

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the LACRALO monthly meeting. Today, Monday the 20th May 2019 at 23:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have on the Spanish channel Sergio Salinas Porto, Harold Arcos, Adrian Carballo, Antonio Medina Gomez, Eli Acevedo, Humberto Carrasco, Ivan Diaz, León Sanchez, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Marcelo Rodriguez, Marcelo Telez, Ricardo Holmquist, Rocio De La Fuente, Vanda Scartezini, Victor Horita, Alberto Soto.

On the English channel, we have Carlton Samuels, and on the Portuguese channel, we have Flavio Wagner.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Steve Chan, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

Our interpreters today are Veronica and David in Spanish, Bettina and Esperanza in Portuguese, and Aurelie and Isabelle on French. Before starting, I would like to remind you all to please state your name at the time of taking the floor, not only for the transcript but also for the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel.

So thank you, and Sergio, you have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Hello, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I'm now going to give the floor to Harold Arcos for him 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.*

---

read the agenda and so that we can approve the agenda for today. So Harold, please go ahead.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Sergio. We are now posting the links to the chat. The first item on the agenda is a webinar. This is a webinar on the PDP 3.0, and we'd like to thank Steve Chan. Then we have a report by the ALAC member Bartlett Morgan. Then we will have a report on the Southern School of Internet Governance 2019.

Then we will have an update on the elections issue, and item number eight has to do with information on discretionary funds for 2019, and we have Any Other Business for anyone who would like to include or add Any Other Business now or at the time of reaching that item on the agenda.

And finally, we will be carrying out an evaluation survey. This is an evaluation survey for the webinar at the end of this meeting. So if there are no other additional items to include, I don't see anyone on the chat. You can also add the items at the end, but if there are no comments, we can adopt the agenda today.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

As Harold said before, the first item on the agenda is our webinar, PDP 3.0, so I would like to give the floor to Steve Chan, policy director for the GNSO. I would like to kindly ask him to start the webinar. Do you have any presentation, Steve? If that is the case, I would kindly ask staff to upload the presentation on the screen so that we can see and follow

---

the presentation. So Steve, welcome once again, welcome to our LACRALO monthly meeting. It is a pleasure for us to have you here. You have the floor. Thank you.

STEVE CHAN:

Thank you very much Sergio and Harold. Thanks again for having me, it's great to be here again. I've been able to meet with you a few times to present on PDPs at various times.

Today is a little bit different. This presentation is not on a specific PDP within the GNSO. Rather, it's actually about the PDP process itself. So the purpose of this webinar is to explain what PDP 3.0 is within the GNSO council. Like I said, it's not about a specific PDP, it's more about how the PDP itself can be made more effective, more efficient, and to really give the GNSO council the better ability to manage PDPs that are within its purview. So like I said, it's a little bit different rather than focusing on a PDP, but it's about making the PDP process itself better.

So today, we'll talk about a little bit of history and where we are today to give you a little bit of context. Then we'll talk about what the council decided to try to improve with the PDP, and then we'll talk about specifically what those improvements are. So without further ado, we'll start with our first slide.

This actually predates my time at ICANN, but in the past, I believe in 2007 and prior to that, the GNSO actually used what's called a taskforce model, and at that point, it was constituencies and/or stakeholder groups appointed a single individual, and in some cases, they were able

---

to appoint special advisors and also in some cases they were able to increase the membership as appropriate in certain circumstances.

So it was very limited, it was only the GNSO that was able to participate. I believe actually the new gTLD policy was a committee, the whole of the council. It was just councilors in that case that developed the new gTLD policy.

So it was determined that this taskforce model was too limiting, primarily because it did not allow input from non-GNSO members and communities. So that is what was the past model.

So where we are now is what's called the open working group model. The switch to this model was a result of the GNSO review that took place from 2008 to 2012. So the recommendation from that review, at least in respect to the PDP model was to try to make the PDP more inclusive essentially, and that was the primary focus of the changes, is to make it more open and inclusive.

So that's why the model is the way it is at this point. So anyone who's interested to join a PDP is free to do so. You don't have to be a part of the GNSO, you could be member of the ALAC, the GAC, or just an individual.

So essentially, the only requirement to be able to participate in a PDP at this stage is to complete a statement of interest so other members of the PDP understand a little bit about your participation.

So this transition to the open working group model resulted in quite an expansion dramatically in the number of members that participate in

---

PDPs. So you can see in one of the first PDPs after the change – actually prior to the change. It was 13 members in a PDP whereas these days, many of the PDPs will have close to 200 members, like subsequent procedures, like rights protection mechanisms. They have nearly 200 members.

Coinciding with the expansion of the membership of these PDPs, the duration of PDPs has expanded quite substantially as well, and they're not necessarily directly related, but it may be a factor. So at least it warrants review and consideration by the council and the GNSO more widely to determine what's making PDPs take longer these days.

So as the council and the GNSO has looked at the open working group model, they realized there are some challenges that they were able to see. As I mentioned, the size of the PDPs and membership of them has increased, and that has not necessarily made them more effective, and as I've said, they've actually made them take longer potentially.

