

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all of you. Welcome to the LACRALO monthly call on Monday September 20 2021 at 23:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have on the Spanish channel Sergio Salinas Porto, Alberto Soto, Alfredo Lopez, Augusto Ho, Gilberto Lara, Humberto Carrasco, Lito Ibarra, Mariano Quiroga, Rodrigo Saucedo, Sylvia Herlein Leite.

On the English channel, we have Claire Craig and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

On behalf of the staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Karen Lentz, and myself, Claudia Ruiz. I will be the call manager today.

We have interpretation in Spanish, Portuguese and French. Our interpreters are Veronica and Claudia on the Spanish channel, Bettina and Esperanza on the Portuguese channel, and Isabelle and Claire on the French channel.

Before starting, I would ask all of you please to state your name before taking the floor each time for transcription purposes and for interpreters to identify you in the corresponding language channels. And now, Sergio, you have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you very much, Claudia. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all of you. Today, we have our September call, and Harold, our secretary, is delayed due to some work issues. So our secretary today will be our secretary elect, Claire Craig. So I will give Claire the

---

*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.*

---

floor so that she can read the agenda for this call so that we may approve the agenda. Claire, you have the floor.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Thank you, Sergio. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening wherever you are. The next agenda item would be a presentation by Karen Lentz on policy research and stakeholder programs in ICANN. Then we move on to the working groups, the multilingualism and IDNs working group, then we have the communications working group who would be doing reports.

The next agenda item would be reports from the ALAC members—well, one ALAC member, Sindy Obed, and then we have the report from the general assembly and Any Other Business. Is there anything else that anyone would like to add to the agenda before we move forward?

Seeing no hands up and no comments, I suggest that we adopt the agenda. Thank you, Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you very much, Claire. Now Karen Lentz will make a presentation. We know something about this topic because we have been working on the group so as to have this topic of the new gTLD round within the agenda of LACRALO. I want to remind you that this has been prepared together with the LACRALO leaders, the [inaudible] leadership because the capacity building group is also participating in this topic. And then we have [inaudible] Rodrigo Saucedo. We have been working with him so that Karen might join us today. So it's a pleasure and it's also an honor to have Karen with us. Welcome, Karen, and you have 35 minutes

---

to express yourself about this topic. I remind all of you that there will be a quiz afterwards, so please pay attention. Thank you very much. Karen, you have the floor.

KAREN LETZ:

Thank you very much. I hope everyone can hear me okay. I thank you for the invitation. The slides are linked from this agenda, I believe. Is there a way to show them? Great. Thank you.

So thank you for the invitation, and yes, I know that the At-Large community has been working on looking at the policy discussions surrounding new rounds of new gTLDs. So this is an interesting time, and I will cover three different areas. One is the background on the new gTLD program, one, we will also look at what are the recommendations from the community in the form of the final report from the subsequent procedures policy development process, and then where are we and what can we expect in the future. Next slide, please.

Thank you. I think probably most people are familiar with this, but I wanted to talk about the term “SubPro,” because we hear this word a lot, and what it actually means. The new gTLD program is a community-driven initiative to allow us to add more generic top-level domains to the domain name system.

This came about as a result of work in the ICANN community where the recommendation was—this is back in 2008—that there should be a process for us to introduce new gTLDs into the DNS, and some of the goals that were stated in developing those recommendations included increases competition to allow for more innovation, more choices for

---

consumers when registering domain names, and it's also always been an important part of that to support top-level domains in multiple scripts.

So ICANN serves the global Internet community and that includes users all over the world who use and speak many different languages and scripts. So that's been a foundational part of the program and that will continue to be an important part of the planning for next round, including how we can support and serve many top-level domains in multiple scripts, and also to work on universal acceptance so that those new top-level domains can function in a consistent and stable and safe way.

And then when we hear the word "SubPro," this stands for subsequent procedures, which was the name of the working group that was formed in the GNSO to make recommendations that go beyond the application round that happened in 2012.

