
MARIO ALEMAN: Today in the Spanish channel we have Humberto Arthos, Alberto Soto, Harold Arcos, Alfredo Velazco, and Aida Noblia.

In the English channel we have no participants.

And we have apologies from Leon Sanchez, Maritza Aguero, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

On behalf of staff we've got Silvia Vivanco, and Mario Aleman. I'm going to be monitoring this call.

Our interpreters today are Marina and David.

Let me also remind all participants to say their names not only for transcription purposes but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the language channels.

Now let me give the floor to Harold to start with our call. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Mario. We will begin this call with a look at our agenda for today.

First, the aim of this session and then the methodology of the participation rounds. We hope this will take most of the call by embracing all of the recommendations provided to us by the ITEMS report, and then we're going to read the recommendations to agree on a few criteria and if there is Any Other Business that the participants would like to add, then we can include this at the end of the meeting.

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.

If we all agree, then we can very quickly start this session.

Item #1 then is the objective of the session. At-Large is preparing the first draft that we're going to bring to the ICANN General Meeting in Copenhagen – ICANN58 – and we want from LACRALO to give our input to this draft so it is included as part of the comments observations and proposals in our region. This is our main objective.

Let us now state that the methodology is a round methodology where each of us will be able to give their input, criticisms, and observations to the three main issues and, of course, to the other recommendations.

I think Alberto wants to take the floor, so Alberto, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

We had a meeting yesterday and I know I lost a long time with a very lengthy remark. If we agree in something then we should simply say that we agree and we should not repeat the whole point itself. I think we lost 15-20 minutes yesterday just to repeat syntax. I don't know who is going to begin, but thank you, Harold.

HAROLD ARCOS:

That's a very good remark, Alberto. Because we can just go ahead in our agenda. If there are no doubts then that we're going to work on round of participation, let's go to Item #3.

We will place Leon's proposal to deal with a few issues that brought about some controversy. Of course, this does not mean that we will only speak about this. If any of the participants would like to begin,

please go ahead. I will personally take down notes because after this meeting, our recommendations and remarks will go to the ALAC draft almost immediately. So the floor is open to start with our round to give our remarks and observations to each of the recommendations.

Mario, do you think you can share the document with the Spanish translation of the recommendations please?

Alberto, you now have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I have a few opinions on the recommendations, but since [nobody] raised their hand I'm going – and if somebody opposes – I'm going to refer to Recommendation #3. They say that At-Large should encourage more direct participation of the At-Large members in ICANN's model through the Empowered model. I made a general observation on the ITEMS recommendation. The thing is that they consider that At-Large and ALAC are the same thing but we need to see who is it that they are referring to. Are they referring to ALAC as 15 members or are they referring to At-Large as a whole?

From the point of view of At-Large, the idea is to encourage participation. So we do need to have a greater participation on different ways.

MARIO ALEMAN:

Alberto, you are breaking up. If you would like, we can call you on your cell phone line.

We cannot hear Alberto unfortunately. We apologize.

Okay, Alberto. We are going to call you then.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Mario. While you try to contact Alberto, if there is any other person – Humberto or Aida – if you would like to give your input to this third recommendation. Alberto was saying it is not clear whether ITEMS referred to At-Large or to ALAC. They are mixing the terms.

Aida, you now have the floor.

AIDA NOBLIA:

I hope you can hear me.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Please don't approach the mic so much so that the sound sounds distorted.

AIDA NOBLIA:

I have been working for a long time with this because I was appointed for the working party, and we have been working together with Holly and with the others. But I wanted to participate in the region because I live in the region and when we dealt with all of these recommendations, they are usually related to what ITEMS or the rationale that ITEMS has.

As Alberto says, it seems they have a number of problems. What we see is there is an advantage to say, "Well, we're going to start working to

improve all of this.” This is something that can be improved, but this has been accepted by the U.S. government, the whole system, and this gives us strength to say, “We know that this works but we need to improve it.” That’s why I see ITEMS’s recommendations are good for us to look at ourselves in front of a mirror.

For these recommendations, ITEMS is based on something that concerns me significantly. They are based on a perception survey. This is a survey of some people that they did as they did this from May to December because the first draft, we got it in December, and this was released in February and it was [sped] up at the last part. That the methodological base from my perspective is one of the potential elements when you consider such analyses and when you consider an entity in its volume.

