BUENOS AIRES – LACRALO Monthly Meeting
Tuesday, November 19, 2013 – 12:30 to 13:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

UNIDENTIFIED: The time is 12:24 on November 19, 2013. In 10 minutes time we will begin the LACRALO monthly meeting for Buenos Aries ICANN 48.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Good morning everyone. And I don't know what your political views are but here was a, good morning everyone ladies and gentlemen.

Jose Arce for the record. Good morning everyone. So, we will have participants joining us… [Spanish]

UNIDENTIFIED: Silvia? You're going to have a summary?

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia Vivanco speaking. We are going to start the LACRALO monthly call. May I please ask you to introduce yourselves so that we can proceed with roll call. And we will start with Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty from ISOC Mexico.

JUAN IGNOACIO: Juan Ignoacio, IMF from [?] Argentina.

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.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto from Easy Argentina.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Carlos AGuirre from IDR.

RAUL BAUER: Raul Bauer from [?] Argentina.

LEON PHILLIP SANCHEZ: Leon Phillip Sanchez from ISOC Mexico.

FATIMATA CAMBRONERO: Fatimata Cambronero from [?] Argentina. [?] from the Notary Republic
                               Association of Uruguay.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce from [?].

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Sylvia Herlein Leite from [?] Brazil.

MARICARMEN SEQUERA: Maricarmen Sequera from [?] Paraguay.

ICANN 48 · 17-21 Nov 2013

NATALIA ENCISO: Natalia Enciso from [?] Paraguay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda Scartezini from Next Brazil.

UNIDENTIFIED: …three minutes of your time in your meeting. Thank you very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Dev Anand Teelucksingh from Trinidad and Tobago Computer Society.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Cintra Sooknanan, Internet Society, Trinidad and Tobago chapter.
                         [Spanish]

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce for the record. I can see that Gilberto Lara is
                         participating remotely. He is connecting from El Salvador, so Gilberto,
                         the floor is yours if you want to introduce yourself.

                         Jose Arce speaking. Okay, he doesn't want to introduce himself, but his
                         attendance is noted as part of the roll call. Aislan is also attending the
                         meeting. Aislan is from [?] Brazil. The next item on the agenda are the
                         action items from our past conference call. So I will post the link.

                         And I will quickly review these review actions, and we are going to
                         address the only open action item on this call, but basically we had to

define the next steps with ALAC RALO governance working group. It's an internal working group, so this link on the Wiki, or this link to the Wiki, will lead you to the only action item that is still open.

Before proceeding with our agenda, we will give the floor to Maureen she will speak about matrix, this is a very important topic, so Maureen we thank you for being here and you have the floor. Go ahead please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Jose. Maureen Hilyard for the transcript record. Thank you very much for giving me some time to speak to you on behalf of the metrics working group. I know that it's a very complex sort of topic to be introducing to you, because the metrics working group has been tasked to measure performance.

Performance of the ALAC members, performance of the ALSs, and of RALOs, eventually. And we're looking at ALAC first of all. And I have provided a link to a draft of some of the things that we're actually looking at. We're actually look at measures, measuring for ALAC. It's based on the fact that we have a new set of rules of procedures for the ALAC. And the ALAC rules of procedure has a section, as it did in the last set of rules, on performance metrics and remediation.

And in that section, it actually states that the ability of the ALAC to represent the interest of Internet users depends on strong participation from all ICANN regions. So that we're actually sort of like saying is that – in order for ALAC to function effectively, ALAC members and appointees meet the obligations of their positions.

We need to look at how well do our ALAC members meet those obligations to the end users. Who are the ALSs? They are you, the ALSs. So we need to get some feedback from you about how do you feel is the most appropriate way of measuring performance?

I have actually given some ideas that have come from within the group. I want you to pull them apart, to really sort of like – have a look at them, to discuss them. You may need to create a working group to work on them. I do have Sergio, he is going to be my contact. So I think if the RALO can work with, feed comments to him, and he and I will liaise.

But please, I mean I'm actually like really, really sort of digging for some feedback. It's really important that we get comments from the ALSs about the issue of metrics, and how we might best measure. At the moment, we're looking at attendance, participation, voting, and something else. But what we are looking at is mainly counting.

One of the things that has been raised with us already is the counting sufficient? Should we be looking at benchmarking certain aspects of performance? The only thing is that we've been tasked to do this job and to have something up by Singapore. We've been working on it for about a month already, and that's mainly been trying to get feedback.

Feedback has been very slow, but we know that if we put something out there, there would be heaps of comments. We'd like to get those comments beforehand if at all possible. So if you could, have a look at a couple of the documents that I'm actually putting out to the RALOs. If I could get some feedback from you, I'd be very, very grateful.

