
SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Silvia, I think we should get started.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco speaking. Okay Sergio. So Terri, if you will, please start the recording, and can you please get the call started as well? Thank you Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you Sergio. We'll go ahead and begin at this time. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the LACRALO Proposal of Metrics conference call, taking place on Tuesday the 5th May, 2015 at 18:00 UTC.

On the Spanish channel, We have Sergio Salinas Porto, Diego Acosta Bastidas, and Humberto Carrasco.

Joining us shortly will be Alberto Soto.

On the English channel, we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Carlton Samuels.

I show no apologies listed for today's conference.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Sabrina. Our Portuguese interpreter today is Bettina.

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.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but also to allow our interpreters.

Thank you very much and back over to you Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Thank you very much, Terri. Hello everyone. It's a pleasure to join you all on this webinar on the document submitted by the governance working group on the topic of metrics. This proposal was submitted some time ago, and after that, it was amended, and then it was submitted again in our region for further discussion, and for further revision or review of these topics, which are really important for us all.

This has to do with the present and the future of the organizations that participate in our region. My idea for this call, in order to move forward, and in order to have the contents of this document clear to everyone, my idea is to read it carefully, so that nobody has any doubts about the contents of the documents. And after that, to open a Q&A or comment session, in which all of you will participate, in order to avoid any misunderstanding about the content.

So I will start by reading the document, and then after that, we will share your opinions, your views, on the work submitted or delivered so far. This is the April 14, 2015 version. It says, "We represent the interest of the Internet, individual users from Latin America and the Caribbean, on a volunteer basis, and without compensation. At the same time, we proceed our private or personal work commitment."

Under the MOU, the memorandum of understanding, signed with ICANN, the regions representatives and officers elected by the [inaudible] of the region, attend, in person, all annual ICANN meetings. And the appointed ALS primary representative also participate, face to face, about every two years, when the General Assembly is held. There are procedures, for example vote in which a specific quorum is needed. And they require a certain number of attended. If quorum is not achieved, then the [decisions] cannot be made. We hold 12 meetings slash conference calls or webinars throughout the year.

We create internal working groups, and some members also engage in ALAC and ICANN working groups. LACRALO working group leaders meet with their members, and they must issue reports on the work done. Discussions of topics are carried out on mailing lists, by accessing Wiki pages also, to get updates or to provide input. ALAC, as well as ICANN, deliver webinars also on occasions during the year.

We think that opportunity for active participation are many, but not all of us are likely to participate in every event due to different reasons. However, the more active the participation is, the more effective our region will be. All this leads to the need of having metrics and applying engagement and participation criteria. In our case, these are similar to ALAC's criteria. Any metrics system has its drawbacks. We may know who has attended a meeting. We know who participates actively, because that person [AUDIO INTERFERENCE]..."

Nevertheless, this does not mean that other participants who have not taken the floor or posted comments, have not engaged actively. Maybe someone who came forward to express an opinion, with which a person

agreed, and there was no need to speak or post comments on the same topic.

This kind of participation should not be subject to measurements. Therefore, participation and engagement criteria indicators, are intended for meetings virtual and face to face, [inaudible], face to face and online, participation in working groups at all levels. LACRALO, ALAC, ICANN participation in mailing lists.

Until otherwise defined, LACRALO's chair and secretariat, shall be responsible for creating participation tables. LACRALO will use the following criteria as thresholds to measure ALS participation within our region. I mean, At-Large activities. One, active participation of an ALS or a representative showing participation in at least 40% of monthly meetings, teleconferences, participation in one webinar, and having at least one of its members in LACRALO, ALAC, ICANN, or cross community working group.

Within the last calendar year being considered. ALSs who are unable to attend a monthly meeting, or assembly, or suggested to send an email to LACRALO's secretariat mailing list, informing the situation. And this will be taken as participation. Metrics belonging to certified LACRALO ALSs who participate in ALAC and/or ICANN working groups in their personal capacity, are suggested to send a brief report on such activities in order to add their participation to the metrics.

