
HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I believe we can start with the call so as to make the most of our time.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Humberto, your voice is a bit faint so could you please speak closer to your mic please.

TERRI AGNEW: I'll go ahead and begin the conference at this time then. I'm hearing Spanish in the English Channel.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Are we ready to begin with the call? Humberto, are you connected to the call? I'm sorry, I cannot hear Humberto. His voice is very faint.

MARITZA AGUERO: Silvia, please let's begin with the call.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you. I'll go ahead and begin at this time.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO monthly conference call taking place on Monday the 28th of November, 2016, at 23:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Tracy Hackshaw, Aida Noblia, Carlos Raúl Gutierrez, Marcelo Telez, Maritza Aguero, Renata Aquino Ribeiro,

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.

Humberto Carrasco, Sylvia Leite, Carolina Aguero, Harold Arcos, Ricardo Holmquist, Natalia Enciso, Leon Sanchez, as well as Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Vanda Scartezini. We also have Telemaque Dumy, and Nikenley Severe.

We have listed apologies from Alberto Soto and Sergio Salinas.

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

Our Spanish interpreters today are Claudia and Veronica.

Our Portuguese interpreters today are Bettina and Esperanza.

Our French interpreters today are Isabelle and Claire.

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

With this, I'd now like to hand it back over to either Humberto if he's reconnected or Maritza who will take over I'm sure if Humberto's not connected. Please begin.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello. Welcome, Maritza. Could you please see the agenda so that we can approve the agenda for today?

MARITZA AGUERO: Okay. Can you please confirm that you are hearing me okay?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Maritza. Go ahead, please.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much. We will begin with the call. We will start by reviewing the public consultations for ALAC and the main topic [still] with ICANN57 Hyderabad. This presentation will be delivered by Harold Arcos. He is an ALAC member, and after that we will be presenting a new topic. This is a new individual members or non-affiliated members for the RALOs in this case. Cheryl Langdon-Orr will be delivering a speech so we would like to thank her for her participation in our call.

After that, we will have a presentation about the underserved regions and the GAC Working Group. These presentations will be delivered by Tracy Hackshaw. He's a member of the GAC representing Trinidad and Tobago, and we would like to thank him for sharing this call with us and with our community.

Then we will have pending topics for review such as the Latin American and the Caribbean DNS Marketplace Survey and the comments about the ASCII characters.

So with this, I give the floor to Humberto. Humberto, go ahead please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Maritza. So we adopt the agenda for today. And now I will give the floor to Harold Arcos for him to begin with the review of the public consultations.

Harold, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

MARITZA AGUERO: Harold, go ahead please.

HAROLD ARCOS: Can you hear me okay?

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes. Go ahead please. We can hear you okay.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay. So let's begin. First of all I would like to know if we can share the slides on the screen on the AC room please.

I will begin by presenting the main policy topics discussed in Hyderabad. Before that, I would like to tell the community that we are within the new meeting strategy. The meeting held in Hyderabad, India, was the Meeting #3. So the first slide is Format A. The meeting we held in Helsinki was Meeting B. That meeting was devoted to the discussion on policies. And the meeting held in Hyderabad belongs to the seven-day meetings. So this is Meeting C. This is the meeting we had in Hyderabad.

So we will speak about strategies. We will speak about the ongoing statement, as Alan said, there are certain statements that are ALAC statements that are still in process and there are some ALAC statements that were not presented, especially those related to technical issues.

When it comes to strategies, we have the Middle East and Adjoining Countries Strategy. This belongs to the [alternative] plans for 2016 – 2019. The idea is to have input and feedback by all the stakeholders because this is a draft document which was being discussed in Hyderabad. Of course, as you can see, there will be certain topics that will be discussed on the wiki page. There are certain topics to take into account. For example, in the description there was a clear explanation of the importance for ICANN to approach Middle East countries and adjoining countries in the framework of this strategy in order to comply with the ICANN Strategic Plan for 2016 – 2020. This is already set forth in the Bylaws so there are certain topics that are important for ICANN such as ICANN Evolution and Globalization and the idea was also to move forward in terms of the technological excellence of ICANN and of course to support a healthy ecosystem and stable ecosystem and to promote ICANN role and to promote the multistakeholder model for ICANN so that we can develop and implement a global public framework.

This is something very important to take into account, as Leon said, in the past. We have to pay attention to the way in which we pronounce our statements in order not to misunderstand certain topics or in order not to recommend that ICANN may have any intentions to influence in any Middle East government.

So these positions, these points of view, are now balanced. They are all reflected in the final declaration. And that was the way in which we move forward. This strategy identified three main topics, three main points, regarding Middle East countries, namely –

This is the interpreter. I'm not receiving Harold's audio. So waiting for him to be reconnected.

