HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. On August 21, we will begin with our monthly call. It's my pleasure to be here. I hope you all have a good day and a good week. And please let's proceed with a roll call so as to see the participants that we have today. So Mario, go ahead please, you have the floor.
MARIO ALEMAN:	Thank you very much, Humberto. Welcome, you all to this monthly call, to this LACRALO monthly meeting on August 21 at 23:00 UTC.

On the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and Barlett Morgan and Heidi Ulrich as well. On the Spanish channel, we have José Ovidio Salgueiro, Harold Arcos, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Wladimir Dávalos, Alfredo Lopez, Maritza Aguero, Humberto Carrasco, Gianina Pensky, Ricardo Holmquist, Lito Ibarra, Aida Noblia, Fatima Cambronero, Alberto Soto, Gilberto Lara, Harold Arcos, and Sylvia Herlein.

On the Portuguese channel, we have Renata Aquino Ribeiro and Vanda Scartezini. On the French channel, we have Nikenley Severe. And from the staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Heidi Ulrich, and myself, Mario Aleman. I will be managing this call today.

We have no Apologies for today to this call.

Our interpreters today, we have on the Spanish channel Veronica and David; on the Portuguese channel we have Bettina and Esperanza; on the French channel, we have Jacques and Aurelie.

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.

So now, I would like to welcome you all once again. And please remember to state your name before speaking, not only for the record, but also for the interpretation – and for the transcription services as well.

Now, I would like to give the floor to Humberto to begin with the call. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Mario. I now would like to give the floor to Maritza, to proceed with the adoption of the agenda. So Maritza, go ahead, please. You have the floor.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Today, we will begin our call with a NomCom update: perspectives and activities. This presentation will be done by José Ovidio Salgueiro. He's LACRALO NomCom representative.

Then we will have LACNIC proposal to modify the initial IPv6 allocation for end users. For this presentation, we will have Gianina Pensky. She is the LACNIC Policy Officer.

Then we will discuss the At-Large Review Feasibility Assessment and Implementations Plan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond will be in charge of this presentation. He is on the English channel. He's the Chair of EURALO.

And for the At-Large Review of the Feasibility Assessment and Implementations Plan, we will also have Aida Noblia. She will be delivering a presentation on behalf of the At-Large Working Party.

Finally, we will have an update from the Formation of the Future LACRALO Council of Elders. This presentation will be provided by Sylvia Herlein later.

And then we will have Any Other Business. So thank you very much and please, Humberto, go ahead please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello, Maritza. Thank you very much for reading the agenda for the… So we adopt this agenda for the call. And let's proceed now with the next item on our agenda. Now, I will give the floor to José Ovidio, who will be providing a report on the NomCom. This is a report on the NomCom, the perspectives and activities. So José Ovidio, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

JOSE OVIDIO SALGUEIRO: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me okay?

AIDA NOBLIA: Yes. Go ahead, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Go ahead, please.

JOSE OVIDIO SALGUEIRO: So I will start by providing a brief introduction of the NomCom for those who are not familiar with it. This is the Nomination Committee and this is the ICANN Department or the ICANN Group in charge of appointing Board members and members for the Supporting Organizations: the ccNSO, the GNSO, ALAC. And this year for the first time, they will be appointing members to the PTI, which is the Public Technical Identifier. And this is a new branch or a new body of ICANN in charge of the IANA Functions after the stewardship transition.

The NomCom is composed by 15 voting members; 8 members are known voting members, and they're appointed by the different committees, decision-making bodies within ICANN. ALAC in this case, appoints five members, one representing each region. And you, LACRALO, appointed me to exercise my functions last year and I was reappointed for next year as well. So as you know, the term is only for one year and it can be renewed for an additional year.

So this year, we in the NomCom after working and after working in all these procedures, today, this year we selected three Board members, two members for the PTI, two members for ALAC, one from Latin America, and one from Africa, one member for the ccNSO, one member for the GNSO. So those members, those candidates were appointed, were selected by us during the Johannesburg meeting.

After a six-day meeting, we met and we had a very fruitful discussion and we worked very hard during that week. So those members were selected by the NomCom. I cannot say or I cannot mention the names of those members because the NomCom activity is based on confidentiality. So once these candidates are selected, the ICANN staff is

in charge of taking and verifying the information that we have. And once all the verifications are done, these people will be duly notified. The community will be also notified and they will start their term during next meeting at the end of October and beginning of November. That would be the next ICANN meeting.

The activities of the NomCom last one year, let me tell you that nowadays, all members from all communities [or more] ICANN communities are being asked about members they would like to have, the experience they need. What are they needs that they have? Of course, we meet with the Board. We meet with the ALAC, the ccNSO, the GNSO. I mean, with all the committees, because we want you and we want all the committees to let us know what kind of members you need to satisfy your needs.

It is important to mention that this information – the information that was provided to us – you mentioned the type of experience desired. Well, the decision is always an autonomous decision and this decision belongs to the Nominating Committee. We, as a committee, do have the full and autonomy to select the people that we deem most appropriate. And of course, we take into account diversity – general and geographical diversity. We also take into account the Bylaws. But the committee is the one in charge of selecting the most suitable people for each decision. Selections are not done only based on geographical purposes.

So once these processes are done, we have the candidates represent a list of candidates. They are the applicants and the applications are considered by the committee, are analyzed by the members of the

EN

committee. We have a list of candidates. We select a list of candidates and then based on that list, we carry out the election. Once we verify the election process – and this is an ongoing process – as I mentioned before, this is a process by means of which the ICANN staff verifies all the information. They verify if there are conflicts of interest, if all the information is suitable and if the candidates can exercise their activities and duties properly.