If such participation calls for the region's opinion, then a [inaudible] consultation shall be made in our mailing list. Once the opinion has been expressed, it will be provided to the current working group. Upon

failure to cast a vote in three consecutive elections, and this is a key number, an ALS shall automatically lose its voting rights and its active status within LACRALO.

If the primary representative were unable to cast a vote, he or she shall communicate the situation with enough anticipation, informing their replacement. The ALS will be notified about the change in its status. Should the ALS perform all of the activities required to become an active ALS within the following 12 months, it will be possible to regain its voting rights and active status. Otherwise, the chair will send ALAC a decertification application for such ALS.

It will be the responsibility of the chair and secretariat to keep in regular contact with the ALSs that are not participating, and such conduct should be duly documented. This is maintain the inclusive criteria in order to avoid decertification and increase participation. Five, an ALS should not be able to apply for funding for a representative to attend face to face meetings held sponsors and funded by ICANN, unless it meets active participation requirements for the last 12 months before the date of the event.

Six, a certified ALS member shall not be entitled to apply for any position within the region, ALAC, or ICANN, if the member does not comply with 50% of active participation required for an ALS within the last 12 months before the application date. Well, as you can see, this is a document, the document that was circulated for your analysis, for your discussion.

And I don't know if Alberto is on the call.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto speaking. Excuse me Sergio, I have received a message from Alberto requiring a dialogue. I don't know if that message has been relayed.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Yes, I can see that. Silvia, have you been able to reach Alberto?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco speaking. The operator is trying to contact Alberto, but we are getting his voice mail. Anyway, we have tried to conference him three times already.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. I'm checking the chat.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco speaking. Sergio, I see that there is a question regarding the versions that are being read out. I want to confirm with you that you're reading the April 14 version posted.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Yes, the version that I have just read and this addresses Carlton's question. This was the April 14th version originally drafted in Spanish and then translated into English. And I did so

because it is more comfortable for me to read in Spanish. And also, because I believe that the document is in line with the spirit of the person, or persons, drafting the document.

We had sub-teams or sub-working groups drafting the document being discussed in the region. And Alberto chaired the sub-group on metrics, together with a colleague from the region. And I know that he and the other colleagues drafted the document in Spanish.

Of course, I am willing to address your comments or questions in the chat room. And of course, please feel free to raise your hand to ask for the floor. Humberto, go ahead please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Humberto Carrasco speaking. Thank you Sergio. The document read out in Spanish, published on April 14th, was sent out for translation into English and into Portuguese. So the document posted in the chat room and posted in the Wiki space, are the official translations into the three languages. I'm just raising this as a point of clarification. And also, I want to stress the importance of reading out the entire document for those people who were not able to read the document, so that you can have an idea of the content of the document and engage in this discussion.

As you know, this is a proposal. And of course, it is subject to changes or modifications on the basis of the input of the members of our region. With that said, I would like to add that you, Sergio, enabled a 30 day discussion period, and plenty of comments were received on the document, and also the comments made now will also be taking into

account, so that we can prepare or draft a final document for the region.

Then, as regards to procedural access, and that was my comment. And other people are requesting the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you for that input Humberto. This is Sergio for the record. I will give the floor to Carlton Samuels. Go ahead please Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Sergio. Good afternoon everybody. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. I was trying to point out the slight difference between what I've seen from the Wiki, and what might be interpreted into English from Sergio's voice by the interpreter. Here is the problem. The interpretation might use words that in the English means something very different.

English has a lot of [inaudible], so that is why I would strongly suggest that instead of reading the document in Spanish, which I absolutely agree is Sergio's right to speak in his language, this problem will be the interpretation. The interpretation might convey a meaning that might differ and it might be slight, but it could be substantive.

And so I would recommend that we adhere to the use of the official translated document, as the official English document. So if we are going to use interpretation, and if Sergio is going to be interpreted, the

interpreter, I would recommend the interpreter read the official English translated version.

