
JOSÉ ARCE: We are going to begin our LACRALO Monthly Call for the month of February. I will now give the floor to Julia so she can proceed with the roll call.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you José. On today's LACRALO Monthly Call, on the Spanish channel, we have Antonio Medina Gomez, Franco Moya, Aislan Vargas Basilio, Sylvia Herlein, José Arce, Carlos Vera, Carlos Aguirre, Javier José Pallero, Diego Acosta Bastidas, Alberto Soto, Gonzalo Lopez Pena, Leon Sanchez, Johnny Laureano and Aida Noblia.

On the English channel we have our guest speaker today, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh. We have apologies from Fatima Cambroner, Juan Manuel Rojas and Sergio Salinas Porto. From staff today we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang and myself, Julia Charvolen. Our interpreters today are Sabrina and David.

Can I please remind everyone to state their names when speaking – not only for transcript purposes, but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel? Thank you and over to you, José. [Pause] Tijani and Dev, this is Julia speaking. José has dropped and we're dialing him back right now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Julia. [Pause]

-
- SILVIA VIVANCO: We cannot hear Sylvia Herlein. Sylvia, is your line muted?
- SABRINA: Sylvia Herlein is typing in the AC chat room and she says that she is speaking. The interpreters cannot receive Sylvia Herlein's audio.
- SILVIA VIVANCO: Sylvia Herlein says that she is speaking, but nobody can hear her. I don't know if there's an issue with her line or if she is muted.
- ALBERTO SOTO: José is asking if we can please introduce Tijani in the interest of time. Thank you.
- SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, of course. While José is being re-dialled into the call, I'd like to introduce Tijani as our guest speaker in our Capacity Building Session. he's here to speak about the ICANN Cross-Constituency and ALAC Working Group. Tijani, if you are ready you have the floor. Go ahead please.
- TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Silvia. Thank you very much for inviting me to participate in your call. Juan Manuel asked me to speak about the Working Groups. I will do, but I think that the best thing to do is speak about the Cross-Constituency Working Groups, since you know the ALAC Working Groups very well and some of you are even chairing them. I
-

think it would be best that I speak about the Cross-Constituency Working Groups.

I worked in three Cross-Constituency Working Groups in ICANN. The first was the JAS Working Group. It was a Working Group composed of people from the gNSO and from At-Large in general. This was the first experience for me, and I think it's also the first experience in ICANN, because I don't think there was, before, Cross-Constituency Working Groups. It was a very important experience for me because it shows how it's not very easy to work together between constituencies, at the beginning at least.

This was a difficult task because the subject was difficult also, because finding a way to support applicants for new gTLD strings is not easy, because there are a lot of things, a lot of effects, a lot of interest. It was not easy to find a way to be all together agreeing on some points on recommendations that the Board had to consider.

It was so difficult that after the first Report we issued, the Board asked us to further elaborate some points, especially criteria for giving support to the applicants. We had to redraft a new Charter, and we didn't manage to have a common Charter between the gNSO and ALAC. In the end we worked with two different Charters, and at the very end the gNSO didn't agree on our recommendation.

Fortunately it worked, and we managed to present the recommendation that had been accepted by the ICANN Board, and the first experience of support for new gTLD applicants was made. We were not very happy with the result, but at least there was this first experience and I think it was a very good experience.

The second experience in Cross-Constituency Working Groups is the ICANN Academy. It started as an At-Large initiative and then we tried to make it a Cross-Constituency Working Group and we managed to do so. After two years of work we have not established a real Cross-Constituency Working Group with all constituencies represented.

We implemented our first project. It was the Leadership Capacity Building Program for the new leadership in ICANN. In fact, our first experience wasn't for the new leadership, it was for the leadership in general, and it was in Buenos Aires, as you know. This experience is very different because it started with ALAC and then we invited people to come and participate.

It was, if you want, smoother than the first experience of the JAS Working Group. There wasn't real conflict or contradictory interests, but everyone tried to find the best way to help the efforts in capacity building and learning in ICANN. My third experience in the Cross-Constituency Working Groups was with the MSWG, which is the Meeting Strategy Working Group.

