
ALBERTO SOTO: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. It's 23:00 UTC on November 17th 2014, so we'll start with our Monthly Call, and now I'll give the floor to Terri for her to proceed with the roll call.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Teleconference on Monday, 17th November 2014 at 23:00 UTC. On the Spanish channel we have Cristian Casa, Raitme Citterio, Alberto Soto, José Arce, Antonio Medina Gomez, Tati Toculescu, Carlos Aguirre, Aida Noblia, Vanda Scartezini, Maritza Aguero and Alfredo Lopex. Currently at this time no one is on the English channel. On the Portuguese channel we have Alyne Nadrade. We have apologies from Sylvia Herlein Leite, Sergio Salinas Porto, Javier Chandía Rojas, Fatima Cambroner, Leon Sanchez, Gilberto Lara, Natalia Enciso, Sergio Salinas Porto, Oscar Garcia, Adrian Carballo and Alejandro Pisanty. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Veronica and David. On the Portuguese channel it's Esperanza. I would also like to remind all participants to please speak their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Alberto.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much Terri and thank you to our interpreters. We'll now proceed with Item #3, which is the adoption of the Agenda. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. We will do a summary of the Agenda we'll be dealing with today. Today we have our capacity training session. Alberto will be in charge of this session. This training has to do with the IANA transition. Then we'll have the participation of Alan Greenberg, who'll speak about public consultation. He'll be dealing with two items in particular. We'll also have the review of AIs, which will be done by Alberto. So as you can see we have a very busy and detailed Agenda. We'll also speak about the ongoing votes. On Item #8 we'll discuss about the items of work for the region.

Then we'll speak about the reports of our Working Group, and in Item #10 we'll discuss a topic related to capacity building within LACRALO. That is in general terms. This is our Agenda for the day. Thank you Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Humberto. Could you please upload my presentation so I can start with my session? Thank you. This is a very hot and difficult topic, a very important topic, I would say. Every Working Group and constituency of ICANN is dealing with this topic, and there are many comments outside ICANN regarding the topic as well. Here we see a brief introduction. In 1992 the US reduces the filing of InterNIC administration. At that time, little was being done with this reduction of functions from financing. There was an agreement signed to operate

the Internet. This was a service for IT registries and domain names, and here the most important people were Steve Crocker and Jon Postel.

I also mentioned the [FC 00:05:15]. This is the origin of the topic, and we also need to highlight that domain names to be registered for example, at that time there was only one person in charge. Then there was a boom in Internet use in the '90s, and from that moment on there was a need to have a structure of multistakeholders, and that's why we started talking about the multistakeholder model – so as to be able to manage the Internet functions. Then the Internet community participated in a process that ended up in the creation of ICANN, to carry out this task.

I'd like to quickly mention that in 1998 ICANN took over the IANA function in the Science Institute in California, and also was responsible for some of the main functions of InterNIC. The registry operations of InterNIC became competitive, or a main area for the registry of domain names. We're talking about the IANA functions, but there is no IANA department. In fact, we speak about functions – not about a department. The IANA functions are specified in Document SAC 67. This is a document drafted by the SSAC, and here we can find a summary of these functions. For example, the coordination of the technical parameters protocol, the technical parameters of the Internet.

The computers work with ports, and each function, for example when we navigate on the Internet, for this function there is a port being assigned. If anybody can navigate at any port it would be a disaster, therefore there is one specific port, Port 80, assigned for this function. Then we have functions such as the incoming or outgoing mail, the

SMTP, for example, and then the incoming mail has another number assigned for that. That's what we call a parameter when it comes to Internet protocols. Then the management of certain responsibilities, associated with the management of the root zone in the DNS. In this case we speak about the root zone.

In the root zone we can find servers where names are located, and they're only modified by means of IANA throughout or through an authorization given by the NTIA. How is this being done? This is done through policies that are drafted or generated not by IANA but by some other group. Then we have the IT resources and the allocation of those resources. In this case we're talking about IP addresses. Then we have other services related to the administration or management of gTLDs and TLDs, for example .arpa and .int for international trading. These domain names are closed domains, and IANA, in coordination with NTIA, is responsible for that.

