
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Call on Monday, May the 20th, 2024 at 23:00 UTC. On today's call, we have on the Spanish channel, Vanda Scartezini, Alberto Soto, Alejandro Pisanty, Antonio Medina Gomez, [inaudible] Eunice Perez, Gerardo Martinez, Hannah Frank, Harold Arcos, Jeffrey Fernandez, Sandra Rodriguez, Sergio Salinas Porto. On the English channel, we have Claire Craig. On French, we have Justine Chew. And apologies from Laura Margolis and Lilian Ivette De Luque. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Claudia Ruiz, managing this call. Our interpreters today are Veronica and Marina on Spanish, Esperanza and Bettina on Portuguese, and Claire and Isabelle on French. Please remember to state your names when taking the floor for our interpreters to identify you on the different language channels. And now, Harold, please, the floor is yours.

HAROLD ARCOS: Harold Arcos speaking. Thank you, Claudia. Welcome, everyone. This is the LACRALO meeting prior to the ICANN 80 meeting. So we would like to thank Justine for being here with us. Sergio, if you could kindly help us with the agenda, because we are glad and happy to have Justine here, but she has a packed agenda, and she needs to leave on time.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. I am going to read the agenda for today's call. We will have an update on the GNSO. This is a presentation delivered by Justine Chew. She's going to have 30 minutes for her presentation. We are going to have a presentation on GNSO council activity and progress in

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.

the next round implementation. This will last 15 minutes, and then we have a Q&A session. After that, we're going to have a public consultation update. And we will be having an update on the CIP. Christelle Vaval and Carlos Aguirre will be in charge of delivering that update, and then we will have the ALS updates about their local activities. And then we have a brief reminder on the elections that are taking place in our region. And after that, we are going to devote two minutes to speak about the online registration process to participate and attend ICANN 80. Harold, please go. The floor is yours.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Harold speaking. Thank you so much, Sergio. I don't see any hands up. So if there are no other business, we will adopt the agenda for today. Lilian is not here today with us because she has some health issues, but she's proposing to have a talk on the hot topics at the GNSO. And some members also believe this is key. And this is going to be the topics for discussion. So Justine, thank you for being here with us. And the floor is yours.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you. I hope I can be heard. I guess I'm speaking through the translator. I guess I'll go. So thank you very much for having me here today. I noted that I recall vaguely I had a conversation with Harold some time ago and a similar conversation with Lilian about the possibility of actually being invited to come for an update to the LACRALO. So I'm very pleased that this has happened. It's just

unfortunate you're catching me at a bad day because I have to leave early for an appointment in about 25 minutes or so.

So I was asked to present on what's happening with GNSO Council. They don't actually have anything like a hot topics to say, but they have a full laundry list of things that they are managing and they're looking into. And Harold also asked about the applicant support program. So I'm going to touch a little bit on that, although that is not under GNSO's purview per se. So this presentation will cover both my portfolios of being the ALAC liaison to the GNSO as well as the ALAC rep to the subsequent procedures implementation review team so that we cover both places.

This is the agenda. I'm not going to go through it. I'm just going to go into the presentation itself. I just wanted to highlight a little bit first off the difference between policy development and implementation and you understand why I'm getting into it, because as I said before, the ASP is now in implementation phase. So that is actually gone out of GNSO's mandate per se and into ICANN Org's mandate. So and I'm going to go through a couple of council activities which are of importance to the At-Large and then launch into a little bit about the next round and in particular the applicant support program. And then hopefully we have a few minutes for question and answer. And by the way, before I forget, if there are any questions that I don't actually have time to completely answer, please collect them here and then get the staff to send them to me and I'm happy to provide a written response afterwards. So next slide please.

So I think some of you or at least many of you would be familiar with this Z diagram, what we call the Z diagram. This is illustration of how the GNSO policy development process actually works. So I'm not going to go into specifics. You can, if you're familiar, you would already know this by heart. If you're not familiar, please have a look at it in your own time. But suffice to say that GNSO is basically only responsible for the Z, the whole of the Z except for the blue bit at the end, at the bottom right hand corner. Because implementation is done by ICANN Org, isn't done by GNSO. But how the GNSO interacts with ICANN Org implementation is through something called the implementation review team. And that one, that particular IRT or every single IRT typically isn't, the membership of that isn't limited to just GNSO people. Anyone can join the IRT, but they always ask that anyone who's interested in joining the IRT must have sufficient knowledge of that PDP process that they are trying to implement. Otherwise you're sort of catching up all the time and it's a bit hard for us to progress. So that's the main difference between GNSO policy development process and the implementation. And bear in mind that GNSO council is the policy development process manager for gTLDs only. ccTLDs doesn't come under GNSO, it comes under ccNSO. Next slide please.

So as I said before, GNSO council has a lot on its plate. This is not even the whole list. I'm just highlighting to you some of them as of May 16th, that was the date of the last council meeting. And the list that you see here is related to policy development. There are a lot of other things that are related to governance, continuous improvement that GNSO council also does or GNSO also undertake. But I'm just going to focus on the policy stuff. And in particular, I'm going to just talk a little bit about

the three that are highlighted on your screen. So the EPDP, the expedited policy development process on internationalized domain names, the subsequent procedures supplemental recommendations, as well as the issue report on the IDN Latin diacritics. So, yeah, just because of time, I just picked three that would probably be of interest to At-Large and to probably LACRALO. Next slide please.

