JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Welcome everyone to the LACRALO governance call on Monday, 27th January, 2014. On the call today we have on the Spanish channel, Oscar Garcia, Jose Arce, Aida Noblia, Raul Bauer, Leon Sanchez, Juan Manuel Rojas, Vanda Scartezini, and Carlton Samuels. We have on the English channel Dev Anand Teelucksingh. And we have apologies from Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Sergio Salinas Porto.
	And from staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Julia Charvolen. And our interpreters are Veronica and David. I see that Fatima Cambronero has just joined us. May I please remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcript purposes, and to allow interpreters to identify you on the other language channel. Thank you and over to you Jose.
JOSE ARCE:	This is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much Julia. This is Jose Arce. Thank you Julia. Hello Sylvia, hello Veronica, hello David, and hello to all the participants on both channels. Thank you very much for your participation in this call. I would like to tell you that today, very early in the morning, I received a phone call from Sergio, and for personal reasons and professional reasons, he was not able to participate or attend this meeting, this call, so he asked me to be the chair for this call.
	So, I was very willing to do that, and today I will be the chair of this call because this is a very important working group and we need definitions. So we will discuss the pending action items, or the pending items on the agenda. We have a topic that was very well discussed last call, that was

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.

the definition of good governance. [?] was to delayed and discuss these characteristics and see if we do all agree with this, so as to be able to move forward and proceed with the development of this working group and the task for this working group.

So, I will read this allowed and please, while I'm reading, and while we take the floor, please let me know if this is the idea we have, so as to use this as a way to understand our objective. Good governance has three, eight main characteristics. It is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective, and efficient. It is also inclusive and follows the rule of law. [?] minimize and the views of the minority are taken into account, and that the voices are the most able to be heard in decision making.

It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society. We had already read this definition, so the idea is to now discuss and talk about this. Take the floor and see if we want to adopt this definition of good governance as one of the main goals, or the ideas for this working group to keep on working for the region. So I now open the floor for questions and comments regarding this definition.

Jose Arce speaking. I see Fatima. Fatima, you have the floor, go ahead please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much Jose, this is Fatima for the record. Can you hear me?

EN

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Yes, loud and clear, go ahead please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: So this is Fatima speaking. Thank you very much. I apologize because in the previous call, I wasn't able to participate. I was listening to the MP3 files and perhaps I am saying something that has always been discussed. The first call that we had, Dev provided this definition of good governance, and I remember that we had been discussing this.

I want to say first of all that I do agree with this concept of good governance, and we said that this was the principle, this could be translated into a principle for us to create or define our objectives. So the idea is… Or my question is, do we still have this into account? I mean do we, are we going to take this definition into account so that we can derive the objective of this working group? So this is my question for those who have participated in the previous call, and perhaps you can let me know about this. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Fatima, yes, I think we still have our same bases, on the same line. So, if there is no other comment, or a comment against this, we can proceed along these lines. I see that there are many people typing on the AC room, so Vanda, you have your hand up. Please go ahead. [?] Jose speaking. Vanda, you have the floor, go ahead please. [?]

This is Jose Arce speaking. I think Vanda is not listening to us, or is not, I mean I see that her audio is very choppy or she is saying that her audio

EN

is choppy. But I think that we all agree with this definition for us to move forward with the discussion. I mean, we all agree with this definition of good governance. So I believe we can proceed or move forward to the following item on the agenda. I see that Dev is typing the, posting the link for the transcript for the last call.

So let's go to item number four so that we can discuss or debate about our, the change, or about our regulations, or about our rules. I mean, I think that this is the opportunity to say that we want to change or amend anything in our rules. What do you think about this? Is it necessary to change our rules? I believe that it is necessary and we take into account how the region works, and the interaction of a different member, and this is all because for a long time we have been experiencing, or seeing these differences in our points of view, and the difference between the Caribbean region and the rest of us in Latin America.

So I think that throughout the dialogue and discussion, we have been able to grow as a region, and little by little all the different ideas and thoughts from the different organizations being part of LACRALO, well I believe that the rules of LACRALO are confusing, they confuse somehow… We are not able to understand perhaps, correctly the rules and the sense and the meaning of the rules perhaps are taking very literally and sometimes this is not good for the region.

