

GISELLA GRUBER:

We will now start the LACRALO Working Group on Translation call on Thursday, the 24th of January, at 20:00 UTC. Welcome to everyone. On today's call on the Spanish channel we have Humberto Carrasco and Jose Arcé. On the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Apologies today noted from Sylvia Herlein Leite.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. Our interpreters today are David and Sabrina. If I could also remind everyone to state their names when speaking not only for transcript purposes but also to allow the interpreters to identify the person on the other language channel, and also staff will be taking action items on this call – if you would be so kind as to state them clearly. And the transcript will be available within 48 hours after the call. Thank you, over to you, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Humberto Carrasco speaking. I would like to thank the participants on this call. I want to thank staff for facilitating and enabling all the resources that make this call possible. I believe this will be or I hope this will be the last or one of the last meetings of this Translation Working Group in LACRALO.

I just want to say that according to our agenda I have to make some comment on the third draft of this group's report, the third draft report of the Working Group. This morning I sent the last or latest report or draft report of this Working Group, taking into consideration the

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

comments regarding two very delicate or sensitive points that were agreed on in our last meeting. Regarding attachments in emails, we agreed that this was already being solved or that staff was already working on a solution regarding this topic, therefore it was not going to be within the scope of this group. However, that was going to be stated in this report.

Secondly, regarding Item #3, that is the translation of documents, I would like to say that first of all, when documents were not priority documents we were going to use the Wiki tools to translate them; and should there be a priority, staff would be in charge of that translation. And that priority was going to be determined by the members – that is, LACRALO’s Chair or Secretariat. In that regard, the priority then was going to be set by them and after that staff would proceed with the translation. Documents that were not of a priority were going to be translated by means of the Wiki tools or the translation software available at ICANN.

So these are my comments regarding this report that was already circulated. I open the floor for questions or comments.

Hello? Humberto speaking. Hello? So Humberto Carrasco speaking. As I was saying, I now open the floor for questions or comments regarding this report that I myself have just commented on. So if anyone would like to take the floor... Oh, excuse me – I would like to give the floor to Olivier first and then after that to Dev Anand. Olivier, you have the floor, go ahead please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to ask one question with regards to the choice of the documents and the volume of translation that was going to be made. Does the Chair of ALAC have any say with regards to the number of translations and so on? Or is this something that is purely left to the discretion of the staff? I'm looking specifically with regards to the translations all costing and a certain budget being allocated for translations, whether the Chair of ALAC would have to be involved or whether this would not need to involve the Chair. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto Carrasco speaking. Thank you, Olivier, for that question. Truth be told we have not discussed this. I suppose that the Chair of ALAC will also have a priority; that is he would be, or the Chair of ALAC would be able to state which document would be translated. So in that regard I think that ALAC's Chair would also be able to determine translation priorities of a document and indicate so to staff. In other words, in summary both LACRALO's Secretariat and Chair and ALAC's Chair can set translation priorities for a document and indicate so to staff. I hope I have made myself clear.

If there are no other questions on this point then I would like to give the floor to Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Humberto, this is Dev Anand speaking. Thanks for the update also to the document. Regarding the Point #3, and it's a good idea – the intent is also for the Chair and Secretariat, for the LACRALO

Chair and Secretariat can look at the upcoming policy comments and if there was an issue that was deemed of extreme importance to LACRALO, a request could have been made that whatever report is intended to be produced then the request could be made I would say even before the report is delivered. So that was the idea behind the thinking of it.

As you also mentioned, a machine translation can be done by putting the public comment directly onto the Wiki and using the translation tool of the Wiki to machine translate. And informal tests have shown that this has worked, well, it's quite adequate. It works, I won't say "adequate" – it works.

I also wonder whether in this report we can include a mention of the transcripts of meetings that are now being produced, and I would say we should probably acknowledge this in the report that a great improvement in the accessibility of At-Large meetings to LACRALO is the availability of transcripts being produced at least two business days after the meeting has taken place. And I believe, perhaps staff can correct me – I believe that even the Spanish versions of our calls, the translations would be available, the transcripts I should say would also be available in English and in Spanish. So I think we should mention this in the report and really acknowledge the At-Large staff and the ICANN Language Services in this regard because it really is a huge step forward for the accessibility of ICANN and At-Large to LACRALO. That's it.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Humberto Carrasco speaking. Thank you very much, Dev. Well, I see that Dev has put his hand down, so I want to appreciate, to thank the

expediency with which staff is translating and transcribing our meetings in two languages, in both languages. This is a very positive surprise. So I would like to thank or express my gratitude because we work much better thanks to these initiatives. Dev is right in saying or in mentioning what he said, he's right in requesting that we should recognize this in the report.