When it comes to protocol parameters it works with policies developed by communities in the RIRs, by means of the ASO, which is the Address Supporting Organization. They also work with the policy development process. There is another exercise by the ASO Council and the ICANN Board, and they have an MOU. It's important to mention that there are agreements and clauses translated into our MOU. Then we have the maintenance of the registry and the allocation to the RIRs. The IANA or the IANA function allocates the functions to the RIRs, and then the RIRs allocate these resources to the IT providers, and then the IT providers provide the resources to Internet users.

That's why and how we connect to the Internet. When it comes to the domain names, policies depend on the ICANN community through different SOs such as the gNSO and the ccNSO for country codes. Oversight depends on the ICANN Board in this case. The maintenance and coordination of the changes in the root one are carried out by the IANA, which is one of the functions, as I said before, belonging to IANA by means of a contract signed within the NTIA. IANA is responsible for this coordination and for the changes in the root zone. This means that any application or any change being carried out, for example, such as .uk or .com, depends on the IANA.

Now the IANA functions. There we have the IANA functions. What are the stakeholders involved and what's the role of the NTIA. Here we can see the complexity of the transition. The administration of management of the DNS and of the root zone, in this case, we can see the parts involved - ICANN, NTIA and Verisign. ICANN has a very important role. It's not only the administrator or manager of the contract, but it's also the one administering the processes in the root zone. The other function that we've mentioned are the Internet numbers. ICANN is under the authority of the RIRs. In this case, the role of the NTIA is only to be the coordinator.

Then we have the administration of the protocols and the parameters, and this also depends on ICANN and the Internet [unclear 00:13:28] board. This is very clearly expressed on the document 68 and I'm not going to go into details, but it's very clear that ICANN cannot amend or modify the things generated or policies or protocols for the IETF. Then we have the ARPA administration, and this also depends on ICANN, and this is also part of the functions administered by the NTIA.

TERRI AGNEW: I have alerted everyone on the English channel that we're unable to hear at the moment. Apologies for the delay.

ALBERTO SOTO: During the transition we need to consider everything that's actually quoted in those agreements, so [unclear 00:15:56] history, the NTIA announced there would be a transition, and this will be [unclear] of the community of stakeholders. This clarification is essential. We'll now go into details. In September 2015 the proposal for the transition needs to be submitted, and on this date it's the end of the agreement between the NTIA and ICANN. This means that the transition will go on. There are several Working Groups that actually will not be able to continue. I believe this date is September 15th, and they will not be able to continue with their proposal for that date.

This implies that the group that needs to submit the proposal probably won't be able to do this by that deadline. As a current [history 00:16:55] then, this proposal that ICANN needs to make needs to comply with this requirement, which is very important. Support and improve the model of multiple stakeholders; maintain the security and stability and flexibility of the DNS, cater for the needs and expectations of customers and partners for the IANA services at a global level and finally maintaining the Internet openness. There are many Working Groups within ICANN, and some of the groups are working outside ICANN.

There are many interests. Once I said that ICANN was attacked with certain issues. They actually want not only to modify the transition. The

transition should be fully transparent, that to reach the same procedures, the same policies need to be maintained, and there are others who want to modify those policies, and [unclear 00:18:00] modifying the procedures. This is almost impossible. Another important point that the NTIA referred to in their information on the transition is that they will not accept a proposal that would replace their role as a solution led by a government or an intergovernmental organization.

This was fully ratified by the NTIA head in London, in a very concrete speech where they highlighted these four points and the non-ratification of this proposal. This means that if there is something similar to this, the NTIA will reject the proposal. How should the transition be? Who should adopt the functions of authorizations and supervisions that the IANA is now exercising? For these purposes, ICANN has prepared a Working Group called the ICG – the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group. This group is made up of 27 components. The ALAC has two positions. They are held by Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir, who is actually the Vice Chair of the ICG.

