
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Call, November 15th, 23:00, UTC time.

In today's call, in Spanish, we have Augusto Ho, Harold Arcos, Antonio Medina, Carlos Aguirre, Laura Margolis, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Maribel Sanchez, Sylvia Herlein Leite, and Vanda Scartezini. In Spanish we have Lito Ibarra as well. In English we have Claire Craig. And we have received apologies from Humberto Carrasco.

From the staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Rodrigo de La Parra, and myself, Claudia Ruiz.

Before we start, if you are so kind to state your name before taking the floor for the transcription and for our interpreters to identify you in the proper language channels.

Augusto, you have the floor.

AUGUSTO HO: Good morning, good afternoon. It's a pleasure for me to say hi [inaudible] in my role as chair. And thank you also for your time. I want to thank the staff and those who have assisted in the organization of the call.

We have a very interesting agenda today. We see that everybody [inaudible] has been called to achieve the objectives. We will have interesting comments on what happened at ICANN72. I also want to

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

thank the fact that Rodrigo and León will be joining the call as well. This is all I have to say.

And I will now give the floor to Claire who is our secretary, and she will present our agenda. Thank you.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Claire Craig speaking for the record. Most of you should be able to see the agenda on the screen. And I will just go through it briefly.

The next item on the agenda would be the ICANN regional plan for the LAC. And that will be by Rodrigo De La Parra. Then we have a webinar, which is the Reference Framework on the Internet by Alejandro Pisanty. Then comments about recent policy developments in the GNSO from ICANN72. And that will be presented by Carlton Samuels.

We also have a presentation on DNS Women, also from ICANN72, by Vanda Scartezini. And then we have some reflections on the presentation conversations from directors of the LACRALO working groups when we talk about the Board.

Following that, we have a short discussion from the Communications Working Group of regional updates which we will hear from León Sanchez.

Are there any other business items that anyone would like to have added to this meeting? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands and I haven't heard any comments. I'm not seeing anything in the chat. Well, I can't see the chat, so maybe there might be something in the chat.

I take it that we can approve the agenda moving forward? Yes? Yes, okay. Well, the agenda is moved, going forward. If there is anything, we will add it to Any Other Business.

So I know turn over the meeting to Rodrigo De La Parra to speak to us about the regional plan for the LAC. Thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Hi, hello. Good afternoon, good evening, all of you. Thank you so much for this kind invitation to join the monthly LACRALO call. I will start by acknowledging the work of the outgoing chair and secretary, Sergio and Harold, for their efforts in leading LACRALO.

It has been clearly an evolution. For those of you who have been here for several years, it has become evident. I'm sure you were able to see how LACRALO has turned or transformed from a passive body to a proactive and participatory group more involved in ICANN's issues. And that is most welcome. And I hope this road can be continued.

Let me also comment Augusto and Claire for their appointments, and note that organizational staff are here to give you support both from the policy group with which you interact on a daily, but also the regional team. ICANN's regional team is at your service and there have been, already, several cases or opportunities where we could interact with you. And we really appreciate your help. Your assistance and your help in meeting the various objective sand goals in our regional strategy. For those of you who know what the strategic plan is about—I'm sure all of you know it exists—be assured that you have a seat in the regional strategy [through which] we want to make sure that our regional

projects have the component representing the various ALSes of the region. That is to say that the end users' interests—the end users from Latin America and the Caribbean—are properly represented. We hope this interaction will be as frequent as possible when the opportunity so deserves and whenever you have a need.

Whenever we organize an event in our mind, we always want to touch base with the ALSes of the [inaudible] country. There was a recent addition of the Roadshow for Central America that had your support. Very successful. Close to 100 participants from several Central American countries.

In addition there were some key sub-regions for our outreach effort. In our engagement map, these two sub-regions show an opportunity. An opportunity to invite them to get engaged and be more present in ICANN.

Having said this, let me move on now to the Regional Strategic Plan. Our LAC Strategic Plan, similar to what happens with the other ICANN regions, represents an addition to being aligned with ICANN's global plan. Now the intention is to have a [inaudible] plan. The reason being very simple. It is to make sure that all discussions that have been held globally—taking into account, of course, the RALOs and At-Large—now they should be implemented at the regional level.

The regional component is perhaps what makes it different from other regional plans. Even though we have the same strategic objectives, the realities of our region can be very different from those, for example, of

Europe or north America or other developing regions such as Asia or Africa which have their own characteristics.

This plan has a term from 2021-2025. That is our horizon. This does not mean that it is engraved on stone. This is a plan that should evolve as certain milestones are reached or whenever specific occasions require us to focus more on some goals.

Let me quickly record that they were five strategic objectives in ICANN's Strategic Plan. Four of them are to be regionally implemented. One could be outside our scope which is ensuring the financial stability and sustainability in the long term of ICANN. For example, we have to encourage everyone's participation when the plans are designed, and also in their annual review.

The other four, the main one which has taken most of our time, is to strengthen the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS Root Server System. That is the main focus of our activity.

