SUSIE JOHNSON:
Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the LACRALO Governance Working Group call on this Wednesday, June 11, 2014, at 21:00 UTC.

Attendance today are, in the Spanish channel, Sergio Salinas Porto. On the English channel is Niran Beharry and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond. From staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Terri Agnew, and Susie Johnson. The interpreters for today's call will be Veronica and David.

Thank you. Over to you, Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:
Thank you very much, Susie. I am the chair of the Governance Working Group of LACRALO, which mission is to discuss the issues and matters related to our Rules of Procedure metrics and operating principles as well.

In this call, we have different items to deal with. Firstly, the roll call, which was already done by Susie Johnson. Now I would like to speak about the current situation of the status of the amendments of the operating principles. Then, we will deal with establishments of new metrics for this working group. Finally, we will see if there are any other business to deal with.

So far when we speak about the status of amendments of the operating principles, we need to perform an analysis to see what we have so far. We have some members of our region asking different questions regarding the timeline. I believe that the timelines for our activities to

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

reach to the assembly are not being followed. We will not be able to comply with those timelines.

Today, I have several meetings with different organizations and representatives to encourage them to read the proposal and make comments. Some of them have requested me to have extra time to be able to read the proposal and discuss because they're discussing those topics with their organizations, so they told me that they need more time.

I would like to mention that there is a rich participation from many components of the organization. For example, Dev has done excellent work on different issues and topics. I think it would be interesting that we may carry out an analysis so that we can discuss the different topics. This is important so that we can have an approach during this call to our goal.

Firstly, I would like to welcome you all. I would like to welcome Roosevelt. He has just joined the call, so welcome, Roosevelt. It has been ages that I haven't seen you, so I am really eager to see you in London.

I think our participation today is very important to discuss these topics that have caught our attention. We also need to discuss metrics. Of course, I think we need further time to discuss metrics because it's a very important topic. But there are also other urgent topics as well, and I think these could be discussed because it deserves the time so it's worth discussing all these topics.

EN

Now, I will give the floor to you. I don't know if anyone would like to make any comment – Dev, Niran, or Roosevelt. I will give you the floor. I am not on the AC room, so if you would like to make any comment or any suggestion, you have the floor. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I would like to take the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Sergio. It does seem what is happening is that everybody is so busy. A lot of the key members in LACRALO are so busy, myself included, in preparing and doing activities for the ATLAS II and for ICANN At-Large. I think this is why there hasn't been that much attention being paid to this topic of modifying the issues regarding the operating principles and so forth.

There have been lots of comments. I have posted quite a few replies to the proposals, and I haven't really seen any direct response challenging it. I don't know if that means that people haven't read it yet or not. However, I – and I'm certain many ALSes in the Caribbean – have significant issues regarding disagreement with some of the concepts of the proposals posted on the wiki.

There's been already counter-proposals that have been suggested. For example, I suggested harmonizing. Let's not do any radical changes

now. Let's harmonize the differences between the different language versions of our Rules of Procedure, so we can get that harmonized first. Then after discussion, look to modify other aspects of our operating documents.

I think though as you said, I don't think we can really even put anything for the general assembly at this point because it requires a certain timeframe for any motions to be heard by any general assembly. So the fact that this has not happened means that at least what we can do at the general assembly is perhaps ask some more direct questions with everybody in the room there regarding the governance.

For example, asking questions: "Why aren't you involved in LACRALO?" Those types of things. "Why aren't you attending the conference calls?" And see whether from those answers and from the subsequent discussions we can at least perhaps come up with the solutions to improve our participation.

Regarding the participation aspect, I [inaudible] to all the persons who said they would be interested in doing the metrics haven't contacted me and they are not on the call, so I don't think any metrics are available at this point unless, Sergio, you have heard something differently. I'm going to say for now I'm incredibly busy, so I don't think I can do any metrics to have any report ready in time for London.

Anyway, I'll stop now and see if anybody else has anything else to add. That's it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Dev. I should say that I do agree with you in what you have said. We have plenty of activities and, of course, we are very busy and we are quite delayed with our proposal in terms of or related to this document and the discussions related to this document for the general assembly.

I would like to suggest to set new timelines to make the commitment to keep on working. Perhaps we can meet twice or three times so as to be able to reach a concrete point when it comes to the Rules of Procedure. Part of the problems we have had in our region are due to the fact that we do not have clear goals or understandable goals in the region. We had many problems because of that, so I believe it is very important.