The ccTLDs and also outside the ccNSO, according to which SO will select it. There is the gNSO. They also include the gTLDs, who have two. The GAC has two Members. The [ICT 00:20:19] has one Member. The IAB, the Internet Architecture Board, has two. The IETF has two Members. The ISOC has two Members. The NRO has two Members. As you can see there is a lot of information here on www.nro.net. They have two. The RSSAC also has two Members. The RSSAC is the Root Server System Advisory Committee. There is SSAC also. This group has no definitions so far. There are many issues being discussed. There are issues being raised, and by an external request ICANN was criticized, because of a

lack of clarity and transparency. There is a Working Group working on transparency and accountability.

There was a request to have only one Working Group and finally two Working Groups were formed. There must be some coordination between these groups. Have a look now at the presentation. There are some Internet shared resources. We said that we work with policies, and there must be someone who needs to supervise and implement those policies. When we talk about protocols, the policies are generated by the IETF community; supervision is made by the IAB, which is the Internet Architecture Board, and the implementation is made by IANA. Now, the root IP addresses, it's the RIR communities that generate the policies; the five international regions. Who supervises them? The NRO.

The NRO is the organization that groups all the RIRs together, and finally the IANA is the one that implements. As for domain names, the policies are provided by the ICANN community, with supervision as well by ICANN, and finally implementation is made by IANA. Discussions with respect to lack of transparency are not really related to protocols or numbers, but actually to domain names. We'll try to have a look at that. What is the SSAC 068? It is a document that is generated by the SSAC, and SSAC 068 contains all the contracts between the NTIA and ICANN, which respect to the functions. It is very specifically detailed. They say what the IANA functions, and what it is they do.

It also provides information on the current relationship with the current administration, with all the amendments included. I think the last one was in 2003, and then it was translated into all the UN languages. It provides information on the current relationship within the NTIA, and

the IANA, under the provisions stated in the agreement. Now look at the Executive Summary. It contains a very specific description of the implementation of the activities of the contract, parameter protocols, parameter registers, root zones, and Internet registration numbers. It's also in Spanish. It's very interesting. You can read it.

Now, how does the IANA transition go on? The ICG needs to prepare a single document with the document that we will provide to the operational components. Who will send the document? It's only the operational group – ALAC for example is participating, but we cannot generate a specific document. It's only the group that can do that. However, the ICG has shown to be very open and it's received everything that ALAC, which cannot send documents, has actually sent. The operational group should have their documents ready by January 2015. This is theoretically. I continue to say that.

The RIRs say they'll have them in their centralized Working Group by the first week of December, and they'll have approximately one month to create all the RIR document, the single document, to provide to the ICG. This also will happen with the [unclear 00:26:25]. There are Working Groups that will centralize their documents and they will send them to the ICG in theory for January 2015. There are divided opinions both on within and outside ICANN. First of all, there is IANA. Is it external to ICANN, or should IANA be inside ICANN?

Imagine the number of variables for the different compositions we can have here – IANA within ICANN. What would it be like? Would it be like NomCom today, which is fully independent? Will policies continue to be fixed as they are fixed today? There are those that say policies need to

be fixed in a different fashion, but I insist that this needs to be transparent, for the Internet interoperability. Now, with respect to an IANA external to ICANN, of course opinion comes from outside of ICANN, and for the time being I'm saying that the RIRs, even within ALAC itself, say that IANA should be internal to ICANN.

We haven't really determined how this would be, but the trend is that the IANA functions should continue to be within ICANN. Now, the problem that has started to appear as we started to work on this issue is the accountability and transparency issue. There were those who complained that ICANN had no transparency, so there is now a group working on that, as I said before. Now, there are many groups working in the different components of the ICANN ecosystem, and they're also working outside of ICANN. We don't really have time to make so many comments. I'm actually going over my time, but let me give a very quick example.

