
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Call. It is Monday, November 16, 2020 at 23:00 UTC. On today's call, in Spanish, we have Augusto Ho, Harold Arcos, Pablo Rodriguez, Alberto Soto, Alfredo Lopez, Carlos Aguirre, Carlos Raul Guitierrez, Gilberto Lara, Lito Ibarra, Raitme Citterio, and Vanda Scartezini.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Claudia Ruiz, managing today's call.

Our interpreters today are Claudia and Marina for Spanish, Bettina and Esperanza for the Portuguese, an Isabel and Claire for French.

Before we start, a kind reminder, please say your name before speaking for the interpreters to identify the proper language channel and keep your lines muted to prevent any interference. Thank you very much, and I will give the floor to Augusto.

AUGUSTO HO: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome, the entire region. I hope you are all in good health and comfortable from your places.

We understand that, as of now, there are certain complicated situations, above all in the Caribbean, so our support to our friends in that region and let's hope it will cause as little damage as possible.

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.

Today, as the vice chair of the group, I will manage the call for you because our chair, Sergio Salinas, is taking care of family. He has a very special situation, so we have kindly agreed with the kind support of our friend, Harold, I have agreed to manage this call.

As always, after each year end annual ICANN meeting, there is a new period starting for the newly elected members. This opportunity, we have to express our gratitude to Harold Arcos who has completed his term as ALAC member. We thank him for his energy, his efforts, his good predisposition to work, and we welcome our new ALAC member for the current term. Let's see if we have any comments or remarks. Otherwise, we will continue.

I will now give the floor to Harold Arcos, who has been following our agenda, so that we will listen to him. He will explain to us what it is about.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you very much, Augusto. Today, we will have a webinar on DNS security in Latin America and the Caribbean. It will be given by Pablo Rodriguez who is the Executive Vice President of NIC.PR from Puerto Rico.

After that, Carlos Raul Gutierrez will present the comments. He's our ALAC member. Then our colleague, Vanda Scartezini, will report on the ALS Mobilization working party report. This is a very important topic for the region.

Item 7 is the secretariat to report on participation tools for the promotion of regional participation. And finally, the regional update by Augusto Ho.

After that, we are going to discuss other business. If you have any addition or any other topic, you would like to include it now, please let me know. I'm checking the chat and see if there are any hands raised. There are not, so the agenda is adopted as it is and we move on to the next item. So that is all.

AUGUSTO HO:

Thank you very much, Harold, for your introduction. I will now give the floor to Pablo Rodriguez.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you very much. It is indeed a pleasure and an honor to be here sharing with you this call. I want to join the prayers and positive thoughts for our brothers and sister in Central America, Nicaragua, and Honduras where the hurricane is going through. It has certainly been an unusual time of hurricanes. Typically, by this time of the year, there are no more hurricanes, but here we are. So, for those of you who thought that weather change—climate change—was not true, this is sound proof, sound evidence, and we're feeling it on our own flesh.

Having said that, thank you, all. Greetings to our dear friends, Lito, Harold, Vanda, very many friends of mine. So, thanks to you all. I will kindly ask the staff to display the presentation now. Thank you very much.

So, this evening, if I may, I'd like to share with you the contents of a study I conducted for my PhD on DNSSEC perceptions of decision makers on DNSSEC in Latin America. Next slide, please.

Here I'm going to discuss the presentation contents, a little bit about the historic background, the purpose of the studies, recommendations, and conclusions as well as results.

The person we see here is Steve Bellovin, professor, who in 1990 first discovered the vulnerabilities in the DNS but he kept quiet and it was not until 1995 when in a conference of the IETF he discloses his research to the world making the world aware that there was a problem and that this problem could cause what we call the cache poisoning. In other words, that someone could pretend being the site addressed or targeted by a website name and deceive the servers and the servers that lead the person to an unexpected website. [inaudible] what happens when the person goes, for instance, to check his bank or her bank account. If the bank website has no DNSSEC, could be a victim of cache poisoning, so the person is taken to another website that looks very much like it but what it's actually doing is recording the username and password that will afterwards be used to commit fraud or to steal identity or to steal money or both.

Then, in 2008, Dan Kaminsky was able to identify what was actually happening. He could prove that it was possible to steal a website, people could steal it and redirect it somewhere else.

Today, even though this is public knowledge, we are aware that DNSSEC implementation is still very slow in our region and in other regions as well. Next slide, please.

For those of you who are not familiar with DNSSEC does, this is the basic diagram provided by ICANN showing how when an institution has no DNSSEC implemented could become a victim of cache poisoning and how its website could be redirected to another website, and once redirected to that second fraudulent site could be a victim of another attack, such as phishing whereby the username, password, identity is stolen.

