

GISELLA GRUBER: I'd like to welcome everyone to today's LACRALO monthly call on Monday the 20th of May at 23:00 UTC. I will proceed with a quick role call. It's Gisella speaking.

On the Spanish channel, we have Jose Arce, Alberto Soto, Antonio Medina Gomez, Guillermo Zamora, Sylvia Herlein Leite, Aida Noblia, Wladimir Davalos, Natalia Enciso, Carlos Vera, Sergio Salinas Porto, Fatima Cambronero, Diego Acosta Bastidas.

On the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Cintra Sooknanan. Apologies noted from Carlton Samuels, Juan Manuel Rojas, Gilberto Lara, Alejandro Pisanty, and Javier Jose Pallero as well as Heidi Ullrich. From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber.

I hope I have not left anyone off the attendance list. If I could please remind everyone to state your names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel. Thank you very much and over to you, Jose.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you, Gisella. Welcome, everybody to the LACRALO monthly call on May 20th. Thank you to the participants on the English and Spanish channel, to the interpreters, to the staff members. I am really pleased because today during the first 30 minutes of this call we will have as our guest speaker today Olivier, who you all know.

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.

We are dealing with the capacity building session of this call, addressing something that is indeed very relevant. That is the policy development – the formal policy development process. That’s why we are all here at ICANN.

So, Olivier, of course let me thank you right from the beginning for your support to this capacity building program since its inception in Costa Rica with Natalia and other of our members. We believe that we can train the region and build capacities in the region to develop policies, but we do need guidance along these lines. So nobody better than you to do so, Olivier. I now give the floor to you without further ado. You have the floor, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jose. It’s Olivier here for the transcript record and for the interpretation. I’m very, very happy to be here and to be able to address your ALSs and LACRALO. In fact, what I’ve decided to do was to basically give you the presentation that I gave over to the APRALO ALSs in Beijing. I took that set of slides. It’s a shortened version of the introduction to At-Large that I give to the fellows. With the fellows, I have something like 6-8 minutes to tell them how At-Large works, and it makes it very, very difficult. They all get very confused by the speed at which I have to go through these slides.

Here what I’ve done is to take the deck of slides, and I hope that everyone is on Adobe Connect because I will be referring to these quite extensively.

Looking at the first slide, I think you all know the ICANN Multi-Stakeholder Model. You've all seen it. I've taken the board away from this slide for the simple reason that everyone has seen the normal diagram with the board in the center, but really the work, according to Steve Crocker, the chairman of the board, the work should really be taking place in the community and by the time it reaches the board, issues must've really been – have found a solution, let's say.

So the board should not be the part of ICANN that makes all of the decisions. Of course sometimes it has to make decisions, but most of the time, it should be able to ratify and have a simple answer to questions because the communities have all provided the answers.

So if you look at the whole muddle, you'll find out it's a complete multi-stakeholder system with governments and Internet users, which is At-Large and the country code operators and the generic name supporting organization that deals with the gTLDs, the generic names; and also the Address Supporting Organization, the ASO. You also see some other advisory committees on there. I think you've all seen that diagram.

I'm showing this because it shows you that we're not the only ones in the whole ICANN ecosystem. We have to also work with the other people in the ecosystem and ALAC members. So the members of the At-Large Advisory Committee are very much encouraged to liaise and to speak with people in the other parts of ICANN. I think it's something that is sometimes missing because you think that as an ALAC member, you just have to deal with ALAC business and ALAC work, but in fact, part of that work is being able to engage with the rest of the communities out there.

I know that many people in LACRALO have actually been doing this due to some work that also has taken place outside of ICANN in the wider Internet governance side of things. That's the way this goes.

The organizational diagram you will have also seen. Here you can see that the RALOs are really the pivot between the At-Large structures – the end users, really – and the At-Large Advisory Committee. As you all have probably heard, on the ALAC you have two people – two members – that are selected by the region, by the RALOs. Latin America and Caribbean would select two people to go on the At-Large Advisory Committee, and one person would be selected by the Nominating Committee which is somehow an external process.

So LACRALO has three people on the ALAC. These three people really are there to represent LACRALO on the ALAC and to work with the RALO in being able to engage in communication in two different ways. There's communication from the ALSs all the way to – and I'm showing here on this diagram you see the ICANN board, but of course all the way to the policy processes in ICANN.

There's also communication that needs to take place in the other direction. When ICANN has, for example, the recent things – the objections process, for example – ICANN has information that it needs to tell the population and Internet users about, and that's where the information goes from the ALAC through the RALOs towards the ALSs, and of course the representatives from the At-Large structures theoretically should provide that extension to their members in being able to send that information over to them.

What is At-Large? I think you pretty much know this one. I just want to draw your attention on a couple of things. First – and in fact, I’m going to use that little red arrow. Here we go. Here is the red arrow. I’m sorry – the green arrow. Why am I saying red? Because there’s red text here. Issue comments in response to ICANN public comment requests. This is a really important part of the work that the At-Large Advisory Committee does.

