EN

ALBERTO SOTO:	Susie, please go ahead with the roll call.
SUSIE JOHNSON:	Thank you, Alberto. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the LACRALO monthly call. Today is Monday, 15 September 2014, at 23:00 UTC.

On the call, we have in the Spanish channel Aida Noblia, Carlos Vera Quintana, Tatiana Toculescu, Antonio Medina Gomez, Fatima Cambronero, Alejandro Pisanty, Alejandra Castro, Maricarmen Sequera, Maritza Aguero, and Cindy Acosta [inaudible].

In the Portuguese channel, we have Sylvia Herlein Leite. On the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond. We have apologies from Leon Sanchez, Sergio Salinas Porto, Juan Manuel Rojas, Gilberto Lara, and Diego Alfonso Acosta Bastidas.

From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Heidi Ullrich, and Susie Johnson. Our interpreters are, for the Portuguese channel, Esperanza, and for the Spanish, Veronica.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Over to you, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:	Thank you very much, Susie. Now we will go and deal with Item 3 on the agenda, and this is the adoption of the agenda. Humberto, go ahead please.

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.

EN

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: We will now introduce the agenda. On Item 4, we have the training cycle. In this case, our chair Alberto Soto will introduce a topic, and this is Security in Information Systems.

After that, we will proceed with Item 5 on the agenda regarding the review of public consultations. We will have an update of all the policy development activities, the recently adopted ALAC statement in general terms. This will be presented by Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

Then we will have a review of the action items. I will be in charge of developing that action item on the agenda. We will discuss the recommendations that we need to deal with.

Then we will proceed with Item 7, that is the reports from the working groups – the Governance Working Group, the ccTLD Working Group, and the IANA Transition Working Group. That's all. Thank you, Alberto. You have the floor. Go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Susie, could you please upload the presentation so that I can start with my training course?

SUSIE JOHNSON: Si, Alberto.

EN

ALBERTO SOTO: The topic that we will discuss today has to do with Security in Information Systems. You will see how this is related as we proceed with the presentation. This is related to our topic that affects our everyday activities.

This is a presentation that the institute delivers. This is a very short, very brief presentation. It's not the complete presentation due to a matter of time, but please go ahead with the presentation.

For the sake of time, we will see what information security is. I made my best to have the slides in both languages, so I hope you can see that information.

As you can see there, we can have an example of a house or a certain place. We have a kind of wall or distance, so please go to the previous slide, please. Okay, there it is.

So there we see a fence or a wall protecting the house, but they are very different. Then we have a wooden fence in one of the pictures. On the other side, we have a kind of wall, a high wall. In the other picture, we see a very high wall with several meters.

You might be wondering, what does this have to do with the topic? Well, this means that someone has to calculate the threat so as to determine the fence that we're going to create. If you think that the wooden fence doesn't mean any defense, well, it means because in that case that fence is used for animals, to prevent animals from getting into the house. In any case, we need to perform the analysis, and the same applies to the information systems. Please, next slide.

There we have the definition of an information system. Someone has a computer, a desktop PC, a notebook. At home, that person works. You think the computer that person is using his own information system. Now we will see the components of an information system. Next slide, please.

These are very basic concepts but – and [Silvia] will support this – when we went to different places, we realized that the people didn't have enough knowledge. These are the components of the information system. We have the hardware, the software, and the different parts of the system.

Software can be divided into different parts. The basic software, this is the software allowing the machine to work and coordinate the whole functioning of the machine. For example, this is the operating system – Windows, Linux, and so on.

The other part of the software is the application software. What is that? That would be the spreadsheet, the Excel application, or any application to use or to write.

Then we have the data structure and how this information is structured or organized, for example, divided into different folders.

The fourth component is staff, in that case you, me. That is to say people in charge of managing or dealing with the software.

So we have hardware, software, data, and staff. These are the four parts of an information system. Next slide, please.

EN

Now if we take the example of a company. They have an information system, but they have certain wires joining or uniting these machines. But this is an information system that still has the four components that we have previously discussed. Next slide, please.