That way I am absolutely sure that what is being said is reflected exactly in the document. That's the first thing. The second thing that I would want to point out is that there is are numerous responses to the document on the Wiki. And they have not been entertained, or seem to reflect any way, what is happening now. Since we have lots of things to talk about, I would respectfully suggest that we dispense with the reading of the document, and simply go to the questions associated with each clause of the document. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Thank you Carlton for your input. And we have made sure that the original document coincides with the final, or sorry, with the translated document into English.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking. Excuse me for the interruption Sergio, but Silvia posted something in the chat room, and our interpreters read out the English version of the text on the Wiki. So if we read it out again, we would be duplicating our effort. And Silvia has confirmed this with the interpreters, but I will ask for a re-confirmation.

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia from staff. Yes, I confirmed that the interpreter on the English channel read out the version of the document which is posted on the Wiki space. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Thank you Silvia. So Carlton, the first part of your comment has been addressed. Regarding the second part of your comment, a point of clarification was raised or made by Humberto before you took the floor, explaining that we are in a process. I invited a new round of revision on review in the region for a 30 day period, and these comments will be taken into consideration when we draft the final document.

So no doubt, the comments have not been incorporated yet, because the discussion or debate period is still ongoing. But the comments and the input will be taken into account, and those that can be incorporated, no doubt, will be part of that document so that they are part of the document in our region. So, please, I ask you to be patient. That's the only thing that I ask you, or I request, so that we can reflect all the comments in the final document. Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Sergio. This is Dev Anand speaking. Well, one of my comments is procedural, perhaps you should have waited, so there is comment on each point, as you have read it. But, anyways, you read the entire document. So let me make some comments that I have posted onto the Wiki as well on this.

Now, point one, I note the attempt to try to state the metrics more clearly in response to my first comment, an older version. However the wording, LACRALO will use the final criteria and thresholds to measure

an ALS's participation in LACRALO, and At-Large activities. That should be in point one and not outside other bullet points.

I do have some concerns about the thresholds, but that's another comment and I'll make that in a separate, I'll make that separately. Now, regarding point two, regarding ALSs who are unable to attend, or a monthly meeting, I suggested we send an email. You know what? That point too implies that sending apologies would count as participation, and is equal to someone dedicating their time and energy to participate actively. This shouldn't be.

Otherwise a person could just automate sending apologies whenever the staff announces any conference calls. And point two should be removed, as a rewards non-participation, and to be enough, inactive, and yet reap the benefit of being in LACRALO.

Regarding point three, which is members belonging to certified LACRALO ALSs should send a brief monthly report. Why don't I make this [inaudible] for those persons and At-Large structures participating in At-Large by writing private reports to the chair and secretariat. The RALO monthly calls should have updates on the working groups as a standard agenda item, for those persons then attend the call and give their updates to them.

So this would bring recognition of persons participating to the LACRALO community, force the discussion of issues being looked at by the At-Large working groups in LACRALO. And therefore, point three can then be removed, as this would then be captured as part of the discussions in the monthly LACRALO call.

Regarding point four, shows that, you know, upon failure to cast a vote in three consecutive elections, which contradicts the first point, that's the one thing. But my more important point to make is that voting in an election should not be counted as a measure of an At-Large structure's engagement or participation. The problem in LACRALO today is that many At-Large structures do not participate in any At-Large activity, LACRALO calls, At-Large working groups, ALAC calls, comments on the Wiki, or emails to the LACRALO list, except when voting for persons as representatives.

So it doesn't make consensus decisions by LACRALO difficult, because of the lack of quorum on conference calls. And it places restraint on the few volunteers on the region, actively involved in these At-Large activities. As it is now, all At-Large structures measured with a metric of having voting in elections, will qualify as being active. And this is wrong. Voting in elections, as a metric, should be removed from this proposal.

Shall I continue with all of these points Sergio? I have two more points to make. Shall I make them and then you respond?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Dev, please, go ahead with the input of your comments.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Very well. This is Dev again. Regarding point five, which talks about an ALS shall not be able to apply for funding. This could be restated by saying, in inactive ALSs can't be funded to attend face to face meetings.

And then you merge it with point four, as a consequence of being inactive.