Despite the fact that there may be upwards of 200 members doesn't necessarily mean that all of those members are participating in equal amounts, or potentially even at all in some cases. So you might have a huge membership but that doesn't mean that the work is spread out evenly.

Another issue is that it's not necessarily clear for the members whether they're participating as individuals or whether or not they're representing a stakeholder group, an organization, a nonprofit, the GAC, whoever it might be, which makes it actually harder to carry out the consensus building process.

Speaking of consensus, consensus by exhaustion. As I mentioned, the PDPs are taking longer and longer, and what that is potentially resulting in is that because it's taking so long, the members essentially just get worn out and give in. It's not worth it to fight for their positions any longer, and whoever's willing to argue the longest, essentially that position might win.

There's also that concept of negotiating, so rather than actually pushing for your interests, rather than trying to take part in the consensus building, which consensus building potentially results in an outcome where there are many small wins for many participants rather than just your position, which is more about negotiating.

So finally, the overarching concern here is that given all these challenges and the longer timelines and the problems in creating an outcome that's built on consensus, this is actually potentially hindering the ability of the GNSO to develop policy itself, and as a result, this is potentially a concern about the legitimacy of the multi-stakeholder model, where the GNSO is potentially not able to create policy, which is one of its principal roles under the ICANN bylaws.

So this is essentially why trying to improve the effectiveness of the PDPs is so important to the GNSO.

Briefly on background, the reason and the origins for PDP 3.0 is that it started out as a background paper that was drafted by staff, identifying some of the challenges that I mentioned on the previous slide. That was followed up by a paper that was drafted and circulated to the council where they talked about the issues in more detail, and then also about

---

---

possible improvements that would help address some of those challenges. That was discussed at the council level as well as a community session at ICANN 61.

That paper, including with the potential improvements, was adopted by the council, and at this point, there's a small team of councilors that's been established to try to carry out the implementation plan to try to bring about the improvements for PDP 3.0.

So there's a set of 14 implementation recommendations that are contained within PDP 3.0, and they fall within four buckets. The first is working group members, the second is about tools for the council so that it can better carry out its role as the manager of the PDP. Most of the recommendations actually fall into that bucket.

There is a bucket on the PDP leadership tools to help them be more effective, and then finally, there is a small bucket – there's only one, I think, improvement in this bucket, that's about the GNSO council liaisons to PDPs.

Before I get started, at a high level, that was hopefully a helpful description of what 3.0 is, and right now, I'm going to transition to talking about some of the specific implementation recommendations that are in PDP 3.0

So just for context on the screen and the way that the slides are organized, the improvements, all 14 of them, will be on the left-hand side of the slides, and then the potential implementation steps are on the right-hand side.

---

I know time is relatively short, so I'll go through these pretty quickly, and of course, you will not get all the detail, but it hopefully gives you a good overview of what GNSO is trying to accomplish here.

As I mentioned on the previous slide, the first bucket is for working group members, and number one is about creating the terms of participation for working group members. There was actually a statement of participation that members needed to agree to for the EPDP, so the idea here is to expand that statement of participation to be used in other PDPs.

What that means is essentially that members of PDPs need to agree to things like the ICANN-expected standards of behavior, they need to commit to engaging constructively, engage in a civil manner, and other things.

So the idea is to determine how well that worked in the EPDP, and assuming it did work well, to introduce that to other PDPs so that working group members are more accountable and invested in the process.

Number three is about new members joining after the start of the PDP. That's mostly about giving the PDP leadership and also actually the staff tools to be able to onboard new members quickly and more effectively, which is beneficial not only to the new member but also to the PDP overall so that that new member maybe isn't bringing up issues and arguments that might have already been raised. So it's about doing a better job of onboarding new members after the program starts, or the PDP starts.

---

So the next bucket, as I mentioned a couple slides ago, is about council tools to help the council serve in its role as manager of the PDP. This is the biggest bucket, and there'll be, I think, four slides on this set of improvements.

The first one is about enforcing deadlines and ensuring bite-sized pieces of work. I'm not going to go through all the things on the right-hand side in this implementation column, but at a very high level, it's primarily focused on developing and integrating better principles of project management, which is all about deadlines and creating smaller milestones and then giving the GNSO council the tools it needs to manage those things effectively, so keeping the council informed and then taking action where necessary if there needs to be mitigation.

And what this will look like, at least preliminarily, is most likely to be essentially a fact sheet, and it's going to give the council a status of where things are currently, what things have taken place recently, potential problem areas, and then other project management tools that might be useful for the council.

So improving the project management toolset for the council is going to be a major seam, and you'll see that comes up in a couple of other of these implementation recommendations.

So as I said, [the project management theme] is strong, so number 12 is actually directly related to that. Once the PDP develops its workplan and communicates that to the council, to the extent that there are changes needed, it's reasonable to expect that workplan developed by the PDP may change at times, but the change here is that the council needs to

---

be made aware of those changes more or less immediately so that they're able to better carry out their role as a manager of the PDP.