Schematically speaking, this is a network. We have a company network with computers. These are the work stations. Then we have a file server. Of course, they have printers, fax machines, a PBX telephone central station, or a Web server. All these graphics are connected to devise a hub, and then this hub is connected to a router. Then this router is connected to the cloud by means of an Internet service provider. This is basically the network of a company. Next slide.

This is a bit more complicated. If you can please zoom in so that we can see this better. This is the structure of a company providing services to the banking sector. This company is in charge of the 65% of the home banking activities in Argentina, so you may imagine the degree of security required for such an infrastructure. I was the chief executive officer of this company for many years, and I retired in 2011.

But as you can see in the picture on the left, you have a database and you have database with a [non-stop] system. In the upper side, you have the common link, the national link, the international link, but there are also certain divisions. For example, on the right, you can see Local Net, that is a local network. Further below, you can see technology area. If you go down, you may also see primary and secondary Web servers. To the left, you will see redundant firewalls.

The layout of this data center, as you can see, and in a system like this, this was developed in a company in Buenos Aires. The Web is the most important component, and this Web can be attached and can be attacked as well. This database has all the information with which thousands of transactions are being carried out online. There you can see an application which is between the Web and the database. This is a three-part system.

I'm not going to drill into the details of this layout, but if you go to the Web page, I can get that information. I can receive denial of service attacks. I have also the tools to block that and to prevent that, but this system guarantees that those operating on the local network, or Local Net for those who are reading in English, may not access the database and may not access applications and they may not access to any other part of the system.

People working for IT are the ones who deploy these applications of the company, and they're in charge of the modifications that are particularly carried out. But only the database administrator can access the database. That database cannot be accessed by anyone else. All the other devices and links that you can see, they contribute to have a very secure system. We have only one attack, but when it comes to databases and applications, we didn't have any security failure.

Now who is in charge of this information or system? The responsible person is the manager of the company. I was the technical responsible, but the manager of the company is responsible for this organization and for this system. Please, next slide.

Now I ask you, who is responsible for your security system? Who is responsible? Who is in charge of that system? In this case, there is one responsible appointed. Do we need to secure information? Yes. Who needs to secure information? Companies are audited because they need to manage and they need to assess risk, and this has to do with the example that I gave you at the very beginning with the walls. According to the risk think about the company has, we need to take into account the investment that will be made.

Then companies that are not audited, why do they need? Because if they have damages or they lost money, who is going to compensate for that? If they do not take those measures, they will suffer the consequences. Go ahead, please. Next slide.

What is being protected with information security? If there is any specialist or expert here, you will tell me only three. But I would say that four things are being protected.

Integrity. What do we mean by integrity? The data is only modified by people authorized. In the previous layout, nobody in charge of developing applications was able to access the database. Only the administrator was authorized to enter the database. This assures or guarantees the integrity.

Confidentiality. Only the authorized staff may access.

Availability. This means that information needs to be available at the time required, when necessary.

No [inaudible]. This means that nobody may deny the issuance or reception of information. This is very simple to say but difficult to implement. Next slide, please.

Who decides over information security? This is always a political decision. This is not a technical decision. Why? Because of the cost that this implies. On many occasions, security measure are not adopted due to the cost.

In a private company, they need to take into account risks and losses. For example, a bank that is being accessed or has certain confidential information unprotected, they start losing clients because they cannot assure or guarantee the information.

When it comes to government, they often need to take into account risks and losses because they have information belonging to the citizens, so they need to protect the citizens. The information in their servers has an owner, and they need to take into account that. The owner of that information when we think about the information protected by the government, the owner is the citizen. My own information, my personal information, belongs to me. It doesn't belong to the government. In that case, they need to apply the law. They need to provide a necessary protection to the information, and they need to provide the accurate or required information when necessary or when required. Next slide, please.

An information security management system should be generated. What is this? This is a set of processes generated through different international standards, and these standards should be met by the

whole organization. This management system should be detailed and documented. We will see how. Next slide, please.

There are many standards to apply for information security, but I will mention the basic ones and I would say the most important ones, the vital ones. These are the ISO 270000. This is based on an international standard. These standards derive from an older European standard. There are several international standards that I am not going to mention, but they are mentioned in the presentation for you to take into account. Because as I said before, there are many international standards that should be used. Next slide, please.