And I don't know how much of my three minutes I've used, but if there is any burning question that anybody would like to ask, please – oh, my gosh. Alejandro. Great.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Maureen. I've been a member of the metrics working group. This is Alejandro Pisanty for the record.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Alejandro, Fatima also wanted the floor. So Alejandro, go ahead please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I will start again. This is Alejandro Pisanty for the records. Maureen, have you been able to – sorry. I have been part of the metrics group, I've been working, I've been silent there. We have had some discussion also in LACRALO about metrics. The reason that I've been rather silent is that I've not found yet metrics that really, that are really meaningful.

And when I say really meaningful, it means that you can – metrics, with almost all of the metrics that I've seen around, the number of sessions you've taken apart in, that's very [?]. You actually just sit in through the remote participation. No one can blame you for not travelling. So physical attendance cannot be a metric in developing countries.

Attending remotely, just plug in and stay there. Make sure your connection doesn't break down, you weren't actually watching a football game. Participation in mailing list, people will just count the number of emails you sent. Participation in public forum, again all these

EN

are [?]. Have you been able to find something that really purchases substance? And that does some grading.

And when I say grading, I think to have, in the RALOs what I observe is we have like three levels of actual participation. When you have participation. One, the most common, is jostling for positions, it's making yourself present so that you can be elected, you can be closing for travel or for [?] or something.

Second, and that takes also a lot of oxygen out of the air, is participation on procedural discussions. Changes in bylaws, changes in procedures, which are not instituted in the bylaws but which are more local, discussion whether something can be taken to a vote and so forth. And ones that should really count differently are participations when you are actually having an incident in the function of RALOs and of the ALAC, which is establishing trust and influencing policy.

Responding to public – discussions that are in public consultation or initiating issues that go into policy discussion. So what you found there, that's – and I'm asking. I know we read the document, but this is not quantified in writing, what's really the spirit of this.

MAUREEN HILYARD: If I could just respond to that. We've had very little back except that the sort of feedback we're getting is very similar. That sometimes you can't assess the different things that people do as an ALAC member the same way. So this is one of the reasons why we're actually sort of like saying, perhaps we need, for some things, we need to have benchmarks, we need to have other types of assessment.

But we just need to get some feedback, sort of like what Alejandro just given to me. And we need to get different perspectives. As ALAC member, I mean, ALAC. As ALSs, you do have an input into your ALAC member, what sort of feedback do you give, are you satisfied with that? When you see ALAC members perform, what's coming out of ALAC?

I mean, it's really just looking at performance in general, and what different ways we might be able to measure that.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. In the interest of time, we are going to speed up a little bit. Fatima, Garth, and Carlos, you are going to be taking the floor. Please be brief. Thank you.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Thank you Jose. I will be speaking in Spanish. I have several questions and I apologize for that, but I believe they are important. First of all Maureen, how did you decide these? Because I did not remember seeing this email sent to the LACRALO list. So who was LACRALO's liaison with the metrics working group?

And is there any possibility for us to participate? Because Tijani said that your work was almost concluded. Then, another question, what are your suggestions to the RALOs? Do we have to wait until this working group job is concluded so that we can adapt it to our own metrics? What is your suggestion?

Is there any recommendation along those lines? And finally, this group that will be evaluating or assessing the metrics, who will be evaluating those that would be evaluating others?

JOSE ARCE:

Jose Arce speaking. Maureen, we will listen to Garth's question and Carlos's question, and then you will answer all of them. Garth, if you take the floor please?

GARTH BRUEN:

…I was just going to listen, but Alejandro has sparked my imagination. I think it would be useful to make the measurements task driven, in that if members of regions are given specific tasks to do, and this can be a measurement of their input.

If they're asked to do something specific, did they complete it? And did they do it well? And was it effective? Rather than more vague measurements of meeting attendance or email response. Thank you.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Carlos Aguirre is my name. I have… This is Carlos Aguirre speaking. …Alex said. I cannot, the subject, when you analyze metrics. On the other side, and in this case, subject to reason, it's also important who decides over these metrics. Are you thinking some measures to see that?

JOSE ARCE:	Jose Arce speaking. Maureen, if you would like to answer to these questions, you have the floor.

SUZY JOHNSON:	This is Suzy Johnson speaking. If I may, please say your names for the record.

JOSE ARCE:	This is Jose Arce speaking for the record. And please state your names before holding the floor. Maureen, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Thank you. Thank you for the questions. Fatima, I have been actually been… My first call was actually to the RALO secretariats. I was on two sessions with the RALO secretariats first of all, online. And I did ask if they would reach out through their RALOs to first of all, get some feedback. That didn't happen as much as I would have liked.
	I've actually raised it also with the regional group, and through that Sergio has offered to be a liaison person, so that's that one. The metrics working group is like other working groups, were we're just given, sort of like, a set of tasks to do. My job is basically liaison, to gather the feedback to take back to the group.
	And it is really important that we get these really – already, some really interesting comments from this group. And I'm hoping that if I can just get – and talk to more ALSs and the other RALOs, that we will get other comments, because it's obvious that numbers, just counting numbers, is

not going to be totally relevant, and I think that this is what we've got to do.