So once this verification is over, then the results are being informed to the community. When the most important thing here is that when this happens, the elected candidate, the candidate that was elected by the NomCom is notified so that he or she can represent the Latin American, the Caribbean region. As you know, ALAC has three members. The region – and there is a third member which or who has not been elected by the RALO. That person is not representative of the RALO itself. That person in fact has been elected by the committee. We're now waiting for the verification of this election process so that we can provide this information to the community.

So basically, this was our activity throughout this year. And for our next meeting, we will begin with our activities for the 2018 period. I don't know if you have any question or any doubt. I'm open to receive questions now.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, José Ovidio for your presentation. So now I'll give you the floor for you to ask questions or comments about the NomCom. So is there any question or any comment?

Okay. So there are seems to be no questions. So thank you very much, José Ovidio, for your presentation. Thank you for your time and thank you for the explanation. You have been very clear explaining the NomCom activity.

So now, we would proceed with the second or with the following item in the agenda. And this is the LACNIC proposal to modify the first allocation of IPv6. So this presentation will be carried out by Gianina Pensky. So, Gianina, thank you very much for being here. You have the floor, go ahead please.

GIANINA PENSKY: Thank you very much. And my [inaudible] is to show you this proposal. There you go.

So first, let me make this very brief introduction for those of you who don't really know how policies actually work in LACNIC. So let me then introduce this quickly. And then I shall deal specifically with what we want to deal with, which is the policies right now in the discussion. It is the policy to modify the distribution for the private user.

So what are policies in LACNIC? These are sort of rules that determine how LACNIC works with members on the Internet that is any Internet provider that asks LACNIC for resources. Well, LACNIC will govern how to manage those resources with these policies. All of these is within what we call the LACNIC policy. It's a manual that you can access online. And you'll see then how LACNIC allocates those resources both in IPv4 and IPv6. So it is indeed final where you can see how LACNIC manages these resources.

The sources for policy creation is extremely important because it is a multistakeholder model. And the idea is that there are – I'd say multiple parties, multiple stakeholders that they may come up participate. I chose this that it's open to the whole community and we don't really need to be present at the LACNIC meetings. You don't need to pay to access those policies. You don't even need to be a LACNIC member. What you need to have is an e-mail and then you just add yourself to the policy e-mail list which is where all the policies are discussed.

How does this process work? Well, there is a diagram that you can see there. But just so you have an idea, there is the community that is all of us. Anyone can be a member of the community. Any person can send a policy proposal. There is an e-mail list and everybody receives this e-mail list and all of the proposals are received there.

Now, there are two LACNIC events where there is the policy public forum, and then the author can again present these policy proposals and there is a discussion that is face-to-face. So aside all these discussions by e-mail, there is a face-to-face discussion. So each community can reach a consensus on the policy proposal then the LACNIC Board of Directors will ratify these proposals and then the process starts.

Before that, there is a period for last comments in case someone wants to add one more comment, and this is when the proposal is ratified or not. If it's not ratified or there is no consensus, it goes back to the e-mail list.

MARIO ALEMAN:
Humberto, can you please mute your line? Because you are coming through.

GIANINA PENSKY:
Once the proposal is ratified, it is implemented. And it goes to the public policy manual that I mentioned before.

So this is just how we manage to establish and implement a new policy. As I was saying, this is the multistakeholder model, meaning that anybody can be involved in the process.

So this is just a brief introduction of how these policies are created here in LACNIC. Let me now address what you were mentioning before, that is the fact that there is a proposal now under discussion to build with more defining the first distribution of IPv6 to end users.

LACNIC currently assigns or allocates IPv6 addresses into 32 to 48 end users. So the current policy is that when there is an initial allocation, actually when the recent IPv4 allocation, LACNIC established as a policy that when you assign or allocate IPv4 addresses, the user can also request an IPv6 address. So the organization do request IPv6 addresses and they leave that block pending and they only use the IPv4 block. So what happens is that they are now using the IPv6 blocks that was pending, and they need to reorganize their structure.

So the main thing that's happened is that this block that LACNIC have assigned them if they're unused. So they came back to LACNIC asking for bigger block of addresses, and they just need to provide the

rationale of why is it that they're asking for this second block of addresses.

So this proposal here is the following. LACNIC implemented recently a policy to be applied to ISPs. So what this proposal does is just that whatever we implemented at the time, in the last consensus for ISP users is now applied to end users. This is more or less what the proposal says. So that an organization that is IPv4 can change its organization into the IPv6 for one time that is if there is one policy that is applied or that has been approved for ISP.

This allows organizations to adjust an initial plan and to adapt it to another plan that is more real. But that possibility does not apply to organizations that are classified as end users. Most of these organizations have a minimal distribution which is the slash forward [case] which may be enough but still our cases when the plan that was presented for this distribution does not represent the actual reality and so they need a bigger distribution. This is more the summary of what happened before.

So the proposal is to provide the same possibility for ISPs than what we provide for end users. [inaudible] of the proposal, the manual is divided in sections and this section is where we would add a new paragraph, making that we would provide a rectification of the original block of addresses assigned. And end user will be able to modify the plan they provided just for LACNIC once the first block of address is allocated – once we can prove that, what has been allocated cannot meet the current necessity.

