
MARIO ALEMAN: Welcome to today's call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the LACRALO Governance Working Group call. Today is Thursday, February 8, 2018 at 21:00 UTC time.

Our list of participants, on the Spanish channel, we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Maritza Aguero, Alberto Soto, Vanda Scartezini, and Aida Noblia.

We have no participants for the English and apologies have been submitted by Antonio Medina Gomez.

The interpreters today are Marina and Veronica for Spanish.

Staff we have Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Mario Aleman. I will also be managing the call.

Let me remind the participants to say their name not only for the transcript, but also for the interpretation. