RAW CAPTIONING – NOT A TRANSCRIPT – A TRANSCRIPT WILL BE POSTED TO THE WIKI AS A SEPARATE DOCUMENT. THIS IS ONLY MEANT AS A QUICK REFERENCE UNTIL THE TRANSCRIPT IS POSTED AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AUTHORITATIVE.

ijani

Wednesday

February 28, 2018

CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2 Plenary Meeting #27

19:00 UTC

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.

[Captioner standing by]

>> Okay, everybody, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening, let's get the recording started for this call.

>> Thank you. The recording has started. You may proceed.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Hi, my name is Jordan Carter, one of the CCWG coshare for the sector and I welcome you to this meeting of the Cross-Community Working Group accountability currently in our Work Stream 2 efforts. And this call is scheduled for two hours. We'll see how we go. The first item is just an introduction and welcome to you all. Thank you for participating. If you have any updates for your statement of interest, it would good to send those to the ICANN staff. It's good that we keep ourselves transparents. And a reminder that the ICANN community standards of behavior do apply to this call and this work as they do with all of our work in the ICANN community.

So if you do have an SOI update to make, please refer to staff supporting us in this work.

Item 2 is a review of the agenda. We had to make an adjustment to the agenda to account for availability of a couple of people who would not be able to present to us the final recommendations for first reading of the diversity materials that has come through. So we're going to just slip that diversity item until after the AOB and before the discussion in the next Plenary, so it will end up [indiscernible]. So after we have done the admin, we'll work through the first reading of the Ombudsman with Tijani Chairing that and then item 5, staff accountability, with me Co-Chairing that. And then the AOB and then we'll get on to the rest of the items.

Are there any other agenda items to raise? And if you have something small to raise, you can raise it in the AOB section of the agenda. ebastien, please go ahead.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jordan. Question are here talking about the [indiscernible] species of the final report, but the final report must also take into account some of the overarching theme and when and where will we discuss that? Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: And that's a good question. I'm going to just hand over to Bernie to talk about that final report question.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Jordan. I believe we're going to try and -- let me back up a bit. Before getting into that, we wanted to be sure that we had all of the final recommendations. As some of you will know, jurisdiction is still working on it and will probably keep doing so until the deadline of 2 March 2018 29:00 UTC. We hope to present something on that, staff will be working with the Co-Chairs on that and you should be able to have a discussion about that in Puerto Rico, at least that's the plan. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bernie. And Sebastien, I hope that makes sense to you. Essentially it's about a week away, the discussion.

And if there are no other comments or questions on the agenda, I'm going to hand over to Tijani to Co-Chair the administration slot. So Tijani, over to you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jordan.

Tijani speaking. So item number 3 is about administration and I would ask Bernie to walk us through this item. Bernie, please.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. I can certainly take the first two items, but I'll hand the third item back to you.

ICANN 61, just a reminder, we're meeting 9 March, 8:30 local for coffee, starting activities at 9:00 sharp, that's 12:30-21:00 UTC. ICANN legal will not need the last hour of our meeting. They thanked us for making that available, but they managed to get a slot during the week. However, the IRP-IOT may wish to take over the last hour to take advantage to have a face-to-face meeting. We talked about it with the Co-Chairs and they did not see an issue with that, so we're not taking any time away from meetings that we have not scheduled, so that will be done like that.

As unusual we will have full remote participation available for those who can't make it. And for those that can, we look forward to seeing you there.

ICANN 62 Panama City, just to confirm we are in the middle of the funding process for travelers from the Work Stream 2 travel fund. This will close Monday, 19 March 23:59. We've had quite a few of our regular applicants. If you have not done so, with an ICANN meeting coming up, time is going to go fast, so just a reminder, if you are planning on applying and you are eligible, I will remind everyone to read the rules if you are eligible, then please do so, probably before you leave for Puerto Rico just to make sure you get in under the deadline.

I covered those two items and I'll hand it back to Tijani for the third one, meeting with the Board cause cuss. Thank you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Bernie. For the thirditem of this -- the third part of this item, it is about the meeting with the Board and ICANN 61. I will give the floor to Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Tijani. Yeah, I should have mentioned this at the start, we have an apology from Thomas Rickert today. He's homesick, both with the flu himself and with sick kids as well. So he's looking after them and that's why there's a bit of skipping back and forward a bit more with Tijani and I sharing the Co-Chairing.