ICANN often asks the community questions about all sorts of processes and policies, and one of the main work that we do in At-Large is to respond to these public comment requests. We are an advisory committee and this is one of our main jobs.

In addition to that, we can comment on things outside of the public comment system, and you can comment on any subject, any process, anything that is ICANN related. It doesn’t need to be in a public comment process. I’ll go into the way that this works very shortly.

We could comment about some external processes as well. This has happened, for example, with the U.S. Department of Commerce during the IANA contract discussions, or prior to the IANA contract discussions. I think there was a comment period that the U.S. government has asked for and we had put together some reply to this public comment that they had.

Then there’s the taking part in cross-community working groups. These are working groups which bring their membership from across all of ICANN. I showed you before the different parts of ICANN. The cross-community working groups are there to bring everyone together. There

are not that many of these around. In fact, at the moment, I think that there might just be one left.

The GNSO has had a few problems with understanding how cross-community working groups work. They had one specific one which was with the ccNSO, and each party to the cross-community working group between the two drew their own different conclusions. It was a bit embarrassing, because really, when you have a group, everyone needs to have the same conclusion. So there are not many cross-community working groups now, but there are a lot of GNSO working groups that are still being created, and very often members of the community are invited to join those working groups. They make policy and we have received on many occasions notes from the GNSO saying, “Does anyone from ALAC or from the At-Large community want to join these working groups?” So we certainly are involved with that.

And then, as I said, relaying the ICANN message to the Internet users around the world – I just put that in one sentence. Of course we’re not relaying the ICANN message itself. What we’re doing is relaying any information about ICANN to Internet users around the world. The communication aspect is really, really important.

And finally, the coordination of the filing of the new gTLD objections from the community. That was the first operational thing that we were given, and it was (inaudible) pioneering thing, because it was the first time that we had to go through this process, and as you know, there were three objections against .health. I know that there was also some discussion regarding objections for other strings, including .patagonia and .amazon. But the way the system was designed, it appears that it

didn't get the amount of weight from other regions for it to be able to proceed forward.

But this is something which will – the coordination of the value of new gTLD objections is likely to continue in future cases after it is reviewed. It appears to have gone okay. I'm not saying it's gone very well, because ultimately, we will only find out when the whole process is finished. I would've thought there were going to be more objections than there were, but there were very few. Maybe this time around was just a test and we'll see in the future if there will be more confidence for our ALSs and for people outside of ICANN to larger objections. Let's move on.

The At-Large bottom-up to the ICANN. We all work in bottom-up. So you see the At-Large structures at the bottom, and you see the regional At-Large organizations, and then the ALAC – the 15 member committee of people. The information, really. When you've got a policy process, the information should come from the At-Large structure. So from the bottom all the way via the RALOs to the top. It's important that the RALO leadership and the people involved at the core of the RALO facilitate this and are well aware of how to get that information through. Of course in disseminating the information, when ICANN has to publicize things, the information has to flow in the other direction.

So let's take a response to a public comment request. How does this work? By the way, I will take questions at the end. So please bear with me. I've just got a couple more slides on this.

ICANN asks for comments. That's the first thing of the public comment request. When ICANN asks for comments, in theory, this is what should happen. The public comments request is sent over to the mailing list, to

the ICANN At-Large announce list. There should be a discussion in the ALAC to discuss comments, whether a comment should be filed. There should also be a discussion of the RALOs to discuss whether there should be a comment file. This is where the At-Large Structures, the ALSs, should bring their input.

Bearing this in mind, if there is a need for a first draft for a comment, then if that's the case, proceed. Someone will pick up the pen, basically. Again that's a case where somebody steps forward and says, "I feel particularly strongly about this. I feel particularly strongly about this. I would like to write the first draft, please." They pick up the pen and they put on the Wiki – I see here, the audio, we cannot hear anything. Is that on the Spanish channel? Because I'm going on. Okay, I'll continue and, hopefully, you will be able to fix the problems on the Spanish channel. I'll keep on going. If you want me to stop, just write a big "stop" on the chat, and I'll stop.

First draft is being drafted by someone who picks up the pen, and then there should be a discussion within the RALOs and within the ALAC and the whole community. And if there is consensus on this – and if here is consensus on the draft – and of course bearing in mind that there are comments that are brought in by everyone in At-Large – then the statement is issued, and then the statement is ratified. The 15-member ALAC will vote on the statement, and only when the statement is ratified is the statement then released.

The challenge that we are faced with here is that between – yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry for interrupting you, but there are many issues on the Spanish channel on (inaudible).

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Fine.

SABRINA: So sorry for interrupting you. Sabrina (inaudible) here. Also when you come through, it is very difficult to hear you. I don't know if you're having that issue on the line.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. It sounds like the interpreters have a problem with their line.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, I'm having it also.

SABRINA: Sorry for the interruption. (inaudible).

GISELLA GRUBER: On English channel, no, we can't hear you well Sabrina. It is a terrible line. I'm not sure if you need to disconnect and redial, please.

