
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to LACRALO ccTLDs working group on Friday, the 14th of August 2015 at 23:00 UTC.

On the Spanish channel, we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Aida Noblia, and Cristian Casas.

On the English channel we have Ron Sherwood and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

I show no apologies listed for today's conference.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Sabrina.

I would like all participants to please state your name, not only for transcription purposes, but also for our Spanish interpreter.

Thank you very much and back over to you Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Hello. Thank you very much. Good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to this conference call. I am Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. And I will be chairing this meeting. We have an agenda for this meeting. So Silvia, I would ask you to kindly read the agenda for this call, because my computer connection just dropped.

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.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. Yes, of course Sergio. Our agenda for this meeting, it's first of all, roll call or attendance. Item number two, resuming working groups and next steps. Item three, is the survey. Item four is the request to open the debate in the GNSO and in the ccNSO about the application of ISO codes in relation with the United Nations rule.

And we do have some reference documents. And we have audios in Spanish and English, that are the audios of the public forum in the last ICANN meeting held in Buenos Aires.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Sergio speaking. Thank you very much Silvia. I am trying to reenter the AC room as I speak. Okay. Let us recall our last actions. We had started work on a survey, so as to work directly with the network information centers in other countries. And draft some kind of plan or map that would reflect the status of our region, so that we can engage with the region, and we can engage network information centers in other countries.

That came to a halt, due to a number of questions raised within the group, or I believe it was Eric who had expressed some kind of reservation regarding certain topics. And Humberto Carrasco, our regional secretariat, had to work together with him on those questions or issues. It is my understanding that the issues are still outstanding, or pending but I believe that we can work so that we can resolve or finalize that once and for all.

It is my understanding that Aida wanted to meet the people in Uruguay's network information center, I did the thing in my own country, and we had told them that we would be sending them a survey, and that came to a halt. So it is a pity, or a shame, not to be able to work with these stakeholders in the region, since we have these, this tool.

So initially, we should focus on the survey. Aida, I don't know if you have the latest version of the survey available, or handy?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. If I may, Sergio, Aida, we have compiled all of the questions. We have all the questions together in one document, and we can display the document on the screen in the Adobe Connect room, so that we can go over the questions together.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Sergio speaking. Yes of course, thank you very much Silvia.

Sergio speaking again. Okay, while we wait for the documents to be on the screen, let me tell you that this is a 60 minute meeting, and we will focus on this document, and we will also focus on item four on our agenda. At the end of the meeting, we can deal with any other business, so if you foresee any other business, please feel free to include it.

Okay, let's see. We have the document on the screen. I am trying to enlarge my screen to magnify it, so that I can read out the document. So this is in Spanish, so I will read it out loud so that you will receive the

interpretation into English. My colleagues on the English channel, my English speaking colleagues on the English channel.

So I will begin with item one. This was put forth by Humberto. Overall situation of the domain. A degree of development and use of the domain, B if the domain subdivided territorially or organized territorially, or by topics or subject such as dot com, dot net. What are the requirements to apply for the domain? What is the person or entity managing the domain?

Is it a public entity? A university? A private entity? What is the possibility of considering the domain name registration as a public service? And what are the consequences of that? Any possible issues in terms of jurisdiction and competition regarding the registrar? Then are there any limitations, absolute limitations in terms of responsibility towards consumers or users that can deprive them of the use of their rights to compensation in case the service is inefficient?

F, what is their intervention and to what degree within the domain of a competent entity in terms of trademarks, registered trademarks? Item number two, regulations. What are the regulations? And what are they like? Are they part of the national regulatory system in place? Is there any provision or rules foreseen to address disputes or for dispute resolution?

What is the degree of openness of these regulations? And also indicate the main limitations in terms of domain name registrations. Can people residing in other countries register domain names? Can an individual register a domain name? Is there an application and maintenance fee?

And can a legal reservation principle be applied in terms of [inaudible] law?