Typically, a DNSSEC attack, if it's successful, leads to a second attack. The first attack is redirecting the website to a fraudulent site and the second attack is the identity being stolen. DNSSEC is one of the most effective options we know to prevent that at present. Next slide.

So, the purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of the perceptions of IT decision makers from the Latin American and Caribbean ccTLD operators who have implemented DNSSEC or not.

In other words, I wanted to compare those who do have DNSSEC and those who do not have it and try to understand their similarities and what are the factors that promote them to do certain things and what are the factors that prevent them from doing certain things.

And based on the learnings, on the findings, develop a set of recommendations to facilitate and implement—promote the implementation of DNSSEC among the ccTLD operators in Latin America and the Caribbean.

I will make a pause here, because you may say, “Wait, we are not ccTLD operators. Why are you talking to me about this?” And the reason is because all and each of us are participants and we are responsible for the promotion of the protection of our ecosystem. And to do that, we have to understand what our role is in this ecosystem. Next slide, please.

This study and the participants of this study were divided as follows. 47 ccTLD operators in Latin America and the Caribbean, 26 of these operators have not implemented DNSSEC yet. 24 are the ccTLD operators in my study and 12 of them have adopted—have implemented ... Sorry, 24 have implemented DNSSEC and 12 have not. Next slide.

There are other studies that have been conducted to identify the factors that could impact, have an [incidence] on the implementation or non-implementation of DNSSEC. But many of these studies are either based on mathematical models or on statistical analysis. This means that nobody [as such] should talk to anyone. That is why I decided to go for a qualitative model, a model in which I can ask the participants why, because in an exploratory case study, this information will be obtained, this information in which [I have my doubts].

But there are other ways of acquiring knowledge that I did not existed and that will also be the findings and the results of such a conversation. Next slide, please.

So, I developed two questions. I made four questions to the participants, and these questions—I’m not going to read them for the

sake of time, but these four questions are four areas that I related to these DNSSEC technologies.

So, the questions are the following. Does this DNSSEC technology fulfill in doing and succeeding what it aims to do? Is it easy to implement this technology? Next slide, please. The third question is, do you believe that there are social influencers that are promoting or preventing the adoption of DNSSEC? And the fourth ... The first three questions are related to the willingness to use DNSSEC, but the fourth question involves the analysis of the [facilitating] conditions. So we're asking the participants whether they have the organizational infrastructure, that is to say the people and the structure to maintain and implement this technology. Do you have the technical infrastructure, that is to say, the servers, the computers, the software, whatever is necessary? So this fourth question is whether you implement or you do not implement this technology. Next slide, please.

So, please remember the fourth question. On the left, you see four boxes. From the top to the bottom, we are identifying these four questions. Is this technology able to do what it says it does? Is it easy or is it difficult? Are there any social influencers? And in the center of the diagram, if the answer to the question is yes, that is [predisposition] to use them.

So this fourth question on facilitating conditions are those that will determine whether it is easy or not to adopt DNSSEC. So this is a concept I decided to work on, but from a quantitative viewpoint. This framework is known as the UTAUT model, the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology.

As I was saying, this is a theory dealing with the acceptance and use of technology, and it is one of the most powerful theories used to predict if a given audience targeted by a given technology will use it or not. In other words, what are the drivers or the factors that make you use the car seatbelt or not? Why do some people use the belt and others do not? Why do some people measure the diabetes sugar in blood and others do not? This is the framework that allows us to determine which are the factors that promote or prevent that.

And this is the data analysis. I'm sharing the data analysis with you because we had been interviewing people from our region, and 11 of these interviews were made in English and 13 of the interviews were made in Spanish. So in order to be able to manage and organize the data, I had to go through this process of gathering the transcripts, sharing the transcripts with those I interviewed to get a confirmation that what I am transcribing is what they actually said to me, not my own interpretation and my own version. So it's a reconfirmation that we are on the same page, that this information is true. Next slide, please.

Let's talk about some of the results. We talk about [inaudible] that I was looking for, because they deal with the [implementation, implementation is easy or difficult,] what are the social influences, [what] about the infrastructure? So let's go about these four concepts we're talking about.

In the first concept, 79% of participants believe the DNSSEC is doing what it is supposed to do. 54% perceive that the configuration mistakes are a risk because if you don't set it right, you will be out of the [inaudible]. [inaudible] that implemented DNSSEC have not increased or

will increase domain registration, and 37% [inaudible] because when I'm buying a domain, the TLD that I'm buying the domain will do better with DNSSEC or not, 37% perceive that it will not do it. So I asked [four or five] questions from different angles to find out whether there was a constructive answer or not, and they say that the DNSSEC is doing what it's supposed to do.