So within the new gTLD program, there was a round of applications resulting in new gTLDs that began in 2012, and when we talk about what happens next in terms of future procedures, the name that we sometimes call it for short is SubPro. Next slide, please.

Thank you. Back in 2012, we did receive 1930 applications from 60 countries, broken down by a variety of types, also a significant chunk of applications for internationalized domain names. Next slide, please.

This also is looking at the 2012 round and the 1930 applications. As you can see, they came from all over the world. And looking at the LAC region, there were a number of applications from the region, not as many as we would have liked to see, but this shows you what the results

---

were of the application round in 2018. Out of these 1900+ applications, there have been 1200+ delegations of new gTLDs to date.

Before I go into the policy section, I will also add that concurrent with many of the launches of these new gTLDs, the community has undertaken to review what happened in the 2012 round from different angles, including looking at the stability of the root zone, looking at trademark protections, looking at consumer trust, the organization and how the implementation of the policy went in practice, and then there's the subsequent procedures PDP itself. So all of these reviews went into the working group that was formed in the GNSO to consider what should happen with subsequent procedures in the new gTLD program. Next slide, please.

So going into what the subsequent procedures PDP recommended, I think it's important also to highlight the existing policy. So this was back in 2008, I mentioned that the community developed a recommendation that there should be a process for introducing new gTLDs, and it should be a transparent and fair and nondiscriminatory process.

So that policy stance, unless it would be modified by a different policy development process. So when the subsequent procedures policy development process got underway, they did affirm this sort of foundational question about whether there should be a way to and continue to be a way to add new gTLDs to the domain name system. So that was affirmed, and that was one of the foundational questions of the PDP, is whether that should continue. Next slide, please.

So looking at the final report, it is quite a long and very detailed report. The working group tackled 41 different topics going from program

metrics to communications to technical evaluation to fees. So it covered many topics and went into great detail in those. You will also see the term “outputs” when talking about this report and how it goes forward, and the outputs are really kind of labels to different elements that are included in the report. And I will explain some of those.

So an affirmation means that they essentially didn't recommend any changes to the existing policy from 2008. Then there was an affirmation with modification, which means that they basically wanted to keep the same policy recommendation but either clarify something or add a detail but it would be a small change to what was already in place.

Then there are, in the report, what are called recommendations and these are the ones that would be considered policy requirements, in contrast with implementation guidance. So if you take a policy recommendation, there could be four or five different ways to implement something, and in this case, if they give implementation guidance, they suggest that it be implemented in a particular way. But that is not a requirement, that is a recommendation. So one of the questions that we get a lot is whether the implementation guidance is a requirement.

It is not, but we take it seriously. As it says there, there is a presumption that we would follow that implementation guidance. And if there's a reason that we can't implement something exactly as it was specified in the report, that we be transplant about that and explain the reasons for that.

And then finally, there is a category yes of no agreement, which there was only one of those in this report from the working group, but there's

---

---

no recommendation because the group did not come to consensus on that particular topic. Next slide, please.

In terms of consensus, as I mentioned, the majority of the 41 topics, they did reach consensus in the working group. There are a couple of exceptions here that I will mention. The first one is on the topic of what are called closed generics. The closed generics is a type of application that was identified where the applicant was proposing to restrict registrations in some way, but the string was considered to be a generic word.

So this was a topic that was discussed quite a lot within the working group, but they did not reach agreement. And so there are no recommendations in the final report on this topic.

The other area where there was not consensus in the group has to do with auctions. The reason that auctions were considered in this report is that they were used in 2012 as a mechanism of last resort, meaning that if there was contention, if there would be more than one qualified application for the same TLD and that contention was not resolved in any other stage, that the mechanism of last resort would be an auction.

So the two recommendations concerning actions that are in the final report that did not receive consensus were, one, having to do with private forms of resolution and what should be allowed or not allowed, and the other one was on the specific auction methodology. There was a recommendation that was not supported by everyone and that is labeled with strong support but significant opposition.

