
TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We will now begin today's webinar.

[CROSSTALK IN MULTIPLE LANGUAGES]

TERRI AGNEW: Before we start, we are hearing Spanish and Portuguese on the English channel.

[FOREIGN LANGUAGE]

SABRINA: Hello, this is Sabrina on English. My apologies for that. We are ready to start the call Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly, we'll go ahead and begin the webinar at this time then.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO capacity building webinar on the topic of GAC and Internet users teleconference, taking place on Thursday the 19th of March, 2015 at 23:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call, as it is a webinar. But if I can please remind everyone on the phone bridge, as well as the computer, to mute your speakers and microphones, as well as state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channels.

We have Spanish and Portuguese interpretation. Thank you for joining and I'll now introduce your moderator, Rodrigo Saucedo. Please begin.

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.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Rodrigo Saucedo for the record. Thank you all. Good evening and welcome. I would like to thank you all for engaging for participating. A special thanks to Olga Cavalli, Leon Sanchez, and Pedro [inaudible]. Before Pedro Ivo Ferraz da Silva. Before starting, I would like to tell you that the LACRALO community members have been engaging in this project, and we have come up with a webinar program for 2015, with a focus on capacity building for the end users.

Once we have finalized this program, we will share it with you. I don't want to take up a long time because we have our distinguished speakers on the call. Clearly, I want to thank Alberto Soto, Humberto Carrasco, and Carlos Dionisio Aguirre, for their ongoing engagement within ICANN to make this type of webinar possible.

So let us now let us figure on our agenda. The first item on our agenda for today is, what is the GAC? And our speaker is going to be Pedro Ivo Ferraz da Silva. Pedro, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri on the English channel. We're not hearing Pedro on the English channel.

BETTINA: Okay, I'm sorry. It was my fault.

PEDRO IVO FERRAZ DA SILVA: This is Pedro for the record. I would like to thank you very much, and for the ministry of [inaudible]. I think this is an excellent opportunity to show how we work as offices of the government, and it's also for me an excellent opportunity to learn, and to see the work that's being done in ALAC and the regional community and LACRALO.

I'm going to talk today about what is the GAC and how it works. I prepared a brief presentation. I like to really apologize because my slides are very simple. I didn't have much time to prepare them. But together with my willingness to show you this. You have a good idea of what GAC is, and how the issues are discussed within this community.

So I would ask you to put on the first slide. Next please. GAC is the government advisory committee of ICANN, and it includes government representatives and the aim is to provide advice to ICANN on aspects and impacts of ICANN's activities on public policies, and other issues related with governments, or international organizations. This is a formal definition that is also written in the operational principles, which is in the GAC bylaws.

I would say that GAC is the channel through which the government may convey their interest and their concerns also, relative to the actions and policies of ICANN. Next slide please. Although GAC is a body that does not make any decisions, although it has a seat in ICANN's body, it does not have the right to vote. So although GAC has this limitation, the advisors that GAC gives to ICANN have a special bylaw.

They should be duly considered, duly taken into account by the Board of ICANN. And if the Board proposes actions that do not correspond to

GAC's advice, it should explain why and make an effort to find a solution that will be accepted by those parties. So would be accepted by both GAC and ICANN's Board. Next slide please.

I would like to talk a little bit about the structure of GAC. GAC has a chair and five vice-chairs that are elected by the GAC members. The current chair is Thomas Schneider from Switzerland, and we have five vice-chairs from our region, Latin America and Caribbean. We have Olga Cavalli from Argentina. Representing Africa we have Henri Kassen from Namibia. From Europe we have [inaudible]. From Asia, Wanawit Akhuputra from Thailand. And representing Europe, we have Mr. Ihsan Durdu from Turkey.

Relative to the members of the GAC, this figure has increased constantly. I couldn't tell you this number, or this figure here is the current figure, but it's very close to reality. We have 46 members, representatives of governments, and 31 observers. We have to highlight that GAC is open to members, or to representatives of governments, and the observers are representatives of inter-governmental organization, or international organization that have some aspect related to government.

To become a member of the GAC, a form should be sent explaining this member or this observer relation with an agency or with an institution, and so his membership will be evaluated by the GAC. Next slide please. Talking a little bit about the GAC procedures. GAC works according to its operational procedures, as I mentioned, that are defined and agreed within the GAC.

