
ALBERTO SOTO: It seems that the dial-outs are complete, so I would like to welcome you all to this call, to the staff, all participants, and of course, our interpreters. So, now I would like to ask Terri to kindly proceed with the roll call. Please, Terri, go ahead.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly, thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO webinar, "Documents Currently Open to Public Comments," on Monday, the 5th of January, 2015, at 23:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call, as it is a webinar.

But if I could please remind everyone on the phone bridge as well as the computer to mute your speakers and microphones when not speaking, as well as state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on other language channels. We have Spanish and Portuguese interpretation. Thank you for joining, and back over to you, Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Terri, for this. Now we will go to item number 2. This is the adoption of the agenda.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: So, this is the adoption of the agenda. I will proceed to mention the items that we will deal with. We will analyze or review three documents. One of them is the proposal of metrics. Alberto Soto will be

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.

in charge of this document. After that, we will have a session of questions, a Q&A session during 15 minutes.

After that, we will be dealing with the proposal of LACRALO procedure for the preparation, issuance, and publication of a statement. As you can see, my name is there, but I would kindly ask Fátima to make a brief summary of that document. And then we will have a Q&A session during 20 minutes. And after that, we will be reviewing the new ALS engagement program proposal. And we will have a Q&A session for this document as well. Then we will briefly touch up on the timeframe and the next steps.

Before giving the floor to Alberto Soto, I would like to say that this webinar was planned for our calendar. But taking into account of the request of certain members of LACRALO and staff, and in order to show that we work in complete transparency, we are now providing this webinar, and any other webinar that may be necessary to clarify any doubt or questions. Now you have the floor, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Humberto, for this. Before going to the first document, I would like to make some clarifications. We have received some critics regarding the working groups. As you know, we have already started working with the open meetings for this working group, and from now on, all the meetings of the working group will be informed to the mailing list, and anyone will be able to participate and be part of that meeting. So, anyone can be a member of any working group.

Okay. Now, let's go on with the metrics document, or the proposal of metrics.

Can you hear me? Can you all hear me? Because I hear some side conversation. Someone has a mic open.

So, this proposal of metrics is being dealt with, not only in LACRALO, but also at the ALAC level, and in other RALOs as well. I think that there is one RALO that has a document ready, and the others are working on this document.

The need for metrics is important because we cannot improve things that we do not know, and we do not know things that we do not measure. Therefore, in any organization, when we try to measure something, the [inaudible] is to improve. We measure to improve. So, first, we need to measure. Of course, we will receive all the suggestions and modifications required. Fortunately, we had a great participation. Many comments have been taken into account. On the Wiki page, you will see the modifications, you will see that we will be doing the modifications to certain items or points in the document. There should be reviewed, or these comments are reflected on the Wiki page.

There is a comment by Dev regarding the first item. We represent the users, the end-users, Internet end-users from Latin America and the Caribbean. What we mean by this is that we represent the interest of those end-users. This is very important to take into account. It's a very timely observation, a very good observation, because as you can see, is us, we are the ones who need to fight for the users.

We do this not only by means of policies, but also by modifying or amending existing policies. Some of the ways that we have to participate, and as you can see nowadays, we have a lot of work to do in ICANN, especially in ALAC. Because, you know, we have the topic of the IANA transition. But we, as an organization that represents the end-users' interest, we need to take into account that this, our topic, should not go against end-users.

Having said this, I would like to know if there is any comment or suggestion. I hope we are all able to read the document and the comments on the Wiki. So if you have any comment, the floor is open. Dev, go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Alberto. Regarding the first opening paragraph, saying we represent end-users, and I see that I commented, like I acknowledged, is it that the text is now going to change to say we represent the interests of Internet end-users? That's what I'm wondering. I see Fátima is asking kind of the same question. How are the comments being incorporated on all of these documents? Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes, that's right. I have just mentioned your comment, your suggestion, of including the word "interests" of the end-users are not the representation of end-users. And there was some other comment or observation regarding this paragraph that we don't represent all end-users. I mean, both comments are very well taken, and the paragraph will be modified or amended by the working group by adding that we

represent the interest of the Internet end-users. I believe that, with that word being added, we will get the spirit of the text.

Is there any other comment or suggestion regarding the document that we have on the Wiki? Any comment? Any question? Any suggestion? Antonio, go ahead, please. Antonio Medina Gómez, you have the floor. Antonio, I see your question. We have the end-users' interest. That is your question. Well, the idea of an ALS – not our ALS, but the ALSes that are a part of ALAC – the objective is to generate policies or create policies for Internet end-users.