This is when we also say what are the rules that were going to private sector. And so if it's not possible to provide an additional prefix to the one that is already being applied because there is always that once LACNIC assigns a block, there is a reservation that you can complement later on. And so if there is an end user that was assigned a slash 48 block, and that proposal states that they come back to LACNIC and say, "Well this slash 48 that was assigned to me, allocated to me, is very small and I want to go bigger."

So there's two options. One option is if you can grow [beneath] with the reservation you have, then you've just frozen it. The issue cannot – then there are these two options. One is to receive a new block of addresses with the prefix that they requested. They will need to return the slash 48 and they need to get a fully new one with this prefix that they're actually doing it. Otherwise, they can receive another block that will complement the example that we provided, the slash 48 that they already have.

So in that case, LACNIC will provide any of the options because they don't want to return the one they're already using, and they will have an additional one. And if they believe it is more comfortable for them to return it, they will immediately receive a bigger block of addresses. So the idea is precisely to put up the same level what has already been implemented to ISPs and so that is equalized to end users.

So that when it comes to changing that initial allocation of IPv6 that they received, then they will have the option to not return the full block but actually sort of rectify the original allocation. This is the part for additional material. There is no link but you can access policy at

LACNIC.net. You will see all the policies which are there. I can send you the correct link.

And I also would like to invite you to participate in the e-mail list so that you can get involve in discussion, both of ISPs or as end users that is used to involve to get into the discussion and to give your opinion on this proposal that we are having. Because you may be affected by this or you may contact the author, the stakeholder, and if they can answer any questions that you may have.

The LACNIC event will be held now in September. As I was saying before, it will be a policy public forum where you can participate, get involved. You can go to the face-to-face meeting if [inaudible]. You can all go there. You can also participate remotely through the LACNIC website or any questions you may want to ask, you can ask them on the chat room. And if you write a question from the chat, then those questions are read aloud to the speaker. So you're all invited to participate, and if you have any questions or queries, I am open for those questions and I will answer them.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Gianina. There is a question here from Ricardo Holmquist. Ricardo, you now have the floor, please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Good evening.

EN

MARIO ALEMAN:	There is this trouble audio here from someone. If you can please mute your line. Thank you.
RICARDO HOLMQUIST:	I hope you can hear me now once again. Gianina, the question I have for you is the policy you want to amend is a policy that is actually related to the end users. Now, end users do not request these IPv6 addresses from the ISP. I mean, they don't request this locally instead of going to LACNIC. Because it is in LACNIC where you actually want to modify this policy because this policy is affecting the way in which the ISPs in each of our countries is allocating the IP addresses for end users.
GIANINA PENSKY:	Thank you, Ricardo, for your question. Actually, these are policies on how LACNIC will allocate those resources, not actually on how the ISPs will allocate them. So this is not affecting how an ISP is allocating an end user. That is, it affects only the end users that come to LACNIC to ask for resources directly.
RICARDO HOLMQUIST:	Thank you very much.
GIANINA PENSKY:	Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is very well understood. Gianina, here's another question for you. I would like to know if you have a view on how the end user could somehow help the creation of policies or how they can provide their inputs to the proposals in LACNIC. That's the first question.

The second question is actually it's more related to representation. There is an agreement between LACNIC and LACRALO. So what can you say about that? Thank you.

GIANINA PENSKY: With respect to the end user, what the end user can do is they can get involve in our discussions, that's the most important part. And as I was saying, there are still instances for discussion. One is stated in the how to participate area. The participation allows us to implement the proposal. Just like we say participation is very important, many times the community doesn't know how to implement this policy and how to manage the resources.

So there are two ways of participating. One is through the policy e-mail list. There's the link for you to get involved. You can just enroll and you will be receiving all the e-mails. You can ask any question you may have by e-mail.

The other way to participate is the face-to-face LACNIC meeting, but you don't necessary be there face to face. You can also participate remotely, and you can also get involved by watching the broadcast online. You can also read the chat room. Everything is read aloud.

So we focus a lot on the fact that everybody should participate in the policy development process because, at the end of the day, you are the ones who determine how LACNIC will manage the resources. I hope I gave answer to the first question. Otherwise, please do tell me.

As for the second question, can you please repeat it because I didn't really get it?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: We actually had the opportunity to interact twice with you in Peru and in Chile. My question is: how did you see the commencement of these agreements between LACNIC and LACRALO? That was actually my question.

GIANINA PENSKY: I think it's a good opportunity for us to interact. It's good that you start participating in the event increasingly that we can start seeing you more and more. And it would be good to get more involved more and more [inaudible].

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I hope you can hear me. Hello?

UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT: We can hear you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:	I can see there are no more questions, and we are [tied] with time. Thank you very much, Gianina, for your participation. It was a very interesting presentation.
	We will now go to the next proposal – actually, the next issue to be dealt with. This would be the presentation by Olivier Crepin-Leblond, who is the Chair. He will provide us a presentation on the feasibility of working with At-Large.
	Olivier, you now have the floor. Please go ahead.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Humberto. Can you hear me?
	Okay. I see that you can. Okay. Well, thanks very much. I'm Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and I wanted just to take you quickly through an update of what's happened on the At-Large Review in the past few months. Thank you for inviting me on your call. I'll try to be quite quick because I also note that Aida is a member of the Review Working Party that has been accompanying all this work ever since its beginning. She probably has a few more things to add.
	I was just going to take a few slides, which were presented a few days ago at the webinar on the 16th of August, last week. Holly Raiche, who is the main person running this review, presented and gave a very quick summary of where we are today.
	Let's go to the first slide, please – oh, and I see I can control it. Let me see. Here we go. First slide.