You would have thought that LACNIC had no problem as an RIR. This is the current policy. In the last meeting we had, LACNIC said that the role or supervision of the IANA functions in the administration of number resources in the Internet needs to be adopted by the RIRs and represented by the NRO. The NRO, as I said, grouped together the five ways, with the formation of a Multistakeholder Oversight Numbers Council, the MONC, made up of the representatives of the different stakeholders of the Internet Number Resources – operators, government and users in each of the RIR regions.

This LACNIC position was taken from an APNIC declaration or statement. It was added to what a group of stakeholder said, because they were

saying that when all the stakeholders are present, the lack of transparency issue or the non-accountability issue is actually solved. Now, what happens with RIPE? This is the RIR in Europe. I received a document and unfortunately I've not read it completely, but it's that should ICANN then become a membership organization? This will change ICANN. Should the members be associated to ICANN? Otherwise they wouldn't be members of ICANN.

So this criteria that RIPE has stated as a new IANA operator is that they should comply with the global policies in accordance with the program for the development of policies. These processes and terms for communication should be established. There should also be strategic obligations on the IANA operator in terms of the functions related to numbers. There should also be mechanisms to review and punishment, and the duration and conditions for the termination of the contractible parties, and the solution of [unclear 00:30:42] jurisdiction.

Something I didn't write down is that RIPE says that the RIRs should not issue an opinion on their technical part, if the accountability part is not clearly established before. This is one of the reasons why the ICG perhaps, on January 15th, would not be able to comply with their deadline – or maybe they will. Now let's go to the conclusion. All the groups are working on this issue, even if they do or do not have supervised reports to the ICG. In ALAC we're also working on this. We have weekly meetings with people participating on the ICG. There are people on the Accountability Group who are trying to get information from other groups.

They're also learning about the different opinions and positions. Many of us are actually in many of the lists – in the ISOC, in the RIRs, in the IETF, and we received those emails from those mailing lists and we provided that information. There are also some voices speaking about the disappearance of the multistakeholder model. I'm not going to talk about that, because we will have time next meeting to talk about it. We in LACRALO are preparing a document by taking what was provided as a basis in ALAC and we are trying to show the updates that are actually needed. Thank you very much. I'm now open for questions.

I've just seen that Roosevelt and Carlton are on the call. Welcome to the call. Are there are any questions or comments? Is everything clear for you? Raitme, go ahead please.

RAITME CITTERIO:

Good evening. My question has to do with the LACNIC Meeting. I was following some of the discussions in that meeting, and they said that some of the possible consequences would be that the multistakeholder model will stop existing. I think it would be necessary that all RALOs work. This was in relation to the accountability process. Much work has been done about this topic, but more people, more stakeholders, should participate and understand how the process works. If the accountability process is not clear for every single part, then the participation of all the stakeholders is at risk. This might be a problem. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Raitme, thank you very much for your comment. When it comes to the [disappearance 00:35:01] of the model, when I say that the NTIA had

certain conditions, that was to increase the multistakeholder model and to sustain that model. Well, I don't believe that the model will be changed. There might be certain changes, but not in the interoperability of the model and in the conception of the model. I believe that is clear. Now, when it comes to participation and transparency, let's bear in mind that every Working Group at ICANN is open, so if I may I would like to make an AI.

I commit myself, not tomorrow but before Friday, to send an email with all the links of the Working Groups, so if there is anyone who would like to participate, even as an observer, you can do that, because all the groups are open, and there are no closed calls or meetings. There was only one meeting that was closed, but that has to do with private or confidential information, which had to do with a secretariat. Of course, this is something confidential and it's not relevant to us. Of course, we have to deal with the cost of that, but not with the information, which is confidential.

As I said before, all the Working Groups within ICANN are open. I will send an email for you to see all the information and have all the links for the Working Groups. You can also access the RIR's Working Group. Some of them say that you can access as an observer. An observer, as in any other case, may provide an opinion, but he or she may not vote. Are there any other questions? Vanda, go ahead please?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I tried to access the link for the last meeting, but I was not able to access that information.

ALBERTO SOTO: Vanda, which group are you talking about?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm talking about the ICG.