And perhaps we are also facing problems that we – were no solution is possible, and perhaps if we can give a clear definition, or a clearer sense to this rule, or a better definition, well that will be very good for the region.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: This is Juan Manuel speaking. May I take the floor. This is Juan Manuel Rojas speaking. Well, I would say that I would agree with you in terms of what you say about the rules, but I also remember that not long ago there was a change in the rules of procedure, in the ALAC rules of procedure. So, as far as I understand, these rules also affect us. And my question is, I mean it's related to that. We have new rules of procedure, but how do they effect, or how will these rules affect us if we change our own rules? Because I know the other rules have been modified, have been changed.

So perhaps there might be a kind of incompatibility among those rules and our rules. And it would be to harmonize the rules. So that is my question basically.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Fatima you have the floor, go ahead please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you Jose. I am Fatima. Sorry, I was muted, and I couldn't speak. First of all I would like to say that, I think the question was not properly done, at least when it comes to the definition of rule… I mean, we have operating principles and bylaws in LACRALO, so the idea would be, or the question should be, if it is necessary to change our operating principles and bylaws.

I have already mentioned this before. My point of view is that this working group should be fine, which are the operating rules, or which

part of the bylaws are to be amended or modified, but it is not the task of this working group in itself. And this is related to what Juan Manuel says. ALAC, I think in April last year, issued or amended its rules of procedure, and the idea is that the RALOs may adopt their own rules of procedure to the ALAC rules of procedures.

So the idea would be to harmonize the ALAC rules together… I mean, in fact, the, yes. The ALAC rules with our LACRALO rules. Now, if we are going to vote this in the general assembly in London, well we are running out of time, so we will need to discuss which rules should be modified, and we should produce a document with the new rules that are being proposed. I don't know what you think about this, but I think this is very difficult because we do not have much time.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Yes, two things. First of all, I would like to mention, or read, what Carlton has typed. He says, I am interested in which characteristics we think we are lacking in our government, governance arrangement. So this would be a point. If you type your answers to this, I would like to say the following. I mean, Fatima, all the work that has been done, because you have been a very active participant, and perhaps Dev because you have been participating in this to improve language barriers.

So this would be a kind of waste of time if we repeat the work, because we are at a stage in our region where we have a good understanding of this. And of course, we need commitments, this is what we're lacking. But taking this into account, we can say that we need commitment. If

we don't have commitment, if we're not committed to working, well everything would be impossible. But if we are able to achieve commitment, then our understanding will improve.

But of course, this is the most difficult thing to achieve in LACRALO. And this is our challenge, I would say. And part of this challenge, well, is to achieve a commitment. This is one of the topics. Now I am reading the comments that are being posted on the AC room. Thank you Vanda. You agree. I [?] with you, we have time. Vanda, I see your hand up, would you like to take the floor to express your comment? Vanda, we are not hearing you. Okay, Fatima, I see your hand up. Go ahead please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Jose, this is Fatima speaking. Thank you Jose. Well, I didn't mention this effort [?] for the Costa Rican meeting before, and it is true, I mean, it is not good to waste or to lose all of the effort made and all the consensus achieved, but when I say, at that time we did not have the new ALAC rules, but we can divide or we make the difference between operating rules and operating principles, and in that case, I mean, we can focus on that.

We can take what has been done, and based on that, well we can check and see what can be applied. Perhaps we can work with that. And of course, I do agree with you in that we cannot lose all the effort that we made before.

EN

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Dev, you have the floor, go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. I have to admit, when I think about the ALAC rules of procedure, maybe I have to look at the link again and study it, but I'm not thinking – I'm trying to think of any particular example that requires a change in all rules of procedure. So I'm really not certain about, okay, the ALAC has updated its rules of procedure, but I'm not certain there is any particular change in the ALAC rules of procedure that requires, well we need to change ours.

So, you think that as a basis as, well, we need to change ours. I don't think that's an appropriate thing, unless there is some specific clause in the ALAC rules of procedure that requires us to look at our, the way we select ALAC candidates and so forth. So that's one thing. I think that any changes really needs to go back to the definition of what we considered to be good governance, and looking at how, and I say if, there are changes to be made, a change that could improve the governance.

So it's [?] identify while I was looking at that definition, do you think LACRALO meets those characteristics of governance?   Of good governance? And if not, why not? And we talked about a few of those things before, in the last call, but what would that be, the appropriate solution that would require changing the bylaws. And I have to say, I don't really want to create too many changes to the bylaws at this point in time, but I will be interested in specific bylaw changes that will achieve good governance. So, that's it.