78% of those who have not implemented DNSSEC perceive that there is a lack of institutional support, that is to say that the institution with the domain name does not really understand why they have to put money in the implementation of DNSSEC. 58% of those who have implemented DNSSEC perceive that there is a certain difficulty and complexity in DNSSEC which is still a disadvantage.

So, what is this telling me? It is telling me that this technology is difficult. 50% perceives that there is a need for highly qualified technicians, qualified in DNS, DNSSEC, networking and cryptography to implement and maintain DNSSEC. So this 50% layer is an indication that necessarily, this top-level domain does not have all the people that are required to manage this. So it is necessary to invest in people, to let them be trained and qualified, and it's difficult lot justify money, the investment or putting money in implementing technology that up to now we have seen there are problems. So, why should I invest in solving a problem I do not have? So it's similar to wondering why we have to pay for car seatbelts if I never had a crash. Next slide, please.

Here, we can see from these influencers I mentioned, 83% that participated in the study perceives that the government—and should remember, do you know whether your government is using DNSSEC, do

you know about the banking institutions, the financial institutions where you have your bank account, do they use DNSSEC? When you go to a shop or ecommerce, do they use DNSSEC? How do you know whether they use DNSSEC or not?

54% of the interviewees do not know anyone implementing DNSSEC, so there's no influence if they don't do it. 33% of respondents perceive that ICANN, LACNIC, LACTLD or IETF wishes DNSSEC to be implemented. 33% of respondents perceive that ccTLDs will implement DNSSEC sometime in the future. Next slide, please.

So, when I go to the fourth question, do you have infrastructure in your organization, do you have the staff or the technological infrastructure, 58% of those that have not implemented DNSSEC answered that they think that the cost of the resources include infrastructure, include new staff being hired, training of the staff, and legal services, because of course, when you have to implement DNSSEC, you need certain documents that are called the DNSSEC practice statement. This is called DPS by the English acronym. So 46% perceives that the chain of trust that is [inaudible] defined in the DNSSEC practice statement, and so they need lawyers to prepare all this document. So it's a kind of roadmap, step-by-step procedure how we are going to implement DNSSEC, how we are going to be assured that everything related to [this key] is protected.

38% perceives that a violation of security in the key, if the key is stolen or something like that, or a poor configuration, may result in financial damages, and at the same time, damage to the prestige of the company. 25% perceives that there is a challenge to the leadership

because they have to convince their superiors and stakeholders or corporate customers to adopt DNSSEC. So these are the four items that I was looking for.

Now, I was not asking for this, but this is something that resulted from all this conversation. Let's take a look. This is what we call the [inductive coding, because the inductive coding] are just what emerges from these conversations, from these interviews. Next slide, please.

Most of 42% of the people that participated in my study believe that they are perceived as competent because they have implemented DNSSEC. 46% believes they are trustworthy because they have implemented DNSSEC. 25% perceives that they are trustworthy because they have a key signing ceremony, and 29% believes they are perceived as safe because they have implemented DNSSEC.

This is really very interesting, because reputation is really key. Many people implementing DNSSEC is not because they think that they will suffer some kind of attack but because they think that it's more important to be perceived as competent, trustworthy and safe. And certainly, I was not looking for that. I did not expect that result.

When I interview only the participants that have implemented DNSSEC, let's take a look. 42% of them perceived that lack of knowledge prevents a corporate adoption. In other words, my customers are not aware of DNSSEC or which is the best way, what they need to implement DNSSEC. 25% perceive that the cost associated—remember those costs that are related to training, hosting, traveling, increase in payroll, they perceive that this is preventing implementation of DNSSEC.

25% also perceive that the technical challenges prevent the implementation of DNSSEC. In other words, DNSSEC is difficult among corporate clients. This means that I am the technical representative of an office in a law firm, and my technological duties are related to what this law firm needs. Now they're saying that they need DNSSEC, and certainly, I'm not an expert in DNSSEC.

So there will be kind of resistance at the very beginning. 50% perceive that to provide promotion incentives and training programs, it's important, when you register domain name, people may implement DNSSEC. And 50% perceive that if we can reduce the workload related to the implementation of DNSSEC for your customer, this will increase the implementation of DNSSEC. Next slide, please.