MARITZA AGUERO: Harold, we are not listening to you. We're not hearing you. Are you on the call, Harold?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Harold, we cannot hear you. So please let's check if he is connected. Adigo is telling me that Harold has dropped, so he's being reconnected to the call.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: So we will wait for him to be reconnected to the call. If Harold is not able to reconnect, Maritza please let's continue with the following presentations.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Harold is reconnected. Harold, can you take the floor please? Harold has rejoined the call so Harold, go ahead please.

MARITZA AGUERO: Silvia, can you hear me?

HAROLD ARCOS: Can you hear me?

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, go ahead Harold. We can hear you. Go ahead please.

HAROLD ARCOS: Sorry for the interruption. I dropped, so sorry for that.

As I was telling you, this is a very important point when it comes to the strategy. To sum up, these were the main discussions in Hyderabad, and the idea is to establish the role of ICANN in Internet ecosystem and of course to have the active participation, the active involvement, by the Middle East community. So this is one of the main objectives of this strategy.

Now let's continue with the ongoing statement [for] declaration. So we have the creation of an agenda for consumers. The community as a whole is posting comments on projects, and this is just one proposal. And of course we have the evaluation or the assessment of the second phase on the competitive effects in relation to the New gTLD Program. As you know, this is the new generic domain names.

When we speak about the creation of a consumer agenda, we need to take into account that this is a concept provided by Garth Bruen. He was the one in charge of drafting this proposal and of course, we have been discussing the proposal because we are interested in the perspective of end users and in this case, we have a term such as "consumer" or "consumers," and this term has a marketing connotation. So there were some proposals being presented by Sebastien Bachollet, for example, and we also had some other points of view in terms of the importance

of the [state names] of making the end user concept visible. That is to say, we not only have to speak about the protection of consumers but it is important that we participate in the region and that we [all] the region we provide our points of view so that we can improve the proposals that are being discussed.

This is a statement that was mentioned by our ALAC Chair, Alan Greenberg. This has to do with the request of August the 1st. And this is important for us because we need to pay attention to the deadline so that we can provide our input in the public comments.

There are some other statements that, due to their technical nature or because of their internal nature, ALAC decided not to provide direct advice to this.

Then we have a request for public comment. This is also important, especially those that are related to the Operational Plan and Budget for the PTI. This comment will close on December the 10th. And we also have the proposal, as you know, there were many comments on this draft [we] have to do with the ICANN community. And I would like to invite the community to get involved, to participate. We have the new At-Large web page and the idea is to have an active page.

To sum up, as you know, after the Helsinki meeting and the Marrakech meeting there are topics that are important for the region, and we can provide our input to increase and to promote the creation of the consumer agenda and of course we need to speak about accessibility. As you know, there is a second phase for this technological tools project that has been approved in order to provide access to new people so

that they can participate in ICANN. And we need to provide our input to keep on moving and to create this new phase.

When it comes to policies, as you know, there are many inputs that are important for us. We have the WHOIS, the PDP on Subsequent rounds, and we have several instances in which we can participate.

We also had, as we know, our meeting in Hyderabad. We discussed the possibility of having a newsletter. We will be circulating this information by e-mail. And of course, we will continue our debates and discussions in our mailing list so I will post a link shared by Glenn McKnight from NARALO. This is a report after ICANN57. I'm posting the link on the chat so this report will be shared in an e-book which is a very good tool to read and to share information.

So now I give the floor again to you, Maritza. Go ahead please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Maritza, are you on the call?

Thank you very much, Harold. I would like to talk that it is very important for us [inaudible] ethical code that talks about [bullying] against ICANN participants. We have Alejandro Pisanty requesting the floor so we may give the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, Maritza. Can you [get] me okay?

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Harold, I have a question for you. What would be the specific concerns of LACRALO with respect to the Middle East and adjoining regions? Why the plan is different from the one that is being developed for us and what are the advantages or disadvantages over providing some feedback in that strategy? Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS: [Inaudible]

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes we do.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you very much, Alejandro, for your question. Yes, as a matter of fact, this is a strategy that, if we remember, is part of the 2016-2020 plan and is part of ICANN [Bylaw]. So the proposal that we have received explicitly says, as I said before, there are some comments or there are some suggestions or proposals so that ICANN may develop this strategy at a governmental level so as to get close to these agents and to raise the awareness of ICANN as a forum that joins the voices of all the multistakeholders and not just the voice of the government at maybe the ITU Forum.

So we at LACRALO may consider this strategy in the Middle East and adjoining country of [MECA] as we call it as an experience. By this I mean we may be evaluating how we are influencing with our voices as end users and how we are in our countries building this bottom-up mode. So this is not just a strategy of government or a corporation like ICANN reaching out to the government decision makers. So I think that we may learn something from that.