So the IDNs on the internationalized domain names, so the EPDP on IDNs, they have just finished their phase two work and the initial report for that has gone up for public comment. In fact, it is closing tomorrow, tomorrow, not today. And ALAC has put in a comment courtesy of the ALAC team that has been assigned to this EPDP on IDNs. And you see that in very high-level explanation, this particular EPDP is about producing policies for the management of variants at the top level as well as second level. So phase one was to do with variants at the top level and phase two is to do with variants at second level. If you want to know what variants are, I think I have to take a little bit more time to go into explanation of that, but so I'm just going to skip that at the moment. But suffice to say that I said ALAC made a comment, so I put the links to the ALAC comment. You can go back and have a look in your own time. Next slide please.

All right. Subsequent procedures supplemental recommendation. Now, so I mentioned earlier that ASP, Applicant Support Program has gone into implementation. Now, that stems from the subsequent procedures PDP [inaudible] process. So I'm going to go back to the SubPro PDP and just mention that right now we only have one recommendation left from the SubPro PDP that is still pending. That particular one has been not adopted by the board. They don't like to say rejected, so it is not

adopted by the board. And so that has gone back to the GNSO for consideration. And that's the one to do with topic 24, string similarity evaluation. In particular, it's about singular and plural. How do we deal with whether we want to allow singular and plurals of the same word to be delegated or not, or under what conditions can they be delegated? So the rest of it has been approved by GNSO Council. So these are the last ones that are still not yet gone to implementation yet because they still need to be approved by the board. And of course, as I said, topic 24 on string similarity, singular and plurals are still being hashed out at the SubPro small team plus level. That is a small team that GNSO Council has established to work on these issues with the subsequent procedures recommendations, the board concerns for it. So if you want to know a little bit more about the string similarity, in particular singular and plural strings issue, please have a listen to the CPWG call from last week, the recording of it, because I started discussing that issue on CPWG. And I believe we're going to have a follow-up discussion on the CPWG call this week. So again, I would invite you to join that CPWG call if you're interested in learning more about singular plural strings, as well as providing your input from that round of perspective. Next slide, please.

Moving on to diacritics and Latin script. So this is the latest issue that GNSO Council has been grappling with. It's not a new issue, really. It came up as a result of the 2012 round, in fact. But nobody kind of did anything about it because the applicants were sort of like, "Oh, okay, no, no, no." But recently, the registry operator for Quebec, .Quebec, put in a submission to the public comment of the IDNs EPDP phase one initial report. So as far as we're concerned, as far as GNSO is concerned,

that is the first official notice that somebody wants something done about it.

So the EPDP itself, the IDN's EPDP, looked at the comments – there were four of them – all pertaining to .Quebec. They looked at it and they said that it's out of scope for that particular EPDP because the EPDP, as I said, deals with variants only. So they're developing policy for variants. And the funny thing about Quebec and .Quebec – .Quebec and .Quebec without the – well, with the diacritics and without the diacritics, they are not variants. So because they're not variants, then the EPDP has no jurisdiction over them. That's why they say it's out of scope. And the reason why they are not considered as variants is a result of the Latin generation panel rule, the LGR for the Latin panel. They are the ones who determine the rules for the Latin script, what is considered variants and what is not considered variants. And the issue there is because the Latin script covers hundreds and hundreds of different Latin-based languages, it's very hard to come to a common base for what you call variant or what you don't call a variant. Because it's not just about French, which is where the diacritic comes into it. Latin also covers Greek, Spanish, English, and a whole – as I said, hundreds and hundreds of languages that use the Latin script.

ALAC did send a correspondence to GNSO. There was a letter on the 22nd of June also expressing concern about this and basically offering our support for any process that GNSO Council would want to take to resolve this issue. And the Council first kind of seriously discussed it in October 2023 in the ICANN Hamburg meeting. But they deferred doing anything about it because we were told that ICANN staff wanted to come up with a possible solution that doesn't necessarily involve a PDP.

So Council had been waiting for a while for ICANN staff to come back to us.

But in the end, ICANN Org came back in April 2024 and it was discussed thoroughly in the Council meeting of April 2024. And what happened is Council basically rejected the ICANN Org proposal because it was improper. And Council basically said that we need to go through the PDP process. Therefore – okay, I should rephrase. We need to consider going through the PDP process and therefore the first step is to actually ask for an issues report. So in May, the recent Council meeting, Council adopted a motion to ask for this issues report. And staff has been directed to create it. So we have to wait until staff comes up with the report. Next slide, please.

And here is now where I go into the implementation. So out of GNSO into ICANN Org realm. The implementation for the next round. So there have been a number of activities in terms of public comments and also a discussion. So you see applicant guidebook, seven topics went out for public comment. ALAC provided comment. The applicant support program handbook also went out for public comment. ALAC also provided a comment. And I put the links there. So I think the link should be live in the deck. You can click on it and get to the statement itself. Registry service provider handbook also the text of it went out to public comment. ALAC did not provide comment for this because it's a very technical area and it impacts on registry services and registry – potential registry service backend providers. So nothing to do with ALAC or end users per se. String similarity review guidelines also went out for public comment and again ALAC provided a comment.

The latest one which we are discussing, as I said, I started the discussion in CPWG last week and it's going to continue this week, is the straw man proposal regarding singular and plural streams. So as I mentioned, it's at the table of the GNSO SubPro small team plus at the moment. And I'm bringing that discussion into CPWG for input because I want to be able to get the At-Large perspective and then provide that input back into the straw man proposal to the SubPro small team plus which I am on with a number of other At-Large colleagues. So I'm not going to talk about that particular issue, the straw man. As I said before, if you want to know more about it, please attend the CPWG call this week and also listen to the recording from last week. I do want to touch on the new gTLD program outreach and engagement plan because this is where the applicant support program comes into play a little bit and Harold asked me to address this per se. Okay, so next slide please.

