

CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2
Diversity Meeting #33
8 February 2018 @ 13:00 UTC
Captioning

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.

2-8-17 ICANN/8:00 a.m. ES.

>> Hello everyone, this is Fiona. I would like to take the opportunity to welcome you to our meeting number [Indiscernible]. The proposed agenda, roll call, review of the comments and any other business. I would like to ask staff to confirm that they have been able to do the roll call.

>> Thank you Fiona. Yes, we have Cheryl -- everyone is listed in the adobe for attendance.

>> Thank you, very much. We'll move on to our discussion, item number 2. You can bring up the document, please on adobe. During the last meeting we were able to approve the recommendations. Moving forward, today -- [Indiscernible] we assume that everybody [Indiscernible] the public comment was received and the comments are presented. We are not going to read it through again. We want to spend more time on the discussion and the input provided but especially it does not support our recommendation [Indiscernible]. 3.1 recommendation 3. Recommendation 3 is not in support of the recommendation. [Indiscernible] if there are any comments. I'm not seeing it on my screen.

>> Perfect. So, we are now looking at comment 3.02 which is from the GNSO. And I'm opening the floor for discussion on that comment. [Indiscernible]. We have no hands going up, we'll consider the input as being important when it comes to [Indiscernible] however, it does not change the recommendation. [Indiscernible] move on 3.06 [Indiscernible] 3.07, that is a comment from the ICANN board and I'll open the floor up again for discussion on that comment on recommendation 3. We have a comment from Julie that we note the points. [Indiscernible] and move on. The final 3.08 [Indiscernible]. I would like to [Indiscernible] conclude that [Indiscernible] required for recommendation number 3. Recommendation number 3 -- (Reading). That recommendation will not change. Thank you Rafik for your comment in the chat. [Indiscernible]. We'll move on to recommendation number 4. We do have support 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 [Indiscernible]. I'll open the floor up for discussion.

[snoring noise]

>> Fiona, if you're speaking we're not hearing you.

>> Okay, thanks Bernie. Mean while waiting for Fiona to connect I guess we can't continue so we have large support for it. Except maybe the board comment which is similar to the previous one. I think they are just highlighting there may be some limitation but I guess we already

talked of those comments previously. So just checking here if there is any question or comment from those on the call regarding this comment. And if we want to respond or clarify... So, I guess maybe most of them -- it's related to regard the time line of the assessment. I guess [Indiscernible]. Okay. If there is no concern or issue I think we can consider that we can consider this as approved and move on to the next, to the next recommendation. Okay. So, for recommendation number 5 -- hi, Fiona.

>> While you were disconnected we went through recommendation number 4 and there was no concern and we concluded [Indiscernible]. So you can takeover from here now.

>> Okay. So recommendation number 5. We have support for 1, 2 and [Indiscernible]

>> Thank you Fiona. Can you hear me?

>> Yes we can hear you well.

>> Thank you. I've just put in the chat a possible slight changing to the wording of our recommendation to take this into account should the group think that that's appropriate. What the registry stakeholder group is saying is that they think that for some groups during an annual update may be too demanding on their time because of all the other activities and commitments that they have. And so, if we considered that to be a reasonable concern, we could accommodate that by changing our recommendation to say group supported by ICANN staff should undertake a regular update ideally annually update of the assessment. The current wording says should undertake an annual update. So that's a possible friendly amendment that we could consider to accommodate this concern. Thank you Fiona.

>> Thank you Julie for that. I think it [Indiscernible] meaning of the recommendation and what you want to achieve. Unless anyone is opposed to that change... Julie has put the text in the chat in case anyone wants to review it. [Indiscernible] be able to make the change and make the recommendation more friendly to the community. Then we have support on 5-point on 4, 5.05, 5.06, 5.07 ICANN board [Indiscernible] previous recommendation. [Indiscernible] in our report. [Indiscernible]. Any comments on recommendation number 5? [Indiscernible]. Any comments on that change? Rafik [Indiscernible]. Not many are clear on what exactly [Indiscernible] so we'll combine the two [Indiscernible] recommendation number 5. [Indiscernible] then we can move on. So we'll move on to recommendation 6. We do have support for 6.01, 6.02, 6.03 then 6.04 the I [Indiscernible]. Any comments? If there are no comments we will accept that. [Indiscernible] making our final report. Rafik [Indiscernible] please have the floor.

>> Thanks Fiona. So, again I think the comments from the board is about implementation. So I think we are not discussing how it will be implemented. So, I think we just can't leave a note and they are saying -- how to say? We are asking to provide some guidance here. Maybe we can just give some notes. We can't really change the recommendation based on those comments but you can [Indiscernible] these are important matters to be considered during implementation. So I think [Indiscernible] if there is not enough resources so maybe some recommendation

[Indiscernible] the execution of the recommendation. [Indiscernible] you want to respond to this.

>> Can I speak, Fiona?

>> Yes, Bernard?