The only possible way of representation is by means of ALAC and by means of LACRALO in our region, or by means of GAC. We know that Internet end-users can see or can know or learn about their rights and rights or requirements that are not being satisfied. For example, if, in the GAC, there is any government that makes a decision or that takes a decision that goes against the Internet users, if the GAC does not find a solution for this, it is us, the ones who have to fight for Internet users.

We know about the policies that are being developed. I will give you an example. When I worked in the Dominican Republic, a journalist came to me and she asked me something similar. Because she said, "I don't have any problem with Internet." Well, that is the Internet end-user, the one that has no knowledge regarding ICANN, that has no knowledge regarding ALAC or regions, the RALOs, who does not have any idea of the existence of the GAC.

We are the end-users, and based on that, it is our task to make outreach, to go to these end-users in each region, in each ALS, go to

them, give them information, receive their questions, and then put all those questions and comments in our region. Then we have to escalate that information. Please take into account that this is a model which is not only a multi-stakeholder model, but this is a bottom-up model. So it is we, the ones who have to be in charge of this, otherwise the end-users will not have any representation.

Fátima Cambronero, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

FÁTIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Alberto and Humberto. Thank you very much for organizing this webinar. I don't know, or I don't understand clearly, how, dealing with this webinar, are we going to read each document, and are we going to analyze each paragraph of each task? Because I thought we were just going to review the document and add the comments. So I don't have clear in my mind how we'll go through these documents. Perhaps we need further explanation because we don't have the final document ready. So I would like to know the procedure, how we'll proceed, because I have concrete questions or doubt, but I don't know if I can give them now or say them now or then.

ALBERTO SOTO: Humberto Carrasco, go ahead please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Fátima, to your question. Well, we decided to organize this webinar to discuss a document in order to make the most of this webinar, or this situation or possibility. Because if we had a final document with all the

comments, we would have to start discussing documents again, and open topics again, and we would never finish. So this will be a never-ending task.

So we decided to deliver this webinar where each of us had to read the document and the comments. The objective is if there are new comments, the new comments will be added to the document or the Wiki page in order to organize our task.

So I would kindly ask, Fátima, that if you have further comments or questions, please proceed with those questions or comments so that we can work with those doubts or questions and add these comments to the document. Because after we have all the information [inaudible] we will proceed with the final drafting of the document.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you, Humberto. Fátima, go ahead, please.

FÁTIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you very much, Humberto. I understand what you mean, and somehow I would say that I will disagree, because in my opinion, and this is my very personal opinion, well, there are still comments, questions, and doubts. And if that is the case, it means that there is no consensus on certain topics and we need further discussions so as to finish with these comments. Because otherwise, it seems or it will appear as if we had a certain period of time to make comments and that's it.

So this is something important. We have been working on these topics for a long time, and we were not able to reach agreement before. So we need to get to the end of a discussion, and this will take us time. Probably we will not finish even today. I have certain concerns that I didn't post on the Wiki because I didn't have the time. These are concerns that have to do with the document, not only with concrete items on those documents.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Fátima. Fátima, these documents were already posted for comments and many people posted their comments. They read the documents, they posted their comments, and they requested certain clarifications. So, from now on, webinars will be carried out at the very beginning of each working group. Not in this case, because we are in the middle of a public comment period.

Humberto is right, and you are also right. We have been working with these topics for a long time. The method of working will take us years or ages, and it will be a never-ending task. I don't know that we'll reach consensus, total or general consensus, but at least we will have the opinion of every single person who would like to give his or her opinion.

So those who were not able to provide their input, they have the opportunity now to do it, and they will still have the opportunity to do it in the following days so that the working group can take them into account.

The public comment period is not finished yet. So we have now 30 days. And, in fact, we have another 30 days, so we have 60 days. And if

someone was not able to read the documents, well, this is not because of lack of time, in fact.

For example, I will suggest a modification that I will post on the Wiki. For example, on item number 2, I suggest – I'm not going to read the document, but the idea is this: that those who are not able to participate should inform the reason why they are not able to participate.

So I suggest that that person should inform that he or she is not able to participate, but without the need of providing the reasons. Because saying that you cannot participate is the way of participating. It might be for personal reasons or for working reasons, but we know there is a meeting and I am not able to participate. So that is another way of participating.

