SILVIA VIVANCO: Carlos, go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. We will start this call, our monthly call, [inaudible] are finished. I will give the floor to Terri for you to proceed with the roll call. Go ahead, Terri, please.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. We'll begin the roll call at this time. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Call on Monday, the 21st of September, 2015, at 23:00 UTC. On the Spanish channel, we have Adrian Carballo, Carlos Dionisio Aguirre, Alfredo Lopez, Harold Arcos, Alejandro Pisanty, Sylvia Herelein Leite, Aida Noblia, Alberto Soto, Humberto Carrasco. Vanda Scartezini will join on the Adobe Connect only, and when she does, she will not have access to a microphone. And Fatima Cambronero.

On the English channel, we have Bartlett Morgan and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

We have apologies from Juan Manuel Rojas, Jacqueline Morris, Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez, and Cristian Casas.

From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Albert Daniel; and myself, Terri Agnew.

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.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David. Our Portuguese interpreters today are Bettina and Esperanza.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name speaking not only for transcription purposes, but also for our Spanish and Portuguese interpreters. Thank you very much, and I'll turn it back over to you, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. We will begin with our monthly call. We will start by approving the agenda. This is item #3 of the agenda.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me okay?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes, go ahead, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: We will begin with the adoption of the agenda, and after that, I will give the floor to Olga Cavalli and she will speak about the use of country and territory name codes of top-level domains. This is a very hot topic nowadays. Then we will deal with item #5, Alberto Soto will speak about the New gTLD Program. Then we have item #6. It will be a discussion on this topic. After point #6, we have point #7. That is documents for review and updates. Here we have the different proposals to review. Recruit new ALSes and the metrics proposal. Then we have any other

EN

business. This is the agenda for today. The agenda is approved, is adopted. Alberto, you have the floor please. Go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: We have [inaudible] difference when it comes to the order because Olga is telling us that she has some issues to connect, and that she will be able to connect through the AC approximately 9:00 PM. So I will start with my presentation, and then when Olga finishes with her meeting, she will begin with her presentation. Dev, you have the floor. Go ahead, please. I see your hand up.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Can you hear me?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes, Dev. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Alberto. I just want to ask two questions since it's not on the agenda for this call. Well, what's the status regarding [inaudible] confidence? Secondly, given that also the motion to select an ALAC representative, given that that [is filled], what are the next steps? I notice that neither of these were on the agenda. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Dev, for your comment. Humberto, please, let's add these two items on the agenda in any other business.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, no problem. We can add those topics on ability other business.

ALBERTO SOTO: I will begin with my presentation, if you could please upload that presentation on the screen. Just bear with me some seconds. I am uploading my presentation.

The topic that we're going to present today is the New gTLD Program. This was a topic already suggested by – I don't know remember the name, but I think it was Alejandro Pisanty. Since the motion is not approved that, we cannot submit that to voting because we have [inaudible] procedures to do before.

But the motion is already created, and with this motion what we do is to take a topic of interest for each monthly call and this would be our [first] topic of interest for our monthly call. After we finish with this, we will begin with the voting.

The idea – and sorry, but I am trying to see the screen. The purpose and objective of this presentation is to provide basic concepts, a little bit of background, and the current aspects of this program. When it comes to the purpose, this is just an introduction to the New gTLD Program. And why is this just an introduction? Because we have a webinar still pending that has been coordinating with the GSE team that was [inaudible]. This webinar will be delivered by I think one or two experts. I am not an expert on this subject, but we need to start dealing with this topic, and I still might remember…

I uploaded this information or some references to this topic on the wiki page for you to read so that we can discuss this topic today.

The objective is to keep the current [regional actors] with the [pace] of events happening in ICANN. We will quickly see the importance of this topic for ICANN. At the same time, I believe this topic should be useful for us to have a better integration with LACRALO in the ICANN process, and to keep us engaged in this topic.

When it comes to the basic concept, let's take into account that this is something very basic. We have top-level domains that are divided into two main groups. On one hand, we have the gTLDs. These are generic top-level domains. For example, .com, .info, .org, etc. In these types, we also have the [sponsored] top-level domains or sTLDs that are [driven] be certain groups, such as [.cat] or [.museum].