ALBERTO SOTO: That was a closed Working Group, a closed meeting.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay, so that was a closed call, because I received an email saying that we could participate.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Vanda for your comment. if I may, let me suggest that if you want to access that Working Group, and you cannot, please send me an email so that I can provide you with the right information, because I participate in most of them. If I'm not in the meeting, I'll send a message so you can see that information. Thank you for your comment. Are there any other questions? Silvia's saying that perhaps there was some AC audio issues. That would be probable. Any other questions or comments?

Unfortunately for Item #5, Alan is traveling so he'll not be able to participate on this call, therefore we will proceed with Item #6 on our Agenda, which is the review of AIs. We have a webinar on the Latin American strategy. We had a visit from Rodrigo de la Parra and Rodrigo

Saucero, and they told us about the ICANN initiatives for our region. The most important thing here is that there are five projects. We need to publish the information on that. But as I said before, this is based on four main points. In the Caribbean region in April, there was a meeting, and also there was a meeting in the Andean region and in South America and in Central America, in Mexico.

There were four roadshows, and they asked us to keep on working with them, so that we can increase the numbers of participants and the number of roadshows being delivered. At the same time, the idea is to work together so as to avoid the overlapping of tasks, because we might be working on the topic, in relation to capacity building, and they are working on that same topic. So the idea is not to overlap with their activities. As I said before, we're working on that and we'll report on this topic shortly. There will be a website for the Latin America and the Caribbean region, where all the information will be contained. There will be online participation or remote participation.

They also said they were going to send a newsletter to the mailing list. I asked why the newsletter was only to the mailing list. They said that this has to do with capacity building and we need to use the Online Platform, because on the Online Platform we have many courses; many in Spanish, and perhaps we are requesting or asking for training, when we have a course already available on that platform. I said that we need training on technical issues, because there is a workshop and it should be oriented to non-technical people – to us, lawyers, etcetera – who do not understand about this. That's important.

This is as far as the webinar is concerned. Our AI from the previous call was to evaluate the members' performance and LACRALO participation. In the LA Meeting there was a debate about that, and it was decided to perform a unique survey for all the RALOs. Humberto was working on that. That was already finished. But not long ago, ICANN sent a survey to assess the participants' performance. This will be applied to all the RALOs. The idea is that if we need capacity building or training, we'll do that within our capacity building plan. If not, then that information or that training should be set outside of LACRALO. Now I'll speak about the regional event map.

I asked all the ALSes to investigate or research and find out events related to the topics we deal with. If that is the case, they should report that to us so that we can work together with ICANN to introduce that event within the mapping that ICANN has done. Why? So our people can participate in those events, because for those events, ICANN has the availability to fund the participation to those events. The idea that we have, together with Humberto, is to make the most of these projects and opportunities so that we can send people to participate. At the same time, this mapping is also useful for us because we have the CROPP and we need to make the most of this opportunity and send people to events.

Now, when it comes to the next Item on the Agenda, unfortunately Sergio is not connected and he didn't send any information. The Metrics Working Group Report was ready and we are also working on the metrics. Sergio is traveling. But I believe that these two topics will be open to public consultation for 30 days. After those 30 days, all the observations and comments will be taken into account, and then there

will be a 7-day voting period. This is something that we frequently do in LACRALO.

When it comes to the IANA transition topic, I've already spoken about that, but if there is anyone interested in participating in the Working Group within LACRALO, please feel free to do that. I invite you to participate, if you're willing to work with me. Please send me an email so that we can work together on that topic. Now I will give the floor to Humberto, for him to proceed with Item #7.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much Alberto. There are two votes in course. As Alberto said, these votes we usually do in LACRALO, there is a 30-comment period. There was a seven-day period for voting. That period is now in course and it will expire on the 19th. There are two proposals for public policies for LACRALO. One is the policy for recruiting ALSes, and the other proposal is the procedure for the preparation issue and some publication of statements. I remind you and urge you to issue your vote, whether it's affirmative, negative, or an abstention. Let me say again that the deadline is on the 19th of November.