And I also suggest, taking into account some comments on the Wiki, something on item number 4. And I'm sorry if I am insisting on this, but if we do not proceed in this way, we will never end with a metrics proposal, because it has taken us a lot of time. So, taking all this into account, we can extend the public comment period.

But please, Humberto, if you will, you can take note, but it is everyone may provide input freely on the Wiki page so that we can add and take into account the opinion of everybody. But we cannot wait for a person to read the document after three or four months and start a new round of comments, because otherwise no working group will be able to finish with their activities.

Humberto, please go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Fátima, I would like to have your comment. I know that you're very busy with the ALAC topics, and of course I do understand that. But I believe that we still have time, while we are adding and incorporating all the suggestions and comments from these three documents, this is not an easy task. Probably we will have one or two weeks. So if there is anyone, Fátima or anyone else, who would like to make any extra comment, you are welcome to do so. You can do it in the following days, because the idea is to add all the input of the comments. And once we have that ready, once we have the final document, that document will be posted for votes.

That is the idea. Fátima, of course you are a lawyer, you know very well that we won't reach total or general consensus in all the topics of the document, because that would be very, very difficult. When we speak about a document, we need to think about negotiations where you can discuss certain topics, negotiate certain concepts or topics, and we believe that we are representing the greatest amount of interests. That is the idea of this webinar and of the documents.

ALBERTO SOTO: Fátima, please, you have the floor. Go ahead.

FÁTIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Alberto. Humberto's audio is very choppy and I was not able to hear him well. But I would like to make a clarification. I'm not complaining about the lack of time, that I didn't have the time to

make the necessary comments in my personal case. I mean, I'm talking in general. We are 45 ALSes and we only receive four or five relevant comments from the ALSes. So that's why I was insisting on seeing today the final document based on that. Okay, let's see what are the doubts that we have.

When it comes to consensus, well, according to our operating principles, our organization is based on consensus. If we put consensus aside and we want to vote on something that we do not agree, I think that we are distorting the nature of our organization. I believe that we have very good comments, very positive comments, and we need to harmonize those comments and input with the text.

I'm not only talking about my lack of time to provide input. I'm also talking in general about the comments that have already been posted. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Fátima. Well, Fátima, I suggest that you provide all the input that you want on the Wiki page. I know that many people didn't have the time to do it. So that's why we are trying to extend the comment period. But we already have comments where we say that we will take certain topic or certain point into account. Please, do clarify which topics should be taken into account, because we need to provide input and we need to be clear on that. Because we cannot wait for everybody to provide input.

When sometimes we had input from only one person and no one else in LACRALO was able to provide input – I'm not only talking about the

proposal of metrics or the next document – but the idea is to have greater participation. This will give us better transparency, greater transparency in our activities in the whole organization. Because we are giving too much time, we are delivering too much time, if someone tells me that in three months’ time that person didn’t have the time to read a document – okay, I’m sorry, but it’s not possible to wait for that person to provide input.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Just to address some comments based on the discussion that I’ve heard so far. One, it’s very hard to get to a consensus on a proposal when the concepts [on] the proposal isn’t clear. I have to say this metrics proposal is not clear. One of the comments that I’ve made is that – let me just say that right now it’s literally scattered across multiple points, and it has different conditions that contradict each other.

So point one says ALS active participation shall mean participation in 20% of monthly meetings. Okay. Point seven, which is from the NARALO’s rules and procedures seems to ignore all of the other points and just says upon failure to cast a vote in three consecutive elections [inaudible] loses its voting rights. This metrics proposal needs to be stated much more clearly. It just needs a, “LACRALO will use the following criteria and thresholds to measure an ALS’s participation in LACRALO and At-Large activities,” and just list them all out in bullet points so it’s all in one numbered point.

I do have another concern regarding the metrics. I don't know whether I have an opportunity to bring it out. But that's my concern. So it's hard to get consensus. And it's also, again, and this is not the first time these proposals are fully being shown on a webinar or in a conference call. So this is the second thing. So most people are now maybe seeing this for the first time on this call. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Dev. My first [inaudible]. Dev made a suggestion, and that suggestion will be adopted. I am sorry for this, but perhaps there might be people who were not able to read the Wiki and they are now providing input. And that is what I really want, that everybody has the necessary time to read the Wiki page. Because in the Wiki, we have responses to different requests, and if there is anyone who does not agree with that, please take that paragraph, correct or amend the paragraph as you want to see the paragraph, so that we can see the result and reach a consensus.