The meeting with the Board, it's just a brief advice really. The Co-Chairs approached the Chair of the Board at -- by e-mail a couple of days ago, maybe a week ago, and just offering a chance for the Board to meet with the Co-Chairs and the Rapporteurs of the currently finalizing recommendations, the ones that have been finalized in the second trench.

To try and minimize the chance of any misunderstanding, so basically to give the Board a chance to ask any questions about recommendations, how they have been arrived at, how the public comments were taken into account. Some of you have been following closely enough that I don't know sometimes the Board's comments have not been picked up in the final recommendations and we thought it would be a useful opportunity for a kind of informal and low key and not sort of, well, a low key discussion to happen before anyone jumps to any conclusions about that process and before we get into any kind of discussions that are pushing up against the final deadline in June.

So that's going to happen at a date and time to be determined. And I think we'll talk about it a bit more at the CCWG meeting at San Juan in Friday if it doesn't happen before, we have an in-person Plenary. Just a briefing for you. I don't know if there are any questions on that. If there are or on any of the other administration items, Tijani will take those. Over to you, Tijani.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jordan. The next agenda item will be the staff accountability, the first reading of the final recommendation. And this will be done by Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Yes, thanks. Me again. Hi, everyone. My job is to kind of follow Rapporteur for this group is to present to you the final recommendations which have been

circulated to you as proposed final recommendations. And they have been circulated with the agenda for this meeting with a red line form and a clean form, and also the documented replies to the public comments have been circulated in draft as well. And this is one of the areas where these are coming through the [indiscernible] because the small Subgroup have not been meeting the quorum rules in some time, so here it is.

And Bernie and staff, I don't know if we are actually going to pull the red line up for us to work through. I think that would be the easiest way to do that. I'll try to keep this presentation reasonably brief and I'll ask any Subgroup members to add any thoughts and then we will come back to a broader group discussion before confirming hopefully a first reading.

The track changes versions of this on the screen now and I would urge you to scroll through it. The suggestion that I'll make to you is that we scroll to the recommendations part of this because the changes at the front are just changing the drafts from being a final recommendations paper. And there have not been any substantial changes to the roles and responsibilities document. And for the issues section, really. So if you look at the recommendations, in the PDF on there, on the screen, they start on page 8. The first recommendation didn't change, it's the same as it was in an early draft form. And it's clarifying what accountability mechanisms are already in place, regarding staff accountability, and sort of being clear about publishing them and making them more visible.

The second recommendation has changed a bit and this one is about the information acquisition, if you like, sort of eliciting feedback from the community on how performance is going and that 2A is the same as it was in the previous version. And the second part, the 2B, if you like, was removed and put later in the recommendations.

And Recommendation 3 -- I'm sorry, I'm getting myself a little lost in the text. I'm probably on the top of page 9. That just tried to clarify more about the inclusion of some community feedback and the performance assessment of staff. Obviously that's a reasonably sensitive issue and one we're working that feedback in an appropriate way [indiscernible] legal obligations to the staff in a way that genuinely helps performance. Just wanted to give a little more context of that, so that's the Genesis of the changes that are tracked at the top of page 9 of this PDF.

I'll try to speak more clearly in the microphone. I see the transcript has meindiscerniblable from time to time.

And Recommendation 3, following the public feedback and consideration by the group has been removed. This is the panel idea and in the end there was a lot of questions raised in the public about the nature of it. We felt in the end given it was an informal proposal and a gathering of people to troubleshoot, if an issue arises that's susceptible to being resolved by that kind of grouping of people and that grouping of people are likely to get together on an as-needed basis, but as we sometimes work in the ICANN community, if we momentalize it, there would be a whole process to form it and go into more detail and specificity about it, which no one was up for and which the public comments didn't necessarily demand. So that one is gone in this final proposed recommendation.

