SUSIE JOHNSON:	Welcome to the LACRALO Governance call today, Monday the 23rd of December, 2013, at 23:00 UTC. Participants on today's call are Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Sergio Salinas Porto, Leon Sanchez, Raul Bauer, Juan Manuel Rojas, Aida Nobila. Apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Jose Arce. On the staff are Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and Susie Johnson. Our interpreters are Sabrina and Veronica. This is a reminder to all participants to please say your full name for recording purposes. Over to you.
SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:	Thank you very much, Susie. Good afternoon to you all. I think we're all in the afternoon of each of the countries. Today, we have a meeting – a call – to give the background to all our initiatives for the documents that will be delivered in our working group, which is the LACRALO Governance Working Group.
	First of all, I would like to make a reminder: Think about what happened in our previous meeting. We worked during one hour, in order to be able to leave with some of the topics, especially we discussed the recent of our meeting. There was a kind of brainstorming. Fatima made a transcription of all the information, with the help of Silvia Vivanco, into Spanish so as to be able to have a reminder or some notes. I will post a link in the AC room and this is the brainstorming.
	I am sorry that Aida is not able to be connected to the AC room for her to see these notes, but I am posting a link into the chat for you to see that information. This was already sent to all of us. This was circulated

by e-mail with all the information that was discussed during our previous and last meeting.

I committed to listening to the MP3 files of the Costa Rica meeting, where there were many things to deal with – and perhaps many things have been forgotten after two years have passed. In that listening, and after listening to the audio file, well there was nothing concrete or substantive, in fact. That reminded me of all what happened in Costa Rica, why we're working with this governance working group, which is of a very critical, vital importance in the [inaudible] of our region.

So now, going to item number three on our agenda, this is the task – well, I think that our task is to start with our mandate and to prepare and pave the way for what we dealt with in our previous meeting. That is to say to create or draft a document. Perhaps this working group will not draft a document, but once we have or once we're finished the document, we'll have to create probably a new governance working group to work in two layers, to put it somehow.

One layer will be to modify the bylaws and the rules of procedure and perhaps to adapt and adjust those rules to the ALAC rules and procedures, and at the same time, to provide an overview or a framework – a referential framework – for the Latin American, the Caribbean region, taking into account these specific and special issues of our region.

On the other hand, there will be a new structure and we need to discuss this. This will have to do with the metrics regarding the organics of the institutional functioning of our region. We have a critical point of view,

and we need to take into account this to see how we work in the region. Of course we have to exceed this. We have to excel in our daily work.

This is our task. This will be the very beginning. We need to pave the way and to provide the framework – the main framework – for our region in terms of internal governance, LACRALO internal governance. On the other hand, we need to invite people to be part of certain committees or working groups for them to work on these topics. Perhaps we might have only one working group divided into different sub-working groups. They will be related or dealing with the changes in the bylaws and rules and procedure as I said before.

Of course, we will have to deal with metrics. Of course, we have been discussing something about this; I think it was in 2010 in Cartagena. I believe Fatima, if I'm not wrong – and perhaps, I'm sure Carlton Samuels and Cecilia and Dev, wll, we have already discussed that with them.

There is something that Dev said that I would like to – now, I would like to give the floor to Dev for some minutes. He said something that made me reflect so much and think so much regarding the way we need to follow.

This was an input provided by Dev regarding a definition of the good governance and I would like that we all together discuss that, so as to think about that definition and to reflect about it.

So I would like to ask Dev if he could kindly read that definition. Okay, I see Silvia Vivanco has posted that on the AC room, but I know there are people who are not connected to the AC room, so I think that it would

be good for them to have Dev or someone read this for these people to listen to that definition. So, please, Dev, could you read that definition? If so, I give you the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Well, I'm trying to find the words exactly. Let me just see if I can pull it up from the text. Apologies. Unfortunately, we have lots of tabs open, which [inaudible] up.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: You have that information on the AC room, Silvia Vivanco posted that information. I don't know if you are connected to the AC room so that you can see that information. I know that you are because I can see you connected. So perhaps you can take that information from the AC room.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, I found the text. So, good governance has eight major characteristics. It is participatory, consensus-oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rules of law. It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account, and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society.