SABRINA: (inaudible) incoming audio on those channels. But we will disconnect and redial very quickly. Sorry for the interruption.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do, do, da, do, in reference to someone. Da, do, da, do, da, do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I hope it gets sorted out; otherwise (inaudible) do a meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It doesn't sound like a good start, huh?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's strange, because the interpreters were (inaudible), but when they were talking to us, they were underwater kind of sound. Kind of strange.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Almost like lack of capacity or something, distortion.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is the interpreter on the English channel. Can the participants on the English channel hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Olivier. Sorry for this interruption.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. So I understand that I have been asked – sorry, it's Olivier here again for the interpreters and for the transcript. Can you

hear me at the other end? I know the interpreters can hear me, but can the Spanish channel hear the interpreters correctly? Fantastic. Okay, this is Olivier again for the transcript.

I will go through this slide again, because it appears that there was distortion while I went through this slide. So, effectively, this is a slide that details the response to a public comment request. So ICANN asks for a comment on any subject – Subject A, let's say – and when ICANN asks for this comment, this is being sent by At-Large staff to the At-Large announce – or ALAC announce list – which I think everyone is subscribed to.

At that point, ALAC members have a discussion on the comment and find out if they think there should be an actual statement drafted about this.

At the same time, in theory, RALOs should also be alert to this and be really looking at the request for their public comment and asking themselves whether there should be a comment and asking their ALSs whether there should be a comment.

Now, the ALSs bring in the input to this and if there is a consensus about whether a comment is required or not, at that point somebody is asked to pick up the pen and to be the pen holder effectively and to draft a first draft. Often it is somebody who volunteers who is very much involved with the subject. There are times when there is a Working Group in At-Large that is very much involved with the subject, so it could be the chair of the Working Group or it could be a member of that Working Group that picks up the pen to write a first draft.

This first draft is put on a Wiki page. That Wiki page is then advertised by staff to the announce list again, and basically everyone is invited to comment on that first draft and perhaps make some amendments, etc. And so the comments can come in both from ALAC members, but also from the At-Large structures. It's really important that our At-Large structures bring their input to those comments, because at the end of the day, what we are doing is to relay the input from Internet users. We can't represent the Internet users, but we can certainly act in their best interest, and the more input we get from At-Large structures, the more likely it is that we'll actually get good input that we can send into the ICANN policy process.

When we reach consensus – and sometimes consensus is not reached because there are several different points of view that don't agree with each other – but the point is to try and reach consensus where everyone agrees to a core statement. When that point is reached – and as I said, there are times when you don't reach it. If we don't reach consensus, then no statement. We can't send a statement if people are not agreeing with each other in our community. But if there is agreement, at that point, the ALAC therefore issues the statement. So there's a final draft that is written and it becomes a statement at that point.

And then the ALAC – before the statement is released, the ALAC has to ratify it. So the 15 members on the At-Large Advisory Committee have to vote for it. Usually by the time it reaches the vote, it obviously means that it's reached consensus here. So 99.9% of our votes are always pretty much nearly unanimous, or maybe a couple of people are abstaining. Very few times is there any real split vote, because really, if

there was a split vote, it means that there was no consensus. You just need to make sure that consensus is reached before that happens.

And then, finally, the statement is released. It's sent to the board or it's sent to the public comment process, the staff in charge of that public comment.

But the reason why I wanted to show you this – it might seem like a long process, but between this time when ICANN asks for comments and this time when the statement is released, we have 21 days. This is the minimum amount of time that we have to comment during the initial public comment period.

There are usually two parts to it. There's a reply period as well where we're supposed to look at the comments that were sent in the initial comment period and reply to them. That's also particularly difficult because we also end up with only 21 days to do that.

So what sometimes happens is I, in accordance – working with At-Large staff – ask for an extension of time so we can send our statement later than after 21 days. Or sometimes we decide to actually send our statement during the reply period, because 21 days is just a very little amount of time to go from there to there. So this is why you might see on some cases when it's very important for us to comment on. You might see several reminders by staff, because every day that passes by is a little stressful to try and get the input in there.

So effectively, it means everyone has to really be ready to be in action (for this). That's the At-Large structure. That's the response to public comment request. Earlier I spoke to you and said that we can also have

spontaneous statements that come out, and spontaneous statements are ones that the ALAC is allowed to comment on everything and anything at any time. We don't need to just wait for public comment requests.

And this is where if an ALS – this is just an example, but let's say an ALS wishes to comment on something that is important to them. The first step is to discuss this with the RALO and within the RALO, and I guess there would be more comments coming from other members in other ALSs in the region. If there is a consensus at the RALO level itself, then the RALO can engage in discussions with other RALOs and find out if this is something that doesn't only affect one region, but it might affect a number of other regions as well. If there's consensus on that, it can escalate this and speak to the – well, the RALOs can basically speak to their ALAC members, and this can be brought over to the attention of the ALAC where the ALAC can discuss the matter. If there is consensus at ALAC level, then we move to the next slide.

If there's consensus at the ALAC level, at that point, the ALAC can carry the statement asking for comment. There needs to be an opening asking for comments from people integrating those comments over in the overall statement. So the statement would be amended according to the comments received, and if there is consensus on this, then the ALAC would issue the statement and then we of course – every statement that goes out needs to be voted on before. So that would be confirmed and the statement would be released.