This also is a real Cross-Constituency, because all the constituencies are represented in this Working Group. We've worked now since Beijing, which I think was our first meeting. Our last meeting was in LA a few weeks ago. This is also a different experience because the issue is also complex and controversial. Everyone has his own point of view. Every constituency has its requirements, so we were asked to find common ground and present recommendations.

We finally reached a consensus on some recommendations that will be presented to the Board very soon, because the recommendations are

now ready. The Report is almost ready and it will be passed to the Board. Those are my three experiences in Cross-Constituency Working Group, and to tell you the truth, every experience has its own charm, if you want.

I learnt from the three experiences and I think the diversity is very useful. The diversity enriches you every time you try to work in a broader [argument? 00:12:40]. I think that the Cross-Constituency Working Groups are the work of ICANN as a whole. From this angle we can consider that this is a very important way to influence the decision-making in ICANN.

I think I will stop here and let you ask me any questions you want. I'm ready to answer your questions. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

I see that Carlos Aguirre would like to take the floor. Go ahead.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Tijani, thank you for joining us. Thank you for sharing your experience with us. I have only a brief question, because I also participated in these Cross-Constituency Working Group, especially in the very first one you mentioned; the JAS Working Group. I would like to know the difference you have noticed between the JAS Working Group and the MSWG – the one that has to do with the organization of meetings and the like.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Carlos. Yes, there is a very big difference between those two Working Groups, because the first was a Working Group between the gNSO and the ALAC only and the last one was between all ICANN constituencies. This is the first difference. The second difference: the first one was about money; about giving money to people.

You understand very well how difficult it is, how complex it is, to find a common ground and to approve on criteria to give money to people. As you know Carlos – you were with us and I remember that very well – there was a real fight, not in the worst meaning, but a good fight, to reach some recommendations. They were especially for developing countries, if you remember.

I was fighting to get something for the developing countries, while some of the participants who are from the contracted parties, and who don't perhaps understand that we have to support those applicants from developing countries, it wasn't easy to reach those recommendations. The JAS Working Group had a big impact on the image of ICANN, because the New gTLD Program was seen as a program of the rich, for the interest of the rich also.

People saw it as a program for which there is no access for the poor people, because, firstly, of the application fees, and also, secondly, for the other fees, the other costs, of a technical platform, etcetera. ICANN needed this program to show that ICANN is not only for the rich. It's for people from developing countries, people from poor communities, etcetera. For the MSWG it is another complexity. It's about the new organization of the ICANN meetings.

To tell you the truth, when we started we were a little bit divided, because there are people who had it in mind to reduce the number of meetings, for example every three years. Other wanted to reduce the duration of the meeting, from six or seven days to perhaps four or something like that. Also, when we started, there was another... People thought that it was better to have hubs to organize the meetings and not to rotate around the world.

This is the entry problem; that people came with different perspectives. Fortunately, through the work we tried to converge and find a common ground, and now we'll present you with our recommendations, very soon, and you'll see that it's a good compromise. It's a good way to evolve the meeting strategy, and not to harm the image of ICANN or the [effectiveness? 00:19:24] of ICANN. I hope I answered your question.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Yes, of course Tijani. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Are there any other questions?

SILVIA VIVANCO: I see Alejandro Pisanty would like to take the floor. Go ahead please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I would like to make a comment regarding what Tijani said about the duration of the meetings, and how that's related to developing countries. Throughout the years, ICANN meetings have become longer

in duration; both the ICANN meeting proper, as well as some other meetings organized by the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group and some other groups related to At-Large.

This means that we need to extend the work, because we have plenty of people that need to attend all these events, and different developing countries have to agree on this. This is regarding the needs of people that work, and also volunteers within ICANN that come from developing countries, that can hardly leave their jobs to attend the events.