That was the summary from that article I had hidden that Silvia's reposted the link in the AC room chat.

EN

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Dev. Based on that definition provided by Dev, I took some phrases or words that I think are really important – that are very important – because I think that when it comes to LACRALO this makes LACRALO work.

Taking into account these eight characteristics, I think one of the most important is the participation, participatory. How do you see participation within LACRALO? Here, I open the floor for discussion. I hope that you can participate and raise your hand to hold the floor. Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Sergio. When I think of participation, I think one of the challenges we in LACRALO face is that all of the 42 At-Large structures would potentially 84 persons in LACRALO because each ALAC can select two persons to be members of LACRALO.

The reality is that the participation – well, first of all, we have to define participation in two ways. I view participation as it's involved into the ICANN policy work. In that sense, there's a lot of room for improvement. I think it's a very few persons getting involved on the conference calls and so forth.

I do note that there's great participation when it comes to elections, that persons who never contribute, who don't even attend conference calls – the LACRALO monthly conference calls, ALAC monthly calls, working group calls – but when they get vote credentials to vote, they vote. I'm often amazed at how quickly the response is.

EN

I would want to see this imbalance looked at, where instead of participation being everybody just voting for candidates or whatever, that participation in the policy issues of ICANN as it relates to the interests of the Internet end user.

That's my first comment. I could stop in case anybody else wants to speak. I do have another idea of how to improve participation, but I'll stop and I want to hear some of the feedback on this issue.

AIDA NOBILA: This is Aida Nobila speaking, can you hear me?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Go ahead, Aida.

AIDA NOBILES: Just a brief comment. Of course, lack of participation is a problem from our perspective, but I think that it would be a policy issue to see how we can solve this.

I work in the Leveling Working Group and we have 42 ALSes; and out of 42 ALSes, only seven ALSes responded. Perhaps sometimes it's difficult to carry out a survey, but I also know that the rate of participation or engagement is really low. So, perhaps, we could see which policies could lead to a greater participation. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Aida, for your comment. Any other one who would like to make a comment regarding this participation issue?

RAUL BAUER: This is Raul Bauer speaking.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Raul, go ahead, please.

RAUL BAUER: I think the concept that Dev is saying is very reasonable. I think it is very difficult to deal with this. I agree with Aida in terms of the fact that we need to analyze and we need to increase participation because we do not have the desired participation but we also need to take into account that all the participants are volunteers, and sometimes not all the volunteers have the same time availability. For example, they do not have the same profile or they're not interested in the same things, so it is reasonable to think that we have a difference in the participation or engagement in this group.

                          I think it is a very good point when it comes to think about this. We need to review this so as to see what is happening and to see why participation, engagement is so limited or narrow. It is not only a question of increasing participation to achieve better response. In fact, the lack of participation may mean that we are not reflecting the real interest of all participants. I think this is the core, the matter, and the main point that we need to revise.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Raul. Any other comments? Okay, Dev, I will give you the floor in one second, but before that, the question is would you like to reply to those comments, or would you like to speak about participation or are you going to speak about the second item on the agenda?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I can respond to Raul's comment, if I can.

SERGIO SALINS PORTO: Yes, of course, Dev. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Sergio. Raul, I hear what you're saying. [inaudible] volunteers and [inaudible] persons who are representatives in LACRALO may not have the time to be effective participants, but at the very same time – how should I put it? This is what you signed up for when you joined LACRALO and you decided to be an accredited At-Large Structure to actually do help participate in the ICANN policy work.