Then we have the gTLDs. As you know, we must have a minimum of three [inaudible] and they must not be associated to countries. They are managed by ICANN. Then we will see what happens with this once Olga Cavalli delivers her presentation.

The second large group of domains are the ccTLDs. These are the country code top-level domains, and these are the top-level domains per country. These are the ones that you already know, and the man characteristic is that they only have two characters and that they are managed or run by agencies in each country. As we said before, gTLDs aren't managed by ICANN.

ICANN was created in 1998, and since then one of the main or fundamental principles was to promote competition in the domain

name market. That is to say, to expand this market. But they have to see how they would be doing this and why, because the expansion of the top-level domain would allow more innovation [inaudible] in the Internet address system.

So how was this achieved? Well, through a process – a consultation process – which was a very detailed and long [inaudible] process between the multi-stakeholders. In this case, ICANN [says that] all stakeholders were involved and it mentioned the different stakeholders, such as government, individuals, civil society, technical community. ICANN also said that the government and advisory committee, At-Large, the ccNSO, the SSAC and the GNSO were also contributing to this policy work. But there is still some discussion about whether we are included or not within the civil society.

ICANN, when mentioning multi-stakeholder, it mentioned the ccNSO and other multi-stakeholders. So this policy was finished in 2006 and adopted by the ICANN board in 2008.

Before, only eight gTLDs existed. Or before the creation of ICANN, only eight gTLDs existed. They were .com, [.edu], .gov, [inaudible] and so on.

In the past, ICANN successfully [led] two previous rounds of applications for new gTLDs in [inaudible] in 2004. In the first case, we have [inaudible], .biz, .corp, .info, .museum, .name. Then in 2004, .asia, [inaudible], and so on.

The GNSO developed policy recommendations which are the basis for all this work and that ICANN uses for the inclusion of new gTLDs. In the ICANN meeting in Paris, the ICANN Board of Directors approved the

recommendations, the GNSO recommendations, for the inclusion of new gTLDs in the Internet address system.

Now, what is ICANN doing to protect property rights or intellectual property rights? Well, [inaudible] have to take into account this is a process based on objections. It is a period of nine months. And this process, as I said before, is based on objections to allow holders of rights to make the corresponding [claims]. Of course they have to [prove] this in case that legal rights are being affected.

Then the new gTLD applicants are asked to explain why they are applying for this gTLD and what are the mechanisms they apply to protect IP rights.

Then all new gTLD owners must ensure that all second-level recognitions are in accordance with the dispute resolution policy, or uniform domain name, the UDRP, in ICANN.

ICANN has been working closely with the trademark community to find solutions in case of potential trademark issues. You might remember that there are certain issues – for example, with .patagonia and some other domain names. So [inaudible] important discussions regarding those new gTLDs.

Olga Cavalli will speak about the use of ccTLDs as gTLDs. We were discussing particularly the issue of geographical regions. We know the GAC is against that, and we, the ones representing the interest of end users, we are also doing that.

EN

In the next slide, there will be a site, a web page, that I will speak about later. In this case, this is the new gTLD website. Okay, let's go back to the previous slide.

Here you can see the applicant [cornered]. So any applicant of a new gTLD has a wide range of collaboration to have everything clear and to apply properly taking into account the rules and the regulations. ICANN also provides support for this.

I believe that the cost of new gTLD is $185,000. So, for example, if a gTLD has a particular characteristic or if there is support program for new applicants, they can apply for a reduction of the fee if necessary. And if the applicant meets all the necessary requirements.

As I said before, there is global support system that would be the applicant [inaudible]. Then it would be the RAA and so on.

In this slide, you can see a link with all the details. This presentation will be available, so you don't need to take notes about this link. The website is quite behind in terms of information. There is a section with news, but in fact, information is not well updated. Since policies have not been updated, I think information is still valid.

The aim here, the aim that we have, is not to purchase a gTLD. Actually, what we need to do is to be aware of all of this as much as possible and to try to contribute within ICANN to what we need to do which is developing, or modifying if necessary, any policies governing [contract changes], and also to see that there is a good tracking of the money being collected.