That statement would be sent over to the board or to the chair of the GNSO or the chair of the ccNSO or the CEO as well. We've had some

statements sent to the CEO. Whichever. We basically send it to whoever is the most pertinent person to send it to.

But that's how the system works for spontaneous comments. It might seem like a long-winded process, but it can actually take place again in the matter of a couple of weeks. The important thing is having enough communication and being able to share that information with the others so as to build that energy – or that synergy – between the RALOs and with the ALAC members to see if a statement could come out.

There have been a couple of occasions where some people have asked for a statement. An ALS was feeling particularly strongly about something and it didn't make it. It did not make it all the way to become a statement. That's no problem. If the ALAC itself believes that there should not be a statement on something because you did not get enough support from at least three RALOs, then you can issue a statement directly over at RALO level. And this is something that has happened. If there is consensus at RALO level, or even at the local RALO level here, nothing stops the RALO from issuing a statement themselves and sending the statement out. This is another case where RALOs are not allowed to say anything where they have to say everything through the ALAC. It's a pretty open process.

Of course having a statement sent by the ALAC might carry more weight than having a statement sent from a RALO because it shows a worldwide concern rather than a more local concern. But the different options are open, basically.

So that's the way that the process works. I just wanted to show you three important links at the end of this quick presentation. The first one

is the correspondence page. This is where all of the statements are contained from – well, all the statements that the ALAC has drafted, and I think that the RALO statements are even on there as well, if there are any.

The second one is the policy development page. This is the main Wiki page from which all of the statements currently being drafted are found. If you want to be involved in drafting and in commenting on anything, you are all very welcome to do so. All ALSs have the ability to do that.

Then you've got the At-Large Working Groups. That's the third one. As I said earlier, most of the policy work now takes place in Working Groups rather than taking place at the ALAC level, and that's because there are so many different fields that we need to work on simultaneously, it's virtually impossible for one person to be involved with everything.

So having the Working Groups make sure that your mailbox doesn't get filled with stuff that you're not interested in. And I must say, as far as the Working Groups are concerned, it's not only the ALS designated representative or designated representatives that are allowed to take part in the Working Groups, but the At-Large Working Groups are open to absolutely everyone.

So if you have members in your ALS that are very knowledgeable about subject but you as your At-Large structure representative are not knowledgeable about the subject, you're very welcome to bring those members in to take part in the Working Group. There is no barrier to this.

The only difference – why do we have an At-Large structure representative is because it is that representative that has the ability to vote when there's a vote that takes place at the regional At-Large organization level. For example, the recent vote that you had with regards to your leadership. So that's the current process for the policy development.

I had another document which was uploaded and that's related to the rules of procedures, and it basically gives out the main amount of work that ALAC members should do. What's the function of the ALAC members, etc., and what is the minimum qualification criteria of ALAC members? But I think maybe that might be for another day. I don't want to keep you too long. I've already spoken maybe for a bit too long for this call. But I'm very much open for questions. I hope I've answered some of your questions already.

I see that Fatima Cambronerio has her hand up, so I guess I'm still running this part of the call. So Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

This is Fatima for the record. Thank you very much, Olivier, for your explanations. This was what we needed in our RALO. I know that your explanation was very clear, but I would like to insist on something for us to have it very clear on our mind.

When there is public comment open or a public comment period open or when there is a spontaneous statement, my question is is there any criteria or roles or best practices to be applied telling us when the RALOs should join the ALAC declaration? Because this criteria helps us

to understand when the RALO may (inaudible) or provide a statement, because sometimes we have particular statements. That is one hand. (inaudible) goes to these best practices or criteria.

And the second question has to do with this. For example, when we have a public comment, ALAC decides not to make a statement. So can the RALO take that issue or topic and say that if they are interested in that issue or topic, they may draft a declaration? And then can they post that in the public comment period on behalf of the RALO?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes. Thank you very much, Fatima. Here's the answer to your two questions. So the first one, is there a criteria when the RALO gets involved with the ALAC on public comments? In fact, there is no specific criteria at all. When the public comment is publicized by At-Large staff – and in fact, sometimes it's publicized even before – I think there are some mailing lists – announcing mailing lists or ICANN information mailing lists that you can subscribe to. You would maybe get 24 hours earlier than on the At-Large list. Everybody would be able to get the announcement of the public comment on a specific subject. So at that point, the RALOs themselves can be involved directly.

Holding the pen to draft a statement is not something that is limited to ALAC members. It can be anyone. Any of our members. It could be an ALS representative that holds the pen to draft a statement. What's important is that when we ask the question, "Do you think there should be a statement drafted about this?" we need to have answers pretty quickly. And if you don't believe that it needs to have a statement, then

no need to raise your voice. But if you really do believe, then please raise your voice.

The judgment call sometimes into whether we write a statement or not is sometimes just done thinking, well, I haven't heard anyone in my region that has asked about this. I don't think they're particularly interested.