And are written in this operating principles of GAC. This is the website. We have three face to face meetings during ICANN's meeting. And we have sessions on several issues that we need to discuss. During ICANN's meeting, GAC prepares the famous GAC communiqué that includes everything that was discussed within the sessions, including the decisions made, advices to the Board, that were agreed by consensus.

The final document of the communiqué is used as a reference for subsequent work of this committee of the GAC. GAC works in different ways according to the subject. Some subjects are discussed in a plenary during the meetings, also the mailing list, but also sometimes when a certain issues requires a study, we build working groups with a small number of members.

Although these working groups have a small number of members, when a decision needs to be made, the whole GAC participates, and this is decided by consensus. For instance, we have the working group, whose function is to improve working methods of GAC, and there is a recent working group that was created in Singapore, which is on human rights. And this issue has become increasingly important within ICANN, and we believe that GAC should approach this.

So we have studied this and this will be presented to the other members of ICANN's community. And I would also like to mention that we have a professional secretariat that is, works full time. It is provided by [inaudible] from Australia. So I believe that in general, these are the fundamentals of GAC and how it works. And I'm at your disposal to answer any questions you may have.

I believe this will be at the end of the presentation. So I would like to ask the next speaker to step in. Thank you for your attention.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Rodrigo Saucedo speaking. Thank you Pedro for your presentation. It was very clear, thank you. So now, I will give the floor to Olga, excuse me, to Leon Sanchez, our next speaker.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez speaking. Thank you Rodrigo. Thank you for this invitation to join you on this webinar. Clearly, I want to thank Olivier Crépin-Leblond, who kindly gave me part of the materials that I will be presenting. With that, I want to speak about the ALAC. ALAC is the At-Large Advisory Committee.

According to ICANN bylaws, ALAC would be like the home of the Internet users within ICANN. And through ALAC, we perform different functions in the interest of Internet users. And I will deal with these functions everywhere. We need to understand that ALAC is an advisory committee that is made up of the At-Large community. I mean, its members come from the At-Large community, that in turn, is divided into five different regions.

And in turn, each region has different ALSs or At-Large structures. These At-Large structures are the ones that host the Internet users in all of the regions. As I was saying, we have five RALOs, Regional At-Large Organizations, one per geographic region according to ICANN bylaws. And in our case, our RALO is LACRALO for Latin America and the

Caribbean. So, I would like to speak about ICANN's multistakeholder model about the ICANN Board and its structure.

As you can see, there are 16 seats in the Board, excuse me, 15 seats, and we have clearly an ICANN President and CEO as part of the Board. We also have different support organizations and different advisory committees. We have the ASO that represents the different regional Internet registries, such as ARIN, RIPE, and CC LACNIC, APNIC, and AfriNIC. We also have the GNSO that is quite a complex structure made up of several constituencies and stakeholder groups, commercial and non-commercial.

We also have the ccNSO, At-Large of course, the At-Large Advisory Committee, and the At-Large structures. And we also have different representatives of the different committees. The Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the IETF, the Technical Liaison Group, and the Root Server System Advisory Committee. Each of them, and of course, the GAC.

Each of these committees, each of these bodies appoint a Board member that will be part of the Board. At-Large appoints the Board member that will hold seat number 15, and that person ultimately will be acting as a representative of the At-Large community within the ICANN Board. It is worth noting that although these representative is chosen by the different At-Large structures, following procedure and then that goes to the RALOs, and then that goes a level up to the ALAC who chooses the person that will be holding seat 15, this person holding seat 15 in the ICANN Board has to act in the best interests of ICANN as an organization, and not directly representing Internet users.

But of course, naturally, it is expected that this person, this Board member, will be representing Internet users, given the origin of his or her appointment. Here we can see what I was telling you before, in terms of the graphic regions, the different RALOs, and I think it's worth highlighting that the primary unit, or constituency, within At-Large, that is the Internet user home within ICANN, well the primary unit is an ALS, the At-Large structure.

These ALSs can be organizations that are made up of several users, or else as in the case in some RALOs, you can have individual users as an ALS. This is of the case in our region. I think it's the case in EURALO and Europe, and I think it's in the case of NARALO in North America. I think they are in the process of doing this, or they have accepted individual users as RALO members.