Ensuring the effectiveness of the multistakeholder system is very important as well for our region. And the third is to develop the Internet's unique identifier system in coordination with the relevant stakeholders. We have an important component for Latin America here.

And finally, address the geopolitical issues that could have an impact on ICANN's mission to ensure a unique global and interoperable Internet. [inaudible].

And we have several projects which you are aware of. Actually, you are active participants in some of them. For example, we have a working

group set up with the Caribbean colleagues which is very active. We're about to start a very interesting project with them that saw the light during ICANN72 Public Forum on the so-called SIDS, which is the acronym for small island nations. And we're going to work also with Asia and the Pacific.

We also have the LAC Space that has been very successful. We have the Roadshow I mentioned at the beginning of my presentation, and others such as Universal Acceptance and capacity building. And you, LACRALO, have to be commended for this because you have been leading the efforts in capacity building. I want to mention Sylvia Herlein Leite here, for her great participation. And we have actually received a request from our NARALO friends for assistance.

In the unique identifier system, we have the next round of gTLDs. There is [still] a lot of work to be done, but with the various actors we are designing projects that could have a great impact in this round, not only for the launch but also now at the time of defining the roles.

I will stop here. And I want to thank you very much for this time. But let me conclude by opening a kind invitation to you to continue with this open channel. So thank you very much, Augusto and the rest, for this.

AUGUSTO HO:

Thank you, Rodrigo. Thank you so much for the invitation and also for this refresher on the objectives. I'm sure LACRALO will be there when needed. Thank you again, Rodrigo.

The next point of our agenda is the webinar. This is going to be very interesting. Alejandro Pisanty will be sharing. I want to thank you, Alejandro, for taking the lead here. This is a very interesting topic that will allow us to understand the impact of the Internet framework [now and the rest].

So you have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

We cannot hear you, Alejandro. Now we can.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

I'm sorry. I was muted. Just bear with me for a second, please because I want to open my presentation. Let me begin by thanking Harold Arcos, in particular, and Augusto for giving me this opportunity to present to you this information.

This is work that I have been doing for some time now, and I would like to ask for your support. And I need your feedback. What I'm going to present to you is a work in progress.

So this needs to be put to a test. I need to hear your feedback. I need to hear from you whether you think that this answers some questions that I'm going to present here, and whether this can help us create test cases.

But I have already presented this is different [inaudible], and I have also presented it in México and at the IGF. So this is quite well-advanced

work in progress. And I think that I could do with your expert opinion. So thank you all in advance for that.

I want to join Rodrigo in complimenting the work that has been done by many of you, especially the work on IDNs and Universal Acceptance. These are interesting test cases for the work that I'm going to share with you. I tend to speak quite fast, so please let me know if I need to slow down because now I can't see the chat and I only have the presentation on the screen now. So let me know if I'm speaking too fast.

Let me share with you something that I think all of us face. I'm sure this is quite useful for many of you in LACRALO. Every day we get involved in discussions where people claim that the Internet is a wonder, that's it's the most beautiful and useful thing in life; and others who say that the Internet is going to bring humankind to its end. And there are people who say that the e-book was never [inaudible] texture of the printed page, or students in college and school may ask their teachers to give them the PDF files.

And there is also a statement saying that the Internet is making us all stupid and lazy. That nobody reads anymore. There some statistical tests that show the [accepted] number of discussions and exchanges that happened on the Internet. There is also a political paper that claims that sexting, [grooming], phishing, and identity theft are the main risks facing children. And when living in developing countries, this kind of statement may seem completely disconnected from reality, and especially with the pandemic with children that were not able to go to school.

We think that there are many more benefits than the risks that we see here; that the benefits outweigh the risks. And then there are people who also claim that there are [four] reasons why the Internet is the worst thing that has happened to humankind.

The truth is that we believe that the Internet is something good in itself, and we try to have an objective opinion here. We believe that we are quite fortunate to be on the good side of the internet. And of course, the Internet brings together individuals, regions, countries. And of course, it contains good things, bad things. And of course, it reflects what human beings usually do.

So let me go back to the basics. What is the Internet? We cannot say that there is nothing new about the Internet and that the internet is not relevant. So let's go back to basics and think about what the internet is because this leads us to other discussions that we usually have within LACRALO.

Sometimes people want to make some adjustments to the Internet or give it a twist to promote human rights or the Internet, to provide better oversight for intellectual property and for trade. But we end up thinking that the Internet may stop being the Internet. It may continue to be a network, but it would rather be an intranet or something different.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Alejandro, could you please speak louder? Because the interpreters are having difficulties in hearing you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Let me change the position of my mic. Is it better now?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Could you please speak a little bit more, just closer to the mic?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: One, two, three. Is it better? So we have a network that is layered. We have packet switching. And these are some general characteristics. With the Internet, we have to ask the designers of the original Internet about their original design during the first few years of the IETF to know what these principles were like. They followed a hierarchical order. You couldn't alter the order because that would have some consequences.

And the first principle of the design of the Internet at that time was [failability]. That is, the possibility of having a failure, that everything could fail. And of course, during those days the network had to be a network that would interconnect different networks through the GPRS. And the radio-based satellites, as we know, are quite susceptible to interferences. So they were quite prone to failure.