This favors the northern countries or the people that only go to the ICANN meeting, per se, but do not have other work commitments. In the interest of equality, we have to monitor the duration of the ICANN meetings.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alejandro for your remark. I think that there is a compromise to find between the duration of the meetings, and the commitment of people that come to those meetings. We have to agree on something. The ICANN meetings have an objective, have goals, and we have to not lose those goals.

The ICANN meetings have several facets. First of all, the internal work of the ACs and SOs. Second, the cross-community work. Third, the outreach; the social events, etcetera. We need to find a way to get all this work done without making the meeting very long, so that people will be disadvantaged because they're losing time in their work at home, and not to make it too short and make the ICANN meeting less and the work not be done.

This is a compromise we try to find. There was also another concern that I didn't speak about. The first concern is why this review of the meeting strategy was done. It was because the meeting staff said that they have more and more difficulties in finding venues that can accommodate so many people, especially in the developing countries.

Staff proposed to work in hubs. They wanted to choose Singapore and another country in Europe and make them hubs, so that most of the meetings would be done there and the period of rotation for the other continents would be longer. This would cause a lot of problems. The first is that there is no real inclusiveness, because when you go to a region other people from the other regions come if they have the money and time to come.

But if you go to their region, even poor people or people from developing countries can go to those meetings. If you restrict the meetings to some hubs you would make the attendance very selective. This is one of the problems, and there are others. Don't forget that those countries where you can find the large venues are the countries where obtaining a visa is the most difficult.

In Europe, to have a Schengen visa, for example for African countries, it's not easy to get it. This is another problem. As you see, there are a lot of things to consider, and I hope that you'll get our proposal for public comments and I hope that you'll find our proposal constructive and helpful for everyone to follow the ICANN meeting without any harm to anyone. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you very much Tijani. While we are waiting for José Arce to join the call I'd like to continue with the Agenda. The third Item on today's Agenda is Brazil Internet Governance Summit 2014. I'd like to give the floor to Leon Sanchez. You have ten minutes to talk about this.

LEON SANCHEZ: Good afternoon to you all. I'd like to confirm that you're listening to me please?

SILVIA VIVANCO: We hear you fine.

LEON SANCHEZ: In relation to the Working Group, for the preparation for the Brazil meeting, I've recently sent a report where I've explained that we've had eight meetings for the past eight weeks and in these meetings we've discussed the different goals that the group has. The people who are appointed by the committee have participated, and also people who are in the SOs and ACs. We also had people from staff and senior people, like Fadi Chehadé and others.

Throughout the discussions that we've had in this group, we've not really reached a conclusion, but we've reflected on the need that this group should become a group with a much larger version than just the meeting in Brazil. There's been a proposal that these groups work on the role that ICANN should have around Internet governance, and to provide some support or give some constant positioning by this group to staff and the ICANN senior staff.

These are the positions that should be stated on behalf of the ICANN Committee. I have sent some links. In one of them you can see the draft of the group Charter. It's still in a very early phase. We're working a lot on this. You can see here what the decisions are that we can make, especially what the way has been to link the work of the Working Group with different communities and the way in which the group should issue its recommendations or its opinions in relation to the work being conducted.

We're also working on the definitions document, whose link I've also sent to the mailing list. We're asking for collaboration from all interested parties, to see if we can define different contexts that are relevant; both for the tasks that the group will conduct, as well as the scope of the recommendations made by the group. Today's participation is restricted only to members who are part of the group. However, any person can take part in the call as an observer, and in the case of LACRALO I can be the channel to bring about the comments that we have. I can serve as a liaison in that case.

We're also planning to have a series of meetings in Singapore with respect to the Internet governance in general and the ICANN concept within the Internet governance ecosystem. One of them is being organized by the [NCUC? 00:32:00]. This will be held on the 21st, before the formal commencement of the ICANN meeting. There are also some other mechanisms to concern those who are interested and want to attend.

There will also be another meeting. We haven't really defined the time it will be held, though it will probably happen on Monday. The time

hasn't been exactly defined. The vision of this meeting is that it should be an open meeting with crowd participation, but with the same [tenor? 00:32:47] of the teleconferences – that is only those members who are part of the group will have active participation, whereas the others can participate as observers.

There are several items to be defined here. You can check the link that I sent to the mailing list, so that you can have a better idea of the issues to be defined, and evidently I advise you that if you have any contribution or anything you'd like to say, you can talk about this or you can mention this to me so I can add it to the list and send it to the whole group. Thank you very much.

JOSÉ ARCE:

Is there anybody who'd like to ask Leon a question? Okay, thank you Leon for your participation. I see that Carlos has just raised his hand. Carlos, would you like to take the floor?

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

I would just like to ask Leon, what is the possibility for participation for those Internet users who want to participate in this meeting? What are the actual possibilities of participating? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Carlos. Because this is still in a planning phase, I would not [bear? 00:34:47] ensuring that it will be closed only to the members who are part of this group. The idea is to have this as open as possible, but I

cannot really assure you that it will be held that way. Mechanisms have not been defined for a broader participation.

There is no doubt that when this is defined I will update you, so that those of you who are interested – and I'm sure you are – can participate in a broader and more productive way.

JOSÉ ARCE: Thank you Leon. Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you José. We are talking here about the work for the Brazil meeting. [Interpreter: audio indecipherable] There should be no objections to this and... [Interpreter apologizes. Audio unclear]

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alejandro. I will start with the group in the next session. I will add this to the mailing list, and when I have a response with suggestions I will update you.

JOSÉ ARCE: Thank you very much Leon. We're going to continue with the Agenda. If anyone else has a question, please ask it. The next item is the update on the Working Group. There are several issues here. Let's see who would like to take the floor first. There is Sergio, for the Governance Working Group, and the gTLD Working Group. There is also the Regional Strategy Working Group. Sergio, are you here to talk about these groups?

I do not see Sergio online. Can you please check if Sergio is connected to this call? Okay, he sends his apologies. Dev, would you like to take the floor to talk a little bit about the outlook of what's going on in the Regional Strategy Working Group?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much. Regarding the LAC regional strategy, myself and Fatima are working on a Communication Plan. One of the things we'll be doing is trying to put together, and asking for assistance one, is a template of an inventory of ICANN resources. The idea being that we'll try to put together all the information – because there's a lot of information available about ICANN and the various ACs and SOs.

If you just wanted to put all of them in one location, the link... Let me post the link to where people can make their contributions. It's a Google Spreadsheet. If you go to that link you'll then see some of the links, such as audio and video links, PDF reports and so forth. So I'd invite anyone who wants to help put together this information to please go to that link and edit the spreadsheet.

With regards to the rest of the Communications Plan, being the establishment of the website and so forth, the structure of the site... Sorry, let me say that again: a preliminary website structure for this website has been proposed, and it was [inaudible 00:40:05]. That link will also be posted up on the Wiki shortly, by the end of this week, for comment.

There hasn't been much activity... I've not heard from many of the other activities and projects from the LAC Regional Strategy, so hopefully I

think we'll want to have a conference call soon to find out more about what the other Working Groups are doing since the Buenos Aires meeting. Okay? I think I can stop there. That's it.

JOSÉ ARCE: Are there any questions? Alberto, I see you've raised your hand?

ALBERTO SOTO: I have just one question for Dev. I have a lot of issues that I took from it. My suggestion is to try to separate this by language. There is one single caller for three languages and then another caller for two languages. For those of us who'd like to search and have some language issues, perhaps it might be nice to have this separated in three languages and three different colors. Is this feasible? For the rest of it I agree totally with your separation. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks for that Alberto. Indeed, I'll talk to Fatima. As you know she's traveling right now, but when she returns we'll look to take that suggestion and implement that. Thanks.

JOSÉ ARCE: Thank you. I see that Diego has a question here?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I was just trying to translate it properly. Regarding [Oscar? 00:42:51] [Overtalking].