It is also worth noting the way in which the 15 ALAC seats originate. Each region holds three seats. Two of these seats are appointed or chosen by the different ALSs and the different RALOs, and then the third seat, the third member per region, is going to be appointed by the Nominations Committee or NomCom. Clearly there is rotation in the term of these representatives. Some of them start serving even years and odd years.

NomCom appointees are a combination, let's say three representatives start on a certain year, and two, I believe, start on another year, but the point is that, these terms are staggered, if you will. So ALAC, once formed with its 15 members, performs different functions. Okay, we are the Internet Users Community. Currently we hold more than 180

ALSs, and the number is on the increase. And clearly, we are focusing on ALSs in the different ICANN regions.

As I was saying, an ALS is a group that represents Internet users in their place of origin, wherever they are located, globally. And the ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee, makes comments or posts or presents public comments in public comment periods, so ALAC can contribute comments about whatever is happening within ICANN. And ALAC can also make a comment on any process, policy topic or issue that is relevant within ICANN.

ALAC can also make a comment on any external process that is related to ICANN, and that affects Internet users. It can participate in cross community working groups, as they are known in the ICANN jargon, and ALAC is there to voice ICANN's message to the Internet users worldwide through the RALOs and through the different At-Large structures.

And it also coordinates the different gTLDs appointments, sorry, applications and objections procedures. Here we see the structures, the bottom-up process in the At-Large community ending up in the ALAC. Of course, with this bottom-up process within ICANN, we see that we have different actions that start at root level from the ALSs that then create their RALOs, and then create the ALAC.

So the ALAC is the last stage in this bottom-up process. Here, I don't know if you can clearly read this on your screens, but this is a flowchart that shows that the way in which we in ALAC, we post a statement. We start discussions at RALO level, then at this level, ALSs can contribute comments, and if consensus is reached within the RALO, then the RALO

can contact, or exchange, or engage with other RALOs to see whether the topic being discussed is also interesting in other RALOs, that can also contribute their input or comment.

If there is consensus, then we move to the next stage, in which RALOs send these comments to the ALAC and the ALAC, in turn, can review or evaluate the comments received, or presented by the different ALSs through their RALOs. If consensus is reached within ALAC, in that a statement or a communiqué is in order, then the ALAC appoints a penholder to prepare a draft statement on the issue being discussed, which later on will be posted for comments from the wider community, in order to make any needed adjustments on the basis of the comments received.

And finally, a final statement is posted, then the ALAC proceeds to a vote. The statement is ratified, and once ratified, it is published and sent to the different bodies or constituencies within ICANN. Ultimately, an ALAC statement is aimed at the ICANN Board. So these statements can deal with a wide range of topics as we have mentioned. On this slide, we can see another flowchart regarding the request for comments.

Here the first or the starting point is the following. We have a community that identifies a specific issue, and wants to drive that issue to moving forward, so we reply to a request for comments, as published by ICANN. This is a different process. So we can see that the flowchart is slightly different, because we have a request for comments and ALAC and the RALOs, at the same time, can make their comments and evaluate or assess whether any RALO or ALAC engagement is required,

and if that is the case, if that is needed is a comment or a statement by the ALAC is needed, a penholder is appointed to prepare the draft, then that draft is posted for community comments.

And if that draft has consensus from the community and from the ALAC, then it goes to vote and ratification stages. And if ratified, then once again, that document is sent to the corresponding bodies within ICANN. Finally, I would like to share some relevant links with you. You have the At-Large mailing list. You also have the At-Large policy development page, and you have another link to access the different working groups that of course, are open to anyone willing to join.

And finally, we can see our presence on the social media, Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube. With that, I bring my presentation to a close. And of course, I would be more than happy to answer any questions that you have. Thank you very much for your attention.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Rodrigo Saucedo speaking. Thank you for your presentation Leon. We will now give the floor to Olga Cavalli, who will be speaking about the GAC ALAC joint activities at ICANN meetings.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Olga Cavalli speaking. Thank you Rodrigo. Thank you everyone. I am Argentina's representative within the GAC. I have prepared another topic before dealing with joint sessions. So I prepared a brief presentation on relevant topics for this year, for 2015. I apologize

because, for not preparing my presentation in English. I was short of time.