As I said at the very beginning, this is something important. It has taken us a lot of time, so we can take a bit more time so as to have a good final result, a positive result so that we can listen to others and take into account diversity. I'm not talking about geographical diversity, but I'm talking about diversity in terms of ideas. I think we need to take into account all these issues and to create a dialogue among all the organizations that are part of the region.

As you well say, Dev, the time will be after the London meeting and not now. I was thinking about this not long ago, and I realized that we're making a big effort to carry out all the activities that we need to do. We know that there are certain organizations that are approaching us. Some of them have come back, and I believe that there were certain organizations in the region that needed certain time to mature their situation or to maturing [fast].

These organizations are now concerned about participating. They want to participate in the region, so that makes me very happy. In that way, we can work all together, and perhaps those efforts will be released in the future because there will be someone accompanying us in our work for the region so everything really works. I fully agree with what you have said.

Of course, we have different topics and questions that we have been discussing. We sometimes believe that we might take our own decisions but, of course, we take into account that this is a long way to go and we can get to the middle of that task and see what to do. But what we need to decide and see what our expectations are and how we can complement our expectations.

I've been reading all the proposals in detail but, as I said before at the beginning of this call, I had the opportunity of talking to different organizations today. I have met more than ten organizations, and I will meet the rest of the organizations during London. But I did it because I wanted to know about those organizations that were not able to participate or that were not in touch or that were not participating in the wiki. I wanted to know the reason for that.

Many of them told me that they didn't know how to start, so this is a topic that we need to address. Perhaps what you are saying, that is to say the fact of having a kind of questionnaire just to gather ideas together, perhaps we can have that kind of questionnaire for the GA so that we can hear different voices.

Perhaps we can take 15 or 20 minutes. We need to see the agenda and try to set that period, but perhaps we can devote a part of our agenda and set some time of that agenda during the GA to ask questions. Perhaps it's even better to listen rather than answering.

In my particular case, instead of discussing topics on the wiki, I wanted to know and I wanted to see all the comments. This is an experience for everyone. These are the rules that will guide us, so it would be very interesting that all those people may express their voices. Some of them will speak about the role of an ALAC member. Some of them will speak about their understanding of the metrics. But we will need to compile everything, and not everything will be included in the Rules of Procedure or in the [bylaws].

Of course, there will be things that need to be set aside, and that is our role. We have a role that is not quite nice because we will need to [sum up] certain concepts. When we [sum up], there are certain concepts that are not taken into account. But of course, this is part of our work.

We need to present a proposal. It is our role presenting a proposal, and that proposal should be as comprehensive as possible. Of course, not everyone will agree, but we need to strike balance on that.

If you had just a little time to perhaps circulate by e-mail a questionnaire, we can create a dialogue for the GA so that the GA may express itself about certain clear topics and so that the members may give their opinions on certain topics.

This governance working group should focus on debate. It should discuss, take into account, and reflect on what is being said. Then the

discussion will be carried out internally with the members. But for the sake of the rules, I think we should carry out this type of work.

Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Sergio. I think that's a good idea. I think definitely it's also too late to really introduce any motions to change any Rules of Procedure at this point. But I think it's really important to [inaudible] because we'll be meeting face-to-face, we'll be seeing each other, and we can probably get to the heart of the issues of why people aren't participating in ICANN At-Large and LACRALO.

Because I would roughly estimate out of the 44 or 45 At-Large Structures that we have in LACRALO, I would estimate that we have about 12 to 15 persons or ALS representatives really involved in ICANN At-Large. By being involved, I'm not talking about voting because apparently for voting everybody is very involved.

But when it comes to the reason why we're here, that is to give input on ICANN policy issues, I would still say it's about 10 to 15 persons who are actively in the various working groups – At-Large working groups – attending the ALAC calls and so forth.

Personally, I think actually this is a slight improvement because I'm seeing newer persons attending the ALAC monthly calls and so forth. Even though it may still be small compared to the entire membership of LACRALO, it's good to see at least two or three persons attending the

ALAC monthly calls, excluding the ALAC members themselves. It's a good sign.

I noticed this year, perhaps I'm seeing more input being driven to comment on some of the policy issues. For example, the policy response to the Technical Liaison Group, I believe something regarding NETmundial, and so forth. Again, small steps, but all journeys begins with small steps.

I think the idea of a questionnaire I think is a good one. It can't be too detailed. We probably have to limit it to, I don't know, two questions. We can certainly propose that in the agenda for the general assembly because I think the agenda needs to be finalized seven days before.