Okay, the applicant support program is part of the new gTLD next round, the new gTLD program. So it is subsumed under the next round program. But from an implementation point of view, what they've done now is they've taken out the applicant support program application window out from the whole spring application program window. So if you remember in the 2012 round, the whole application process was just one single application process, which ran for about three months I believe. So in that process there was also people, applicants indicating whether they wanted applicant support or not. And there were a bunch of problems and challenges that happened with the applicant support from the last round. So therefore it went through a review, a policy review through the subsequent procedures PDP process. And we came up with a bunch of – the PDP came up with a bunch of

recommendations to try and improve the applicant support program for the next round. So you see bits and pieces of it in the applicant support program handbook, that went out for public comment. And as I said, ALAC provided comments.

So what's happening is the SubPro IRT, implementation review team, the ASP track, so there's a plenary IRT and there's a sub-track for the ASP. The sub-track of the ASP is only meeting to my today or your tomorrow. So I can't tell you what is being done about the public comments because we're only going to hear about it at this particular call on the 21st of May. But suffice to say that the program handbook itself, the ASP handbook itself, it's a combination of the 14, about 14 SubPro policy recommendation and implementation guidance. I think it's 14. I can't remember exactly, but I think it's 14. There is a 15th one, which is 17.2. 17.2 has got to do with the resources for the pro bono service provider. Recommendation 17.2 is about how we provide support to the applicant support applicants, namely not beyond financial support in terms of a fee reduction. So the question about 17.2, recommendation 17.2 is to address what can applicant support applicants, expect to receive beyond just a reduction in the gTLD string fee, application fee.

So we talked about things like training, actual mentoring type thing from with pro bono service providers, so how you would position your gTLD application, potential financing sources from other places. Also what sort of fee reduction percentages can we anticipate. At the moment, it is sitting between 50% to up to 85%, and that it's a range at the moment because we still don't have any idea about the ASP funding plan. ICANN Org has not announced that. So we don't know how much

money is being allocated to the applicant support fund that's going to fund these things that we are providing to applicant support applicants who are successful obviously. And therefore, that's why it's a range. So the idea is that at the minimum, they would get a 50% reduction in the gTLD string application fee. If the funds are not exhausted, however much there is, then it could potentially be up to 85% discount. The handbook also incorporates the nine guidance recommendations from the GNSO guidance process on ASP. So I've talked a little bit about that. Next slide, please. Moving on, because I'm conscious of time.

The program highlights, very briefly where we're up to at the moment in terms of what's in the draft applicant support program handbook, is that the application, so I said that the applications for applicant support, that period is now being extricated from the whole application of the string process. So it's going to precede the application for the string. So now at the moment, it's planned for the application period for applicant support is planned for 12 months from quarter four of this year to quarter four of next year. And that precedes the window for the string application that is targeted to be launched in quarter two of 2026. The evaluation for the applicant support program applicants themselves is being proposed to be undertaken through two phases and across five evaluation categories. So you see there that phase one is the general business due diligence. Phase two is a bit more into the weeds. So it talks about public responsibility due diligence, financial need, financial stability, and then it targets, this is important, it targets certain eligible entities. So it's a bit more focused in terms of who they are trying to reach for this applicant support benefit, which is number one, non-profits, charities, equivalents. Two, intergovernmental organizations.

Three, indigenous and tribal people's organizations. Four, social impact or public benefit micro and small businesses. And five, or the difference between four and five is five is businesses located in less developed economy. So again, you want to know more about this, you can feel free to contact me. I can point you to the links. Moving on, next slide please. And by the way, some of these things might change depending on how the IRT deals with the public comments that have been received on the applicant support program handbook in the recent public comment. Next slide please.

Program highlights. Okay, so this is more program highlights. I think I have mentioned this in passing earlier about what the program actually involves or the benefits that the applicants might receive. So this is a summary of what's in the handbook. So please feel free to have a look at this. And again, as I said, some of this might change because of the discussions that's going to be taken at the IRT, the implementation review team on the public comments received. But suffice to say, I think some of these are probably going to be more or less fixed. They're probably going to be just a few changes. Next slide please. And I believe that's the last slide.

So what I wanted to point out really is there is at the last IRT call, the plenary call, the ASP call, the ICANN Org has just released a high level, I would say high level outreach and engagement plan for not just the applicant support program but the new gTLD program itself. So as I said before actually ASP forms part of the new gTLD program or what we call the next round. So ICANN Org has taken an approach that they should be one and the same. But maybe in the outreach and engagement plan for the program itself, there is one part that deals specifically with

applicant support. And they have alluded to that. Now I have looked at this, the outreach and engagement plan. There are some information in there but not probably to the detail that we would like. So we are asking them for more information as and when. Which is why I say it's limited details, more to follow as and when.

At this point, I think staff is trying to possibly arrange a session at ICANN 80 to discuss this outreach and engagement plan with ICANN Org staff, two senior staff. I think they're trying to get two senior staff to come and talk to us about this outreach engagement plan and to see basically where At-Large might be able to support it because the they are focusing on certain regions and certain countries. So if we have input on that, we can provide input. But more importantly, we want to see how we can provide support for the regions and the countries that they're not focusing on. So that's where the power At-Large and in fact GAC as well comes in because we have the networks to reach out to people who might be interested in applying for a gTLD but may not have necessarily the full means to do so and therefore might be interested in applying for applicant support.