Our risks right now would be we have not [reviewed] our LAC strategy, but I think that your question is quite appropriate because the experience of the Middle East and Adjoining Countries Strategy may get us gain some experience and draw from lessons. So over time the whole region, even though we may have different perspective, I think that we may share the same. So thank you very much, Alejandro, for your question.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

I have a comment and a follow-up question. One question is why specifically it is addressing governments in that region? And the second question is that many of us in different ways and different sectors, we act as representatives in the ITU. For instance, I have spent two weeks in the general standardization assembly working for one of the groups so I have had quite an experience and I think, Harold, it is important to present the documents that have been studied because it takes a long time if you don't study the document, and then you have to articulate with the people working in those spaces so the Latin American is not lagging behind because we are working as a block and they have much

more influence [than] we may have as [inaudible] in instances like the ITU.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you very much, Alejandro. I take your comment and I will take this observation so as to mention [then] at ALAC is part of the reality that we have been discussing and that we have discussed when we submitted this document. ICANN is living in this region and at all RALOs we have similar problems. Our Bylaws establish that we have to act according to [our] mission. Therefore, there is a recommendation that was made by Leon so as to be careful with our language where this strategy was being implemented, so a proposal of a governmental approach.

But I think that this is part of a wider discussion and a richer one. Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Harold, can you please tell us why this topic was given priority over some things that ALAC has said it will be no statement on the [triple X] issues that are of global importance?

MARITZA AGUERO:

Harold, sorry for the interruption, but can we answer Alejandro's follow-up question briefly because we have no more time and so we have to follow with the next presentation. Thank you very much and sorry for the interruption.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you very much. Yeah, okay. I will try and be brief.

MARITZA AGUERO: You may go ahead, Harold. Harold, you have the floor. You may go ahead. Harold, can you briefly answer – Harold, can you please answer briefly –

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I think Harold has dropped.

TRACY HACKSHAW: I think that you were talking about the ethics and my call dropped.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: We're going to leave all questions in this respect because I think Harold dropped. So there is a question pending, but let's be respectful for the next speakers so that they may have time enough because Harold unfortunately dropped so please let's move forward.

MARITZA AGUERO: Okay, Humberto. So now Cheryl will have the floor so that she may speak to all of us. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. Let me first just thank you very much, LACRALO Leadership, for asking Holly and I to respond to a question about the requirements for each of the Regional At-Large Organizations to allow for the capacity to have individual members, and I know that some think – and I apologize I have call waiting but I shall just ignore it on my line.

Each of the regions have had to grapple with this. NARALO – North American Regional At-Large Organization – took the initiative well in advance of everyone else and has from almost its very beginning had the ability for individuals or unaffiliated members to join its ranks, and now I believe we have EURALO and APRALO also fully capable of having individual members, and AFRALO will be shortly coming public with its specific rules and requirements regarding its individual membership.

Just to frame the conversation and then I'd like to answer any particular questions or issues that some of you may have because I'm sure you've discussed this matter at some length. The requirement for our Regional At-Large Organizations to allow for individual member participation came out of the very first At-Large Advisory Committee review. It was one of the specific recommendations from the review process and it is at this stage one of the very few recommendations which has not been substantially completed. So I would like to think that if LACRALO takes its conversations and its deliberations a little further that we may, whilst this current second review of the At-Large Advisory Committee is going on, be able to at least substantially complete this particular outstanding action item from our first review.

With that, I would be very happy to open the floor and answer any particular questions. You have in front of you the Asia Pacific Regional

At-Large Organization Rules of Procedure regarding individual members or unaffiliated individual members, and you'll see they are relatively lean, relatively simple, and most importantly, allows for an unaffiliated member to be in that category and then for example, shift from that category should they later either join an At-Large Structure or in fact, as we have in APRALO, we have unaffiliated members who are undertaking the creation of an At-Large Structure – so they are participants as unaffiliated members until such times as their At-Large Structure is formalized and accepted by the At-Large Advisory Committee and then of course, they cease becoming unaffiliated members and they will undoubtedly be amongst the ranks of the representatives from the new ALS.

The floor is open and I'm happy to take any questions. I see Ricardo.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Maritza, I'm connected to the AC room and I would like to make some comment in this respect. As a matter of fact, at LACRALO, we haven't given any priority as mentioned in the recommendations of the Review Team, and I know that we haven't discussed on the certificate as well [as that] what I may say is that this topic may be discussed in the mediation meetings to be held in Los Angeles by the end of January next year. So this would be one of the issues in the agenda.

This is a kind of a side comment. I'm connected to the AC room so I can check in the comments as well and I think that Ricardo is asking – Ricardo Holmquist – if I'm not mistaken. So you have the floor, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Good evening. Can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, we hear you perfectly.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I have two questions. First, what's the whole idea of having individual members in the various RALOs, because we are representing the civil society so I don't see the point in having individual members that are part of our RALOs.

My second question is, once we have accepted them or once you have accepted them as APRALO, is there any [period] so that the membership of that person and individual has to change to an ALS? Can you please tell me if there any maximum period or a deadline for that individual member to become an ALS? Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Ricardo. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Humberto. Ricardo, if I can answer your second question first. There is no limitation. An individual, unaffiliated member in all of the regions – that's North America, Europe, and Asia Pacific that currently have acceptances of and active members who are individual, unaffiliated members – there is no time limit for how long one can stay one.