And regarding point six, you know, point six which talks about, an ALS member shall not be entitled to apply for any position within the region. This is impossible to enforce, and ALSs will just simply quit LACRALO, to be free to better contribute to ICANN if other areas of ICANN are more rewarding to them. So what you could say instead is that inactive ALS representatives will not be eligible to be elected as representatives from LACRALO in ICANN supporting organization.

And again, you can merge this with point four, as a consequence of being inactive. So I'll stop there right now. Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Dev. Alberto Soto is asking for the floor as well. Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Yes, please wait Alberto. Dev, I am aware that you have posted your comments on the Wiki, and we will study this case in order to see how we can shape these comments. Alberto, Carlton asked for the floor before you, so Carlton is first. Carlton, go ahead please. You have the floor.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Sergio. This is Carlton Samuels speaking for the record. I was hoping that we would not have to go through this because a lot of these things will be reported on the Wiki. But for what it's worth, let the record show that I am endorsing every one of Dev's interventions, and I will now restate my own.

Number two, which say representatives shall send an email to the secretariat of the LACRALO mailing list, stating the issues that keep them from participating in monthly meetings, or conference calls, and this would count as participation. No. That is not participation. So that one is dead on arrival.

Number three, members belonging to certified LACRALO ALSs who participate in ALAC, and/or ICANN working groups in their personal capacity, are suggested to send a brief monthly report of such activity in order to actively participate in these metrics. To me, that's getting two bites of the apple. What Dev says is very much important, if you want to report, come on to the meeting, come on to the conference report, and do the reporting there.

You only count that once. With respect to the business of having recordings from an ICANN working group. This [inaudible], the person who is actually engaged in the business that LACRALO is raised to do, what is provide policy development advice to ICANN. This proposal actually penalizes that person who is actually doing the work. Then the person who didn't show up and send an email to say, "I can't show up." So, but I have participated [inaudible]...

I don't know how that does not count the person to see [inaudible], that doesn't make any sense, because you actually impose the burden on the person who is actually doing what LACRALO is supposed to do. That one is dead on arrival.

The number nine is even more insidious. Because it says a LACRALO member shall not be, apply for any position within the region, ALAC, or

ICANN. If the member does not comply with 50% of active participation required for an ALS. Let me just go to form and tell you that I find these metric [inaudible], are an exercise in [inaudible]. They're not useful. This is a voluntary organization. I am not compelled to be invited or be interested in every single element of every single thing that happens in ICANN, and maybe what I'm interested in does not come up more than once or twice in a year. But I certainly would take offence, and I use the word offence, to anyone telling me that because I don't, I am not interested in an issue and therefore I don't say anything on the issue, but only participate in things that I have interest in, then I may not apply for an ALAC or ICANN position.

That is a sad [chamber] of proceeding, that cannot stand in any democratic organization. That one is also dead on arrival. We need to understand something. Let the record show that I say this. Participation must have an objective. The objective is to advance policy development in names and numbers policy. That is what we are about in the LACRALO. That is why the MOU we signed with ICANN extends to us.

The fact, anything, in my opinion, anything that you do that does not [inaudible] to policy development for names and numbers is not useful. Therefore, if any metrics, and I'm saying, I don't sign these metrics because they are wrong. If any metrics that is ever accepted to clarify, or classify, or to measure participation goes outside that boundary, it is dead on arrival. Thank you very much.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Carlton for your input. Alberto, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you. These metrics were drafted according to certain criteria that were put forth, and according to comments, and by the way, my apologies for joining you late. I am speaking on my cell phone, I have no land lines and no Internet at home now working. So I understand that we are volunteers, and if we think about this, we have to focus on the following.

If I have 10 meetings, and if I send my apologies to 10 meetings, then, well, that is not feasible. Of course, the wording, the current wording leaves much to be desired. So we can say, I don't know, after 10% of apologies send in all of these monthly meetings, or this means, being a volunteer means that at some point in time, we will have a certain occupation that will prevent us from participating. So we need to send our apologies.