Because if we have a group and nobody makes a contribution, well, now you will have the time and the possibility of doing it, because the working group will be open. We have presented this information. We have received comments. We are delivering a webinar and we are receiving comments during the public comment periods. Those [who work] make mistakes, and if anyone believes that something that is being made is not right, please take that paragraph, correct the paragraph, and that paragraph will be taken with the necessary modifications.

But please, do not say, “I don’t like this paragraph,” and just that, because that is not the way of contributing. The way of contributing should be, “This is incorrect. I will correct it and I will show it on the Wiki for you to see.” Because otherwise we will spend years, it will take us ages to discuss documents and we will never get or reach agreement.

Now, based on Fátima’s comment – that’s correct, we will do this, Humberto. For this very first time and for this unique time, with the help of the staff, we will accept or we will take all the suggestions. They will be analyzed by the working group. Another document will be drafted. And that document will be posted for consideration. But please, I do need that everybody read all the information that is already posted, because suggestions are being made on certain topics that we have already agreed upon. That is the collaboration I am waiting from you or that I would like to see. Humberto, go ahead please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

What we can do is to take the document with the comments already existing, perhaps we can post that document for the following days. Because we need to analyze the document and then we need to analyze the comments. And perhaps we can all spend a final public comment period, a short one, so that we can have the final document with all the comments included. Very simple. The idea is to have a document with a change control function so that everybody can see the changes that are being made to the document.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Humberto. I think that that is a good idea. We have already exhausted the time devoted to this topic. So we will leave the public comment period – in fact, we will extend that period. We will provide or present another proposal for comment and after that period we will draft or have the final document.

I see that the first paragraph has the proposal or the amendment or the modification proposed by Dev, and that's right, because that's the very time, when Dev posted the comment, that it was accepted and incorporated. Humberto, would you like to make a comment, or your hand is up from the previous comments? Okay.

Now let's continue with item number 5. That is the following document, which is "Proposal of LACRALO's procedure for the preparations and publication of statements." Fátima, you have the floor, go ahead.

FÁTIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you, Alberto. In fact, I didn't know that I was going to speak about these proposals, so I will just make a brief and generic comment regarding this document, something that we did in our meeting in London. This was already to have in writing what we were doing in LACRALO in an informal way. That was just a draft document to analyze and see if everybody agrees with the rules of procedures to draft statements in our RALO.

There were comments by [inaudible] and Dev that were really important to be taken into account. I don't see any other comments, so I don't know if any other person would like to make a comment regarding the document. I understood that Humberto and Alberto were

in charge of the document, so that's why I wasn't able to add all the comments to the document. This document is something useful for us.

[inaudible] in his comment said that – I don't remember who, but one of them said that the statement should contribute to the ALAC statement. This was not the case. That's why the idea was to promote comments from our region; that is to say, to have points of view from LACRALO. But we have other background questions or issues that we need to take into account. Perhaps we need to analyze if the LACRALO should draft statements, or if LACRALO should contribute to ALAC statements. I will stop here because I don't have further comments, and I will give the floor to you, Alberto. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Fátima. That's good, that's fine. We are giving a clarification of why we are having these proposals. This was also posted for comments. A public comment period was open, and the comments will be added as in the previous case, as in the previous document.

Now, the floor is open for you to provide your input or make any comment or observation regarding this document of LACRALO, the proposal of LACRALO for the procedure for the preparation of statements. I believe that we need to have a procedure, or a proposal at least, because in the past we had to generate or create an opinion, but we were not able to work on that opinion.

If someone, for example, provided input regarding lack of participation regarding our region, and perhaps someone else read that comment and agreed with that comment, but that is not the opinion of LACRALO.

So in some cases, LACRALO's opinion should not be provided in such a way, or an observation or a note should be included saying that or stating that such comment or opinion does not include the opinion of the whole LACRALO.