So sometimes we use a term that is not the proper one, but here we wanted to have a good result by using multiple links in case there would be a failure in one of the links. There could be some redundancy and the communication could be maintained. The results of the [hypothesis] that the communication takes place through packets that are sent over the net from one computer to another, and that the order would not matter.

Another principle of the Internet was interoperability as well as openness. And this also extends to the governance of the internet. We also have these characteristics of a network that would cover end to end. Of course, there is a lot of intelligence and engineering of the network, but the network has to be focused on sending the packets in an accurate manner.

And then there are some other characteristics that include security and stability. And this doesn't mean that they were not taken into account in the original design, but security was something that was considered afterwards. In the 1970s when the most important protocols were developed, there were a lot of designs being made because they were commissioned from government and they had to have high levels of security. There was General Motors and then there were different nuclear threats and many other things that required high levels of security.

But those were the years when the PKI, the Public Key Infrastructure, was being developed. And cryptography was being developed at that time using math and introducing that into the hardware and the architecture. So they just tried it, at that time, to make the network adaptable to any kind of security system. Not to tie it to a specific security system.

Then there is this parameter or this characteristic of decentralization followed by two other objectives or goals: scalability and universality—the universal reach of the Internet and as we know, permissionless innovation.

Once again, permissionless innovation means that this is not the wild west. This is not left to its own. Of course, there is some kind of law, and everything is subject to some kind of rule that this authority is within the network.

So by way of background information, let me say that 20 years ago, there was a [team] set up for trade and other commercial activities based on the Internet. So 6F was created. It had to do with certain characteristics to determine when we have to buy an airfare ticket. We could decentralize that process. Instead of having to go to a store, we could do it in a different way. So a network was developed and many intermediaries were left useless.

That team was left aside, and now I propose to you a new scheme. It is not a recent [inaudible] because we know that [inaudible] on the Internet always leads to some problematic results. So here, we use this scheme to compare the Internet against something else like mass scaling. Here we can include the network itself. When the network is bigger than the sum of its parts because interactions are also very important.

Another characteristic is identity and anonymity.

HAROLD ARCOS:

I'm sorry to interrupt, Alejandro. At this point that it's so important where you are comparing the two networks, the interpreter needs also to ask you to slow down. And can you please reposition your mic or just speak up because we are not sure whether you are speaking far away from a mic or ...

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

My mic is next to my mouth, but perhaps I can increase the volume. I also see the comments in the chat from [Sylvia].

So, six factors. Mass scaling, including the network effect and size effect. We do not only have more uses, but also more interactions. Second, identify. The Internet give us an IP address as in identity element.

And there are other effects that happen at the different levels. The domain name addresses or the credentials for banking or for school or for e-mail accounts or for e-commerce accounts are at the top layer. On the Internet layer, we only have this kind of elements: identify and anonymity. Then we have some cross-jurisdictional effects.

There are no geographic barriers here where I'm talking about cross-jurisdictional or trans-jurisdictional and not cross-border because on the Internet, we speak about the jurisdiction. So you can have a municipal rule unlike what happens at the state level, at the federal levels. You can have something at the local level or the municipal level. For instance, in the states of Guerrero or Quintana Roo, you may have a certain rule that on the Internet nobody knows that those rules exist. That is why we talk about jurisdiction.

Then we have some economic barriers that may be hindering some commercial activities or the activities by companies. That is why we talk about barrier lowering. We need to bring down those barriers.

Then we have friction reduction. This refers to the number of transactions and the time that is required to do something. As it

happens with economists, economists usually talk about friction reduction in asymmetric markets. And then we have memory and forgetting.

So we can have a good example of all these factors in Wikipedia where we have approximately 5 million authors writing on Wikipedia. And that content is read by hundreds of millions. So that this the criterion for mass scaling. In terms of identity and anonymity, we have an anonymous contribution that is favored.

Information is produced on Wikipedia by people who may live in countries where that may not be allowed. In the case of sexual or reproductive health education, you may have content about that topic, although that may be banned in certain countries because of religious or other types of reasons. That is where the trans-jurisdictional element comes into play. Barrier lowering where we compare Wikipedia against the Britannica Encyclopedia, especially when we talk about [CDs] or print copy.

Then friction reduction. You may have effortless editing, instant writing/posting. And of course, you may have [plain] [words] that have required new layers here.

And finally, we realize that the memory [aspect] is presented here because Wikipedia acts massively to memory of the world. And at the same time, you can also do editing in order to forget, selectively, certain content. Here we need integrity tests. And not the example, so to speak, of the application of these six principles would be [inaudible].

This is a conduct where we are wrongly taken to a certain place by [inaudible] by [screaming out] somebody who wants to take us somewhere else in order to commit a crime. So here you have all the factors represented. You may have the identity, your bank identity, robbed. And this crime happens at a mass scale because a crime goes from 50 perpetrators a day to zillions in a [inaudible].

You can also hide the identify of the perpetrator. Therefore, you have anonymity here. And it is difficult to us to establish the attribution for that activity.