So we can scroll down past that to the top of page 10 of the PDF. This is now Recommendation 3, but was Recommendation 4. The red looks like new text, but it was so [indiscernible] it was impossible to show it. There was strong community support from all around the community for this idea of serve level approach to be taken to how, you know, to help ensure and make transparent the quality expectations the community could have and the services ICANN provides. And the Board pushed back on that reasonably strongly and said it didn't like the idea of a serve level approach to managing relationship and service quality, but the Board didn't propose an alternative approach by which it wanted to do that. So in light of the strong community support for that approach, especially from the parts of the community that have the privilege or misfortune of being on contractual relationships with ICANN, and for them it's an even more important result, we tried to add a bit of an evolutionary approach to make it clear that you start with the most important, critical services and so it's a bit about prioritizing the classes for which targets and guidelines and services have been implemented and define how that would happen. And then in that, developing the service, there were also guidelines of expectation about how people will work together. And then to publish information about those service levels and targets in a coherent place. So we tried to allay concerns we want be expecting services levels for everything ICANN does. And we wanted to make it clear that evolving in that direction was something that the community has strongly supported, so there's no real prospect in our Work Stream 2 work of saying oh, we, you didn't like that so we're not going to do that because the community voice was pretty overwhelming on that.

We did our best to adjust for the comments and make it a more workable process that does alleviate some of the concerns. And of course, if the ICANN Board does have a different way of working, that doesn't involve serve levels, but also meets community needs and expectations, I'm sure they will say, yes, and thank you, and we look forward to hearing what it might be.

So that's my run-through for you of the recommendations, the changes that have been made. I'd like to thank everyone who has participated in the work of the staff Accountability Subgroup, it's been a tricky Subgroup because staff accountability sits right beside the executive and CEO and it's often sometimes difficult to draw a line between staff accountability and overall organizational performance. And so I think those issues have been reasonably well handled in the discussion. There's been bumps along the way, but I think we've got to a set of pragmatic recommendations that will improve the situation and importantly give ICANN and the community more information in the future on which to judge how these matters are being dealt with and to assure all of us in a nice, clean, transparent way how the organization is doing.

So with that, I'll take off my presenter hat and put on a Co-Chair hat alongside it and to ask for any feedback or questions or objections to the idea of giving this a first reading. And after the chance to speak on this, I will then reconfirm that this is the first reading of the set of recommendations.

Are there any questions or comments?

And if I'm right, the second reading of this set of recommendations will be at the in-person meeting in San Juan. So if you are still thinking about questions, you have a chance to raise them

there and talk them through in-person. So in absence of the speaking list and the agenda we've got, I'm going to formally regard this as a first reading success of staff accountability recommendations in Work Stream 2. And thank you all for your consent and through silence and a few chatted notes that say yay.

And I'm going to hand the Chairing job back to Tijani now for our next agenda item which is on the Ombudsman recommendations. Tijani, over to you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Jordan. Yes. Agenda item number 5 in this case will be Ombudsman, so the final recommendation and the first reading of the final recommendation. Sebastien is the author of this Subgroup and he will present the final recommendations.

Sebastien, please.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Tijani. I hope you can hear me better than Tijani because he is very faint. But the final report is presented here with very few changes. And if you want to follow them, we have one change on page 5 which is just reorganization of the text, but the idea is the same. And then let's go to page 6 and must tell you in the summary, we have the same changes, exactly the same in pages 17 and 18.

The changes here under Recommendation Number 9 is to add one of the requests from some of the comments we received in the extension of the Ombudsman to perform [indiscernible] after feedback from the committee. And Recommendation Number 11, it's to really insist on the fact that the Ombuds can be involved in policy revision or processes and the sentence is meant to be a little bit clearer than the previous one.

Those are the three changes we are offering in this report of the Subgroup on the ICANN Ombuds Office. Thank you very much, Tijani. Back to you. Tijani, if you are speaking, I can't hear you and I guess the others either. It's Sebastien speaking.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me now?

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, go ahead.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Very good. Thank you very much, Sebastien, for presenting the final recommendation of the Ombud's office. And I ask you all if there is any comment or remarks about the recommendations. I would like to remind you this is the first reading of the recommendation. Any questions? You are very clear, no questions. Okay, I have one, Sebastien, go ahead.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, it is to add to that --

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sebastien --

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. You can hear me, Tijani, thank you very much. I would like to thank the people who participated in each and ever call and we have done this job because they were participating and I want to thank especially Alberto, Cheryl and [indiscernible] Ombudsman, because they were here we were able to do this job. Thank you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sebastien. So once more is there any questions or remarks about this recommendation? I don't see a hand or hear anything. This was the first reading of the Ombud's office recommendation. It is finished now.