We in APRALO have simply had the situation where we have used this ability to have individual, unaffiliated, members active amongst our activities as a way of engaging or early engagement with people who are also then going on to create an At-Large Structure. But you'll note that the critical point about criteria to be an unaffiliated individual is that they are not a member of a certified At-Large Structure. So as soon as any person becomes a member of a certified At-Large Structure they have to cease becoming or maintaining their unaffiliated, individual, member status.

That rule, I believe, runs across all of the regions that currently have unaffiliated members. Why does one need one then – why does one need this category of membership? Which of course is a requirement under our first ALAC review? It's because of two particular factors.

The first one is, it allows for individuals – noting of course that we don't have At-Large Structures in every one of the countries that we have listed within the confines of the ICANN regional structures – if there is not an At-Large Structure in their domicile or there may be other reasons that they cannot or will not join a particular At-Large Structure – it does not then act as a barrier or an impediment for active participation of interested individuals. And it was felt during the first ALAC Review that that openness and that capability was very important as we go forward acting in the best interests of the At-Large community and Internet end users.

There is however a second and very important reason for this to be a important consideration, and that is, we are well aware of – and this has always been the case – that some of our At-Large Structures are

basically very, very, small operations. In fact, these operations may be so small that they were only formed with a couple of people in the first place so that they can become an At-Large Structure, be certified, and be active within the At-Large community. And it was felt to be a little silly to force an individual or a very small number of individuals to create an entity just so that they could engage.

The problem with those tiny entities that may have been formed right back in the early 2000s with only three or four people is that they end up being just one person anyway, and so we carry a few At-Large Structures still certified who really as entities are little more than individuals acting in an entity's name.

Back to you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I would like to add that this is a topic that has to be discussed. We know and we understand we have a problem in this respect and we will have to cope with it. I think that Alan is requesting the floor. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Cheryl gave a very detailed answer and all of it was something I quite support. I'll look at it from another angle, however. The ICANN Bylaws say that At-Large is the home of Internet users in ICANN. That means we must provide a home and an opportunity for Internet users to participate. If they choose to form an ALS and form together with a bunch of other people in their area, that's

fine. But if they choose not to, we are still obliged according to the Bylaws to provide a home for those users to participate in our activities.

For that reason, we have no choice but to make sure that if someone wants to work within ICANN in At-Large, that they have an opportunity.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alan, for your comment. I saw some comments on the list. This is a topic that of course we will not be able to solve right now. Of course we will have to continue with our discussions, and of course we have to continue, as I said before, with our debate on this topic.

Now I would like to give you the floor for the last time. If there are no comments, perhaps we can continue with the next item on the agenda. Our next presentation – Maritza, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. I have two very brief questions for Cheryl. The idea is not to extend this presentation but my question is, how do you manage the vote of these individual members? And why, in the case of individuals, would be just necessary to have one statement? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm delighted that Alan is also on this call because he of course is a unaffiliated, individual, member of the NARALO that has grappled with this question the longest. APRALO has chosen to follow what NARALO

did, and that is, we have formulated a system whereby the unaffiliated, individual members are gathered into what is effectively for the purpose of voting a virtual At-Large Structure. So the group of unaffiliated members in the region act in a voting capacity via their nominated representative in a directed voting way.

In NARALO – and I’ll ask Alan to speak to that – they would take many more votes than we ever would in APRALO. APRALO celebrates diversity but we also celebrate the fact that we rarely if ever go to vote. We build consensus. And so effectively, there is very little if ever a time when that group of unaffiliated individuals has to act as a virtual At-Large Structure. That is the mechanism we’ve put into place for when such a vote would be called upon.

We are reviewing this however, because with the population we have in Asia Pacific, we realize that should it come to pass that we have a very large number of unaffiliated, individual, members, we may need to in all fairness have a level where there is a maximum number of individuals clustered into such a virtual At-Large Structure for the purpose of voting. But that’s a question we’ve yet to finalize. But what it would mean is that we would not have a certified At-Large Structure with say 30 members holding one vote and a virtual At-Large Structure having perhaps 50,000 unaffiliated members – and we have the population in Asia Pacific that we could do that of course – and that entity having the same voting weight as the one with 30.