Number 13 is about the effectiveness of the chairs of PDPs, so it's about determining how well they're carrying out their role. Some of the things that the GNSO has looked at to try to address this implementation recommendation is to potentially carry out surveys of the members to determine what the members of a PDP think of the job that the PDP chairs are doing. It's potentially also reaffirming the PDP leadership on an annual basis to make sure that the council thinks that the chairs are also doing a good job. This one is not completed, still in flight with the small team of councilors.

Continuing on with council tools, number 14 is really looking at some of the things that are already within the working group guidelines, which are about data gathering and using data for better policy development. It's also about the chartering process for PDPs, and it's also about termination of a PDP when it's deemed that potentially it just doesn't make sense for the GNSO to continue chartering that PDP.

So those three things about data gathering, chartering and termination, they're already within the GNSO working group guidelines, but it's about making sure that they're still fit for purpose and then improving them if and where they're necessary.

Number 15 is about conflict resolution. As I'd mentioned, there's times where consensus cannot be reached, or it's even worse, there's actually disputes. One member might dispute the designation of the consensus by the working group chairs for instance. So essentially, when there's

---

conflict to try to determine what the tools might be available to the council to mitigate the conflict.

They haven't reached any conclusion yet here, but it could be that the liaison that I mentioned, the council liaison to the PDP could serve in that facilitation role, conflict resolution. It could be the ombudsman, it could be outside consultant. So they haven't yet made decisions, but the idea is to try to have some sort of independent conflict resolution mechanism there.

Number 16 is another one of those recommendations that's closely related to project management. It's about communicating changes – it's about developing a template, actually, that allows the PDP leadership, and then also potentially the liaison to communicate changes in the workplan, issues that might arise or that might be present within the PDP to help develop a tool and template to communicate those things to the GNSO council.

So the last slide, I believe on council tools, number two is about potentially alternatives to the open working group model. I think I mentioned briefly that recently, there was the expedited PDP on the temporary specification. That was actually not an open working group model, it was a representative model where there was a fixed number of appointed members from each of the stakeholder groups of the GNSO and constituencies, but also, our appointees from the supporting organizations and advisory committees. So that was a slightly different model than the working group model.

---

This is also connected to, I think, the potential concerns related to the large number of members for the PDPs, and then also the slow progress. So it's trying to give the council a toolset, essentially, to understand what might be the best model to resolve an issue that's ahead of them. So essentially giving them a checklist to determine which attributes of the working group model makes the most sense for a particular issue.

Number 17 is another one very much related to project management, and it's about reporting on the usage of resources but also identifying where there could be potentially need for additional resources, which could be connected to data gathering, could be securing the resources, potential legal resources and things like that.

The third bucket is on tools that are going to be useful hopefully for PDP chairs, and so number four is called the capturing consensus playbook, but it's more about giving PDP chairs a toolkit to help them develop consensus or manage the consensus building process.

This one has actually resulted in an additional budget request that was submitted by the GNSO. It was actually accepted, but it was made a little bit more broad so it's not going to be directly and specifically for the GNSO. It's intended to be a toolkit that can be used by the wider community. So you all, to the extent you're not part of the GNSO, would also hopefully benefit from this playbook.

So I think I touched on it briefly earlier, but some of the things that could result are that consensus building is sort of a skillset rather than something that everyone is innately aware, so things like creating a

---

solution that has many winners is a potential thing that could come out of this playbook and give PDP leadership the ability to do so. It's also something that would help ICANN staff in supporting leadership, but it's potentially something also that would benefit members of the PDP, and then also others in the community.

Number six is about the role and responsibility of working group leaders. It's about making sure that working group leadership knows what is expected of them. This is actually connected to number 13 that I mentioned a couple slides ago about making sure that the working group leadership is doing a good job.

So number six, you need to know – the PDP working group leaders need to know what they're supposed to do, and number 13 is being able to evaluate the PDP against the roles and responsibilities.

Number nine is actually probably not a substantial change, but it's more about making sure that the working group members are aware of the process that's actually already within the working group guidelines. This one actually refers to 3.6. Section 3.6 is within the working group guidelines and it's about the methodology for decision making, which also includes the consensus level designation process.

So it's primarily about making sure that members of working groups are familiar with this process so that they understand how it works and how that process of designated consensus works.

Finally is the last bucket and the last improvement. It's tools for the council liaison to use in their role. There's a few things here. One is about defining the roles and responsibilities of the council liaisons. It's

---

making sure that these council liaisons are onboarded to help them become effective and understand their role, and it's also about better understanding the relationship between the liaisons and also the PDP chairs to make sure that they have a good working relationship and they know their respective roles and responsibilities.

The liaisons are actually a really important element of PDPs, because it provides eyes for the GNSO council to see into the PDP to make sure that the council itself has a good understanding and grasp of where the PDP is, where there might be problem areas and other things like that.

And I think there's just one final slide, and hopefully, this was not too fast for everyone, but the last one is just about where things are and next steps. I believe I mentioned briefly there is a small team of councilors that are working on the implementation of all these things I mentioned on the past seven or so slides.