Here you also have the trans-jurisdictional characteristic because criminals can go across borders. There may be a domain name registered in [inaudible] that is being used in the United States in order to steal the credentials of a Peruvian user in order to buy objects or products in China. So these are trans-jurisdictional things that cover different jurisdictions. Anyone can access the criminal system with very low barriers.

The [instantaneous] [paste] and click is the response to fear, and that this key in order for phishing to exist. And then you can also have memory and forgetting because archival information facilitates phishing, and the traces are erased.

I'm going to skip this section. So what is ICANN's role, especially with a focus on the DNS since we have the role in terms of scalability? The DNS is a hierarchical system that follows a delegation principle. So this implies that it is highly scalable. It was designed years ago, but the architecture is still the same. The underlying technology is still the same.

But within the same technology, there has been an increase in scaling. And there is a potential weakness, and that this the root. And of course, here the ICANN plays a very important role in preserving and maintain the security, the stability, and the resiliency of the DNS system.

As far as identity is concerned, while this represent a significant challenge for WHOIS on the current platform both for legitimating and also hiding the identify of registrants, and of course all the different variants that you may have of identify theft like spoofing, name hijacking, cybersquatting, and personal data protection and anonymity protection.

The cross-jurisdictional effect was very important for ICANN's design. Initially, there was an attempt from the U.S. government to just keep their IP and names within the jurisdiction of the United States. But later on, this was extended to other jurisdictions. So there was an evolution from national jurisdiction to the Empowered Community.

And of course, here there were a number of contracts and rules established, and the GAC also played an important role. So now we have the currently Empowered Community. In terms of barriers, it is very easy access to registration, and to the [inaudible] businesses, and of course to registrars. And we have lowered barriers to the creation of new gTLDs.

In terms of friction reduction, we have easier and faster access to domain names, and we realize that we need less friction in ccTLD redelegation or in the creation of new gTLDs that may bring about destabilization of the Domain Name System.

And then the memory of the world needs to be preserved. ICANN plays a very important role in preventing this memory from being blocked or having a denial of access to memory.

So let me conclude by asking you the following question. Because we are trying to gather some test cases where this scheme, this framework would be applied. So my question to you would be the following. Could you please share some test cases to validate or invalidate this framework? Thank you.

AUGUSTO HO:

Thank you, Alejandro. You have given us a very compact summary of all of this process, but I'm sure that this will open the door to more participation from more ALSes. And this will also enable us to look at the interaction among the different layers of the Internet. So thank you again, Alejandro.

Now we have Agenda Item 6 with Carlton Samuels who is going to make some comments on the recent policy development processes at the GNSO, specifically during ICANN72. Thank you, Carlson, for accepting this invitation. This is very important. We need to hear his experience at ICANN72 within the GNSO. And I understand that he also had the chance to bring about a certain position there.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Sorry, Augusto. Before we give the floor to Carlton, there is a hand raised.

AUGUSTO HO: Sorry. I could not see the hand. I apologize.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Both Sylvia and Lito. Lito, you have the floor.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Alejandro. I think this is a topic that deserves an extensive discussion, but let me share with you some initial reflections. I think we should convey this model or see the model in conjunction to the potential segmentation of the Internet, for example, and the new possible technologies for name resolution that are being discussed and see which direction they will take.

I think this is very much related to what you were saying. Just a few additional areas to continue thinking about it.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you very much.

AUGUSTO HO: Are there any other questions or hands raised? I cannot see.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Harold wants to speak.

AUGUSTO HO: Harold, you have the floor.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Well thank you, first of all, Alejandro, for sharing this work with us. Extremely interesting and useful. You referred, among other things, to the generation of new domain names and in our agenda, as you will know, there is this discussion about the new rounds. So you are referring to this.

In my opinion, this should be taken into consideration because these are two items in ICANN's agenda, and this could be a tool for this analysis. I share Lito's view that there are other challenges as well—the fragmentation scenario. So if I may, I would like to see this topic included in our work in the agenda, including your comments on your views on how to implement it for future discussions in ICANN. Thank you, Augusto.

AUGUSTO HO:

Yes, thank you. And indeed, considering that you have mentioned it, Harold, will kindly ask you and Claire to share this brainstorming comment in our e-mail list to enlighten our discussion. Thank you very much.

Now back to our agenda. I have already said that Carlton was going to introduce the—or present it. I understand there are no more hands raised. Right? So let me give the floor to Carlton. Carlton, you have the floor.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you very much. I hope you can hear me. Good afternoon, everyone. First of all, let me congratulate Alejandro on presenting this framework. It's very, very important for us to understand how this framework actually impacts and looks at the threat to fragmentation for the single available internet that each of us is connected to all of us that we [created].

I think it's very important for you to look at the [identical] elements identity, and all that would help friction reduction and lowering barriers, and so on. I think this is a very important topic for us to pick up, and I look forward to participating in the conversations around this framework.

Having said that, I promised Harold that I would give him a little feedback on what has happened in the GNSO as it relates to the kinds of things that would be of interest to the LACRALO community in particular, and overall, the At-Large community.