With regard to the reports for those people in a working group, in a working group that is not an ALAC RALO working group, that is an ALAC, or ICANN, or cross community working group, well, I don't have the document right before me, but I believe that the document says something along the lines of, it is suggested, so it is... So some people are working only in one cross community working group, and not working for LACRALO.

So the idea is to suggest or recommend that they send a report so to have some metrics that will favor that person that is working in that

ALAC, ICANN, or cross community working group. if that person doesn't want to send or submit a report, okay. So be it. But I want to reaffirm that if someone has to give an opinion, and it is a LACRALO opinion, on behalf of LACRALO, that person has the obligation to consult LACRALO, because if not, that person's opinion will be a personal opinion, and not LACRALO's opinion.

I think that should be clear. With regard to the last point raised by Carlton, within ALAC, in all of the meetings and in the last meeting held in Singapore, people said that there were all in agreement in having metrics, because there are some people who do not participate in any activity.

Carlton may be right in that I may participate in the topic that I am interested in, but if that were the case, we would have a one person or a two person meeting, depending on the topics of their interest. And I believe that we need to take into consideration a spirit of collaboration to participate, not in all the topics, but at least in those topics where we can make a contribution.

And that type of participation is the tool that trains us, that gives us the proper or sufficient training, so that we can perform in ALAC, NomCom, etc. So I cannot say that somebody has participated for the last two or three years, and then wants to send an application, or apply for the NomCom, and then well, that person, at the end of the day, is not acting in a personal capacity, that person is representing LACRALO.

So there has to be some kind of collaborative participation, and that is the necessary training for any other positions that people may want to apply for. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Alberto for your comments. Carlton Samuels, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Chair. Carlton Samuels speaking for the record. So I'm going to make a very clear point. At the moment, there has been, for two years now, there has been a working group, a cross community working group called PPSAI, Privacy Proxy Issues working group. It is a very important piece of work for those of us who understand WHOIS, and who understands privacy, and the impact of privacy on national law.

I can tell you with certainty that I am probably the only one from this region that actively participates. It has been going on for two years, weekly meetings of an hour each, online. There is one called the WHOIS conflict implementation working group, that has been going on for close to two years. And I can tell you that I am probably one of two in this region who participate in that one constantly.

I can tell you that there are numerous mailing lists with other working groups that are going on, and I am absolutely sure that very few of us take part in that. Here is the thing, and this is where I [inaudible] generous. I do not believe that because you have no interest in these issues, you should be penalized. I do not believe that. Some people, for

example, have an interest in the working group, to do the meetings calendar, and they go in that.

I have a [walking brief]. I follow the email list, but there is not any stuff in there that even [inaudible]... Because in the final analysis, there isn't much that's going to happen there. It's all about [inaudible]. If you believe that these should be used as a metric for my participation, then you are also believing that those who do not participate in that one, should be penalized. I think that's wrong.

I do not see, and I can never see, 10%, one meeting, sending a meeting to one meeting out of 10, or two meetings out of 10 in any given year, an apology that I cannot come to the meeting. How that could ever be classified as participation. So it's not 100. No I can't come, but it's two no I can't come, I don't see how that ever could be classified as participation. So here is the close up. I reiterate. I understand we're all working people.

I understand that we have just so much time to commit to this. Some of us more than others. I do not begrudge others who spend more time at this than I do. And I can tell you, I put in about 20 hours every week. I am not suggesting that everybody who spends five is less worthy of recognition. What I'm suggesting is that because my 20 hours is to be equated to five hours, then somehow I get the brass ring and the other fellow gets the gold. I do not believe that that is equitable, and you can't create equity in participation using those metrics.

I am sorry, it is impossible. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Carlton for your input. There are three people requesting the floor, or four I think. And so I will be very brief, and then I will give the floor to Dev. Carlton, on very few occasions, or very rarely, do I disagree with you. I always consider that your participation is really important, and almost all occasions we see eye to eye.

However, I disagree now with what you have said. And I have a concern. All the activities in which you participate, well LACRALO is not aware of those activities. And so maybe this participation reflects your personal interest, and maybe I am wrong. You belong to LACRALO, but we haven't even received a report about those topics that are very important.