[They meet on a] biweekly basis. Their role is to develop implementation recommendations and documentation and many other things. Those will ultimately go to the GNSO council as a whole for their consideration and hopefully adoption.

So the council is aiming to complete the implementation of all of this work by the annual general meeting in 2019, or ICANN 66. As I said, hopefully I didn't go too quickly, but that was actually the conclusion of my slides, and hopefully you've understood well and there's some questions that I can hopefully answer for you. Thank you.

---

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Steve, for your presentation. Now I'm going to give the floor to the audience for questions. Is there any question or any comment? Steve is here to answer any question that you may have. So please, go ahead if you have any question or comment.

I see no hands up.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We have three people, Dev, Vanda and Carlos.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay, we will now give the floor to Dev. Please go ahead, Dev. Dev, are you connected?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, I believe that he's connected, but we are waiting for the interpretation.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Perhaps we can now give the floor to Carlos Raúl or to Vanda.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Vanda, go ahead, please.

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

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I have a question for Steve. Do you have any expectation, Steve, so as to see when we are going to see these issues are not solved? When are these issues going to be solved? What are the next steps when it comes to the tools? Do you have any expectations on discussions? Is there any deadline to take into account? Thank you.

STEVE CHAN: Thank you, Vanda. The council created a small team of councilors. I think it consists of about seven councilors. They're currently in the process of developing or I guess implementing all the recommendations, all 14 recommendations. Their goal will be to develop whatever the case may be, it could be documentation, it could be changes to the GNSO working group guidelines. It could be additional documentation in help documents. But all those things will eventually go to the GNSO council for their consideration, and the target for the council overall to complete implementation of all of the recommendations captured in this report is the AGM. So ICANN 66. Thanks.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you very much, Steve, for your reply.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Steve. Now we will give the floor to Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Dev, please go ahead. Dev, are you on the call? You have the floor,

---

please. Well, I believe that he cannot take the floor right now, so I'm going to give the floor to Carlos Raúl. Please, Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RAÚL LEAL: Hello. Steve, thank you very much for your presentation. This is a very important aspect.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Carlos, could you please speak closer to the mic? Your audio is really faint and interpreters cannot hear you.

CARLOS RAÚL LEAL: Hello. Is it better now?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, it is better.

CARLOS RAÚL LEAL: I'm sorry for the interpreters. Again, thank you for your presentation. Thank you for coming to the LACRALO meeting, and I would like to ask you about your comment on the direct participation that ALAC has on the process, for example Work Track 5 on SubPro or the participation on the EPDP process, because I believe it is really important for us to be able to participate and that we have evolved to [direct] participation of ALAC. So what is your point of view on that? Thank you, Steve.

---

STEVE CHAN:

Thank you, Carlos. As I mentioned I think very early in the slides, one of the primary recommendations out of the GNSO review that took place from 2008 and 2012 was exactly as you said, to try to make the PDP process more inclusive and more open. So the point of PDP 3.0 is not necessarily to change that. The PDP 3.0 is not supposed to be a revolution or actually it's not really an evolution of the PDP, it's more of an incremental improvement to the effectiveness of the PDP and also the GNSO council's ability to manage the PDP.

So as far as my understanding is concerned, I don't believe there's any intention to change the model going forward to make it any less inclusive. To the extent that there is a limited membership to something like the EPDP, there is potentially a cap on the number of appointees from each of the different organizations, either constituency, stakeholder group, supporting organization, advisory committee, so there might be, say, two from each, but it wouldn't prevent the ALAC from contributing. That's an improvement that's I think baked into the GNSO process, and I don't think there's any intention to change that. And if you ask me personally if I think that's a good idea, I think it's absolutely a good thing to have wide community participation in this process. Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you very much, Steve. So I believe that we now have Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Dev, can you take the floor, please? Please go ahead.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Sergio, we are reconnecting Dev to the call, so please just a second.

---

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. We will now give the floor to León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: This is a comment more than a question, and this new version or the PDP 3.0 is really relevant for the discussion that we now have regarding the evolution of the governance model, especially for the multi-stakeholder model at ICANN. So of course, I would kindly ask you all to really engage in this model, not only in the EPDP 3.0 but also, I would kindly ask you to engage in the discussion regarding the evolution of the ICANN governance model.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, León, for raising this topic. Let's see if Dev is already on the call.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Can you hear me?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, Dev, we can hear you now. It's a pleasure to hear you. Please go ahead with your comment.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Well, thanks, Steve, for the presentation. So my question is, regarding anybody can join a PDP working group in the GNSO, does that

---

mean anyone not an existing member of an AC or SO, meaning there could be a person straight from the public who says, "I'm interested in this and I want to jump in?" That's my question. Thanks.

STEVE CHAN:

Great. Thanks, Dev, and I'm glad you were able to connect to the audio. So in fact, that's accurate. For many of the PDPs going right now, so there's Subsequent Procedures, There's Rights Protection Mechanisms for all gTLDs, those PDPs have members from all the SOs and ACs and stakeholder groups and constituencies, but also, there's individuals participating on behalf of themselves.