---

I mentioned these two areas where there was not consensus because these were not in the recommendations that were passed along to the Board, which means that when we look at the next stages, there are some issues around these topics that we will need to figure out. Next slide, please.

So as I mentioned, the report is quite an extensive report in terms of the amount of work and the number of topics. It's difficult here to do it justice, but I will try to give a brief summary of what's in the report. The group agreed that in the instance where there was not consensus to change something from the existing policy, that the status quo would continue to apply.

In terms of the report, the basic foundation of the program mostly has stayed the same in that there are still evaluations, there are still requirements, there's still a registry agreement and so a lot of the components of the program are recommended to still exist in the same way.

And some of the areas where they did recommend some changes—there are a few here that I will mention. The first is to have a pre-evaluation process for registry service providers. So in 2012, one registry provider might be supporting many applications, and each application went through a technical evaluation individually.

So what is recommended for the pre-evaluation is that a provider could go through the technical evaluation in advance and then they would be able to use that same approval within—if they've passed the evaluation



---

for many applications, as many as they would like to use for when the application process is open.

The group also recommended a predictability framework. This is because it was recognized that we cannot predict everything, that there will always be some form of unexpected issue that needs to be solved while the program is underway, and so the group recommended some procedures to determine how applicants can be informed of new issues and how those can be properly resolved in a transparent way.

The group also made some recommendations on applicant support. This was also a program where an applicant could seek fee reductions according to some eligibility criteria, and there are some more recommendations about how to advance that program for future rounds.

Another area of change has to do with string similarity. So one of the policy requirements is that we should not add new TLDs that would be confusingly similar to something that already exists. And to do that, we need to review each of the applied for TLDs to make a determination of whether they would be confusingly similar.

So the group provided some more guidance in cases where there are a singular and a plural version of the same word that would be applied for. So more specific guidance to that review. Also, community priority evaluation which was another form of resolving contentions, and this is evaluating whether an application should be given priority based on its status as a community-based application. So the group provided some more guidance on how that evaluation could occur.

---

And then I mentioned others because as I said, this is a very large report and if I didn't mention something, that does not mean it's not important. Many of the issues you will see coming in the next phases are not on this list, but you will see a great deal of discussion around how those are done as well. Next slide, please.

Thank you. And we'll go next into where are we today. This graphic, you may be familiar with, but this is how every policy development process works. It starts with an issue report and goes all the way up to a final report. And where we are now is right between public comment period—which has happened—and the Board vote which has not yet happened. And you see an arrow there saying ODP, which I will talk about next. Next slide, please.

Thank you. So typically, how this works when we get policy recommendations that come from the community, there's policy development which happens in the community, if the Board directs us to implement those policies, then the Org takes that on with support from volunteers on an Implementation Review Team.

In this case, we have policy development and we are about to undertake what is called an Operational Design Phase given that these recommendations are complex and are expected to have a high operational impact. So the Operational Design Phase is a relatively new process—and I'll talk a little bit about that—but you can see what the milestones that have already been completed.

So there's been a final report, the GNSO voted on the final report, the recommendations were sent to the Board, and then the Board, about a week ago, resolved to request an Operational Design Phase which we

---

are pending to initiate that. The Operational Design Phase as you can see from the graphic is intended to inform the Board in making a decision on these recommendations. Next slide, please.

So an Operational Design Phase, as I said, is something that the Board requests ICANN Org to do. It is a process that we're still building, but we intend to make it transparent by sharing the work that's in progress and providing an opportunity for the community to provide input to that work.

I will mention also that in a way, this work is not new. It's always been part of the organization's job, to provide information, to prepare the Board for making a good decision. This is something that is described in our consensus policy implementation framework, but the ODP formalizes that process and gives us a structure to do the work and to share it with the community.

I will also emphasize that the Operational Design Phase is focused on operations. This is not a way to change any of the policy recommendations that came from the community, and any policy questions would always need to be referred back to the GNSO.

