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.

.

Check.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Check.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: This is a sound test for the captioner.

.

>> RAFIK: Hello, this is raw peek speaking. It's time to start the call. Please start the recording.

[Recording started]

>> RAFIK: Thank you. And thanks for everyone to the come the to today's call for the diversity subgroup. It is for us to go through the comments. So in the last call we could finish the rest of the recommendations so we covered the 8th recommendation and the comment related to them. We made a small changes. So what remains for us to work on is the comments related to diversity office and, also, to small items and number 10 and 11 I think in the document.

So, we will focus today mostly on the office diversity office option. So Fiona and myself created the document to kind of summarize our understanding of the comments and, also, to see the level of support for the option.

Okay. So you can see -- so you can see the document in Adobe Connect.

So, in the first part, as you can see, we did the summary of the response from the public comment. So we go to total of 15 comment related to our question of the not regarding the diversity office. First we see that 6 had no comments on an office of divert. There's three comments that supported an office of diversity or a panel. And three supported an office of diversity and three rejected the notion of an office of divert.

So this is the comments in general. If we do a breakdown here to see, from whom the comment are coming in term like SO/ACs and the board. And this is important to highlight since those are the -- those that are going to approve our recommendation and the Work Stream 27 final report at the end. So among the 7 comment coming from SO/ACs and the board, 4 had no comments and while 3 rejected the notion of an office of diversity.

We go to comment of 2 governments. 1 had no comments on an office of differrity and the other supported an office of differenterrity. And 6 individuals associations 1 had no comments on an office of diverty and 3 supported an office of sieverty or a panel and 2 supported the other. Please go to the -- yeah. Up.

Yes.

So, what we summarize here, for what coming from the comment 1 is to you establishment of an office diversity or a panel similar to what is proposed in this ombuds recommendations and the initiate shall establishment of an office of diversity and third, I think we support here is the rejection of an office of the diversity in favor of staff performing this work.

So, I think that the matter for us here is to determine kind of the level of support of office of diversity since that's what we ask it in our public comments. We try to seek an input from the community on this regard. So, what we see here, that we go I think here we have to have in mind, we also receive it other option that's not necessarily responding to our question directly. Because like proposing the idea of finding something we debit discuss before. So we have no kind of I think no time or bandwidth really to elaborate more on this.

So, I want here to hear -- so after this presentation and quick review of this document, which is put for discussion, and try to help us to discuss the matter, I'm going to open the floor here and to get comments from those on the call.

I see Julie, yes Julie please go ahead.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Rafik Julie Hammer speaking. I think it, as you will not be surprised to hear, but I think the logical conclusion, given the input from the SO and ACs and the board, is that they office of diversity should not be a recommendation we go ahead with. And we did not have a conclusion decision prior to the public consultation. I think we had back from the organization that need to approve our recommendation is that would not be comfortable with the he couldation. So I think we should not include it.

Thank you.

>> RAFIK: Thanks Julie for the comment. And, also, I see that we can assume here that heart and your comment. Yeah.

Twice. So, yeah, I think this is kind of, if you are trying to weight here the   comments, I think it's important to see how it goes from starting organization   are reacting to that question. And see if they are supporting or not. I see Sebastien in the cue. Sebastien, please go ahead.

>> Sebastien: Thank you very much Sebastien speaking. You will not be surprised that I support the idea of an office of diversity. You I think that the discussion here is quite amazing. The comments, it's not about either for a lot of people's support or very people didn't support of the reverse. Comments, it's comment, if we want to vote then it will happen when the SO and AC will have to make a decision on the report.

Or if we want to have a vote, we need to ask for a vote before. I didn't struggle about the fact that at what point in the discussion it was said that there's no -- there is a majority, no consensus but the majority against. And I don't think it was true, but I didn't struggle at that time. Maybe I must have.

But my other trouble is that we are trying to discuss something about the implementation on how we will do that. To the idea, it's not so much to decide how we will decide, but there's some elements that must be taken into account. First, it's a buddy, not just to call it a [indiscernible] or panel, it's a buddy that is independent from each SO, AC and from the body and there the staff [body]

If we look to the result of the first study made by [indiscernible] on that, about the leadership. Ins and outs it's long time ago, it was quite interesting to see the reverse.