Then three, disputes or conflicts. Is there any record of conflicts or disputes, examples of legal or court resolutions, and a brief description of these resolutions, and finally, what are the mechanisms to recover a domain name?

After that, we have some questions contributed by Aida Noblia. Local legislation that provides a legal framework to a country's domain names and numbers. When was the ccTLD established? In what year? What gTLDs are linked to a ccTLD? What is the ccTLD manager in your country?

Is that a private or public entity? Who is in charge of the ccTLD administration? Is that administration outsourced? If so, in what way? Is it only the administrative side that is outsourced, or also the technical aspect is outsourced? Is that outsourced to a private or public entity? If the ccTLD manager is a university, is it a private university or a public university?

Is the ccTLD management or administration delegated to another entity? Is it outsourced by means of outsourcing? Or by any other type of outsourcing? In this case, how does it work? Do you delegate responsibilities? If so, which responsibilities are delegated? How many commercial names are there? How many of those names are related to education? To health? To state agencies or government agencies? To private entities? To professional associations?

Do you have any further information about this point? If we're speaking about private entities, what industry are they in or what market are they in? How many of them are government entities? How many domain names did you have in private years, or at the beginning of your ccTLD?

Were they allocated in the same way as they are now, among the different areas, business, private sector, education or academia, government entities, professional entities, etc.? What is your growth projection for the next year and for the next five years?

Is it necessary to pay in exchange for the delegation of the domain name? How much is that payment? Is it the same amount for the domain name country? What is the amount in case they are different? Or there is a difference, difference, sorry? Does the state also pay for the use of domain names? Is this affordable to the overall population, or is this very costly?

Does the person in charge of the administrating entity hold tenure permanently? Do you have a dispute resolution in place? If so, please describe it. Do you know the jurisdiction of applicable law? What is that jurisdiction? What is the rationale? Please name the people in charge of running the network information center, their contact email, their address and phone number.

And an email for ccTLD and gTLD users to report issues related to the ccTLD. Then we have my own questions. So again, the person or persons responsible for running the network information center, their contact email, their address, their phone number. Again, an email for

users to report issues related to the ccTLD, local legislation that provides a legal framework for the domain names in the country.

What are the gTLDs linked to the ccTLD and what is the growth projection for the next year, and for the next five years? So what we have read out together is a list of questions that we had discussed or analyzed previously. So what we need to focus on is on putting everything together so to speak. Start to compile a series of questions or a questionnaire that will be this survey, that we can send out to the network information centers, because in my opinion, this is very lengthy.

So, we should focus on having something that is useable. I don't know if, at this point, any of the participants on the call would like to work on this, and finalize this questionnaire for our next conference call. Do we have any volunteers?

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida speaking. Can you hear me?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Yes, of course, go ahead Aida please.

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida speaking for the record. Okay, yes, I volunteer to do this within my possibilities. I can see that some questions are duplicated, so we can summarize this questionnaire, and we can focus on the most relevant or

important questions, so as not to overload the recipient, or so as not to include data that perhaps is not that relevant to us.

And so as not to go into a lot of details. So I am willing to work on this, maybe we can hold another meeting to agree on how to work together.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. I agree with your proposal Aida. So if you can take the lead, then that's a good idea. I dare say that I would like to join you so that we can work together, and have it ready for our next conference call. So if the group members agree, then we can get started.

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida Noblia speaking. Okay, maybe we can get together on Skype.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Yes of course, a Skype meeting will do.

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida speaking. This is fine by me. I don't know if the other participants agree.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. And of course, if somebody else wants to join us...

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida speaking. It would be, it would be important to have other people joining us, so as to reach an agreement or consensus.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. I believe that the moment we discuss this, Humberto and Eric should also join us. Maybe we can have an email exchange on this list of questions. And if there is something that needs fine tuning, we can work that out on our email exchange list, and we can define or agree on the questions, and we can all work together on that.

Maybe they cannot join us on the conference call, but they can reply to an email, or they can add or delete items from this list of questions.