Before the Buenos Aires meeting, I talked about it because this was going to be [dealt with]. I received no input. I actually received one input in person. One was from Alejandro Pisanty, and the other one [inaudible]. Actually, I wanted Alejandro to talk about this, that he said he didn't want to do that and that he [trusted]. So I went there and I participated in the round. At that time, there was 65 million [pesos] available. We expect to have another 65 additional million [pesos] incoming.

What I did after that [talk] is… Well, evidently, we have no more need for more [inaudible]. We have need for leader training, for education, for people who are concerned about the region. We can have funds available to support this, but this doesn't necessarily imply that we need to have [inaudible]. Maybe we should have another ATLAS II and we should formalize it. It was very productive. Since Mexico until London, a long time passed by. So probably we should have them more closely.

We also had an ALAC meeting with Fadi and with his team. These are actually two different meetings. They asked us who we wanted to have a talk with in Dublin and I asked the finance area to be present and to answer with respect to what we have asked in the Buenos Aires meeting regarding the investment of the collection of the auction for the gTLDs and what was it that they attempted to do with the proceeds of the new auction.

We now have more than 500 TLDs that have been delegated. Have a look at this. Africa has six gTLDs. Latin America and the Caribbean, 55. While there are 251 in North America, 131 in Europe, and 63 in the Asia-Pacific region. So actually, the emerging countries have… I don't really

know if it is a low impact or low interest or low income, but this is one of the talks we actually need to have. This is one of the discussions we need to have. What are the suggestions to try and revert this situation? It is believed that the progress of domain names make an economy improve, so we need to do this in favor of our own regions.

From now on, I'm going to go very quickly on this. This is a [nine-month] timeline that I mentioned before. You can read this later on. I'm not a specialist and I'm not going to read this because it really doesn't make any sense. The latest news is since this year that reports have been presented on rights protection mechanisms. There were also reports on consumer trust and consumer choice. Review of metrics are also available. There was also data collection and analysis that was on June 8th. And ICANN announced that they have results from multi-year consumer study on the domain name landscape.

We continue to review the implementation program. I apologize right here. Who is moving this, please?

The program is being reviewed and we are dealing with these issues. Is anybody scrolling the slides? Hello? Can anybody please tell me if they are scrolling on the slides? Okay, right here.

So there is a review of the program implementation. It encompasses operation, support, applicant support programs, application processing, application evaluation, [inaudible], contention resolution, objection on [inaudible] resolution and contracting as well.

There are only two parts that have been completed. One is the application window and the evaluation. [inaudible] 2014. Now the rest

EN

goes from 4% [and the] other one that is missing, [62%]. And something that ends in 2015 and something else in 2016. The last part is the delegation.

This means that we still are on the review part and studies are being conducted. We can also see that the implementation program – I'm sorry, the program implementation review. We still need to go to consumer competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust; and finally, security and stability.

Please remember that within this new gTLD program there still are studies on the impact of the addition of new gTLDs in the DNS system.

This is all from me. I don't think there will be many questions on this. If there's anybody who would like to ask, of course I can answer.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: There are a few questions on the chat room, and also some corrections because there were a few issues that probably were not very properly presented. At some point, for example, you talked about .com as if it were a Spanish part, when actually you should refer to the .es. It's a typo probably, because the part in Spanish was okay, but probably the part in English was not really properly written. This is what Dev said, actually. Then also Carlos Aguirre asked if the new round is open. If so, when it will be open. Fatima and Dev also said that it's not open, that the round has not started yet.

You also mentioned 65 million pesos, Alberto. Actually, I think it's 65 million dollars. Correct me if I'm wrong.

ALBERTO SOTO: That's right, $65 million, which actually could be $130 million. I apologize. It was my mistake.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Dev also says that there's a number that's also wrong. There were two applications for new gTLDs from Latin America, not 55. 55 was the ones that were mentioned [inaudible] presentation and Dev says there actually are 24.

ALBERTO SOTO: If I'm not mistaken, the information is updated as of February 2015. This is not my own information. It's provided by ICANN. I actually took it from ICANN. I will take note of this and tell ICANN that they are wrong.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I think this is a summary of all the questions. There are some other comments and I'm trying to see if there will be some other input. Is there anybody who would like to ask any other questions?

