CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to LACRALO Monthly Call, this Monday, January 20th at 23UTC. On the Spanish Chanel we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Harold Arcos, Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, Carlos Gutierrerz, Vrikson Acosta, Cristian Casa, Adrian Carballo, Lito Ibarra, Vanda Scartezini, Carlos Leal and Bernard Turcotte. In English we have Rudi Daniel and Kerry Kerr. We have received apologies from Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Alberto Soto and Antonio Medina Gomez.
	From the Staff, today we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Claudia Ruiz, for management. The interpreters today for Spanish are Marina and Paula, for Portuguese Esperanza and Bettina and for French Jacques and Claire. Before we start, a kind reminder before you take the floor for transcription purposes and also for the interpreters to identify yourselves in the respective channels, please say your name. I will give the floor now to Sergio Salinas Porto.
SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:	Thank you very Claudia. Good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is our first call of the year and there are several topics and issues to be discussed today. I'm not quite sure if we have one hour or 90 minutes but we'll try to do everything within one hour so we can leave at 24 UTC. Very quickly I will give the floor to Harold for agenda discussion and adoption.

EN

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Sergio. I'll very quickly share the agenda. There is additional time available because there are several topics to be discussed and we have great participation from the members of the meetings. We are going to be briefed from the Communications Working Group, the Capabilities Capacities Working Group, the Multilingualism and IDN Group.

Then Item 7 is Regional Conversation format, to be motivated by Vanda Scartezini on the ATRT3. Then we will have an update on a conversation with the ALAC Members and an update on the current processes of the LACRALO Board of Directors.

In Other Topics of Interest, we will be receiving the view point of our Secretary Elect, he wants to make a question to the Regional Members on the topic of our agenda. We will open up the discussion, if there's anyone else who'd like to add anything else for Any Other Business, will you please write down on the chat. Nevertheless, you will have the opportunity to add further business when we get to that item. The agenda is adopted as it is.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Before I give the floor to Lilian, I will make a few remarks. First, we want to remind all the ALS Members that are promoting active participation in ICANN, so we are requesting everyone from the region to start the year with a major effort, big activity in our working group and in ALAC working group. I'm not sure but we have some interference. As I was saying, we should make the most of this new

year momentum to flood, literally, all of the spaces where we have engagement opportunities.

The voice of the Caribbean is very important and collective thinking from the region is also significant. There are several working groups that I work in, both in ALAC, LACRALO, in the Cross Community Group, so we should find our interests in those groups. If we do not know what to do, there are some members in this region who are always willing to accompany you.

Please, join this huge marathon of active participation with all members from the region. I will now give the floor to our dear friend, Lilian De Leque, who will give us a report of the Communications Working Group. Lilian, you have the floor.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Lilian, if you are speaking, we cannot hear you.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE BRUGES: I hope you can hear me now. What I was saying is that this week the Communications Working Group has sent a mass email to make a call, inviting people to join this working group. I have already received replies from two or three people. I am giving them guidance on how to join, although there was an explanation on how to do that.

We have also circulated a Doodle Pole, to pick a time, date for our next meeting. Unfortunately, until yesterday the only person who replied was myself, so we have sent some reminders. We are waiting for

people to join and if they do not reply to the Doodle, well they will have to join at the time that will be selected eventually.

What else? I have sent an email to the mailing list encouraging the participants to be more active or to explain the reason for the non-participation because we might adjust ourselves so there might be different times of the day or topics of interest, so I'm waiting for people to reply but I haven't received any yet. It was only one reply from one person through WhatsApp. I've asked my fellows to officially become a member of this group because there are very good ideas over there.