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida speaking. Yes, I agree.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Okay. Cristian, are you on the call?

CRISTIAN CASAS: Cristian speaking. Yes.

SABRINA: The interpreter apologizes, several speakers were overlapping.

CRISTIAN CASAS: Cristian speaking. My apologies. I'm not at home right now, but I am on the phone, and I agree with these proposals.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Dev, do you agree with these methodologies proposed?

CRISTIAN CASAS: This is Cristian speaking. Yes, I agree.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Dev, please go ahead. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev. I agree that there is some duplication of questions. So indeed some work needs to be done to consolidate these, this set of survey questions. I do have two comments though. You know, one, what's the ultimate goal of this lengthy survey? Because the questions are asking a lot of things, and I mean, if we had this information today, how is that going to help us?

What's the ultimate goal for us to do? My second question onto this is that, I'm sure LAC TLD has a lot of this information already. So would it be simpler to just simply ask LAC TLD if they have some sort of public facing report, which has these, a lot of this information already? And if so, then it will cut down on the number of survey questions, because it won't be a repetitive, you know, what is your, you know.

What seems to be, I would say, details that is already well known to LAC TLD. Those are my two comments. Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Sergio speaking. Thank you Dev for your contribution. Yes, when we started reading out the document, some parts or items were duplicated or repeated. So the first thing we need to do is to fine tune this or adjust it. And then, after that, there are some questions then, I'm not sure if they should be in the questionnaire.

So we, in the group, the group members, need to see whether these questions really have to be there, because maybe the person responsible for the network information center does not feel like replying to these questions. Now going back to your original question, the idea is to have a map of the region with information on the different network information centers in our region, so as to have a sort of social map. With distinctive features that can help us better understand the domain name delegation or allocation process in our region.

Going back to the number of questions, I believe that the questionnaire should be much shorter, or briefer. It cannot be longer than a one pager. And each question have to be quickly replied, or expediently replied, or maybe the respondent can point us to a link so that we can access the information. Also, they will have to answer other questions so that we can draft this regional map.

The idea is to link the network information center to the different organizations within the network information center's country, the country that makes its date. So the ccTLD managers can be linked or

engaged to the user associations that are participating within LACRALO. That would be a secondary objective.

That would be pretty helpful so that the multistakeholder system works better within ICANN. So the goals go hand in hand. Here is the proposal, or suggestion, for you. Aida and myself can get together, or work together, during the week, work on this list and post it to the email exchange list, so that we can fine tune the questions. Maybe some questions are not very nicely drafted, they have mistakes, and it doesn't have to do with spelling, but surely with grammar.

So that we can better reach out our respondents. Since this document was drafted by several people. At the first step, what we will do is to take the document as is, without any type of edits, other than deleting the repeated or duplicated questions, or deleting some questions that we believe should not be there. After that, we will work on the remaining questions, focusing on drafting a questionnaire that would be understood by everyone.

This is our goal. Surely next week, or between this week and the next week, Aida and myself will be working on this, so that we can discuss it within two weeks. So it will be on the Wiki space. In the meantime, let us work together on our email exchange list, let us exchange emails with the different points of view about this document.

I don't know if there is any further comment or question at this point.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. Sergio, if I may?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Yes of course, go ahead.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco speaking. First of all, I have a suggestion on the basis of several surveys sent out by staff lately. We realize that we have very few respondents. So it has been really helpful to give them yes, no questions, or multiple questions, with two or three options, so that the respondent can choose one item very quickly, and the survey is not time consuming.

So I would suggest options, like a multiple choice options A, B, C, D, E for instance, on the basis of our recent experience with surveys. Secondly, I have a question regarding who will be the respondents? Or who is the target audience of this survey, because you do need to take your target audience into account.

We have volunteered in our At-Large community, and you know, time, they are always short of time. So we do need to take this into account, and thirdly, within the survey you perhaps might include the aim or the goal of the survey. That's my contribution.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you Silvia for your contribution. I have just typed a message in the AC room saying that your idea is a very good one. Regarding the target audience, we are targeting the ccTLD registries in all of the countries, all the entities responsible for the ccTLD

registrations in the country. And the idea is to circulate the survey among these parties.