So the only requirement to be able to participate in a PDP is to complete a statement of interest, and that's really to make sure that other members within the PDP have at least some understanding of your background as a member of the PDP, your motivations, your affiliations and things like that. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. Thank you. If there are no further questions, we will proceed with the next item on the agenda. Steve, thank you very much for your participation in our monthly meeting. Again, Steve, thank you very much for your participation.

---

We will now continue with the next item on the agenda. Please bear with me. Let me see. Okay, the next item is now Bartlett's presentation on the ALAC member report, so I would kindly ask Bartlett to proceed with the presentation. Bartlett, please go ahead. You have the floor.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much. Hi, everyone. This is Bartlett Morgan, and I am your ALAC member, and I would like to give you a quick update on some of the live policy issues that are before the ALAC right now. Can you confirm that I'm being heard?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Bartlett. I can hear you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, Bartlett, we can hear you okay.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much. Alright. Next slide, please. So if you look at the slide that's coming up now, you will realize that technically, there are two live policy issues before the ALAC now where we are drafting a comment. The first has to do with the process for streamlining the organizational reviews, and the second has to do with evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model.

There is also another policy issue which we are to make determination on, but we'll get there shortly. Now, if we go on the next slide, the first

one that I wanted to mention to you guys very quickly is a process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews. The comments are due the 15th of July 2019, and I just want to give you some context as to what this is about.

Now, pretty much every AC or SO, essentially all organizational structures within the ICANN community are subject to periodic reviews from time to time to more or less determine and streamline how effective they are.

The reason why this has come up as an issue for the board in a board sense is that community members from time to time have been expressing concerns about the number of different organizational reviews going on at the same time, and also, there are concerns about the way they're being conducted. And I understand that the board itself is trying to improve processes and increase efficiency and effectiveness of the organizational review process.

Now, I guess the question sort of comes, well, why should anybody in LACRALO care? I would suggest that the reason why we perhaps should be concerned is in a very broad sense, which is since [inaudible] part of all the different constituent bodies within the ICANN structure doing their job well is having effective reviews and criticisms they can use to adjust the way they approach their work. Then I would say by extension to the extent that the ALAC and the At-Large in general and LACRALO in particular in that broad sense would be subject to this, then it would be in our interest to ensure that this process is done effectively since in a large sense it determines how we'll do our work going forward.

---

---

Now, at this juncture, the policy advice is [inaudible] four major questions they're trying to respond to. Essentially, a document has been issued, and if you go to the link there in the presentation, you'll see a link to a document which has been issued which asks to list some key issues, but those issues have not been defined as yet, interestingly enough, and those are the issues that should be focus of the review going forward.

In addition to that, they've also listed some underlying principles which will be important to consider, and they also want our inputs on that to see whether or not they've got this right in terms of the principles that they've used. I'm talking about things like accountability, consistency, the timing of the reviews and what are considered to be industry best practices.

The other major part of this, which I suspect is where we have the most input, is that they're seeking input on the community role in the streamlining process. Essentially, there are a number of aspects to do with how the community will interact with the actual process of reviews and so on, so they want inputs on that.

I don't want to belabor the point, but essentially, these are the factors that they require community members to think about [and put together] comments. And by extension, or specifically, the ALAC in putting together its comments.

If we could go to the next slide, the other live issue that the ALAC is currently [inaudible] right now is a policy question involving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. Now, essentially, this is really a question

---

[inaudible] broad which is, well, how do we do it? What's the best way to more or less evolve our model?

Now, in doing this work, the board essentially – at this point, based on the current draft, there are I would say about 21 different issues that have been identified, and it's perhaps not useful to go through all 21 of them, but suffice to say the board identified a number of issues which it is considering important for us to consider as a community in terms of the overall application of the multi-stakeholder model.

The real question, as always, is, well, why should we care in LACRALO? And I would say it comes down to this: the multi-stakeholder model, as most of you know, is the center of how we operate in the ICANN community. So by extension, the output of this process will determine the continued viability of that model, which we all subscribe to. Certainly here in LACRALO. So in that broad, philosophical sense, it's very important that we have a sense of where we're going with this process and how the model is being potentially modified going forward, especially given the fact that [inaudible] first time, the multi-stakeholder model is being questioned as being the dominant or best approach, the governance aspects of the Internet. So in that sense, it's very critical for us.

In terms of overall process, there are about three or four things that have been happening in really short order. The issues list which I mentioned earlier is going to be updated and revised based on feedback from this public comment as we now know. In other words, we will still have the same 21 issues at the end of this process. And then following that updating, there's going to be a webinar which is going to be held.

---

There's no set date yet, but I presume it's going to be very soon to speak about the public comment period and facilitate a general conversation.

Thirdly, there's going to be a summary report on the issues list, which will be provided early June 2019, we're told, and then finally, there'll be another webinar in June, prior to ICANN 65, to produce a final issues list and begin developing a workplan.