Another question that we get frequently is asking about the work of the IRT. Typically, there is an Implementation Review Team that works with the Org during an implementation phase of policies. The ODP is not replacing that. These are two different processes. The Operational Design Phase is prior to the Board's decision, providing information to the Board, and the IRT is something that we will undertake if the Board

---

directs us to proceed with that implementation, we would follow the usual processes with convening an IRT. Next slide, please.

So I mentioned that there was a Board resolution on this last week. I will highlight a couple of things out of this. The text is on the screen. But first is the request to undertake the Operational Design Phase for the SubPro recommendations. There are some timetables in here. First of all is an internal project organization phase to allow the Org to get and to organize the resources necessary to actually undertake the answers to all of the questions that have been posed in the scoping document.

And then once the ODP is fully initiated, the Board has requested that the output be provided within a ten-month period. This is going to be a significant piece of work for the organization and the community, I think, to review the work and provide input. But the second piece of the resolution has to do with providing the resources. So there are some financial resources provided to allow the Org to undertake the Operational Design Phase without taking away the resources that are needed for ongoing ICANN operations. Next slide, please.

The scoping document that was linked in the resolution is the basis for how the Operational Design Phase will be organized. With all of the questions posed by the Board, they're organized according to 12 different scoping areas, and I will tell you in the next slide that there is a webinar next week that I hope you can join that will go through these in detail.

But these are the ways, the types of questions that we're expected to be able to provide information on, which include governance, the systems, the financial elements, the timing, the actual model of how the process

---

would work, and I will highlight also number three, which has to do with global engagement, linguistic support and localization. So I've mentioned how important internationalized domain names are, and this is making sure that we are paying particular attention to how we can support those in considering future rounds. Next slide, please.

What is the Org working on now? As I mentioned, a lot of enabling us to start the Operational Design Phase has to do with resources, whether that is hiring or moving people around or training people on what they need to know about new gTLDs and about the final report.

We are also continuing to support the Board in the planning discussions as well as preparing a community webinar. So this is next week on the 28th. There will be a detailed review of the scoping document—more than I could go through here, but it would go through how it's organized and what all of the different types of questions, how those are being handled.

And I will also mention the next slide, which is links that may be of interest, but along with the scoping document is an annex that maps each of the topics from the final report to where in the scoping document those would show up, which may be in more than one place. So that is also available, but I wanted to make sure to highlight the webinar next week which will go through the scoping document as well as what to expect as far as how we plan to undertake and share the results of this particular Operational Design Phase.

With that, the last slide is the references to some of the key documents that I talked about. And I think I am just about at the time, so I will turn

---

it back to, I think, Claudia, or any other questions or comments. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Karen. I'm going to give you some time just to check if our colleauges have questions for you. I should say, by the way, that your presentation was really great. So thank you very much for this presentation.

Let's see if there are questions for you. Dev, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Thanks, Karen, for this excellent presentation on this. At least it got me thinking about what's happening in the new gTLD program.

I guess my question is, one of the things that At-Large was very involved with when the actual gTLD program launched was the ability to file objections to gTLD applications. I was curious, were there any changes in how objections are handled, or are there different classes of objections and so forth? Thanks.

KAREN LETZ: Thank you, Dev. To your question on objections, yes, I do recall in developing the 2012 round some considerations around the ALAC having a role in filing objections in certain cases. As far as what is recommended in the final report, there are not significant changes to how the objection process worked previously. There's nothing that I

---

would characterize as a major change. They did recommend, though, not just for objections but for in a few different steps that there should be an appeals mechanism, and that would be new. So that would be something that didn't exist previously that would need to be developed.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes. I see Claire has her hand up, so Claire, you have the floor.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thank you. Whoever has the slides, can you take it back to the map with where the applications were? Karen, this was an excellent presentation, it really helped me to understand the work that has been done, tremendous amount of work. It helped me to understand the work of the working group and the next steps. My question, which was not covered, and probably was not part of the mandate for the group, would be when you look at the areas, there are certain regions, particularly Latin America and Caribbean and the African regions where the applications were particularly low.