When that is not possible, we will send them an email with the questions, or asking them to reply to the survey to take five minutes of their time to reply to our online survey. But whenever possible, our ALSs within the region will be able to interact with the entities responsible for running the ccTLDs in their own countries.

Some of us have already engaged with our ccTLDs, but plenty of people in our region do not have that possibility. Maybe some people have not been able to travel, or have not been able to interact with their ccTLD managers. So we thought it might, it was really relevant to have the ALSs interact with these people. I don't know if this replies to your question, but it is what I can say at this point.

Dev, I see you're asking for the floor, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand speaking. Can you hear me? Just to make sure?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER Yes, I can hear.

SABRINA: Go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you. This is Dev Anand speaking. I just posted two links here, because I keep hearing the relationship that we want to have a relationship with the ALSs, and the ccTLD operators to have some, either some informal or formal relationship with, in place. There are two, I'm just pointing out two links I posted in the chat.

One is the LACRALO dashboard that's been around for several years now, and that link shows, well, maybe it's out of date, I haven't checked it since the beginning of the year, but it shows the relationship of the [inaudible] in terms of the countries in LACRALO, and whether the country, the ccTLD of that country is in the ccNSO or not.

And also, if there are ALSs in that country. And it also shows the country breakdowns. If you were to look at the country breakdown tab, you'll then see breakdowns of which countries have ALSs and ccTLDs together. And there are 24 countries that they are, sorry. I should say there are 18 countries with At-Large structures, and members in the ccNSO.

So I'm just pointing out an example there. The second link is what's being done as far as the project two communications, which I'm one of the primary, one of the chairs, along with Fatima Cambroner. And one of the things to divide the stakeholder map of the Latin American and Caribbean region. You know, identifying in a graphical detail what, you know, statistics about the various stakeholders in each of the countries.

What's on the ICANN LAC site is very preliminary, but it's something that was taking from information from LAC TLD. So it's still being built

out. And I'll be working with the group of stakeholder team, on how this could be further enhanced and updated.

But I'm just pointing out these two things, so we don't have to reinvent the wheel. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you very much Dev for your participation and for this contribution, for sharing this material with us. This is fantastic. I believe that these two initiatives or thoughts, do not pinpoint, sorry, do not bring together the ALS representatives of our region with the ccTLD operators in each country.

However, this material is really, really valuable, really important, so thank you very much for sharing or reminding of this material, because it's super valuable, and it reflects a lot of work so I am very pleased to see this material, and to be working with you.

If there are no further items, welcome back Aida. I see you are reentering the AC room. So if there are no comments or no further comments on this item, I would like to move on to the next item on our agenda. We still have plenty of time. Let us now move on to item number four.

And open the discussion within this working group. As you know, for several years now, we have been speaking about what ICANN has done regarding the application of ISO calls in relation to territories in dispute, especially colonial territories or colonies. And as an Argentinian, I have to say that we experience this with the [inaudible] and in the last ICANN

meeting, ICANN 53 held in Buenos Aires, there was a very important contribution by the Board, telling us that we might form a working group or draft a document to start working with the ccNSO on ccTLDs that were allocated, but which are not in line with the United Nations.

I will give the example of [Medina] for Falklands. I don't want to focus on this example alone. I would like to focus on other examples of ccTLDs delegated, and to work in relation to this United Nations list of domain names. The United Nations takes a list prepared by a private entity, this list was very well thought out.

It was done efficiently, or drafted efficiently, and the UN takes this as is, and puts that list in practice. And ICANN takes that very same list on the basis that the UN is using the same list. In the case of the [Medina] Falklands, and I am sure that is the case in other cases, and it is my understanding that the ccNSO has noticed this. The United Nations, several years prior to the ISO, has said that no further or new initiatives, or measures could be put in place in these cases.