There’s the ALSes that are basically what they observed – the ALSes and the RALOs. It seems they do have a terminology problem, but the recommendations as a whole seem to say that when they refer to “At-Large,” they gave the impression – when they include comment in Recommendation #3 – they refer to the “ALS” community. Then they also have an issue with the RALOs and ALAC because there is a very significant modification of the RALO function and this is actually very concerning.

The issue of Recommendation #3 is that they understand there is a possibility for better participation, and I agree only with the first part of this recommendation. ALAC should encourage a greater participation. This is already happening within the working groups and the working parties. Perhaps I will put a full stop there because I actually do not

agree with the [means] this Empowered Membership Model includes individuals as opposed to ALSes.

So all the ALS system is a cooperative way of working, from my point of view. And with all due respect, this is anti-historical because now everybody worked in teams because there is collective intelligence, etc. So it seems we're going to go back to individual development with individuals and people working in isolation. I actually believe this goes against history, with all due respect.

They have a very good intention in this improvement, but I see that the means are not really adequate. And, as I was saying just to begin with, the rationale that they used, they are based on a perception survey. I know that there are statistical data. That data needs to be not only based on perception but also based on [facts], based on specific material. These are called "structured," "semi-structured," or "non-structured" data, and these are non-structured data because they are perceptions of reality which is not perception itself.

We should bring reality and this is not going to work. It can be improved, but it is not necessary from my very modest point of view, to change the structure itself. We need to see how it works. It's a functioning problem. That is the baseline of the discrepancy with the rest of the issues.

Of course, analysis is very good. That's all I have to say. I don't want to take more time from you. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Aida, for your so significant contribution and the remarks. Certainly in this Recommendation #3, the key, as you very well say, in many of the recommendations I have noticed that they start with a very proper and appropriate drafting which we might even say that we feel identified but then they move onto uncertain parts.

Now we have Alberto online on a more stable line. It would be fantastic to have a [closing] or supplementation with his comment. Is Alberto online?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes. Along the lines of Aida's words, I agree that that more extensive participation could be attained through different ways and those ways should be discussed. We have to bear in mind that our representatives are working on a voluntary basis and they should have available time and make a commitment. We have several people registered for the working groups but they have never participated in any working group.

We cannot understand why the model should be modified to expand participation. Why? This is not understandable. Because ITEMS does not provide any rationale for that change. That's it.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Alberto, for the end of your remark. If you're so kind to repeat your words.

ALBERTO SOTO: I will now repeat it on the chat.

HAROLD ARCOS:

We are discussing Recommendation #3 and writing down the main concepts of what Aida has said so that we have it in writing and develop some feedback on the general analysis of the recommendation. So we should bear in mind that the perception of Recommendation #6 which deals with Seat #15 at the Board.

This process took place very recently as foreseen in the rules, however, according to this recommendation, NomCom would become the single authority under which the candidate would be screened and selected, which is what happened. But later it defines on a random basis who would be eligible based on the assumption that the slate of candidates are all on an equal footing of capability.

So, on this recommendation we would like to make some remarks. Leon said that he certainly was not in agreement because it was different from the previous process in which the community participated. If we as At-Large community have both voice and vote, if we are engaged on work as on a voluntary basis, and if we cast our vote, with this proposal, with this recommendation, we would be doing away with the model we have developed throughout the years. We would now be taking a decision at random as a community.

It is also true that this could be useful to us as a means to analyze and to understand that we as a community do not fully know our leaders so that an informed decision could be made on whom to vote as the representative for Seat #15. So we might eventually recommend to strengthen the participation system such as the wiki where we all make

our contributions to the various working groups and that's a means to be familiar with the dynamics and the mechanisms and the characteristics of the community leaders. That is to say we would be strengthening our common [spaces].

On this specific aspect, would you like to make any comment?

ALBERTO SOTO: May I take the floor?

HAROLD ARCOS: Please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: If I may, I'd like to have more concrete words on what we are talking about here. Talk about each of the recommendations concretely. I have my opinion which I'm not going to say now, but I will make this request – can we please refer only to the recommendation and each of us give the opinion on each recommendation individually? See how we complete the analysis of each recommendation and then move on. Otherwise, we will not have sufficient time for all.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Alberto. We are talking about Recommendation #6. If there is no comment on this one, we should move on to the next one.