These are some of the recommendations I want to give to you, because some other recommendations of course are for ccTLDs and they're not relevant to this webinar, but the questions I would like you to think about are, has the ccTLD implemented DNSSEC? The reseller, the registrar is facilitating the implementation of DNSSEC for their domains? You're not buying directly from the ccTLD, so when you buy to a second level that will be the registrar or another of the [inaudible], [does this thoroughly] give you the opportunity of having DNSSEC in your domain name? Does your domain name have DNSSEC? Is it easy or difficult to sign the zone with the ccTLD? If you are a direct customer of that ccTLD, is it easy or difficult to sign that zone? The ISP you're using, the ISP that provides you access to Internet, do they have DNS resolvers so as to validate DNSSEC in their network? Are you aware of that? you know if they have it? Because this is something we need to know. this is something we need to ask, because each of these questions thoroughly

have an impact on our ability to be protected and to protect the ecosystem in which we work and operate. Next slide, please.

These are some of the recommendations that I mentioned before that really are interesting. When you visit a webpage that does not have a digital certificate, what we call an SSL, whether it's Chrome or Yahoo or Explorer, will immediately tell you this webpage does not have SSL, be careful, do not do any business, or if you do so, you're doing it at your own risk. That is the page [inaudible] that have DNSSEC won't say anything. So there should be some kind of notification in the browser so that when we go to the browser, they say this page does not have DNSSEC. It will be great to have something of that sort so when you go to a webpage, apart from the HTTPS, apart from the padlock, whether it's green or not, that lets you know whether it has SSL or not, the same may happen with DNSSEC, a kind of shield or something like that.

And in our workshops, we have to include our ccTLDs and think about the actual cost of this implementation, but not from the point that, well, there are some costs, but from a comprehensive perspective. And to that effect, some organizations are talking about that, so we'll still find out the best answers to those questions.

Do you remember that I already mentioned the DNSSEC practice statement? This is a legal document that involves step by step what you're going to do to secure these keys that will be used to protect that they are genuine, that they have the proper configuration. So we need lawyers to help us with that, and we need to develop this type of document for all ccTLDs [inaudible]. So the lawyers in the audience

willing to participate, please take note of that, because we need your help for all ccTLDs interested in implementing DNSSEC.

Additionally, how much work do we need for the implementation of DNSSEC as a DNSSEC user so that you may have it in your webpage? If it is difficult, if it is really very complicated, it would be difficult to be adopted. But if we may facilitate or pave the way, the adoption will be easier.

For regulators, there are some regulators in the United States in 2009 an actual [inaudible] a federal act so that all departments and federal government agencies should implement DNSSEC. Of course, this came with a budget application to finance the implementation.

However, that piece of law did not cascade down to local governments or state governments, so the idea would be to promote all this in some countries where regulators are in charge of the ccTLD, they may think about passing certain laws so that the DNSSEC may be adopted, particularly when we talk about the Internet service providers that will offer their business, their services, their deals. So they should have DNSSEC or they must be obliged to have DNSSEC implemented.

And also, it's better if all of us reached a consensus that we know that the ccTLDs come from different backgrounds. Some are not-for-profit, some are for-profit, some are operated by academia, from the private sector, in some cases from the public sector. So each ccTLD has a philosophy of their own. And so they prioritize the use of their resources. And I'm talking about human and financial resources.

Finally, thank you, all of you, for this opportunity. You may visit or you may write an e-mail to me, Pablo@nic.br, and the full complete study, the link is at the bottom of the page. So if you have any questions, here I am, but thank you very much for your attention.

AUGUSTO HO:

Thank you very much, Pablo. Certainly, we may make some comments about this and about your background, Pablo, because you have given a very interesting presentation. Pablo Rodriguez is a high executive with experience in cloud computer, customer service, and strategic management. He has very good experience with customers and with telecom operators at global level. He also participated when in North America, they generated the ccNSO. So, thank you very much, Pablo. Are there any questions? I think that Carlos Aguirre has requested the floor. Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Thank you very much, Augusto. This has been an excellent [inaudible] was very nice to see you again. I have a very short question. In one of your slides, you showed statistics about [inaudible] ccTLDs that nowadays had implemented DNSSEC, and you mentioned 12%. Which are the countries that have implemented [inaudible]?