But in the way we are working, we are working in an open way where everybody can provide input and say if he or she agrees or not, and provide all the necessary input and modifications. What we can do to [inaudible] any misunderstanding or doubt is that any proposal, if there is any ALS who does not agree, well, we should say, "This is the LACRALO's opinion, but for such ALS, which does not agree with our opinion," and we can also provide the background or the comment of that ALS supporting or being against our proposal. Is there any comment? Dev, you have the floor, go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Actually, Carlton Samuels wants to take the floor. So I will lower my hand for Carlton.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Dev. Carlton, go ahead, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Alberto. I hope you are hearing me. I really am quite challenged to see how this proposal extends LACRALO's participation in the policy making processes of the ALAC. If the objective is for LACRALO to have an early [inaudible] vote in policy formulations at the ALAC, it

would be more productive if LACRALO lends itself to full and better participation in the agreed ALAC [process].

To my mind, and certainly from my experience, every time that LACRALO has attempted to exercise a sovereign right to make a statement, it has been, one, ineffectual; two, too late; three, of no consequence. And so I would caution all of you to consider what you are talking about [here].

I understand LACRALO to have one principle objective: to participate in policy development for names and numbers through the ALAC. The ALAC is the official representative of the At-Large in the ICANN community – to the ICANN community, and the ICANN Board. To my mind, trying to develop a process that does not integrate [smoothly] in the existing ALAC policy development processes [does not fit our purpose]. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Carlton. Carlton, a question to you. I believe that the objective of this proposal is to organize, somehow, the drafting and publication of statements that are being requested and that are not only generated in LACRALO. When you say that we will have to do it through ALAC, how would you do it? Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

ALAC has a process that is published, that is well-understood. Those of us who have participated in that process ought to know how to it goes. There is a process, there is an ALAC policy [inaudible] production page.

It's posted. An issue comes up, it's posted, and the question is asked: does the ALAC respond to this issue? How does the ALAC respond to this issue? Usually there is a request, and it starts from there. There is no policy process that's can literally get into without—

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry, I already know that, but if we don't do it through by means of a proposal, or a publication, how will we generate internal consensus to participate within ALAC?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Alberto, we have two representatives on the ALAC. They are meant to be our mouthpieces for the ALAC. They are meant to guide us about what the sense of the room is on the ALAC on any policies. I am suggesting to you if we are paying attention we will not be caught unaware of the policy issues that are bubbling up that the ALAC [inaudible]. As far as I'm concerned, it is more useful to pay attention to what is happening in the ALAC through our representatives than to find [our own] way of trying to generate the [inaudible] for the ALAC.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Carlton. We can do it through the ALAC members, but ALAC members may request the opinion to the RALOs, and they create a joint statement at the RALO level. In LACRALO, we have provided our opinion to them. But what we said is not binding for ALAC members. They may say something different, and they have the right to do it, to say that.

In that case, if we say, for example, that our opinion at the LACRALO level is such and such, and ALAC members, or the ALAC member involved, does not agree, well, that person may say, and I really think that's why that person was appointed, he or she may say that is his or her opinion and not LACRALO's opinion. And we are not talking about only generating or creating policies, but we are also talking about modifying existing policies. Is there any other comment or any other question that you would like to make?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'd like to answer [inaudible].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, Carlton –

ALBERTO SOTO: Dev, go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Alberto, and thanks, Carlton. Just to agree with what Carlton is saying, the thing is that the At-Large policy development pages are open for all in At-Large to comment on. It's not just restricted to the ALAC members to make comments. So anyone, and I think this is what happens first before LACRALO tries to develop a parallel sub-process to try to follow it. Because it just takes up too much time and bandwidth and energy that we don't have.

So persons can make comments on the policy development pages, and the discussion can have on the ALAC, at the ALAC level, or at the working group level, looking at the comments. That's what needs to happen more. And I put that text and put a link to the policy development page in the chat. Thanks.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Let me say this. I just want to follow [on with it]. Let me say this. The issue for our policy, it's the results that matter. I don't care much about how it works. What I care about is the results. There are 16 ALAC members. If you intend to have results from running your mouth, you had better be able to convince at least a majority of those ALAC members that what you are saying makes sense. You don't convince them by being parochial. You convince them by integrating with them at the top level, and have an opportunity to speak to them directly.

The way you speak to them directly is not make a declaration that says "This is LACRALO's declaration." That, unfortunately, is not going to get you very far. What you want to do is to be in a position to manufacture – and I'm using the word "manufacture" decidedly. You want to manufacture consent. You want to manufacture consensus. The way to manufacture consent and manufacture consensus amongst 15 voting members, including our two, who will make the final position known to the community and to the Board, is by integrating yourself and harmonizing yourself with them at the global level. That is where you need to have the [perspective] known.