ALBERTO SOTO: Please remember what I said in the beginning. This is an idea to start the discussion. Now, the details need to come from a webinar that was ready to be started a month ago, and I asked Rodrigo and the webinar is not ready yet. And this webinar needs to answer all the questions we have with respect to the status of this issue. Please remember that all of

EN

this is outdated in the new gTLD website. Unfortunately, it's really very outdated.

I don't see any questions or hands raised. Let's go to the next issue, please. The next item then is the discussion of the New gTLD Program. I hope you've read what I posted on the wiki so that we can start having a discussion right now. We have several minutes to do this. I see no one starting. I have already mentioned that we need to read all this to then give an opinion and participate. That is why we have posted the documents on the wiki that was given us a very good idea, actually.

I also mentioned I will discuss the cost issue. That is what the [inaudible] will be like. If you have not read this, I ask in the few minutes we have that you make suggestions on what the proceeds of the auctions should be invested in.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: There are two relevant comments on the AC room. I'm going to translate what Dev says. There is a report by the GNSO. It's a preliminary report with respect to the new gTLDs, the procedure for the new gTLDs. Dev also posted here a link, and [inaudible] is saying…

SILVIA VIVANCO: Humberto, we are not listening to you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I just came back. I will repeat. I am saying that there were two comments. One was from Dev. He posted a link in relation to a

EN

preliminary issue report on new gTLD [inaudible] for comments. He posted something there. There's also a comment from Terri with respect to a new gTLD auction process discussion paper. It is posted right there on the AC room. Alejandro Pisanty seems to also be writing a comment on the chat room. This is a summary of what is on the chat room [inaudible].

ALBERTO SOTO: Let me ask you again. Do you have any suggestions or ideas?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Alejandro Pisanty is correcting the word [process] in English, which means profit. It means income and not procedures as it has been translated.

ALBERTO SOTO: That's right. We'll correct that. Alejandro has raised his hand. Alejandro, please go ahead.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you very much. Can you hear me fine?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are hearing you. Your audio is a bit saturated.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: When you go away from the mic, we can hear you a bit better.

EN

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: We reviewed the different types of applications for the resources that have already been discussed.

INTERPRETER: We apologize, but it's very difficult to understand Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: The idea is to apply these resources to technology development. For example, the idea is that developing countries participate in this. We also consider the scale. We are talking about $65 million. These are approximately 30 ATLAS II meetings. This is a very non-rational use. We need to try to see that the proposals that we received in LACRALO and At-Large do not…

INTERPRETER: We apologize. It's very difficult for us to understand Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I think all of this will be useful for the proposal. A proposal that will have a sense of contribution.

ALBERTO SOTO: We will confirm Alejandro what we said before. We don't talk about [inaudible], but specifically ATLAS II should happen more often. We have another meeting on Thursday, so I will continue to propose this so

that this can be included within the Dublin agenda with Fadi's team. They are [inaudible] a lot really. Alan, you have the floor. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think there may be a misunderstanding. The current discussion and call for comments is not on how to use the money, but is just the start of a process. Currently they are asking if the discussion paper has omitted any important issues, that will then result in a charter being drafted, which people can participate in, and then a cross-community working group. That cross-community working group will then discuss the substance of how the money should be used, but that's not where we are yet.

So right now it's just asking are there any issues that were omitted or wrong in the discussion paper based on the meetings that were held in Buenos Aires. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Alan, for your comment. It was not a misunderstanding, in fact. I know this is still in process. The thing is that nobody has posed anything else to be debated right now. I don't really know… I mean, I don't really know why topics are not being presented. I tried to present a topic to debate and this is [inaudible] something to debate. Alejandro, go ahead, please.