I don't know if there are any further comments on this point?

JOSE ARCÉ: Humberto, this is Jose speaking.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Jose, you have the floor.

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you, Humberto. Just some comments: I posted a link in the AC room. As I said in the previous Working Group call, my last comment on that page should be part of this work. This is just a guideline for a person that comes across a document in a language which is not his or her own language. So I have provided a guideline regarding how to interpret this document. So I think this should be included in the document.

Secondly, I also mentioned in our previous call, I mentioned that official LACRALO documents, for example a comment that may be posted in the public comment forum on behalf of the region and any other document – well, that should be taken into account but this is of lesser importance. Of late we have not had the opportunity to send an official

document for translation to measure the delay or the delivery time. The last two documents uploaded to the public comment forum, well, they were drafted in Spanish and the English version was corrected by a member, a native English speaker of our region. So many a time we can see that member contributions deem official translations unnecessary because we can agree and reach agreement, and that is fantastic and it should have taken place a long time ago.

And I want to move or take a step ahead if you will: I think that the document should address what we discussed in our previous conference calls. Dev and I made some proposals regarding the translation of our Rules of Procedure, and Dev proposed the improvement of these Rules of Procedure in the GA. In that regard I said that for a long time in our region we set aside our rules and I proposed that we should do likewise in order to modify or amend this. So Humberto, I don't know if, or Dev, I don't know if you were able to discuss this with somebody else – where do we stand in this regard? What progress has been made? Can we reach consensus and say “Okay, well we take this document, we work out this issue in a very simple manner, straightforward without wasting any time?” That's it, thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto Carrasco speaking. Thank you, Jose. I would like to give the floor to Dev. Dev, go ahead please, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Humberto, this is Dev Anand speaking. Well, Jose, my concern would be that the Rules of Procedure is an official document. And I think that the simplest thing, in order to demonstrate that we have consensus is to ensure that the recommendations – and I see that the report basically outlines the recommendations to update the various Rules of Procedure, to harmonize the differences between the English and Spanish versions. I think by having a vote on it would be the surest way of demonstrating, well, that we all agree on this. I don't anticipate that there will be anyone disagreeing or anything like that.

Once it's circulated to LACRALO a vote could be held and remind people "Take a look, make your comments." And then after a sufficient time, it could be a month or two, just put it formally to a vote in LACRALO by electronic vote and see what happens. Given that most persons in LACRALO have voted when it comes to things like elections I am certain that we would be quorate enough and get two-thirds majority to have it passed. That's my comment.

Actually, I should say – sorry, also to follow up something: actually, in a way our Rules of Procedure... The reason why we have these differences in the Rules of Procedure is because of what we did to ourselves, so to speak. I remember when this was being drafted in Puerto Rico in 2007, and what had happened is that after we had done the drafting of our Rules of Procedure in one language – it was done in English – a member of LACRALO was tasked to produce the Spanish version and ensure that the changes that were done in the English in the conference calls, and we spent several days in Puerto Rico doing this for the entire day. But that person then submitted it back and that was

transmitted to ICANN, and that's why we have the differences today. So I'm just pointing out something for the record, so to speak. That's it.

JOSE ARCÉ: Humberto, this is Jose. May I take the floor, please?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto speaking. Oh, I'm sorry Jose, are you requesting the floor? So you have the floor, Jose, go ahead please.

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you, Humberto, thank you, Dev, for this historical background. I think I know the name of the person in charge of that and I think that person's job has been wonderful. It gave that person perhaps a headache, well... To take two, three months for this vote, this is what I am trying to avoid – that is, excessive bureaucracy and the strict formalities that have led to LACRALO's stumbling on many a time. And many people see our region as one of the regions where progress is hardly made.

So it took some time for everybody to stick to one set of rules, so why are we discussing today, why are we debating doing something that will save the region plenty of time? I wonder what took the region to stick to a rule that was nonexistent anywhere? Why can't we do this nowadays if this is for the sole benefit of the region? We are not seeking personal benefit or a group benefit. Making this decision would only benefit the region in general overall, and surely this will show the region's nobility towards the entire region.