If you have a system that does not link into that global level more [expectedly], I am saying to you that you are going to be spinning wheels, but you're not going to make [inaudible] contribution to policy that you put [inaudible], even if you have propose [inaudible] and agree to it. It is something that you would have an input and an influence on. The intent is to influence. You don't influence by being parochial. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Carlton. Fátima, go ahead, please. You have the floor.

FÁTIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you very much, Alberto. I would like to make a comment regarding this topic. When we decide to provide this proposal in a written form, because in the past we did it in an informal way, we had several reasons. The first reason was to have a procedure in place to issue statements even though we may not use it frequently, but at the same time to increase participation. But as Dev said on the [chat], the important thing is our members in our RALO should be able to participate when input or advice is being requested regarding ALAC policies.

The ALAC is an advisory constituency or committee, and in this case, we are talking about regions. The thing is that sometimes we have little time between the period for public comment and the time we have in LACRALO to issue a statement, so we need to provide a short statement

if we want to take that to ALAC when ALAC is requesting comment. So that is something that we need to take into account.

If we want to foster improved participation in our [RALO] [inaudible] for the statements, we also need to take into account the timeframe. And doing something very quickly is very difficult for us. This happened to us in the past, and the areas where we have a problem to achieve consensus, because not everybody had the necessary time to devote the time to read and include comments and provide input, and to go to the policy page that is being developed by ALAC.

So if all these things are not properly highlighted in the document, well, they should be taken into account in the future. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Fátima. I do agree with you. And I do agree with Carlton as well. I would like to make a comment on a clarification. We have taken this proposal that I think was drafted or presented by Fátima or someone else – it was started by Fátima or someone else. We were working in a working group that was the LACRALO Strategy Working Group. In that case we identified strengths and weaknesses. It is very difficult to explain everything once we start working, and we need collaboration. We need input.

So in this case, we also have a lack of training, a lack of skills. One of our greatest faults when we do not participate as a ALS or as a region in the page that was provided in the chat, well, the most important reason is that we lack the necessary knowledge or the training. It is not that we lack the capacity or the ability, but we lack the training. And sometimes

there have been very important topics being dealt with, but we were not able to provide our input. We are seeing these problems. We have training problems, capacity building problems.

The idea is to avoid this, to avoid this lack of knowledge so that each ALS, every member, may provide input knowing or having knowledge about the fact [inaudible]. And we need to do something to start. We need to take the first step. If we don't take that first step, we won't be able to move forward.

So I believe that what was said before – and I remember that some ALAC members in the past said that our opinion is not binding – so this is important to take into account. If it is an ALAC member providing an opinion, but that opinion is not in agreement with LACRALO, well, we should be able to generate a statement, to draft a statement, by our region, coming from our region, providing our opinion for that ALAC member.

I do agree with Carlton that we need to access that ALAC member, that we need to work with that ALAC member. But, before that, we need to have a tool to do that, a common tool to work on that. Carlton, go ahead, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS4:

Thank you very much, Alberto. I want to emphasize again, the way we [can] work is like this. There is a policy page, and where all of the policy issues come up for mention, where any member of the At-Large, including our representative to the ALAC, can make an intervention. I am suggesting to you that our ALAC members are clearly visible on

those pages. Our At-Large members from LACRALO are clearly visible on those pages, not just to LACRALO, but to EURALO, NARALO, APRALO, all [of them].

This is an opportunity for us to, A, learn something; B, influence others to our thinking; C, give our LACRALO representatives to the ALAC a sense of the consensus, a sense of our thinking [in] from this region. I really do believe that if we have members, I do not believe members should be given a week to vote a certain way on the ALAC. I personally do not agree with that. But I certainly do agree that members who are sensitive to LACRALO needs and who are elected by LACRALO would take into consideration the comments and the input that comes from LACRALO. What I am absolutely sure and hoping for is that when LACRALO members operate at the global level and share their concerns with our colleagues around the world, there is a very good opportunity that some of what we say can actually be represented in the final outcome in a faster, more direct way, than if we establish a whole set of processes that are parochial for LACRALO, that in the end do not allow us to influence anything that happens on the ALAC, or even give our representatives an opportunity to be influenced by the collective wisdom of LACRALO membership. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Carlton, and thank you Alan for your comments regarding ICANN policies. Alan says we will never be talking about detailed ICANN policies and get a large number of people involved. It will always depend on a small number who have a knowledge and interest and can understand how the policy impacts a large number of

users. Carlton, you have your hand up. Would you like to make any other comments, or that was from your previous [intervention]?