And yes I know the staff tried to do something, set up a survey on that. But what we needed something will take that into account in the long range and make proposal on changes. And that can't be the staff that makes popular changes. It must be something else. What I call the body, it's an independent body. Now we have, if we decide we wanted this idea, when I say this idea, it's nothing more than the idea. Then during the implementation phase, yes we'll to discuss when it's an office, whether it's a link or not with the duty of the ICANN ombuds office. If it's link with the compliance office, if it's the complaint officer. If it's something like with an vental panel that will help the ombuds office to ICANN ombuds office to work. But that's not the decision and discussion we need to have today. I think it's important that we set up the idea of we need more diversity in this organization. And one way is that it can't be done by one or the other. It must be something in the panels of all. And when I say all, I include of course staff, what we call -- what they call them, ICANN organization today. The board and all the SO and ACs and all the groups.

Thank you very much.

Sorry for to be a little bit too long.

>> RAFIK: Okay, thank you to Sebastien. We try to kind of comment what you say. Yeah, it was a little bit long.

So you said that we are not voting. I don't think anybody talked about vote here. What we are trying to, we ask the community for guidance. We put a note, asking this question. We expand what -- that what people thought about the idea of office of diversity. I think we clearly put that office of diversity. So we ask people to react to that. To give us some guidance and help us and what to do here. And what we get is kind of mixed results. It's not giving us clear guidance and we have to be mindful with regard to timing. The time constraints. Since we have I think there's day 9 of the second of March. That's in two weeks. So we got this situation to deal with. And since you -- I mean I'm kind of confused when you talk it's not an office it's not a panel but it's something that independent. I think what we spend time before, regarding recommendations we need to not focus on the implementation. I think that we reiterate that several times. But to focus more on the functions or what can be achieved which means the requirement and we try to

think. And in particular recommendation number 8, to describe what can be done as a functions. So it can be maybe handled at the time of implementation and to see how those kind of function can be taken by fool. We are not kind of respective here. So I think at the end, if it's your saying it's not a question of implementation that we are not discussing that. But we are really issue with that with the recommendation we have.

So once we are talking about independents I'm not sure how this can be achieved. I mean I may try to understand what you mean independence. Some kind of outside organization telling the community how to be diverse?

So I'm kind of really struggling here. I may understand that you may not want anybody have undue influence or control of this, but how we can achieve this. So maybe it's at the end, it's a question of implementation. But we as the subgroup we try to work more on the recommendation. What we want to achieve at the end. What kind of goals we are trying to reach. So this is my understanding from the beginning.

So if in term of input I think it's clear [indiscernible] if other member of the subgroup they have different opinion or interpretation I welcome the hear from them. Because what we try to summarize here, it's not -- I mean we didn't get kind of a final, I mean a clear, straight, path to follow. So we are not getting that. So yes, I see that Cheryl is in the cue please go ahead.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Rafik Cheryl for the record. I believe and I would be surprised if anyone can prove my belief as in error that the inclusion of the office of diversity as a office -- a preferred option in public comments was to seek when there was any significant, if not overwhelming support from the wider ICANN community for, this is a proposal. I am not seeing this from the analysis that you and Fiona have put together. I'm not seeing overwhelming support from the ICANN community. Because and I have said this in just about every work group I've ever been in, I believe and I think most people do tend to believe similarly, that there's a valid reason to weight ACs and SOs more highly than individuals. This is not that the individual voice is not considered and looked at in the public comment process, but a consensus view or a view that is gone through particular development and scrutiny in response to a public comment coming are from a group or subsection of recognized group or subsection of ICANN has certainly in my view and always has been in my view, more weight to it than an individual. So I don't think this is a voting exercise. I don't think that what and you Fiona have done is trying to make this a voting exercise.

We have evidence in front of us and now we may decide what we do with that evidence.

We can, of course, ask our communities of the enormous, if we want the leave it to the vote, if we put this forward as a add on, a belt on, do you really want to have a level look at this question in the final report, then we will get a response formally, I assume, from the chartering organizations.