And in another slide, you also talked about the reputation that was after implementing DNSSEC, they have a better reputation.. So, all of them have this improvement in reputation because there have been some improvement in some things of this sort in Latin America? And I was

willing to know whether this effected TLDs that had DNSSEC implemented or not.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you for your question. I have to meet regulations as a researcher, which prevents me from [inaudible]. So in my case, in my study, 24 operators participated. 12 of them had implemented DNSSEC and 12 have not. And they are distributed in the LAC region. I may tell you that in the Caribbean, we found the lowest adoption rate. I hope this may help you.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you very much, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: You're welcome.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you very much for the question. Now Alberto Soto has his hand up.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. I hope his pandemic ends soon, Pablo, so we may share a Coke together.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: I think that in 2022, we'll meet again here in Puerto Rico.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I want to make a comment. Because there are many places being targeted, so the DNSSEC [inaudible], I remember speaking with Rodrigo de la Parra and making a proposal, the same in the LAC IGF, I think in Panama, but the point is the dissemination. I may do it in Argentina, maybe primary dissemination, a primary communication, which includes the implementation of DNSSEC.

So, [inaudible] association that gathers all ISPs, and I think that a large number of ISPs in Argentina gather in that [chamber or] association. I'm a member of the board and I may speak to them so as to prepare a plan on how to cascade down DNSSEC, who has DNSSEC implemented, who has not. And this may be done in whole Latin America. Then if somebody comes, we may discuss if any implementation plans [inaudible] through LACNIC, and in some cases, we did it face-to-face [inaudible]. And in the case of Argentina and Latin America, we may start from the top down. Thank you very much.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you for your comment. I have decided to keep my presentation within a certain time limit, therefore I didn't give many details. Nevertheless, let me tell you this. The DNSSEC is a complex issue. And beware, complex is not complicated. Complicated is sending a rocket to the moon. Complicated means that there are many problems, that it is difficult but which may be compartmentalized and isolated, and the problem can be identified. If the problem is the fuel, you go to chemical

engineers. If the problem is mechanical, you go for mechanical engineers, electricians. If it's a programming issue, we can isolate it.

With DNSSEC, it is an assembly, a set of many pieces which are all moving at the same time. So although what you're saying is very true, it is very valuable and very relevant, it doesn't depend upon only single one group. I am aware that Argentina has DNSSEC and is making great achievements with DNSSEC, but it also requires, when I refer to the legal study, if I'm an engineer in a legal study or the technical person in this legal firm, I will probably be working on minor issues and [inaudible] and do things that are not technical. But if you tell me that I have to adopt and implement DNSSEC, it's big time, big work.

The DNSSEC and DNS are things that the lawyers will have to learn, and you are telling me that my workload is now three times my usual work, I have to do many more things. So quite probably, your staff, your employees will put a break on your expectations or will ask you, will tell you, "I need help." And that requires money. So you go to the TLD and you say to the TLD, "I need you to help me implement DNSSEC in my office," and the TLD will tell you, "I can't help you. I can help you if you have the keys and you send it to me, if you do that." But quite probably, the TLD will need to automate this process beforehand.

And as you can see, these are many pieces moving all at the same time. There is something that you have to do, there is something that the TLD has to do, there is something that has to be done by organizations in-between for this to function, because it's not a single person's responsibility. Several people, all of them moving at the same time. It's

like an orchestra. Each of us is playing one instrument but in unison for it to sound nice.

So it's very complicated, but certainly, for sure, what you have said, [well,] this group has to be involved to explain what DNSSEC is and why it is important to have DNSSEC and what is required for DNSSEC implementation. How do we do that, Well, we have to involve the TLD and LACRALO if necessary. We have to involve the Internet Society chapter and many more. We must have several people all start at the same time to see how we facilitate this, because it's not a responsibility of a single group. It's like an onion with several layers. Each layer is tricky.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you, Pablo. I forgot—actually, I did not, but I didn't want to use too much of your time—whenever I'm talking about this, I refer to all TLDs. [They should go to] each country's ISPs. LACNIC should give to me or to the ALS a PowerPoint presentation, the same PowerPoint throughout Latin America. And ALSes will be very happy to collaborate and work [inaudible]. Thank you very much.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ:

Thank you very much.

AUGUSTO HO:

Thank you for the questions, to participants, and thank you to Pablo for his thorough and detailed explanation. Thank you for the valuable information provided. And Pablo's e-mail address has been posted for

those of you who want to make questions to him. You can send them to this e-mail address.

So now, we will have a discussion with our ALAC member, Carlos Raul Gutierrez who will talk about the ALAC. By the way, we will send our regards to our ALAC member, Sylvia Herlein Leite who is now going through her problem.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, certainly. A big hug to Sylvia and hope for her recovery. I will be brief for two reasons. First of all, what is happening in ALAC will be presented by Vanda in a few minutes, so I would be very brief in this respect. It is an internal matter which is, in my view, very important, to which we have to pay full attention.