While preparing the presentation, I realized, I was aware of this, but I realized even more about the relevance of these topics to the Internet users, and about, I realized that we do need to work together even more. So, of course feel free to use my presentation later on, after this webinar. Right now, the GAC is working on the IANA stewardship transition.

And the GAC is engaged in the IANA stewardship transition coordination group in the CWG stewardship, and in the CCWG accountability. I am a group here. I am a member of the last of these three groups. All the GAC representatives that is a bit more interested in these topics or have a bit more time available. Well, we have tried to engage in all of the working groups and in all of the sub working groups related to these processes, and whenever possible, we are coordinated what we do.

Pedro is joining me, working with me, in the CCWG accountability. This is almost like a full-time job. The RALO members that are engaging in this process can sympathize. And we are evaluating whether the GAC needs to give any type of reply. This would need coordination, led by our Chair, Thomas Schneider.

When the GAC position needs to be stated, we tried to work with Thomas and the co-chairs of these community working groups, also coordinate with Thomas. I have posted a link. This is a link that will give you access to very clear information and some info-graphs that are very clear. So you can check the link after this webinar. Since the beginning

of this IANA stewardship transition process, the GAC has been working on a set of principles that, according to the GAC should be taken into consideration, in order to define these transition rules.

We have done this, or with [inaudible] in 2007, for the new TLDs, for the ccTLDs. So, sometimes the GAC drops a series of GAC principles because, as Pedro very well said, what the GAC does is to issue advice, and to present advice to the ICANN Board. We are not a policy making body. So we draft principles on topics that we believe are relevant, and present to the ICANN Board, to the working groups, or to the wider community.

Pedro, briefly, touched on the working groups, the GAC working groups. I listed here, on this slide, the most recent, or most interesting working groups within the GAC, and the ones that could potentially become open to the community. And why not work together with LACRALO and with At-Large?

I have been coordinating a group since the Durban meeting in 2012, and that group is the geo names protection working group for new gTLDs. As is the case, for example, of Patagonia, or the case of names that are not in the ISO list, or that are not included in the list of protected country names or geo names. So what we are trying to do is to minimize uncertainties to communities, countries, territories, and of course, applicants.

Within the NomCom, I am also engaged with GAC participation within NomCom. If you're familiar with NomCom's structure, you will know that the GAC is, or holds an observer status there. But we are not

actually holding that seat. There is a proposal to modify or change the NomCom's structure so that the GAC can participate.

In some countries like Argentina, we believe that government participation is relevant within the leadership position selection and appointment process. In other countries, they think otherwise. There are some issues in between, so we are holding an internal discussion that started about four months ago.

As Pedro said, we have a human rights working group based on a document issued by the Council of Europe. Peru was interested in creating this working group, and the representative of Peru, from the Peru foreign ministry is leading this group. There is a group that will be created. We don't know if it's going to be a GAC group, or a cross community WG. This group will focus on the funds obtained by means of the new gTLD auctions.

We don't know if it's going to be a cross community working group, or a GAC working group. There is also the idea to start focusing on engagement between ccTLDs and governments in Africa. Some ccTLDs are being managed by people that are not even based there. So the idea is to start relating some ccTLDs with the government. And of course we, and I don't know how to say this in Spanish, underserved regions working group.

If any of the interpreters can tell me how to say underserved in Spanish, I would be very grateful. Lebanon is coordinating a working group on engagement between governments and ICANN. And then we have another WG on two character names, on the second level. And I'm also

a member of a very important working group that is focusing on an early engagement between the GAC and the GNSO. The GNSO focuses in on generic names.

The generic names supporting organization is, has PDPs, Policy Development Process, but then at the end of this PDPs, the GAC does not agree. So the idea is to have an early engagement between the government, and the government view, and the business oriented and more practical view of the GNSO, so that by the end of the PDP, the GAC will not likely have objections and voice objections in the communiqué.

We also have some, or are engaged in some, cross community working groups. There is the Academy WG that was created by At-Large. We haven't received a formal invitation. And when I say formal invitation, of course, all I mean is just send an email to Mr. Schneider at the GAC, so that we can engage. We would like to engage there. We know a session was held in Singapore, but we haven't been formally invited.