Now, [inaudible] next issue – can we get the next slide – has to do with the possible policy statements that we're considering at the ALAC level. There is really just one issue there, and it has to do with the study on technical [inaudible] of root zone label generation rules.

So what is it all about? Well, first of all, I should be very honest with you because one of the questions I always answer when I give an update is, well, why should we care? I think in a broad sense, we should care because this is an aspect of the work of ICANN, and one of its policy outputs would be the question of root zone and the rules generate from it.

In a broad sense, and not to overstate [inaudible] the root zone has to do with the different scripts and languages and so on that are [inaudible]. Now, there could be an argument that in the context of Latin America and the Caribbean, there isn't a significant sort of focus on this particular issue since we are [inaudible] generic scripts to begin with.

So the ALAC must now decide whether or not it's interested in putting together a public comment on this. The third version of the label

generation rules was released in April of this year, and there are at least 16 scripts being integrated into it out of 28 which were proposed. So that is why we are now considering whether or not we should have a say in it.

I think in the context of the At-Large in general, we probably should. From a Latin America and Caribbean perspective, it's probably not such a significant issue, but in the context of what we do on the ALAC, which is to look out for end user interest I definitely think it's an issue worth reviewing and commenting on. Next slide, please.

That brings us to the end of my time, which I just realized I may have probably gone over just by a little bit. But as usual, I just want to use the opportunity to encourage you all to sit in on the weekly Consolidated Policy Working Group calls. Every single week, there is a meeting where we sit down and discuss the live issues, make determinations about which issues we ought to pursue and which we will be commenting on.

Usually, there is a [GNSO-led] discussion about aspects of the policy which may be [of importance] to us. So I would definitely suggest that as part of our core work, that if it's good for our schedule, we take some time to sit in on one of those Consolidated Policy Working Group calls.

I've included a number of links there for you to click on just to have a sense of what's going on in the ALAC from a policy perspective, and as usual, I would encourage you to reach out to the ICANN staff if you have any general questions. And thank you very much.

---

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Bartlett. I'm going to leave a few minutes for consultations or questions that you'd like to ask. From now on, you have time to raise your hand, and if there are no questions for Bartlett, then we can just close this issue and go on with our agenda. Dev, you have the floor. Please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Okay. Thanks, Bartlett, for this. One of the comments I think I want to make regarding the evolving the ICANN multi-stakeholder model is regarding the amount of time it takes to be involved as an ICANN volunteer. What I'm speaking about is the fact that for someone to be really involved in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model and be involved to the point where they're going to the face-to-face meetings, ICANN's three face-to-face meetings, means that if you were to go to all of those meetings, you have to basically give up a month of your travel dedicated solely to travel and attending those face-to-face meetings.

That's a month away from work, from your family, and so my mind, to me, this really curtails the type of volunteers that we get in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, because persons who are starting a family, persons who have a job, they're working in the government, they might not be able to get time off to do this.

So the persons that perhaps are more going to these ICANN meetings are those persons that are being paid as their day job to look at the DNS so they're paid to actually go there and represent their views. Two, retired persons that don't have a day job but then can devote the time to travel. And probably persons that own their own businesses and have

---

enough flexible time to dedicate to going to the ICANN face-to-face meeting.

So in my mind, the structure of the three face-to-face ICANN meetings is a hinderance or a challenge. And my suggestion would be is actually for ICANN to consider to reduce the number of face-to-face meetings, to reduce it to two meetings. And I think doing that would save money, allow those resources to be dedicated to conference calls, outreach, etc., and it would allow I think a greater diversity of persons to attend one meeting or two meetings, and participate. So that is my comment that I want to make towards the evolving the multi-stakeholder model. Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Dev, for your participation. I see that Carlton Samuels has raised his hand, and I also see that Rudi Daniel has asked a question. Can somebody read the question in the chat room? Carlton, you have the floor. Please go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Just to make a comment on the evolving multi-stakeholder model. Most of you who know me already know that I have always had a concern that the involvement and the contribution of volunteers to the multi-stakeholder model is, A, underrecognized, B, undervalued. And unless the multi-stakeholder model is evolving to recognize and give greater value to the contributions of volunteers, I believe it would have missed an opportunity to make the multi-stakeholder model more substantive and more formidable and have a greater opportunity for success.

---

The fact is that those who are volunteers, we are volunteering against a set of stakeholders who have vested interests, and we sit beside them in working group and we argue with them in working groups, and at the end of the day, the amount of time that they can spend in advancing their interests simply pales to what an ordinary volunteer can contribute. And we see the outcomes of this on the amount of time you can contribute.

I think the time has come. Dev thinks that it might mean reducing the number of meetings, but I think the most fundamental problem is how you [inaudible] the contribution of volunteers in relation to the contribution of the multi-stakeholder participants who are paid to be participants.

I don't know how to do it, but it has always been for the last [umpteen] years, [since 2007,] I've been concerned that there is a reckoning that is given to volunteers versus participants who are paid to participate that is not being addressed, and maybe it is time for us to look at that in some detail. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you very much, Carlton, for your input. There's question in the chat room. I think it was a question from Daniel. I'm going to ask Silvia Vivanco to read it.