Now, I know the working group recommended applicant support, but is there or have there been any studies to understand why the applications in these regions are so low? I'm sure we have our suspicions as to why they might be low, but are there any studies to show why they're so low and what can be done to increase the application rates in some of these areas? Thank you.

---

KAREN LETZ:

Thank you, Claire. That is a very good question, and you're not alone in raising this. So to the first question as to whether there have been studies, there was one that I know of that was part of the competition, consumer trust and consumer choice review team that was working from 2014 through 2016-'17. But they actually did commission an study that was done by AM Global that looked at essentially why people didn't apply, went looking for reasons in areas where applications were low, talking to people about whether they considered it, and if not, why not, what were the factors in determining whether they applied or not?

Applicant support is, as you mentioned, one of the things that comes up in this discussion of looking at the different regions. But another thing that comes up a lot is communications, partly from the standpoint of how long it takes to explain the DNS and the opportunity and what would actually be needed to apply for a new gTLD.

So some of the recommendations do have to do with starting the outreach pretty far in advance, and also with being thoughtful about who the audiences are, who would be the likely types of entities who this would be something that would be relevant and important for them and to start those communications early, as well as trying to provide resources that help explain the application process and requirements.

So especially for those who might be new to the ICANN world, understanding all of the terminology and why certain requirements are important for security or stability. So a lot of the discussion went also to communications and what other types of support could be available to applicants in multiple regions. I hope that answers your question.



CLAIRE CRAIG: It did, yes.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Karen, thank you very much for your presentation. Really, it's been an excellent presentation. There have been some comments in the chat, and it's really good to know that we can come to you to discuss this topic in which we are certainly interested. So thank you very much, and now we will continue with the LACRALO call.

So I'm trying to take a look at the agenda. And now, well, you know that the leads of the working groups will have to give an update. One is by Sylvia, our lead in multilingualism and IDN as well as universal acceptance will take the floor and give an update. Sylvia.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening all of you. I am here as the lead of the IDNs universal acceptance working group to tell you that certainly, there has been a lot of work in our group. And universal acceptance—as we would imagine, there's a lot of interest in it, so many people in our group have been working within the group and outside as well, as well as people who certainly were not a member of the working group but have been working on universal acceptance.

I would like to speak about something that perhaps you've seen something, because Vanda made a presentation to ALAC in the finance and budget group. She made a presentation and spoke about the universal acceptance activities in the Asia Pacific region as well as in our

---

region, and which will be the road ahead. You know that we have a prepared course which is really successful in our region, and so taking advantage of all of that, because we have the material and it has been translated, we are going to get in touch with the regions' ISPs so as to offer them this course.

You know that there have been some webinars. Raitme prepared them together with Daniel Fink. So now we are going to contact some other ISPs in the region to use this material. And Vanda mentioned this in the finance and budget working group, so as to find the best way to do it, the most interesting way sot do it.

There was a webinar in this respect held on August 30th. Raitme and Daniel Fink were in charge of that, and with the people of the center of study for broadband in Nicaragua—their name is CEABAD—they learned about the course and they wanted to use it. So they asked for a webinar so as to really understand what the course was about.

The people from CEABAD are in contact with COMTELCA. COMTELCA regional technical telecommunication commission. So many countries like Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama and the Dominican Republic are part of that commission. And Ms. Lizania Pérez, the new chair of COMTELCA, got in touch with us and asked for the possibility of replicating our course within their group.

So we are going to get in touch with all ALSes in the countries I've just mentioned. We're going to put them in contact with them so that there may be an integration, and our ALSes representing the end users may get in touch with these people, and so all of them together may carry out some activities. I think this is great because we have a [technical

---

community] that certainly may understand the interests, the needs of end users, and I think this is great news.