ALBERTO SOTO: I apologize. I didn't want to waste your time.

INTERPRETER MARINA: Sorry, but Alberto's audio is off.

HAROLD ARCOS: We apologize, Alberto, but your audio is choppy.

ALBERTO SOTO: My opinion is in the chat. I was saying that I didn't want to use the time on my opinion on Recommendation #6 because my opinion is already in the chat. Thanks.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you. So we've completed this recommendation. Let's move on to the next.

Aida, Humberto, Alberto, do you want to take the floor about this recommendation which refers to joining the leadership role of the RALOs and the ALAC role? I open up the floor for comments.

Sorry, Aida. Were you speaking?

AIDA NOBLIA: No, I was actually requesting the floor.

HAROLD ARCOS: Go ahead, Aida.

AIDA NOBLIA: I just wanted to say that it caught my attention to see how the RALOs and ALAC roles have been discussed here because the RALOs would now be only for outreach and the bottom-up approach does not happen. The end users' views are therefore not going to go in a bottom-up direction. They will be just in contact with the individuals who'd be mentors who would convey the opinions. And they are the ones who are going to take over the RALOs' roles.

In the 90-page report, at some point it says that ITEMS was considering the removal of the RALOs. As the Bylaws prohibit that, they decided to keep them but with this outreach function. And they would become like mentors.

I can't quite understand what ALAC's role would be or if it's going to be removed. I don't know if Alberto has any other comment. I don't want to use more time, but it's one of the greatest concerns I had because the entire system is distorted. They, with all due respect, believe that they're going to solve everything with this but they are actually complicating a system that is properly working bottom up.

HAROLD ARCOS: Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO:

It is not yet clear if the Bylaws will be amended or not, but the implementation of the EMM model entails that the ALAC and the RALOs will not disappear but the roles will be merged. How this would happen, it is not yet specified. But the RALOs would disappear being merged with ALAC. And then these mentors would be set up who are not organizations but individuals. And this would enable a greater rotation.

This modification – which is in several points – has been rejected by the vast majority of RALOs and ALAC members because this does not provide any new functionality and there is no guarantee that this change would create any improvement in the role of representation of end users. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Alberto. So this point has been made quite clear. Does anyone else want to make an additional comment on this recommendation?

There is none so we will move to the following. Alberto, in the working space there are two recommendations that specifically identified. Why don't you give us your view on those recommendations so that we can put them in writing?

ALBERTO SOTO:

I don't know if you've heard me before but I have my own opinion on virtually all recommendations. I'm working now on analyzing the entire 90-page book. Based on this, once we are done with this call – because if I do this now we'll be wasting the time of the call – what we can do is

I've just posted on the chat my opinion on one recommendation if you want to read it. There is no need, but if you want we can read it and then we talk about it.

HAROLD ARCOS: Yes. We have exhausted analysis of the other three so let's move on to #1. What is your view you'd like to share with us?

ALBERTO SOTO: The main point here is that we are all ALSes. We are all working. I believe that ITEMS has made this recommendation without a proper understanding of what we are doing. There was a request I made. Some ALSes have completed my request and I'm going to submit – not to this group but to the ALAC group – I am going to submit a report on what has been informed. This is three to five years ago.

Changing the model will be harmful. Why? Because the members of each ALS, those of us who belong to organizations, are invited, for example, to make presentations in other venues and that's when we talk about ICANN, Internet, security, and all the other topics related to ICANN. If that is now going to be individuals, I don't think these organizations will be inviting individuals to make presentations in international or regional events, even national events. With this recommendation, if this model is changed, we would be losing this chances of international, regional, national, and local, participation. That is what I wanted to say.

HAROLD ARCOS:

If anyone wants to take the floor before I give the floor to anyone else, I would like to say that this recommendation #1 makes sense [based on the time] that the community should provide funding to increase participation. However, this happens through CROPP and other funding programs so that these goals are met.

These funds which are obtained, the proceeds of the auctions, these funds might be used to give greater participation to the regions – IGF or any other RIR's participation. In my view, I think this recommendation should also be considered as an opportunity to strengthen the access to funding.

Aida, you have the floor.