My thinking is that if you are not really able to contribute the time or effort or energy, or it's not your primary interest, then you should find somebody else in your At-Large Structure to be that person. That will probably be one of my suggestions. We have a primary and secondary rep and sometimes we don't hear anything from them other than elections. A solution is that we encourage those At-Large structures to

EN

find somebody else within their At-Large structure to see if they have an interest in the policy issues related to ICANN [inaudible] domain names and numbers. Otherwise, I don't think the situation could ever improve. That's my first comment.

On another topic, or another issue: If you look at the LACRALO memorandum of understanding between ICANN and LACRALO that was signed in 2006, there's mentioned here that – let me see if I can find the exact text here. Okay, there's mention of what individual members could possibly join LACRALO.

Currently, the way LACRALO's structured, you must be an accredited At-Large structure, and after you become an accredited At-Large structure, that accredited At-Large structure sends two representatives to LACRALO.

But if there was a what you call an unaffiliated individual or individual person from a country – and especially from those countries that we do not have At-Large structures – perhaps we should look at a mechanism by which those persons can become members of LACRALO and have the same privileges as At-Large structure members in LACRALO, to the point where they could go up for an election seat, for example, serve as a LACRALO chair or secretariat or so forth. That's a suggestion, and that's possibly we could look at. Thank you. I'll stop for now.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Dev. I would like to make an exception, and I would like to say that I do agree with Raul because he presents a greater or a wider overview.

EN

Everyone participating within this structure participates in ICANN, taking into account a political destination of that. The representative – and I say this because I have spoken with some members of ICANN and sometimes we [inaudible] because they do not find a reason to participate because they do not understand what happens within ICANN.

So the problem, I think, it is not just a question of time or a matter of time – each organization defines or appoints its representative but I should say that those people are volunteers. The problem here is another one, and that is my personal point of view. We have seen this with Aida and with Diego Acosta Bastida in the Leveling Working Group.

We see that not all the answers are correct; that many people who participated do not know about certain topics that are very important to understand the ICANN process. We need to double our efforts to provide basic knowledge for all of us to be able to decide freely whether we can participate or not within ICANN.

Today, this is not so, because we're still not understanding – at least, from my point of view – why we participate within ICANN. Now we'll give the floor to Raul and then Dev.

RAUL BAUER: Thank you very much, Sergio. Let's see. I didn't want to or didn't mean to focus on the volunteers and the efforts. I just mentioned that because that is a very concrete aspect. But this is not the core of the matter.

I think that Dev is right when we cannot participate. But we also need to take into account expectations and knowledge, as Sergio said before. It is not only a question of knowing the formal mechanisms. When I speak about interest and engagement, we need to take into account the topics that are being discussed.

It is possible that within such an organization, there are topics that are of interest for some people and sometimes they are related to the ICANN board or to the ALAC, and sometimes the board asks us to deal with certain topics.

We are somehow representing a certain group with their own interests and concerns. Sometimes, I would say that we should perhaps have our own agenda. We need to give or provide topics of interest for us and I think this will improve engagement or participation and we will be able to engage more people and help to define the topics of interest for ICANN as a whole.

I don't know if this have to do with a topic we need to discuss today. This is not very clear to me, in fact. I'm just giving or expression or speaking out of my mind; I'm just giving my idea.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Raul. Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Yes, it's volunteers, and yes, I understand that they may not the time or the effort to do it. But, again, it really comes back down to if those persons in that At-Large Sructure do not have the time or energy

or interest, if this really is not the interest at all, why are they here in LACRALO?

I think the question really has been posed to them. If you can't do it, then perhaps another person in your organization can do it and be part of the monthly calls or something like that, and to be involved in the working groups.

The second point is regarding interest and so on. Ultimately, ICANN policy work requires you to read a lot of material. You have to spend time to read it and to understand it, and if you don't understand it, ask questions. I don't think that's something that could be – there's nothing in the bylaws that can mandate that.

Already, you really have an interest – a genuine interest – in the policy issues, or you don't really have that interest. I can't feel an easy motivation – I can't think of a motivating factor that can be instituted by LACRALO to do that.