As you can see there, there are many standards. In bold, you can see ISO 270001. Then you have the good practices code for the security management. This code is important for the company. The staff of the company needs to know about this code, and the [printed] standard should be taken into account by technicians. These are the most important ones. Then we have some other standards. For example, we have guidelines related to information security and also we have some other standards related to applications.

Are there any questions so far? Next slide, please.

As you can see here, this diagram seems to be a bit complicated, but this is the methodology for the deployment and follow-up of information security. As you can see on the upper chart, you can see that this is an information system. What do we need to do to verify or check this type of system? We need to take a picture of this system.

How? By means of a penetration test. This penetration test is what we call a [inaudible].

We have external and internal penetration tests. This test is carried out in the company. The internal test should be carried out by a company that [requires] a contract to perform this penetration test. In this penetration test, all the data should be taken into account. They need to also point out the different things that they find and different factors so the company knows very well what they need to perform.

In this chart, we have the penetration test. Then there is an evaluation report. After that, they verify if the company has the necessary security implemented and documented. If not, they implement information security policies. They are created; they are drafted. After that, there is a training course at the manager level. After that, procedures will be generated. After the creation of the procedures, there is a training to the whole staff.

After that, they need to create the contingency plan. What is that? If a disk, for example, is broken, I need to continue the operation. If a certain part of a network disappears or a certain part of a network stops working, I need to keep on operating. That business area needs to continue its operations. If the whole website goes down, I need to continue with the operation. When we speak about contingency plans, these contingency plans need to be proved.

When we speak about contingency, we need to take into account the power system. For example, if everything is okay when I am testing the power supply, if I stop or if I interrupt that power, nobody should realize

that power has gone off because everything needs to continue working in the same way. If there is anything that is not working, I need to go back to the contingency plan and review the steps. This is a cycle that needs to be met continuously.

Are there any questions or any [inaudible] so far? Next slide, please.

Everybody knows how Internet works. We said that with [Silvia] in Santo Domingo, for example, that we had to explain that. I will just deal with that very briefly. What we have in the center of the picture are what we call the carriers, the large Internet service providers – Global Crossing, for example, and so on. These are large companies, those providing services among continents.

Then we have the Internet service providers with different communication links. For example, I mean the fiber optics, satellites, and the copper wire that is still being used. Some of these Internet service providers are interconnected apart from being connected to the central carrier. When something goes wrong, they use the other ISP and the client doesn't realize that there is any problem.

As you can see, that is a computer with a telephone because there are many parts in the world that still connect through telephone or by means of mobile or by means of any other devices. Please, next slide.

IP addresses, we need them to work. I would like to remind you that IPv4 was adopted in [April] 2014. When I say it was adopted, I mean it was adopted the general distribution. There are some [inaudible] have of still available IPv4 addresses to deliver. There you can see the

numbers. These are the amount of IPv6 – that large number – that is the amount of IPv6 addresses that are available. Next slide, please.

I'm not going to speak about this slide because you can find that information and that picture how Internet executes or how Internet works. You can see that information in many languages. Next slide, please.

These are the functions coordinated by ICANN: the domain system as you know, the assignment of IP addresses, the registration of parameters and protocols, the root server system, the management administration of the gTLDs, the ccTLDs (the country code top-level domains), and the database administration of different time zones. Next slide, please.

Who is responsible if the agreed to my service provider email [inaudible] and sent e-mails to my name causing me serious harm? For example, family problems, job loss, etc. Next slide, please.

Generally speaking, who is responsible in the case of an electronic scam? Next slide, please.

Another question: how do we fight against terrorism, pedophilia, arms trafficking, and illegal propaganda groups online? Next slide, please.

We are talking about the responsibilities. Responsible ones are the governments, businesses, and individuals who must take the decision to protect information from people who want to attack their systems. Governments, businesses or companies, and individuals. Next slide, please.

However, if we ask who the end user blames for it –next slide, please – the answer is ICANN. ICANN is the one to blame for it. From my experience and after [inaudible], when we ask for responsibility, the end user replies ICANN. Why? Because ICANN is responsible for the Internet governance according to the end users. With this, we need to say that we are the end user's representatives. Why? Because we have the knowledge to defend, to create policy, etc. Next slide, please.