At the same time, what we want is to get the feedback, put together some sort of document, and before – like, I mean, this is what I'm saying. We need to get this information back from you by the end of this month, put something together so that we can get it back to you for further comment. It's really important that we get that feedback on a recommendation of what we come up with.

We certainly do not… I mean, I'm certainly getting the message, and it was something that we already thought of ourselves, but we need to hear it from that numbers aren't going to be the only way of measuring. As Alejandro says, how do you assess participation? That is an absolute…

It's just… It's a real hard one, but it's something that we will have to make some sort of call on. Okay, and I don't really want to hold you guys up, but please, if you have any queries, you can send them through Silvia, or send them through Sergio, or directly to me. Not a problem. Okay? Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking for the record. I see that several people would like to take the floor, make comments or have questions, but unfortunately we are pressed for time. We had allocated five minutes to the discussion of this topic and we have far exceeded these five minutes.

As you know, Sergio is the liaison for this working group, and you can contact him, or you can contact Maureen directly, and surely we will

have feedback, and then Maureen will be sending the document, probably through Sergio. And since we are all very interested in this topic, I invite you all to engage in this task on our next conference call or on the Wiki.

There is a member that has to leave the room, but she wants to address us before leaving. So Cintra, you have the floor, go ahead please.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thank you so much Jose. I just want to say apologies for leaving this room and the meeting early. There is a conflict that I have with the non-commercial stakeholders group meeting, starting at one. I do have some brochures from the constituency group that I am part of, in the NTSG, which I will leave at the door, as well as some candy for all of you.

Because I know these days are too long and sometimes you need some sugar.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. I just want to record my attendance at the meeting. I apologize but the city of Buenos Aries is really chaotic today.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Welcome to the meeting Sergio. Jose Arce speaking again. Okay, while Cintra gives out the candy that she has kindly brought us, thank you so much Cintra, we will move on with the next item on the agenda. I am posting a link in the Adobe Connect room.

Technology allowing of course. This is a link to, okay. The next item on the agenda is the agreement or MOU rather, this idea came up in our last meeting in Durban. We had the opportunity to share a space or a meeting with the regional Internet registries, and AFRALO told us that they had signed a memorandum of understanding with their regional Internet registry, and the aim was mutual cooperation.

So after that, I took that idea onboard, and I thought we might follow suit. So I posted the draft agreement signed by AFRALO for community discussion. We received certain comments, we received opinion for and against on our conference calls.

So, Silvia and I would like to have a substantive discussion on this and set a deadline to decide whether our region wants to sign this kind of agreement. One of our LACRALO members, Natalia Enciso, proposed a draft, a MOU draft, so that the region could debate that draft today in five to 10 minutes, and to see if we can set that deadline.

The idea is to vote on the final document between December sixth and the 13th. The document has been posted on the Wiki. Since Natalia posted that document, it was posted both in English and Spanish and we had the Wiki translation tool to that end. So the idea is that we should all give, or present our views on this document so that we can finalize it and proceed to a vote.

I don't know if there are any comments at this point. Silvia will be in charge of the speaker's queue. Sergio, go ahead please.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Thank you Mr. Chair. I will stick to my position, my initial position. I believe we do not need to sign a MOU with LACNIC. I do believe that we do need to start engaging in policy discussions to decide how we're going to work from now on within ICANN.

Regarding LACNIC, well, we can leave that to specific initiatives of mutual cooperation for a specific event. But other than that, I believe we do not need to sign this agreement with this RIR. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: This is Alejandro Pisanty. Good afternoon again. It's very good to have a document that we can read.   Initially, I wouldn't even take this document to my lawyer to be honest, because the jurisdiction is not defined, dispute resolution is not defined. That is, routine legal aspects that we always focus on before we focus on the content.

So, as from your explanations, the objective of this MOU, or the objectives include the substitution or the complementation of some administrative functions currently performed by ICANN, and we do not agree with that. And it also includes some financial aspects which, to my mind, are like a double edged sword.

On the one hand, okay, it's very nice to having funding and to stop being ICANN dependent on funding. But on the other hand, the funding that we receive nowadays from ICANN has at least some accountability and transparency mechanisms. LACRALO is currently not formed according to the mechanisms that will enable it, or enable it to handle financial arrangements.

We do not have a treasury department. We do not have transparency, accountability, or audit mechanisms. And if we were to sign this agreement with LACNIC, a part from remediating these floors that I have supported, well, we would need a very different LACRALO.

So we would like to see a proposal for these mechanisms that I have mentioned. I do not think we are able to give a blank check to this type of activities to our authorities, given our current constitution or formation. And this has nothing to do with who are our authorities.