And the last thing is this has been a topic of discussion between the ALAC and GAC for a while. It resulted, we did a joint presentation at ICANN 79. I mean some of you may have been there. And the result of that is that we sent a joint ALAC and GAC letter to the board basically asking about, number one, telling them about what we see should be the way to implement 17.2, recommendation 17.2 as well as asking for more details on the ASP communications plan which they have now come out to tell us about the outreach engagement plan for the whole program as well as the applicant support funding plan. Because as I said,

we still don't know how much funds are going to be allocated to the fund itself. And again, we may have a short follow-up discussion with the GAC at ICANN 80. We don't know yet. Still in the works. And I think that's it. We just go to the next slide. I believe that's the conclusion. I'm happy to take questions if there are any. Yeah, great. So are there any questions? I'll need some guidance from the...

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you so much, Justine. Excellent summary in record time. So let me ask the people here if they have any comments. There have been several aspects discussed. I don't know if you have any comments or questions. Next week there will be a meeting of the policy working group. The IDN working group will, for example, discuss some of the issues. Let's see. Okay, Hannah, you have the floor.

HANNAH FRANK: Hannah speaking. I'm Hannah Frank for the record. Thank you so much, Justine, for your presentation. Very dynamic and concise. With regard to the new gTLD round, why is it that 12 years have gone by, as you said, why 12 years since the last round? And what are the main differences between the 2012 round and this round?

JUSTINE CHEW: The answer to your question is why has it taken so long for the next round to be even dated in 2026. Number one is there were all sorts of issues that came out from the 2012 round. And as I alluded to earlier, the GNSO PDP process requires this review of any implemented policies

after a certain period of time. So if you imagine 2012 round was when it happened, when it started, it didn't necessarily complete until much later, because 2012 is only attributed to the application process, the period. The round itself continued because you talk about evaluation, you talk about objections, you talk about content resolution, that takes time. All those take time. And in fact, there are still a couple, I think three if I'm not mistaken, strings that are still pending resolution from the 2012 round.

But the suffice to say is because there were so many issues, gaps in the policy that were highlighted in the implementation of the 2012 round, GNSO has this responsibility to review the policy recommendations and see what needs fixing. So that particular process, which is the subsequent procedures policy development process, that the working group only kicked off in 2016, because you have to have, you have to be preceded by issues report. So the issues report involves the ICANN Org staff going and studying all the issues, recording them and then presenting them in some coherent way in issues report. That gets sent to GNSO council, then GNSO council determines whether a PDP process is needed to take action on all those issues brought up in the issues report. So that happened and as I said, the PDP process only kicked off in 2016 and it took until 2021 to finish the work because there were so many issues, 41 topics altogether. So imagine, I think SubPro and RPM phase one are the record PDP because they've taken five over years, nearly six years to complete.

So then after the GNSO council finally adopted all the recommendations out of the SubPro PDP final report in 2021, that gets sent to the ICANN board for consideration. ICANN board instructed ICANN Org to do a

review of the recommendations. That took a year. And then more time for the board to consider the ICANN Org's recommendations or highlighting of issues. And as they say, the rest is history because then board took a very fragmented approach in approving some of the recommendations, not approving some of the recommendations and you see the last vestiges of it, which is what I said before, topic 24, recommendation 24.3 on string similarity. Just to cut a long story short.

And what are the key differences? Oh, a lot, actually a lot. I mean, if you imagine us, the SubPro PDP having gone through 41 topics and the final report is 400 pages long. So that's a lot. I can probably just touch on the fact that we had a lot of things to say about applicant support program. So that is definitely a change, how they're going to run the applicant support program for the next round. Things like appeals and challenges to certain decisions, that's something that we've tried to push in. Streamlining public interest commitments and registry voluntary commitments, that's something that has been in the SubPro PDP as well, but now board is looking into the implementation of the RVCs, how we're going to deal with RVCs and that's a different discussion altogether. IDNs in terms of variants, that's the first time we're going to be introducing it for the next round. So just to name a few things that are different. Moving on.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Harold speaking. Yes, and Justine, we have a question by Carlos and then Alejandro. Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Hi Justine. The first round was long, as you said, five, six years before it was finally released. A lot of work involved. And the applicant guidebook of the past round will be very different from the one you've described with so many changes and modifications of the EPDP. That is a question, actually.

And the second question, I guess some prior studies have been conducted on the number of applications that could be expected. That is what I would like to know, if there is any estimate. And also, I would like you to expand on the fund, the applicant support fund and if any applications from Africa and Latin America are expected in a higher number than in the first round, based on any study. Because in the first round, there were very few applications from Latin America and Africa. Those are my questions.

JUSTINE CHEW:

You probably have to remind me. I have a bit distracted this morning. So, there were four parts to the question. Some of it, I can't answer. I don't believe it's my job to answer. So, for example, the ASP fund. We, at the ALAC level, are also asking ICANN Org for details on the ASP fund. So, I can't answer you that. All I know is the board is supposed to allocate the ASP fund, a certain amount to the ASP fund, to fund all these benefits that are being offered to the applicant support applicant. In the last round, it was \$2 million. But only one out of three candidates actually got anything out of the ASP program last round.