Another person recommended by Alberto Soto, who also wants to work, I think we can build a team with that. As people see that, that it's a team, they might feel motivated. This is what I've done this week with Staff support. If you have any suggestion or anything to add, happy to hear. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Lilian. A suggestion of mine, is perhaps to contact members n individually over WhatsApp because often times emails are overlooked and if there is cascades of emails, while from various lists and nobody reads.   On the other hand, direct person to person communication, the members are not so many, we might have a reply.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE BRUGES: Yes, this is the personal approach. Actually, with Marcelo, we are considering how to set up a group. I'd rather go towards telegram because on WhatsApp people have too many groups and information

EN

might get lost. I will reach each one over WhatsApp to see if we can set up a telegram group and in this, perhaps the communication will be more fluent like this and quicker. What do you think?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Very good Lilian but please check if everyone has telegram and actually reads and follow telegram because you might have it but not follow it. Let's find all of us together for a way. Let me say this again, group again is something we might not pay attention to but if we contracted individual, the case is different. Perhaps we should work on a more basic way because we have great hopes and expectations that this group can be nourished with several of the ideas considered for the region. Lilian, go head, you're working great, your work is great.

Now, the next presenter will be Adrian Carballo. Adrian is the director of the Capacity Building Group. I'm sure what he will tell us is very interesting. This is a group that is making a lot of work, perhaps their work is not easily seen. They work in parallel with the region but I will let Adrian tell us about it.

ADRIAN CARBALLO: Thank you, Sergio. As he was saying at the beginning of our call, I'm going to make a very specific remark. We have established a group with DSE to consider the most interesting aspect for the region. I have a request for Harold, perhaps we could submit to the consideration of the region, a group email to leverage their input to understand what is the topics they're most interested for the next webinars.

In addition to what we already have in our structure, we might supplement with the Community input. The group is a very open group, we are prone to consider any interest you might have in terms of training. Then, we are working in the LACRALO Academy Group, our intention is to launch it in the year 2021. We actually developing a project that is taken more time than we expected but it moves very well.

Again, I call on everyone interest to join this initiative, which is mostly focused on capacity building and training in Spanish for our region. We are working with Becky on ICANN Learn. Most of the courses are in English, some of them in Spanish but there are other courses that are no longer relevant because of time reasons, so new content should be developed.

We hope that the group email to be posted online so that we can get input on topics of interested and proposals for capacity building for the region. This is a huge challenge ahead of us. Even though we are considering essentially March 21, it will be for a period, for a period going until 2025, here we have to consider budget, policies, many things.

Again, I make again this request through the email, I would like to see the contribution from anyone who might be interested. Finally, the next Internet Governance Self Governance Call will take place in May in the School of Economic, the information is already online for application of grants; it's www.governance.[inaudible] which is a very interesting event. A lot can be learned and leveraged from there. This is all for the

time being, if you have a question or anything else to add, well, here I am, available to you. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Adrian. Let me say that your working group is doing very fine work, all of you. Let's continue along these lines, working on topics relevant for the region. Now, I'm lost. Next is Sylvia, is Sylvia with us? I know that she was going to join the call later, I don't know if she is already here?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: She's not with us yet.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay, let's move on to this format, the Regional Conversation, with is ATRT3. We will have a presentation by Vanda Scartezini, who will kindly give us an update on the issues discussed there. Vanda, you have the floor. It's a real pleasure to have you on this call.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Good evening to you all. Thank you, Sergio. I think you all know that now we are in the reporting period. We are working on the Public Comment Period, that will conclude on January 31st, we already held webinars. As we are in the middle of that process, I decided to put some bullet points into a presentation and these are items on which we are trying to gather information and you will have the presentation here in Spanish. This is a slide deck in Spanish.

Please, go ahead with the first slide. We have some special items here to consider. First, let me say that we have -- we started working on April 2019, so before April 5th of 2020 we need to have a final report containing all the necessary considerations ready. We are the first review group that is following the new standards with very strong requirements in terms of recommendations. We have Bernard Turcotte with us, who has been specially hired to help us with ATRT3 and he's in charge of the final drafting of this report and he has joined us for this call today.

There were some relevant points that did not deal with all the recommendations requirements under these standards, so in the group we started using some other terminology. Instead of using the term recommendations, we decided to use the terms suggestions and strong suggestions.

What is important to note is that this may be replaced by other terms but what is important is that we cannot call them recommendations because actually they do not meet the criteria of the standards to be called recommendations. We will give the suggestions and the strong suggestions to the Board; the ICANN Board and the ICANN Board will deal with them as if there were recommendations. So, although they have a different name, they will be considered as recommendations by the ICANN Board.