The policy issues are there, they are evolving, and they require a constant input – especially as there are other stakeholders in the ICANN ecosystem, making their contributions and their suggestions and so forth. It's like walking on a treadmill. You have to keep going at it, unfortunately.

My concern is that we only have a very small subset of persons in LACRALO doing work, and in a sense I don't know how sustainable that is, in the long run. I'm all for asking ALSes if they haven't been participating in any of the working groups, in any of the monthly calls, in any such thing, they should be asked, "Can you please find another

EN

person that could join and be a part of the monthly calls?" as a start. That's my suggestion. Otherwise, I don't see how things will change. Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Dev. Your point is clear and well-taken. I must admit that I tend to agree with you in some of your points, which I believe entail changing or being able to change points of view or exchange points of view until we find a common viewpoint. I believe that your input is interesting.

There's another point or another topic included in our eight items, the eight items we have to address today. This has to do with governance being consensus-oriented. Is there anybody willing to make a comment on this? Do you understand what we're speaking about when we speak about consensus? Anybody would like to contribute any input on this topic? Are you all in agreement? Okay. Raul says yes, I say yes, and Dev would like to take the floor. I will give you the floor in a little bit, Dev.I would like to see more people in agreement with consensus. First I will give the floor to the Dev, and then to Aida. Oh, okay, Aida had expressed her agreement, so, Aida, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

AIDA NOBILA: I was thinking about a consensus-based solution. I believe it's the right solution because another solution would be a majority vote and in these topics, also in the organization where I work, we work on the basis of consensus mainly and we always reach very good results.

Regarding the prior topic, I believe that Dev's suggestion is a good one. Maybe we should shift the persons representing the ALS. That could be a solution. Also, we need to encourage the interest or motivate people, engage a little bit with these people and explain what it is that we are doing. This is what I'm trying to do within my own organization. That is to explain ICANN's significance to the people within ICANN and to the people in the organization, because people sometimes are not aware of this, so they do not participate. That was my comment, thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I'll just agree that [inaudible], that indeed consensus is very important. I just wanted to say just that. One of the things, though – I don't know if you, Sergio, want to talk about – is I do know that LACRALO does seem to have a great difficulty reaching consensus on many issues, and then it resorts to a vote. I noticed that, unfortunately, happening a lot of times. I suspect the problems are lying with more in trying to understand the different viewpoints being expressed and so forth.

This is an observation that I think everybody wants consensus and we don't really want to put to a vote because it's not about majority rule or whatever. It's about getting consensus so that all the interests of the region, of the Latin American and Caribbean region, are recognized. I know that finding consensus in LACRALO is sometimes a challenge. That's it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Dev. Leon Sanchez, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Sergio. I would like to go back to Dev's point regarding ALS's representation. I believe we need metrics of that, and maybe we should address this within this group and consequently determine the weight of each ALS on the basis of their participation, of their effective participation within LACRALO.

I believe that in as much as an ALS makes a contribution, an effective contribution, to LACRALO's work, then they will have a heavier weight at the time of voting. This, of course, may be controversial, because we need to define "effective participation," but this might be an initial step forward that we could explore in order to set up a metrics system to determine who is effectively contributing to LACRALO's work and who is within the structure but without actively participating. Then we could work on a validation of ALSes. That's my comment.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Leon. I shouldn't do this, but I will address two comments. On the one hand, Dev, yes, I agree with you. Latin America and the Caribbean as a region is a bit complicated in terms of consensus-based results. No doubt this has to do with the way we, the Latin American people and the Caribbean people, the way we are, the way we live, we experience life in our different countries. Also, I do understand that the most benign way or the best thing that can happen to us is to agree, to

reach agreement, instead of resorting to a vote. We should reason things out with a diversity of ideas and viewpoints, which is not always possible.