EN

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:	I know Fatima is asking a question. How much time do you believe or do you think will be enough for people to make contributions…
INTERPRETER:	We interpreters apologize, but Alejandro Pisanty's audio is really bad quality and no interpretation is possible. We apologize for that.
ALBERTO SOTO:	Thank you very much, Alejandro, for your comment.
HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	Alberto, if I may. I would like to ask Alan whether he was able to hear Alejandro's question because Alejandro was addressing a question to him. There is also a question by Fatima. Could you please answer that question?
ALBERTO SOTO:	Yes. Please tell me Fatima's question.
HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	Fatima Cambronero's question is this. Why ATLAS II should be held more frequently? She also wants to know the argument for this.
ALBERTO SOTO:	Okay. I was not able to participate in the first ATLAS meeting. I know that in the ATLAS II meeting, there were many recommendations, a lot of participation. But [inaudible] not so good as we would like to, but

EN

there were many recommendations that went beyond ATLAS II. Specific working groups were created to deal with those recommendations. I know that in ALAC there are many recommendations that are being dealt with, and there are specific working groups that are dealing with those recommendations. This is something good to take into account.

As Alejandro said, the [inaudible] are really high. I know there are many people that are against the ATLAS meeting, but if it is being held every three years instead of every four years, perhaps it would be more useful. But I think it would be even more useful if we were able to participate in policy development and policy discussion.

For example, I am asking right now if there are suggestions. I'm only receiving questions about something that I have to explain. I mean, I like explaining and I am trying to explain and justify all the topics, but perhaps we will need further input.

Alejandro, go ahead, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I have already typed my question for Alan. This is a motion of procedure to ask Alan Greenberg for him to indicate in writing what he has requested and then to postpone the discussion about the [inaudible] or having a new ATLAS meeting, and then to give the floor to Olga Cavalli.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay. Do you all agree with Alejandro's motion?

EN

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	I agree with that and I think Alan Greenberg has raised his hand to answer to Alejandro.
ALBERTO SOTO:	Since there is no disagreement, we will proceed then to [inaudible]. Now Olga is already connected to the call. I will give the floor to Olga Cavalli for her to proceed with her presentation.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Can you hear me?
ALBERTO SOTO:	Yes, Olga. Thank you very much for your participation. Welcome to our call. I have asked Olga to participate in this meeting, because not long ago, I sent an e-mail asking for collaboration to people knowledgeable about this topic, and the only one participating on behalf of ALAC was [Cheryl]. So taking into account this and taking into account that in the [inaudible] of Costa Rica, I asked Olga Cavalli to please give us a presentation about this topic.
OLGA CAVALLI:	Thank you very much, Alberto. This is a cross-community working group and this cross-community working group deals with domain names – country code domain names – with two or three characters [as TLDs]. This is a working group created by the ccNSO, GNSO, and At-Large, and the GAC is also participating on the working group. But the leadership or the leader is the GNSO.

EN

I would like to make reference to an e-mail sent by one of the co-chairs of this working group, Carlos Aguirre. He makes reference specifically to the GAC participation within this working group and I will read this e-mail. The GAC has made a counter-proposal with a larger definition scope. The GAC initiated a study on territory or geographical names before this cross-community working group was created. The GAC started to work within this working group after the Durbin meeting where we got the GAC advice, again .amazon and .patagonia, which was [inaudible] after these specific studies.

So this statement indicates that this was something that was initiated before the creation of cross-community working group. They said that the GAC has [denied] consistently to work on these and participate on this working group, and this is not true because [inaudible] participating in this working group together with other co-chairs. Particularly I wasn't able to participate [inaudible] meetings because they were very late at night. Then they changed the time of the call.

GAC has also indicated that they would like to participate, but in fact I am the only one participating in this call.

There is another part of this mail, which reads we don't know much about the GAC group. I personally do not understand the aim of this comment. Why? Because, first of all…

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry, Olga, for interrupting you. Since [Carlos] is not here, I would appreciate that you give us an outlook of the discussion topics and then once we meet with Carlos, you can discuss with him these topics.

EN

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Well, I am participating in this cross-community working group as I said before. This is a working group studying the [ISO list] for two characters that can be used as a TLD.

On the other hand, there is an internal GAC working group, and this is quite confusing, according to the e-mail sent by Carlos. This internal working group is studying geo names that are not included in any list and that might be used as TLDs. This cross-community working group has delivered certain documents and they're now sending a questionnaire for three characters and two-character TLDs. I know there is a public comment open. I know [that Cheryl] has participated in this public comment period.

The most interested group is the GNSO, of course. The GNSO is interested in this because they are creating the policy for the new round. There are also certain definitions. They're working on definition about geo names, what a geo name is and what should not be considered a geo name.