The first question was to do with applicant guidebook. Yes, there are changes to the applicant guidebook, and that is the job of the

implementation review team for SubPro. As I said, I'm on that one and in association with some At-Large colleagues as well. I don't know whether there are some people on the IRP that put some sign-ups, and I don't track their attendance. I'm sorry about that.

But the applicant guidebook is being put out for public comment in parts. So, the approach that ICANN Org is taking is they're going to go through three partial public comments. So, they're cutting up the applicant guidebook into three major parts and putting those three parts out for public comment. And the first part we've already seen covers seven topics. The second part is only due out for public comment in September, and the next one, I don't know, I think it's end of the year. So, if you want to see the differences, then I suggest you follow the IRT or you follow the public comment process for the IRT.

What was the third one? In terms of the study for strings, again, that is not something that I can answer. I don't believe that's my responsibility. We have been asking about, and I believe GAC has also been asking about the study. We had earlier asked about the question whether we actually need more new gTLDs, and I think the answer is basically that we'd like to see more IDNs, and definitely more community-based niche TLD operators rather than stack the existing big players portfolio even more. Okay, and I'm sorry, I can't remember what the third question was, but feel free to contact me because I'm mindful of time. I have to get off soon, and I want to see whether I can answer Alejandro's question.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Carlos is speaking. Thank you, Justine. I have a very brief question, another one. And I would ask your personal point of view, because some time ago in the region, we discussed the fact that so many domain names, new domain names, over 1,600 in the first round, and now perhaps we have many more, may lead to confusion. They may confuse end users, I mean the individuals, ordinary people. Has ALAC considered this issue? Has ALAC made any comment, any mention on this particular aspect because having over 1,600 domain names that may have a similar second level and a different TLD may lead to confusion. So, have ALAC taken this into account? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, I will say definitely, and I'll give you two examples, okay, very clear examples, and there may be more. Just off the top of my head. The first one is that we have been very active in the SubPro, and we have also now commented on the string similarity review guidelines. Okay, so that's one aspect of where you would catch similar strings. And the whole point about string similarity evaluation review, sorry, string similarity review is to try and not allow for strings that are confusingly similar to be delegated. So that answers the question about confusion.

The second one is because now that we're going to start and try, we're going to try to introduce variants at top level as well as the second level variants have been out there for a while. But in terms of top level variants, they want to try to introduce that. So that's why ALAC has also been very active in that particular EPDP on IDNs that's dealing with policies for TLD variants. I was the vice chair of that PDP for phase one, and I had to drop off because I had to take on other responsibilities. So I

can tell you for a fact, because I was party to it, that we pushed very hard for elements of risk of user confusion to be addressed in that PDP.

I'm mindful of time. I really have to leave. So I'm wondering if Alejandro and Hannah, if you don't mind, could you get your questions to staff and I can reply to them either private to you or to the lab list. I don't have access to the LACRALO list, so I'm happy to just provide my answers to staff and staff can pass it on. Is that okay? I'm really sorry. I have to leave for a hospital appointment, so I can't miss that.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Harold speaking. Yes, thank you so much, Justine, for your presentation. Alejandro, Hannah, if you could be so kind so as to send your questions to staff. This meeting is being recorded, so we can send our questions. Of course, this is not going to be the only time you're going to participate in LACRALO. So once again, thank you so much for your time. We know you need to leave the call. Hannah, Alejandro, please let me know in the chat what your question is for Justine. If you want to ask your question out loud, you can also do it because this meeting is being recorded. Or you can type or send your questions to our mailing list so that we can send the questions to Justine. Alejandro, please go ahead.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you so much. There are some additional issues that are even prior to Justine's involvement. The last round was not the first round. In fact, it was the second round because back in 2000, we had the first round, but it was a very open round and it was not well-structured. Seven new domain names were presented. It was a very interesting test

at that point in time. .coop was one of the first TLDs appearing. Then that TLD disappeared. Then we have .org and .coop for cooperatives and .org and .com for businesses. In the second round, we have .info, .biz, .aero. We were able to learn very important lessons for this second round, the one in 2012. We had a more structured process. As Carlos said before, now having a great amount of domain names may lead to great confusion. Some names may be quite promising at first sight, but they end up being a problem. There are names such as .canon. They applied for the name for internal use, but they end up giving up the name. We need to take time to see what is the real need of having new TLDs, particularly for companies willing to apply for names to use them internally in order to avoid any gambling in the domain name space.

In the 2012 round, there was a case that had to undergo all stages, even the auction procedures. There was another case, if I'm not mistaken, it's .bmp. It has a very minor level of activity, but this company is offering services to other agents. This is good because they provide benefits to their clients. That's why we need to carry out the whole process. We are not only talking about opening new businesses. We are also talking about modifying or changing the root of the domain name system, and this is key.

One of the questions that were addressed in the previous rounds was the scalability of the DNS root and the mechanisms being used for domain name resolutions in comparison to the amount of domain names or gTLDs that could exist. For this period of time and for this new round, we need to take into account user confusion, as Carlos mentioned before. I would like to highlight that what Justine said about .Quebec needs to be taken into account carefully. There is a technical

issue or reason why those names are not considered to be variants, but they use the diacritics. We need to be very careful with those cases because this is something we see frequently in our region, particularly in Spanish-speaking countries or in French-speaking countries. Our English-speaking countries in the region said that this issue is not of interest for them, but this topic has been addressed in the UA group because this could be a possible starting point for discussion.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you so much, Alejandro, for your explanation. This is really clear. Okay, this is, as you see, a topic that needs further discussion. So please feel free to ask your questions or provide your feedback. Because, as we already know, the next ICANN meeting is a policy forum. And there are public comments still ongoing. So this is key for us. This is important for us to have an impact on all these topics that are being discussed.