Another important issue to note here is that as you know, the GAC is made up by government representatives, therefore they work in a piacular manner and often times this representative cannot strictly follow ICANN's proposals and the Community's proposals because

sometimes there are some differences with the government's positions. Often times some ICANN proposals cannot be considered by GAC representatives. If we have some questions or if you have some questions, you can look at the annex of this report but all the appendices, all the annexes have all the necessary details to clear out any questions. There is a proposal, if you allow me, I will refer to that at a later point in the presentation.

Please, go ahead with the slide. What have we already done? We have assessed and we have enhanced the Board Governance, we have assessed the role and effectiveness of the GAV. We have also assessed and improved processes, the way in which ICANN receives the Community's input. We have also assessed to what extent ICANN decisions are backed and accepted by the Internet Community. We also have assessed the Policy Development Process, to facilitate debates in the entire Community.

We also looked effectiveness and timeliness of the Policy Development Processes. As you know, the reviews are taken a lot of time, sometimes people who are externally hired are not suitable for the work required. We have also assessed to extent the recommendations of ATRT2 have implemented. We have also looked at some specific reviews like the SSR Review. We have also reviewed the Accountability Indicators. We have looked in detail into this Accountability Indicators and another important point is that the Board has been working on Prioritization and Rationalization of Activities and Policies and Recommendations.

The methodology used was the following. We organized a report based on a list of topics that were previously defined. We also reviewed the

EN

Implementation and Effectiveness of the ATRT2 participant recommendations. There were some questions for people in different structures. We conducted a survey on a wide range of topics of individual structures, we had the different structures answering those questions.

We held interviews and meetings with Community at ICANN 65 and at ICANN 66. We also received several briefings from various groups, such as the ICANN Org Public Comment Team, the NomCom Review Implementation Working Group, where I also participate. We also reviewed the ICANN Accountability Indicators in detail and many ICANN documents that are found in ICANN's website. We also requested and received several clarifications from ICANN Staff on issues for which we couldn't easily find.

We reached some conclusions; we had some key findings to share. For instance, regarding Implementation of ATRT2 Recommendations, ICANN was much different in the past then what it is today. Before, the IANA Stewardship Process, ICANN was very different. Key findings we found that 60 percent of recommendations were implemented. 23 percent were only partially implemented.

You can find the rationale for all these in the corresponding annexes. 17 percent of recommendations were not implemented at all. In some cases, big changes were required, that is why they were not implemented. That was in the case of the review we had in 2012. Then, we also have the GAC issue. GAC had to consider some other aspects because those changes, those recommendations may have an impact at the government level.

Another important aspect that we learnt from the ATRT2 Implementation Process, was that in some cases, some groups would implement the recommendation, would start implementing the recommendations, then another group would take over and they would have to consider these recommendations too. That has created some problems for the organization as a whole. Volunteers had to do a huge effort to resume work on the recommendations that started to be implemented and then with all these changes came to a stand point. Then, other priorities emerged and they also took time from volunteers.

In order to be brief, I'm going to stop, to look at some specific points that are important to us. There is not full consensus among our group. We have received different reactions from different groups when we held the first consultations on the first interviews.

We believe the suggestion, the Board should make sure that the first competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team, CCT1, the Second Registration Directory Services Team and CCWG Accountability and Workstream 2 Review Team should provide mentors for the implementation of these recommendations as defined in the Operating Standards for Specific Reviews, in order to avoid misunderstandings and confusions regarding the intention of the recommendations during implementation and also to better organization the implementation to avoid overlap and also to avoid discontinuation of the implementation of certain recommendations.

We also believe that if the implementation of the Specific Review Recommendations is transferred to another process, the Board should make sure that any report on implementation should clearly state this

and should also guarantee factual reports about the progress made with implementation of those recommendations that have been transferred over because we have seen several groups working on the same recommendations and it seems that they don't talk to each other, they don't know what each group is doing and they end up implementing nothing because sometimes they get some opposition.