EN

JOSE ARCE: Dev, this is Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much for your comment, it is very precise. Carlton, could you please clarify so that we can discuss and perhaps have an action item, or question. I mean, could you, because, I mean you're talking about the characteristics, or speaking about the characteristics we lack in terms of governance. So, I mean, what is your point, when it comes to this?

And once we have that clarification, we will be able to move forward. Either we can discuss that, or we can leave that as an action item for next, for the future. Carlton, would you like to take the floor? Or perhaps you can type in the AC room.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton. Can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. If you look… It's Carlton for the record here. Although you said the principles, the operating principles that came out of ALAC are the ones that we should embrace as [?], and then you look from those operating principles, there comes of rules of procedures. The rules of procedures are intended to conserve and reinforce the operating principles.

It is important if our objective [?] to look at the attributes, the characteristics, of good governance and the ones that are named in the document that we are all agreed, includes consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, [?] inclusive, effective and efficient, follows the rules of laws. Where you have the rule of law there, we would want to make sure that we're not talking about rule of law as it was in a legal framework individually, because that would mean individual countries or anything.

There is a set of rules and principles that are called a natural law, that we can all agree on. And then of course, there is the participatory of characteristics, which is the one that I think you're going to have some problems with in determining metrics, because unless we have some metrics, we will not know how well we are tracking this – the attributes of good governance which we are committed. That's the point I was trying to make Jose, thank you.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Carlton, thank you very much for your clarification. My idea was to produce or drop the document, I mean I have already mentioned in another call, I think perhaps we can have a reduced group of people working on a document, and perhaps those people, or those members, should be people knowledgeable about the characteristics of the attributes. And this will help us to improve the relationship of the members of a region.

So we need to take into account the text in of itself, but also the experience that we have, because otherwise we will be in the wrong

way, or the wrong path. You mentioned, Carlton, the issue of the metrics, and we know that our region is very complicated in that sense because sometimes people, or a person, the hand to participate or to be against perhaps, or in disagreement, with another member of participants.

And sometimes we are not dealing with people who use their common sense to achieve what we know or what we call consensus. Perhaps sometimes in our regions, the word consensus is a taboo word. So my idea would be to have a draft of this rule, and based on consensus or means of a vote, perhaps we can reach London and to change the rules to what our common sense determines.

And unless there is opposition, I think that in a vote, consensus and common sense will be the winners. We have been growing throughout time, and of course we need to discuss and take into account consensus. I see that Vanda has had a comment on the AC room. Is there any other comment or question regarding this item on the agenda? Otherwise, we will leave this as an action item, that is to say the creation of a sub working group to produce a proposal, to create a proposal. What do you think?

Let's leave this for next call. I mean, we should have a group of two or three people, I mean to have a sub group, so that a proposal could be drafted and to have our information. We should draft this document and discuss this document internally in our next call, and then we can open that document to the rest of the region. Otherwise, we would be working against the principles of good governance.

EN

Let me know if you agree with that so that we can move forward with the agenda. Let make a clarification. This draft that I am requesting for next call, it is a draft… I see Carlton is typing. Okay. Carlton thank you very much for your support, for supporting this proposal, because we know that common sense is the less common of the senses. I see Fatima wants to take the floor. Go ahead please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima for the record. I see this question is related to the other item on the agenda, but we have been talking about, or have mentioned, something about metrics. In our [topics] in Costa Rica, the topic of the metrics was included for that RALO, and this is a topic where it was very difficult for us to find agreement. Now, my question is, when it comes to the metrics for LACRALO, should this be included in the changes to our rules?

I don't know if you can answer that question, or perhaps this is a question that should be debated by all the members. I mean, I am concerned about this. This is my concern in fact.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose speaking. Fatima, as I said before, discussion about metrics would be to feed somehow, or to give reasons to these people, these difficult people, to be against us. So I think we should leave these issues of the metrics for another moment. I mean, we should [?] if we can draft something about the metrics. Of course, we have something which is very important for us and this are the ALAC rules, but I think

EN

this would be a very good proposal, or an interesting proposal for the next call.

We have something before, we have a document that was produced for, and we need to make the most of this document. And of course, perhaps adapting the rules, the ALAC rules, to governance working.