AIDA NOBLIA:

I agree with what has been said and confirm what I said before, which these people would base their report on a survey of perception. They missed the facts. They are facts they are not familiar with.

On several occasions in the wiki, I have stated there was an event – Rodrigo De La Parra went to an event – to a Federation of universities, an agreement was signed with the Federation of IT Law. This was one of the events. Another positive side of this report, if we are to work on the positive side, is that we should have this disclosed on our web page so that all events that are going to be held are learned about. Perhaps there's not sufficient dissemination of what is being done. This is all. Thanks.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you. Alberto, you've raised your hand. Please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: What Harold is saying is actually in Recommendation #15 and there is a Cross-Community Working Group that works on these issues, on the auction proceeds coming from the new gTLDs. So my idea is, let's focus on each of the recommendations and let's leave the discussion on each of them for later. This issue in particular is included in Recommendation #15 – new gTLDs auction proceeds.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Alberto. Now let's go on. Let me know please if you want to focus on any one in particular. Otherwise, we will just deal with the outreach through they recommend such as social media, appointing someone from staff that is in charge of this and can make outreach more efficient. I think there are three recommendations that call upon the same issue. Would you like to make a comment?

ALBERTO SOTO: Which recommendation number is that?

HAROLD ARCOS: Are you requesting the floor?

ALBERTO SOTO: Which is the recommendation number?

AIDA NOBLIA: This is Recommendation #8.

HAROLD ARCOS: Alberto, if you are speaking, maybe we can focus on Recommendation #8 and #9. This is the one I was referring to right now. I believe these recommendations can be dealt with altogether because they make reference to outreach, to a good use of interrelation platform for joint work. I think they all make reference to the same thing.

ALBERTO SOTO: I'm sorry to insist, but our responses need to go recommendation by recommendation. We cannot group them together. If we want to repeat, then we will have to do this in one recommendation and the other, but we cannot respond to two recommendations altogether. We have to provide one answer per recommendation.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay. So let's go now to the next one since we have already dealt with the first three. Let's go to Recommendation #4 – At-Large support. Staff should be more actively involved in ALM engagement in policy work for the ALAC, drafting position papers and other policy related work.

Is there any remark to this recommendation?

Alberto, go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO: This recommendation goes for ALAC staff. It's not targeted to us. So I think we shouldn't even spend time to answer it. As an ALAC member, let me say that this should not be so because the work the staff has is already a lot.

INTERPRETER DAVID: We apologize we are not listening to Alberto any longer.

HAROLD ARCOS: Alberto, we are not hearing you anymore.

ALBERTO SOTO: I suggest that we do not consider this recommendation.

HAROLD ARCOS: However, if you look at it, it refers to At-Large staff, the general staff that supports all of the community and specifically to the ALMs to [thank] those here, as a substitution model for the ALSes. They call upon them to have a drafting position papers for those that are going to be related to ALAC. That we could go and focus on other recommendations now.

ALBERTO SOTO: There will be one member of staff that will be part of ALAC. How it will be called, I don't know. But the RALO will no longer exist. We will no longer have an internal staff for each RALO. That's why I say for this

recommendation, I can leave it right there. If there is a modification, we can go back there. This is only for ALAC.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Okay. So let's go now to Recommendation #7. It says, "At-Large should abandon existing internal working groups." There is a confusion once again here. We would like to state this in writing because it seems that they actually refer to the ALAC role and not to the At-Large role. They want us to abandon existing internal working groups and to focus on policy advice. Evidently they make reference to ALAC even though they are saying "At-Large."

Let's now go to Recommendation #8 – "At-Large should use social media much more effectively to gather end users' opinions." I believe this is part of the argument that we mentioned. It seems they have no knowledge when creating this report because there is even one group that is devoted to social media. Ariel Liang is part of it. And I think we should give more outreach to this work.

Same happens with Recommendation #9, or something similar. "At-Large should consider the appointment of a part-time web community monitor position. This member of the support staff could either be recruited or a member of the current staff could be officially trained."

This reinforces the argument that they mentioned in #7 and #8.

Recommendation #10 – "Consider the adoption of a Slack line online communication platform, an instant messaging [inaudible] work space alternative to Skype, the wiki, the website, or the mailing list."

It seems that this was taken from our meetings or the Technology Task Force where we have discussed these recommendations. But it seems this is more related to the tool and not so much to the strategy itself.