Another important point is prioritization. We said the following about prioritization. We suggest creating a community lead entity that will be in charge of developing a clear a prioritization process. We consider that the new standards already set a very sound foundation for prioritization. We also believe that the members of this community lead entity need to have some significant ICANN experience and they should have participated in some important processes, such as the Cross Community Working Group, ATRT Teams, EPDP among others.

In those working groups where you have information gathered from the ICANN Community, should also be involved because they need to have a clear understanding of what is going on in ICANN. We believe that in the prioritization process we should also include representatives of the Board and ICANN Org. This community lead entity would have a one-year term to do its job. As you know, some review processes may take five years because some other priorities emerge along the way. It is a never-ending process so it is very important to have a clear timeline.

The entity can also hire an external expert that could help with its work. The work should be done annually. Even if you have a four or five year review process, there should be an annual review of that process. The

group must stick to the recommendations that have already been issued, it cannot come up with new recommendations.

The role of the group would be to give priority to the recommendations that have already been issued. Of course, they should take into account costs, budgetary issues, complexity, the impact on the community. There may be an ALAC related recommendation and perhaps they don't take into account the impact on ALAC, so they need to consider also the impact on the community, the relevance to the mission and they cannot establish new recommendations.

Reviews are also a problem and because there are many reviews, in our survey 67 percent of AC and SO's consider that reviews are not effective and 91 percent of them think that they should be amended. There should be another way to carry out those reviews. We also see that there is an accumulation of reviews running along the same period. The Board took these into consideration and issued this statement. The Board believes that streamlining entails improving both the timing and cadence of the reviews.

Now, we are asking for your opinion about the two options that are right here. These are the options that we put out for Public Comment. The first option is to maintain the current set of specific and organization review as they are because they are important accountability mechanisms for the Community in combination with a new oversight mechanism to manage reviews and implementation of their recommendations.

EN

This new oversight mechanism should be the responsibility of a new independent accountability office that somehow would be similar to the ombudsmen office from the point of view of oversight. It should also include accountability of SO's and AC's as well as coordination of reviews and implementation of their recommendations.

Let's look at the second option and then I'm going to show you a chart comparing the two options in terms of workload and the effort that they entail. We have AC's and SO's, Reviews and Specific Reviews. The AC's and SO's Reviews. There will be a change of concept here. The concept that we would implement would be one of continuous improvement. Trying to have three to five-day workshops, focused on self-assessment.

These types of reviews would take place every three years and they would result in a report that would be in incorporated into a general review, a more holistic review that would encompass all the AC's and SO's reviews. All the reports internally previewed by each AC and SO for their own review. This holistic review would take place every seven years with a maximum duration between 12 to 18 months.

Then we have specific reviews like AT, SSR, CCT, RDS, the CCT and RDS relevant party would be combined into a single AT Review and this type of review would take place also every seven years and it would last at the maximum for 12 to 18 months. SSR could be three to five-day workshop or it could have some other duration, depending on the topic at issue.

EN

Now moving on to the next item, which is very important. Let's move onto the next slide. I know this is difficult to read but let's try. This is the comparison of both options, one and two. In colors, the number of months, total number of months or reviews. For example, ATRT3 would take three months, people involved and time required, that's the concept. In green you see those low demand items. If we continue working as we do now, there is a significant number of reviews accumulated and this is the current situation.

In red, we have a workload, this is just for one year, 2023 2024, so this is too much. That is why people are not interested in working as volunteers because they cannot do anything else but the review. It takes a lot of work. These reviews, they have to be there two days a week, three days a week, so you have to think that we're working with volunteers and most of us have our jobs. We give some of our time to ICANN but we kind of live off ICANN, we have other things to do.

For some people, this will be a problem. We don't think this is feasible because the reality as it is, it's not working very well and we know that. Option two is this, we work one week for each group, these three reviews are internally held because problems arise internally.