JOSÉ ARCE: Diego? I'm sorry Dev. There are still some issues here.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I'll stop.

JOSÉ ARCE: Until we resolve the Adobe issues... There is a Leveling Working Group. I think Aida is the Chair there. Could you write down on the chat room if you want to make a comment there? If you'd like to inform the whole region on the chat room on what the Leveling Group is doing? it would also be nice if you could provide us with a deadline that this group has so that we can start [right now? 00:43:44] what we did last year. It's been some time now since then.

To continue with the Agenda, Item #5, with the LACRALO and LACNIC activities there are several issues. I see on Item #1, Carlos is in the Communications Group. Carlos, would you like to take the floor?

CARLOS AGUIRRE: As you know, in June we will have meeting #50 in ICANN in London, and at the same time, and in the same place, we'll be holding what we call the ATLAS II Meeting, or the At-Large Summit. It's number two, because three or four years ago we had ATLAS I in Mexico. The At-Large community met together with representatives from different ALSes. I think that was in 2009.

The representatives of each ALS met and they had a very good discussion on key issues that concern the different users. Right now, we're defining the Working Group led by Eduardo Diaz, and defining the Agenda to be discussed in this meeting in London. Within this ATLAS II Working Group we've also considered many items that should be included, and among them one of the issues that touches me directly, because I am the Chair of this Sub-Working Group, together with Natalia Enciso and [inaudible 00:46:10] from Paraguay, is the issue that's related to communication.

This communications Group encompasses and includes the creation of a newsletter and the creation of a web page, together with imagining what could be the souvenirs or the gifts to be given during this meeting. Now, in relation to the first item – the web page and the newsletter – we've had a first meeting of Co-Chairs and we have established a few issues that we'll try to agree together on, with the more than 20 volunteers we have in the Group, from all the regions.

Although, we are missing some volunteers from the Asia Pacific region. If you know someone from that region who'd like to work in that Working Group, just tell them to communicate with us and join us. They'd be very welcome to provide us with the Asia Pacific impression and idea in this Working Group. Our first meeting will be held this week. Today we launched a Doodle to agree on the date and time for it.

For those of you who'd like to participate, there are many members in our region who are involved in this Working Group, but we also welcome new members, because we have an important task ahead. So you're all welcome to our meeting. When the Doodle is closed and we've set a

time and a date I'll send an email to the region to inform them of when the meeting will be held – it will happen this week, as I was telling you – and we hope you'll join us.

Thank you very much. I hope to see you in London in June. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

This is a question to Carlos and the rest of those organizing the Summit. I'd like to call upon you so that the organization, the times and places etcetera, can be chosen in such a way that they do not interfere with the main activities and days of the ICANN Meeting. Because even though it's important to hold the At-Large community together, this community has a task within ICANN and this task can only be conducted properly by participating in the substantial issues in ICANN. Thank you.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

I will convey your opinion during the meeting that we'll hold this week. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

I think José has lost his audio. I would like to continue with the Agenda. The next Item is to discuss... I think we can go to #6 – elections for the Presidency and Secretariat of LACRALO. Sylvia Herlein-Leite has five minutes to talk about electing the Chair and the Secretary. Sylvia, can you speak? I think Sylvia cannot really speak, so if you'll allow me I'll try to provide you with an outlook on the calendar.

As was announced – you can see this on the Wiki page – the nominations period has already concluded and we have the candidates who've accepted their nominations. For the LACRALO Chair we have Sergio Salinas Porto and Alberto Soto. For the LACRALO Secretariat we have Humberto Carrasco and Juan Manuel Rojas. Both of them have accepted their nominations.

We will hold a 90-minute teleconference for questions and expositions of those candidates during this week. Then we'll have seven days to vote; to express the will of the ALSes. It's going to be an online vote that will be held from March 8th to March 15th, according to the Rules of Procedure that LACRALO has.

By the end of the voting period, the votes will be counted in accordance with Rule 12.9 of the Rules of Procedure of LACRALO. Elected authorities will hold their positions for a one-year period from March 28th. This will happen after the meeting in Singapore, and their mandate will continue until the first ICANN Meeting in approximately March of 2015.