For example, in the case of [Medina] that has a different name, and this created an issue for us, because ICANN delegated a ccTLD to a territory when the United Nations itself is saying that no new initiatives or actions were to be put in place. That is, names in that, or in that list couldn't be used in case of territories in dispute. And the United Nations colonization committee or commission, is also dealing with this topic or situation.

So my proposal or idea is the following. Together with the ccNSO, we could start analyzing or considering this, to date, regarding ccTLDs

branded or delegated on the basis of ISO list, and review ICANN's actions in this regard. This was what I meant when I included this item. So now the floor is open.

I don't know if you have anything to add.

CRISTIAN CASAS: Cristian Casas, if I may?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Welcome Cristian, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

CRISTIAN CASAS: Cristian speaking. I think this is very interesting in terms of international law. If the survey you were thinking about had multiple choice questions, in one of the questions, we might include what Sergio was just speaking about. That is to see if recipients or respondents are aware of this, and if they are not, if we can work on this together with the ccNSO.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you Cristian. I think, I believe this is not going to be possible because the idea is not for the other ccTLDs to take sides on this. At the end of the day, what we are trying to do is to see, within ICANN, the way in which these domain names, these ccTLDs were

delegated. And additionally, to see how this can be remediated. So there are two big issues.

On the one hand, ICANN has made a mistake, that is my point of view, ICANN has used a list prepared by a private entity, and the United Nations has taken that list as if it were its own. However, with the caveat that, for the United Nations, some territories are under dispute. So there are some reservations regarding those territories. It is my view that inadvertently, ICANN has done something that does not go in line with ICANN internal rules overall, and this has to be solved. We need to look for a solution so as to see the problems that arose, and the possible results.

I believe this is the great challenge ahead. [Inaudible] and I think that this is a great point of view expressed by the Board, by giving us this chance. However, [Mike Silver] told us to see the broader picture. So I believe this issue goes beyond the issue of [Medina]. We need to resolve or see how the ccTLDs were delegated by ICANN to territories that are under dispute, and territories that, according to the United Nations, should not be subject to any new action or measure.

So I believe this is the core of this discussion. To that end, we should draft a document. And I wonder if I could contribute basic document, which is the same document we submitted to the Board on three or four prior occasions, but I believe that document needs to be reviewed, because maybe there are some mistakes in that document, because I have interest in this situation.

Dev, go ahead please. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand here. I think I'm going to have to say that I disagree with this line of thinking here that has been proposed. ICANN doesn't really decide, and it should not be, it's not qualified to decide, and it should not decide what subdivisions or what territories of our planet, are or are not worthy of a ccTLD delegation.

So, going back to how the ICANN decided to take its cues from the ISO, and ISO in turn takes their cues from the United Nations, when it assembles its list of ccTLD identifiers. So it's a private organization that is doing its own thing. It takes its cues from the United Nations statistical office.

I can't remember the exact name of the division, but it's the, I can't remember the name of it. But the United Nations statistics division, I believe. They're the ones... So, I mean, I really don't see the intent or the purpose here of this discussion, to suggest that ICANN or the ccNSO which under the ccNSO, doesn't really have a say in, you know, the, what two letter characters are assigned to countries or territories.

What are you see it in dispute or not. So I just disagree totally with this intention here, because it's not... The principles of it, I don't support. And again, ICANN doesn't decide what territories are or are not worthy of a ccTLD delegation, and that is essentially what you're trying to say Sergio, that some countries or territories are worthy of a ccTLD delegation, and some aren't, or there should be some standard arranged by somebody, some grouping that could make a decision on

which country or territory is worthy of a ccTLD delegation, and that should not be. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you Dev. I think you did not understand my point, so I will explain it again. So I said, let us leave the [Medina] issue aside, let us leave any hot topic aside, because if not, we always discuss the same. I am not saying that ICANN defines anything related to a territory. I know that ICANN cannot be part of any international political dispute over a territory.