Given the time I have, there are three things that I think would be very important for us to get involved with. We remember that we had the SubPro Phase 1 report and recommendations. That came up. It's 41 recommendations, and it was full consensus only on 21 topics. And 15 topics are consensus. Some topics definitely did not make it. And that was provided to the GNSO. The GNSO voted and made its proposal to ICANN Board.

The proposal from the GNSO was that all of those SubPro outputs would be taken up in full, and they recommended that they go to what we call an ODP, Operational Design Phase, which is ICANN Org looking at all of

the issues and having a determination of how they can be implemented. Most of us would be very interesting in those topics.

The topics that I personally was most interested in was things like the Community Priority Evaluation process. I didn't believe that it gave everything that we wanted, but the recommendation was that it should be efficient, transparent, and predictable. I think it went as far as most members had wished to do it.

The PICDRP, Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Procedure, was a very important thing, I believe, for the At-Large where public interest declarations for the folks who applied for new gTLDs would be addressed.

You will recall that there was quite the controversy about whether those PICs were [formed] voluntarily or there were going to be commitments and they had the force of Compliance associated with them. I am pleased to see that they now say that the PICDRP procedures will look at them regardless of whether they were voluntary or not and they would go through the same triage to make sure that they are put in. I think most of us would agree with that.

The Community Priority Evaluation was always a big thing for us. We wanted to ensure that if a community applied for a gTLD, the way that they are adjudicated to get that gTLD be transparent, is efficient, and is predictable. In the last round, we see where community applications were disenfranchised, in my view, because of the way that they were evaluated. We see that happening. We see some movement on that.

The big one, of course, was the Recommendation 35. This was the one to deal with mechanisms for the last resort resolution when you have contention sets. Meaning that more than one group applied for the same string. And there was no major consensus in that one. It is going to be another go around for that to happen.

We see that most of the people were saying that you should have private auctions, most people could not agree with the mechanism of the auction. For example, there was a lot of talk about second-price auction method, and most people didn't agree with that.

So those were the ones in Phase 1 of the SubPro. Accuracy was a big issue in the GNSO, and that this the accuracy of the registrant data that was supposed to be in the WHOIS or the RDDS system. My position on that has always been clear. You have to have standards. We agree. And you can enforce standards for content and syntax. At collection, you can make sure that the telephone number is right and you can make sure that the address is right. And you can check those things against the standard.

But the truth is harder to come by because anybody can put in a name and it looks right, and it passes all the tests for content and syntax, but it is not truthful. And that is where we have the problem because truth requires verification. If anybody establishes a certain identity, it has to be checked to ensure that the ID is positive, that the assignee is reachable, and that the assignee is responsible. That is about accuracy, mind you.

And there was a lot of conversation around what the PDP would look at in accuracy, but I believe that we still have time to make our views known about the accuracy. I believe that is very important. In my view, if you're collecting data and it's not accurate, as I usually say, it's not worth a bucket of worm spit. And the accuracy of it means the truth of it has to be established. I believe that is important. If you are not going to do that, it makes no sense to collect data.

The other one that is of interest to us is the Transfer Policy. This is the one in which registrants can transfer domain names from one registrar to another. And the policy was bootstrapped. We have a PDP running now to look at the procedure and the requirements for that.

The big problem there is how do you authorize the transfer. How would the registrant authorize the transfer between registrars? And what are the forms of authorization that are absolutely required and accepted? And you must have heard a lot of talk about the Auth-Info-Code. And you heard about the Gaining and Losing Registrar having an FOA, the Form of Authorization. You will see all of that come up time and time again. There are some arguments about whether or not these things are even in today's day.

It is important to this community to understand that because those kinds of transfer could [inaudible] our people across registrants and users of the Internet and Domain Name System being scammed. It is important for us to keep an eye on that. I would certainly give everyone here advice to keep track of the Transfer Policy situation in the GNSO, the Accuracy PDP in the GNSO.

And we move on now to the last one I probably want to point out to you. And this is the Phase 2 of the SubPro Phase 2. Most of you would remember that the SubPro Phase 2 had three major issues of contention there. You had to have a differentiation between legal and natural persons, and you had to ensure that that is collected.

I believe that the PDP made that optional instead of making it absolutely mandatory. I don't see why you should not make it mandatory because data about legal persons is not covered under the privacy act of the premier privacy legislation in the globe. And that is the European GDPR, General Data Protection Regulations.

So I was a little disappointed that the PDP did not see it fit to make the distinction between legal and natural persons an absolute requirement. I was a little disappointed to see that they did not mandate common data elements for all contracted parties.

Here's the problem that you face. If every registrar collects a different data set when you're looking at accuracy on the global system, that has holes in it. And I simply don't understand why you would not mandate a common set of data elements to be collected for RDDS, Registration Data Directory Service. I have a problem with them seeing how that works.

There was an issue of how you contact registrants, and the question was anonymizing an e-mail address or pseudonymization of an e-mail address. We needed to have a way that maintained privacy of the individual but still give us some way of contacting that individual. I

believe that is absolutely required. I do not believe that the Phase 2 PDP report effectively handled those concerns.