Please be aware of the 90-minute teleconference that will be announced for the questions and expositions for the Chair and Secretariat of LACRALO this week. Do you have any questions? Please go ahead Carlos.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

The only question I have, or concern actually, is that I hope the four candidates will be present on the teleconference this week so that we can ask them openly. I'd like to ask you Silvia – because you're

organizing and coordinating this teleconference – what will be the question method? Will we ask questions loudly on the teleconference, or will we send an email? How do you think this is going to be held?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

The methodology needs to be coordinated with José Arce and Sylvia Herlein. That's because we've had similar things on previous occasions. You can send questions to the list and we can compile them and put them on the Wiki page. We'll then read them aloud during the teleconference. You can also ask questions continuously during the teleconference, but we can advance some questions and put them on the list.

We the staff, together with the Secretariat and Sylvia Herlein-Leite, we can put them on the Wiki so that they are ready for the teleconference.

SYLVIA HERLEIN:

It would be nice if questions could be sent in advance so that they can be compiled.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Is there any other questions regarding election? On the English channel, do you have any questions?

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ:

Goodnight to you all. Unfortunately I couldn't connect on time. I had some communication issues. The question I would like to ask is that the outgoing Chair and Secretariat can provide a general idea of what

happened during the time when they held those positions. Thank you very much.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Can you please ask specifically what your question is, or your concern?

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: I'm trying to make a reminder, because before José Arce and Sylvia Herlien became Chair and Secretariat of LACRALO...

SILVIA VIVANCO: Just to repeat what you've said – you suggest some kind of reminder of what has been the time in which José Arce and Sylvia Herlein held the Chair and the Secretariat positions? If there are no further questions regarding elections I'd like to proceed to Item #7 on the Agenda, and that's the MOU between LACRALO and LACNIC and the next steps. I don't know if José, who wanted to speak about this topic, has worked out his audio issues. Maybe he can type his comments in the AC chat room.

SABRINA: José Arce is typing about the MOU. Next week the first draft will be ready for community comment. Silvia Vivanco is asking José to provide a summary of what he wanted to say.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I see there are some audio issues. We cannot hear José. I'll proceed to Item #8 – ALAC news or updates. Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. The ALAC is currently voting on two statements – one was the draft criteria and process for selection of the Multistakeholder Ethos Award Pilot Program. There is also a second statement, which was a review of the trusted community representation in the root zone DNSSEC key-signing ceremonies. I note that there was a lot of contribution from LACRALO.

Apart from myself there was Aida Noblia, Fatima Cambroner, Alejandro, all making several comments on the statement that's now currently being voted on. In terms of new policy statements that the ALAC is now considering whether to look at it or not – one is the proposed review mechanism to address perceived inconsistent [expert determinations? 01:00:30] on string confusion objections.

What is this? This is referring to that as part of the New gTLD Program, one of the processes by which applicants can file objections on string confusion, that the string could potentially be considered confusing if the [board? 01:00:52] were deployed in the root.

Now, what happened was that in two cases some applicants filed objections to multiple applications for the same string, and the string confusion objector, in reviewing the case, made different determinations. The two determinations were on .car versus .cars, and .cam versus .com. Because of these perceived inconsistencies, several

principles have now been posted by the ICANN Board's New gTLD Program Committee, and that's what the policy is about.

The second statement that's also being considered is the translation and transliteration of contact information. Now, this is more of a request from the gNSO, which is currently undergoing a policy development process on whether to proceed with the issues report regarding translation and transliteration of contact information.

This is referring to... Well, a lot of the contact information has been in the ASCII, which is English characters. But as with IDNs, which obviously don't use English, having been deployed in the root, there is therefore a need for this information to be captured. However, it's how to improve WHOIS in order to be able to capture this information. There was an issues report that was posted some time last year, and the request is now for us to make some comments on this issues report.