I just thought I'd give you a quick background and tell you where we are today. The review started quite a number of months ago. I think it's about a year ago. It's part of the organization on review that all of ICANN has to go through. Each one of these Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, and all the different processes that take place at ICANN need to go through a regular review process, where an external contractor is hired to go and do some work and basically ask people in the community, etc., and finally write a final report.

First, the draft report is subjected to a public comment process. You might have remembered that about six months ago we were asked to comment. Therefore, there was the original report that was drafted by the contractor, called ITEMS. Then the ALAC drafted a comment, and the Regional At-Large Organizations, the RALOs, drafted a comment as well. All of those went into the public consultation. Then the contractors wrote a final report, and that was then sent over to the Board.

Now, the level, the next thing that [we] needed them to do was to put together, based on our responses, a feasibility assessment, an implementation, a plan of some sorts. Here it's called "Feasibility assessment and implementation available." There were a number of meetings that were set up by the working party to draft a first draft of a Google Docs based on the input that was received both from the ALAC and from the RALOs.

The input was taken from our combined statements in the public commenting period. That's how it was drafted. Then the consultation took place the past few weeks. You will have seen in your mailbox a number of requests for input and for feedback on what was written. We

were in a very short timeline. The finalization of the ALAC response had to be finished by yesterday, by the 21st of August. At the beginning of the weekend, Alan Greenberg, the ALAC Chair, said, "That's it. No more comments. Now let's just draft and polish the document so that it actually looks okay."

It was then shared over with the ALAC, the 15 members of the At-Large Advisory Committee, who are meeting on a conference call in a few hours' time. It says here that the ALAC approval will be on the 22nd of August, but I've heard from Alan Greenberg that he might not push it that quickly, since there is an understanding that we are in a holiday period for some parts of the world. So he will look towards having a good discussion on the ALAC call in a few hours' time about this final response, the finalization of the response and so on, and then launching a vote shortly after that.

Why are we in such a very short timeline? Because there's a consultation then that needs to take place with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. That's a committee of the ICANN Board.

So the submission of that plan needs to be done by the 15th of September, and then the consideration of this plan needs to be done by this Organizational Effectiveness Committee by the 21st of September. Then, if it is happy with what's been written or it wants to make some modification, a final proposal needs to be then sent to the Board before ICANN60, the next ICANN meeting. That's taking place in Abu Dhabi at the end of October. So you see it's all very, very tight indeed.

Now, when it comes down to the recommendations themselves, if we go to the – if I click on this, there we go. There are three sets of recommendations. They basically fell into three categories. There were the ones that our community was pretty outraged with. The great majority in our community asked for them to be rejected. They were the ones which were partly accepted or accepted with some amendments, which are actually depending on external factors, such as staff or funds. And there are some which could actually be implemented by our community or which are already currently being implemented or started being implemented after the review or maybe thanks to the points that were raised in the review.

First, looking at the rejected recommendations, Recommendation #4 – by the way, when the contractor wrote their final report, they renumbered all their recommendations. So don't look at the old documents. Look at the new documents for these. The current document's Recommendation 4 was basically saying, "Dissolve the At-Large leadership team. Dissolve it. Get rid of it." That was pretty much impractical because the ALT is there to really coordinate things so that a key set of people are able to talk to each other a little bit more often than just once a month when the ALAC call takes place.

Then there was the Board election process, Recommendation #6, which, if you recall, was a system where you would effectively have a draw. You'd get a selection done by an external party, by the Nominating Committee, and then the final selection for the Board candidates would then be done at random. That just didn't fly at all, so that was rejected.

Then there was Recommendation 7, the elimination of the working groups. Now, seeing that most of the work in other parts of ICANN and in At-Large takes place in working groups, that was definitely not going to be accepted, so that was also rejected. But some implementation suggestions on policy and metrics and things were taken into account.

Then there was the proposal, Recommendation 11, to replace the At-Large Summit, the ATLAS meeting. Seeing that we already had two At-Large Summits that were very successful indeed and that we have really put together a schedule of General Assemblies and At-Large Summits, getting rid of At-Large Summits was just not something that gained any support. Indeed, keeping the rotation of General Assemblies and At-Large Summits was the way forward on this.

Then there was Recommendation 14, which basically asked for auction funds for the ALAC to ask that the auction funds be given to At-Large for the At-Large community to be able to use and be properly funded for a number of years. Whilst the intention, I guess, would be really great to get millions and millions of dollars – I'm sure nobody is going to say no to that – the whole point is that the current working group that ICANN has put together for the use and allocation of auction funds is already a process that is in place, where the ALAC is definitely not in a position to ask for those funds. That was absolutely rejected too.

There were also some parts of the Empowered Membership Model, the EMM, which were effectively rejected. In fact, it's interesting because parts of the Empowered Membership Model were actually accepted. There are some parts which are good. But the one – for example, the 4th, where the RALO leaders were also selected at the ALAC, the RALO

leadership, Chair, and Secretariat would also be ALAC members. That was rejected because the RALO leaders already have an enormous amount of work on their hands, and doing both was seen as being completely unworkable. I'm sure Humberto is shaking his head at the moment.

Then #6, the NomCom appointed liaisons. Our liaisons with other parts of ICANN would then be appointed by the Nominating Committee, completely outside the scope of our community. Seeing that those people are liaisons with the GNSO, with the ccNSO, and with the GAC, these liaisons really are ambassadors. I think [inaudible] it was better that we actually appoint them and that we know who we, as in our community, appoints them, and we know who they are and we know they have the knowledge necessarily to be appointed.