We are nowhere near that as a problem yet. We rarely if ever go to vote, and we also have less than 10 unaffiliated members – in fact we have less than half a dozen unaffiliated members. But Alan might want

to add something from the very specific experience of North America.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I will add something very briefly. The issue of voting versus consensus has varied in North America depending on who the leaders were. We went through a long time where we virtually never took a vote and the unaffiliated members would decide by consensus how their representative would participate in some decision, whether it's a vote or a consensus decision of we've gone through a number of Chairs and Secretariats over the last few couple of years that have felt strongly that we should vote and not use consensus and therefore we have. That's varied. But again, the principle is very similar regardless of whether it's a consensus decision or a vote decision. In Europe, they have taken a slightly different form in that they've actually formed an ALS made up of individual members. They're more structured than we are but the net effect is very much the same. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much, Alan and Cheryl. Alejandro Pisanty, you have the floor for the last question.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you very much. I will be very brief. I believe this is an open discussion of the very important thing here is that when we create the At-Large Structure and when we create the concept of a RALO, the process that as you know when we have the RALOs we express our

opinions through them. So the key was the web structure, that was a concept that was used. That is to say that is an organization that is certified by some organization in order to know if this organization [inaudible] certified as a real organization, a legal organization so that we can have information on the nature because of course we have cases where there are organizations that are fake, that are false that they have only one person or organizations that are not real. This concept of web [inaudible] is important for the constitution of At-Large and these variations that are being proposed, we need to take them very seriously. We need to consider them very seriously.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alejandro for your comment. I see there are no further questions. I would like to thank Cheryl for her presentation, her very interesting presentation. Of course we will continue with this debate. Now I will give the floor to our next speaker, Tracy Hackshaw. He will deliver his presentation, so please go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Hello, everyone. Can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hi, Tracy, yes, I can hear you. This is Dev.

TRACY HACKSHAW: All right. Can everyone else hear me? Okay. So up on the screen I'm hoping the Spanish [inaudible] not what I'm going to speak to. So those

who have English as a native language can follow. So I'm here presenting on the GAC Underserved Region Working Group. The reason for starting this working group was a recognition within the GAC that when we had several discussions ongoing, there was a significant lack of participation from a series of regions within especially the small [inaudible] developing states within the African continent and some areas of the Middle East and even within Latin America, primarily Central America and in some parts of Asia.

So a decision was taken some time ago to address that issue through our Capacity Building Working Group which merged into this underserved regions working group, but seeks to try and tackle the issue from a broader than capacity building discussion. I'm going to literally ask you to follow through the reference which is simply on the screen. [Inaudible] my English so you can follow in Spanish.

In effect, the working group focuses on regions underserved by the DNS Industry and, in particular, on the [least] economies and the small island developing states. We are particularly focusing on underserved regions, economies and countries that are in an area called the ACP Region which means Africa, Caribbean, and Pacific. So those are the regions that have a particular focus for this working group. However, it does not mean that we're not looking at any other regions, this is the focus that we would generally have on some of our activities. The objectives of the working group are primarily as you can see under the objective column.

One, to increase the number and participation of GAC members from these countries, these least developed economies as well as developing states to increase the knowledge, understanding and capacity of GAC

representatives from least developed economies and smaller developing states to enable them to engage with ICANN policy processes and specifically the GAC. In order to increase participation and engagement from underserved regions during [especially] gTLD rounds on the one hand and encourage growth and development of the domain name industry, including registries and registrars in regions currently underserved. The group is expected to work with all aspects of the ICANN community both within the GAC and within the At-Large community, including the staff. So one of our major thrusts is to work with similar or like-minded working groups where they exist. And one of them is the future gTLD round thrust within the ICANN community, both working group and the staff-generated activity as well as working with this... I can't remember what it's called now, but I think it's the GSC Team. I'm not sure if that's the correct phraseology for the new name. But, basically, the team has been looking at both the government engagement and the large engagements at the regional level. So we're within both the Sally Costerton's team as well as Tarek Kamel's team. So it's a double [inaudible] thrust. We do work specifically with the regional VPs and managers where we need to.

So in the Latin America Caribbean region where this is focused from we'll work specifically with Rodrigo and Albert Daniels to help us get all this work done. As well as when necessary, Rodrigo Saucedo and Daniel Fink [inaudible] accompanying us to have our meeting. In the Pacific realm we work with [Save] in particular and on the African side we work with everybody, I mean, there's a large team there. In particular, we're working with [inaudible] and Pierre. So we're looking to generally have

this work – reach out to the community and as I said before, all of the major thrusts is capacity building.

In the working group who are currently members we are asking them to participate and demonstrate knowledge and expertise about the areas that they're trying to focus on. We're looking for expertise in the new gTLD process, in the government [inaudible] particular regions, if they are experts who are understanding how the regions work so the Pacific Islands we have a different way of working than the Caribbean Islands as an example. Of course, Africa works at entirely [EEC] and asking them to commit [past] dates and activities of the working group [inaudible] on an active basis.

We have a few working objectives and working [work plan] that looks specifically to deliver and on the one hand capacity building and trading activities. Working to ensure that there are more fellowships and [inaudible] support for GAC members and for community members [for the] fellowship program. Support the onboarding the recent pilot onboarding mentoring program that was launched in 2015, I believe and starting in 2016 officially. And working with the Nextgen group as well to see how best we could support those. We're also looking at working with to see if we can get the applicant support program that was dealt with under the recent gTLD round. We look to see how best we can find a way to revisit what happened there and perhaps [inaudible] a new framework for working if another round does, in fact, happen. And also if there's a way to address the spend of the auction proceeds if some aspect of that can be dedicated or streamed into the underserved regions.