And to that end, I've certainly been watching what the ALAC, current ALAC's response to the sharing that Alan did, to the ALAC on the -- on our ALAC list as ALAC and regional leagues. And I'm not seeing in that either severalled particularly with the current financial concerns from

an ICANN perspective that this would get overwhelming support from the ALAC. We can leave it to the vote if we want to -- not the vote, sorry, leave it to final opinion from the charting organization if need be, but right now I'm you just not seeing it get the traction it needs to be involved. Thank you.

>> RAFIK: Yes thanks Cheryl for the comments.

Can try to see if there's anyone in the cue who want to comment? Or maybe it's asking question.

Okay, so yeah, I think in term of procedure here, we went through the positive comments and to kind of to, we were seeking for improved, to see how the communities reacting to our recommendation to see if we were on the right path or not. So we find out for most of our comments, most of them we were fine. We only had to make small changes on the material.

So, when it's come to this question, it says we kind of we said, this is kind of my reading, this kind of makes us reserved. We didn't get a clear overwhelming support to make it clear for us, that yes, we should cover this idea of office of diversity. And again, yeah, I mean we didn't -- we are not talking about votes here. We are trying to kind of interpret how the community, particular those from the SO and ACs are responding to our comment.

Okay, so not sure, I don't see anybody in the cue. But I also see some comments in the chat. I'm seeing Thomas, I think the comments that were not changing the recommendation.

And from Taylor. Just to comment something we need to be included egg precision of the language is critical given that we cannot tread down the path of implementation.

So, okay,.

I was not in jurisdiction called, I have no idea what happened there. But I think this is likely very always the kind of tension between what you are recommending -- what we recommend and how it's implemented. And I think we have this discussion several times. And we need to focus on requirement in terms of how recommendation. To think what we want to achieve. So we are not kind of asking for a particular way to do things. What we are thinking that we have some goals and some expectation that we want to reach. So we leave the implementation for rarity on. That phase, that's why we have implementation. And that's where the details and specific will be worked out.

Okay, so I'm really asking here for any comment or, I mean if you want to intervene so we can hear from everyone. Because at the end of the day, we have to kind of to see if we have consensus or not. And I don't see that we have that on this matter.

Okay, I see Fiona wants to chime in here. Yes Fiona go ahead.

>> FIONA ASONGA: Thanks Rafik from where I'm sitting what I'm observing is we have reached a point in this discussion on the office of diversity where we are no longer able to continue that discussion. We have put it into our report. We have looked at the public comment. We do not have strong support for the office of diversity to enable eyes, add that into our final report. I think at this point in time we should -- it would be good for us to then draw the

conclusion that you will not be putting any proposals on office of diversity in performance that you are providing comments. So we move ahead with the recommendation that we just -- doesn't change the recommendation. So it doesn't come in as an addition, isn't coming in as addition or recommendation either. Thank you.

>> RAFIK: Okay. So thanks Fiona. And I think so we, let's see if there's any objection to your proposal and what you're suggesting here.

Okay, I don't see any options. So I think we can include that we cannot add this proposal to our report. We give here a chance to, for people to intervene and to share their thoughts. So I think we, it's our analysis and having a discussion we have, you can conclude that we don't have a consensus around this.

So, I'm think yeah, I think we can -- okay, well I was going to -- I think we can move on, but let's see what Julie wants to comment here. Yes Julie go ahead.

>> JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Rafik, my suggestion was going to be, that we have a look through the report to see the wording where the office of diversity is mentioned. I think it's on about page 10 of the document that went out for public consultation. And we see when we need to update the words of that to reflect the fact that a public consultation was conducted on this issue. That feedback had been received, summarize the feedback and conclude that there was no overwhelming support. And simply update the report to reflect that. And I think that that would be the appropriate action to take at this point. Thanks.

>> RAFIK: Good point. I don't have access to the report. But thanks for distinguishing the number. It's page 12 -- I mean Bernard, I don't want to put you on the spot but is it possible to put that text in the Adobe Connect? If we need to make, yeah, okay. Description of issues. So we need to make changes there. Likely. So we can put that as a task maybe for the staff to make change to this part. So this is an action item.