There comes a time in which, if you do not agree to consensus, you have to resort to a vote. I believe this is – how shall I put it? This is the solution in order to work things out when it seems that they are in an endless funnel.

Then, going back to Leon's comment, I do not agree with having first-class and second-class citizens – people that can vote and people that cannot vote. I believe that we can have participation metrics and maybe, if one ALS has spent – and I'm just thinking aloud, thinking about examples that have been addressed or discussed within ALAC. So if an ALS has been inactive for a certain time, then that ALS loses the voting power but not the participation power.

I think this is the way out or the option that I would take. Taking into consideration Leon's comment now to blindly decide "this can vote and this cannot vote," well, that would be a little bit complicated. If that is what you are proposing, Leon, well, this was discussed in Cartagena, at one point in time. I believe this is the way ahead, if you will.

Let us address our third item. I think Dev focused on this when he spoke about an organization, an ALS, that should choose a responsible person. I don't know if there are any comments or if anybody would like to make any contribution about this – that is, being responsible for LACRALO's governance or responsibility in terms of a governance

EN

structure. Any comments of this? Anybody would like to make a comment?

Okay, if there are no comments on this point, I will proceed to item number four: transparency. When we speak about transparency, what do you think we're speaking about in terms of governance within our region? Any ideas for us start discussing transparency in governance?

AIDA NOBILA: I just wanted to say that we have legislation in many countries regarding transparency, and of late we've been seeing that type of legislation. We need to know how things are handled internally, except of course when we're speaking about a certain type of sensitive information. That is transparency, or what transparency is about. So whatever is done has to be adequate or appropriate to the function being performed.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I am now speaking about the old timers – that is Dev and myself and Sylvia that has just joined the call. Have you seen these issues in the region? Has anyone – okay, maybe the word is not seen, but is there anything that could be improved in terms of transparency?

Let me rephrase the question. Is there any room for improvement in terms of transparency? Dev, do you think there is anything that we could create within the region, so as to improve transparency in our governance?

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I should say that one of the things that I noticed – especially when I was serving as Secretariat – was that there's a lot of misunderstanding as to our rules, especially when it came to elections and so forth, the concern about why this process was used and so forth.

Typically, what I try to do was to try to lay out the process beforehand: "This is what's going to happen." I noticed that this has been kept, that "Okay, this is what the process is," that to be transparent, we're going to do this, this, this, this, and this. If there's an explanation that needs to be given regarding if there has to be a change due to a last-minute circumstance, then that has to be explained, as well.

So, that's one thing. I do think sometimes, though, that when you have very short deadlines, there's a perceived lack of transparency because an announcement is given saying, "Well, if nobody says anything in five minutes, then the statement is given and you are considered to have approved it."

Especially when persons – this really comes up in elections, that they did not get the vote credentials or whatever and they weren't even aware that the vote was ongoing. When they try to find out afterwards, "well, the vote is closed," and then they feel disenfranchised. Transparency, I think, also requires adequate time to ensure that everybody's made aware of what is happening when. That's one observation. That's my observation.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Dev. Yes, I do remember your time in – or your tenure in the Secretariat. I do remember that you explained things in advance, and I

must admit that it had a good effect – that is, your explaining things in advance. Sylvia, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Thank you, and apologies for being late. I think I agree with Dev's comment, and he paved the way significantly and he helped me a lot to continue his work in the Secretariat. Evidently, transparency is a practice and a process that we still need to go through and Dev started that process by explaining the way things work.

Unfortunately, our rules of procedure are a little bit vague or ambiguous if you will, and they leave room for things to be randomly worked out or, if you will, interpreted in different ways.

We have people from Latin America, we have people from the Caribbean, and our legal systems and the way we conceive the legal systems are very different and hence the interpretation – our interpretation. Sometimes, some situations were considered as lack of trust when in fact they boil down to a different interpretation.