Most of you would know that I voted no in the GNSO against adoption of the report. I did it because I was not satisfied that enough was given to the consideration of data quality and data integrity. And I believe that they've been tinkering with this thing for way too long. We should have gotten it done a long time ago.

So those are the kinds of issues that I think are of importance for us to keep track of that is happening in the GNSO. There are recommendations now that are supposed to go to the Board. For example, in the SubPro Phase 2 report, the ALAC had a minority position that was listed. I would tell you that the ALAC position kind of coincided with my own independent views.

Most of you would know that I've been involved in the registration data issues since 2007 and I at one point chaired the WHOIS Working Group for the At-Large. So those issues, I'm very familiar with. What transpired in that Phase 2 report certainly did not meet the bar, as far as I'm concerned, in addressing some of those issues. And that's one of the reasons I voted against it.

I think there were three or four other no votes of councilors. It was certainly carried, but I believe that it is important for us to make our voices heard in these kinds of issues. The ones that I have picked out to highlight to you are those issues I believe would be of great interest to the At-Large community, to registrants and end users. If there's

anything else that I can certainly bring any attention to, I'll be happy to do that.

With that, thank you very much for listening.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you, Carlton. I will ask the staff to help me out here, to help me if there are questions. I cannot see if there are any hands raised. I see there is one.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Augusto. This is a hand raised by Harold.

AUGUSTO HO: Go ahead, Harold.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Carlson, first of all for this brief on the GNSO discussion which is usually being held at the same time as At-Large discussions. That is why we cannot be following both. That this why we have At-Large members in both.

Actually, I wasn't able to follow the plenary sessions. In the plenary sessions, there was a presentation on the three key main topics of the GNSO you have just referred to. And one of the comments was precisely the one you made. I think it is important, and let me put this to the table, perhaps we could take this on a regional discussion level first and see if we can move on. And see if other people from the working

groups, see if we can present arguments to these views and offer other perspectives.

But I think LACRALO should first become aware of these issues and see how we can provide an input in our regional mailing list. I know the time during the meetings is short, so perhaps we can share all this in our mailing list. Thank you, Augusto.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you, Harold. This is very interesting and also important because we need to have that kind of information in order to enrich the discussion.

Okay, let's move on because we are running out of time. We are going to give the floor now—

SILVIA VIVANCO: I apologize for interrupting, Augusto. Carlton has raised his hand.

AUGUSTO HO: Sorry, I didn't see that. Go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you very much, Silvia. I just wanted to point out to re-emphasize what Harold has said. But I also wanted to bring your attention to the framework that was addressed by Alejandro. That is the modality, I believe, that we can bring some of these conversations through because, believe it or not, what is happening in the GNSO could be

[inaudible] to any one of several of those headings that you see in the [6H] framework that Alejandro presented. It's very important for us to ground the conversations into these kinds of frameworks so we understand what they mean across the region at the larger level.

So I would strongly recommend that we look at the discussions and the framework that was presented by Alejandro—some of the things there that you've seen that he mentioned in terms of the reduction in friction and the identity issues and the memory and [inaudible].

That's a very interesting one that he brought in—memory [inaudible]—because this is actually most of the reasons the Inter-Registrar Transfer issue is so important. It speaks to memory and it speaks to [inaudible]. And it's important for us to get these things together.

I just wanted to point that out. Thank you so much.

AUGUSTO HO: I don't know if there are any other hands up or we can move on with the next agenda item. Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO: No. No more hands raised.

AUGUSTO HO: Okay, so now I'm going to give the floor to Vanda. Thank you in advance, Vanda, for the work that you're doing in order to promote several of the topics of the ICANN agenda through the DNS Women's

space. So I think we have the right person there. So the floor is all yours, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you, all. Good evening to you all. Okay, now I'm going to spend a few minutes talking about what we discussed on Universal Acceptance at ICANN72. Our plan was to invite two interesting speakers, Mark Datysgeld who is part of the GNSO and Maria Kolesnikova who comes from .russia.

There was no presentation. We had a very rich discussion, quite rich. We had the CEO, the chair of the Board of Directors. And we had a very interesting discussion. We don't have too much time here, so I'm going to share a brief summary through this presentation. Harold and Claire have this presentation. They can share it with you. It is in Spanish. But later on we can review the transcripts from our session in English or in other languages. Okay, let's move on with the next slide. Thank you.

This is just the agenda that I want to address due to this presentation. Who we are. You know that DNS women is a group of women with a role of connecting, inspiring, and helping women thrive in their own professional careers dealing with their challenges in the world of DNS.

We had Universal Acceptance, and the Universal Acceptance Steering Group in particular. And the purpose of Universal Acceptance is that all domain names and all e-mail addresses can be properly operating in all software applications. And we want to mobilize software developers for them to update their products to make sure that all they develop is Universal Acceptance-ready in order to improve the end user

experience. That is the ultimate goal. This is just a reminder. We are looking at Universal Acceptance readiness, but we are still far away from what we need to have.