And so, we, after we do that, they make proposal through working that part that can be shared in the main that we can [indiscernible] we are fine with that update. Are we okay with this approach?

Okay, I see no objection. I'm not sure if you were supporting from before or supporting now. But I will take that as support [chuckling].

Okay, so so we got that done. So we will update the part in the report with what we concluded so an action item from the staff and hopefully we get that in as soon as possible. So we can finalize it.

As we said, we have two kind of, I'm not sure how to call them, items, number 10 and 11. They are not covering specific recommendation. But I think we have to cover them. So is it possible to -- possible to share the comment summary again in Adobe Connect?

So it's number 10 and 11.

Is it possible to scroll down?

Okay, so yes. Yeah, can you please scroll up a little bit. Okay.

So here one comment that is coming from ICANN board with regarding changes on SO and ACs.

Let's look at its cut at the end.

So I think this is the question, again, yeah, thanks. So I think it's against the comment regarding the resources. And here is require -- I mean the implementation require support from ICANN and SO and AC community and must participate in this efforts and order to achieve full implementation. While ICANN organization can produce reports and make items available in the websites.

Okay, so I think there is just to, I guess, the question here is that the SO and AC, they have to -- to kind of update or modify their working practice, and so on, to meet the recommendation that we are proposing. And so I think it's probably here that the board wants to meet -- to make clear that the organization can't impose these kind of changes. So I can't implement these as part that we are asking that should be coming from the SO and ACs to do that work.

Okay. So I think this is a matter of implementation, if I'm not mistaken and can be, I think decided at that time. So I don't see that we need to make any response. And then in our report here. And then probably while we are sharing the comments, so that can be covered in that time.

So I got also the parts I'm hearing that the -- yes. So the plenary, the prioritization implementation is decided by ICANN and the community here.

So thanks Bernard for this.

So, any comment or question? Or any suggestion on this part?

Okay, I don't see any. So I don't need to make any changes or respond to this one. So it's coming from the.

So please center the comments. So this is about language. It's not possible for capture for the wide diversity languages. To improve the quality of documents implementation order to include the participation important also from the diversity point of view.

Okay. So here it's necessary to explore other ways it needs to breach cultural and neutral for graphics animation video that are language literature and can be utilize it. So, also I see egg there's mappings of captioning. So I think here it's really again, since it's the comment going into specifics regard the language and the what can be used, if you want just to translation and interpretation. I think this is again the implementation matter. And our recommendation in our recommendation already included the element of language and element of diversity. And so if this is more definitely I think a question for implementation. So this is something to be shared for the implementation phase of a go into the details of what can be done. I think with within the available resources.

Okay. Any comment or question on this one?

I see none. I don't see anything in the Adobe Connect.

So, okay. So just note that the two comments can be covered during the implementation as something to be noted for that.

Also, for the offers of diversity, we will make change in the text to adjust it to what we agreed at the end. So, I think here we covered all of the comments. And we got all our recommendation so we can approve it.

Wondering here if we are done? Somehow and we just need to make the last changes in our draft to be shared.

For the plenary, if I'm not mistaken.

Okay. Fiona do you want to add anything here?

>> FIONA ASONGA: Fiona here. Thanks Rafik. I think we have covered everything and what is left is for us, as a repertoires to update the report. And that connect to the subgroup members. And then after that, share it with the LGBT that is going to be included in the final report.

Maybe Bernard can advise if that's the process.

Thank you.

>> RAFIK: Okay, and I think that's it. Okay, we are really ahead of time. But thanks everyone for the work done last month. I don't think it was easy, but I think we should, the point that we wanted. So I know that it's not -- it's not everyone is happy with what we get, if it's enough or not. But I think we did a good job here. And I want to really thank everyone that spend time to join the cause and participate in the different drafting. And yeah. I think that's it for today. And I guess we don't need any call from now. So thanks.

>> Thank you Rafik.

>> Bye.

>> RAFIK: Thank you bye.

>> Bye.