The point here is that we are not ready to take on the responsibilities implied by this type of agreement, especially given the objections that were initially mentioned that are not there in that draft agreement.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Alejandro. I have a comment regarding what you said. Regarding the close on arbitration, personally I believe that clause shouldn't be there. And this is what I liked about the MOU that AFRALO signed. It is just putting in black and white what they have been doing in practice, in life, for the sake of formalities.

ALEJANDRO PISANTE: This is Alejandro Pisante again. If I may, I have an additional comment.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking again. Okay, thank you Alejandro. Speaking about funding and accountability, the organizing committee for this showcase has really proven that they are able to handle funds, and to

be accountable for that, because Alberto Soto and all of the team worked very hard.

They got sponsors, they got funding, and there was real accountability and transparency about the money they used. So we have an example that shows that we can do this. If we are going to wait until LACRALO is able to do this, then we have to think about, what is it to be able to do that?

And that will be very time consuming. So, our next speaker is Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: This is Vanda for the record. …LACRALO that is not an organization to sign anything with a formal organization. I don't get it, I don't know how this could be done, as legal issue. Probably should be approved by ICANN and to make sure that everything was done through ICANN, because we are just not a formal organization with the power to sign, or to receive money, or manage that.

How are we going to do that? That's my first question. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce. Thank you Vanda. You're on the line Fatimata. As it was signed by ICANN, some other bodies like ICANN believe that we are kind of an organization and signed a MOU with LACRALO that is not incorporated.

ICANN believe that we are something, I cannot define it right now. If ICANN believed that we are able to sign and LACNIC may believe the same thing and sign it, simply with the commitment of the work the

EN

people that are part of our community are doing, if they think it is worth doing that, I think this type of association that does not have any legal status can continue along the time.

I have no other answer. The questions and the thoughts you have Vanda, are the questions and thoughts we have, and this appeared on the AFRALO on the Wiki, and my answers on the Wiki are the same as the ones that I'm providing.

We have already discussed the idea of incorporating legally. Next one is Carlos Aguirre.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you Jose. Carlos Aguirre speaking for the records. Two things. First, the question whether we need to sign a MOU with LACNIC. And my vote is positive. I think it is very good to have a relationship with someone. I think in the synergies we can find solutions and better things.

Even more so, the status of LACNIC. LACNIC is an organization that has been working and working very effectively. So I think it is very good to have a relationship with them and to formalize the relationship in a way. Secondly, to Vanda's questions. I think all lawyers here at the table know that a group of people with common interests working towards the same interest are a cooperation de facto.

In all legislation in Latin America, this is included, whether we are incorporated or not this is a legal definition inside of our legislations in our nations. We have limitations and our duties corresponding to a legal entity. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you, and next one is Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto for the records. I coincide with the last appreciation made by Carlos. I think including, if there are any de facto incorporation may have commercial activities without any type of inconvenience. If someone does not want to do that, we may have – let's have the memorandum, the full of it, and let's remove point number two, or eight, that says to gather external financing for common projects.

And this would mean that the agreement that we may have some inconvenience to develop any type of activity. As Jose said, we have demonstrated that we have, we were able to handle money without money passing through our hands and everybody was in agreement with that.

I think it is positive to sign that. Regardless of all the other issues that we need to consider and address. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Alberto. I would like to add that many associations that belong to LACRALO have been beneficiaries of many LACNIC programs. And the idea is for many more to be beneficiaries of these programs. We have [?] remotely who was awarded in one of these awards.

He was able to travel to many IGFs. He was also awarded with some money for his projects within LACNIC. Note all the associations present

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty. My point was covered by Vanda.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Fatimata has the floor.

FATIMATA CAMBRONERO: Thank you Jose. I am Fatimata for the records. I would like to comment
                            something similar to what I said when this issue was brought to the
                            attention. At that moment, I said that I didn't have any opinion, and I
                            wanted to check the opinion of the region. Now that we have heard
                            many persons and with many arguments in favor and some others
                            against, I do not understand why forced to sign an agreement when we
                            do not want to sign that, or when we do not agree with some of its
                            points.

                            The collaboration with the LACNIC with the fellows belongs to LACNIC.
                            That doesn't mean that if we sign the agreement we will be fellow with
                            LACNIC, members of LACRALO. I think that forcing situations does not
                            go well, if you don't want that.

JOSE ARCE: Thank you Fatimata. It seems that we want to force something, and this
                            happened from the very beginning because when I posted the draft on

the Wiki, they said, "You're forcing us to sign." Two people made a comment over a long period of time, and they did not even vote that.