So that is not reflected in our collective effort. A person participating in any activity that can send a report will. That should be taken into account as participation within the region. Now, if we do that in an individual capacity, then we have a problem. Because then how can we evaluate that in the region? It is very important to have it clear, that we represent an organization, a collective group of people, and that that collective group of people is linked to an even bigger collective group of people that is the region.

So what I can say now is, we welcome any type of participation in any community within ICANN, but it would be very nice for us to receive a monthly or bi-monthly report, because we have plenty of activities to submit a monthly report, but it would be nice for us to receive a report on what our colleagues are doing. Because if that colleague is representing the interests of the region, and the region can influence on

those activities, well that wide, broad, comprehensive, collaborative participation is really welcome.

Many a time, our colleagues in ICANN are engaging in activities without taking this into account. That is, if you are aware of the fact that you belong to a collective group of people, to an organization, then the work, or the activities that you do, will have a better impact and result on the interest of Latin America and the Caribbean. With that, I will give the floor to Dev. Go ahead Dev, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand speaking. So yeah, I think we will have to respectfully disagree with you, because I think I understand what Carlton is saying. And in that, the persons who are doing the most work, seems to be not getting the recognition for the work they are doing, and it's being passed on to the entire LACRALO region.

My point is this, there are three points, I'm going to respond to Alberto's points. Regarding point two, if a person is responding that they are unable to attend the meeting or whatever, then you know, that cannot be constituted as participation. We have set a threshold, which is, I believe 40% of all monthly conference calls. And if they're not able to be active in those 40% of monthly active calls, then so be it.

So point two, again, that should be taken out. It actually rewards non participation in LACRALO. For me, who attend LACRALO calls, and sharing working groups, and participating in other working groups, it's kind of frustrating to this type of statement. That says that well, a

person who sends an apology just, you know, is somehow equal to me dedicating their time and energy to participate.

So we have a threshold specified in point one. If they're not able to meet that threshold, then let them be inactive. There is no problem, and for them being as inactive. All we're doing is they're obviously losing their voting rights, and they will be unable to, you know, not get funding to attend a face to face meeting, or be eligible to be listed as representatives from LACRALO.

Second point, and this goes back to the point of, instead I think, privately for the chair and secretariat, which I don't see what good it will do, because it's not really... Because if the goal is for LACRALO to be aware and informed, then we need to make it a standard policy of LACRALO monthly calls. That which is have an update from the various working groups. And therefore, that way you get persons in those working groups coming onto the call, sharing some of the things they're actively doing, and if LACRALO wants to have a discussion about what's happening, then great.

And then perhaps another person attending the call can then join that working group, because they are now interested. But sending it to the chair and secretariat is [inaudible], and it just actually, to me it's just an additional report on top of the additional work you're doing. It doesn't make sense. Having it as a standard part of the ALAC RALO monthly calls. And eliminate that point three.

Regarding point six, applying for any position within the region. I just restate exactly what I've said before. What you can say is that an

inactive ALS representative will not be eligible to be elected as representatives from LACRALO. Because, for example, there may be person in the At-Large structure, and in fact we do have examples, that are on the GAC, for example, and I think it's kind of ludicrous to suggest that somehow LACRALO can block a person serving on the GAC, or serving on the GNSO.

It seems absurd. It comes up as LACRALO being, it seems reprehensible to me. And in that someone who is caring enough to put forth the time and energy, is then being shackled, to say, you must do this or you must do that. And again, so that's why, point six as worded as well. That's it for now.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Dev. I will now give the floor to Alan Greenberg. You have the floor Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll make a couple of comments. First of all, I give credit to LACRALO for trying to do this. This is not an easy task, and part of the reason it's not easy is the At-Large overall has not set, really has not set expectations of what we want from ALSs and from representatives of ALSs, and therefore, you're working in a complete void.

And hopefully in the coming months, we will rectify that, and we will put some better processes and better guidelines in place to enable you to do this in a much more informed way. So I would suggest you be

careful and not lock too many things in stone, because we are working in a changing world, and there will be an At-Large review also, with external reviewers looking at some of these issues. So this is an area that is going to be changing significantly over the next little while, and I think we have to remember that.