That is to say our function representing the end users is to apply the knowledge that we have to make policies so that we can represent really the end user. Next slide, please. Next slide, please. Next slide, please.

The security task –next slide, please – needs to be carried out by multidisciplinary teamwork. Next slide, please.

We need technicians. We need legal advisors. We need engineers. Next slide, please.

Now what are the responsibilities in this Snowden case? What information systems were violated? The information systems that were violated were those systems, but in those cases ICANN was not responsible for that security. Those systems were attacked. They attacked e-mail, private information, and so on. Next slide, please.

Who is to blame for that? Internet service providers, governments, and ICANN. Next slide, please.

EN

ICANN is always explaining its responsibilities. ICANN is responsible for the DNS, but ICANN never says what it is not responsible for. Next slide, please.

This is not discussed in the different working groups that I have been part of. Next slide, please.

Please, this is the end of my presentation, so are there any questions, any comments? Are there any questions or any comments?

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: May I interrupt?

ALBERTO SOTO: Go ahead, Antonio.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Thank you very much for your presentation, and I would like to congratulate Alberto for his birthday. Alberto, in your presentation taking into account all the topics that are related to the Internet Governance Forum, we see greater participation of end users because they're worried about their privacy and related aspects. What recommendations would you give for LACRALO in this context?

ALBERTO SOTO: The recommendation according to my presentation is, for example, we need to tell the user who is responsible for it. If there is a problem related to data, the user needs to go to the ISP, to the Internet service

EN

providers. If the user has a problem with a bank because there is missing information in the bank but the bank doesn't have the necessary tools to provide security, the bank is responsible for that. Our task is to provide primary information, but then the user needs to be trained. Of course, we can discuss that later on. Thank you.

Is there any other question? If not, we will continue with the agenda. Our next item on the agenda is Item 5, review of public consultations. Olivier, please, you have the floor. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Can you hear me?

ALBERTO SOTO: Olivier, go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. Can you hear me? Just checking whether you're able to hear me.

ALBERTO SOTO: We are hearing you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You are? Okay, fantastic. Thanks very much. Okay, well, very hard act to follow here going through all of these public consultations that we

EN

currently have. There have been several consultations which were dealing with two-character domain names.

I think I explained last month that because of the nature of those consultations being very similar to each other, it sounded like a repeat consultation for various domain names in each case. The ALAC adopted a special way of adopting all of the recommendations that were copied from the original two statements that we had sent out.

In the past month, we've had another two more statements that were sent out using this accelerated procedure. The procedure is effectively to put the consultation for At-Large input on a Wiki page just like we usually do. Then if there are no objections to the same statement being sent to the consultation within about a week to a week and a half, then automatically that statement is ratified without needing a vote from the ALAC.

We had two this month. Next month or in the next week or so, we have another one that is coming up, and I'll be speaking about it in a moment.

Other statements which were adopted were the proposed bylaw changes regarding the consideration of the GAC advice. All of the other ones were just the two-character domain names.

Now currently, the statements being developed by the ICANN are as follows. There is one on enhancing ICANN accountability. The enhancing ICANN accountability process is one which is just starting with a cross-community working group on accountability which is going to be put

together. There's also a coordinating group on accountability that will be put together.

All of the plans are linked from the section which has the public comment request on our Wiki. If you are interested in the process, please have a look at them.

These plans were originally proposed by staff about a month ago, and no public comment period was opened at the time. The chairs of supporting organizations, advisory committees, and stakeholder groups that were present in Istanbul met with the Board and with senior staff every morning during breakfast every day. The discussion yielded the fact that there needed to be a public consultation on this.

This is a very short public consultation. It's a 21-day comment period. If you have any points to make on any of the process, then please do so on the Wiki as soon as possible. It's a short period.

A few ideas: one would be the role of the cross-community group itself. What role should it have? Is the composition of the cross-community group correct? How should it be put together? Should it just have supporting organizations and advisory committees, or could it also include people that are unaffiliated to the supporting organizations and advisory committees? Should this thing be open to the rest of the world as well?