Once again, no particular motions to change anything, but really let's have a dialogue. Let's come to an understanding and more importantly get to an understanding of each other because I think you're right, Sergio. I think we don't understand each other, and I think that's really a challenge for us to overcome.

Okay, so I think, yes, perhaps one or two questions. I think there's a LACRALO monthly call on Monday. I'm not sure. Perhaps staff can confirm that. I'll stop now.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Dev. I'm not really sure if the meeting will be held.

EN

SILVIA VIVANCO: No, actually that meeting for Monday has been cancelled actually. I think we will have a London meeting. The monthly meeting actually will be held in London.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Silvia. This clarifies a lot of items and just shows us directly that we need to prepare the questionnaire. I'm not really sure how many questions will this questionnaire include. But we need to take advantage of the fact that our dear president Alberto has just stepped in, and we can ask him if he can provide us with a few minutes on the assembly so that we can raise a number of questions.

We need to define how many questions it should be. Perhaps not many. Maybe two, three, or four questions, but no more than that. We should listen to the different members and provide a limited amount of time for each of the members so that they can express themselves. We should only listen; we should not reply.

Silvia is telling me we have three hours. If we can have a limited number of time, perhaps we could ask questions and listen to our colleagues in the region and have a more clear idea of what they actually mean.

This is what Dev and I are saying: we should prepare questions. I don't know really how many. Do you think four might be too much? Okay, so maybe two? Two questions? Dev, what do you think about that? Just say "yes" or "no" right there in the chat room. Okay, that's very nice. So two. Two at the most.

We should decide then what these questions should deal with. With these two questions, we should see what the assembly is saying. We should listen to our colleagues, define these two issues, and then this will provide us with a framework that we can work from there.

If Alberto will allow us and will give us a green light on that, he knows what the times of the assembly are. Alberto, can you please take the floor now? Silvia, is Alberto on the call?

SILVIA VIVANCO: I think he's only on the AC room. If you allow me, right in front of me I have the agenda for the general assembly. I can read the items one-by-one.

The first item is the Latin America strategy with Rodrigo de la Parra, 10 minutes.

The second item is a discussion on the procedure to determine the way to reach consensus with respect of the opinion that ALAC has to certify and ALS. This is 20 minutes.

The third one is the procedure to see the way in which LACRALO will issue a statement on a certain issue. That's 10 minutes.

Four, proposal for mechanisms on how to improve participate for an ALS and its members in LACRALO or in ICANN. This is a half hour.

Then five, a proposal to uniform the reforms, the amendments for the Rules of Procedure in English and in Spanish. This is 25 minutes.

Then, the proposal to amend the operating principles for LACRALO.

Item five has 25 minutes, and I see an item six here. I see there is sufficient time then to analyze a little bit this questionnaire. Of course, Alberto needs to confirm this because this is just a draft for the agenda, but this is what we have. This is what we posted on the wiki, and I am now posting it on the chat room right now.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: With what Silvia has just read, I think we have sufficient time to include it here. We need to be very strict with the time allotted for each of the members to speak. I know I myself speak a lot, but there are others who speak a lot but they speak very slowly. So we will actually have some problems for everybody to express themselves.

If we can have a very tight schedule on how to participate within the general assembly, then we may be able to go further but only that way. I'm not sure if you agree with me. It should be then just a few minutes, maybe one or two minutes. We need to think that on television when somebody is being interviewed, they speak only for three minutes. So I would need to know if you agree with this. Please go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Silvia, for posting the link to the agenda. At least item six, since there are not going to be any modifications as such, we can use that time for additional discussions and add it to one of the discussions about the various procedures. I suppose the discussion regarding the

EN

procedure to improve participation of ALSes in LACRALO and ICANN, we can dedicate the hour to it.

The thing is though, while I kind of understand the idea of everybody wanting to speak, there will be at least 40 ALSes there. Even if you just have two minutes, that's 80 minutes. I think that it just wouldn't be practical, unfortunately. Perhaps what can happen is that – and that's assuming everybody sticks to two minutes. Everybody starts talking for three minutes, basically you take three hours and that's the entire time we will use there.

Perhaps what we can do is issue the questionnaire to try to ask a question as to why as an At-Large Structure representative you're not participating. Maybe if enough persons respond, maybe the thing is to just allow persons to make these suggestions, make sure people agree with that or not agree with that, so we come up with the issues. Then from that, we then try to have a discussion as what do you think are the solutions.