Once again, we call on you to vote. I'll send an email anyway to remind you of this. I will send this to all of the community; to all the region members. This is all I can say about Item #7.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Before continuing, Dev in the chat is saying that there is lack of transparency, that there were no proposals. I would like to remind

everybody, not only Dev, that these proposals were welcomed with our team. These two were submitted at the GA and we said it would be sent for public comment. We opened these for public comment. One of them received observations, and those observations were introduced. Then after that, we actually opened the public comment for 30 days, so there were reminders. Once the 30-day period expired, we opened it for a vote for another seven days. That is, we are doing this, and it doesn't really mean a lack of transparency in my view. Go ahead Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. The comment I placed in the chat was referring to the Governance Working Group, and not so much these proposals. I will say though however, that regarding the timing, I do have to comment two things. One, I know there was some reminders, but to be quite honest the reminders were very infrequent. It was literally one last month, and then perhaps it was due to the [unclear 00:49:38] translation on the mailing list, but I didn't see any Twitter announcements like, "Seven more days left," or anything like that, or, "24 hours, please review the documents," and so forth.

So I think some better alerting and reminders could have taken place rather than suddenly the vote announcement, regarding these proposals. My second question: were these proposals translated formally, because I'm seeing some discrepancies, I think, in the English language version. That's all.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you Dev. First, we will consider your observation and we will try to send the reminders more often than what we have done so far. Now, the proposals are translated... This is how it works. If there is a Sub-Working Group that is dealing with an issue, once the Sub-Working Group finishes its work, it will send it to the Governance Working Group for example. Then Governance will take it, they will discuss it, and then before sending it for public comment we'll send it for translation. Then it's up for a 30-day period and then it goes to voting. But yes, these translations are official. Cristian? Cristian is having some problems with the line. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you. I just want to make some comments. These proposals do not really refer to or have not been worked on by the Governance Working Group, because we had received a Mandate from the GA in London, and the processing was [written to 00:52:45] to the Secretariat of this organization. That's why we have processed both the 30-day comment period. Just to remind you Dev, we have sent three emails during the 30-day period, reminding Members that they had to vote. I sent more than one of them in both languages so that it could be read both in English and in Spanish.

I also want to say that once the processing of this proposal has been sent to the Secretariat, comment have been taken both by the Chair and Secretariat, and they were introduced into the final document. I'd also like to remind Dev that when this document was translated by staff, the idea is to avoid discrepancies, and the corrections at some point were made by myself. They were very small corrections, when there was

some kind of comment. These should have no impact, because they are very small. There was a document by Fatima.

This was translated by staff in full, as happened with the other document, and no modifications were made there because aside from the comments I wrote, which was outside the deadline, there were no other comments. That's why both of those things [interpreter apologizes for poor audio quality. That is all from me. I would like to make another comment for Roosevelt. Roosevelt made a comment when there was no possibility to make any modifications, but that doesn't really matter.

He's saying – and perhaps he's right – that the plan to recruit new ALSes is not the same in the Caribbean region. That's why I proposed let's meet, let's discuss this, and let's see what is the best way for us to try and have more ALSes, in the Caribbean, which is what we want with this document, which is now open for voting. If you can send me an email whenever you want, we can meet and discuss this issue. Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Just one clarification regarding translations. The documents that were submitted in London, they were sent for translation by ICANN staff. Now, if there have been some minor adjustments, perhaps this second or third change was not translated by ICANN staff. However, what I understand is that this was undertaken by Humberto himself, so there may be some small paragraphs or words that were not exactly translated, but we can definitely do a review and make sure that the translation is 100 per cent made by staff.

However, I do believe that the substantive content of the document was not altered and there may be some grammar issues, but now, once documents are approved, they need to be sent for translation so that they can be perfectly consistent in each word. Finally, I'd like to tell Roosevelt that we received his comments with respect to the document and I think his idea is very good. I have actually shared his idea with Rodrigo de la Parra so that staff in the Caribbean can also talk to Roosevelt and to the people in the Caribbean. I also ask Dev, who is part of the regional group. We do have ICANN staff in the Caribbean.