So that's one issue that's been up for comment and discussion by the ALAC as to whether to file a comment on that. I should note that a policy that we commented on, and in fact the ALAC voted on in, I believe, late December, was regarding the Technical Liaison Group by [Law divisions? 01:03:51]. I know many in LACRALO made a comment on this, and this was accommodated in the statement that the ALAC voted on in December.

The ICANN Board has reviewed the comment and in a sense, the ICANN Board has disagreed with those recommendations. It's stated... Now, just to confirm what our statement was saying: we expressed support for the intent to increase the availability of technical advice to the

Board, and the effectiveness of the Technical Liaison Group. There are two proposals that we made.

We said that the [delimitation? 01:04:37] of the Technical Liaison Group Liaison to the ICANN Board not occur until a mechanism to seek [inaudible 01:04:43] advice from the Technical Liaison Group was in place. We also posed the removal of the NomCom Technical Liaison Group delegate, on the basis that that removal would likely hinder the community outreach by the NomCom to the various technical communities.

The rationale given by the Board said two things: one, that the Board has already reached out to ask for the Technical Liaison Group to be filled, and it also said that regarding the concern regarding the NomCom delegate, the Board noted that the four organizations that make up the Technical Liaison Group were already engaged in community outreach efforts.

Curiously, it also said that the action of removing the Liaison, and removing the delegate, was anticipated to have a positive physical impact on ICANN, and would provide a financial [feeding? 01:05:50] to ICANN. I thought that was very unusual. I think those are the key ALAC issues that are present. I'll stop now.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you Dev. I'd like to give the floor to Alejandro Pisanty and after that to Carlton Samuels.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you Silvia. Thank you Dev for your comprehensive report. I'd like to make some comments on the points you've raised, especially the one regarding the DNSSEC signing ceremonies. I think the draft prepared by Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro was very satisfactory because it reflected divergent positions but reached no resolution. So we have to pay attention to that document to make sure that this is favorably resolved.

Dev and the other ALAC representatives, well, we have to task you with this specifically. Regarding the Ethos Award, the way it's put forward, well, I think it's a little bit [strange/tainted? 01:07:25] with being amicable and being cordial. It's focused on being collegial, but effectiveness and achievement and transparency, in terms of conflict of interest, are not given the same weight.

That would be equally important in terms of ethics, in terms of ethos in LACRALO, in ALAC and in ICANN in general. Finally, regarding the last topic that Dev very comprehensively described – the transliteration of IDN data in the WHOIS, well, I believe we have to ask ourselves what the interest of the LACRALO community is. Our domain names in our region, in Spanish, Portuguese, English, etcetera, are not really affected by this issue.

However, we might wonder if there is a specific interest – because some people act as WHOIS because of their job –, maybe they're interested in having correct and consistent transliterations of Hebrew, Chinese or Arabic. We have to focus or wonder how much representation or delegation we need from LACRALO. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Alejandro for your comments. I'll now give the floor to Carlton Samuels. Carlton, go ahead please. You have the floor.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Silvia. I wanted to make a comment on the translation/transliteration with respect to contact data for registration directory services. Firstly, this issue has been with the Expert Working Group on WHOIS and we've spent quite some time discussing the issue on two points of merit. The first one is whether or not we would disenfranchise users that use the Latin script in the event they're impacted by events from the IDN scripts; whether it's Arabic or Chinese or so on.

The feeling right now is that there should be at least some effort to make translations available, and then the issue becomes, "Well, if that is a service, who would be responsible for providing it, and who would the cost of providing the service go to?" We have not come to any decision on that, but you may have seen a lively discussion taking place right now on the ALAC list about these two particular issues.

I agree with Alejandro that with respect to LACRALO's interest, it's not so much a direct interest to us, since most of the websites in this area would naturally be in a Latin script that we can all read, if not translate. But our involvement is not so much about websites that are provisioned in this region, but whether or not we could be impacted by issues that come from websites that are provisioned outside of this region and are in IDN-type scripts.

