN staff. Is there some hidden meaning in that? That means if not every   a part volunteer part of ICANN?

>> It's no hidden meaning. It's simply where SO/AC's need some staff support for actually collecting data, that staff should be available to do that as part of their supports for the activities that the SO//ACs.

>> We're not asking the volunteers to do all the work. Thank you!

>> Exactly. Thanks.

>> Julie before you move on since we're reaching the top of the hour let me just briefly share with you that I suggest you go into overtime a little bit so that we can go through the recommendations and hopefully conclude the first reading. So, I will note one edit based on Alan's suggestion and I would ask the group's patience with Kavouss, it will be on quorum which is noted which we will put at the beginning of the subsequent meeting. So, we won't

[Indiscernible] into everyone's day or night time but I think it's important we get this part of the agenda concluded. So back over to you, Julie. Thanks.

>> Thank you, Thomas. And we'll move on to recommendation 5, please. Measuring and promoting diversity. Each SO/AC/group, supported by ICANN staff, should under fake an annual update of their diversity assessment against their diversity criteria and objectives at all levels including leadership. They should publish the results on their official website and use this information to review and update their objectives, strategies and time lines. So, this is simply about having established a time line, let's keep the attention on diversity going and review it. Seeing no hands in the interest of time I'll move on to recommendation 6. Supporting diversity. This is where we have two recommendations that relate to how we would seek ICANN staff's support to this initiative. Recommendation 6 is ICANN staff should provide support and tools for the SO/AC/groups to assist them in assessing their diversity in an appropriate manner. ICANN should also identify staff or community resources that can assist SO/ACs or other components of the community with diversity related activities and strategies. And recommendation 47, ICANN staff should develop and publish a process for dealing with diversity related complaints and issues. So, not seeing any questions on that I'll move on to recommendation 8 which I believe is the final recommendation. ICANN staff should support the capture, analysis and communication of diversity information in the following ways: Create a diversity section on the ICANN website, gather and maintain all relevant diversity information in one place, produce an annual diversity report for ICANN based on all the annual information and provide a global analysis of trends and summarize SO/AC/groups recommendations for improvement, where appropriate. This should also include some form of reporting on diversity complaints, include diversity information derived from the annual

diversity report in ICANN's annual report. What I want to emphasize is this isn't ICANN staff driving what's happening but it's by no means intended as such. It's ICANN staff supporting what the SOs and ACs themselves are driving. So, that's how narrowly what the focus is. How do we need ICANN staff to support these initiatives? And the next slide   right. This is the point that I wanted to bring to your attention and did earlier. That the issue of whether a specific Office of diversity is necessary or not is an aspect that the group did not come to consensus on but that we did want to highlight to both the plenary and the wider ICANN community and seek feedback on that in the form of public comments.   I guess that concludes the recommendations and the presentation and I would be very happy for Sebastian or Cheryl to come in with any comments. I see Alan and Kavouss have questions. So, Sebastian would you like me to take the questions first or would you like to chime in? I think we're a little short on time. Okay. We'll take the questions. Alan.

>> Thank you. Just a very quick one. In all your discussions in in Office of diversity has there been a discussion about size? I think if something's going to be called an office there probably should be 6 people or something. If it's just going to be one person I think it's overkill to give it a name and a substance like that. So, I would have thought whether it's a separate office with separate management it would depend largely on how large or heavy duty you think it is. Otherwise it becomes the name driving the process.

>> Yes. I think, you know, there are a number in the group that think this should actually   and I'll ask Sebastian to jump in if I'm presenting this incorrectly. There are views that it's not necessarily a staff office. That it's potentially an office that's comprised of volunteers. And to answer your question, no there hasn't really been a discussion of the size. I think some people may see it as a staff office. But, as I say there are others within the group who feel that it's more

important that the functions that are required to be undertaken are defined and allocated where they are best undertaken rather than to see this in terms of an office as such. So, it really I can't answer a question about size because that discussed. And there is quite a range of views on how this is best undertaken.

>> Thank you.

>> Kavouss.

>> Kavouss, the floor is yours.

>> Yes, thank you very much. I would have a general [Indiscernible] at the end of your report. If the recommendation is a useful recommendation in which the result of the entire exercise would be monitored, whether it is a diversity office which increases [Indiscernible] more than 1 percent because when I raised the issue in our groups Sebastian implied there is no Ombudsman office [Off mic] more than one. Or you want to say diversity officer, one person. So, if you are clear whether we look [Indiscernible] diversity office [Indiscernible] and the way they proceed to decide how many would be or that diversity office would also be diversity to take into account or not officer. Yes, yes. I have experience with this. Many years. I know how difficult. But it is a [Indiscernible] take advantage.

>> This is not a recommendation.

>> Please kindly [Indiscernible] office or officer.

>> Kavouss I would just like to stress this is not a recommendation. It's because consensus could not be reached. There is no recommendation regarding an Office of diversity. It is simply

recorded as a point of discussion that the group held divergent views on. Diversity in fact. I think this is something I know that Sebastian feels quite strongly about and we have different views on it and I would be more than happy to have Sebastian chime in and add his perspective here. Please go ahead, Sebastian.

>> Thank you Julie and thank you for all your questions. Part of this question is from my understanding more the question of implementation than a question of policy I would say or recommendation as such. When people I will not talk on behalf of the [Indiscernible]. I was thinking about the Office of diversity what was the purpose? It's to do all what was requested from staff and to be independent from all the organizations to be able to say things independently. And where we will [Indiscernible] it's something we need to discuss. There may be some discussion at that time. But to the point here it's to think about how we want to deal [Indiscernible] and making recommendations and my point of view is that it would have been better done outside of staff than in Office of diversity. It's.