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: ICANN Org recently published a [first HRA,] that is the acronym. Is this relevant for this [decision?] Will ALAC comment on this? That's a question from Rudi.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Bartlett, you have the floor to answer. Please go ahead.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Yes. Thank you very much. Rudi, the short answer is it's not directly on our dashboard for right now, but certainly, if you believe that this is something that we ought to comment on, we can raise it with the ALAC. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Bartlett. We ended the ALAC report. We can then take a few minutes for the report that was prepared in the city of Mexico. As you know, we participated in the speakers panel, Humberto Carrasco, our ALAC member, as well as myself.

Should recognize that [I haven't] paid attention to the great work done in terms of the south school on Internet governance and the level of exposition and the mastering of a topic was really good. We had long working days. We started at 9:00 AM and we finished at 6:00 PM. We had very high-level speakers, but the most important thing for our region is that the opportunity that LACRALO had to participate was really positive. Humberto made two presentations, and I had the opportunity to participate as well by presenting the role of Internet governance and how to participate in LACRALO.

---

So the result of this event when it comes to quantity, when it comes to numbers, we had the addition of nine new members in our region as individual end users. And once we have the participation of end users already, we will have to decide if we are going to be observers or not. We have now end users coming from different countries, from different backgrounds. I don't remember exactly from which countries, but I believe it was Mexico, El Salvador, Paraguay, Trinidad and Tobago. So these are really important, and this is very interesting for us.

And at the same time, we have five ALSes that are willing to participate and that are going to work. They're going to start participating for example ISOC Bolivia. I don't remember right now, but we have, as I said before, an ALS coming from El Salvador, another coming from Guatemala, and some other coming from the Dominican Republic and Mexico.

So I believe that this is really important and really interesting, because we can see the impact of the region on events like this. We had Sebastian Bellagamba from the ISOC. Glenn McKnight was also participating representing NARALO, and we also have members from the ISOC community. We had a representative from cybersecurity from Mexico.

So just to sum up, it was really a very positive event, and I would like to insist on this. I believe that all new ALAC members or LACRALO members should be part of the south school of governance, because this creates background and it gives us the opportunity to learn and to grow, and this should be part of our agenda. This should be part of the

---

strategy of this year. We need to participate very actively in the next school of governance.

By the way, I believe it is very important for us, the interaction with the people that are already participating, but it is also important the possibility of seeing the power that you have when you represent end users in regions like this.

I don't want to go further into details, but I just wanted to mention again that this was a very successful event when it comes to participation, so we have a very active participation, and I believe that next year, we should be focusing on this event.

Now I'm going to give you the floor just in case there are comments or questions, and if there are no comments or questions, we will go to the next item on the agenda.

I see no hands up, no comments, so we will continue with the next item on the agenda, and this is the update on elections for 2019. As you already know, there were some issues that we had to discuss with the different members. There is some interest in the region that we need to discuss so as to be able to define how we're going to carry out elections in our region.

We need to say something, and this is that ALAC is having a really strong, if you will, or is providing a strong support to us so that we can succeed in this topic. This is a very important topic for us because it has a strong impact, so we need to discuss the elections.

But once we have the rules of procedures already implemented, I believe that this is going to be solved, because of course, we are going to have very clear in our minds the steps forward.

So with all this in mind, we've received a strong message from ALAC. ALAC is proposing to take more time after Marrakech so that we can define the next steps, and I strongly believe that we can resolve this issue before the Marrakech meeting. I am calling for a governance meeting for this week on Thursday, so probably today or tomorrow, you will be receiving an invitation for this meeting. Those of you who participate in the governance working group. So we have to agree on the time, but the idea is to solve the issue very quickly.

So staff is telling me that the invite is going to be delivered tomorrow morning, so this is very good news. However, I would like to make a point of clarification. I believe that we need to find a very quick solution, and we're paving the way for that. We have some comments by Dev, and I would like to invite the governance working group members to discuss the issue, to solve the issues so that we can see how we are going to move forward. And I really hope that before Marrakech, we are going to be able to solve this issue and we are going to be able to hold our elections.

So I think that Dev is asking why this is so short notice. Well, because we have been discussing this for a long time now. I sent a message to you, to Carlton and [inaudible]. I only received the reply from [inaudible]. So since we have been discussing this for such a long time, I believe that we have to start working at once. We have to start discussing at once.

---

---

We have three days to discuss the [time for] this meeting, so we should meet and then we should take the necessary measures.

This is going to be discussed in the governance working group. This governance working group is going to decide on the topics, on the way to carry out the election. We're not going to finish discussing the topic on Thursday. So we will start discussing the issue on Thursday. Perhaps we are going to have another call to discuss the topic, but at least this is a starting point for the region, because we are going to discuss the elections and we are going to move forward, and then we can start discussing ICANN policies and we can start participating in the important issues for Internet users, and at the same time, we have to move forward so as to populate working groups and to create a kind of bridge to reinforce participation within ALAC.