Before we start with the discussion, let me first commend Pablo for his work. I think timing is of essence. In our group, there has been a vast discussion—perhaps not that deep or not that thorough—on trust and confidence on the Internet. This way not by chance. It was the result of an exercise on the analysis of competence and confidence. Analysis. It was conducted a long time ago, but it was followed up. And I was happy to see the qualitative questions in your study. Being a nontechnical person, the big question is whether it is useful or not, and if I may, I would add, if it's useful for the Internet. I think we should take this to the Internet confidence discussion as well.

Now, let's see what's happening in the ALAC. As you said at the beginning, every year end, there is a transition among members. And the general assembly this year was extended, was too long for me, for

those of us who have other things to do, other jobs. So let me mention a couple of things in particular.

The first is the elephant in the room. There is still the same elephant, it's still very big, and we still have very little idea on how to move forward. The first elephant is data privacy and data registration. The WHOIS, which is now GDPR and which internally is called EPDP, and we wanted it to end with the EPDP 2 but it did not, so it was not complete. We started with EPDP 2A.

The most difficult thing is to find a chair for that group, because the previous chair committed himself to work for one year. It was actually two years in that role and he couldn't continue, so we are now trying to get a confirmation for a person for this group which ALAC must have two regular and two alternate members. We had two excellent representatives, Hadia and Alan Greenberg, excellent workers. They worked very hard holding the end users' position very well. We still have to see if they can continue. We have our doubts. We need volunteers.

And the second elephant in the room is the new round or the new rounds that move at the speed of a hurricane. Without being really certain about its feasibilities, financial and political feasibility, and this is an aside, and as a final comment, we need more rounds when we need more rounds. We have to pay full attention to the report that will be submitted to the comment period in the next few weeks or months. This is very important for LACRALO to develop our own position on this topic.

So back to Pablo's presentation, what is our market like, whether this is what we need or we should make any additional efforts on this. These two topics, these two issues used up 90% of the policy process. Other, minor processes are about to start which are not extremely important.

Regarding the resources, we can see, as always, that our RALO is underrepresented. On our internal matters, Vanda will talk about the very important thing which is the report on the ALAC and the role of RALOs, which has led to an internal ALAC process on the needs for personal resources, the personnel resources, the need for volunteers, whether they are members or affiliated to an ALS or not. And this is the comment I will make on Vanda's presentation, because facing the challenges the organization has, we are short of resources. And this is especially for ALAC. Because of our nature, we're representing the end user, but we have a problem because we do not have resources to be involved in the entire process.

So I view them as the bottleneck which ALAC has had structurally and LACRALO in particular. So we started the year with many participants in many administrative and policy activities. I hope they will be able to work. As I said on some occasions, my passion is ICANN's internal matters, not so much outreach. But whenever you ask me, I recommend the CPWG meetings that involve both outreach and internal affairs, internal matters and where you can very quickly catch up to see it and know how we are trying to meet our agenda. I will stop here to see if there are questions, and in addition, I have another Zoom meeting which is about to start in a few minutes. So if there are questions, please make them now. And if not, please follow Vanda's presentation very closely because this deals with our very core business. As

[inaudible] asked, there is a big debate on whether the only way to get organized is through ALSes or whether we'll have to resort to direct participation. Thank you very much.

AUGUSTO HO:

Thank you very much, Carlos, indeed, and in order to make sure that our regional ALSes are aware of the work party report, we'll now give the floor to Vanda. She will share the most relevant aspects of this work. This is only the starting point for a discussion. Probably, we will discuss this in our governance group as well. So Vanda, you have the floor.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you. Thank you all. Thank you for this opportunity. Originally, this was a presentation made by Alan Greenberg, and with Harold, we have translated it for the purpose of ease of conversation, to enable conversation. So, how have we got here? Very quickly, we will probably remember that we had our At-Large review in recent years. The independent examiner, you will remember, wanted to remove all ALSes because he understood that they were all the same, all equivalent to a single user.

Certainly, At-Large did not agree, and the group [inaudible] the reason why the ALS has to gain access to the ... Agreed that the reason for this was that the ALS has access to its members. So we wanted to support the ALSes and we proposed through the board to maintain them and encourage them to reach their members. And the board accepted that.

As I said, the ICANN bylaws establish the goals of At-Large, which is to involve the persons, the end users, to allow all stakeholders to share their views and get involved in Internet matters in general. Please let's move to the next because we do not have much time.