With respect to the users' course, the one we mentioned after the technical course for September, it was postponed to October. It will be held on Wednesday, October 21st. It will last 90 minutes and the speakers will be Dennis Tan and Daniel Fink. We're going to send you the flyers so that you may invite—because this is for users—the members of your ALSes so they may take part in this course targeted at users. This is a universal acceptance course.

Finally, as we have already announced when we started with the course of technicians, we wanted all RALOs to have the possibility of using this material. We know that NARALO has [inaudible] this idea and they are organizing this course to be held in January 2022 if I'm not mistaken. So they're going to use our course, the same format but for NARALO. And I think it will be held in English and French.

These are the news and updates for universal acceptance. Thank you very much for listening.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Sylvia. So now Marcelo Rodriguez will give an update on the working group on communications. So Marcelo, if you're on the call, you may take the floor.

MARCELO RODRIGUEZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Hello to each and every one of you. Thank you for being here and for giving me the

---

possibility of telling you what we are doing in the communications working group.

It was mentioned in the previous update, giving my colleagues some of the details to be considered when discussing these issues in the future. We have been working day and night so as to produce newsletter number three. We've received some contributions and we would like to thank you for that. But we need as much participation as possible. I've said all this before.

But we have this opportunity of getting in touch with the whole region, of participating, of giving the perspective of each of the ALSes participating in LACRALO. So we're going to send again the e-mail that we've already sent so that it may be used as a reminder. If you would like to take part on that, it will be sent out after ICANN 72 because with Sylvia, we have discussed preparing a [inaudible] we have some contributions, we need some [address] that are in the pipeline. We understand that it takes time to produce something, but it's just one page so that it may be added to the newsletter.

And we expect it will be prepared because one of the characteristics—and we certainly stress that in the communications meetings—is that if possible, and the idea was to prepare in the shortest way possible because of the pandemic and everything that has happened in all regions around the world. In Argentina, we have been working a lot so that the Internet may be declared a public and universal service. We have made some presentation in this respect. We keep on fighting for that. But within the region, there's various activities, within

---

the RALOs, and the idea is that a summary of each presentation maybe submitted.

Additionally, and of course taking into account the times, we have a radio show Monday from 7:00 to 8:00 Argentinian time. You may listen to it [inaudible] alternative media. And certainly, in that show, we talked about Internet users and certainly, we invite all of you to participate so that—I repeat, it's a radio show from 7:00 to 8:00 Argentinian time if you're willing to participate.

Additionally, Mariano Quiroga is here with us. Perhaps he's no longer connected, but certainly together with him, we're working on internal communication and everything related to social media. We have prepared a communication plan related to social media of our work. We have to prepare plans so as to give a certain identity, and to propose a new mission, vision and values, it will have a given aesthetic. Mariano is in charge of corporate colors and the idea of showing the essence.

We're not going to start from scratch, but this new plan will be added to everything that has been developed regarding digital content. We are going to work [inaudible] to streamline it, to fine tune it and we will go to talk with our speakers, as well as a SWOT analysis—strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats—so as to have new participants. And the idea is to have objectives included in the SMART methodology. That is, specific, measurable, attainable, etc.

And other ideas to use the content in the various channels and to define everything related to the logo, the colors, to define the format of each content to each media, to define metrics because we need metrics in this respect. Also to use the same [literature] particularly in the

---

weekend, to have a calendar with the highlights of the month if possible, and to assign roles.

This is why it's so important for ALSes to appoint a given person for communication, because this is certainly something that will not depend on a single person but every person may have a different role so as to put in practice the program we are preparing. This is what we have prepared and we have discussed with Mariano Quiroga. I want to thank him for the opportunity of being part of the LACRALO communication working group.

I have nothing else to say. I don't know if there is any question or comment. Thank you very much for listening.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Marcelo, for your report. This is a very good report. I see Alejandro's hand up. Alejandro, please go ahead. You have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to congratulate you for all the activities and also the COMTELCA project. Some years ago, I had the opportunity to work with COMTELCA because Mexican government and the EU one were working together in order to develop a network for the [inaudible] region. So probably, all the officers are still working ...