You should know there are two regions or two definitions of what a geo name is. For some experts, especially those that are related to IP (or intellectual property) issues, geo names are only those names that are included in certain recognized lists, such as the ISO or the UN list. In our case, we believe that there are other geo names whenever they are relevant to the community or to the [geographic] they belong to.

EN

We took certain examples of names that have been taken from our region to be used, such as the case of .patgonia, [.roma], [inaudible], or other names that belong to a community and have been taken as a TLD.

So the discussion deals with… Or the fact that whether a geo name should be taken into account from the list or if the definition of geo names should be extended to other communities or regions.

These community working group focuses on the geo names that are contained in recognized lists and they are now working on two character domain names and three character domain names.

This is all the information I have to give to you, but if you will, I can provide further information and further document or we can exchange some documents that are now being posted for comment.

I would like to clarify that since the e-mail that Carlos Aguirre has been circulated in the list, all the affirmations and statements contained in that e-mail are not true.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay, Olga. Thank you very much for your comments. I know what you mean, but I don't want to advance on a discussion if the other party is not present. As I said before, I offer you the possibility of having another call to make all the necessary clarifications and for people from our region to collaborate with Cheryl Langdon-Orr because I know she's working alone on this topic.

EN

OLGA CAVALLI: Carlos is a co-chair by the GNSO. What do you mean by working with him? Is he working in the same group?

ALBERTO SOTO: No, he's not working on the same group. What I'm trying to do is to find some volunteers to work with Cheryl Langdon-Orr to help her. That's all. I mean, nobody is going to represent LACRALO specifically. It's not going to represent LACRALO. Alejandro, go ahead, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I want to know whether you can hear me better. I think it's really interesting to have the discussion and to see all the – or to take into account Olga's comments regarding the GAC. The thing is that the acceptance or two or three character domain names have to be discussed.

                       And I should say that I didn't have the chance to consult with the leadership of other groups, but I believe that at least three character domain names for country codes or for countries should be contained in the ISO list, and they should be given to the [TLDs] for a reasonable amount of period of time for them to have that information in order to avoid… Devote resources to this and to avoid conflict with regional organizations or regional bodies, and to pay high cost in terms of litigations.

                       When it comes to representation, well, Carlos is someone with great technical knowledge.

INTERPRETER: I am not receiving Alejandro's audio.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: So he is member of the GNSO on the NomCom and he also represents members of the GNSO. From the GAC perspective, well, this is something to take into account.

INTERPRETER: Interpreters apologize, but Alejandro Pisanty's audio is not clear and it is not possible to deliver an accurate interpretation.

ALBERTO SOTO: Here is a question for Olga. You mentioned a city which is Rome. We have also heard about [Amazon] and [Patagonia]. Is there any other issue that is not a geo name that is actually related to the name of a city or a country?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah, we have heard about important [communitive] names such as [Halal] and [Shangrila] and others. I can't really remember all of them right now. I can just look for this and send it to you. But the GAC communique in Beijing lists all of them.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay.   [inaudible] send it. My concern is whether an aboriginal community could also be included within this list.

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, of course it can. Our concern, actually, is the concern of many country is these names are [nice] because our region is [nice]. These are interesting names for companies, for marketing purposes. These are names that convey very good sensations because they actually are associated with those very good sensations and they belong to us.

At least what I am concerned is what belongs to Latin America and the Caribbean, and in general as a country, we want these resources for those countries and the communities being used the way they need to be used, with the agreement of all stakeholders in our community. This should not be actually for the benefit of one stakeholder only. This is an internal working group on the GAC and actually we have posted all those documents for public comments. We have received comments from At-Large, from the GNSO, and the ccNSO.

I don't really agree with my friend, Alejandro, that a member of the GNSO Council has more freedom. A member of the GNSO Council is such even if it is a NomCom appointee or not. I was a NomCom appointee for the GNSO for four years, a vice chair of the GNSO for two years, and [inaudible] on the GNSO. Then I left that role and I held another role.