LEON SANCHEZ: This is Leon Sanchez for the record. Thank you very much Jose. I mean, I do agree with you in terms of the metrics, is something difficult and complicated, but I think we can reach consensus and perhaps we can have written metrics as a guideline, but they should not be a part of the LARALO rules of procedures or RALOs, I mean this would be a point of reference for us. We should have these metrics drafted or contained in a document so that we can use them as guidelines for LACRALO.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking, thank you very much Leon. Raul, would you like to take the floor?

RAUL BAUER: This is Raul Bauer. I mean, I'm not sure if I have all the information, all the necessary information to work, but when it comes to the metrics, well I feel that we are not focusing on that, we are not doing our best to address the issue. I mean, if we're going to work together, I think we have to make a decision, perhaps based on consensus, or by means of participation, or taking into account the opinion of the majority.

EN

Perhaps I didn't have many opportunities to participate, and I apologize for that if I did miss any discussion, or an open discussion, regarding this and regarding the different alternatives that we have to deal with metrics. But I would like to address this issue and face this issue. That's all. Thank you very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hello?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah, I'm here.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah okay. I'm just wondering if Jose was [?] okay. Because I am not hearing anything from the interpreters.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Dev, yeah, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you very much. This is Dev Anand speaking. One of the comments I want to make is that before looking at enshrining some metrics in our rules of procedure as to membership follow this, this, this, this, I think we really need to perhaps study and perhaps develop some reporting of the metrics that we may think are useful.

EN

I just think where exactly [?] our members lie, so instead of the attendance policy, working groups, etc., etc., etc. And actually develop it to see what our current state is in right now. I know for a fact that right now, as I discussed in the last call, we're very good in the participation when it comes to elections, but in terms in the participation of the ICANN policy where we are, I think, lacking. But I would rather recommend we looked to develop – do some reporting first, then see about whether we should put metrics in there or not.

That's my suggestion as a way forward.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce speaking. Thank you very much Dev. I will express my personal point of view. As I said before in terms that we need to work in small groups, I mean if – although this reporting that Dev is mentioning is very important, I mean I think that taking into account other regions, well I think this goes against our region because this kind of development democracy, well sometimes goes against our region.

Perhaps there might be people who may believe that an objective or a group of people who thought to have a [?], because otherwise we will not able to reach London with a [concrete resource], but I do believe that we can have a document, as Leon said, to have a standard or a guideline, and to have more metrics [?] somehow. But, if the region wants to discuss this, of course I'm not going to interrupt that discussion.

What I say is that long discussions sometimes generate a bureaucratic action, and this is something that goes against our region. Carlton, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you. This is Carlton for the record. Let me address the issue of metrics. Most of you will know that I have a serious concern about adopting metrics willingly, because if you focus on objective, it's the results that matter. It's always the results that matter. And to my mind, I see metrics as being misinterpreted in a serious way. Let me give you an example.

There are issues in policy development where some of us simply don't have an interest, and I don't believe a volunteer should be penalized for not having an interest in a specific topic. That's the first one. The second one is, there are going to be uneven participation in all of these debates of policy and policy development, and the reasons are very clear. Some of us will come more prepared than others to participate, and because we read more documents, because we have more conversations, because we even come into the conversation with a lot more experience and a lot more references than some of our colleagues.

I do not believe that you should reasonably have anyway to penalize a volunteer who may come to the table with an interest, but with an interest that is not full formed. If you look at the metrics that are proposed, some of them talk about how many times you participate in

the teleconference…   How many times you post in a list, or those kinds of things.

I don't think that you use those objectives. I really don't believe… What I will support is there is a set of metrics, that has been developed by the ALAC. I would support….

DAVID   Can you hear us? [CROSSTALK]

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. I can hear you.

DAVID: Carlton, there seems to be some problem with the translation and they're not hearing us. So could you please wait a moment?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev.   In fact, we were hearing the Spanish audio, we were hearing you interpreting it, in fact. So as Carlton was talking, we were hearing the interpreters Spanish. Okay.

DAVID: There must be some kind of problem then. Let me see if we can solve that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay.