I have tried to continue what Dev initiated, and we try to explain things and sometimes we read things very, very quickly. We want to reply things quickly on the chat, on Facebook, and we are in a hurry and we do not exactly read – I mean, we are reading, but very quickly and we reply and we send a reply to the list and then we realize that if we had reread that e-mail, maybe we wouldn't even have asked anything about what we read.

I believe that we are building transparency. We are far more transparent now. It doesn't mean that we didn't want to be transparent before. This means that we are learning about this process, so that everybody sees everything and everybody sees that nobody is concealing anything. It's just that sometimes we do not realize that we have to explain the process to the letter. I believe this is what is happening. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Sylvia. Okay. We have four items to address, and I want to keep this call within the hour. We have to focus on efficiency or effective and efficient in terms of governance. That is, governance has to be effective and efficient.

This has to do with management, but also it has to do with participation. On the one hand, we have to focus on governance management. That is, how you manage governance within a structure that should be effective. No doubt, this leads to efficiency. However, our participation within a governance structure should be this way.

Is there any comment on this point? Do you understand that something could be done or maybe we could bring something on board in order to improve on this?

Okay, I see there are no comments, so I will proceed to inclusive and equitable. Those are two other aspects of governance. What do we mean when we speak about inclusive and equitable? No doubt we understand this. I

EN

f we think about "equitable," this has to do with what Leon was commenting on. Is there equitable participation? Is there equitable or equality in terms of rights? That is, if I participate and I am an active participant in the region, it is very likely that I will have the possibility to vote. If I am in the region but I do not make any contribution, is it equitable for me to be able to vote? I think Dev was also addressing this when he addressed participation. What do you think? Is participation feasible and equitable, the way I have described it? Leon, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Sergio. It is very difficult to define effective participation, because, as Raul very well said, not all the ALS participants have the same interests or capacities or the same knowledge in order to get involved in all the topics.

However, we could assume that maybe, throughout a year of activity, there should be at least substantive participation on one of the topics or one of the comments to be published by LACRALO or within At-Large.

I believe we should focus on this aspect in order to determine or reach consensus on what we consider as effective participation. That should be our starting point.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you. Excellent, Leon. Is there anything else you would like to add on this point?

LEON SANCHEZ: No, Sergio, that's my comment. Thank you very much.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sylvia, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Thank you, Sergio. Of course, we have to do what Leon said – that is, we have to sit down and agree on what participation is. We have done so, we did so in Cartagena.

There are some documents, already, in which we started to define what is substantive participation. Is it just answering e-mails? Is it being a member of a working group? How many conference calls do you need to participate or to attend? Let us remember that we are volunteers and sometimes our time, our schedule – we hold these conference calls at 23:00 UTC. That is complicated. Timing is complicated.

The fact that a person is not there when we hold a conference call doesn't mean that the person is not participating, because we have our recordings, we have our transcripts available. There were people from the Caribbean – I believe Fatima, Sergio, and several others working on that – and we have to define exactly that.

That is, certain factors in order to determine this that do not restrict this to one or two requirements. There are many ways in which people can participate, and I believe we should rescue or recover that work that we did in Cartagena.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. We got to Leon's suggestions; I have to admit, it's an interesting suggestion. It reminded me of a novel by Heinlein called Starship Troopers which was made into a movie. Essentially, one of the premises was that the governance system was that you had to serve into the military in order to be able to vote; otherwise, you would not be allowed to vote. Leon's suggestions reminded me of that when he was being interpreted and I was hearing it.

The challenges, of course, as Sylvia was saying, what exactly is the effective participation? Because yes – and in fact, because the transcripts are available of the conference call typically four business days after the call, we have transcripts so the persons don't even have to listen, take the time to listen to it. They could read the conference call in much less time than to listen to the entire hour.   There's   been great improvement from ICANN language services in this regard. I'm not convinced, however, that people are actually doing that, though. I think the challenge would be how do you measure what is effective participation?