Then #7, the random selection of the ALAC leadership. I spoke about it just a moment ago.

So these were the ones that were basically refused. Now, there were some recommendations that were accepted that depended on staff and on funds. First, staff involvement in policy so as to get more support from staff in helping out with writing some of the policy documents that we have that we've released in response to public comment, etc. That was supported. Of course, having more staff or having more staff time devoted to this costs money, so this we will see might be something that we'll have in the future. But that's of course depending on staff and funds.

#5, staff travel support for I* events. Again, I think that our community is trying to be involved with a lot of I* events. I* events are effectively the Regional Internet Registry work and the Internet Society and the World Wide Web Consortium, etc. All of these other organizations are there. But of course, that requires funding to go to all these events.

Then the web community manager, someone that would be devoted to actually help us out in our communication and development of the website. Obviously that would require funding for someone to be paid to do this.

Travel support for region events. Well, that speaks for itself. Accepted, but that would require, again, funding.

Finally, transparency for travel support. That's one recommendation which asks that all of the travel support provided to At-Large participants would need to be shown on a publicly accessible page. This is already actually the case with some of the travels in ICANN. But our response to this was, if this kind of transparency is required, we didn't think there was any pushback on that. But it would have to be the same for everyone. So travelers from other constituencies, from other parts of ICANN, would also need to be listed on this.

Finally, recommendations to be implemented. That's on the next, final slide. There are a number of them which, with a few amendments, would be really good. First, the tracking of issues and the improvement of the website. That was really supported. The push for individual membership and support of participation and the Rules of Procedures for this were supported. This was something regarding the individual

membership that nearly all the RALOs are now moving forward with. Although the recommendation which was made by the contractor was to effectively weaken the At-Large Structures and put the individual members on exactly the par level of an At-Large Structure, we pushed back on this. So we are now in the situation where we're saying, "Look, we're happy with having individual members, but at the same time, our At-Large Structures are extremely important." So each RALO is doing its own work to be able to access individual members in one way or another.

Recommendation #8, developing social media policy. Again, we have a Social Media Working Group, and certainly a pilot program can be implemented on this. Then the use of other types of technology, like Slack.

Recommendation #10. It's funny that the contractors focused on one type of technology whilst our Technology Task Force has done a lot of work on various different types of alternative technologies for communication between our members.

Then 15, rapporteurs. Obviously we're supporting a lot of work to do outreach out there. The Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program is now not a pilot program anymore, so that is something that we're making use of.

Then 16, the Metrics Working Group is taking care now of all of this accountability that is required of our community. So that recommendation is accepted.

The original document is linked to your agenda. That's the document which will be put in front of the ALAC in a few hours' time. It's got the executive summary, the overview of each one of the recommendations, and a table, and the recommendation feasibility assessment and implementation plan for each one of these. There's a lot further down, after each one of these recommendations are dealt with in turn – it's interesting because you I've got the examiner's final recommendation, the issue identified, and then whether the ALAC supports it/doesn't support it, and a whole explanation underneath for each one of these recommendations. So it's quite an extensive document all together. I understand that it will be translated eventually in other languages, but for the time being, it has to be sent over to the Board in a pretty quick fashion.

So that's what the document is. I am sorry if it's taken a little bit of time, but I thought I would take the time to not rush through this. I hand the floor back to Humberto. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Olivier. It was an excellent presentation. Of course, you were very precise. I would like to give the floor to the participants. We are a bit behind the schedule, so if there are no questions, I will give the floor to Aida.

If there are no questions, Olivier, thank you very much for your presentation. It was a wonderful summary. Now I would like to give the floor to Aida Noblia. She will talk about the scope of these recommendations.

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

AIDA NOBLIA: Well, Olivier gave a very detailed presentation. I have circulated a PowerPoint, so perhaps you will see the PowerPoint on the screen. I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak and for giving me the opportunity to participate in this working group. This working group is composed of a group of very interesting people. We were able to provide feedback on the wiki, so I hope you find this information useful.

Now, when it comes to my presentation, I think we should reduce the presentation because we are running out of time. You will see the presentation on the screen, but I would like to speak about some details, if you will, because I made a distinction between low, medium, and high priority recommendations because I believe this classification is important for the implementation phase. When it comes to high priority of recommendations, we have 1, 2 – we have also the recommendation talking about the individual members. We need to provide a good rationale for this recommendation and for the reviewers to understand that this was already implemented that are ALSes, for example, which do have voting rights.

When it comes to the working groups, something that caught my attention was the participation of end users. We are always talking about working groups, so I believe that this is something strange, if you will, speaking about individual users.

So Recommendation #2 speaks about the individual members and the change in the functions of the RALOs. They say a Bylaw amendment is necessary. All the individual users would be somehow isolated in the bottom-up process. This was again the Empowered Membership Model. This Recommendation #2 has an implementation time of one to two years. Everything is quite detailed in the working plan. As I said before, the implementation time for this is one to two years.

Recommendation #12. As part of the RALO strategy, the idea is to continue promoting participation of RALOs in different events. There was a change in the wording. We said, "To continue participating in events, Recommendation #13 requires further participation of RALOs in regional events."