I do not think that it's normal. I do not think that it is convenient for ICANN to do. ICANN has to remain aside of any territorial dispute on this planet. But what I am saying is that ICANN took sides, and by taking sides, did not take sides by any or either of the two parties.

What they did was even stranger. So, it is my understanding, what I understand about [Medina] is, this is what I understand. But it is very likely, and I know that our conflicts or disputes regarding this same topic in other places, elsewhere. So my proposal is to review how, or to review the steps necessary for ICANN to delegate a ccTLD. Because, and now I will bring up the example of [Medina]. In the case of [Medina], that was wrongly delegated.

Not because a ccTLD was delegated, because there was an express resolution by the United Nations saying that no further action could be taken, and ICANN, and I believe that ICANN did not overlook this because there were plotting with somebody. I believe that ICANN was

not aware of this when they delegated the ccTLD. So they inadvertently overlooked that. This is what I am saying.

So I am pointing to a process that was strongly implemented. I'm not saying that ICANN has to say that the [Medina] are Argentinian, British, or they belong to Trinidad and Tobago. What I am saying is that the process by which dot SK and dot GS, in this case, the process by which they were delegated were wrongly implemented.

And it seems, and this is what we need to discover, that other ccTLDs were delegated in the same fashion. So looking ahead, we have to remediate and within or as long as it is possible, we have to remediate this backwards. So we need to see what ICANN is going to apply. Is ICANN going to apply the United Nations rules? If that is the case, they started off on the wrong foot because, what do they do? Do they take the United Nation rules as subsidiary or secondary rules?

Because these territories were in dispute, so nobody should have taken any further action or measure. This is my point. Dev, go ahead please. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Sergio. This is Dev. I'll have to disagree, because ICANN did not take sides in this. It goes back to ICANN, is not the arbiter, and I think you said you agree with it, but you're saying that ICANN is taking sides. It does not. There was a wish of the local populous on these islands, on the islands, for the ccTLD to be delegated to them, and they made the request.

And in general, and again maybe someone from the ccNSO could collaborate on that, but ICANN through the IANA department always pays attention to the wishes of the local populous. Whether it decides to re-delegate a ccTLD to an entity. And you know, and that's it. It's not whether, it's not getting it to the political or territorial disputes, or which is totally irrelevant to ICANN.

And again, it doesn't decide what territories were not worthy of a ccTLD delegation. So the fact that you're bringing in the issues that maybe the United Nations has said that, what you're saying the United Nations has said. It doesn't really matter. It's not in the sense that the UN statistical office has recognized [Medina] as Falkland Islands, giving a two code and three code letters.

The ISO has noted this and taken that assigning the two letter code to that territory. And the local populous or local government there has applied to ICANN for this. And ICANN would always pay attention to the local populous, I would think, when it decides it wants to re-delegate, or delegate a ccTLD.

Nothing to do with... It's not looking to the United Nations. That's my point. So as, I think we agree on some points, Sergio, but I don't think overall I agree in this approach or the final principles on which to go forward on this. Thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. Thank you Dev. Now I give the floor to Cristian Casas.

CRISTIAN CASAS:

Cristian Casas speaking. I understand that, and I share Sergio Salinas Porto's position. So I disagree with Dev in this regard. We are not speaking about simple letters in a domain name, or simply commercial or business matters. We're speaking about something that as Sergio Salinas Porto said, has to do with a sovereign state.

A state that has a population, and that population is part of a sovereign state. And within ICANN, we know that we work at a territorial level, and at a spatial level. So a state sovereignty comes first in everything, even its cyber spatial and territorial sovereignty, beyond a commercial or business viewpoint. So first of all, a state political sovereignty comes first, within a population, or with a population.

And secondly, all the commercial or business issues come in after that. So in Latin America we have the [inaudible] association for business, but we have the [inaudible] for physical reason or matters. So we cannot leave aside or leave political sovereignty aside.

So even though there is a population that applies for a ccTLD, that population belongs to a state. ICANN has to consider, or should have considered that there was a conflict between two sovereign states, and as Sergio Salinas Porto said, should have at least refrained from giving an opinion until a resolution by two states.