We have some issues. Lilian, as we said before, had a health issue. And Marcelo has a personal issue as well. So they were supposed to join us later, but I don't see Marcelo connected. But we had Alejandro's and Justine's interventions. So I think we're okay. We can now move forward with our next item on the agenda, and this is the CIP update.

As you might recall, this is the continuous improvement program. This program is being carried out in order to contribute to the holistic review. The idea is to create a framework to allow the holistic review to take place. And there are different regional members that are participating in this group. We have Christelle Vaval and Carlos Dionisio. Christelle was not able to join us today. And she will not be able to

attend the next CIP meetings because of some personal situations. So, Carlos, you will need to pay more attention to the CIP activities in case there are things to update.

I would like to thank the members that are still participating in this working group, in the CIP. I will share with you the link in the chat for you to access the document that was shared some weeks ago. In this document, you will see the results, the first results, the principles, criteria, and possible indicators that will be used to define the framework for this holistic review.

During the first three or four meetings, we explained the timeline. However, I would like to highlight that this document is still open, and we do need feedback from all the regions. As we said in the email, this is an ongoing process. This is not a one-day discussion. We need to access the document and review the document and make our comments. In Google Docs, each comment remains open up until it is approved. So, the comments will be open so that we can read what other colleagues from the region have commented and see if there is something else we can add. So, this is the benefit of participating all together. That's why I'm sharing with you the link. Now, I will give the floor to Carlos. Carlos will update us on the CPI last meeting, and he will also speak about some work guidelines. Carlos, please go ahead.

CARLOS ARGUIRRE:

Thank you, Harold. You've made a good summary, Harold. I believe that the most important thing here is what you said at the very end of your intervention, and this is the need of having feedback from our members

in the region so that we can express and convey our message to the working group. This working group is working at a steady pace, and we have been discussing the five principles. Some principles were mentioned by or explained by Alejandro. Alejandro made a comment. We took Alejandro's comment to the working group, and they agreed on the fact that we were right about the comment. We believe the holistic review is necessary, and this review needs to start right away. They are fully necessary. However, changes will not be made because there is a set process, and this process will continue up until 2030.

This week, we worked on a particular principle. This was a request by Tijani Ben Jemaa. He came from the NomCom, and he put forth a sort of change in principle number four. It has to do with some language issue. The NomCom has no constituencies, so he was proposing to replace the term "constituencies" by "structures" in English. So that was discussed in the group. Most of the members agreed on the change.

The second part of the meeting, we had a ccNSO presentation, but there were no changes. The third part of this meeting, the CPI meeting, had to do with what you said at the very end. You know, the need of having that feedback so that everyone, I mean, constituencies, SOs, ACs, and NomCom, may be able to make their comments, and those comments may be discussed in the meeting.

The idea is to finish with the five principles by next week and June the 5th. So if there are comments, changes in the drafting or in the text of the principles, please let us know so that we can convey those messages to the working group and debate about them. We really need the region's input, particularly from those who have been participating here

for a long time now. Because that's the idea. We need to improve mechanisms, and we need that feedback. Comments will be more than welcome. I see Claire with her hand up. Please go ahead.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Thank you, Carlos, for your presentation, and thanks for sharing the link for us, Harold. My question is, I know that Carlos and Christelle are the delegates who are assigned to the CIP, the general CIP working group. My question is, does LACRALO have a small team to work on this document and prepare the input for this continuous improvement? Okay, I'm seeing Carlos is saying no. I think it is critical for LACRALO to pull together a small team so that this can get done. I'm saying that because we at ALAC have pulled together a small team, and I am a member of the ALAC small team, because it is quite a lot of work to get done in a very short period of time. Lilian is also on that small team for ALAC, as well as what we've done is also selected persons from other regions on ALAC so that we can review the ALAC process, the ALAC continuous improvement process.

Now, I understand as well that other RALOs have pulled together small teams to make the work go quicker, as well as to make it easier. So I just want to reiterate that I think we at LACRALO seem to be way behind from what is showing on that document. Not a lot is populated. I'm just seeing the five principles. I'm not seeing the criteria defined for each of the principles. I mean, some of them have up to seven criteria. Some have 10 criteria, and I'm not seeing that in the LACRALO document. So I think a lot of work still needs to get done, and I think you need to get

the support from the LACRALO community to get that done. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Thank you, Claire. Let me tell you that, indeed, this group should be the governance group helping us. And I believe that both Claire and Lilian's support would become very handy because they are in this ALAC team. And with regard to your mention of the criteria in the document, I have put down some things, but not all, because I am of the view that this should not be my opinion. It should be the region's opinion. So actually what I'm doing is pushing for this input for this joint work so that all of us together can be able to express that. It would be great, Claire, if you who are already working on this would give me your feedback, your comments. They could be over WhatsApp or in a written form, anyway, actually, for us to become aware and thus be able to draw our own conclusions in the region. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Carlos, and thank you, Claire. Yes, exactly. If there is any remark, it would be great if you could put them in the document. That is why we have this document for the entire region. All comments and remarks should be made to the document. In recent meetings, I guess the document is for update, not just the old contents, but the most recent ones.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Let me step in, Harold. This group has a wiki space where you can see if you visit that wiki page, you will see that there is a chance to participate there. We can do that work. Actually, we're going to do that work. But anyone could very easily go to this wiki page and participate.