Small groups of people get together and do this internal analysis and they find the issues and they produce a report that will later be sent into a holistic meeting where all reviews, GNSO, At-Large, NomCom, RSSAC, SSAC, ccNSO, they will all be working on that. There is a significant concentration of workload but it all stays within the green value but a little on the yellow. There is just a small concentration of

EN

yellow workload. In terms of hours devoted, here we have 13, there's only one.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Vanda, we have three questions for you. I don't know how much -- how you are doing with your time in your presentation, we're rather pressed on time?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This is the comparison of both options for easier analysis. I thank you for your attention. I know there are questions. The first question from Alejandro.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, actually we have two questions from Alejandro and one from Rudi Daniel? Alejandro question is as follows. Isn't mission that ATRT makes suggestion because the topic is not part of its mission? Can you explain please? This is the first question.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The other question is whether ATRT has considered the possibility of simply find the processes of ICANN instead of seeing a growth in number of rules verses some priorities? I'm trying to find the question because this is not the one. Here is it. Isn't it mission that ARTR makes suggestions because the topic is not part of its mission?

No, Alejandro please read attentively the standards that were adopted in June last year. The requirements for a suggestion to become a recommendation is big, major requirement and sometimes it's not possible to accept the information either because there isn't any or because perhaps the internal group are involved, the GAC is involved, so Government, where we have no actions to take there and ICANN cannot either be specific on what to do in each country but all suggestions are part of mission.

We haven't invented anything, no. When we think this is an important recommendation, if it goes against the new standards, provisions, it is not accepted. Information has to be there to support it or justify it. When discussing this with the Board, we came to the conclusion that the Board will consider this suggestion as if it were a recommendation.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: The second question Vanda is from Rudi Daniel, he says, ATRT3 ATRT2, does ICANN have any specific policy on recommendations not yet implemented? I'm referring to ATRT2.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, many things were the result of overlapping, so there was this work of moving whole structures. Many things that were not yet implement, they were not implemented because there was no point in implementing and others were built into other efforts that were actually efforts to review the review themselves. This is something worth saying that should not be done anymore.

The other question or -- there was for instance aspects related to the GAC that impacted the internal processes of government so there was no room there. Those were the main issues overlapping. Also, something that goes outside the ICANN stability to step into government remit.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Alejandro has made another question. Has the ATRT consider the possibility of simplifying the processes of ICANN instead of increasing the number of rules, processes and priorities?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, exactly, we are aiming at reducing the workload by reducing the number of reviews.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The interpreter apologies but Vanda has no audio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Vanda, are you there?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Apparently, we have lost Vanda, will you please take care of this Claudia.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTTO: Is Vanda online? Has she dropped?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We see her connected but we cannot here so I'm going to check this with the operators. An unidentified participant agrees he cannot hear her either and she's on the phone.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: While we let Vanda reconnect, we could move on with our agenda. This is the time for the report by the ALAC members, we have two of the three members. Sylvia will be joining later. Carlos or Humberto, are you able to do a quick report on what the ALAC hot issues are at present?

CARLOS GUTIERRERZ: I don't know if Humberto is with us?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Dear Carlos, if you want to start, you have the floor and I will complete it if anything is missing.

CARLOS GUTIERRERZ: The Policy Committee, we have been discussing the .ORG case. We are setting up the working group to write the comments on the budget that is to be submitted very soon. Then we are also discussing the plan for the Mexico meeting. Those very quickly are the three groups that have met at the beginning of this year. Humberto, I don't know if you have anything else to add?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, just something I said at the Board Meeting the other day. We do not know if Sarah will be confirmed for the Fellows Group, I can't remember her last name. The ALAC member might have consensus but I have the impression that in our next ALAC call we will be discussing this again. As Carlos said, most of the discussion was around the .ORG. The proposal for this to be managed by an organization.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Actually, on that, I wanted to ask, could you take any position about this? Please Vanda, I will give you the floor in a second, just please wait. I was asking if you have any position on how to set up a cooperative? It is not just a non-profit organization because cooperatives are non-profit organizations but with specific characteristics, solidarity based contributions, collect decision making, its structure is rather different. Have you been able to make any position heard? I have my own position, which I'd like to share because I think a cooperative would be a step forward. I don't know if you'd had any chance to say anything?