The way the working group works is going to be primary to position [inaudible] statements. And just to clarify for those who don't understand how the GAC operates, the GAC is a consensus-based organization and, therefore, the working cannot and should not make any decision without coming back to the GAC for discussion and for consensus decision. So you would not find [inaudible] good members being able to make definitive statements on issues. However, they will be asking from inputs from the ICANN community on position papers that they may produce or for points of view that they may have in meetings and sessions that they may conduct at ICANN Meetings or intercessionally. But everything that is being done there has to be taken in and then put back to the formal GAC Plenary normally at a face-to-face meeting for discussion and potentially a decision which normally would go in a community.

So that's a summary of how it works. And to date we have done two capacity building sessions. One for the larger GAC group as well as a specific one in Hyderabad for the Asia-Pacific community. We had interventions at a high-level meeting to explain that to the governmental officials what our intention is. And the intention of the working group is to continue pushing forward to ensure that the places of the underserved regions and the volumes of those voices are much louder in the GAC fora.

As I indicated before, it's a GAC-specific working group. So the primary object was to get it working in the GAC thinking. Although we do want to ensure that the contributes were necessary to other areas where underserved regions issues being addressed. So that's it from the

standpoint of my brief presentation. If there are any questions, I'm here to answer them. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Tracy, for your presentation. Now, I give the floor to the ALAC RALO members for you to ask questions. Is there anyone who would like to make a question? Anyone who is not on the [tab]? Alejandro, you have the floor. But the speaking, sorry, Renata? Renata, you have the floor. First, Alejandro Pisanty and then Renata will take the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you very much, Humberto. Sorry, Renata, for interrupting you. It's really very interesting to receive such a proposal by the GAC. We need to receive this proposal in a formal way. We need to acknowledge receipt of this proposal and then we need to decide how we will discuss these proposals.

I am very pleased to have Tracy representing governmental institution because I know him very well. So greetings, Tracy. I know that we count on him for receiving clear explanations once we discuss these initiatives, so thank you very much.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Hello, can you hear me? May I have the floor?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, Renata, go ahead please.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: It's really interesting to hear Tracy and his presentation in terms of these underserved regions. However, I would like to know if the working group is considering topics which has regional inequality. For example, in Brazil, Brazil is a country with different regions and these regions within Brazil have many differences. We have the Amazon Region. We have the Northwest Region. They are different. Rio de Janeiro and San Pablo also very different regions when it comes to, for example, internet governance. So we also participate in ICANN and LACRALO, so my question is, is there anything that these working groups may do in terms of these differences existing in the regions such as, for example, discussing these regional inequalities? Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much for your question, Renata. Tracy have the floor, please, go ahead.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you. I just want to reiterate that this particular working group was focusing on government countries, territories that defined in a way that is... how should I put it? We are not currently looking at what's in a particular jurisdiction because that is something that the GAC as a rule

does not get involved in. So you'll not find a GAC getting involved in the internal discussions of any one country even if there's a very valuable point to raise about underserved regions within a particular jurisdiction or territory. So as a rule, the GAC does not get involved in those discussions and the short answer is that it probably would not look at that unless the Brazilian government made it a point to be raised as a GAC meeting that this is something that [we] wanted to have addressed. It's entirely possible that these issues may come up in a different fora, where that comes up within the LAC GSE setting and the underserved region [inaudible] going to assist. That's one way of looking at it.

And perhaps whether it can come up with the questions on the... I see you have next on your topic the DNS Marketplace Study discussion come up in those fora. It might be something to discuss there as well. But I don't want to get us confused that we are looking at every possible underserved region that could exist, for example, in terms of gender or inequalities or other areas that that would be something that for another group to deal with. So I hope that's clear enough because the GAC itself is not able to treat [inaudible] as a matter of its current proceeding. And I hope that's understood by all. That's how the GAC operates. It cannot get involved in internal issues of countries. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Tracy. I don't know if there is any other questions because otherwise, we will continue with the agenda. Okay. There seems to be no more questions for

Tracy. Thank you very much, Tracy, then. Thank you very much for your presentation, it has been really very interesting. So we thank you for that.