That's our only issue here. It's a small one and the risk is probably quite low, but that is something that we should bear in mind, to decide how much we should invest in this issue. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you Carlton for your comments. If there are no further questions regarding ALAC then we'll proceed to Item #9 on the Agenda – the ICANN Strategy Panel; regarding ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem. Alejandro Pisanty, you have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you. I will focus mainly on the Strategy Panel on ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem. Carlton Samuels is also part of that group. We've worked very hard on a comprehensive document and an executive summary in order to explore – as we mentioned in our last call – ICANN's activities within this context. In the document we explore certain principles that could be the foundation for ICANN's evolution, and for the evolution of other organizations within the ecosystem.

We present a very cautious, rational proposal. We're in our final editing phase of this document in preparation for publication, and surely it will be published in the coming days. Other panels have engaged in other activities. We have the Panel chaired by Beth Noveck. That Panel has been very active; making several proposals, and the Panel on Public Responsibility is also ready.

Also, the Identifier Technology Innovation held a meeting and a webinar and internal meetings, and this has been very interesting. Thank you. I believe that Carlton can supplement by presentation.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Alejandro. I believe Carlton has left the call. Next on our Agenda we have Item #10 – the Meeting Strategy Working Group that met in Los Angeles. Sylvia Herlein has typed a comment in the AC Chat Room. She’s saying that Tijani spoke about this topic, that he summarized what went on in Los Angeles, and the first draft published by this Working Group will be published shortly; in a couple of days.

I believe that we can bring this call to a close. Before that, I see that Carlos Aguirre is raising his hand. Go ahead please Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you Silvia. Before we bring the meeting to a close I’d like to welcome the new participants that join us. They come from Aegia Densi, Argentina: Gonzalo Lopez Pena, Franco Moya, Candelaria Lopez Castro and also Javier Pallero. I would like to officially introduce them and thank them for their participation as volunteers. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Carlos Aguirre. I join you in thanking these volunteers. On behalf of staff I welcome the new members to the LACRALO community and thank them for their participation. Dev is also raising his hand. Go ahead please Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I just want to make a reminder regarding the Community Regional Outreach Travel Program, or CROPP. It's just a reminder about what the CROPP allows for: up to five trips within the region that could take place before June 30th 2014. There are certain terms and conditions attached to this CROP Program, and I posted this to the list some time ago. I'll probably post it again tonight.

The important thing is that any applications to the CROPP have to be filed at least eight weeks before any such travel can take place. Given that the deadline for when the travel can take place is June 30th 2014, that means that really you only have time to file something by the end of mid-April. The region needs to really consider any particular outreach effort it wants to go to. That's one thing.

Second thing: I know that there was an organization that applied to be an accredited At-Large structure. Can I find out the status of that application? Do we need to send regional advice, for example? That's it.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Dev. Thank you for your reminder. Is there any further comment? I cannot see the Adobe Connect room either, so unfortunately I don't know if people are raising their hand.

ALBERTO SOTO: I would like to take the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Go ahead please Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is a personal issue, that was going to be raised by José Arce, but he's got communication issues. Today he received the definite list of participants attending the meeting in London, and the former representative of my organization is included on that list, despite the fact that I updated my information in the survey. I think it was in the November or December ALAC meeting that I noted that mistake.

I noted that you sent out the survey to the prior representative, who forwarded the survey to me on that very same day. I completed the survey. Anyway, there must have been a mistake because the prior representative was included on the list, so I really hope you can work that out. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Alberto for putting forth your concern on the record. Please send an email to staff and I'll immediately forward this to the people in At-Large taking care of this. If there has been a mistake we'll do what we can in order to work it out, but thank you very much for that point of clarification.

Well, finally, I'd like to bring this meeting to a close. I'd like to thank you all for your participation and apologize for any technical issues or challenges. I'd like to thank all the new participants, the newcomers, and also the usual participants that are always joining us. Thank you very much and we look forward to meeting you this Thursday at midnight UTC for the LACRALO elections and candidate call. Good night

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]