[Inaudible].

Office/officer, I think office is better but I have no it's not the point here. It's more the idea [Indiscernible] strong voice in the group did agree with this idea and that's why we are in this conversation. I think it's something we need to discuss maybe a little bit more but we have no time today and I will be happy to answer your question and I hope that others who support this recommendation or this proposal will be able to answer your questions. Thank you. And by the way just before I finish, I am very happy with the presentation made by Julie. I think the last point about Office of diversity and the question raised by Alan about staff role in different

recommendations it's at the crux of the discussion here. Thanks again Julie for making this presentation very well.

>> Thanks Sebastian. And I'll hand it back to you now, Thomas.

>> Thanks very much, Julie for this presentation. Thanks everyone for this discussion. As promised earlier before trying to complete on this I had promised to Kavouss to be given the opportunity to make his general remark, getting back [Indiscernible] Kavouss you still want to speak?

>> Are you giving me the floor?

>> You had raised your hand before Julie started her report. And I promised you that I would get back to you and give you the opportunity to speak. But if you made your point in the meantime then we can move on.

>> Yes, I have a general comment. If you finished with everything I have a general comment to make. Please let me know at what point I can make it.

>> Is it on the diversity report?

>> Yes, diversity report. Yes.

>> Go ahead. Then people should hear it before we conclude.

>> Yeah. First as a participant of the CCWG I sincerely appreciate the efforts, devotion and activities of this group and what they have produced. Second, with some experience outside the ICANN I see that some of the recommendations, not all, would be extremely hard to

implement if not impossible to implement due to the lack of [Indiscernible]. I will give you an example. We have a germination of language or diverse language and who decides on that? Should it be UN language, other languages, population language and so on and so forth or age. I don't know who will decide on the age. Below and above. So, extremely difficult to implement. It's based on wishful thinking and theories. It has not been possible to implement that elsewhere. [Indiscernible] many, many years. [Indiscernible] go beyond the wording. Very difficult to implement in terms of impossible. And once again not all, some of them. And that does not have anything [Indiscernible] we sincerely appreciate the good work of the group. Thank you.

>> Thanks very much Kavouss. Your point is noted and I think it will inform everyone as they decide whether or not they should make themselves with objections. Sebastian is this an old hand or new hand?

>> It's rather futon give some inputs to Kavouss' issue. But if you don't have time I will do it by other means.

>> Go ahead if you want to make quick remarks.

>> Yeah, I think your point I want just to put this aside [Indiscernible] upside down. If you have a group with just people who have asked first language English or a group where all the people are just above 50 years old, this group can ask themselves how they can enhance diversity and having younger people or having people with not English as a first language. Therefore, it's not so much that we want to have a dream world but we want to find a path to diversity and that's what role of this sub group was meant for I guess. Thank you very much.

>> Thanks very much, Sebastian. I guess that's very helpful. Now that we've gone through the recommendations, now that we've heard a couple of comments, I got 2 or 3 recommendations for slide edits to the language which don't alter the recommendations or report as such. I have not heard objections so far with the report. I've heard some concerns about the implementibility of this by Kavouss. I've also seen there was a little bit of confusion surrounding the diversity office so let me make this abundantly clear. It was not a recommendation, it was a discussion point added to the report so that everyone can take good note of it. So, let me now ask this group whether there are any objections to accepting the first reading as being successful. No objections.

>> I want to be a little bit more specific about what you say, not recommendation but point of discussion. I will accept as a member of this group of the CCWG this report. But I want to raise the fact that we never get really through [Indiscernible] and we end up having this report written   it could have been written in the other way. It is not   you can't say that the Office of diversity just [Indiscernible] here it's an important point that we want this plenary and the public comment be made aware and can discuss it. But don't dismiss it as it's not a recommendation. Because if not I will ask that we go back to sub group and we make a real decision on what is majority and minority and [Indiscernible]. I don't think we have time for that and I don't think it's a good time spent. But, please don't dismiss this proposal as not a recommendation. It's a point of discussion that may end up to turn this report having that as a recommendation and that's an open question, really. And it's because of time that we and I and others didn't push [Indiscernible] to see [Indiscernible] of the sub group. And I am not asking the same here. But need to take that into account, please. Thank you very much.

>> Thanks very much and I was using language from the report and from Julie's presentation. But your point is well noted. Certainly, it's an important topic and everyone should know about that so that they can chime in when we have public consultation on this. Inca views and Alan's hand was raised. Can you please be brief? We've already gone into overtime for 20 minutes. Kavouss, please.

>> Yes, I would like to categorize this last part not as a note, as another term such as other consideration or gentle consideration, but not note. Notes should be associated with some recommendation. General note does not suffice. So, I would like to change the title of this and I suggest it is an important issue, it may not be a recommendation, or maybe. It depends on the group. However, it's not note. It may be general consultation or additional consultation on the diversity activities. Just change of term. Thank you.

>> Thanks very much Kavouss. I guess the pen holders for this report will take that to heart and I note that there are no objections against this report so we can deem the first reading successful and record that accordingly. I would ask to thank all of you for this good discussion. I thank all of you for staying on with us for longer than anticipated. I would like to especially thank the diversity sub team for its excellent work. Again, let's note that quorum question raised by Kavouss will be dealt with first thing during the next call and with that I would like to conclude this call and thank everyone and let's talk again and continue the discussion. Bye for now.