There's also the composition of the coordination group itself and the risk of influence from within ICANN. What protections could be built into the process to protect against any specific individuals or interest

EN

groups to push their point forward to the detriment of the other [points] out there?

A number of questions in there. We've already submitted some comments to the first draft which was sent out. What we're seeing now on the table has been amended by staff and by the Board. This really is one more chance to comment before the work starts with the accountability process. Of course, we will be asking for some volunteers to join these groups.

There is currently a process. If I may just expand on this. There's currently a process where a selection committee is going to select one person to go on the coordination group for the accountability process. I think it's going to make its decision this week or next week. The period for applications has been now closed, I believe. Or maybe it hasn't. Maybe it's until the end of this week. I'm losing track with all of the timings. But in any case, past the 21-day period, everything is going to start moving.

As you know this process is linked somehow to the transition of stewardship of the IANA contract. Whilst they are not completely linked to each other, there is an element of time that is related to this process on accountability as well. We can't just waste more time on this. Work has to start very soon, indeed.

The next one is the Board Working Group report on Nominating Committee. The Board Working Group has been reviewing the Nominating Committee and has made some recommendations on how to improve the Nominating Committee. The report is now online. It's

EN

interesting because, of course, At-Large has five members of its community on the Nominating Committee, so it's very important for us. It's a significant process that we contribute to. Not only that, it's also a process that we benefit from since five members of our At-Large Advisory Committee are selected by the Nominating Committee. It's a two-way process, and I really urge you to have a good read of this report, the points which are made in there. I think that the majority of them will be absolutely acceptable and are well-received. There might be a few that are not. If there are any disagreements with the recommendations, you are highly encouraged to voice them now. Now is the time to do it because once these changes get implemented, then we have a problem. There are already quite a few comments below on that Wiki page, so have a read of these and add your point of view.

Finally, the introduction of the two-character domain names for .JETZT, .GLOBAL, .NEUSTAR, .KIWI, .BERLIN, etc. As I mentioned earlier, this is the accelerated procedure. If you believe that our standing statement which is already on the Wiki page should be amended or changed in any way, please say it now. Because if there are not comments on this, then we will just proceed forward with the automatic ratification and sending the statement over to the public comment forum.

That's it for the time being on the [policy] calendar. Of course, I'm open to questions or comments.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Olivier. Is there any question or any comment about this? I would like to ask the participants, but then I will circulate

EN

an e-mail, but I would like to ask you to read this information because, as Olivier said, we have to participate.

Now let's continue with our agenda. I see no comments, no questions, so I will proceed with the agenda. Item 6 on the agenda, Humberto, these are the review of action items. Humberto, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alberto. We had a meeting with the RALO secretariats, and we discussed the recommendations after ATLAS II. We have four items or topics that are related to the RALOs.

For example, Recommendation 28, the ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSes to map the current expertise and interests in their membership to identify Subject Matter Experts and facilitate policy communication or the commission policy. We need to create a working group or anybody so as to comply with this recommendation.

Then we have Recommendation 29 that reads the ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking the topics of interest that are currently being discussed among the RALOs, and this should be accessible for everyone. For example, we are discussing the amendments of the Rules of Procedure the way in which it should issue statements. This needs to be in an automatic system, and we need to consult with ALAC to see how to implement this automated system.

Then we have Recommendation 42. This recommendation reads that ICANN should enable somehow annual face-to-face RALO assemblies,

either at ICANN regional offices or in accordance with or in concert with regional events. This is very important for us because we can meet on a regular basis. Of course, we need to discuss with ICANN and see how we can contribute to that and how we can develop this idea to comply with this recommendation for input. This is a very important topic.

Then the last recommendation is that RALOs should encourage their inactive ALSes to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements. Silvia Vivanco has posted a link on the AC room where you can see or read this recommendation. In the Governance Working Group and in the Metrics sub-group, we have been working with this topic very hard, and this will be analyzed later on. But when it comes to Recommendation 43, I will say that we're well advanced. Of course, we need to keep on working and we need to comply with that ALAC minimum participation requirements.