CARLOS GUTIERRERZ: Well, there will be a call tomorrow with some representatives of these cooperatives that have already been setup. As you know, the NPOC will be directly impacted because they represent the operational matters of the .ORG registrant. On December 9, the NPOC submitted their conditionality idea to the Board and tomorrow we'll be learning this cooperative. In my view, this is a fantastic idea perhaps for the next round.

EN

I see we have to take a step backwards and not be so much focused on what we can do with PIR, this is a decision made by the ISOC Board that has already been made unanimously and remit within the public interest. This is actually the name of the organization, Public Interest Registry. What we found was that Public Interest Registry as well as ICANN is in the process of privatization that is much more surprising and much more open than ICANN.

What could I say? It is a great topic for discussion. A cooperative is dependent upon its members I do not know, I'm not quite sure that all .ORG members want to join .ORG organization. We should frame our discussion in the overall context in ISOC tomorrow we will share a final draft of this topic that we will be sharing with the chapters. We are all surprised and all of us have many ideas. I hope that this discussion can be followed in the council or in the ISOC chapter.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Well, thank you to both for your report. We'll be following closely this issue. Vanda, now because of time restrictions.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I had already completed my presentation so I can work with Alejandro, if he has any further questions, we can take if offline. Can I say something about .ORG?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Of course. If you want to say something.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, very quick. On the one hand this group had a lot of money, etc. but we have to remember that the PIR has it was a non-profit organization was not paying taxes or lots of taxes, first. Second, if it becomes a commercial, a .COM it will have to pay taxes in arrears because…

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, we can hear you Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, sorry there was a message, I apologize. This is problem. The issue with a cooperative in my view lies in how to ensure the continuity of the services and in the independence of incoming and outgoing members of the Community. A cooperative is not structured where we can give concrete guarantees because the cooperative belongs to diverse interests.

There is a completely different focus, so in order to ensure governance, there is some risk of seeing the quality and the stability of .ORG being jeopardized, this is not an easy task but we have to follow the events of ISOC and everything and we will have to see what happens, what's going on but it's been some time that ISOC tries to be self-sustainable and achieves something more concrete in those countries where it is acting.

At the beginning, ACTO was doing a lot of tasks, for example, in Brazil, my region, it collects for everyone to participate as any organization. I

don't know how ISOC will bear the costs or survive. The members are small. Within ISOC there are groups that are very important for the region. That is all I wanted to say about the cooperative. The justification, there are people saying that they will sell personal data basis but those are the registrars. What will happen with the personal in those groups, those are the registrars, not the registries? Thank you very much.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Vanda and thank you all who have participated with your comments. Let's move on to the next item. We are going to give you an updated on the current processes and the LACRALO Board of Directors. As you know, last week we organized our meeting in Cancun. In the middle of the ICANN meeting we have started putting together an agenda. We know that we will have a full week of meetings.

There will be some preparatory meetings for us, this will allow us to follow the certain methodology. We want to get there, to the meeting with some preliminary discussions on all topics. We will have a busy agenda to discuss but I think that at the same time we have been able to make process on the administrative side, we know how we will organize our meeting.

You know that we are working to transcend institutional aspects of the LACRALO operation. You know that we have a structure in place now. We have laid the foundation for that. Our plan is to come up with a five-year plan at the institutional level for the Board of Directors of

LACRALO. This is will not be a plan for the entire region, this would just an administrative type of plan.

We will establish and we will define some scalable metrics in order to assess our performance and also to improve our work in the region. We will start on March the 6th until March the 11th. We will have that meeting during that period between the 6th and 11th of March and we will also have our ALAC meetings there. We have tried to make this compatible with the ALAC meetings, so that the entire Board of Directors of LACRALO can also attend the ALAC meeting. This will be a unique experience for us.

I think this will be a milestone from an organizational standpoint in our region. I think that this will also be reflected in terms of institutional equality and quality policies for the region, that is our goal. The main idea is to be able to produce a document that will be publicly available later on. That document will deal with future processes and we have chair elect and secretary elect part of this new structures, these are new positions because there were recently elected but also, they had wide experience and we may identify some strengthens and weaknesses in this structure.