That's my suggestion. Trying to have everybody speak, Sergio, I think it just may not practical. It's just simply not practical, unfortunately. That's it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I'm going to give the floor to Alberto, but I will ask you to let me say just something very briefly.

I wonder – and I'm asking this question because I think this could lead us to a good point – we could talk about something more general

EN

without really getting into a debate that could generate discussions within our assembly.

What we could do is have a survey to be answered right at the same time, perhaps posting it on the wiki so that everybody can answer, on two questions. We can give them sufficient time to all ALSes, all the representatives, so that they can answer that right at that moment. Then we can have a representation of everything they want to say.

Of course, there should be a limit in time. They cannot look at this for a very long time, but perhaps we can allow them seven or ten minutes or whatever we think is necessary within the assembly. This is something I'm just thinking of right now, but this could be really interesting for us to have it inside.

With this we can also so some education to those ALSes that never write anything on the wiki. Perhaps it would be a good time for them to start using the wiki, and our assembly can have a certain degree of education if you want to so call it.

Please go ahead, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Good afternoon and good evening to you all. I apologize for being so late, but I was at the doctor and I was received very late and it's raining in Buenos Aires, so I apologize. I'm sorry to be late especially because I don't really know what are the conclusions that you have reached, what is it that you have dealt with so far.

Now with respect to participation of all the ALSes, it will be virtually impossible. We have tried. We want all of the issues to be dealt with at the assembly to be dealt with much in advance. The same applies to modifications to the procedure. So if somebody wants to discuss all of the procedures at the assembly, we will have another Costa Rica, and this is unacceptable.

I think any person who wants to request the floor [will take the floor] if the chair of the GA – which will probably not be me – I mean, it is said in the bylaws that they can provide them two or three minutes. Also, when the time for the speakers exceeds that time, it can be determined that they should speak for a certain amount of time but no more than that.

This means that now I am more interested in trying to deal with issues such as how can each ALS participate and how can each member provide more of their input. We should deal more with this than with the amendment of the procedures because otherwise we will die looking for amendments to the procedures and we will not deal with the substantial issue, which is why is it that nobody participates.

There are two or three issues there. Unfortunately, it's a little bit late to deal with this, and I apologize again that I'm being late. I'm not sure if I'm saying something different as to what you actually said.

Just because we opened the amendment to the procedures much earlier and we haven't really attained a lot of participation, I would even take it out of the general assembly. I would remove it from there so that

one month after the general assembly we can continue discussing these issues.

Then at the assembly when we say what is the best way – and this is what we should reach – what is the best way for each ALS and each member of the ALS to be involved, then I think we will get a better result if we deal with the changes to the Rules of Procedure later on.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Let me say that what we were saying is that there has been a lot of interaction on the wiki, but we need a lot more. I talked to many of the organizations in our region yesterday, today, and the day before yesterday to see if they were able to read the proposal if they were interested in participating. There were many ALSes that I contacted that I talked to who told me they are studying the issue. They think this is very interesting, but they all told me that they needed some time.

Now considering what happened in Costa Rica, which for all of us was [havoc] really, I think it is necessary to take the necessary time, whatever is necessary, so that we can finish it.

Now the debate will happen anyway. What we do now, and what Dev was proposing that I think is interesting, is the possibility to be able to have two issues to debate and discuss at the GA. I actually framed this within the idea of being able to have just what everybody thinks. Not a really a debate, not a discussion, but these groups should choose one or two topics to discuss and say what they want to say, what they think.

Then perhaps instead of telling them what each of them thinks because we actually are 40 ALSes and two minutes each is 80 and one minute each is still 40 minutes.

So I think maybe if we add something else on the wiki and then in the middle of the assembly when we have the time allotted to this, we can ask them to access the wiki and write these two questions in their own language. We have a translator that works really fine. People can write in their own language and we don't really need to wait for them to access it.

So we can ask those two questions so that they can answer them in writing. This will allow us to work on this as well because this is part of the discussion that we are having.

This is my report, and I ask that you lower your hand because Dev was first and I'm going to give the floor to Dev. Dev, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you very much, Sergio. Okay, well at least the [consensus] is [use] of Rules of Procedure we agree that we need more dialogue. I think so because fundamentally I think that's it's going down to the real issue of why we are here. In terms of when I say "we," we in At-Large being involved in At-Large in terms of providing policy input to ICANN policy issues.

To me, the Rules of Procedure don't really – to me there's no real restriction that the Rules of Procedure place, so I'm glad to see that the Rules of Procedure emphasis is not so critical for London. Otherwise I

think, yes, it would be just a repeat of Costa Rica, which was, as Sergio said, indeed a great headache for me, for many.