So, far away from forcing the signature of something, we have had over the last teleconferences some discussions on what to do with that. Nobody is forcing anything. We may go to a vote and the vote may say whether we want to vote to sign the agreement or not. Next one is Sergio Salinas Porto.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Mr. President, I am Sergio Salinas Porto for the transcript record. I would like to thank the honesty of Fatimata in her words, and for you to be at ease, Jose. No one thinks that you want to force something or that anyone can force something. This is a proposal, we are debating that, we are taking that as it is, beyond the debate that we are doing here.

When we sign the MOU, individual organizations signed it, and these organizations are forming original strategy within ICANN and within ALAC, in that sense we were individual organizations. What I would like to suggest is that if anyone wants to sign an agreement with LACNIC, they can do it on an individual basis, and it's okay.

If we all agree that we are signing with LACNIC, surely we maybe in a way that your proposal is considering. Otherwise anyone of the organizations may be free to work that out with LACNIC. In our case, we reserve our rights to work with LACNIC or not, and on the other hand, and this is very interesting to consider Fatima's words, because it is like that. You may be a fellow, you may be travelling to the IGF to

participate with valid tools within LACNIC, and to which are being appreciated by the community.

But that doesn't mean that you are tied to the organization, that ties the whole region.

JOSE ARCE:
Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Sergio. Regarding the last point that you made, I would like to highlight that no moment my intention, or what I said, was to provide more visibility to that, because the comments made by Fatimata or you. I would like to place on record that the intention of my words was that it would benefit on many aspects, but not to get tied to anything.

So we are on the hour. Raoul has the floor.

RAOUL BOWER:
Raoul Bower speaking. I would be more favorable to the possibility of discussing concrete and shared actions, or concrete actions than having some time dedicated to debate to an agreement that does not have unanimity. I would like to say that I am not a lawyer.

I have a certain objection to an attitude to document these type of things. I would like to go to the facts, and I would like to have more time with LACNIC potentially or actual, and to develop that. I would be favorable to moving away from it. So I would not support the signature of a formal agreement.

I would like to have concrete facts first.

JOSE ARCE:

Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Raoul. And we will make most of the presence of LACNIC representative, and we can – we would like to have, Andreas. Yes sir.

ANDREAS:

Andreas speaking. I come to LACRALO to the conference because I am a person close to the LACRALO and I came by and I meet and I just pop up in my quality as LACNIC representative. I am surprised by this discussion. With Jose, we have an ongoing dialogue, and with most of the people here we have an ongoing dialogue on our side.

There is a closeness with LACRALO and we have all of our willingness to work with LACRALO, with all the ALSs, with ICANN special, and with members of LACRALO in strategy, in INF where many of you work and participate. And some of you are fellows of the IGF or some other entities or levels.

Our side, this discussion and this debate is surprising, and this was not put on the table in LACNIC, or the Board, or the community. Perhaps we have some pending points that this was not made visible within the LACNIC community. I think that we're far from a document. I can say that in this environment that I feel like home, but for me it would be difficult to have this in my area, even if I had the channel to do that.

What I propose is that to work together, and this discussion is difficult for you to. For us it would be very difficult. We are not trying to do that. Sergio came to me and he said, "Are you pushing this through Jose?" And I said, "No." I don't think that we need a MOU, if LACRALO

makes an unanimous decision and wants to propose something, we are open to that.

But I confess to you, this would be very difficult for LACNIC to understand the reason of this type of agreement, and to formally to commit to something so stable with LACRALO.

On the other hand, we have a huge commitment on the LACNIC side, with these discussion, these key issues in 2013 are security, IPv6, and Internet governance. This is what we have been discussing.

And we are there, we will continue to be there, and this is the message. Perhaps it would be productive for you to focus on pushing forward in that sense. A few years down the road, we can discuss this, and we will always be there.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Last one raising his hand was Alejandro. I would comment something, which is – I deem pertinent here. In Durban, after the meeting where all the RIRs agreed that this would be beneficial, and the meeting ended, I could speak to LACNIC Board and [?] agreed that this would be beneficial.

And now I find that this would be internally difficult. Two people from the Board have expressed that I should push this internally and that this would go through, and now I find this. Why did we bring this issue?

There was a dialogue with some people and with people from the community, the whole community of the RIRs. So I have no problem

with the final decision being a no, but this was not parachuted here without any prior framework of work.

Diego is still on the speaker's line?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Mr. Pisanty speaking. I did not want to effect the credibility of any statement. I was not in Durban. I was not in Beijing. Honestly, I do not doubt that this dialogue existed. What I do need to say is that the LACNIC Board or the staff are dealing with this issue right now. It may be in the future but if the Board members are interested, they will themselves push it.

From my own perspective, individually, I am fully available and aware to whatever LACRALO proposes.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Andreas. Before passing the floor to Andreas, this is just internal discussion. So thank you Andreas for your clarification.

DIEGO: Diego speaking for the record. I agree with Raoul that discussions and debates that will be – that deal with legal issues are difficult. So, I would like to share these difficult matters with some pleasant moments. So I would like to share some chocolate with macadamia to sweeten things up.