CARLTON SAMUELS: That was from my previous [intervention], sorry.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. Silvia Vivanco, you have the floor, go ahead.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Just a brief comment that might help you or guide you regarding the benefits of creating a process for the preparation, issuance, and publication of statements, which is parallel to the one existing in ALAC. My only concern, thinking in the advantages and disadvantages of this proposal, would be that perhaps we might devote too much energy to these processes of creating statements or opinions that, in the end, or at the end of the day, the Board will take as an individual opinion. Because we have an institutionalized or formal process that is being adopted and that is legally constituted, and that has a representation before the Board.

So perhaps you should take this opinion into account. Perhaps we should review the process through which LACRALO provides input to ALAC, and we should review that process instead of creating a parallel process. However, having said that, perhaps it would be a value of having a parallel process. But this should be something that perhaps should not be that formal, or perhaps to have a process for very urgent situations. So that is something for you to take into account and to think

together as a group, without the benefits of having a parallel process, and if we really want a specific process of this kind for LACRALO.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Silvia. Humberto, you have the floor.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

I would like to thank Silvia for her comment, because we need to justify the reason why we should have a procedure for the drafting and publication of statements of interest. Because the thing is, not all these statements that we draft have to do with ALAC. Perhaps we want to provide a statement regarding NETmundial. I mean, any statement that may represent the interests of end-users, and in that case, we would go away from ALAC remit. And the fact of having a procedure for issuing statements will promote and increase discussion within LACRALO. And in that way, we will be contributing to the engagement and the participation of the members in the region.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Humberto. I should say that I do agree with Humberto, and with the fact that there is an issue with the time and capacity building. With these, we are trying to achieve this to go with objectives to have time and to have the necessary knowledge. Not all the members of the ALSes will be able to provide input, but since we are independent from ALAC, we will be able to draft a statement for NETmundial or any other similar organization.

In that case, we will have the necessary training, and the majority of our people involved. We do not have the time right now, because we have very little time. We cannot in 20 days' time train people and at the same time provide input, as Fátima said before. We do not have the time. We are just starting to work on [this] so as to review the time and increase our capacity-building, increase training, and be able to provide something based on consensus or agreed upon, all of us. This is not only for policies. Fátima, you have the floor, go ahead.

FÁTIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you very much, Alberto. I would like to go back to a point mentioned by Alan. And if it is exactly what he said, but I will relate my opinion to that. The fact of being able to participate and provide input and provide statements regarding certain issues, well, we should understand that this is not a task for all the participants in LACRALO. Probably we will have a small group or a group participating in the drafting and publication of statements. And some of the group will be able to participate in procedures, and some of the group will be in charge or devoted to elections.

So the idea is not to train many people in one year to participate in all the public comment periods. For example, in this case, we have the IANA issue or the ICANN accountability issue. Not everybody has the ability or the capacity to participate and provide input in those topics. It is to have a relation between that and the end-users' interest. So it should not be compulsory for everybody to be trained on that if there is no relationship between the topic and the everyday work being done by the person [or] the interest of the Internet users in their organizations.

That would be an ideal situation that will never be reached in LACRALO. We have already had experience in that, and we should learn from our past experience.

And I repeat what I said before: when these documents were posted for comments, very few people read the document because they didn't have the time, they are not interested, they believe it is not relevant. And as Carlton said, we should analyze if it is convenient to have this procedure or not. Now we have the situation of seeing if it is necessary to have it or not, or if we should have this procedure implemented for a future situation. I mean, I believe we have many other things to take into account outside the content of the document. It should be taking into account at the time of making decisions in our region and for the benefit of all of us. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much. The objective of the training cycle is that everybody takes what is necessary to that person, not that everybody takes everything. We have a capacity training or a capacity building cycle, and we are seeing how to work with that. We lack the time, and I insist on this. We have a structural problem in our region, as in any other case. We cannot only take or take only one measure. We can work, as we are working right now.

We had a strategic plan on which Alejandro Pisanty worked very hard, and we learned a lot from our region. But we do not have time for all measures to be taken and implemented simultaneously. We need to do that. We need to implement those measures little by little. The training

program does not say or state that everybody should take every single training course. In fact, we need to take into account the most important topics, and based on that, we need to develop the training cycle. We have already started with that in our monthly calls, and we will continue with that.