Even though I do recognize the merit of my colleagues, I believe if there is someone who is the co-chair of a working group, a cross-community working group, they give a certain relevance to that role which may confuse the rest of the participants in terms of their opinions, especially if it's the joint opinion.

EN

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: The same would apply to the vice chair of the GAC. Is that correct?

ALBERTO SOTO: Olga, many people are telling me it would be convenient to have those links, so if you could please send [inaudible] so that we could send it to the list.

OLGA CAVALLI: Which links do you need?

ALBERTO SOTO: The links that you mentioned regarding the GAC document that was in the GAC communique from Beijing and Durbin.

OLGA CAVALLI: I will send both of them, [inaudible].

ALBERTO SOTO: Is there any other questions?

OLGA CAVALLI: No, I [inaudible] and you can call me anytime you need me.

EN

ALBERTO SOTO: I apologize that there was an overlap in those meetings, but I want to [inaudible] what I said before. The government and us, the ALSes, represent and ALAC represents the interest of end users. I think that we should work together because we can have a good result from our work because what the government does good or bad with respect of all of this can cause a detriment or a benefit to the end users and we can't prevent issues that way.

OLGA CAVALLI: The government also represents users, so that should be [inaudible].

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I'm sorry, Olga. Alejandro Pisanty says that the GAC communique, we know the GAC communique, but the position is the document that Olga mentioned.

OLGA CAVALLI: The documents prepared by the GAC were posted for public comments for three months. They were presented in the Singapore meeting, and actually At-Large commented and many others commented as well, but I can of course send them to you. I don't have my computer here with me, but I can send them to you. I'd like to receive comments from you as well.

ALBERTO SOTO: [That's all]. Thank you, Olga. We will receive all of that.

OLGA CAVALLI: Then I am [with you on this also].

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. We know you need to leave. Thank you very, very much for your participation.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you for inviting me.

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry, Humberto, we will now go to the next item on the agenda, please. Item #7.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I understand that item 7… Well, the proposals for new ALSes is sort of paralyzed. The same happened with the metrics proposal. I'm referring to the ALAC member election and the censorship motion. We're going to refer to that in item #8.

But we do need to say that before this meeting we finally received the translation of the last document related to the procedure proposal for the creation of a statement and publication of statements as well. So we will try to generate a calendar and put this [to vote] because this document… We held a webinar related to this. We received a comment both from Dev and [Rosa King]. And since we now do have the document we will just put them to [vote]. I mean, we need to

EN

coordinate this with the rest of the issues that are still pending in LACRALO. So this is in relation to item#7.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay, let's now go on to item #8. Please refer to the censorship motion.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Are you asking me, Alberto? I can make that motion.

ALBERTO SOTO: So in connection with the censorship one or lack of trust motion, we need to say that we are awaiting a [LAT] translation that we should receive tomorrow. Then we will announce what the procedure will be. So the reason why the motion was paralyzed was just that we needed to wait for this, but we will continue to process this. This is in general terms.

Now, tomorrow we should have some news and all of this depends on the translation team. It doesn't really depend on us. But it actually depends on the translation team. If it's not tomorrow, then it will be on Wednesday. But we hope we will receive it tomorrow.

Now, with respect to the ALAC member election, as I said and as I explained to [Carlton Samuels] at the time, he said there was an issue with the censorship motion which was a point of order. He gave the argument to the list and we [inaudible] said that it was not a point of order in our view because in accordance to the rules, a point of order needs to call the attention to the chair with respect to a certain issue or

EN

procedure. But what [Mr. Samuels] was asking was related to the fact that the members of the community wanted to issue an opinion. So this didn't really merit to be considered a point of order. That's why the election was not suspended.

And then Mr. Samuels said that those who abstained should have considered as they have voted, and I explained to him in an e-mail why [inaudible] we consider this as part of the quorum, and he still insisted and I said that he needed to give me some time so that I could answer more in depth why was it I disagreed with his opinions. So this is a summary of the issue that happened with this item.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Humberto. Does anybody else want to make an additional comment? No one else? Okay. So we have completed our agenda and since there are no other questions or concerns, we will finish our meeting a bit earlier so that we can take a break.

I would like to thank you all. So thank you very much. Have a good afternoon or good evening. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you, and thank you to the interpreters.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]