We have Albert Daniels, we have Rodrigo de la Parra, and any concerns with respect to ICANN reach to that are, please feel free to contact Rodrigo and ourselves, so that we can work together and see what are the synergies that we can create. ICANN is in the Caribbean, and staff is at your disposal if you have some concern in this regard.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you Silvia. If you have not read the document that has been put up for voting and has a deadline of the 19th, the document Humberto referred to, there is a way – and I know [Rosa 00:59:11] doesn't like this, but we can discuss this for the Caribbean region, and see what it is that we can do – but there is one matter that is described. If you can just get contacts in place where there are no ALSes and generate the event; that is one way we can use. Then all of the rest of the sectors, in CROPP, and the other issues, is established in the CROPP regulations.

The LACRALO event that I wanted to hold, which unfortunately I could not hold, because I didn't have the full translation information, we will

be able to hold it in February perhaps. For this the issue is the IANA transition. Now, in each place, are we going to generate our own LACRALO document? That is a document that has to be agreed. Because my idea is to agree with the document. I could finish this presentation, but I could not agree on that. So the idea is to finish the presentation and put it to our list.

Once there is an agreement with this document, it will be official and it will be the document that we need to show in each meeting on the IANA transition. That is one way. We are of course open to suggestions to see what other methods we have.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you Alberto. I'd just like to tell Dev that he said that there are inconsistencies in the document. It would be nice, Dev, if you could tell me what those inconsistencies are. If you could send me a private email? Let me reiterate, for the proposal for a public statement, I haven't really intervened in that document, because there were no comments within the deadline. Still, if you have found some inconsistencies, it would be nice if you could say what those are, in an email.

Now, with regards to the other document, there is actually a phrase that I added after the comments. It's a phrase that I agreed to add with Alberto. If there is an inconsistency, I propose probably to Alberto that we cancel this voting process and once we have the translation by staff we can call for voting again. This should not be the deadline to issue this statement. That's all I wanted to say.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Humberto. Since we have the power of permanent assembly, as LACRALO Chair, I'm now saying that we will cancel the voting; we will suspend it. We will verify the translation and once we have confirmation that the translation is fully correct, we will open the seven-day voting period again.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I just wanted to refer to the document for the proposal to reach new ALSes, because I haven't intervened on the other one, because there was no comment during the deadline. If we need to suspend one, I only refer to the proposal to engage new ALSes.

ALBERTO SOTO: Silvia is asking in the chat room whether it's the document for engagement of new ALSes. Yes. The rest need to continue with voting.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I understand.

ALBERTO SOTO: Item #8 is the [unclear 01:03:30] and work for the region, originating from the Latin American Strategy. Those tasks are to create the mapping of events, and after the mapping of events we need to issue... Unfortunately Fatima is not here. She is travelling. She and Dev are the ones who are part of this Working Group, together with Rodrigo. They

have the details of all of the issues there. We are not going to have sufficient time, but we're going to leave this for some other time. Maybe Dev, do you want to say something?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No, I don't think right now. No. Thanks.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Dev. Once I have all the details in Item #8, I'll put them on the list. I managed to quickly write down the issues that I mentioned – the pillars, the projects, the communications, etcetera, but since I just took down notes, I don't want to make any mistakes and feel I have these in my hands. I will include the details for the Strategic Plan in the list. Are there any questions? Now we'll come to the next Item on the Agenda. Unfortunately Sergio is not on the call and I don't have his report, so we'll not be able to discuss this, but I insist there are two documents that are ready.