Yes, we have people who are experts in the matter. We have Alan Greenberg who is the GNSO liaison and we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is the ccNSO liaison. So when it's a matter that takes place in the GNSO, we often ask for the input from Alan Greenberg to try and find out whether he believes, knowing the subject very well, if it's important for us to comment.

Now, if the ALAC decides not to comment because it's something which was deemed not to be important to comment on, the RALOs are very much free to be able to comment directly of course. They're not told by the ALAC what to do. So if your RALO decides it wishes to comment on something – and that's by the way, as I said, for either a response to a public comment period or sometimes a spontaneous comment, then you don't need the green light from the ALAC to go ahead with this.

The only thing I would ask, though, is for you to make sure if the RALO is going to have a comment to make sure that you do have consensus in your region. It's not because it's a top-down thing saying you need to have consensus in your region. No, it's because when you are able to show the process by which you have reached consensus, you will notice that people who are reading that statement that will be released will be interested and think, "Aha. This really is a consensus position," and they

will take this into account a lot more than if it looks as though the statement is just drafted by a couple of people and there was no real consensus on it.

You can be sure that when you draft a statement, someone who will read it who is interested in the subject will ask people in the region and say, “So yeah, what was this system about? So you all supported this, so there was consensus.” That’s the nature of the game I guess. I hope I’ve answered your question.

Okay, thank you. I say Jose Arce has got his hand up. Jose, you have the floor.

JOSE ARCE:

Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much, Olivier. Your explanation has been very clear for us. I would like to ask you something. I would like you to tell us the real impact that the ALAC advice has on different issues on parameters. So I would like you to tell us about the advice provided by the ALAC and the impact that this advice has.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much, Jose. It’s a very good point. It’s a very good question for a simple thing, because I often sense that there is frustration among our members that our advice does not get listened to. And this is something which I think might have been true a few years ago. Three, four years ago, a lot of the advice that the ALAC was providing was – well, we sent the advice over to the public comment process and we never heard any feedback or anything about what

happened with our advice. We didn't know whether it was put straight into the bin or whether it was funneled.

And if you look at the history of things, you will notice that some of our advice was actually followed, but we were never told that it was followed and some parts of the New gTLD process have actually been dealt with specifically because the At-Large community had asked for it in the past.

I don't have exact – well, I could say there's one example which I remember just out of memory like this. I think it was the issue of fast (flux) setting up domain names temporarily and then changing it. It was a complex issue, and it's a loophole which the At-Large community pointed at right away.

Another issue, for example, was compliance. We have the At-Large community and through the committee has complained that the compliance function was not being done properly, and had a number of points to make about compliance and very quickly recently, there were answers from Fadi Chehadé, the new ICANN CEO, who took the compliance function out of the jurisdiction of ICANN legal and moved it into the department where the head of compliance reports directly to the new CEO that this is one thing which has been done directly related to the comments that we have actually sent over the years during the times when we had the chance to do so.

So I think that whilst in the past our advice was not really listened to, more recently our advice has been listened to a lot more. And certainly with the new management team in place now, Fadi Chehadé, Tarek Kamel, and Sally Costerton, and of course David Olive is in charge of the

policy. There is a team now that I think listens a lot more to the whole community – not only to At-Large, but to the other parts of ICANN as well. But certainly the importance of ALAC advice and At-Large advice is a lot higher than it was in the past. That's also partly due to the fact that ICANN needs to be more transparent, needs to continue improving its process so as to really respond to the needs of the Internet users.

At the end of the day, the Affirmation of Commitments, which is the contract that ICANN has signed with the U.S. Department of Commerce to be able to run and coordinate the domain name systems and the numbers – the IP addresses – this contract mentions specifically. It has clauses in there which specifically mention the public interest, specifically mention the transparency, the accountability, that ICANN needs to have for the public.

The ALAC, as being the part of ICANN that brings the input from the public, has got a growing importance in this overall structure. In the past, this was negated by private interests, organizations that had a vested interest in place. But thanks to the new management team, and also the new chair of the board – it must be admitted – this is changing, and it's changing for the better. I think that we are on a good streak. It's not perfect yet, but it's getting better. And the more input we bring and the more – the ALAC and the RALOs and the ALSs are able to bring that input and do that job of bringing the input from the edges, the more likely it is that we will be listened even more. I hope I've answered your question here. I know I'm a little verbose. I speak a lot.

Any other questions? I see Jose as dropped off. I see Natalia Enciso.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: This is Sylvia Herlein Leite. I would like to read Natalia Enciso's question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: She's asked, Olivier, based on what (inaudible) regarding comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. So for any comment, can we have a statement from the ALAC—

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: So based on what you said for any comment, can we have a statement from the ALAC, another from the RALO, and maybe another from some ALSs. Is it (inaudible)? I don't know if Olivier can read the question from the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Sylvia. It's Olivier for the transcript. Yes, I have just read it from the chat here. Can we do this? Can a statement from the ALAC, another statement from the RALO, and another statement from an At-Large Structure be released?