Recommendation #11 states, "At-Large should replace five yearly globally ATLAS meetings with an alternative model of annual regional At-Large meetings."

This idea... Did you want to add anything else on this? There is a hand up.

Aida, I see you raised your hand.

AIDA NOBLIA:

I thought Alberto was going to take the floor.

With respect to the previous recommendations, I think it would be proper to state that we agree with the prior recommendations because sometimes one can issue criticisms, but after all this ITEMS team will be heard and so we agree with these prior recommendations and probably we should state that.

With respect to the current ones, I think they should be maintained. They should be complimented. I see no replacement because world summits are very good to have a global perspective. They say that we should have a comprehensive or a holistic view, and in our ATLAS meetings there is a joint, holistic, view. This is probably based on the principles that they handle.

HAROLD ARCOS: So Aida, your proposal is to maintain the ATLAS meetings every five years?

AIDA NOBLIA: No.

HAROLD ARCOS: I agree with you. I think we should take that.

AIDA NOBLIA: And also they want to replace the ATLAS meetings – the World Summits – but because this Summit actually has a holistic function and they referred to holistic issues, maybe it would be consistent with their principles to maintain ATLAS.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Aida.

Alberto, let me say that my connection is very slow so when you raise your hand, I see it at a later time. Alberto, did you raise your hand before?

ALBERTO SOTO: I agree with Aida but I disagree in their holistic concept. The holistic idea they used is complete opposite to the one we are using in our multistakeholder model. Multistakeholders are many players who discuss, agree, and reach a result. A holistic view is the opposite.

I can even send this to our mailing list, but somebody from ITEMS asked today why is it that there is so much rejection by At-Large? And of course, for them At-Large or ALAC is the same thing. What I answered is I'm going to send you the e-mail and you will see that their idea of what's holistic is completely different to a multistakeholder model.

Finally, our constituency – ALAC and At-Large – is working different from the rest of the ICANN ecosystem. This is what it seems. It's a completely different way of working and this would fully change our functionality.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Alberto.

Recommendation #12 states that we should continue, maintain – that is, there is nothing new – they say that through outreach strategies the regions should give priority to regional events. I think this is probably related to what is already happening in the regions, so let's go to the next one. And I think we're also running out of time as well.

Recommendation #13 states they should work closely with ICANN's regional Hubs and regional ISOC Headquarters and At-Large who would bring forth this global outreach and engagement strategy with a view to encouraging the organization of Internet Governance Schools in connection with these At-Large and regional gatherings. More than a recommendation, this is a strategy proposal, in my view.

Do we have any background proposals? Is there anything that you'd like to add to this?

ALBERTO SOTO: I wrote in the chat room that I fully agree that [inaudible] needs to be reinforced with GSE for the coordination because you can work with the CROPP program or with some other foreign support requested from GSE. So this needs to be worked on. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay. So we agree when referring to the five regions that GSE is present.

Let's now go to Recommendation #14. "In the interest of Transparency, all At-Large travel funding should be published as a one-stop shop contribution to the At-Large web page." There should be a record then of who received the funding.

This is part of our outreach strategy, in my view. It refers directly to Transparency and I think this is also being discussed in Work Stream 2 with respect to Transparency. Transparency in At-Large.

If there are no more comments on this Recommendation #14, would we support it for publication?

ALBERTO SOTO: There is a dashboard for this, and this is already listed there. But I think the dashboard still needs to be maintained. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS: Recommendation #15 says that, "At-Large should be engaged in the intercommunity working group on the auction proceeds from new

gTLDs and initiate discussions with the ICANN Board with a view to gaining access to these funds in support of the At-Large community.'

In this case, as this is a Cross-Community Working Group, it is clear that several sectors of the community are participating. If we want to make a specific remark on this recommendation, I'm asking what your opinions are.

ALBERTO SOTO:

We have two representatives in that Cross-Community Working Group. I am a participant of that group, not as a representative but as a participant. There isn't yet any group that is working on the final use of the proceeds. This group is only analyzing the necessary procedures. It will not have the power to decide how this money will be used but just procedures. So this is not yet implemented. It's only a topic we are working on.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Any other comments?

So we agree we understand that this is an ongoing process that is in the process of being built and developed. The processes are being developed on how to use these funds.