DAVID: Please go ahead Carlton, the problem has been solved now.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. So I was saying that my concern is making the right set that is good for purpose. The objective is to have our colleagues participate in the policy development process. I am the first to tell you that there are policy perspectives to which I have very little interest. I would not be wished to be penalized as a volunteer, because I don't have interest in that specific topic. Equally, I would not wish for a volunteer to be penalized because the topic they're interested in, they have a long time to develop primarily because A) they don't have access of all the documents, and because of language, we know the problem of language and translation and how that works.

B) They have less experience, and therefore come to the table with less capability than somebody who has more experience in the subject area and so on. Otherwise, I don't believe the person who shows up should be penalized for that, and that could depend on how often they would probably intervene on the list, or say something on the teleconference.

You might believe it is important for somebody to listen and learn. There is a problem because somewhere it says if you want to learn something, listen more than you talk. So, I don't believe that you should penalize volunteers who generally attempt to participate, but are hampered one way or the other from participation. It's going to be

EN

uneven. Participation is going to be uneven. That is, as far as I know, that is the way voluntary organizations have always been, and will likely always be.

So what I'm saying is that I would not be opposed to us taking the ALAC metrics, and looking at them to see which ones are appropriate for the LACRALO context. I would therefore not wish to see metrics adopted in ROP or even adopted as official, wherever we want to put them, until we would at least look at them and to see how useful they are.

Probably even have a kind of a test driving stage before we start looking at metrics. That's why I'm telling you that I would support what they would say, Dev was saying, we should just not go adopt this set of metrics, but really tease and look at them to see which ones are appropriate for us, and even spend some time calling them for a period before we said which ones are the ones we think are useful are adaptable. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce speaking. Now Fatima has the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Fatima for the record. I fully agree with what Carlton is saying in the sense that we need to analyze what are the adequate metrics for us, and to see which ones we should adopt according to our own reality, and where we should place them, where should these metrics be included. Now there is an issue or point where,

EN

we once again fall into discussions, and this is something that has already happened.

I understand we all our volunteers and there is no reason why we should be interested in the same issues, we're all different, and it has to be that way. And we should not be obliged of course to go and learn a new issue that's not interesting for us. Now, this is an election time and participation has increased, and participation is understood as one plus one, and this is not actually active participation.

This is what we're saying for a very long time. What do we need to do to have active participation? We have identified that there are difficulties for participation, and we identified why this is happening. And one of the reasons was that people were not trained in certain issues. So, we provided the LACRALO telephone training, and we're going to provide some news, email this very soon. And we also provided training for people and participation did not increase.

We centered our discussions in terms of policies that are affecting LACRALO, and we are all the same ones participating, it's very few people. So we still a very high deficit in terms of participation. So if we could provide these tools and people still do not participate, then we need to make some decisions because the result of an election cannot depend on that, and a person who wants to run for a certain position should not be a person who has not been in any of the calls.

So we need to take this seriously. We should not see who is going to adopt another [?] notification.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose speaking. Thank you for your comments. I agree with you, and I think everybody agrees with Carlton as well. None of the volunteers should be penalized for not participating. So I think the challenge in being able to have quick results, and those results are possible in my view, with this very small working group that I have been insisting for a long time, should be made up of very competent people, and we do have those people.

So we should have objective metrics including all the members in the region without falling in what Carlton has described, and we can have that proposal for the next call. And we can do a sort of test trial and get to London. I'm trying to think of times here. I would like to have a definition by London, and to be able to modify the rules. We can modify the rules without really having those metrics, without having those metrics in place.

So, I think we're always ahead of ALAC, and that's not always the idea. The idea is to finish with this so that we can progress to the next level to discussing policies, which is what Fatima is saying, and this is what we are here for. And however, we have those groups, because this governance group is a group that is in charge of seeing how we can change the policies and how we are dealing with the metrics to see how we can, or we're actually speculating with some kind of moral sanctions, moral penalization, or institutional sanctions.

And that's not our idea, and I think results should be seen quickly. If we take this discussion seriously, and we have discussed that price, then we will have – we need a year at least for this. And so, this is just one of the items of this working group. So, to try to sum up, to close this idea, I

EN

propose to all of you here to have some volunteers in the call today, and you can submit a draft for the next teleconference.

I don't really know when that teleconference is. Maybe someone can confirm this would be every month or every two weeks. There was one in December and now we're having another one. So, there should be a proposal based on the previous modifications of our rules and principles, and an eternity for these metrics. I don't really… We have two, three, or four people who could be working, so imagine if it's four people working, two could work on the metrics and the other two could work on principles.