So personally, I would be interested in participating in this group, and so would other colleagues at the GAC. So it would be great if you could share that information. Then there is a working group that is dealing with ccTLDs, and the names, country names and codes in TLDs. And we would like to participate there.

The GAC holds a high level governmental meetings every two or three years. There was one held in Toronto, and one held in London. The one in London was more important than the one in Toronto. The aim is for governments to engage in the different policies related to domain

names, and the coordination of Internet resources. And the next high level governmental meeting, will take place in Morocco in early 2016.

I will now speak about what Rodrigo mentioned. The GAC and ALAC joint sessions. Personally, I want to express my gratitude for the comments contributed by the ALAC on the document prepared by the GAC, on the protection of geographic names. That comment was very important for us, it meant significant support, because it reinforced the concepts that we included in our document.

That is to take into account experience, to require the approval or consensus of the parties that are not included, or whose names are not included in the list of protected names, or in the ISO list. I am an engineer by trade, I am not a lawyer, however I have learned quite a few things about this process.

So some of these names can be used just by anyone, without asking for anyone's approval or permission. Some governments, not all of the governments, within the GAC, we believe that there should be a prior communication, a prior engagement between the TLD applicants, and the community where that TLD name has relevance, such as [inaudible] among any other examples, Rome, or Roma, too.

The GAC drafted a document and the ALAC comment was highly relevant indeed. And further on, because At-Large raises this in their comment, I will see how the GAC and the ALAC can work together on all of these items listed on the slide. So as to decrease uncertainty. Of course, you don't need to answer right now. This is just a proposal that I am putting forward.

But when you do have some time, please give it a thought about us working together. This is unheard of within the GAC, that is to have these open sessions open to the entire community. This was very well received because people were able to see that the GAC is opening up to the community's views.

So once again, we want to thank At-Large. The group on geographic names, would like to have a more accurate definition of public interest. People bring this up in their comments, we received more than 50 comments. And people say that we should have a better definition of public interest. We are also interested in the Academy working group. We know this initiative was born within At-Large.

And of course, we are interested, we are open to any other topic. Please feel free to contact me, and I'm sure Pedro will agree. If you have any idea, we can always engage in a phone conversation, in an informal chat. We can give you our point of view, before you formally present something to the GAC chair. And with that, I will stop speaking because I have spoken for quite a while now. And I will gladly take any questions you have.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Rodrigo Saucedo speaking. Thank you Olga. I don't know if Pedro or Leon have any comment regarding the GAC ALAC engagement on collaboration.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez speaking now. Thank you Rodrigo. No doubt, as Olga said, we have to strengthen the links between both communities. That is not only important, but also, as we have seen recently, if the more statements that we draft jointly, that are jointly drafted by several committees, well the more powerful that will be.

That these joint statements are considered with more attention and with more care. So no doubt, we would like to see a closer collaboration between the GAC and the ALAC. And hence, our statement supporting them, which is highly relevant, we look forward to continuing working this way.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Rodrigo Saucedo speaking. Thank you Leon. Okay. I believe that we are a little behind our schedule. So, we are now going to open the Q&A session.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: This is Carlos Aguirre. May I take the floor?

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: Rodrigo Saucedo. Yes, Carlos, go ahead please.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Carlos Aguirre speaking. Thank you. Hello everyone. I have plenty of questions. We have listened to three excellent presentations, so I would like to congratulate all the speakers. We are very happy to have

them here on this webinar. But my question is, for all of the three speakers. I am really interested in a certain topic, and I have been interested in this topic for quite a while now.

And this mainly has to do with the multistakeholder system, or multistakeholderism. Some governments, at least this is my view, some governments do not think or do not consider users engagement, do not take it into account because they say that government have sovereign powers, because they have been chosen by the people, who have vested these sovereign powers in the government.

So the governments are entitled to decide in the best interest of their citizens. So when there are discussions with users, users are not considered that much because the user is sort of included within a government that has been elected by the people, so the people have vested their powers onto the government, and the user is left aside.

I would like to know if this situation is discussed within the GAC, if the GAC thinks this way. Because I find it alarming in some cases. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

This is Olga speaking. May I take the floor?