And this may go against the formality, or the status of the meeting, but I think some sweet moment help that and may help Andreas to have that sweet moment. Andres to be speaker for fund management. We do not need an agreement.   And to know more about participation mechanisms about ICANN, we do not need that.

I think I've been clear enough, and sweet enough in my participation. Thank you Jose.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce for the record. Thank you Diego.

LEON PHILIPPE SANCHEZ: This is Leon Philippe Sanchez now for the record. Thank you Jose. I think that Andreas has summarized all of our reviews. There has been review work done. There has been very interesting debate, so I just want to reinforce Fatima's position. If in fact, this is taking place, then I don't think we should restrict these to a written agreement.

I have been benefit, or I have had the benefit of intervening or engaging with LACNIC. I have been a LACNIC fellow. I think that LACNIC is always very open. They support fellows. So I think we should stick to the facts, and before legally binding the RALO, we should give or have or shape our structure a little bit more, especially regarding accountability and audit mechanisms.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Leon. We are going to read a comment in the Adobe Connect Room.

SILVIA HERLEIN LEITE: This is Silvia Herlein Leite speaking. We have a comment from [?] from Brazil. I think before putting this document to a vote, I believe it should be better to discuss and explain the [?] regarding LACNIC. Whether to analyze if this agreement would be beneficial for LACRALO. And [?] says that on a separate note, he fully agrees with Carlos Aguirre's comment, and that he personally believes this is a very good opportunity.

That is to take the MOU into account.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Silvia. And now Carlos Aguirre is the next speaker. Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: This is Carlos Aguirre speaking. Thank you Diego for these sweets, they are indeed great. This is Carlos Aguirre for the record. I see that certain things crop out, certain things that I had not taken into account regardless of the wording of the MOU, and regardless of what we decide.

I wanted to give you the grounds of my prior position. [?] is a LACNIC member, and we in fact have obtained plenty of results because of this relation. Only, just participating in LACNIC's email exchange list is really, really beneficial. So those of you who do not want to engage in a relation with LANIC, well please participate in that email exchange list because you would learn a lot.

I believe we should engage in a relation with LACNIC, regardless of how we formalize it, be it a contract, an agreement, etc. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Alejandro, you have the floor, go ahead please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: This is Alejandro Pisanty speaking. Thank you. We are going from one surprise to the next. When analyzing this agreement. I believe we should perform a due diligence process, first of all, before debating or discussing an agreement that the party is willing to sign.

And we should do this in the same way in which we do in other normal places. When you submit a document to an assembly, or a GA, or a group of people, the document has been previously agreed on. And I do not claim to say that there is consensus, but there is a widespread view that, regarding this agreement, form follows function and we are putting the cart before the horse and not vice versa.

So, when we follow or study agreement with LACNIC, well we need to do it with the formalities that the agreement requires. Maybe LACNIC and Andreas in LACNIC have something that they can sell to the attorneys, to the legal counsel, and the Board.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Alejandro. I think that there are people can all participate here, so we should use this period between

the sixth and the 13th, this vote period, and once we have the reply, where if….

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: This is Alejandro Pisanty speaking. I have a point of order regarding procedures.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking again. Let me finish, if I may, let me finish and then I will give you the floor. And we have been discussing this within the region for quite some time now. So, Alejandro you have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: This is Alejandro Pisanty speaking. A motion of procedure. I would like to propose to stop discussing this MOU until we are certain that we are ready to sign an agreement or a MOU, and until accountability mechanisms and other factors mentioned here have been resolved. We cannot sign an agreement or debate signing an agreement if the counter party has not accepted that, for example.

So this point of order, and motion, or procedure of motion is to withdraw from the agenda. To withdraw this MOU from our agenda. That's my motion.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Mr. Chair, I second Mr. Pisanty's motion.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Alejandro for your comment. Ultimately, what we want to know is what the region wants, and we do not see all of the voices represented, the only way or the only thing that we can do is to make sure that everybody can vote. So we're not even certain that we are quarried to proceed regarding these motions.

So maybe we can do this online, and I believe that would be the best course of action.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: This is Sylvia Herlein speaking now. The proposal and the voting period that our chair was mentioning was only to decide whether or not we want to sign a MOU. We are not analyzing this document, or we're not voting on this document.

Initially, do we want to vote? Secondly, if we vote, we're voting whether or not we want a MOU. If we do want a MOU, then we will start analyzing a document.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: This is Alejandro Pisanty speaking. Now, I have another motion, regarding our mechanisms. And I would like to see the horse behind the cart, and not the cart before the horse.

LEON PHILIP SANCHEZ: This is Leon Philip Sanchez for the record. If I may translate what Alejandro has just said. What he means is that we should focus on the substance of the MOU, and then we should decide whether we want to

sign it or not. It is very hard to support signing a document that we are not familiar with.