>> Yes, thank you. For those that missed it the plenary on Wednesday this week 0500 addressed this issue, the cochairs basically understand the concern of ICANN and we'll be posting something that will cover the ICANN board comments that were made essentially in all 4 of the public comments touching on this. Basically, the work stream 2, accountability work stream 2 doesn't have the knowledge or the expertise to comment on implementation requirements and it's really a matter for the board and the community to workout. So, I think there was general agreement to this. We also went through the process that will be coming regarding implementation and approval of recommendations. So just to very quickly walk you through this, you know, it gets approved -- the final recommendations get approval from the plenary. Once there's approval from the chartering organization we'll prepare the recommendations for the ICANN board. And as part of that preparation will be an implementation plan. And, you know, this is required for the board to consider what it implies actually approving these recommendations. What the cochairs were discussing with the plenary on Wednesday is that the CCWG wishes to ensure that they are involved in the development of that implementation plan, not the whole CCWG, but sort of an oversight group. So that what goes to the board meets the spirit of the requirements. After that, once the recommendations and their implementation plan goes to the board, whatever the board approves, there will have to be a discussion between ICANN board and the community as to how to prioritize this. We've been working for the last 15 years on developing a process with the community and implementing recommendations that have any kind of significant requirements now, does require that discussion with the community. So, sorry to be long but I thought this would be useful information. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much Bernard. It is useful information and it helps in terms of moving forward and the next steps. Therefore with that recommendation number 6... We conclude we shall not make changes to that recommendation and if anyone is opposed then please let us hear your views. Moving forward to recommendation number 7, there is support for recommendation number 7 from comment 7, 01, 02, 03, 04. And there is a comment from the government of India, comment number 7.05 that she's not in support. So I open up for comment. And Julie your hand is up. Please have the floor.

>> Thank you Fiona. Julie Hammer speaking. I wonder if we could briefly go back to 7.03 which is a comment again from the registry stakeholder group and again I think it's a friendly comment. They've actually proposed even though it's not green, they've proposed some alternative wording to our recommendation 7 that I think is worth while to consider. What we have recommended is that staff develop a process for dealing with diversity related complaints. But what they're suggesting is that the process should be developed by SOACs and groups supported by staff and that the groups should develop and publish the process for dealing with the complaints and issues. And I think that's a sensible amendment and I'll put there exact

wording of the new recommendation as they suggest, into the chat. And I think it's also in the comment there. And I think that is a possible suggestion and the group might agree. Thank you Fiona.

>> Thank you very much, Julie for bringing that to our attention. Anyone who is opposed to that friendly amendment? On 7.03. The current wording of recommendation number 7, thank you Bernard for putting in the chat. Which reads ICANN staff should develop and publish a process for dealing with diversity related complaints and issues and the friendly amendment... Anyone opposed to that friendly amendment? Okay. Not opposed so I think we can consider that we have agreed to make that friendly amendment. Thanks, Julie for taking us back. We will now move on to 7.05 which is a comment from the government of India. Any comment on their input? Any comment? There being none then I think this is something we will -- [Indiscernible] and see how it can be addressed or possibly at a later time, not necessarily with the first round of implementing the recommendation. Move on to comment 7.06. Issue of privacy that should be paid attention to. Any comments on that? Okay. I see the chat that we should be talking [Indiscernible] from Julie and see how [Indiscernible] in the implementation. Moving on to 7.07. This is again from the ICANN board in view of the comments that were provided to us. I don't think that there are any comments regarding the comment from the board. However, if there are [Indiscernible] to give your input. So N view of the discussion we've had on recommendation number 7, we are going to make a friendly adjustment to recommendation number 7 to read ICANN staff should support the SO/AC's group in developing processes for dealing with complaints [Indiscernible] as has been proposed. Anyone opposed again to that amendment? There being none we'll move on to recommendation 8, public comment for recommendation 8. We have support for 8.01. We have some support, conditional support for 8.02. I would like to open up for discussion. Are there any comments? So the issues raised by the group -- the issue same as earlier. Rafik, I can see you have a hand up. The floor is yours.

>> Thanks Fiona conduct regional stakeholder this is Rafik speaking. About the NCSG comment, it's about having external expertise when it's needed. So I'm not sure if it's a possibility to add this maybe that as a friendly amendment, just that we can mention that we can get external expertise when needed. I don't have specific wording here so any help is welcome. I don't think the change in the spirit of our recommendation but just provide the opportunity when needed. Also regarding implementation of the budget, I think that will be the factor so we can have -- I mean we will provide kind of an option in the future if possible.

>> Thanks Rafik. I see Julie, you have your hand up.

>> Thank you Fiona. Julie Hammer speaking. I think something like this would actually add direct costs to the process that we're suggesting. So I'm a little bit hesitant to put something in. Certainly, you know, perhaps a comment could be made in text but I would suggest that we not change the wording of our recommendation to include anything like this because they're already concerned about the resource and direct monetary costs of doing some of this work. So at most, perhaps a comment in the text about it. Thank you.

>> I'm not sure if Fiona is here on the call but let's go with Bernie then we will try to respond to Julie. Yes, Bernard.