HAROLD ARCOS: Yes, I know, but we are discussing Claire's comments on this call for participation. This is one of the tasks of the CIP, how to find the space, not only in the monthly meetings, but also a space where to collect all the information. So, Carlos said that we could do it through the governance working group. I think that is a good option. Or perhaps explore a specific space from the wiki page. Out of the four topics mentioned by Claire, I think that is one of the possible ways. Sergio, you have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio is speaking. Along Carlos' words, the governance group, I agree, should be working on this. If you agree, Carlos, perhaps we could issue a call with you and Christelle in it for you to provide baseline guidance so that we can start working right away. There is a call. I have asked the staff to set up a doodle for this. Maybe next week we might have a meeting of this group and start working. That was all I wanted to say. And just to support this work both of you conducted.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you, Sergio. I think it is absolutely necessary and it would be actually very, very important in addition to this essential support of the

governance group. It would be essential for Claire and Lilian to convey to us their ideas because they are in the ALAC group so that we can work on it as well. Sergio is speaking.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, no doubt about that. Having Claire's view on this and her input, that would be great.

HAROLD ARCOS: I see your hand raised, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I just wanted to take the floor to confirm that it is relevant. It would be great to have this group in NomCom. We did that with Tijani, who is our representative. And the leadership groups are supporting Tijani on CIP matters. In my opinion, the governance working group is the most appropriate one to get involved here from LACRALO. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Vanda. And the rest. We have this process to follow, as we said before. Christelle will be for some time absent, not participating because there are issues to solve. And actually, there are some pending things to complete. Carlos is on his own here. With this, we will move on to the next item of the agenda. That's going to be taken care of by the staff. An update on local activities. We have the reports of the ALSes. An update on the most recent activities they've conducted on universal acceptance, for example, those that have been planned and

those that have been scheduled for the future. So, Eunice, Humberto, perhaps you can start with your brief reports. Go ahead, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, and greetings to all from Chile. Well, on May 15, we organized an event on Internet governance and universal acceptance, consisting of the following. In the morning, Internet governance with Patricio Poblete as the keynote speaker, and Luis Arancibia, the president of LACTLD, and myself. And we presented on the various topics involving Internet governance. And Patricio Poblete spoke about universal acceptance because he was the keynote speaker.

In the afternoon, we discussed universal acceptance. And I don't remember exactly, but I think it was Margarita Valdez. No, sorry. It was Rodrigo de la Parra who started the second session in the afternoon. And after him, Margarita Valdez, and then Sergio Valle, ambassador for Latin America for universal acceptance, who is a member of LACTLD. And then there was a Q&A session, and we ended our event. It was organized and streamed. And in my opinion, we were able to successfully fulfill its purpose. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Humberto. It was a great event. And now we see Laura's hand is raised. Laura, you have the floor.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Good evening, ladies and everyone, gentlemen. We are organizing a universal acceptance event to be held next Monday at Casa de Internet

in Montevideo, face-to-face. It will be a technical training. And the guest target is systems managers, server operators, and administrators, and also members of LACNIC locally, ICANN staff. Daniel Fink will be with us, and some remote participation as well. So in our next call, I hope I'll be able to provide a report on it. I just wanted to give you a heads up.

HAROLD ARCOS: Great, Laura. Even though it hasn't taken place yet, it's very good for us to be aware because we have it in our calendars. If you're so kind to share the calendar invite or the link.

LAURA MARGOLIS: I will share it. However, the event will be face-to-face because there will be hands-on server practice exercises, et cetera. Nevertheless, I'm going to share the link in our group.

HAROLD ARCOS: Great. Thank you. And now we have Eunice and then Gerardo. Eunice, you have the floor.

EUNICE PEREZ: Great. I wondered if you give me a chance to share a link to a website over the chat. I wanted to show you something very quickly. You can check it on the website. On April 26th, we held a universal acceptance event, which we entitled Universal Acceptance in Higher Education Curricula. This is an activity organized in conjunction with the National Association of Universities within the Committee for Internet

Development. I'm the technical secretariat of this organization and two other organizations, the Technological Institute of Merida and the [inaudible] University.

In this activity, we organized a webinar on the baseline and principles of universal acceptance. Daniel Fink was the speaker, and one of our strategies was to translate into Spanish the chapters proposed by the universal acceptance team so that the academic community could do a prior analysis before the event.

This webinar was attended by 52 people, all from the academic community, holding different roles, performing different activities, teaching, operations, network operations, technical support. All of them involved in IT, network management, with knowledge and practical operation of these systems. There were 42 face-to-face participants and several remote. This was very interesting because they represented 25 higher education institutions from all over the country. And there was one representative from NIC Mexico. We started with the conversation with Daniel Fink on the technical principles for multilingual Internet, and then we got split into working groups, into parallel sessions. In these sessions, we worked on the identification of barriers and awareness, implementation in the various types of education systems, formal, informal, and technical, and the types of knowledge and content that the universal acceptance team has already proposed.

In the link that I've shared with you, you will find a section on the right referring to documents of interest. You will see the materials there. You will be able to hear the recordings of the webinar, and you will be able to see, to watch part of the activity. We had very good results, very

successful, and we were pleasantly surprised by the fact that in addition to the technical community people who work on these matters, who teach these matters, we also had lawyers, students that joined for Daniel Fink's presentation. So it was very successful. And with the same link, you will see the final report being published. We already have it in English and Spanish.