I volunteer to work on the metrics and to bring a draft with a proposal one month from now. So we would need three other volunteers. If you agree with this, you can write your comments on the chat room.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: This is Juan Manuel speaking. I would like to contribute with the metrics too. I would like to work on this issue.

JOSE ARCE: Jose speaking. Well, I'm seeing that Leon Sanchez is also joining the metrics group, and Juan Manuel has just given his support to do something. I see that, I didn't expect any less from Dev. I see that Dev is volunteering to help contribute as well. Dev, would you agree, and I need you to confirm this, would it be okay to modify the operating principles and rules of procedure? We can have three and three. If

everyone agrees to this, then it would be Dev, Vanda, on the operating principles and Juan Manuel and me on the metrics issue.

I await your confirmation. Confirmation… I see Fatima has just raised her hand. She dropped from the AC room, now she's back. I see Fatima is saying she is joining this too. Fatima, Leon, and Juan Manuel for the metrics. Dev, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Jose. This is Dev Anand speaking. I guess I'm trying to understand clearly that I understood the part about looking at the metrics and tell me what objective metrics, and so forth. I'm not 100% sure what you mean by looking at operating principles and rules of procedure. Looking at that to do what exactly?

Because as you were describing it, looking at these objective metrics, and developing it, testing it, might take a year too actually to do it and see how it works before we make any changes. So what exactly did you mean by looking at the rules of procedure, or the operating principles? [?]

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose speaking. Yes, of course. Well thank you Dev. Jose speaking for the record. Well, the idea with being able to subdivide this, the goal is to progress, and to reveal the work we had started some time ago. Perhaps the whole work was done by other members, but the work that the region makes, it was work that couldn't really be passive in the

EN

previous GA. The goal is to resume that work and to see if we need some other kind of modifications.

And one specific issue in dealing with the metrics, and this would be done by other two or three people to see if they can be addressed, then the analysis by one of the groups should be to resume the work to see the work done at the time, is still in effect and is still needed, and if we need something different. And the second group would be focused on metrics, so in the next teleconference, which should be if we can merge these two issues and elaborate the final document to take to London.

That's the idea. So Dev would you like to take the floor?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Okay, thanks Jose for that. I'll think more about it. My concern would be that I wouldn't want to make any hasty changes to the rules of procedure, because we would be in February right now and so, I'll think about it some more. Thanks.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose speaking. Thank you Dev for your comments. The truth is the region is working more or less properly, so it is true we don't really need a hasty change, but I do think that changes the role possibly, so if we have serious work in a short time and we can make changes, those changes would be a lot more positive than just staying under a status quo, and saying well, this is working more or less.

And I think we should make changes and really do them. So, we cannot discuss changes with work done by others, and we have been discussing

these changes since [?], and I think it is crazy to look at somebody in the eyes, a person that's been working on this and tell that person, well you were in [?] in 2010, and you've been working for four years, so let's just take another four years so we can discuss this and have a view on this.

So we need a change on this. I really don't need a crazy change, but I think there are other people that are trained, who can prefer something serious so that we can adopt it. Fatima has just raised her hand.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Thank you. I fully agree with what you have said. This has been in our region for a long time now, and we need some concrete definition definitely. I do share the concern in terms of time. Dev and I were part of this thing, working on elaborating new operating principles presented in Costa Rica.

And it took us a very long time to agree on this. So to a certain extent, I share that concern on whether we are going to have this ready by London. And in my view, we should have three subgroups because we have the operating principles on one hand, the rules of procedure on the other, and then the metrics. If we don't want to mix them with the rules of procedure. So I think we should have three groups.

One for each of these issues. One for operating principles, another one for rules of procedure, and another one for metrics.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose speaking for the record. Thank you Fatima, thank you for your comments. If you agree, up to now we have six people who have

EN

volunteered, if you all agree we can subdivide it into three and do this. Carlton here is saying, we should have this in line with the operation principles of ALAC. So, these are the people who are commenting to bring a serious proposal for the next teleconference.

We should have this characteristics of good governance and bring a proposal that's aligned not only to these current characteristics, and proposal that's aligned to ALAC principles, or to the At Large community. I am fully convinced that if we fully subdivide in three groups and two people in each, as Fatima is proposing, I think these people are trained to bring a proposal, an objective proposal, and a proposal that will have common sense.