A couple of specific points. Regarding people who work in areas that are heavy work areas in ICANN, but not necessarily in the RALO, I think you do have a reasonable expectation that you get feedback from them. I'm not sure a written report is the proper way, but I certainly encourage, and I think we have a reasonable expectation, that people who are working in ICANN, in association with At-Large, do participate in RALO calls and at least give verbal reports and things like that, and maybe written, if it's appropriate.

But I think you want to make sure that you are taking people who are working the hardest, and put commitments on them which make their job even more difficult. One of the other points I'm making, in your point number nine, I'm not sure what the intent is, where you're saying people cannot apply for other jobs in ICANN or ALAC if they haven't been participating in LACRALO.

Certainly that can be true for ones that require the endorsement of LACRALO, but I don't think you have any, any RALO has any control over what individuals do if it is being done completely outside of the RALO environment. So if someone chooses to apply to the NomCom or an ALAC position, or as was suggested, chooses to go on the GNSO, or the GAC, or something else, that certainly is nothing that can be controlled by the RALO.

And lastly, I think, with regard to Dev's comment on apologies. This is one of these areas where you have real difficulty if you try to make things black and white. Someone who never goes to a meeting and only sends apologies, clearly is not participating. On the other hand, if someone goes to eight out of 12 meetings, and simply doesn't show up at the other four, versus sends apologies saying they are occupied, they won't be able to make it, I think there is a substantive difference between those two.

So apologies do count, in my mind, but they don't count as equivalent to participating if they end up being the majority of the tick boxes. So there are some subtle things that I think you end up becoming, getting into a very dangerous place if you try to make things too black and white and have the rules simple. There are nuisances, and we're going to have to be flexible on a lot of these ones. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Alan for your input. I will give the floor to Carlton Samuels now. Carlton, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Sergio. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. I want to address two issues. The first one concerns people who might be involved with working groups, and so on, that are not necessarily RALO designed. We have At-Large working groups, and there [inaudible] working groups, that we have always invited people from the region to populate.

Actually the intent is for people from the region to participate in those working groups. There is no requirement that [inaudible] as members that are proposed from the region. Because that is not the intent [inaudible], and it is [inaudible] that matters. The At-Large working groups are intended to create a space for argumentation and exchange of views, that informs the ALAC posture on a policy issue. That is what that are raised for.

I have always said, and I will not retreat from it, if you are not at the place where you are reasonably involved in influencing and shaping policy, there is absolutely no reason for you to be involved. We have seen too many times when discussion in the RALO simply do not have an impact of what we expect in the discussions that are taking place in the At-Large working group or on the ALAC.

The ALAC is our vehicle for policy advice to ICANN. And the closer you get to the ALAC structure, the better it is for you. If we think this At-Large working groups are not useful, then let us say so on the record. What we have established standing At-Large working groups, the intent was that they would be used to argument or to develop ideas that goes directly to the ALAC for consideration. And until someone tells me that that is not a useful exercise, then I still remain firm on this is where we could create the space for all conversation we have, if we want to be able to influence not just ALAC, but our colleagues from around the globe, about all the details. That's the first thing.

Second thing, is the issue again of sending in apology. I was raised right, and I can understand an apology is fully tested, it's to be polite, and it is intended to reflect good breeding. But that is all that it is. It cannot be

construed as advancing policy. And no way, shape, or form you can acclimate that into gold. It is [inaudible]. It is not gold. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Carlton, thank you very much. I will give the floor to Dev...

ALBERTO SOTO: Excuse me, sorry for interrupting, this is Alberto Soto. I have been waiting to take the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. My apologies. Alberto, you have the floor. We have five minutes left.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. Please, my apologies, I am only on my cell phone. So, I will try to be brief. I think the last point is being misinterpreted. Although I agree that we need to be more flexible, and we need to amend that point. And I take up that commitment. What we mean is that when LACRALO is asked for an opinion about that person, well then LACRALO will give an opinion.