We will go to agenda item number 6 which is the proposed agenda for face-to-face meeting on 9 March. We will go to Jordan.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Tijani. And thank you for the good and first reading of the Ombudsman recommendation. I'm going to hand the Chair over to Bernie who will take us through the draft agenda for the face-to-face. Bernie, please go ahead.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Jordan. We don't have a detailed agenda yet, but basically it's going to look a lot like the agenda today, but we hope that we will have the Jurisdiction recommendations. So far the changes that have been brought to the Jurisdiction Report don't seem to be monumental. They are taking in some of the comments and trying to adjust, but as all things in Jurisdiction, everyone wants to make sure it's done right.

So -- and to that we will add, as we said earlier, this overarching section of what the final report will look like before it goes to public comment.

So that's what I have for you.

I'd be glad to take questions or suggestions as to items that we need to discuss. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Bernie.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thanks, Bernie.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Are there any questions on that or suggestions that you'd like to raise? Kavouss, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody. Just a very, very small question. At what time UTC does the meeting start? At what time UTC the meeting starts? The face-to-face.

>> JORDAN CARTER: It starts at 12:30 UTC on Friday the 9th of March and it runs until 21 hours UTC. So we think it will finish a little bit earlier than that, Kavouss. So 12:30 UTC through to the very latest 21.

>> KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, just a minor point that I will not be able to attend physically at the meeting. I will attend remotely and I will be just two or three hours before the end of the meeting. Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Thanks.

Are there any other questions or suggestions for the agenda?

Sebastien, please go ahead.

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I have just one question. A lot of the comments were done by the Board for all of the our report and that was good and well done. I have the impression that some of the feedback from the Board were almost based on the same idea and a lot of different Subgroup reports. Do you think that we will need specific time to be -- to have an exchange with the Board on feedback on the comments? And where to go for the next phase? Because I think it's one of the important pieces. Of course, we will have also the decision of each of the sponsoring organizations to be taken into account. Yeah, my question is, do we have a specific time slot to have a deep exchange with the Board from [indiscernible]? Thank you.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks Sebastien. Jordan here. And the short answer is yes, I outlined a plan for an exchange with the Board under the administration item and that we would talk more about the exact nature of that session in San Juan because that will be before whenever it happens.

And then in terms of the next phase of the work and responding particularly to the Board prioritization and implementation process, I have a few things about that in the AOB. So we'll come back to that, if that's okay with you, after we have run through the diversity recommendations -- first reading rather. Thanks that's a green check.

If there are no other questions about the agenda, can I remind you are very welcome to suggestion items and do that to the e-mail list or the Co-Chairs or to the staff. Don't hold back if we have items to discuss. And we will get a draft written agenda out to you soon.

And now let me hand back to Tijani who is going to Co-Chair the diversity recommendations first reading. Tijani, over to you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jordan. The next item will be about diversity and we have the final recommendation that will be presented by one of the Coordinators of this Subgroup and it will also be the first reading of the recommendations. So Fiona or Raphael, who wants to speak?

>> FIONA ASONGA: Hello, everyone. This is Fiona. Thank you, Tijani.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Right.

>> FIONA ASONGA: The diversity group, we received a total of 72 comments from the public comments period on the different issues and recommendations, there are others regarding implementations and there are others also on recommendations, but the approach was very different from what we had proposed. And of those comments we were able to accept nine of them to change the recommendations and so the recommendations that were changed were recommendations 1, 5, 7, and 8. We can just scroll down the document that is on our screen and look at those

Recommendation 1 there is a suggest to change the tone by adding "should." So we are recommending that groups "should" agree that the following key elements of diversity should be

used [Reading] within ICANN. And the groups must agree and it was more forcefully the language, so that has changed to "should."