Is there any other comment? I see Alan is leaving the call, so than you very much, Alan, for your participation. Is there any other comment regarding this document, this point on the agenda? No? Let's go to item number six, that is new ALS engagement program proposal.

In this case, we had certain observations that were taken into account, particularly from Roosevelt King. What was posted was very interesting, and I proposed him to generate a working [inaudible] with people from the Caribbean, and I will be included in that working group, so that we can start working specifically on what he is requesting. I think this is a very good proposal.

However, this does not mean that the document should not be generated. We need to see how we will innovate or improve things in developing countries where no resources are available. That is something that is called social innovation, and we should apply social innovation to what Roosevelt said. We may modify this, partly to have the participation of governments, medium- and small-sized companies, and universities. We are discussing this with a small group and we are scheduling a meeting to deal with different [approaches] so as to be able to carry out this.

When it comes to the amount, I do not agree with Roosevelt in the fact of fixing an amount or a fixed amount. We had a different project in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. And for example, when I was there, there was a problem, and on that occasion, I had to take one plane to the Dominican Republic and another plane to Haiti. That situation exceeded the amount provided or the amount foreseen for that trip. So I don't think if we should fix an amount, but of course, we need to make amendments or modifications.

Is there any comment, or any questions, suggestions? I see no comments. I see no hand up. Carlton says "I'm always intrigued as to how you train someone to be interested." With Humberto, we started our term, and our role. The participation in webinars and meetings in ALAC or ICANN webinars, we had perhaps only one or two participants from LACRALO. In our meetings, we had almost 30 participants, with only one apology. And as I said before, apologies are active participation.

So we had 33 out of 42 ALSes. Generally, we only have 20 people participating. How do we achieve this? Well, by contacting people by Skype, by e-mail, by texting them, so that everyone can see the topics that are being discussed and participate on those topics that are interesting for them. Dev, perhaps, can tell us about his task to increase the ALS participation. Dev, please go ahead and tell us how you increased ALS participation.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Alberto. One of the approaches in the ALAC strategy plan is to build a sort of map of the stakeholders in each country in the LAC region, and then look to try to alleviate those gaps in those countries. I think perhaps our first effort should be those countries where there is absolutely no stakeholders from ICANN from a country. Those would probably be the first prime targets for engagement, because I think the desire is to have stakeholders from all the countries in Latin America and the Caribbean involved.

The proposal has been discussed, and I can post the link in the LAC strategy plan, and has been presented extensively [in] conference calls. So I won't go into detail.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay, Dev. Thank you very much. It's not necessary for you to post the link, because as I said before, we are working with ICANN and Rodrigo de la Parra. I'm sorry, but I forgot his name – and the other Rodrigo. We are working on that. Rodrigo [inaudible], thank you very much for the reminder. We are working on that strategy plan.

So we are moving forward. We are working. And we cannot say, "Okay, we are having meetings every two weeks." We are also providing information. We inform that we are working with ICANN, that we are dealing with three projects that are now being discussed. And we have a [clarification] on three projects. We are working on the CROPP program, and we are also taking into account the ICANN budget with the support of Rodrigo de la Parra. Humberto, go ahead, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Alberto, sorry for interrupting you, but I would like to deal with item number seven, and I would like to tell you about the timeframe for the three documents. After the webinar, we will be drafting a final document that will add all those suggestions. Of course, they might be perhaps in a Word document with the change control function. This document will be posted for comments for some date with the idea of reaching consensus. Once we have those comments and that document, that document will be posted for votes. The timeframe and deadlines will be informed in the Wiki page and in the mailing list.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead, please. Be brief, please, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Humberto, I suggest to you if you are posting the second version, post it on a separate Wiki page and label it “second draft of proposal whatever” so that everybody can understand clearly this is the second version, for us to then review and comment on. I do think that the public draft [inaudible] needs to happen. There needs to be a governance working call to discuss the issues and [reinforce] comments, because I’m not sure there is understanding. That’s it.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Dev. I would like to thank you all for your active participation. This is what I mean by active participation. The idea is to finish with this task. You will have the information on the mailing list. I

would like to thank the staff and our interpreters who are very patient with us. Once again, thank you very much for your participation, and may you all have a happy new year. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW:

Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining us. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, everyone. And thanks again to the interpreters.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]