So we need to see how we are going to make this happen but in my capacity as the region's Chair, in February I want to have this situation defined once and for all – at least so that the Spanish version coincides with the English version. Oh, and one more thing: we have to focus on the Portuguese version, and in February we will surely be addressing this. Thank you, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto Carrasco speaking, thank you very much, Jose. Well, after listening to Dev – and Dev, I don't know whether you would like to hold the floor again? If that is the case, Dev, you have the floor before I can give my own view. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Actually this is Dev. Humberto, I would like to hear your view first before I respond to Jose. So I'll put my hand down so you can go ahead, and then I'll respond.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto Carrasco speaking, thank you very much, Dev. I appreciate Dev's and Jose Arcé's opinion because that enabled me to have a picture of what happened at that time. Dev has given us the historical background since 2007 to date and the reason or the origin of these inconsistencies, and I see Dev's opinion in that he would like a faster amendment if you will of the Rules of Procedure. This is my opinion. I would favor a reverse vote; that is, we know that we have Translation Working Group members that agree on amending the LACRALO Rules of Procedure. Therefore, should there be any vote against this then this, in

other words would mean that that person wouldn't vote in favor of the proponent of these amendments.

On the contrary, this person would vote against these proposals. So in that way we would see the following: the person voting against these proposals should justify why he or she is opposing this consensus. So I think that my opinion comprises all the opinions in this group. Having said this I give the floor to Dev Anand.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Humberto. I agree, and in fact, the fact that any member per our Rules of Procedure which we are attempting to modify, it states that all votes have to be transparent in that it's recorded and you can see who has voted for what, for or against any motion. So I really don't see any problem with doing it, just actually amending it. And because also amending it is, amending the Rules of Procedure is in our Rules of Procedure, so to speak – we have to have a vote by two-thirds of the membership of LACRALO voting to approve the change. It's a systematic way and I think doing it formally I think is the way to go forward because I really don't see why anybody would object. That's it.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Who would like to take the floor?

JOSE ARCÉ: Humberto I would like to take the floor.

INTERPRETER: This is the interpreter. Humberto has disconnected and he's being called again.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking. Hello, can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: We can hear you – this is Dev.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you. I was listening to Dev. So just to continue with the point we were touching upon, I propose to have an internal vote before, sort of a reverse vote.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose Arcé speaking. I haven't really listened properly but I think you were giving me the floor. Can I speak then?

INTERPRETER: We are having some trouble hearing Humberto.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose Arcé speaking. This is going to be my last intervention, just to say regarding Dev's last comment and some other issues. First, and please consider if you can add the link that I posted perhaps we can just talk about a text that I can understand in a language that's different from my own, so I would like this to be a part of our discussion.

And secondly, I understand, that is I want to know what was going on before when our Rules of Procedure were staying the same and everybody just adhered to a rule that was nonexistent, and Dev was one of the persons who followed that rule. I said this many times and I still cannot find the explanation to have the quorum of eight ALSes on a teleconference call. Nobody has ever been able to give me a reply to this and this rule continued for a certain time until one day I said I just couldn't really find where this issue of the eight ALSes is written – and then it seemed to just pass by. So what caused everybody to follow this rule? That is my question.

And so when I started to work in the region and I was a member there were some people who followed that rule – they were members of the group and they didn't really read the document. They didn't really get to the inside of the document because this is not written in there and this rule that is not written anywhere was being followed and had actually caused the quorum in the region to be possible; and the vote was possible because otherwise there was never a quorum. And so if at that time not following the rule was beneficial I don't want to follow the rule because it is beneficial for the people.

So not follow the rules not because I'm looking for a personal interest, not because this is for the group – I actually want to just give a benefit to the region. I don't want to take four months to have a vote that will end up in nothing. So I'm looking for a consensus not to follow the rule to sort of accommodate the situation in the region and then to be able to follow the rule. That's all, because otherwise we will never be able to leave these obstacles in which we're all together. This is my way of thinking but still decisions are made by the region all together and I will

just continue in my office and I will continue thinking this because I am only looking for the benefit to the region. Thank you, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking. Now Dev has the floor before we continue. Dev, go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, this is Dev Anand speaking. Thank you, Jose, and in fact this is precisely why I think it's important to formally make the change. When I became Secretariat in 2009 I was informed that well, this was agreed to in a conference call. And this was.... It may make expedient sense now to say "Well, we all agree, nobody's going to say anything," but a few years down the line we're going to be the new Chair, the new Secretariat, the new persons in LACRALO that are going to be running this – they're going to look back at the idea of writing these Rules of Procedure as the reference. And if it's not updated and so forth you're going to wind up with misunderstandings I think, and I think that's why it's important to document these things and to say well, "Our Rules of Procedure, an amendment was voted at such and such a date to change this to this," and we have that history in it the same way we voted on the history of creating a LACRALO Chair in the first place.