So here in black, you have 2017. And the lighter color, you have 2020. And these are all the e-mail addresses that are accepted through Universal Acceptance at the global level by the top 1,000 websites. You can read all the transcripts with all their descriptions for this chart that has been provided by the UASG. That is quite interesting. This is just to show you that we have made progress, but we still have a lot of work to do.

So which were the lessons learned? Because during our session, we tried to see what our current status was and what we needed to do. Of course we know that there is a considerable effort being [devoted] to Universal Acceptance to make sure that e-mail addresses and domain names are Universal Acceptance-ready. But e-mail addresses in local languages may not work, so we need more people to adopt UA in practice.

So we can hear what Sylvia Herlein can tell us about how to do this in practice, how to ensure that Universal Acceptance is adopted in practice. There is a working group doing some measurements. The approach needs to be changed to disseminate more information to stakeholders in order to promote UA readiness because we're still far away from making this a reality. Next slide, please.

These are some other lessons learned. There is a question here on the slide, and it says, "What are the [innovative] ways of communicating

this message, conveying this message to the world in order to be more respected?” We are asking this question to everybody who listens to us because we are trying to gather more information. We need more participants. We need new ideas, other points of view in order to produce more innovation and to reach out to most of the people who need to put the UA principle into practice.

Sylvia is going to talk about capacity building, but that is a very important challenge for us all. How are we going to reach out to the community? That is challenge for all of us. We all know that there has been some impact on work efficiency and effectiveness during the pandemic. Therefore, we need to look for more effective ways of providing information and training to the community. Next slide, please.

This is another question that we asked during that meeting. Who are the stakeholders who are not yet sufficiently enrolled in Universal Acceptance? You all know that in our region, I’m working together with Sylvia. Sylvia is playing a key role in this field, together with Mark Datysgeld. He is from Brazil and he is a member of the GNSO.

And all of us in the software association in the Brazil are doing some independent work on Universal Acceptance in Brazil. I am the director of this association, and we have shared this information with ICANN. And we succeeded in getting ICANN involved in our work, and we published two more studies. We succeeded in getting ICANN to publish two more studies about this.

But for us, the ultimate goal is to make sure that we have greater involved from civil society. We see that the civil society is not as

involved as it could be as activists. Of course we still feel the consequences of the pandemic, but we are having a lot of meetings, a lot of presentations. And it is very important for our region to play a leading role doing more activities to promote Universal Acceptance.

And of course, you can all count on us for working on this. I am strongly focused on this, but Sylvia and Mark are always available to help you. We have some large companies that are getting involved, but there are only a few. But they are not all the ones that we need to engage in this work. We need the people from the community itself to get more involved.

So now I'm going to give the floor to Sylvia because we are running out of time. Sylvia, it is your turn now to talk about what you are doing quite successfully.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE:

Thank you, Vanda. This is the promotion advertising the course that we delivered. I have shared this with you on previous meetings. This was a highly successful course. We did a lot of work in our working group, and we have wonderful speakers/instructors, and a lot of support from the staff. So different people got involved and we all had exceptional results.

I always receive all the compliments and the congratulations, but I need to share that with all the people that were involved. This was the first course devoted to technical people. We had participants from all the region, from LACRALO. So it was a [inaudible] success.

And now our know-how is being replicated in NARALO. This course is going to be delivered again next [inaudible]. Of course, the last time we did it in Spanish, we had translation into English. But since now we have a lot of participants from the Caribbean, you are all invited to participate in the course that NARALO is preparing following our steps.

All of us here know how important it is to promote Universal Acceptance. Part of our objective is to convey that message. We want the entire community to be aware of this. We want all end users and individuals to know how important this topic is, not for the future but for the present. That this why, with Vanda, this year at ICANN72, we decided to talk about Universal Acceptance in the DNS Women space.

So we have 150 women from all the RALOs present at DNS Women. So we try to convey the message also from that space. We are also doing some capacity building activities for [our space]. We have already run some webinars with Paraguay and Bolivia. That was in 2020. This year we had another course with the center for bandwidth for development based in Nicaragua.

So we are always looking for new ways to reach out to more people. I asked Mark about this. I asked him ...

Well, this is a technical issue, and somebody said, "Well, this is not a technical topic," but you have to make sure that ISP managers, or TLD managers become aware of the importance of Universal Acceptance and do something about it. So it is about reaching out and conveying the message. So we are trying to think about new ways of reaching out to more people.

Let me share some news with you. We are planning to do a course for you [first]. This was already planned beforehand, but we are going to prepare something specifically for the LACRALO General Assembly. We still don't know when that is going to be held or where, but we are trying to schedule some activities in order to take advantage of the ALSes that will be there in order to convey this message to them and have them replicate this message about the importance of Universal Acceptance.

Thank you. That would be all. Oh, as you can see here at the bottom of the slide, there is a link. I'm also going to paste it on the chat box. Here we have our Wiki page for the work involved, so you can [inaudible] information there.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you, Sylvia. Just to conclude, we are looking for more women. We are looking for women who are willing to take the role of ambassador. This may be one or more women because the UA ambassadors have proven to be very useful. But we need more of them. So from DNS Women, we would like to have a woman to take on this role of ambassador. Of course we also accept men, but since we are in DNS Women we are trying to get women involved.