We will look at that and we will try to make sure that those weaknesses turn into strengthens for the region. We will also try to make sure that we can enhance those strengthens that we identify for the collective good. We are very happy with this process. We are very enthusiastic about this new challenge ahead of us and we are making progress now.

I see that Sylvia is already with us now, so I'm and going to give her a few minutes for her to talk about the Universal Acceptance Working Group. Let me also make two comments. I know that Kerry also had some questions for the region, so he will also be given some time to discuss that.

Now that I have the mic, let me also take this opportunity to say something else. We have completed the Rules of Procedure and we are going to finalize that work in our working group. We will meet again to look at those final details. We have some regional funding available to the region and we have used that funding to work on this process with David Plum in order to conclude the Rules of Procedure work.

There was a request from Alberto Soto about reviewing the metrics. There is a Google Doc with the metrics on a monthly basis for all the meetings in the region. Probably we will use that to put a document or to have some output, some deliverables. We will also focus on strengthening those groups that are not doing so much work. We are very much concerned because there are some ALSes that are not working actively, so we will try to see what we can do to help them engage more in the work of our region.

Now, I'm going to give the floor Sylvia Herlein, for her to give her report. Sylvia, given the time, I'll ask you to be brief. I know you have a lot of information to share with us. You have documented that you need to be congratulated on but please try to be brief because I also want to give time to Kerry Kerr to take the floor.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Good evening to you all. I apologize for being late. I have very good news. I'm sure that all of you have discussed a lot of information but I have very good news for you. We finally came up with a final report of our project. This had to do with the first part of our project for LACTLD and we have already sent it out to all the working group members for their consideration and we are planning to have meeting on January 28th.

We wanted these members to have that report ahead of time so that they can look at that in detail and in our meeting, we can clear out any doubts. Gabriella has helped us because she did a wonderful job and after the meeting on January 28th, you will be able to see that document posted on our wiki page because the plan is to send it to LACTLD during the first week of February so that they can give us some feedback or they can have a discussion with us in Cancun about that document.

We are very happy with the results. It contains a summary of the studies and the research work done by all the members of the working group. We will disseminate this information to you. As to Universal Acceptance, we were a little behind but now we are in the final steps of the drafting of the relevant document. We are also planning to look at the details, the final details with the working group.

As you know, in our working group we have two subgroups. In the meeting on January 28th, we are also going to look at the final details of this report and this will also be sent during the first week of February to the Global Universal Acceptance Group. I'm very, very grateful for all the work done with all the collaboration that we had in this group, so thank you. That would be my report. Harold, I see that you have

EN

posted the link in the chat room. It is a link outdated right now, so after the meeting we will have more updated information.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Now, I'll give the floor to Kerry Kerr, our Secretary Elect. Kerry, you have the floor.

KERRY KERR: Thank you, Sergio. Greetings everyone. Please, let me first start by noting that the Outreach and Engagement Working Group has sent out a call for members. This is a great opportunity for LACRALO to have a very input in this area. Concerning ICANN67 Meeting, the upcoming meeting, in E Working Group I'm co-chair, we were brainstorming about possible activities that we could have and several ideas came up. However, a possible collaboration with LACRALO for a movie social networking event came up.

This would be based on a short film titled Meant to be Broken, that was organized by Jonathan Zuck, who recently won an award for the film. The idea is to have him give talks and be there just to help motivate and get persons to participate. The only working group, we're asking about the possibility of having this social movie event, networking event done. That is what I have to update. Thank you very much.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Kerry. It is a very interesting idea. We will follow up on that. I'm very interested in looking at how we can work with Jonathan for that event. We are now about to reach the final time for this meeting.

We can now spend a few minutes talking about Any Other Business if there are no more comments or no other business discuss, we can adjourn this call. I don't see any hands raised.

Let me say that there are several working groups. I insist that we should be interactive, that we should really engage in the working groups, that is the only way we can have our voices being heard in the ICANN discussion. Greetings to you all and we conclude this call. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]