And a final comment is that we are in the South region, where it is sometimes difficult to communicate in another language. So when you say to someone that we're going to have a meeting, and we provide a document in English, well, that creates a barrier, a mental block. So one of our strategies was to translate, and that was very successful, very positive results. So we move on.

Last year in our institute, we had another activity with faculty members getting involved, and you see they are already having an impact on students. So we want to have a greater impact. We want to develop awareness. We want to work with faculty, with the academic community. So that is our purpose. That's all. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you so much. For the sake of time, please be brief in your interventions. Thank you for all these comments. Now I'm going to give the floor to Gerardo and Luis Valle. Please, Gerardo, go ahead.

GERARDO MARTINEZ:

Hello, everyone. This is Gerardo Martinez from the records. Let me first thank you for being here. My report is very brief. We held the first

universal acceptance event in March 2023, and this was a great activity, because organizing such an event is quite complicated. We managed to organize the event with the maximum educational authority in the country, and we also worked together with the science and technology committee. We held the event in a technological university, and we had over 200 participants. And we also had the participation of ambassadors, [Sergio Bache] from Bolivia, and we also had the pleasure of having Sylvia Herlein from Brazil, and they presented on the topic. And we also had the participation of different universities.

The most important result of this event was to learn about universal acceptance and to show participants what ICANN is, how ICANN ecosystem works, and what LACRALO does. And we also wanted to take the message that this is not something for technicians only. We can all participate in the ecosystem. So it was really important for us to present on universal acceptance and to provide information about ICANN so that we can have more participation in the future. We addressed two key aspects, and this is the educational and the legislative aspects. And please, if you have questions on the event or how to organize an event, please let us know, and we will be able to help you.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you so much, Gerardo. Luis, Sandra, and then Alfredo. Luis, please go ahead.

LUIS VALLE:

Hello, everyone. I am Luis Valle from Bolivia. During the last month, we have been working really hard in Bolivia. We launched three main

activities. One, a study with ECLAC on the modernization processes. This has the financial support of ECLAC. The study was carried out in Bolivia, but it was also replicated in five other countries. We are also participating in the EULAC project. This is a European project, and Bolivia is a focal point there. This is to help businesses. So this is the second event.

There is a third element, and this is last Friday, in the framework of Internet Day, we started the discussions on universal acceptance as a key factor for business competitiveness. There was an event held by a university. We had great attendance, and we also had Rodrigo de la Parra as a keynote speaker. There were some discussion sessions with Harold Arcos and Sylvia Herlein from Internauta Brasil. We also analyzed international context and some best practices in terms of universal acceptance. We also had a discussion with a government agency. This is [inaudible], the academia. We also had the participation of ISPs from the country. This was important because we were able to discuss about a universal acceptance implementation strategy.

All key stakeholders in the ecosystem will contribute to universal acceptance. We have also been working on the draft document. This is an important document where main stakeholders will sign. There will be an implementation stage, and Bolivia will take this document, this agreement or pact, as a template, as a guiding document, and also as a state policy. This is my summary, Harold.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you so much, Luis, and thanks for giving us your report. I believe this goes in hand with ICANN's agenda. Alfredo, please go ahead, and we will close the queue with you.

ALFREDO LOPEZ: Thank you, Harold. We held an event on universal acceptance in March. The event was led by Daniel Fink. He was a guest speaker, and we also had some colleagues from Peru and colleagues from Switzerland. We also had [Dia Solis] from Bolivia discussing on universal acceptance, and we have representatives from the Universidad Tecnológica from Panama. We had [Philippe Bauland.] He is our French colleague. They were all participating in the event, and we also had some university authorities participating in the event. This event was organized with the contribution of different local organizations in Colombia. The event was held in three different universities, and one of the universities took this event as a future challenge. We also had the presence of representatives from [inaudible] and there were some other university students from other universities participating in this event. And in all, we have about 400 participants participating face-to-face, and we had remote participation from Spain. We had [inaudible] from the Blockchain Center in Catalonia. He delivered a special talk on the topic. This was a two-day event on March the 8th and 9th. We made a summary of this event on universal acceptance on May the 4th. This event was led by [inaudible] and we discussed the universal acceptance topic.

On May the 17th, we celebrated the Internet Day. We had plenty of opportunities for participation. In this last event, we also discussed the

topic, and we had our friend [inaudible] from Bolivia participating as well. Thank you, Harold.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you so much, Alfredo. Thank you for your active participation, and thank you so much for inviting me to all these activities. And thanks for inviting the community to participate. We will now close the queue. Please remember to share this information in the mailing list. And now I'm going to give the floor to staff member. Silvia, please go ahead.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Very briefly, let me remind you that elections for leadership positions in all RALOs are open. This is the case for LACRALO as well. Elections will be open up until Friday, May the 24th. So please cast your votes as soon as possible because the election period will be closing on Friday. The next announcement is that the next ICANN meeting is coming soon. So you'll be able to register to the meeting online. And once you register, you will be able to have access to the schedule and all the meetings you would like to participate remotely. This meeting will be held in Rwanda in Africa. So please remember to register to the meeting so that you can participate remotely. That's all. Thank you, Harold.

HAROLD ARCOS:

And before the Kigali meeting, we have the prep week. So please stay tuned and remember to check your email because we have the prep week and we need to participate in the prep week. So thank you, everyone, for your participation. And I hope to see you all in Kigali. And

after Kigali, we will be resuming our activities. Thanks again for your participation. Bye-bye, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]