Yes, it can. Strictly speaking, there is no prevention from anyone for making a comment and for drafting a comment. However, you have to look at the weight of your comment. The weight as in, how heavy? What significance will that comment have?

A statement – a comment that is made by an individual just engages the responsibility of that individual. A comment made by an ALS engages the responsibility of that ALS. A comment made by the RALO engages the responsibility of more than one ALS, since it would be the RALO itself, and a comment made by the ALAC is a lot of ALSs. In fact, with more than 150 At-Large Structures around the world, that weight would be carried when it's actually taken into account.

Now, if the comments from the RALO, the ALS, and the ALAC differ, I think that it would definitely bring a mixed message to whoever it is that is going to read those comments.

But the message that it might bring is the fact that the ALAC in its whole believes one thing. There might be a minority point of view from a RALO, and in a RALO, there might be an even different point of view within the RALO from an ALS.

I don't think that there's anything wrong with that because many of the subjects in ICANN are not just a black or white yes or no matter. They are sometimes based on shades of grey, and sometimes there is truth. Several points of view might be correct, but might not be aligned together. So I don't think there's anything wrong with that.

Is it good practice? Well, of course ultimately, I would rather like to see our community really cemented together and speaking with one voice. That's the ideal thing, that we all agree with each other. But there are some subjects where we're not going to agree with each other, and rather than having no statement whatsoever, perhaps it is important to explain what our diversity is and what our diverse opinions are like. That

shows maturity in our community. I hope that we can convey this. I hope that answers your question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is (inaudible) speaking. We have now reached the hour, so Olivier, on behalf of the region, I would like to thank you for participating in this call and for being so clear in your explanation. We have a (labeling) grip, and I am personally in charge of developing certain material for this Working Group. So I would like to take your PowerPoint presentation if you allow me to do so, because that would be part of the content for that material.

So now we need to continue with the agenda, so if there are no other questions or comments, I would like to go on with the items from the agenda.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much, Olivier. We will contact you if we need your help. Now the following item on the agenda is the SARP update. I don't know if Cintra is still on the call. If so, Cintra, would you like to take the call and make a summary of the last call regarding this issue?

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thank you very much. This is Cintra Sooknanan here. Thanks, Jose, for your introduction. I'd like to just talk a bit about the SARP. The SARP is the Support Applicant Review Panel. The SARP was born out of the efforts of the JAS. JAS is the Joint Applicant Support Working Group.

This is an instance where At-Large policy comments and working groups really resulted in positive results for our community and for nonprofits and developing countries. Many of you will know that Carlton Samuels was the co-chair of the JAS along with Rafik Dammak.

The SARP provided support – financial support – to applicants from developing countries, and specifically nonprofit organizations, who could not afford to be part of the New gTLD program.

The SARP followed guidelines in the Financial Handbook. This Handbook basically followed a lot of the rules that were set out by the JAS Working Group and which were modified by staff so that it could be set out in clear rules.

Each application was evaluated on its merit. Instances where there were questions and thresholds relating to the criteria, I was asked to give my opinion of what was the intention of the JAS Working Group. My role in the SARP was really to be an independent observer. I was not a voting member. I was there to give support to the SARP where they needed it on instances where there were questions or maybe comments as to the mindset of the JAS Working Group and coming up with the criteria.

Out of three applications that came to the SARP, one was approved and this was the .kids application. I wanted to mention that two of the applications came from Asia-Pacific and one came from Africa. There were none from Latin America and the Caribbean or the other regions. I think this was largely due to a lack of outreach, maybe on particularly in terms of staff giving announcement to the community as well as our own internal mechanisms to reach out to NGOs that may have been interested.

Part of the reason was due to the fact that this is a new process and there are risks involved in any new process since all the rules are not well understood.

I can't say too much in terms of the results of the JAS simply because – sorry, in terms of the results of the SARP – simply because some of the applications that were rejected are still under reconsideration, but essentially a lot of the communication that has been given on the SARP has been done by staff. It's also been done directly to the New gTLD Working Group, which Avri Doria is chair.

I suppose follow-up correspondence will take place during the next few weeks. I want to open to discussion. Unfortunately, I'm not on the Adobe Connect room, so please if you could just intervene by phone, that would be great.

JOSE ARCE:

This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much, Cintra. Now I will open the floor for discussion. I remember seeing an e-mail on the list where there were many ALSs participating in this meeting. I think it was Sergio Salinas Porto and I think (inaudible). Is there any question for Cintra?

CINTRA SOOKNANAN:

Okay, while I'm waiting for questions – this is Cintra Sooknanan again – just to let you know that applicants that have been approved by the SARP, they now form part of the new gTLD applicants. So they fall directly into the process of a new gTLD applicant and they will be subject to all the rules of new gTLD applicants.

But I'm assuming as well that there will be follow up action by SARP and by the community just to make sure that the rules and criteria that allow them to be qualified for applicant support (inaudible).

So, for instance, if one of the qualification criteria was that they are not-for-profit organization, that they will maintain that not-for-profit status rather than becoming a commercial entity, for instance.

JOSE ARCE:

This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much, Cintra, for your presentation on this update regarding the SARP group. I see that there are no questions on the AC room. Some people are typing. Sergio has a question, so I will read that question.