Having said that, we move into Issue #7. But I think that Alejandro Pisanty has a question. I confirm that question because it was written in the chat part. But [Inaudible] hasn't made any statement about the changes in the agreement and the safeguards regarding the dot XXX extension and as Alan has said, nobody at ALAC thought that a statement was required or that we should create a group of volunteers to prepare their statement. But if you think it's proper, Alan, you have the floor so you may give more explanations in this respect.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. That's basically the answer. We asked whether anyone thought that the changes warranted a statement. A number of people had looked at them and everyone who had looked at them felt that no statement was necessary. And we didn't have a volunteer to write such a statement so we passed on it. The only way that we can create a statement is if, indeed, we have people who believe that something needs to be said and are willing to draft it for the approval and discussion of other people. And this one didn't meet that, so we ended up not doing anything on it. Thank you. I can go a bit into the rationale of why people thought it wasn't necessary, but that's the short answer.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alan. So now, let's move to Issue #7 that talks about the Latin American Caribbean DNS Marketplace Study. So to be brief, we required an extension because it has not been over what couldn't move forward. We had only the study in English and not in Spanish. So we talked to Daniel Fink and require for an extension. And so we have now up until December 15th, but Daniel asked if we might say something before December 1. Maritza, you have the floor. If you want to say something in this respect.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Yes. As a matter of fact, new comments have been posted on the wiki. The members of the work groups are aware of this extension and what has been said in [inaudible], we're going to incur it, everybody to say something before December 1st or otherwise the final document would be provided on the updated deadline. I know that Harold was working in this respect. He had to say something in this and this was made clear in the mailing list [inaudible] to post the URL for the wiki so that you may have access there whether you're part of the group or not. But you may make your contributions there. So in that wiki, you will say that there is a 15-day extension period. So all of us may participate in that so that this group may issue its comments during this extended period and that will be all, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Maritza, for your comments. Now we'll move to Paragraph B in ICANN 7 of the Agenda that talks about the comments

on the two-character script. Sorry, ASCII. This was because we have only received a few comments about the LACTLD statements. And Carlos also said that he did not agree on Alejandro Pisanty at the very beginning said that he agreed that before the meeting at Hyderabad, we requested a vote [inaudible] to cast a vote in this respect according to the procedures. But if there is no other opinion, I think that we're going to launch the [inaudible] because we have received no comments and we'll go into launch the voting process to decide whether we support this statement or not prepared but LACTLD. I don't know. Somebody had something to say in this respect. I see Carlos's hand is up. Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Carlos Gutierrez speaking, can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes. Loud and clear.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: I don't want to discuss under principles, but I want all of us to understand that the framework, the environment to this [letter] is a complex one and it is related to some other SOs and ACs at ICANN. We are talking about the ccNSO and the GAC. They are discussing with the Board about this process. So I think that we are kind of jumping ahead and we are going to vote without discussing if the ccNSO will support or not this regional decision. Please remember the ccNSO is not made up by regions. So in order to maintain a level, we have to be well informed

before casting any vote. So I analyze this document is this complex versus complex at second level, but at the same time it has not been settled on the first level because it's related to the use of two or three letters at first level. So if it's not settled over there I think that as it has been said by Alejandro in the case of the GAC Initiative regarding the [underserved] region, when we are discussing a topic related to some other group at ICANN, we have to be cautious and very formal just to understand the different perspective [inaudible] when the GAC makes a proposal as Tracy has told us, it has to be submitted formally. If the ccNSO will provide a decision, we have to be cautious and clearly understand the position of the ccNSO. I think there's no single position, this is why we are in this situation.

And so the statement we are sending it's being sent to other people that we have to look at their faces day after day. So as Alejandro has said, with the underserved regions, please let's be formal and let's be thoughtful. I think that we should devote some hours to read the comments of the documents that are open. I think this is valuable for us.

And secondly, be careful when we think about this pull systems, about the three [inaudible] system. And nothing against Vanda from Brazil.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much. Alan, your hand is up and then Alejandro Pisanty. So why don't you have the floor first?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you very much. The particular LACTLD statement is an interesting one and I did look at it a little bit. And I would strongly suggest that if you're going to go to a vote that you make sure that the ALS representatives who are voting have access to a good summary of the document. The reality is most of them are not likely to read it in detail and it includes a number of statements which may or may not reflect how gTLDs are used. In particular, their premise is that if you register a second-level domain that looks like a country code, the reason you're doing it is to sell third-level domains and to masquerade as that country code. And I'm not sure there's evidence of that. Maybe there is and I haven't found it. But I think it's really important if you ask the RALO members to vote on something that you make sure that you're presenting a fair and balanced summary of the issue to them. Otherwise, you potentially end up with a vote which doesn't really reflect the understanding of all of the members.

So I strongly support taking a vote if the electorate is well-informed, but make sure they are. And I'm a little bit bothered by the early comment saying not very many people commented, which may well mean not very many people either understood or felt strongly about the issue. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Alejandro Pisanty, you have the floor. And thank you very much, Alan, for your words.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Loud and clear. Go ahead.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I was one of the first to propose that we should support this document. So I feel I have the obligation to give some explanation, although brief. I think that the [inaudible] principle that we mentioned that [ISOC] Mexico and their fair share but some of the authorities and member is that we have to be careful because the resources [inaudible] and to respect the users we are representing so as to avoid any misunderstanding. However, of course, these principles are up and running but we have seen the reactions of the LACRALO members, they are different because they are different relations with the gTLDs of each country and so [inaudible] the statement is not mature enough. And I think that the discussion is not mature enough within LACRALO so as to support or not.