We have also changed Recommendation 5 where it was proposed that we give regular undates and not necessarily annually. So each SO/AC/group receive regular updates of the their diversity assessment against their diversity credit tier ya and objectives at all levels including leadership. Ideally this update should be carried out annually, but not less than every three years. They should publish the results on their official website and use this information to review and update their objectives, strategies, or timelines. And they are requesting that we don't restrict it to annual, but maybe sure the updates are regular. And make sure that the SO/AC/groups in ICANN can adjust to and that's why we say no more than three years.

Then the other recommendations that changes was Recommendation 7. We clanged to ICANN staff should support SO/AC/groups in developing and publishing a process for dealing with diversity-related complaints and issues. Initially we had worded it differently and so based on the comments from the public comment period, we have adjusted to ensure that staff support the ACs and SOs in developing and publishing these processes and not staff doing it as it read before.

Recommendation 8 also changes and in that we said ICANN staff should support the capture, analysis, and communication of diversity information and while allowing them to seek external expertise if needed. Initially we had just left it wasn't allowing them to seek any external expertise, but based on what came forth in the discussion we had in the group, we considered and agreed that having external expertise may be a necessity in some cases to enable that recommendation to be implemented.

So those are the recommendations that changed. We have comments that touched on implementation and these came from different groups within the ICANN community. And on this I will recommend that the Co-Chairs look at the comments on implementation and become part of our discussions with the Board because the ICANN organization is going to have to consider the aspects of implementation and [indiscernible] that are raised within these comments.

And then there are three comments that raised issues that proposed approaches which were not agreeable to the group. And so for those who are not able to accept or agree on the approach and, therefore, did not take in the recommendation, but have made a comment explaining to the groups that what they provided was not considered agreeable in terms of their [indiscernible] for the group to use would be [indiscernible]. And this is because there is a need to help the community understand that the diversity issues, we are just beginning the process of addressing the diversity issues and, therefore, we are [indiscernible] more change. With a little time we may be able and best blessed to check [indiscernible] in terms of steps that [indiscernible] diversity within ICANN.

And I think that is the summary of the comments. But one thing that is important to note is that we did not get significant support on creating an Office of Diversity. We got different -- three different views. One was for having external entities access diversity. Another was having the Office of Diversity. And others were not supporting the Office of Diversity. So those came

through and then the issue of Office of Diversity we didn't get any traction in terms of strong comments to support having the Office of Diversity, so we have since removed it from our report, but we put a footnote in our document indicating that had been considered, but it did not receive significant support from the community and from the Subgroup in the CCWG.

And I think that summarizes our comments on the diversity Subgroup. [Indiscernible] I think a lot of the Subgroup are free to add in.

Thank you, Tijani.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Fiona. Thank you for this report. You have already a question from Cheryl. Cheryl, please go ahead.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you , Tijani. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. It's not a question, it's a [indiscernible] Allan Greenberg has requested that the following be read to the recording of this meeting as we deliberate on the diversity first reading. I will skip over from the e-mail, general apologies for not being here, and now I'm quoting, "I note that the diversity recommendations being considered do not include one to create an ICANN Office of diversity, the OOD. There was an extensive discussion on diversity and OOD within OLAC over the past weeks. As one might expect from such a regionally-based organization, OLAC supports all of diversity within it's form and say we are collectively in record passionate about diversity does not fully convey our feelings. However, if every person who contributed to this discussion and that was a majority of the ALAC members and other community leaders felt that there is no need for an Office of Diversity and to create one would needlessly increase bureaucracy and cost without any real benefit. There was support for ICANN organization to consider diversity amongst its staff, but that should be handled within Human Resources. In summary, the ALAC would not support creating an OOD." That's the end of the quote from Allan.

And just a minor point from me, on reading this work and thanks to Fiona and [indiscernible] to the rest of the team, including Julie, for what has gone into this, I know we refer both in the executive summary and later in the body of the document before we talk about step 12, the diversity Subgroup focused on requirements 3, 4 and 5 for its work, but that the bullet points it's referring to, it strikes me we would be better off having a numbered list if we were going to refer to numbers in the following text. Thank you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. The position of Allan and ALAC is noted, well noted.

Any other comments? Any other remarks? Yes, Sebastien. Sebastien?