Sergio Salinas Porto is asking about .patagonia, .amazon, and .cba. I see he is still typing in the chat room. This is Sergio's question. You have the floor, Cintra.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN:

Okay. This is Cintra Sooknanan. Let me just say that those applicants – those new gTLD applications – didn't actually apply to the SARP for applicant support. So their criteria, or their evaluation, was (inaudible) new gTLD was in (inaudible) procedure. Sorry – the new gTLD application procedure. Not within the assessment by the SARP. The SARP was really developed only for applicants that needed financial support in order to take part in the program. Does that answer your question, Sergio?

JOSE ARCE:

This is Jose Arce speaking. Sergio is still typing. Perfect, he's saying. Perfect, dear Cintra, thank you for your answer. So there are no other questions. So I would like to thank you once again for sharing with us this update and for being there always supporting us. I know that you're well involved in this issue, and you have great knowledge. So thank you very much, Cintra.

Now we will discuss item number five on the agenda, and this is the update of the regional strategic planning. Fatima, would you like to take the floor?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

This is Fatima Cambronero speaking. Thank you very much, Jose. I will briefly tell you the latest news regarding this issue. I will post the link on the AC room for you to see the information.

As you know, during the first part of April, we delivered the presentation of our strategic planning in (inaudible). I will post a link to the details where you will find the presentation. We had already presented this strategic – or this planning – in Beijing. But now we wanted to take this closer to the region and to the community and we wanted to seize the opportunity because we had the LACTLD and LACNIC communities. So we had a good perception of these presentation and we are very happy for that.

Now, next steps. We will start working on the implementation. As you might have read from the document we sent, we have more than 70 projects within the strategic planning or the strategy divided into different areas. As you know, operations, economic activities and so on.

The following step is to unify the different projects coming from the different areas that might be similar and give priority to those that should be deployed during the first implementation stage, during the first year of this planning.

Once we're finished with this phase, we will start working on the implementation within the Strategic Planning Working Group. We will have coordinators in charge of the different (inaudible) areas and then this will be open to the whole community for those who would like to participate in the implementation of the specific projects. Of course we are not looking for the collaboration of different organizations and regional organizations such as LACNIC, LACTLD, and the different organizations participating in the drafting of the strategy.

So we will keep you posted on this. Once we have finished with the projects and we invite you to collaborate during the implementation of these projects – at least the ones that are the priority for us during the first year of the strategy.

This is my update, and of course if you have questions and if I have time to and if we have available time to answer those questions, I would like to answer them. And on the Wiki page, you will find further comments. Thank you very much.

JOSE ARCE:

This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much, Fatima, for your update. Are there any questions? I see Dev is congratulating Fatima on her summary. I don't see any hands up in the AC room. Is there any questions from those participants not connected to the AC room

regarding the regional strategic planning? I see a question, Fatima. Sergio is typing the question.

In the meantime, I would like to tell you that we still need to discuss two topics on the agenda, so we will be brief. Fatima, be brief in your answer to Sergio. I will read for the record. Sergio says, "What can you tell us about the participation of (inaudible) of the regions in the ICANN meetings?" He's still typing, so I don't know if that is the end of the question.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking. Jose, I can answer that question. That is a very simple answer. That is not within my role or my remit, so I won't be able to answer the question. This is related to surveys. This has to do with the groups or the interested groups.

I see the second part of the question. I cannot answer his question because that is out of my role or I don't have any list of the attendees to the meeting. So perhaps he might ask the question to the staff.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Fatima, if you agree, let the (inaudible) because we need to finish with this meeting. I would like you to take Sergio's question and (inaudible) and please send us your answer to the list.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Jose, I do agree with you and the panel is open, so I will receive all the questions and I will answer them.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. I see Silvia Vivanco is typing that they will send these questions to Rodrigo who will be able to speak about this. Then there is another question regarding the implementation. Perhaps you can answer this question as well.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Okay, Jose. Thank you very much.

JOSE ARCE: Thank you, Fatima, for your great work within this Working Group. I would like to congratulate you on your work. Now let's move forward. Let's discuss the next item on the agenda. This is the update on the Meeting Working Group. Sylvia is part of that Working Group. Sylvia, would you like to take the floor and tell us about this group and about its meeting?

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: This is Sylvia Herlein Leite speaking for the record. I would like to speak about this Working Group because there were some misunderstanding, some confusion, from my other Working Groups because we're having a great deal of activity and perhaps that's why we have certain confusion.

In February 2013, the board requested the creation of this Working Group and this is the meeting of strategy Working Group for future ICANN meetings. The chair of the group is Sébastien Bachollet and we have members such as (inaudible) and other staff participant members such as Sally Costerton, for example.

This group is created by different stakeholders such as the GAC, the ccNSO, the ALAC and Margarita Valdés Cortés belonging to the ccNSO; Tracy Hackshaw from the GAC and myself from the ALAC, we are participating. And we do not have any relationship. We (inaudible) working together with other Working Groups, which is that (ATLAS-2).