Then we have medium-priority recommendations: Recommendations 1, 3, 5, and 8. Recommendation #1 is to give priority to some advisory in questions that's important to the community. That is to say, we want more quality than quantity. When it comes to this recommendation, we would like to focus on quality rather than on quantity. As we are now working in LACRALO, the idea is to improve participation. The period of time for implementing this recommendation is six to nine months.

Recommendation #3 [implies] more active support from staff in the policy development. This recommendation was rejected in the case of individual users because this is something important to take into account when we speak about those tasks. But the idea is to activate or to promote participation in this type of activity.

Then we have participation in social media, and then we have low-priority recommendations. These are Recommendations 9, 10, and 16. Recommendation 9 has to do with metrics. Recommendation 10 has to do with multiple communication channels. ALAC should elect or appoint a web manager or a web community manager. Of course, this needs to be taking into account.

I know we are running out of time, so thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to provide this short presentation. I don't know if you have any questions.

I know Sylvia has to provide her presentation as well. Thank you very much.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Aida. We [considered] your presentation and Olivier's presentation. We definitely did have a very good sort of conference in connection with the recommendations, the report affecting the implementation, the feasibility, and the recommendations we got from ITEMS. So thank you, Aida. I do want to acknowledge your efforts. I know that you have gotten involved in the past two years and you have provided us with your input. I would like to congratulate you once again.

Now I'm going to open the floor if you have any questions very quickly on this issue. Otherwise, we will just go to the last item on our agenda before, of course, going to Any Other Business.

I see no questions. It has been very clear with these two presentations. Now I'm going to give the floor to Sylvia Herlein. She's going to provide us with an update from the information of the Future LACRALO Council Working Group.

Sylvia, I would like to thank you for your participation. You now have the floor. Please go ahead.

INTEREPRETER: This is the interpreter. We cannot hear Sylvia.

MARIO ALEMAN: I would like to confirm whether Sylvia can hear us.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: It seems Sylvia wants to get a call. It would be essential if you can to call Sylvia again, please.

MARIO ALEMAN: Okay. Thank you. We're calling Sylvia now.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This concept of elders is a very controversial concept. [inaudible] about the elders. Sylvia, they are calling you right now, so we can start with your presentation.

Usually, in the LACRALO leadership, we are very happy with this working group that has progressed significantly. As you know from the e-mails

that we have received from you, it is my view that, if we deal with other issues of interest – well, I'm going to show you the chart on how the mediation process should progress and I think this is one of the issues that we need to deal with first. So, we're also very happy about this and we are still waiting for Sylvia to be called. Please, if you can call her so that she can provide us with her presentation.

I would like to know how the group is going, what is the observation has been, what the remarks has been. This is of course open for comments from all of us, from the whole community.

I think the timeline is 30 days for comments. It's going to be after this presentation that we're going to address these ideas from her. So, you can have any comments or if you would like to provide your input, feel to go on the wiki.

You can also send e-mails to ask questions that we're getting from Ricardo. He's asking if comments can be sent by e-mail or if they want to post in the wiki. But ideally, they need to be posted on the wiki but there's no problem if you want to ask the question or make your comments on an e-mail.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: I'm sorry. This is Sylvia speaking now. This is Sylvia Herlein speaking for the record.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, Sylvia. We're about to start with Sylvia's presentation. So, Alberto, if this is a question in section with the previous issue, maybe

you can ask it later or would you like to maybe to wait for Sylvia to finish her presentation? Please tell me what [inaudible].

Okay. So, thank you, Alberto, Sylvia, we can now hear you. Please go ahead with your presentation now.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Thank you very much. Good evening to you all. I would like to comment a little bit about what we did with the working group that is called Formation of the Future LACRALO Council of Elders. This working group was created as you very well know as a result of the mediation where they advised that LACRALO should have a Council to help leaders organize the work and to promote the work in general in the region.

So that's why we created this working group that is made up of 14 people. We work from May until August. We had several meetings, several contributions. So, we are now waiting comments from the region as a whole so we can get your input from what we have discussed in a little bit more [to man] the work.

The Council already has a new name that was very controversial because it was this Council of Elders and of course [inaudible] was made with the word Elders that we're now just going to call it an Emeritus Council.

There were some seven or eight names that were post and so we posted, and the most [voted] name was Emeritus Council of LACRALO. Emeritus is a [Latin] word so it's actually valid both for English and Spanish, and the other name that was also very voted on was the

[Compulsive] Council of LACRALO. And, actually, the [inaudible] the name was the Council of Emeritus. So, was now asked that we use that name and so that we leave the Council of Elders name aside.

Aside from choosing the name, we also determined the functions or actually the mission of the Future Council. I'm not going to read it for you because it's actually very clear on the wiki page. You can read it yourself and we don't really have lots of time.

We also determine what the formation of the Council should be like, how many people need to make it up. We decided we should have five members. That [inaudible] was an interesting number and we also decided how the election, the appointment and the renewal would be in case one of the members has to leave the Council for some reasons. We also decided what the renewal of that member would be like or actually how the condition that that person was leaving would be filled.

We also established the requirements for the Council. There are eight requirements as of date. Those of you who want to be members need to meet at least four of these requirements. We also determined the time of the mandate for each of the members and we [inaudible] what the work of the Council should be like, how the Council should work of course with transparency and openness, and of course considering the different [representation] in the region.

So, this is basically what it is. We are still waiting for you to provide us with your comments to tell us what our work is like in your view if you think that we should ask more issues to be dealt with. And then, by early August, we send this final report for [presentation]. We wrote it in

Spanish because it's for team members that was involved in this working group even though it is open for the [inaudible] but they were members of Latin America. So, we have word in Spanish even though all the meetings have been recorded and we did have interpretations into English.