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Yes, I was thinking how to say what I want to say. I don't think there was a formal decision about this text. The text read by Cheryl and thank you for that by Allan Greenberg. I'm not sure that it's yet an ALAC position as such. And I will not comment today on that any more. I want to be released by the second reading of the Ombud's office in order to make personal comment, therefore, I will wait for the face-to-face meeting after the second reading of the document I am the Rapporteur of and I will give you some input at that time. Thank you very much.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sebastien. Any other comments? Cheryl, you still have your hand up.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I'm having network problems. It's down for me. I have orange lines in network. Sorry.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Okay, thank you. Greg Shatan.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Tijani. Greg Shatan for the record. This is maybe a fool's rush in where angels fear to tread sort of comment, but I would just mention that it's, you know, quite common for organizations to have a chief diversity Officer, whether that person has to have an entire Office of Diversity that they are the head of, that does seem needlessly Bureaucratic and wasteful, but assigning to Human Resources without there being a person with whom the buck stops within that Human Resources organization, as a person who is the chief diversity Officer, whether that's their own job or they wear six hats, you know, anything that needs to get done in an organization, I believe, tends to get better if somebody has ownership of the issue and not just a group, but ultimately a person. So I don't know how that fits in exactly. That's the full part of my comment, but I do want to note, you know, having worked with a lot of corporate clients in my day job, chief diversity Officer is a very accepted concept in and of itself. Thanks.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Greg. Sebastien?

>> SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Tijani. Sebastien speaking. Greg said we are not staff and what we are dealing with here is about diversity of the organization -- sorry, I can't [indiscernible] this any more, of the structure of the [indiscernible] not of the staff, and therefore, it's something different. It's why I guess a proposal was made to have this office. But I think your point was discussed at length in the diversity Subgroup and we may come back with some idea in the near future hopefully with finding some solution for that. Thank you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sebastien. Fiona?

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thank you, Tijani. This is Fiona for the record. In response to Greg's comment, what we discussed and what we concluded as a group is that trying to advise on the Office of Diversity, whether it's an office or an individual or how ICANN choices to implement that diversity, it's looks like we are getting very involved in implementation issues, so we tried to get ourselves out. And I would like to suggest possibly if when we have the discussion on implementation, that is where we can put that. And if Greg with his experience can share different scenarios of how that is done it will help us significantly in making positive headway so that we are not just making recommendations that will end somewhere with no one responsible, but they will be followed through and implemented. So it's just that because of the mandates that we are given, it looks like we are getting too much into implementations. By taking the conversation with the Board, Co-Chairs can [indiscernible] that as something that needs to be paid attention to. In terms of implementation and having [audio cutting out] during the implementation discussion. Thank you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Fiona. Steve DelBianco.

>> STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Tijani. It's Steve DelBianco from CSG. CSG supported versions of this diversity report which did not create an Office of Diversity. I believe we would like to associate ourselves with the comment that Allan Greenberg submitted. And while I am familiar with the Office of A diversity Officer in certain corporate entities, I believe that applies to the employees of that entity and not necessarily to the customers of that company and the affiliated stakeholder groups that interact with that entity. So with all respect to Greg, I don't see a parallel between core operations that have a diversity Officer and the entity called ICANN where the diversity we truly seek is not within the corporation's employees, but within the stakeholder groups that surround it. And to that end, as one of the Rapporteurs on the SO/AC accountability group, our final recommendations included one of the good practices was that in the area of outreach, that each SO/AC/group should have a strategy to do out reach for the parts of the targeted community that is not significantly participating while also seeking diversity within membership. So I believe we attack it through a lot of other ways, but not through creating a position within ICANN, which is limited to the employees that it controls. Thank you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Steve. The next one is Greg.

>> GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan. Just briefly, all points well taken. I will say that diversity Officers also deal with vendor diversity and other kind of third party diversity, but I do think this is a case where ICANN is a unique organization and I think that really rather than having a chief diversity Officer though they can for their employees and vendors, is probably beside the point for this group's work. I think what's key and I agree with Steve on this is that ICANN provide the right type and amount of support for diversity efforts to take place within the community. The very issues that cause a lack of diversity also make it hard to work on diversity issues. You know, digital divide and economic and other issues. And if there isn't support from ICANN and, you know, a very strong interlink obviously with engagement outreach on boarding, education, all of those things, it's just going to give diversity lip service or worse yet, you know, go into some sort of metrics exercise, which is really not the point. The best way to achieve diversity is to have a diverse pool, in my view. And for that, we'll need support, not a chief diversity office support, but a panel of support and maybe there should be somebody on the inside who is responsible for kind of looking at it holistically, not the chief diversity Officer. Maybe it's a multi-stakeholder strategic issue or something. I'll still go with the buck stops here concept, but I think in this case the CDO is not the person for whom that task would be relevant. It's not a Human Resources issue really either because, again, that goes back to the same point Steve made. HR even more deals only with employee issues. So the key is support and somebody for whom the quality of that support is a job description definer. Thanks.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Greg. And thank you all for this discussion, this fruitful position, in my point of view. I know that the diversity office was a point for which there was two different positions inside the Subgroup and this discussion is the proof of the good help of our work and I would like to remind you that this is the first reading of the report. We have another reading. And I hope we will have the good talks also before we finalize the final report, the final [indiscernible] report.

Any other remarks? I don't see any hand.

So no hand and hearing nothing, I will go to the next agenda item which is any other business. Is there any other business? Yes, Jordan, go ahead.

　　>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Tijani. I just wanted to, as I said earlier, make a point about the prioritization question. And just before that I thank you and the others for confirming that was the first reading of the Ombudsman's recommendation.

　　The point of prioritization was raised by the ICANN Board in quite a few of it's comments. I'm sorry, the one we just confirmed was the diversity recommendations. My apologies to everyone. I have too many titles in front of me.

　　Prioritization is starting to be raised in our group in terms of the broader implementation of our Work Stream 2 implementations. And I guess in implementing these the first point to make this isn't like implementing Work Stream 1. We don't have to hire 20 lawyers and massively rewrite ICANN's bylaws at a very high speed and then get them all through. We can be a bit more planned about it.

　　The second point to make is that implementation will require changes to practice across the ICANN organization and so there's going to need to be some implementation framework process oversight that involves the CCWG or successors of the SO/AC leadership in the ICANN staff and among the ICANN Board. So the only thing really I wanted to do with this intervention at this point is to suggest that implementation has to be a live issue. And we should talk about that more, I'm kind of giving you a heads-up about talking about that more in the meeting in San Juan. And we may need to have some comments in our final report that sort of gets a clear mandate from the chartering organizations when they move towards approval about how we're going to handle that process.

　　I would imagine that there are different views and different parts of the ICANN community and organization about it and we need to think about the process we use to implement and various aspects of what is done when and so on. So getting a really clear picture early on about how that is going to be done will be essential to avoiding any unnecessary sort of conflict.

　　And so that is all I wanted to sort of just throw your way at this point. And I don't know if that will give rise to any questions, but anyone is welcome to discuss that or raise other points, I guess. And I'll hand back to Tijani to Chair.

　　>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jordan. David McAuley.

　　>> DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Tijani, it's David McAuley for the record. I wanted to go back to a subject Bernie raised at the top of the call with respect to the final hour of the CCWG Plenary meeting in San Juan on March 9th, 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM local time. Now that ICANN legal and ICANN policy have identified a separate time to meet with SO and AC leaders on establishing a standing panel for IRP, which itself is an important topic, that hour became available and so I'm just speaking now and I want to ask those in this group who are also members of the IRP implementation oversight team, take a look at your mail and see if you can assure us or commit to attending a face-to-face of the implementation oversight team. I think it would be very good to sort of re-energize ourselves. If we could take advantage of that hour,

that would be great. Just look in your mail on that list and if you could let us know, not later than noon UTC, this coming Friday, Bernie and I can then decide if we have sufficient attendance to have such a meeting. And then we'd let [indiscernible] know, too, because it would be open. And it's a good opportunity, so I encourage you to take a look and attend if you can. Thanks very much. Thanks, Tijani.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, David. Thank you very much.

Any other business? Seeing none, we can go now to the next agenda item which is next Plenary and we spoke about that. On Friday 9 March from 8:30-17:00 local time in Puerto Rico.

And now if there is not any remark or any questions or any other intervention, is there any other intervention? I don't see anyone, so this meeting is now adjourned. Thank you very much.

>> JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, everyone. See you later.

>> Thanks,