The last recommendation #16 says, "Adopt a set of metrics that are consistent for the entire At-Large community to measure the implementation and impact of the Empowered Membership Model, which is part of the ITEMS recommendations, and track the continuous improvement of the At-Large community."

This is directly related to metrics. Any comments?

Antonio, Aida, Humberto, Alberto – Aida?

AIDA NOBLIA:

I agree in relation to this recommendation with the metrics. There are metrics groups. I think that metrics and accountability are both very important for the working groups and for everything. So to adopt uniform measurement criteria for the entire At-Large community I think is fantastic.

Now, the impact of the EMM – well, to measure the actions of the ALSes and the working groups, to have metrics on everything and do continuous improvement so if we are not going to keep the part of the impact on the EMM, the rest I fully agree.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Yes, I agree with you on this because this Empowered Membership Model is actually what we are challenging.

Alberto, is this an old hand or a new hand?

ALBERTO SOTO:

It's a new hand.

I have posted my opinion on the chat but if I may, I will expand on it. I'm saying that if the EMM model is implemented, we cannot assume responsibility for the development of metrics. Why not? Because they

have asked for statistics on where this EMM model is operating, and I have had no answer.

How many million users can be added in each region? Is it just a few thousand? We cannot assume responsibility over something that not even ITEMS knows how many we're talking about.

I have no problem in developing metrics for my ALSes but I cannot develop the metrics for end users – millions of users, tens of thousands of users. Who is able to control attendance and many other issues? So I have complained on this to ITEMS because they said that you ALAC – the working groups – are responsible over this. And I said, “No sir. As a member of a working group I assume responsibility for what you have reported, and you report nothing. So I’m responsible over nothing.” I don’t know if I’m being clear.

We cannot take on responsibility on something that I know nothing about, even though I’ve asked for information. Thanks.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Alberto. Just as you are saying, we should also ask ourselves how many staff members required to deal with such increased individual participation? We are all aware of how much the staff workload has increased. We can’t even imagine how many working hours would be required to provide to deal with these high numbers.

We’re about five minutes before closing. So we are now facing this challenge and we are assuming this commitment to discuss, as we’ve

said with Alberto, to discuss the recommendations. We've made some progress with the round.

Aida, is this a new hand? I'll give you the floor to close. And in the last five minutes make an outline of everything we've said and then move on to Draft Team.

AIDA NOBLIA:

Very quickly on Recommendation #6. I believe it is okay with the exception of the EMM mention, which is something that we do not propose, we do not agree with, based on the arguments on the reasons we've already expressed. And certainly we should warn about the problems that would emerge I guess that if they are making the proposal, they are aware of what is entailed but we certainly cannot take on responsibility over that.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Aida. Okay. Having read this, we might make a few comments on what ITEMS has stated on these recommendations that are the output of the general report. There is confusion. They are mixing up the terms "ALAC" and "At-Large." As Aida said, this is the model that has been accepted by the U.S. government during the transition as the model that met the expectations and even though it may be subject to improvement, the recommendations of ITEMS are again, the substance of the multistakeholder model approach.

Alberto said we should not do away with the ALAC and RALO model through their merging. And then the metrics, which is an area of

relevance which seems to be of impossible implementation as suggested by Recommendation #16 because they are for the individual membership model and this is virtually impossible to deal with.

So if there is any final comment to make, Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Yes. As we do not have much time left, I'm going to post it on our wiki and I'm going to send an e-mail for you to write it on. However, if I may I will advise you to read the 90-page book or split it into chapters. I'm going to take a chapter so that we can move forward faster. That's all. Thank you.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Alberto. So we make this commitment to move forward with this summary, probably tonight because tomorrow the ALAC we are members of will close the draft that we'll submit during the Copenhagen meeting, and then this will be the first draft response from ALAC.

The 24th is the deadline for comments. This process has been an excellent experience of a joint collective construction and participation that we've been able to do during this week with everybody's contribution. So this is our engagement and my final word is thank you for your participation.

So we'll continue our next step which is to submit the draft. Thank you to the staff and thank you to the interpreters for their time.

Thank you very much.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, everybody. This meeting is over. Please turn off your lines.
Thanks to the interpreters as well and to the Adigo staff.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Mario and good-bye, Silvia.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]