So, we have sent then the report, the final results of our work by August 10. And also in August 10, we posted a link on the wiki page, it would be English version but unfortunately, this is not the final version. It's not the one that has been translated, the one that we posted online.

And so, now, the Translation Department will translate finally the final version and we will start a new one-month period so that all of you can make your comments and provide us with your input.

So, the date for comments was September 10 and is now going to be postponed. We would provide you with a new date and the staff will tell you by e-mail what that date will be because we actually found that what has been submitted was not the final version.

So, this is it basically. If you have questions, I am open for your questions and comments now.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking and Sylvia speaking also. I hope you can hear me, Sylvia.

There is one hand raised. I think Dev would like to ask a question. Dev Anand, if you'd like to ask a question, please go ahead. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much, Humberto. And thanks, Sylvia, for your presentation.

So, I got to have some comments, just one. There was a Google Doc that was originally with a lot of this work was being done and then this was translated into English. What I've noticed now that the wiki page has removed the link to that Google Doc, Carlton Samuels made several comments on that Google Doc which I support. He made about five or six comments. So I hope that that information was captured properly before the Google Doc was removed. So, that's one.

Just another comment about the Emeritus, I mean, just reading what Emeritus says. It's an adjective used to describe – this designate a retired person. It's conferred automatically for all persons who retire at a given rank and it's used when a person of distinction in a profession retires or hands over the position. I posted a link to the Wikipedia entry.

So, my thinking is that that the term probably needs more work and probably needs rethinking. Maybe it's just a mentorship council or like [inaudible] council, something of that nature.

Finally, overall comment and I'll try to make more comments on the wiki page. I don't understand fully the need for doing this Council because I see a lot of the responsibilities of this Emeritus Council, which would fall under the existing LACRALO members that – and it's a sense of LACRALO's responsibility and so forth.

I mean, if the goal is to find persons that are able to assist persons to help them become involved in At-Large, I could think of – well, if that's the goal then certainly, we can probably approach it. I know time is of the essence so I probably will stop there and I'll make some more detailed comments on the wiki page. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello, can you hear me? Okay, Sylvia, you have the floor. Go ahead, please. And then, I will give the floor to Renata because I know she has some questions.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Thank you very much, Humberto. Well, Dev, thank you very much comments. Thank you for posting your comments on the wiki page. Thank you very much for that because that is what we really want. We want everyone to concentrate on the wiki page and of course, those posting comments on the mailing list will be taken to the wiki page so that everything is on one single place.

When it comes to your first comment on Google Doc, well, that was a document that we started internally to work with that document. That was only for the working group members. For the first meeting of our working group, that was a document and we had many problems with that document.

And then, the members of the working group, they said not to use that document anymore and to put every single comment on the wiki page and also to post all the comments on the wiki page. That first original

document was only considered in our first meeting in May and that's why me and myself at the end of the day because there were some people asking about that document, I removed the document because everything is on the wiki.

Of course, I have access to the document and I can post it again if you will but it makes no sense because we only have there just some questions and some comments, the first, the initial comments.

Now, when it comes to your comment on the Emeritus, well, we have discussed on many definitions and we discussed that definition for a long time in the working group, and we end up deciding that the characteristics of the members of this Council may be considered or covered by the concept of the term Emeritus.

So, thank you very much for your comment indeed. And of course, no problem. We can analyze again the term and participate, and discuss it.

Now, when it comes to the need of the Council, well, you are not the first one who is posting this or saying this and of course, we are receiving the advice from professionals from the mediators. I know that you were in Los Angeles when this recommendation was made.

So as a follow-up for this recommendation, this working group was created. So we are not talking about only one single person but we decided that this Council should be composed by at least five members. I mean, this is a minimum and maximum, and the number is five. So, that's why all comments on the need of this Council was pleased. Post all your comments on the wiki page.

I see Dev is saying that there is no access to the Google Doc. Okay, that's okay because access is just given to the members, to the 14 members of the working group. And, since it was not a useful tool for the working group so we only use that document in our first meeting and then we began working on the wiki page just to avoid confusion.

But of course, we kept all the documents made by Carlton because all documents, all the comments on the wiki page and then we found there was a mistake, there was an error because their staff sent a document which was not the final document to be translated, so that's why we are going to restart the comment period once we have the final version of the document posted on the wiki page. That's all. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Sylvia. And I will give the floor to Renata and I see Dev, and then Dev and then Humberto. So Renata, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Thank you. I have a question about the Council. I have commented that it seems to me that this council has a function to clear any doubt for the members of the group. I would like to know if this is true. And, they could guide for proposal for IGF Brazil or any other proposals that the group may have. And what is the role of this Council considering the participation of the group so a member can become a president on NomCom or a secretary? Will this person have another role before becoming an Emeritus or must be an Emeritus to be appointed to these other roles? So, thinking about the other presentations, I would like to know about this role of the Council. Thank you.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Thank you very much, Renata. Well, the function of the Council… Can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes.

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes Sylvia, go ahead please.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Okay, the functions of the Council, if you go to the wiki page and if you see there is a final version that was published on August the 4th, you have to scroll down at the end of the page where you will see a paragraph which is highlighted in orange so that you can see that information. So, if you go to the wiki page on item number two, you will find the functions of the Council. There are eight items explaining the functions of this Council.