There is another item on the agenda that is Item 6.2 regarding the meeting that we will have on October 14. Alberto and I will meet in Los Angeles as well as the ALAC members. We need to define our agenda no later than the 19th. Silvia Vivanco, could you please check that information?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, that's right, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Silvia. We need to take this into account, and we need to have this information translated into the different languages of our

region. Of course, this is a very important topic that we need to take into account.

That is all regarding Item 6 on our agenda. Since Sergio Salinas Porto is not on this call today, if I may I can continue with Item 7 and speak about the Governance Working Group.

ALBERTO SOTO: Go ahead, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Sergio Salinas Porto sent me the reports, so I'm going to read the reports that he sent me. I know that there is nothing to [report] about the Metrics sub-group, so once I have finished with the reports, I will open the floor for questions.

The Governance Working Group on September 12 prepared or drafted by Sergio Salinas Porto starts with the Metrics sub working group. After the creation of the Metrics sub-group, the members were [consulted] by e-mail. There was a mistake with one of the members that was solved in the last meeting. The group is composed by Sergio, Humberto, Sylvia, and they communicate or they work by e-mail [of type].

When it comes to the Metrics, the Metrics are [referred] to a face-to-face meeting, special voting, and online voting, in participation a working group, participation also in mailing lists. The task is still to be finished. After that, the information, the report, will be sent to the Governance Working Group. Then that information will be sent to the RALOs, and then that information will be sent back to the Government

Working Group again to implement or make any amendments. Now this is the end of the report of the Metrics sub working group.

Now when it comes to the Rules of Procedure Working Group, it is composed by Yuyuqui Loqui and Aida Noblia. They met. They defined the topics that they will deal with. From the existing material, there were several topics to deal with, so they assigned the different activities and tasks.

They also observed that there was a lack of clarification. There were certain terms in the Rules of Procedure or certain words that were not clear enough and so on. Then they have different terms that they defined. In some cases, they observed the inaccuracy of certain terms that may not be applied to the region. Some of the concepts are not in accordance with the region.

They created a primary list of the terms that should be defined, and that information is attached to the report. There will be a call next week where they will present the terms and the definitions proposed. The objective is to have clear concepts to draft a clear document for all the users. Since this work needs the contribution by the Metrics report, the deadline for the delivery of the report is November 24.

When it comes to the Operating Principles Working Group, they have made [advancements]. After they have published the draft report, there was a great deal of discussion. They received a lot of suggestions, and some of the suggestions will be sent to the Rules of Procedure Working Group. Some of the other recommendations will be sent to the Metrics sub working group.

Some of the topics required further consideration or more detailed attention, and they're still discussing some of the topics. They're also working on a glossary of terms for a better using of the terms. After that, the report will be sent to the Governance Working Group for the Governance Working Group to read and make contributions. Then it will be translated and put for the comment of the LACRALO members.

Now I will speak about the ccTLD Working Group report dated September 12. There was a meeting Aida Noblia, Sergio Salinas Porto, Yuyuqui Loqui, and Ron Sherwood. They worked on a questionnaire, and this work is about to be finished. They also identified data sources for different purposes [inaudible] for example [inaudible] LACTLD. Their next meeting is scheduled for next Friday.

With this, I will say that I have finished with the report and I will give the floor to Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Humberto, there is a question from Dev. Could you please answer to that question?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, Dev, the information has been updated. I would like to discuss that on any other business, but I'm posting also the link for that to see the information. But I will speak about this later on. Alberto, go ahead, please. You have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Now we will speak about the IANA transition. This is Item 7c on the agenda. Our transition working group needs to work very hard because one of the main topics of the document that was drafted for this working group, one of the main topics was that we need to have active participation in case there is any issue with Internet users so that we can represent them and defend their views.

This is not possible because in the ICG group, we do not have direct intervention. We cannot make direct proposals. I will draft a report, and I will explain the progress made in this regard. We do have representatives from ALAC in the ICG, but we cannot make direct proposals. We will discuss that in a report that I will give to you later on.

Is there any question or any comment so far?