So let me remind you all that we need to take into account the metrics, because they have been approved, and they are now open, so I'm going to request the follow-up of metrics so as to see how participation is going on in our region.

Having said this, I think that I have finished with my comment, but now I have to take another five minutes to speak about the discretionary funds. If you have any question, now you can ask your question, or else I'll continue to the next item on the agenda.

I see no hands up, so I will continue with the next item on the agenda, and this has to do with an update on discretionary funds. Silvia, I would kindly ask you to tell me the amount of money that the LACRALO has available for today.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you, Sergio. Nowadays, we have \$1300 available for LACRALO. These funds are available for all the RALOs. LACRALO used \$2700 and there are \$1300 available for LACRALO. This for the funding of local engagement activities, and you can promote and provide information on ICANN and these activities are ICANN-related activities so you can use those funds so as to for example provide promotional materials at a local level.

So these funds are available up until [June the 30th,] and this is up until the end of the fiscal year 19. So this is very important for you to understand, because you have to make use of the funds some weeks before the event.

So you basically have just a couple of weeks to request these funds for events during the month of June. So I kindly ask you to make use of these resources. Thank you, Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Okay. I have an idea. We discussed this idea with Harold, and the idea is this: that we can make resources available for all the regions, we should divide \$1300 by four so that the regions could use these funds that are available.

I don't have this very clear on my mind. I would kindly ask staff to help me with this. Now I'm going to give the floor to you all, but before that, I would like to ask staff to help me with this. I don't see people raising

---

their hands. I don't see hands up in Zoom. Can you please help me with that?

So we are going to divide this on an equal basis into the four regions. As far as I understand, we will have to give priority to those regions [sending] things, or please help me how we can figure this out. This is little money, as you know, but I believe that perhaps we can use it for drafting some brochures or for paying tickets. I don't know if that is going to be enough money.

I know there are people raising their hands. In the case of Antonio, Antonio and Vanda. So Vanda first, Antonio, and then Alberto Soto. So please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Sergio, this is just to confirm that I do agree with your proposal so that we can continue with the rules of procedures, because we have been discussing this for almost two years now. So we need to finish with this topic. And secondly, I believe Antonio wants to take the floor, so I would like to give the floor to him. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Antonio's question was already replied, I believe that now Alberto wants to take the floor. Alberto, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you, [Sergio.] I do agree with the use of funds. I have raised my hand before because I have some Internet connection issues, and I

---

cannot see the chat and the conversation. So I believe this is just an issue with my Internet connection.

Now, when it comes to elections, I believe that we need to [read the chat] so as to avoid any delay in the discussion. We said that the governance working group should make proposals, but LACRALO needs to approve those proposals, so we need to take into account deadlines. Otherwise, we will have some problems with those people who are traveling to take over positions.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you, Alberto. Your comment is really good, because Maureen already mentioned that, and I believe that we have to take that into account. So that's true. And on the other hand, I really apologize if I was not reading the chat, but I was not able to see your comment on the chat. Sorry for that.

Anyone else would like to ask questions, has anyone else raised their hand? Alright, so let's then go on to the next issue. I have already answered Antonio. I texted him on the chat room. Let's then go to the next issue, the electoral issue is going to the governance group again who will try to solve this as soon as possible. we need to start working in the rules of procedure, because if we don't finish this process, we can't simply go on.

So if there are no other issues that we want to say and it is now 25 minutes past the hour, I think we can adjourn this meeting. But before this, there is a webinar assessment. I think the staff is going to upload it now.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you, Sergio. If you can please give us five minutes of your time to answer a few questions on the webinar. This is the survey. Okay. So please, Claudia, you have the floor to answer the questions.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: First question is, how was the timing of the webinar? Too early, just right, too late? Can you please answer the question?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I don't know how to answer.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Can't you select any of the options there? Okay. Go now, I think you can select the options now.

Second question, how is the technology used for the webinar? Can you answer the question?

Question number three, did the speaker demonstrate mastery of the topic?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: If there was some kind of movement – we can't really answer the third question.

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We still are in the third question, now moving into number four. Are you satisfied with the webinar?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Please, move the screen, because if you don't move it, then we just can't move it. I have already answered number two, but I can't [see] number three and number four.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Can you see question number three on screen?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I cannot see it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Don't we have a scroll bar on your right side?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: I see some people have even answered the fifth question. So Vanda, can you see the scroll bar for you to scroll?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, I don't see it.

---

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Are you on the window? Are you on a separate window, or are you using a PC? Try to see if you can make your window bigger, because perhaps your scroll bar is hidden. You can move it on the sides. Thank you very much then. We still have one more question, but I'm going to put it on the chat window, because you need to give us suggestions and we can't use it on Zoom.

So the last question is, which issues would you like us to cover in the next webinars? You can add suggestions in the chat room, so please do that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: If you can provide us with the topics that you're interested in for future webinar sessions, please go and do that. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, Sergio, I think we've completed it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much to you all. I hope you have a good evening, and I think with we can adjourn today's meeting. Thank you very much, and goodbye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**