And the idea is to work with very concrete goals, and we need to bear in mind that everything is oriented to network operation and Internet issues are a challenge for them. So this topic that Sylvia is presenting to

---

them might be a new sort of challenge and surprise, and perhaps we can work with the right team so as to be able to understand what we need to do.

So probably, that is going to be the best objective, because this is a way of strengthening our region. Particularly, there is a very important point here, and this is that we have to focus on universal acceptance and we need to leave IDNs aside for a little bit because I believe that perhaps in Guatemala, IDNs are not going to have that much importance, and perhaps we can contact the team. Carlos [inaudible] was the director for some time in Guatemala. He's a great engineer. He's now retired and he's working in consulting services. And when it comes to Costa Rica, I believe that we have to be very careful when dealing with the agencies related to COMTELCA, and we perhaps need to approach with our colleagues at the [SOC.] So thank you. That's my comment.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Alejandro, and thanks for your support with this. Please feel free to contact Sylvia and Alejandro, contact each other and please try to make the most of these meetings so that we can have a good approach.

Now it is time to give the floor to Sindy Obed who is going to speak about comments by ALAC members.

SINDY OBED: Thank you very much for giving me the floor. Good evening, everyone. Thank you again for this opportunity. So for the temporary specification final report, phase 2A of the policy development process, what we are working on now is the commentary by ALAC on that topic.

---

So within ALAC, we recognize the work of the PDP phase 2A, but we believe that phase 2A did not actually fulfill its mandate. So consumer protection entities and law enforcement entities. There is a concern. We do not believe that this topic was dealt with appropriately. There's a number of registration data that's not protected with the data protection laws, and we don't believe that the right balance was found. So as far as our statement for ALAC, we are very concerned about some aspects that I just mentioned.

And the issue has to do with the legal versus natural person differentiation. There's a concern with the common data by all contracted parties. And we have concerns with the process as well. We are concerned about the fact that the process was expedited which means that there is an important impact on the ability to define the policy. The deadline did not enable us to have sufficient discussion with all of the stakeholders, and then the scope as well was not explicitly mentioned in the GNSO instructions in order to enable all stakeholders to contribute.

For example, the code of conduct recommendation was an issue. And then there were a lot of expectations that were not met.

INTERPRETER: The interpreter apologizes. I'm having a hard time hearing Cindy.

SINDY OBED: In terms of the—



INTERPRETER: I'm sorry, I just can't hear him. Let me tell him.

SINDY OBED: So we regret that the EPDP was not able to follow a methodology that enabled us to better manage anonymization of contact information and e-mail addresses. So the phase one recommendations enable anonymization but without that, we will need a webform for contact.

At the end of phase one, what we need is a webform to effectively communicate the information. The idea is not to differentiate the data between legal and natural person. If we looked at the GDPR, we need to differentiate between legal and natural person data, including the name, the contact information of the legal person.

So if we looked at the temporary specification final report for phase 2A, we do not believe that it has fulfilled its mandate appropriately. We believe that in terms of data and differentiation, a lot of work still needs to be done. Thank you very much, and I hope you were able to hear some of it. I apologize for the noise.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Sindy, for your updates regarding ALAC activities. I don't know if there are questions or comments. Otherwise, I'll go to the next agenda item. This is a regional update and this is going to be really brief.

I am trying to get organized because my work agenda is really complicated due to election campaign. There are two colleagues in our

---

region that come from Argentina and we are in the national election processes. So this has not allowed us to have enough time to work.

At the end of this week and probably at the beginning of next week, we are going to have a meeting with the Board members and this is due to different reasons. One of the reasons is that Augusto and Claire are going to take over their new responsibilities, positions, chair and chair elect, and we are going to work with them in the next two years, but that is another topic that I would like to mention. And then this is a topic that we will have to discuss in the Board.