Humberto, please go ahead with the other topics.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Alberto, there is a question by Fatima, or a comment. Alberto, let's say that there is a discussion right now about the communities that can make proposals. Fatima, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Alberto and Humberto. Just briefly because Alberto is actively participating in the At-Large IANA transition working group, and that working group is the one who should provide support for the ALAC representatives in the ICG. They are Jean-Jacques Subrenat

EN

and Mohamed El Bashir. They are the representatives of ALAC working on the ICG.

Not long ago, the call for proposals was open. I will share that information with you. It is also in Spanish. But within the coordination working group, they were debating about the communities that are allowed to present proposals because there is a sector that says that the communities are the ones representing names, numbers, and protocols. In that classification, there is no room for other communities such as the [inaudible] representatives.

However this is not quite clear, so perhaps if there is someone who is more involved in this topic, that person may make any contribution. But in general terms what was decided is that those in the At-Large Working Group may participate or let's say monitor the things that are being discussed in other communities.

There are many other lists that are open for discussion, but in our region what we have is the [inaudible]. There is an exclusive mailing list devoted to this topic. Some of the members of the coordination group said not long ago that the [RALOs] were not actively participating, so now the [RALOs] are actively participating.

This is a very complex topic, and everything is complex. Even the information that is being circulated is complex, so perhaps we can go back to the archives of the mailing list. This information is open to everyone. Also, the calls are open to everyone. We are not members. We cannot give our opinion, but we can participate as observers.

I hope that this explanation may help to clarify the topic.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you, Fatima. You have been very clear with your explanation. You have simplified the topic because the topic is really very complex due to many reasons.

I [started] my investigation with the creation ICG, and I can say that Sébastien Bachollet complained in the first meeting before London that ALAC did not have any representative. There it was said that the operational communities or groups were the ones able to present proposals. But Sébastien on that occasion made a very good point, and Fadi replied to him that we are all Internet end users.

I do agree with Fadi in everything but for that because, of course, we're all Internet end users but not all of us are Internet end users' representatives. Those within ALAC are the real representatives. If situation comes from the GAC, of course that person will be an Internet end user. But at the time of expressing his or her opinion regarding Internet, that person will express its view in favor of a government. That's the point.

Humberto, please, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much, Alberto. The last item on the agenda has to deal with a [inaudible] question. As I said before, the idea was to coordinate the information on the rules to identify the differences on the Rules of Procedure. I highlighted that information in red. You will see that in red

EN

there is the information that I have highlighted and that I have modified.

However, after that I realized that we have kept Rule 15. In the next voting or in the next meeting, we should deal with this. This would be a pending topic. Of course, we need to improve the design so that the rules are understandable for everyone.

As Alberto Soto mentioned before, we need to report about the Duolingo. We have been discussing this topic, and I have sent the draft of that report so that we can finish that report. I hope to have news so that we can have the agreement ready by the end of this week. That is all for my part, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Humberto. There is a delay, and this delay in the agreement from Duolingo is not our fault because Duolingo was dealing with some internal modifications. That's why there is a delay in the deliberation of the agreement. But I hope that we can finish with that very shortly.

Is there any other question or any other comment? Otherwise, we will bring this call to an end.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: I have a question, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Go ahead, Antonio.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Alberto, I would like to know about the process of the remote hub for participation in the Los Angeles meeting. I know there will be remote hub.

ALBERTO SOTO: Could you rephrase or repeat your question?

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: My question is this: I would like to know about the remote hub for the Los Angeles meeting. We would like to set a remote hub for the meeting, and I would like to have any update about that.

ALBERTO SOTO: I sent two reminders – the last one was sent not long ago – and the only reply came from Gilberto Lara. He will have a remote hub, but this is only an audio remote hub, not video remote hub. Unfortunately, each organization was the one in charge of saying or requesting the information and applying for that. I know there is certain reimbursement of money by ICANN, but the deadline is over. Antonio, please bear with me and let's see if there is any possibility.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: We would like to participate in a remote hub.

ALBERTO SOTO: Well, the registration is now over. I will ask and see if there is anything that we can do to help you.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Thank you very much, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay, is there any other question or any other comment? Otherwise, being quarter past 9:00 PM, I would like to thank you all for your participation. It is a pleasure to share this call with you. Thank you very much, Olivier, for your participation. Thanks to the staff. Thanks to the interpreters, and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]