Again, I think if the questions can be circulated ahead of time and maybe persons can reply on the wiki one time. Again, whoever is the chair of the assembly would have to really be very clear on establishing the time limit.

I think that's it. I haven't heard from Niran or Roosevelt. I'm not sure Roosevelt is on the call anymore because I'm not seeing him in the AC room. I'll stop there.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Dev. Alberto, please take the floor now.

ALBERTO SOTO: I agree with Dev. Do see that I mentioned one of the items for the GA which is, how are we going to deal with the procedure for the participation of ALSes in any topic being dealt with at the meeting? The custom should be that if there is a work group that has already issued a document, then everybody – this working group has worked for a very long time.

Dev did something which is perfect. He takes whatever he does not agree with and he modifies this. That is, he says, "I don't agree with this," and he justifies his disagreement. Then below that, he adds the paragraph that he suggests should be modified in his opinion.

EN

We have received another participation where somebody corrected and added a new document that has been completely corrected. Perhaps this is modified in 5% or 10%, but we can't really read the whole thing or the group cannot read the whole thing – not a single member and not the whole group. In this assembly we need to fix this procedure and not [as a custom] but actually as a rule we should work that way. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Alberto. We need to see still how is it that we're going to pose, to ask those two questions. I would rather they not be asked orally, but they should be in writing. I will [insist in fact] that if at the assembly we can have some minutes for people to answer online in the middle of the assembly, that would be nice. They could answer on the wiki these two questions, so it would be nice.

ALBERTO SOTO: These questions cannot be asked during the assembly because of the time that's required.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Can we have a few, some time so that this can be answered?

ALBERTO SOTO: It's not a problem if they are added, but the time to analyze them cannot be taken from time on the assembly because if we have 40 ALSes we have 80 answers.

EN

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: No, there is no analysis. There's no back and forth. It's one way. You ask the question, then people answer. Then the group will study them in the one or two months that we're going to take to work on this.

ALBERTO SOTO: I apologize. I misunderstood.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: If you tell us that we can have ten minutes or seven minutes so that people in front of their computers in the middle of the GA or wherever they are on this item, which could be the last item, if people can answer these two questions that we are asking, then it's going to be a very short questionnaire which is not very long questions because we're not going to read them. The reply should be very concise. If this is possible, then we could go on and work on this.

The specific question is, can we have ten minutes that we can take for people to answer these two questions? Alberto is telling me that we can do this.

There was an issue with Alejandro Pisanty. I can't really remember what it is that he said, but Alejandro Pisanty said in a formal e-mail that the working group should start working on the metrics request for each of the ALSes working. Alberto, please help me with this because I'm really lost.

EN

ALBERTO SOTO: I was typing, but I will repeat this because we don't really have much time. This is not a problem of the working group because I already told Alejandro Pisanty that the agenda for the WG has always been defined, and we cannot modify it all the time.

We will add this topic to deal with this very quickly, and then we will see how we can continue developing this after the GA. If this will go to the governance group or if a new group will be formed, this is something we're going to discuss after the GA.

We cannot tie a specific topic that does not require urgency because we need to deal with those issues that are urgent and are productive. I've already discussed this with Alejandro. He already said this, and I [insist]. I'm not sure if they will be on the governance group or not, but we will know this after the assembly. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Alberto, for your input. We are just reaching the top of the hour. We would like to thank the enormous support and contributions we had from staff and from our interpreters, both David and Veronica, who are here with us today.

Unfortunately, this meeting has been undermined in participation but not in productivity. I suggest that if you can send these two questions that we can ask on the GA, can you please send these to the mailing list of the working group and see if there is anybody else who could not be here on the call today. Maybe they can add something or they can add something else so that we can start [putting this up]. We will be working on this in the next few days before the assembly.

This is off topic, but then Dev we won you on the football match the other time, so we hope we will be able to win the World Cup now if we're lucky. We will meet then and perhaps enjoy a match together in the next meeting that we're going to share in London.

Dear colleagues, these are the last seconds we're having, so I just want to say goodbye and we will have a very good working day in London. I'm sure we will have to work a lot on this. I'm going to send another e-mail to the list explaining how procedures are going to be dealt with.

I think we're going to need some two months to continue working after London and perhaps another two months to fine tune the final proposal. This will probably be the work that we will need to [inaudible] in October or November. I think in October/November we will really meet the deadline.

So we will meet then very soon in London. Thank you very much and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]