So even though we have discussed whether we want to sign an MOU or not, well we are treading on water, really.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce for the record. Thank you Leon. I think that the problem in the region is that we devoted plenty of time to this discussion, and if we keep on focusing on this particular aspect, and everybody seems to be interested in this, but then, when we are really going to debate it, the debate does not take place.

Well, you know, we even proposed, on conference calls we proposed having a specific session to address this topic and people said no. So there is a contradiction in our regions. We need a cut off line or date, and we want to or need to move forward with our agenda.

So we will leave the vote on hold, put it on hold. We will define that in the next, or in the coming days since we're all here together, and we will leave that for later on.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: This is Carlos Aguirre for the record.

JOSE ARCE: Jose. Please be brief.

EN

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Okay. There is a motion put forth by Alejandro. I believe we should proceed to a vote on that motion, and I believe we have to put in place a mechanism to that end, maybe next week, in two weeks' time, next month. But we need to decide whether or not we want to engage with another agency, LACNIC or another agency, or if we're going to be, you know, continue working on our own.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty speaking for the record. Excuse me…

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Carlos Aguirre speaking. Alejandro, there is no motion.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty speaking. It's the same motion we are debating. I believe the chair does not need to proceed to a vote to negotiate the terms of an agreement. Once you have an agreement in which the counter-party has expressed their view, well that bring that up and we will proceed to a vote.

UNIDENTIFIED: [?] for the records. This has to do with what we are discussing right here. As I have heard, Jose had an agreement with some LACNIC persons, and from what Andreas said, this is not an issue that has been even discussed at LACNIC. It has not even discussed the LACNIC Board.

So my question is, is this document the result of an action of enthusiasm, or does it have a legal framework that can be covered with

ICANN 48 · 17-21 Nov 2013

all the interests that the community of LACRALO has? I would like to get confirmation about the origin and with whom are we talking, because I had the impression that the formal – that the channels of communication are not formal.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much Jorge. We will pass because the interpreters will be only until 1:45, and we need to proceed with the agenda. This is a déjà vu of what happened in Costa Rica. So we would like to proceed with the items on the agenda.

The item number five is to working groups that were formed in Costa Rica, that is the governance working group, and I would like to define that issue that item now that had been preceded by, chaired by Antonio [?] Gomez. I don't know if Antonio is on the Adobe Connect to give him the floor.

But the community debated this issue, and there were no significant progresses made. Now we want to push that because the result of this group will be – the outcome of this group will be important in conjunction with the draft or with the final report made by Alejandro that is on the Wiki.

This has been on for some time. I would like to call anyone to chair this group and to start working immediately, and we may have the formal meeting of this group in the week. This meeting will be face to face, so as to advance on issues.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio Salinas Porto. I would like to volunteer to proceed with that, if there are no objections by our colleagues from the region.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Sergio. Sergio is a person that has always participated for a long time, within the community and that knows the work that this working group needs to do. I don't know if anyone wants to join Sergio in doing that work.

I would like to volunteer myself to work with Sergio.   Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty speaking. I would like to make a proposal. If what we're speaking about is to rebuild the governance working group, I think it is important to accept the motion and to retake the motion made by Natalia Enciso to have on black and white some consultation, motion, and resolution of proposals, if this could be including to this working group, if possible.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Vanda speaking. Yes, I can be of assistance. Count on me please.

NATALIA ENCISO: Natalia Enciso speaking. I would like to get clarification because there are many working groups. One is the governance, this would be a new

working group and the one I proposed, I volunteered myself for is for processes. So I will work, but please tell me on which working group I was on.

FATIMATA CAMBRONERO: Fatimata for the records. I would like to clarify to you Natalia that this new working group on processes is a different group from the one of governance. The objectives on the governance or the scope was not defined, and it is different from the policy development processes of LACRALO working group.

And I offered myself to work with Natalia. It is another working group, it has not opened because we were waiting for the chance to decide on what was happening with that.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Sergio has the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio Salinas Porto for the records. Jose, after Alejandro's participation, Natalia and Fatimata, I do not know what group we're building and we're making. I can be in charge from the physical, intellectually on the governance working group. Not only being responsible.

Vanda was onboard and Jose was onboard. Is there anyone else to be onboard to make up a group? Philip Sanchez is on.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto for the record. We have a list.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. We have a list of speakers. I would like to clarify something for everyone to know. I started saying governance group, chaired by Antonio Medena, and it was created at the Costa Rica meeting. The clarification made by Alejandro, or his comment, was due to a proposal made by Natalia, and Fatimata said that very well.

It is another thing, we want to continue with the governance working group and to proceed with the task that should have been ready some time ago, a long time ago. So right now, this governance group is made up of Sergio, Vanda, myself, and [?]. I will be on too. Leon, are you on? Raul? Raul Bauer?