I've always advocated for this. We should really be looking at the absence of participation – persons who are not really active in anything at all. To try to have a conversation with them, to say, "Look, is there any particular topic you're interested in? There's this working group working on it, and you can join that working group." Interact with them that way rather than try to legislate something, because if anything,

that's just going to be seen as a disenfranchising person. [inaudible], "Well I'm a volunteer and I'm being excluded and so forth."

Again, from a participation standpoint, we have very good participation in elections. I'm very amazed at the election, how people got involved in elections. It's astounding. I wish the participation in elections was in all of the other working groups and policy statements and ideas on questions and so forth.

But maybe they don't feel – I don't know if the thing to do is to really have [inaudible]. I don't know how to address the problem directly, because even trying to do something like, say, have a survey, they may not even respond to it. I'm not sure, Leon, if what you propose is the right way. It's something to think about. Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Dev. I will now move on to the next item to be addressed; we are running out of time, and there's a very important point. Out of these eight points, there is one very good point that was central in the Costa Rica meeting, and that is the very last one.

However, before that point, we have to focus on – and, please, Silvia Vivanco – on the rule of law. Before that, I will ask Silvia Vivanco to confirm our finishing time.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Sergio, we are only some minutes away from the top of the hour, unfortunately.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay, we have two remaining items that perhaps we might discuss on the Wiki or we might address during our next meeting. One of them has to do with the rule of law – that is, to stick to our rules, to observe our rules. Staff is there to ensure that rules are observed, and to deliver transparency in our management.

But then we have the minorities to take into account, and we have to listen to the voice of the most vulnerable participants. This opens the door to a debate or a discussion about things or topics that were previously discussed within LACRALO, and that is why we have this governance group.

Do you believe we should address this point on the Wiki? Do you believe it is not worth any further discussion? Please, let me know about this so that we can plan our future work ahead because we are some minutes away from bringing this meeting to a close. Dev, you have the floor, go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Sergio. That's to say that I think we do need to have the discussion, so perhaps we can work on it on the Wiki and then have the next conference call. We can discuss those remaining two issues.

I think rule of law's one thing but I think the equity and inclusiveness aspect is really a big issue in LACRALO and I think this is where there's a lot of tensions and misperceptions that there are different factions in

LACRALO and so forth and different sides and some competing. I think this issue requires some time to really discuss, but not right now.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Dev. I agree with you. I think this is crucial. This is a core issue. Now, with so much water under the bridge, we can address this in a more relaxed way and maybe even reach the consensus that we were speaking about. I agree, we should post this on the Wiki, we should discuss this on the Wiki, and then include it as a core point together with the other remaining points to be addressed during our next meeting. Silvia, I will give you the floor before we bring this meeting to a close.

There are some points pending discussion. My concern is our next meeting. I will be on holiday starting now until, I believe, if I remember rightly – until January 20th, I will be on holiday. So, can we hold our next conference on January 20th or do we have the LACRALO conference call?

SILVIA VIVANCO: We should coordinate this with staff. Maybe the call could take place that week, but I cannot tell you right now exactly if it should be possible to hold that call on January 20th. I should have to consult staff, Sergio. I think that we will be holding the monthly call, so maybe the day after could work.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: That week, for sure.

SILVIA VIVANCO: That week. But we have to coordinate that, and I will send you an e-mail.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay, I will be back on the 20th, and I will resume my activities on the 20th, so please feel free to contact me as from then. If you all agree the week that goes from the 20th to the 24th, we would hold our next conference call, we would circulate a Doodle. Leon agrees, Silvia agrees, and I feel that Dev and Juan will also agree.

Before bringing this meeting to a close, there are some items pending discussion, but I want to tell you all it's been a real pleasure and an honor to have been able to work with you throughout all these years. I wish you all a very happy holiday season, Christmas and New Year, and looking forward to seeing you again in 2014. And of course, warm greetings to Sabrina and Veronica.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you, Sabrina, Veronica, and everyone, and have a happy holiday season.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: A very happy holidays and merry Christmas to everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]