If we do not think in this short term goal and if we do not think with these people, and if we have doubt, we have a bad basis to begin with. And I think we will need another four years to keep discussing on this, and four years from now we will adopt this now. I think we need a change now, and there are people who have been trained and they can propose a change, and the others can contribute to that change as well.

I'm not saying that there should be no discussion, no deliberation, but that this should not be fully open because if we open it again, as I was saying, deliberation democracy is good, but if we exceed in giving a lot of participation to people, then these deliberations end up giving us bad results and we cannot have a concrete issue to show the results.

So is there, we're just reaching the end of the hour. Is there anybody else who would like to take the floor? Do you want to say if you wanted three groups to be created? Are you in favor? Are you against? If you

do not want this group to be created? Do you want to have a specific teleconference for metrics maybe? So what do you want?

Do you want to have a teleconference for metrics only? Do you want to have, Dev we can have one teleconference every two weeks, one for operating principle, one for rules of procedure, and another one for the other issue. Or we can decide if the three groups can bring a draft in one teleconference. What do you prefer? I want this to be decided now, or if you have another alternative, please speak now. We have a few minutes more here.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. I volunteer to work on the operating principles group, and Oscar is asking about this link that I share on the AC room. This is a document that we prepared together with Silvia, Sergio, and some other people in the region, and we have reached some kind of agreement and this was the draft that we wrote. We can take this as a basis for discussion, and if it is aligned to the new ALAC rules and to the good principles of the good governance.

And I think it is good to have three groups and to have one call per group and then to meet again when we have a result, and once we have progress on this issue.

JOSE ARCE: Jose speaking. Thank you Fatima. I'm not sure if the calls of this three subgroups needs to be with half involved, perhaps two people can just

join. Carlton can you please clarify your proposal, I'm not sure I understand that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. I am agreeing with you Jose, that is better to have the three issues separate because they are bite sizes, one is not overwhelming for anybody to look at all at once, only one group. And then you take what comes out of those three discussions and harmonize them in the larger group. That's what I'm suggesting, I'm agree with you there.

JOSE ARCE: Jose speaking. Thank you Carlton. Do you think one month is enough time? Perhaps we should harmonize this for the next teleconference, and then we can see if each group will call for another teleconference, that I think one month… What do you think actually? Is one month a lot of time? Is it just a short time? Then we have some other three people. Dev? Well, actually, Silvia can we take note of this please?

Dev then will contribute to the rules of procedure. Fatima says rules of procedure as well. Vanda will work on the operating principles. And then we will need someone else for the operating principles again. And we have people for the metrics issue. So Vanda and Fatima are on the operating principles group, Vanda and Fatima operating principles again.

Dev will contribute to the rules of procedure.

UNIDENTIFIED:	This is another speaker speaking. I offered to work with Vanda and Fatima in the operating principles.

JOSE ARCE:	Jose speaking again. I would need someone else to work on the rules of procedure. I can move to the rules of procedure and work with Dev, that I want all of you to agree that Carlton and Juan Manuel will work on the metrics issue itself. We're going to close this call, and we will meet one month from now with that document.

Just to confirm these groups and then we will close this call. And once we confirm this here on the AC room, Juan Manuel could you please confirm? And Carlton, could you please also confirm that you will be working on the metrics subgroup? I will like to thank Julia Charvolen, Silvia, David, Veronica, and all of you who are on the Spanish and English channels for participating in this call.

Once we have all of this… So Carlton then has just confirmed, Juan Manuel has confirmed again, I confirm, Fatima, Vanda, and Dev. Is there anybody else who like to say anything else, otherwise we will adjourn this call?

SILVIA VIVANCO:	This is Silvia Vivanco speaking. Very quickly, I want to thank you for chairing this call, and if you need an additional call for any of the subgroups, please tell this to me one week ahead so I can include this on our schedule. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE:	Jose speaking. Thank you, and then the next call will be in one month from now. I will attempt to harmonize this element. Silvia I will add that we state on the record, that the call should last one hour and a half because I think we will be able to debate more, and I think one hour will be a very short time to harmonize all of this and discuss this. So thank you again. Thank you for participating and good afternoon, good evening, and good night. We will be talking again next month. Thank you, thank you all.

[Various Goodbyes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]