So that would be all. Thank you both. Sylvia and me and Mark are at your service to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you both. We are running very, very late. So now I'm going to quickly give the floor to the directors to see if, in a couple of minutes, they can share their information. Perhaps they can appoint a co-chair. We want to get more volunteers involved. So let me move on to directors.

Carlos Aguirre, are you there? I don't see him. Okay. Sylvia, are you here?

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Yes, I'm here. Since June this year, the co-chair of the Universal Acceptance group is Gabriela Gijón. She's Argentinian. She comes from the city of Tucumán. She's an engineer, and she participated in the course we delivered. So she's deeply involved in Universal Acceptance. So Gabriela is our co-chair. Unfortunately, she was unable to join us today due to personal reasons.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you. Marcelo Rodriguez.

MARCELO RODRIGUEZ: Hello, Augusto. Thank you. Good evening to you all. We still haven't appointed a co-chair because we are discussing with Harold who the co-chair can be. So next meeting, we will have a name, hopefully, and perhaps we can even give that name before that meeting. Thank you.

[AUGUSTO HO]: Adrian Carballo, are you there? Adrian Carballo?

ADRIAN CARBALLO: Yes, hello. Augusto?

AUGUSTO HO: Yes?

ADRIAN CARBALLO: Humberto Carrasco has joined us. [He's here]. He was previously co-chair. We had a co-chair before that. Humberto Carrasco is helping us with the communications, and we are trying to get more participants in our group. Thank you.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you, Adrian. León, could you please give us your impression about ICANN72? León, you have the floor.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Good evening, Augusto. I know that we are running very late. We only have a few minutes, so I apologize to the interpreters because I will be speaking very fast because we don't any more time.

But as you all know, we had a very intense meeting with a large turnout. As a result of the pandemic, we have extended our meeting over the course of three weeks. So I think that two of the topics that were central to all discussions were what Carlton mentioned—the ODP, the

Operational Design Phase—concerning some policy development processes, especially the future rounds of gTLDs, and Standardized System for Access and [Dissemination]. What we used to call the WHOIS.

Of course, this is an important phase because it seeks to provide information to the ICANN Board to make the right decisions. With this new phase, we are trying to make sure that the Board doesn't have approve a project that later one during the implementation stage casts some [inaudible] and financial obstacles that prevent its implementation. So we are trying to avoid that, approving some recommendations that later on cannot be implemented.

So the ODP is open to the entire community. So we are trying to provide transparency during this phase and [inaudible] a project or a recommendation is adopted by the ICANN Board, we want to make sure that project or that recommendation can be actually implemented.

We also had the Board Workshop. It was a three-day workshop. We looked at different topics. Of course, the ICANN73 meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico. As you may well know, it has been decided that this will also be a virtual meeting, given the uncertainty that still remains as a result of the pandemic and all of the challenging logistics.

We understand that there are a lot of people who have already been vaccinated and would have been willing to participate in person in that meeting. However, we know that mobilizing human and material resources with this short period of time and all of this uncertainty was going to be very difficult. So we are still trying to see if we can have a

hybrid meeting for The Hague meeting, ICANN74. We are consulting with some experts to plan for that meeting to make sure that we do not have to postpone this.

But as you know, these days the situation is constantly changing and, of course, we need to give priorities to the health and the safety of the community and the staff.

And we also had our organizational meeting where we set up different committees. We also elected the chair and the vice-chair of the Board of Directors. In this case, the petitions were ratified—Maarten as chair and myself as vice-chair. We have been ratified in our positions, and we will continue to provide service to the Board and to the community in our own roles.

So with this, Augusto, I conclude this flash summary of all these activities. And once again, thank you for giving me the opportunity to be here with you. I congratulate you on the excellent work that you have done, and I also enjoyed the framework of reference presented by Alejandro. I think it is a useful tool not only for the ICANN Board, but also for the different constituencies at ICANN. Thank you again.

AUGUSTO HO:

Thank you, León. I think there is a hand raised. Silvia, do we have time to take the comment? Yes?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes. Just one more minute.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: León, congratulations on your reappointment as vice-chair. Let me go back to this topic of the in-person, the face-to-face meetings. We asked to include this topic in our mailing list. I think that we haven't received enough information about the obstacles and the difficulties that many people face in developing countries to move around.

I know of an experience of someone who traveled to México to Paris, and over the course of that flight, the rules changed and that person had to be delayed in the layover city for two weeks. So we know that we also need to give attention to that. Thank you.

AUGUSTO HO: Thank you, Alejandro. Let me say that I want to thank Silvia and Rodrigo De La Parra for answering some questions that we asked them along those lines. We know that in January, we will have more clear definitions along these lines. So let's wait for January to see the [approvals] that will take place.

We are running very late now. I don't know if there are any other hands raised.

SILVIA VIVANCO: No.

AUGUSTO HO: I apologize for rushing through this part of the meeting, for running late. Thank you all for your participation and your support of the speakers, the directors, and the staff. Thank you. God bless you all.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. Thanks to the interpreters, too.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]