In 2007 when we were doing the Bylaws there was no LACRALO Chair for example. And to have the responsibilities put in the Rules of Procedure I think is important. And I don't see it being an onerous task or a problem or anything like that, because again, once we've circulated this report nobody makes any comment to disagree with it then we can

formally make it a motion and then just have the online vote. And once successful, and I'm sure it would be, then we can update the actual official document so it's up to date. So it's precisely to avoid these kinds of misunderstandings and so forth, because you're right – this informal eight-person quorum rule, you know, even I didn't understand the history behind it to be quite honest. I was just "Okay, well this is what it is" and we just went along with it. And nobody really complained I guess, or pointed out where in the history did we do this until you did, Jose, and it was probably a good thing you did.

And also, just this is not really a translation issue per se, but going back to in terms of Bylaw modification, that's why as Secretariat I always insisted that in conference calls, if we did not have a sufficient number of people beyond 20 all the votes and so forth had to be electronic and therefore documented so that we can document to the outside of LACRALO, to the ALAC for example, that "Look, we had this decision and we have the document in support." So anyway, that's not a translation issue. That's it.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking. Thank you, Dev. I think Jose is requesting the floor. Jose, please go ahead.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose speaking. I actually had raised my hand before in the Adobe. I am going to put it down but I will make a comment anyway. Thank you, Dev, I understand your point, but if not following the rule will allow

me or the region to finally start working I personally want to not follow the rule and I would like to have your opinion in this regard. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, this is Dev. Humberto, do I have the floor or do you wish to...

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Please go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you Humberto, this is Dev Anand speaking. Jose, when you say you don't want to follow the rules I have to admit I'm puzzled. I suspect this is not really a translation issue anymore – this is more talking about Rules of Procedure and this discussion should probably happen in another working group, either Governance or Strategic... I think Governance is probably the more appropriate working group for this.

But since we have time, I don't understand why you say you do not want to follow the Rules of Procedure. I mean how should I put it... I mean by that same token any member could say 'Well, I don't want to follow the Rules of the Chair because I want to be the Chair.' You know, the Rules of Procedure are meant for everyone to abide by. I guess I don't understand why you would say something like that, so if you can explain why you would say that and what circumstances would want you to do that so I can better understand. That's it.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking. I think the question goes directly to Jose, but before giving the floor to Jose I want to rephrase that I understand what Jose says. I know what the current Rules are and that is why I proposed to have a reverse vote. What does this mean? All of us in the group should agree with what Dev Anand proposes, and this means that we agree with the translation proposed by Dev Anand. And in the report that the Translation Group issued we want to know if there is some kind of a disagreement to this reverse vote because that may be one of the points in this group. And I think nothing prevents us from having a reverse vote because we will send sort of a signal, a signal of union, that we have been working together and that this is what's right for LACRALO.

And so facing this confusion it is difficult to have a member of LACRALO, and that is why I suggest to have this reverse vote and nothing prevents us in the current LACRALO rules from doing that. Now I give the floor to Jose if he wishes to speak.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose speaking. Thank you, Humberto. I can barely hear you so if I can't properly respond to what you said, perhaps if you want to actually write in the chat room what your proposal is. But you know, through common sense I think what you're saying is that you're asking for a simple vote and to just follow the rules. And I agree with what Dev says. I'm not sure if this is the right place to say this but we do have the time.

So because this is part of the issues that we're dealing with in the Governance Group, it is just a separate issue, I just refer Dev, and I hope I'm making myself clear...

INTERPRETER:

It's very difficult to understand Jose. He sounds very bad.

JOSE ARCÉ:

I am not proposing anarchy. I only want to make the necessary steps right now only to say that I can comply with the rules that we are having. We are having some rules that we need to abide by; we need to follow many steps and I propose to take a shortcut so that we do not make so many steps. I only want to have an idea situation where we can say "We have clear rules and we need to abide by them." And this is not clear now. This is not present today.