So I agree with Sergio. Anybody from LACRALO working outside LACRALO is representing LACRALO. So, I agree with Dev and Alan in that those who are actively engaged in a working group, and want to

participate in the LACRALO monthly calls, to give us an update, I welcome. And that is a contribution they can make to LACRALO.

With regards to sending apologies, I will redraft that, I will remove that point and redraft it so that people that send their apologies are not going to be considered as people who participate, but apologies will be considered. That doesn't mean that we're going to stop sending apologies. And also, apologies will be taken into account when we have to review a vote.

And I will ask the participants on this call to rethink, or give their input, because I've heard you saying that item such and such should say this and that thing. That's why we ask you to redraft the text on the Wiki space, in the Wiki space, and submit that new version. Please, I ask members of this group, please draft this paragraph that you feel like amending or redrafting and go ahead and amend the paragraph or redraft it, and submit your proposed version. Thank you.

tSERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you Alberto. We are running out of time. I

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you Alberto. We are running out of time. I think we ran out of time already. So I apologize, and I will ask you to post your comments or give your input on the Wiki, or send an email, so that we can bring this call to a close.

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia speaking. Sergio, if I may? This is Silvia Vivanco. Interpreters can stay some minutes longer so that you can give the floor to Dev and to Humberto.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Oh, thank you. So Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead please. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand speaking. Thank you Sergio. My point, going back to the apologies, it's important for apologies to be sent. It's a common courtesy because unless there are enough apologies sent, to the point where a working group may not have members attending, then that call can be rescheduled. And I make reference to, there was a LACRALO ccTLD call last week, and it was only me and Sergio that attended the call.

And nobody sent apologies. Well, one person sent apologies. So, you know, that is a waste of ICANN's resources, you know, in terms of interpreters and you know, the telephone call costs and so forth. So it's important for everybody to send their apologies when needed. My point is that it shouldn't, can't be used as, it can't be counted as participation.

If we have a threshold in point one, saying 40% of monthly calls, so... Or maybe we need to look at that threshold again, but let's stick with a threshold. And if a person is reaching that, sending apologies all the time, then they aren't qualified, which is the intended effect.

Going back to point six regarding applying for a position and so forth. I kind of wonder also that had metrics been in place, I would wonder whether a person would be elected even in the first place, if these

metrics were available before. And I'm kind of looking forward to actually seeing this, when the metrics are in place.

So a person going for a position, we can now see how well they are interacting, they are active or not. Finally, again, whether they're representing LACRALO I think is not the point. In effect, what you're trying to do is create a top down position. This is not a top down organization. We are all equals. We just have certain rules which have certain responsibilities.

And I sense that what this kind of thing that we are working on behalf of LACRALO, we are working underneath the chair and secretariat, let's avoid that. Let's work together. And that's why having the interactions on the monthly calls is much better than writing monthly reports. That's it. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto asking for the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Before that, Alberto, Humberto had asked for the floor. But you posted a comment in the chat room.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto Carrasco speaking. I'll be very brief. What are we going to do? Are we going to wait until the 30 day comment period is over, then we will take or consider the comments and draft a final document? Well, that will be done by the governance working group. And finally,

the final document will be posted in the three languages of the region.
Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you Humberto. Alberto, now I'll give you the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. I understand that Dev maybe did not understand what I said, because he spoke about the apologies, and...

SABRINA: The interpreter apologizes. But Alberto Soto's audio is cutting at times and it cannot be interpreted accurately into English. This is the interpreter. I believe Alberto Soto's line dropped.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto again. And Dev was mentioning the last item, the last point. I said that that point is going to be more flexible, and that it will be completely redrafted, so that nobody feels punished or penalized, but that point is going to be more flexible. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: This is Sergio speaking. Thank you Alberto. Okay. We reached the end of this conference call. I would like to thank our interpreters for joining us. I would like to congratulate all of the participants on this call for their participation. And the governance working group is here to help

not only you, but the people that did not join this webinar, for any comment or input you want to contribute.

With that, I send you my warm regards. I appreciate the staff support. Thank you very much for joining us. Let's keep in touch. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]