This group has been created to improve meetings and taking into account the needs of all the ICANN stakeholders, the (inaudible), and the mission of this Working Group is to discuss and propose strategies for future ICANN meetings. All the activities of this Working Group will be taken into account by 2015.

We will need to discuss, for example, things like the number of ICANN meetings during the year. You know that now we are having three meetings. What we'll be discussing is is (three) enough or if we need fewer meetings, then the location of the meeting, the length, if we're going to take into account rotation if we can repeat a continent within the same year or if we need to still keep on rotating. We will discuss also about visas. This is a very important issue on the travel support, remote participation. We will discuss remote participation. How can we improve this issue? Outreach.

This is of course something general. This is for all the constituencies that are part of ICANN. As Jose said before, we met in Beijing and we decided to have two monthly calls. Our next monthly call will be Thursday the 23rd. That's why I sent an e-mail to you. And the working language is English, but you can send me an e-mail giving me ideas to see what we can improve, what you think should be improved or implemented in order to facilitate participation in future meetings.

The Working Group will end on October the 28th and we will deliver the final report of this Working Group and then the board will comment on those results in the meeting in Buenos Aires. This is my update. If you have any questions, you can ask me now or by e-mail. And if you have any idea to improve meetings, they will be more than welcome. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE:

Jose Arce speaking. Thank you, Sylvia. You are doing an awesome job indeed, and we do need input and feedback from all the regions. For those of you that have attended meetings, well, your feedback and input will be more than welcome. Alejandro Pisanty made a significant contribution in our mailing list. So as Sylvia said, your input will be more than welcome.

Now I would like to address the last item on the agenda, because we are running out of time. Oh, I see Dev has a question of Sylvia. I don't know, Sylvia, if you would like to take Dev's question while we upload Alberto's presentation. So Sylvia, if you want to reply, you have the floor.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE:

This is Sylvia speaking. Yes, of course. I was typing my reply. In fact, I will post a link to a Wiki – the Working Group Wiki. We have no transcript yet because we held only one teleconference. We will have another teleconference next Thursday and three subgroups will be created. But I will post the link to the Wiki and I have sent that by e-mail also. Thank you.

ALBERTO CARRASCO:

This Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you, Sylvia. I will try to take three minutes instead of five for my presentation. We had proposed budget following amendments and this is the proposed budget.

We have 16 ALSs in 33 countries as of April in our region. This project aims at having as many ALSs as possible in different countries. So we need to create a Working Group and that Working Group charter will be to determine the type of research to reach the different types of countries. (inaudible) (Guatemala) with almost 15 million inhabitants and then we have the (inaudible) countries on the screen with roughly 40,000 inhabitants. This is being done in order to see how we can approach the different countries and different organizations that eventually may become certified ALSs.

The Working Group is expected to hold eight webinars, three of which will be conducted in English, three in Spanish, and two webinars for all participants simultaneously. Tentative dates would be the third quarter of 2014 to hold these webinars.

I have posted a link. It reads “metrics” but metrics is something that I can compare against something else, and I cannot compare anything here so we are going to focus on objectives and the objective is to have at least one organization in each of the countries that currently do not have At-Large representation. Once we achieve that, we will have the webinars and we will initiate the accreditation process. There will be – or there is – material in Spanish and in English. Printouts will be ready in the last quarter of this year and the first quarter of 2014. And the webinars would start in the first quarter of 2014.

Material will have to be sent out to organizations prior to the webinars provided that the project is approved. That's my presentation. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you, Alberto, for your explanation. I see that there are certain questions posted on the AC room, so Alberto, if you could take the questions and reply to these questions on the e-mail exchange list.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. Yes, of course. In the interest of time, I will do that.

JOSE ARCE: And also, Sergio, if you would like to post your questions on the list, surely Alberto will be replying to your questions. So Alberto, Dev, and Silvia Vivanco was supporting them so any of them will be able to help you. We look forward to your e-mail.

Finally – and we are not going to reach item number eight on the agenda, but I have two final comments. First of all, the original (IGS) that has been taken place for six years will be held in Argentina this year in the city of Córdoba. (inaudible), an organization to which Fatima and I belong, will be collaborating with this. So we are very pleased. You are all encouraged and invited to attend. We will be informing the different topics at a later stage, but we want you to know that the (IGS) will be held in the city of Córdoba in Argentina.

Secondly, I want to congratulate Fatima Cambronero on her new appointment as a member of an advisory body to the UN Secretary General in terms of Internet governance issues. So Fatima, we congratulate you – or I congratulate you on behalf of the region. We are very pleased to see that your job has come to fruition. You have reached very important results because you are representing not only the Internet users, but also our country, our region. So congratulations, Fatima. Well done.

If there are no further comments, I would like to bring the meeting to a close, thank participants on both channels, interpreters. Olivier, thank you very much for the capacity building session.

Of course staff members, as always, you have been great. Thank you, everybody. We will keep in touch and I look forward to our next call. Goodbye.

DEV ANAD TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks everyone. And of course, thank you to the interpreters.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're welcome, Dev.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]