Vladimar? And Dev Anand Teelucksingh. All of them are on. And Mr. [?], Herberto, I think he's on. So we have a numerous participation.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. We need to plan the first teleconference and let's see if we can advance the ones present here with the first steps. Thank you very much to all of you for volunteering to complete this task.

Jose Arce continues. Since we have five more minutes, ten more minutes, next item on the agenda is working group processes and evaluation for the persons in item number 15, point number 15. We have said that there are two working groups to be able to set the person to succeed.

Sebastien Bachollet the seat number 15, selected by the At Large community to be member of the Board of Directors. In a group, we have Carlos Aguirre [?]. Carlos I would like you to take the floor and in three seconds you may present your group.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you Jose. This is Carlos Aguirre for the transcript record. The group is called BCSC, Board Candidates Selection Committee. This group works together with Jose and Dev. The group with Jose and Dev establishes a procedure, and organizes the procedure and how the interaction takes place.

And this group, my group and Carlos [?] group, and I would like to call Carlos [?] to be on board, because on the two calls he was not present so it would be a very good idea for us to be on the committee representing the region. This committee, this BCSC aims at selecting candidates that will be selected by the ALAC.

This is our task. This is a secret and confidential, because we are handling confidential information for each one of the candidates. I cannot tell you more because of that, but that's our task.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you Carlos. And as we said in the other group that we are in charge of establishing a voting procedure. Dev is participating and myself, we are participating. Dev, would you like to say something?

And the following item on the agenda is that possibility of outreach that you are responsible for that. So if you want to finish up with some comment for the selection of seat number 15, go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. As Carlos said, the BCSC has met and we have agreed on a timeline, final timeline for the selection of seat number 15 by the At Large. The BCSC is more of an oversight, just making sure that things are working smoothly with the process.

Ultimately, the sequence of events that require the selection of seat number 15, requires that seat to be transmitted by ICANN by, let me just double check just to make sure. I believe the announcement is made by the 16th or the 15th of April, 2014.

So that's also a sequence of our events that have to take place. The announcement has to go out, and it should be going out very soon. Right now, it's just undergoing a 24 hour consensus call on the final timeline. So once that is confirmed, the announcement will be going out to all of the mailing lists, and well…

So candidates interested can read the criteria on the Wiki, and select it to the BCEC for evaluation. Thanks.

…but I don't know if you have enough time for that, so I was saying wait for the announcement, it's going to be comprehensive and list of timelines and deadlines.

JOSE ARCE:

Jose Arce speaking. We are about to finish. I wanted you to say something about point number seven, item number seven on the agenda. This is visibility and we are short of time, and I think that we have two items. This is the working group of Dev. If in one minute you can speak about strategy, that will be Fatimata and we would like everyone to have an update on that. Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thank you Jose. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Myself and Fatimata Cambronero are co-chairs of project two. The communications panel as part of the Latin American and Caribbean regional strategy. This project is one of the projects that has been fast tracked, so that we can announce some [?] by this meeting, and in order to – well, advance the work of it, if not finish it, ahead of the other projects in the Latin American and Caribbean strategy.

So in a nutshell, there are many materials available in multiple languages: English, Spanish, Portuguese. A wide variety of material has been posted by ICANN on the ICANN blog. There have been also, in terms of the social media, there are now ICANN accounts in Spanish and in Portuguese, so that persons can see – well, posts, tweets, in their language.

There has also been a collection of articles of ICANN in the press, in Spanish and in Portuguese, and is like a collection, a site where all of these are collected. And now we've also looked at how the Latin American and Caribbean website, which is a specific website, get for the LAC region.

And we've come up with a structure for the website, and we are looking to, well document what is ICANN, what is – some background information about the DNS, some information about the various stakeholder rules available in ICANN for anyone to participate in.

So, for example, if you are interested in trademarks, you may be interested in the IP constituency in the GNSO for example. And then what we have done, we have each, part of the website -- sorry, I should start again. There will be a section of the website for each country, in the Latin American and Caribbean region.

And what we are doing is identify, well I should say we have identified the stakeholders from each country in the LAC region, for two reasons. One, for networking purposes so people can see who in their country is already involved and they could contact that person.

And the second is a way to identify the gaps in the stakeholder representation. And the intent is that we will then develop a communications plan for each country based on the gaps. So if there is a gap in say, the business constituency, we will target that sector explicitly and it will be tailored for each country.

So I think that's a summary unless Fatimata has something else to add.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Fatimata we are about to conclude, but before that, I would like to thank the interpreters and the people and the ICANN staff for having made a wonderful, an almost impossible task. So Fatimata has the floor, and thank you all very much for being here in our monthly teleconference in Buenos Aries. Fatimata has the floor.

FATIMATA CAMBRONERO: [Spanish]

JOSE ARCE: Okay.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]