>> I simply wanted to point out on recommendation 8, you know, we've got 4 subpoints there. Create a diversity section on the ICANN website, I mean that's no special expertise. Gather and maintain all the relevant diversity information in one place. Again, it's gathering the information that we've requested in the previous recommendations of this report. .3, produce an annual diversity report based on the annual information provided and a global analysis. Now, I understand on the global analysis, but we're really doing an analysis of the information that's been gathered from the SO and ACs and include diversity information derived from the annual diversity report in ICANN's annual report. So I mean this is gathering, centralizing of information. It's not generating new diversity information, if you will. And I'm unsure of the expertise requirement to do that. Thank you.

>> Okay. Thanks, Bernard. So, I can understand the concern regarding the budget and the cost and so on but I think the suggestion is saying we can adhere external assistance so support can be provided when needed. So, I think we can even add text that when budget -- or we can put a constraint that we don't go directly to asking for support every time but really we need and we should support that opportunity. So I think we can add some text like that. It doesn't change the spirit but can maybe respond to add concerns because it's not the only time the mention of external expertise was made. So we should respond to some extent. That's my suggestion here.

>> Thanks Rafik. Any comments to his suggestion? Yes, Bernard? Then Julie.

>> Thank you Fiona. I think I understand Rafik's point and I -- at this point I would consider it a friendly amendment and I can weave in something in the wording. Thank you.

>> Julie.

>> Thank you, Fiona. Julie Hammer. Yes, I'll -- if Bernard thinks there's something appropriate that can be added to the wording of the recommendation, I'm happy to support that. Thank you.

>> Thank you. So we'll work on now a change on that recommendation number 8 this is the discussion we've had so far. And then have got a comment from the government of India. 8.04 which is a comment from [Indiscernible]. Any comments? 8.04. Okay. Moving on to 8, Rafik you have a stand in you have the floor.

>> I think the comment basically supports the recommendation as it is and I think what they are saying, they don't have any position regarding the regularity. So, yeah, I think that -- I think they are happy with the recommendation as it is. So... Yeah, we don't really need to respond to that.

>> Thank you, Rafik. Moving on to 8.05, the comment from the board. And again in view of work Bernard shared with us earlier we will not address that one at this point in time unless anyone is opposed. Okay. Moving on, Rafik your hand is up. Thank you. This is from the GNSO [Indiscernible]. Any comment? Your feedback and comments? Anyone have a comment, the floor is yours. Rafik I see your comment that you suggest we make a note. This has to do with implementation. And they are being very specific about what should be collected.

Anyone holding a different view? Those are all the comments for recommendation number 8 and thank you Bernard for recommending text, it's been put in the chat and for the benefit of those on the call only I'll read. ICANN staff should support [Indiscernible] recommendation of the information seeking external expertise if needed in the following ways and then there are different ways in which ICANN staff can support. So [Indiscernible]. Are there any comments on the wording of the recommendation number 8? So moving forward I'll suggest that [Indiscernible] share with us a clean sheet of just the recommendations, what worked and what has changed and we can track changes so that you're able to have a read through as well as a clean sheet and then [Indiscernible] and move this to the plenary. Now we'll move on to other public comments that we received that did not necessarily touch on the recommendation. We had in the beginning looked at the issues of -- had a discussion around the issues of the Office of diversity and oversight. So with your permission I would want to address other issues. Because, I think for that we want to send out a document [Indiscernible] have a conversation on the recommendations and come back to these. So we are 6 minutes to the end of the hour. Julie has her hand up, yes, the floor is yours Julie.

>> Thank you, Fiona. Were you wanting a discussion on the Office of diversity now?

>> No. Because we are 6 minutes to the end of the hour. But I was giving a recap of what we had proposed to do with Rafik. So that's now -- we held back on the document, the summary on the discussion of the inputs and the options that came up, we are now going to share that [Indiscernible] so we're now going to share that with the members of the working group so that we can then visit the discussion [Indiscernible] Office of diversity which is an issue that has been raised. Then we'll also have a conversation on the issues raised on including changes on the SO's and SE's and the issue of languages. So there's a bit we need to go through and also membership, the different [Indiscernible] privacy, training. And the overall comment. So we're going to eventually go through all the comments. But, now we can begin the conversation on email once the document is circulated [Indiscernible] office of diversity. Deliah I see your hand is up. You have to be brief because we're at the end of our time. Dalila? Dalila, we cannot hear you. No, we can't hear you. Okay. Thanks, Brenda.

>> Yes, Dalila we will continue from here. So this will be on the agenda and we hope to be able to discuss all the other pending issues. So I think in view of the current time that we have, I would like to bring this conference call to an end. Rafik, your hand is up. The floor is yours.

>> Okay, thanks Fiona. So, yes, in the next call we will discuss about -- how to say, item number 9 that I think will take some time. But I also notice we have item number 10 and 11. So I think we should Justin sure that we review them and respond. I think we can respond to them quickly. But just to ensure that we cover them. So, this is kind of not for us. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Rafik. So our next meeting will be on the 15th of February, next week. Again 1300UTC. I look forward to a very fruitful discussion and thank you all for being able to participate in this call and in the