So please read that information, read the document, read the final document and if you believe that there is something missing that there is something that should be added to the sections or if there is any other item that you would like to add, please make your comments on the wiki page because we, the members of the working group, after the comment period will meet and we will review and analyze all the comments because we know these are valuable comments.

Perhaps regarding your other comments, perhaps it is a misinterpretation. I mean, the Emeritus is not one person. This Council will be composed by five people, by five members and within this group, there will be coordinator. The term will last one year but the Council itself will have a duration of two or three years. I mean, the first members will have a duration of three years and the other members will have a term of two years. So, this Council will be composed by five members. It is not just one member. So please read the information and post your comments.

Is there any other question or any other comments?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Sylvia, now I will give the floor to Alberto Soto and then Barlett, and Dev because I see them on the AC room. So Alberto, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Very briefly. Well, when it comes to the name of the group, well, this Council or this group is just a concept, the Council of Elders. Well, it's a concept. In the past, this used to be an element, a governance element. I believe that the name is not that important because – I mean, this is not a Council of Elders because if that is the case, we will need to have elder people as members of this Council.

So in fact, this is just the name. [It's] the Council that might be composed by young people, if you will, but they need to meet certain requirement as Sylvia said.

And then we have a collaboration request. So, if you have any comments, please read the document, read the paragraph and make your proposals, make the proposed modifications that you would like to see. For example, let's say, "I would like to have this modification in this paragraph because of this." Thank you.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Thank you very much, Alberto. Barlett, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Sylvia, are you there?

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Yes, I'm here and waiting for Barlett's comment.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Barlett, you have the floor. Go ahead, please. Unfortunately, we cannot hear Barlett.

BARLETT MORGAN: Hello.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Barlett, can you please type your question on the chat because we are running out of time.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Barlett, we heard you. Go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: So please can you kindly type your question on the chat?

BARLETT MORGAN: Do you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, Barlett, I can hear you. Go ahead.

BARLETT MORGAN: Okay. Excellent. So, the point I want to make was really more to do with the overall objective of the Elders Council or whatever name we settled on. But firstly, I will say I agree with Humberto that the name really isn't that important at this point. What is more important is the substance of the Council as it were and what it's supposed to do, and that's where my question comes from.

I wanted to have an idea of why or why there was a move away from the initial objective that was agreed on during the mediation towards what seems like very different of concepts. No, that was initially then. I just want to appreciate what they're thinking of the working group was, when it moved away from the initial objective, which as I understood it, was to more or less create a group of persons who could offer a mentorship in different ways to the membership and the leadership of LACRALO. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Sylvia, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Thank you very much, Barlett, for your question. Yes, that's okay. The initial objective was that and we keep that objective. We keep it in the functions of the Council because these functions are being developed in item number two and this is – one of these functions is to advise leaders and we want to involve the secretary, the ALAC members, the Chair. So the idea is to provide support to LACRALO leaders on policymaking issues or questions or issues relevant for ICANN.

But there are eight items. I'm not going to read them all right now because I don't have the time but there are eight items on this document detailing the objectives and the functions of this Council, so we believe that the idea of mentoring is also included in these eight items that we have and these other functions of the Council.

I really would like to apologize to the people on the Caribbean region because I know that you don't have the final version of the document in English but the staff promised us that they will shortly provide that version. We will be able to have that version shortly. So once you read that version, you will be able to see that on item number two of the functions of the Council, there is the original idea which is the mentoring objective or the mentoring function of the Council. So I would like to apologize really because you don't have the version right now but you will shortly be able to have the final version translated into English. Thank you.

EN

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Barlett. I see your hand raised on the AC chat, AC room. Do you have any other comments?

Okay. I don't know if we have time for Any Other Business.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Sorry, Humberto, for interrupting you but I would like to make a brief comment. I would like to thank you all for your comments and your questions. Vanda and I are really happy to see all these. So please, we will have one month, one additional month to provide comments. So I would kindly ask you to provide your comments because this is for the benefit of LACRALO, so thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. Dev Anand, last question. You have the floor. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Thanks, Humberto. This is more of a question for Any Other Business, so is it okay to just quickly say it? It should be 30 seconds.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Let's now deal with Any Other Business. So you have the floor. You can ask your question, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Thank you, Humberto. Two things: one, the update to the LACRALO mailing list, as you know, the Technology Taskforce is a subgroup they are working on testing this new translation tool. And the general thinking is that if it's ready for deployment for the regular LACRALO mailing list before that happens, so I'll probably would like to have a special call and/or maybe a special TTFs call with interpretation to explain what we are looking to achieve with the new tool and some of the things that we want members to do.

So, just to give a heads up on that. All right, and I'll follow-up with you Humberto and [inaudible] with some e-mails as to possible times. Okay. That's it.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Dev. Okay, we will organize a call for that topic. I believe this is something really important for us.

So, for the sake of time, we have exceeded the time allotted for this call, so please Mario, can you confirm that?

MARIO ALEMAN: Humberto, yes, we need to finish this call.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, so the pending topic, which is the flowchart, will be added to the link. We will post that information on wiki page and we will circulate that information on the mailing list so that you can see the tentative timeline to discuss the topics that are still pending for the mediation process and we will work on that.

I put that information on an Excel sheet and I think Ricardo Holmquist and someone else requested that information, so we will post any information on the mailing list.

Having said this, I would like to thank you all for this wonderful call. It was a very interesting call and of course, we would like to keep on working and participating, and engaging because we feel happy. So, congratulations for this and thanks to the interpreters, thanks to Mario and Sylvia. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]