What was the mandate for the group? To review the rules and the focus was on presenting an extensive mobilization. To do a general cleanup, not to do a redesigning of At-Large, and also to avoid substantial controversy and confrontation if possible to make it start up very quickly with this proposal. And the mandate was also, by the end, a report was to be made and sent back to the ALAC, the RALOs and the ICANN Board. Next slide, please.

So, what is it that is being proposed? To change the accreditation criteria, the expectations of an ALS and the accreditation process. Next slide, please. The accreditation criteria that was proposed was the following. First of all, the entire process must have the explicit support of the ALS leadership. Each ALS must prove that it has support for the accreditation before it takes place.

The ALSes must have a sufficient number. That number is not known, but it should not be just the representatives or the leadership or just a chairperson. There must be more. There should be an overlapping, an intersection between the ALSes' own interest and ICANN interest for it to continue being accredited. So it has to prove that it is involved in ICANN. Many of our ALSes are engaged in completely different work, but there are certain areas of intersection with ICANN's interests. That is the aim.

There is no prohibition for an ALS to be involved with other parts of ICANN. For example, if it is a technical ALS, it could be in LACNIC or SSAC, or it could be part of the registrar group, whatever. What we do care is that the ALS must be clear that it is also doing that. It is not prohibited, but transparency is required. There is also a provision for an ALS with membership that does not map to a single ICANN region. For example, I have a group, known by everyone, of women. This is a group with 400 members and these members are from 69 countries.

Some time ago, I also set up an ALS in Brazil because we didn't have yet a clear idea. We still do not know, but there might be people who wanted to participate and were not in an ALS could be members of my ALS. And that was the case with people from Uruguay, The Caribbean, Central America, but later, they went and joined their own ALSes.

This special provision is something we should focus on. For us, for LACRALO, as we have a system of rotation between the subregions of our region—Latin America and the Caribbean—this becomes complicated, although it is not mandatory, it is not required. There is simply an opportunity for an ALS with members who are not mapped to a single region. Such an ALS can be approved under the accreditation criteria. Next slide, please.

What are the expectations then for this situation, for this proposal? That as RALO, we have to discuss it, to understand it, and to participate in the final decision. So the idea is to have more active people in ICANN. ALSes should work, and the idea is that the ALSes should work and have more active members in ICANN. Not just the same people.

Most of us here all have been working and participating actively in ICANN for many years. So one of the expectations is to increase the number of active people because the ALSes will attract them to work in ICANN.

And the idea is also that the ALSes may mobilize the people that have been in the roster for a long while but are not active. ALSes should then be ready to send to the staff [so as to b] accredited the contact data of their members so as to get in touch with them. They may prepare summaries. They may be asked questions. And perhaps these people may contribute something specific so that they start collaborating. The language should be simple, everything should be translated in several languages, so all the information that an ALS has available for communication should be translated into several languages so that other members of other areas may also understand what this ALS is doing.

These ALSes should not require more than a monthly report, something like that, but this may change in the future. But the idea is not to force any participation that is not a constructive participation. The idea is to somehow measure the participation of that ALS. Perhaps there may be a significant effort so as to produce something and then circulate it among the other ALSes so as to attract people from one region or the other so that people may join ALSes. And another expectation is that ALSes should be prepared to react if people bite [inaudible]. So if they bite, they buy the idea, the ALSes will be ready [to give them someplace] to work.

Perhaps there are some people like “No, I'm not interested in ICANN, there's nothing to do with ICANN, ICANN is not my interest,” but we need at least to try and get them here. Of course, there are some exceptions or [inaudible] class of ALSes and perhaps each RALO may have, for instance in Europe there is an ALS for all individual members, all unaffiliated members. If they are individual members, they have been a group or gather in these ALSes of individual. [inaudible] This is how they have attracted more people to participate. This may happen. Next slide, please.

The second expectation is that all ALSes should prepare a report every two years. In this report, it should confirm the aspects of the original criteria they met when accredited. They also should present some reports about representatives, tell about activities, and this process should be initiated by staff. Staff should work on an online form specifically designed to be as painless as possible, not just to be a form of 200 pages so that you need to devote lots of time to fill it in.

And of course, we know that all the personal data should be protected so as to comply with the law of each of our territories. In Brazil, we have a law, and I would say all countries in Latin America, and I think some of the Caribbean countries as well, should have some kind of data protection law. And of course, this should be considered when providing [inaudible].

This report should also include the status of the ALSes in terms of Internet, social media presence of the ALS, if they have a website or not. So any information that may be on the Internet.

Expectation [number three,] the representative of the ALS must respond if and when contacted. Perhaps in the form of surveys or request for help of a particular issue because one of the information that an ALS may send, for instance, I have 60 members and the members are experts, whatever, cybercrime, cybersecurity, data protection, etc.