Probably, I'm going to have a meeting with Silvia and Heidi and have some consultations before the meeting. Today, we had a meeting with Göran Marby, our CEO, and he mentioned some important topics for which the Puerto Rico meeting is going to be canceled, and this has to do with COVID and the process that Puerto Rico is undergoing and all the things going on in the US, because there is no clear understanding, and that's why we are not going to be able to be face-to-face in the March meeting.

So part of the ICANN delegation that needs to go to Puerto Rico to discuss some topics that have to do with the ICANN public meetings, well, [inaudible] due to the pandemic, and our possibility of having a face-to-face meeting is no longer available. So based on this and some other discussions we're going to have throughout time regarding our meetings, how we're going to work in the future—Silvia, would you like to take the floor?

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Sergio, if I may. I would like to make a point of clarification, and this is that, as you said before, we are just analyzing the necessary conditions to have a face-to-face meeting, and we are still awaiting for discussions at the Board and we still do not have an official decision. So we are waiting for the final decision, but we cannot say right now that the meeting is officially canceled.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes. You are right. Probably, I am quite pessimistic on this. But after the meeting, I started reading and seeing the COVID map all around the world, and perhaps we can experience a miracle and perhaps the North American conditions may improve, and that might give us the opportunity to have a face-to-face meeting. But in any case, we have to wait for ICANN to speak about this and we have to wait for the Board to decide whether we are going to have a face-to-face meeting in Puerto Rico.

But we need to have a B plan. And if that is not the case, we need to think about this and we need to see how we're going to work. We have our already delayed course for the ICANN academy in Spanish, so that is something that we're going to hold even if it is virtual, and after that, we will have to rethink our activities and see what we should do with the general assembly.

Having said that, and before meeting with the Board, Claire, Augusto, Harold and myself will meet with the staff to discuss these topics because this is also part of how we will need to manage and work from now on. Claire and the colleagues have made a great job in dealing with the agenda, and on the other hand, we saw Augusto in these meetings

---

taking over his position and working on the activities in order to lead these meetings. And I believe these are two great colleagues that are going to have a very important responsibility and they're going to be great leaders. I am sure that this is going to be the case.

And after having said all this, if there is anyone willing to take the floor, please go ahead. Alejandro, you have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you very much, Sergio. I have a comment regarding face-to-face meetings in the future, in the upcoming months. There might be a process and in some countries, different vaccines are being applied and the vaccination rate is going to increase. But some vaccines are not being recognized all over the world. For example, in Latin America, they're applying Sputnik B vaccination that is a Russian vaccine, and some Chinese vaccines, and I believe that based on the agreements in the following months, we are going to see an increase in vaccination with vaccines coming from Cuba and other places.

So this means that anyone not willing to choose the vaccination that you're going to receive because the government is determining that, and perhaps if you're being applied a vaccine that is not [inaudible] or does not qualify for the US, well, that is an issue. So we need to take into account this equity element. Even if this is not a face-to-face meeting, we need to think about a hybrid meeting.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Yes, and with a follow-up comment, I would like to say that this is a marketing issue and that restrictions regarding one vaccine or another

---

probably has to do with the relevance of pharmaceutical companies over others.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Well, I don't know the reason for this. The thing is they are not registered in the corresponding healthcare authorities because of their phase three processes. The thing is that if you don't have a particular vaccine authorized by a region or by the health authorities of a certain country, you need to [inaudible] isolation period, and that is an issue for all of us.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

I fully agree with you. There are plenty of vaccines available that have been published studies, clinical trials have been published but they are not accepted by North America or the European region. But this has to do with a marketing issue. But of course, we have nothing else to add about this, we can just discuss but this is not being defined by us.

Is there any other comment, Any Other Business? If there are no further comments or business, I would say that we are finishing five minutes earlier. So I would like to say something, make a correction. Today when I mentioned the evaluation survey, the webinar survey, that is going to be circulated by e-mail after [inaudible] call. So please, fill in the survey.

And with that, thank you very much for joining, and I hope to see you soon. I hope that this pandemic comes to an end soon and we can meet face-to-face. Thank you very much.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]