They are the metrics document that was sent to the Governance Working Group, and also the amendment for the Rules of Procedure that is ready. When it comes to the Working Group, I've already talked about this. Raitme has volunteered for the Working Group. So has Cristian Casas as well. I will contact them offline. That would be an AI, to add them to the Working Group and start working together. Humberto, for Item #10 you have the floor. Go ahead please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you Alberto. I just wanted to point out and inform the rest of the participants that together with Alberto we had certain issues in bringing new speakers to lead the capacity building cycle that we're organizing at an internal level. Unless we want to see and listen to your opinions, the idea is to create a Working Group so as to solve this issue and continue with our capacity building cycle in our region. That is our general idea.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much Humberto. I'd like to remind you that we have the capacity for the training plan, and I'll send that to the list as an AI. I will forward again the capacity building plan. As you can see, all our discussions are done through the Wiki page or through the mailing list. We need to make the most of this hour and a half that we have during our monthly calls, and we should have two capacity building sessions, each of them of 20 minutes, and then the remaining half an hour should be devoted to our monthly meeting. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is regarding Item #9 regarding the Governance Working Group document. I've seen, perhaps four or five days ago, two documents circulated internally to the Governance Working Group. First of all I'll await the translated versions of this document, but I would strongly, strongly recommend and urge that there needs to be a call with the Governance Working Group so that the ideas behind the proposals can be discussed. I have great concerns, based on the machine translation of the two documents.

The metrics one seems to be contradicting itself in various paragraphs, and the modifications to Operating Principles, there's absolutely no context as to what these modifications are attempting to solve. What seems to be worse is that it seems to be unchanged from the previous document that was circulated for comment earlier this year, which was a substantial comment made to that document on the Wiki, regarding the various component. The proposal appears to be unchanged from that, to which there were some grave concerns expressed.

So I'm very concerned with what's been proposed again, seemingly not taking into account the comments made before. So I'd really like to have a conference call of the Working Group to really look at these proposals carefully before any votes start, after 30 days of emailing the document, without some sort of discussion. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much Dev. According to Sergio, he had asked for a call but the Members of the Working Group did not participate. There ended up being one or two participants. I have participated in many calls of the Governance Working Group. I've participated as an observer, not as an active Member. I participated in the Metrics Working Group as well, but there was no one to work with. But I know that for example Roosevelt sent something very important, that was taken into account and that was included in the document. Roosevelt's contribution was really important and a very concrete contribution.

Sergio has told me that they had incorporated or included everything that was suggested by Roosevelt. Anyway, as an AI, please, I would like

to have Sergio Salinas Porto to call a call for this Working Group, and I hope and expect that all the Members participate in this opportunity, since I've had many complaints regarding this topic. After this meeting I'll publish the names of the Members of the Working Group and the ones that have participated. I will ask Sergio to provide a report to me so that I can see the participants. Dev, you have your hand up?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to say that the call should be announced on the LACRALO list, rather just to the Members of the Governance Working Group, so that we can all be aware of the discussions, and secondly of course, once the documents are fully translated. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much Dev. Your suggestion is noted as an AI, so our calls should always be fully open, and I hope we can have more participants, because now you know this is an open call and you can participate. Only Members can vote, but the rest of the participants can speak and can participate. Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you Alberto. I wanted to make a proposal, if I may. Since these documents are so relevant for the LACRALO governance, I'd suggest this. Once the Working Group meets and discusses the final document, we can provide a webinar for the whole region, with the official Members of this Working Group, where they can present this document. That is the last opportunity that they'll have to add any input. Perhaps we can use

the PowerPoint presentation to express the content and gather information and input. That is my suggestion. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Okay, Silvia, thank you. We will try to do that, but one of the most important discussions within these meetings was that there were some people that didn't even read the document. So we will do that, but I would kindly ask those that would like to participate that before participating, please do read the document and do get informed so that you can participate in the webinar. But of course, we can do that.

Okay, the last Item on the Agenda is Any Other Business. There is no other business, so if there are no further comments or questions, we can bring this call to a close. Any questions? Any comments? Any doubt? Any suggestion you'd like to make? If there are no further comments, I'd like to thank the interpreters and staff. Thank you all for your active participation. Now we'll bring this call to an end. Thank you very much.

TERRI AGNEW:

The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you for joining. Please disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]