So I think that we should break it down and decide which of the things that we are going to support and which of the things we are not. We have carefully read other documents, most of the organizations. And so we think that there's no sufficient evidence or consensus so as to push it forward. And then on the other hand, on the basis of time, we cannot rewrite a statement so as to maintain these two principles [inaudible] so be careful with the current resources with this 10-letter combination and to avoid any misunderstanding for users. Thank you very much.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alejandro Pisanty. Harold Arcos on the floor and then Maritza Aguero. Harold, are you there? You have the floor.

HAROLD ARCOS: [No response].

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Maritza you have the floor then.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you. I agree with Alejandro regarding what he said that the discussion is not mature enough. We have wiki, certain [inaudible] have imposed it for and against that even though there have been very few comments, even though we have extended the period. Perhaps we should go deeper so as not to launch a vote, a survey, whatever for the final position because as Alan is saying, we have to vote if we are well informed so as to have a very conscious vote to cast.

So I would propose except that Alejandro [inaudible] experts may say in the country when they promote a kind of debate, discussion so that we may listen to both sides, to both opinions so that everybody may gain information under the basis of the new information, we will launch a new vote or a new statement or a new position or whatever. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you. Harold, are you there? No. No response from Harold.

HAROLD ARCOS: Harold speaking, hello, can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, Harold, we can. You have the floor.

HAROLD ARCOS: Can you hear me now?

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, you may speak.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you very much. I wrote it on the chart because I had a proposal in that respect because the leadership had had the same strategy before as many as Maritza would say in some other issue, there has been some webinars so I think that it's important that some [inaudible] in the region, Alejandro, Carlos, may in a future meeting or in an intermediate meeting give some time to which to provide or RALOS with sufficient information because I think this is really very important.

We have heard several points of view. The capacity of having sufficient information so as to make a decision, a well-informed one. And particularly for those countries we are the managers of the [inaudible] domain have not evolved fast enough. So it's important to have the information so as to make a decision regarding this LACTLD statement. And, of course, I support what Maritza has said. Thank you very much.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Harold. I don't know, Harold, your hand is up. Is it an old hand? Thank you very much then. It was an old hand.

I think there is some consensus based on the comments I've heard. So I would like to postpone, let's say that we're going to suspend the vote or put it forward because I think that that topic is not mentioned. But I've heard some consensus in this respect. So once we have understood, once the topic is mature enough, once we have a more decision and viewpoint to analyze and LACRALO may have a say in this respect, then we may... I don't know, reach a consensus for the statement or whatever we may decide, whatever we may agree on the future.

Is there any one of you opposing to that because otherwise, we will suspend the vote then and we will continue discussing this topic. Okay. No notes. So those of you who are not in the chat, but are on the telephone lines, you want to say something in this respect? No. Okay.

So, let's move to Item #8, regarding any other business. I would like to discuss something. First of all, to say by the end of January there will be a meeting regarding the mediation process and all people, the 16 persons, no 17, I think, persons have been interviewed will be attending this meeting. And the purpose of the meeting is to reach a new agreement in the region so as to settle all our differences and disputes for the mediator, the mediation group has chosen those people and then they would have a kind of a fear of what would happen in the region, of course, if this meeting will generate a change or an amendment in rules of the region and that was governing the metrics of the region and perhaps the consideration of having individual users or not. And, of course, this will be discussed by the members of the region.

But I'm just telling you that this is what will happen. The mediation group has sent a report and the mailing list. And you can see the list of the people that has been interviewed and the people that would be attending the meeting in LA. So this is the first point.

Secondly, we have discussed the GSE and they were kind of concerned because there has been not much attendance to the training webinars, so we made the proposal and there is that there would be a kind of monthly meeting, although they will be held every two months. There will be some training in each of these meetings because there are lot of attendants and so we are not overwhelming people with so many meetings and virtual calls and virtual meetings because we know that we do not have much time, we all volunteer our time. I see Silvia Vivanco requesting the floor. So Silvia you have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

I just wanted to add when it comes to mediation that the mediation group sent a report to the LACRALO mailing list. So I invite you all to read this report. When we had our meeting in India that was November 7th, the link is posted on the [link], there was a meeting so the recordings of that meeting is posted so that you can listen to David [Inaudible], the mediator. In that recording he explains the mediation process. So I invite you all to read the report because as you know, we are still discussing the LACRALO members may be able to put forth their points of view, they may provide their feedback. So once again I invite you all to listen to the recordings, to read the reports, to see the presentation and to keep on exchanging points of view, providing feedback regarding these important projects. As you know there is a

survey that was circulated and, of course, you have the link posted and you can also access that survey and answer the questions. That's all.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Silvia. So this takes me to the last item on the agenda which is the survey. That document was not circulated because there is something pending so we didn't want to mix up the two surveys that are being circulated. So we expect to have this survey ready for this week and I wanted to comment on that. So now I give you the floor for the last time, if there are no further questions or comments, we will bring this call to an end.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]