After that we have the business, commercial, social aspect of that population. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Thank you Cristian for your comments. I would like to go back to the core of this discussion. I would like to lay the emphasis on [Medina]. I'm interested in the following, and I believe the Board understood this, and hence their statement in a public forum. They understand that have to discuss this, and that they need to bring this to a closure, and that will be, or will take place, within the ccNSO.

The ccNSO considered it is interesting to engage in this discussion, and to resolve some issues that may be complicated for some of the parties. I don't know what part of this is understood. Aida, go ahead please. You have the floor.

Aida, you have the floor, go ahead please.

Sergio speaking. Aida? Are you there? Aida, are you there?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia speaking. Aida, we cannot hear you. Maybe you are muted. Aida is typing a message in the chat pod.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. I think that Aida's audio is not active. We still have six minutes on this conference call. Aida, would you like to type your message in the chat pod? We still have some minutes left.

Sergio speaking. I think Aida is typing her comments.

She's typing her comment.

Sergio speaking. Aida, unfortunately we cannot hear you, but maybe in our next meeting, we will be able to hear you. So with that, I think I'm going to bring this meeting to a close.

And Aida, the thing is, that in your case, in the case you are mentioning, there is no conflict, but surely a ccTLD would not be delegated to a Uruguay state or province. Dev, you have the floor and after that, we will bring the meeting to a close. Go ahead please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. This is Dev here. Just posted a quote from the ISO's website on country codes. And I think I'll just read it, just to make sure everybody understands it. The purpose of ISO 3166 is to define internationally recognized codes of letters and/or numbers, that we can use when we refer to countries and subdivisions.

However, it does not define the names of countries. This information here comes from the United Nations sources, specifically the terminology bulletin country names and country and region codes, for statistical use, which is maintained by the United Nations statistical division.

So again, it does not, so I'm just reiterating, and I disagree with Cristian there, because saying that, because well some territories did not recognize this territory, ICANN should not have granted the delegation of a ccTLD delegation, re-delegation. My point is, again, it comes back to ICANN does not, should not get, be deciding which country is worthy or not worthy of a ccTLD delegation.

The request was made, and then, and it had the support of the local populous, and that's what ICANN usually does. It pays attention to the wishes of the local populous, when it decides to delegate or re-delegate a ccTLD. So that's all it does, and ICANN should not be making any decisions otherwise.

I still continue to disagree Sergio. But thanks.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Sergio speaking. Thank you Dev. And just to bring this matter to a close, at least on this conference call, I insist, ICANN took sides and delegated a ccTLD to a territory. And this territory is under dispute by Great Britain and by Argentina. But this is not the issue at stake here. We could speak about another territory in dispute between, or under dispute between Brazil and Trinidad and Tobago for instance.

The issue or the problem here is a different one. The issue is that ICANN does not pay attention to the UN directive by using a list used by the United Nations. The issue is that the process, or the administrative procedure was wrongly implemented. This is what we are discussing. The administrative procedure was wrongly implemented.

There were pre-established rules, established years back, indicating that, that two letter code was being disputed. And in spite of that, I can take that two letter code and delegate it. When the United Nations had said that shouldn't have been the case.

So we're speaking about an administrative mistake. We are not speaking about sovereignty. I am simply speaking an administrative

mistake made by ICANN, that ICANN somehow has to remediate. So my suggestion is to continue this, or to further discuss this, because this is not working.

ICANN cannot go beyond international law, cannot overlook international law. And it cannot take sides on international political matters. ICANN can do all of the rest, but not these two things. So the process, the procedure, as Aida is pointing out, needs to be reviewed.

We have reached the top of the hour for this conference call. I would like to thank you all for joining us for your participation. We have agreed on these two action items for our next conference call. A Doodle poll will be sent out, so as to schedule our next working group conference call.

I thank you all for joining us, for working on this call, and we'll be in contact soon. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]