So if we need some specific help for specific talk or this or that, we may contact that representative and so there should be a direct contact to the ALS members so as to be contacted and request their help for a specific topic. Also, the ALS should provide the address or link of all members, designate from two to four representatives, and there's no prohibition on being active in other parts of ICANN. this fact must be declared by the ALS or by the members, because the members of the ALS may be members of some other constituencies and I may say [it's not] personal case that I'm the [director] of the Brazilian Association of Software, and this association is a member of the Business Constituency.

So [somehow,] I am involved in two different groups, end users and Business Constituency. But there's no prohibition. [inaudible] any incentive so that people of At-Large may be part of some other constituencies in ICANN. But if are involved, if you're willing to participate in a RALO for instance, this is open. So the ALS [may] register or join and be accredited as an ALS, but that when you—

AUGUSTO HO: Vanda, we're running out of time.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes. I know. There are two important points here, but there's no major changes. It's important not to be a major change in everything that we have but [a little cleanup.] So there's a 90-day target to end up everything, to be flexible so that all the information discovered using [inaudible] that there should be an opportunity during the due diligence process of the staff so that an application may be suspended, that there should be time for an ALS to participate in ICANN meetings. We must pay attention to the privacy issues. And we will stop using terminology "disaccredit," but we are going to withdraw the accreditation.

So the process has to be described with the various parts, depending on the circumstances. Next slide, please. The highlights [when we talk about] the agreements of this work party, this will be applicable to all existing ALSes. [inaudible] Should [we voting?] No. Should we participation at meetings? No. But [inaudible] participation of the members of the ALSes will be traced so as to find out whether they are participating. And the RALOs are free to define their own rules. Next slide, please.

Regarding timelines, will be all of the same, the six months after the formal approval, it should be implemented. But you know that it takes time. We need to submit these proposals to discuss within each RALO [inaudible] in ALAC. ALAC will vote on that and there should be some processes because there will be changes to bylaws, so everything has to be approved by the board. Next slide, please.

AUGUSTO HO: I'm so sorry, Vanda, but we're running out of time.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, this is where the information is located. We need to read the report of the working group so as to then prepare an online discussion of this situation, because this will start by the governance group. They will start discussing on the topics related to other RALOs so [inaudible] then give our opinion. Thank you all for your attention. Certainly, there's a lot of information. [Our time] should be more than the one allocated.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you very much. Alejandro Pisanty, you have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you very much. Good evening. I think that Vanda made a presentation—we have to certainly pay attention to this, particularly to our governance group, and also to the council members. I think that this is a very good topic to launch the meetings of this council. And I'm saying that because what Vanda is saying—and this comes from the work party mentioned before—is something confusing. On the one hand, we want to be more flexible so that people may participate, but on the other hand, we are mixing in [threats,] as Vanda has said, participation with one association or more than one, an international association, [they're] representing end users, on the other hand, it doesn't matter whether it's government user, vendor, ISP, registrar. And then you may be part of the Business Constituency. But you were saying that the conflict of interest [inaudible] of course.

Internet Society [is starting to separate from the board a person as these] ALSes from Latin America and the Caribbean because of the conflict of interest. So, [inaudible] participate as broadly as possible, avoid silos to improve communication, but on the other hand, we should not have conflict of interest and we should not be pushing on the interest of one space or another.

So what we are really now observing, we are [setting the field] for future conflicts of interest, because there are many hats to be worn by the same person. People buying domain names, people representing end users, and [inaudible] perhaps in the Government Advisory Committee. So I think that we should be clear. And this is what I'm asking. Thank you very much.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you very much, Alejandro.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you very much, Alejandro. Certainly, we don't have much time, so I will now give the floor to Claudia. Am I right? Because I think Claudia has a survey, some questions for a final survey.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Can you see the questions on the screen? Number one is, how was the technology used for the webinar? Second is, did the speaker demonstrate mastery of the topic?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Sorry, Claudia, is this for Carlos?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This is for Pablo.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you, Vanda. Third question, are you satisfied with the webinar? Question four, how many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? And the fifth and last question, what topic would you like us to cover for the future webinars?

And in this question, please, there's no space for suggestions, so please write your suggestions in the chat box. Thank you very much.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you very much. So, we are out of time. This is the end of our monthly meeting. The idea is to have an open discussion through the mailing list. So, thank you very much for being active. And Sergio Salinas has given us the very good news that [inaudible] doing okay, is healing. So, very good [inaudible] and thank you to the interpreters. Good evening everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]