If we need to make ten steps to get there I am proposing to make five, and that's what I actually think. If we need to move the Rules of Procedure then we need to just go through a certain step to amend those Rules of Procedure, and this path is what we need to do to amend them. So I think this is very bureaucratic, there's a problem of interpretation and we need to say millions of things that will only delay something that should be modified instantly. It should also be amended through common sense because this is going to be for the benefit of the region.

If we make a vote through a simpler path, the path that is dictated by our own common sense...

INTERPRETER: It's very hard to understand Jose.

JOSE ARCÉ: Nobody would disagree and I will say why: some of us will not disagree because they know the rules and they would say that through common sense we can take a shortcut; and others would just supply the same rules that applies to the eight ALSes – that is lack of knowledge. And I don't want to use lack of knowledge to have just total anarchy. I actually want to reach towards what I said before, to these places in the region where there are clear rules and we should abide by them. And we are not there. And if we don't get there soon there's going to be a vicious circle and we just need to... I actually just wanted to make this clear. Thank you, Humberto.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: ...finally reach an agreement because once this is resolved, the problem of translation is secondary. So the translation issues need to be separated from the Rules of Procedure; that is, I see this may be distractive from the main objection of this Work Group which is to focus on a straightforward communication between the Spanish and the English mailing lists. And then we can see the issues of the Rules of Procedure, that in addition we can see through this month... Since I'm here I have seen that this issue has a very long track record and the Rules of Procedure in LACRALO will be affected by the rules of ALAC that are actually being amended.

And so we should agree that once the ALAC Rules which are the general rules are approved, then the LACRALO Rules of Procedure would be reenacted considering the ALAC Rules. And so I think we should be able to separate the issues – that would be my suggestion to reach and create results. That’s all, thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking. Thank you, Sylvia, for your interesting comment. Jose, you now have the floor.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose speaking. I think Dev wanted to speak. I’m not sure if he had actually placed a comment in the chat room. He probably wanted to speak after Sylvia. I’m not sure but probably he was first?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev, okay.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Please go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Actually the communication on the English channel cut out so unfortunately I didn’t hear most of what Sylvia was saying because there was a gap of about a minute there unfortunately. Having said that, I think what Sylvia is saying, if I understood what she said towards the end I think I would support it because all we’re doing is we’re harmonizing the Rules of Procedure just so that it’s a common base to

again begin the ALAC Rules of Procedure that are looking to harmonize the RALOs' Rules of Procedure. So yeah, I would support that. That's why I say to me it's not a complex thing to do. To me it should be a very straightforward thing to do, and in fact it is the quicker way to ensure that everybody agrees with it, everybody understands what it is. So that's it.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking, thank you Dev. I'm going back to Sylvia's comment. I would like to thank both Sylvia and Dev, and as the Coordinator in this group I insist – and my idea is with the aim of simplifying any vote. I think the vote should be direct and...

INTERPRETER: It's very, very difficult to understand him.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: We need to show there is a consensus with the group in the sense that we need to synthesize the rules, and the Translation Working Group proposes by consensus that this should be the translation. And whoever is against this should point this out, should vote against it, should specify it. So from this point of view we'll show a consensus and we'll abide by the LACRALO rules that are actually enforced in the present. Is there any other comment that somebody would like to make?

I think we have just a few minutes to reach the top of the hour so if there's anybody else who would like to take the floor? We have had a

very good discussion. If anybody else would like to take the floor please go ahead. If not then I will consider the report approved and I will submit this to a reverse vote with just what Olivier has said; that is the translation of the document. So except for Olivier's comment I would like to consider this call adjourned, and if you agree I would like to consider this group completed.

And yes? I will just include what Dev said on the AC room. So we will add what you have pointed out in this meeting, Olivier, and with your permission we will just commit this to a reverse vote to have the Rules of Procedure being put to vote.

INTERPRETER:

It's very difficult to understand him.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

I see Jose is writing something in the AC room. I don't know if he also would like to take the floor? We will wait a little bit. Okay, Jose, I will add your last comment, and having said this I will wait until Monday to add the last comment to this meeting. And I will circulate this internally since there is a difference that the report will be sent to the LACRALO group and we will put it to vote soon. If there are no other comments I will consider this meeting adjourned. Being 18:00 hours in Chile I think it's 20:00 or 21:00 UTC – is that so?

And so if there's no other comment this meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much, Gisella – it's 21:00 hours, thank you very much. Thank you for having been in this meeting. I thank you for all the interventions. Olivier, thank you for having been in this meeting.

[End of Transcript]