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Rodrigo speaking. Yes, Olga, go ahead please.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Olga speaking. Hello Carlos. I am also based in Argentina, so good evening. I think your comment is highly relevant. And it's very interesting. People say that the government thinks this way or that way, but within a government, you have different bodies. And not all of these bodies share the same views on a certain topic.

The same happens in Civil Society in the business community. So to my mind, and this is a personal opinion, this is not Argentina's government view, multistakeholderism is a process. It's a process by which, little by little, different government actors or stakeholders that were most used to, the multilateral approach, are more open to the multistakeholder approach.

This is an approach that started some years ago, and now we are beginning to see some of its benefits. However, we need to take into account that ICANN has, or is also part of this stakeholder process. You may be surprised to hear me saying that governments are not an equal footing within ICANN. Because a government member cannot be an ICANN Board member.

A government official cannot be appointed by the NomCom to hold a leadership position. So, Argentina believes, and this is my personal view, that governments within the ICANN structure are not on an equal footing compared to other stakeholders. Clearly some people say, "Well, but the GAC advice is really important, and whatever the GAC says is taken into consideration by the Board."

Well yes, but in any advent, advice is advice. So, there is a multistakeholder vision within ICANN, that we need to work on, and

that's why Argentina and many other countries, think that this working group is relevant. For instance, to focus on government participation when the NomCom chooses people to hold leadership positions. I believe that we have to engage in this process by showing the benefits.

The benefit of reducing uncertainty, as is the case in the gTLDs. That results from multistakeholderism. So lower the uncertainty for the government, for the users, and for the applicants. That results from the multistakeholder process, but multistakeholderism needs to have all of the stakeholders on an equal footing. If everything works well, then we can show the benefit of this multistakeholder process.

And if that is the case, then it's very hard to say no to multistakeholderism.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Rodrigo Saucedo speaking. Thank you Olga for your reply. Unfortunately, we're running short of time. We have only five minutes left. I don't know if there is any other question or comment? Go ahead please.

I think Alberto Soto was asking for the floor. Alberto, can you hear me?

PEDRO IVO FERRAZ DA SILVA:

To the three speakers, I believe that multistakeholderism is essential, that is far from being solved. I used to say that multistakeholderism is a concept of variable geometries. Each institution, each process has a different concept on this issue. In Brazil, for instance, since 1995, we have an Internet management committee that coordinates the activities

related to dot BR and IP address distribution, and we have a multistakeholder management, and we believe that all of us, all stakeholders should have the same position.

We started with the predominance of the government, and then we've evolved in 2013, when, where governments are not the majority. But all members of the committees have the same status, they can [inaudible]. In the Brazilian government, we do not believe that ICANN, that the same model that we have in Brazil is applied in ICANN.

Olga Cavalli mentioned the governments do not have equal footing. The GAC members cannot vote in ICANN's Board. As Civil Society is underrepresented within ICANN's decision making. So this is a very complex process that should be continued to be discussed. I believe that ICANN's structure is not ideal, but I believe that we should face this as an evolving process.

There are many discussions being held within the work group, accountability group, and IANA transition group, and I believe not all of the issues will be approached. This needs to be continued to be discussed, and I believe that we should make an effort to make ICANN a corporation that really represents the community as a whole.

And could act according to the global interest of the public, which is its main mission. Thank you.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Rodrigo Saucedo speaking. Thank you Pedro. Okay, we have our very last minute. I will give the floor to Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you. As I type in the AC room, I believe that rather than a probability, it is a need, there is a need for the GAC and the ALAC to work together. I think that in the case of dot [inaudible] in our country, if we had worked together within the region, with LACRALO, for instance, that exercise would have been far more enriching, and we would have saved plenty of time.

I repeat, ALAC is the voice of the Internet users, but at the other end of the spectrum, we have the government, and the government has a lot to do with the Internet users. And if we work together, we would achieve some kind of harmony in terms of laws or legislation that affect the Internet users. And the same applies to the RALOs. And in my capacity as LACRALO Chair, I want to express my gratitude to the three excellent speakers that we have held in this webinar, and I think the topic couldn't have been better. Thank you.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO:

Rodrigo Saucedo speaking. Thank you very much Alberto. So bringing this webinar to a close, I would like to thank our three guest speakers for their time, for joining us, and we will send you the invite to our next webinar, once we agree on a date or time. Thank you all very much, and with that, I bring this webinar to a close. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]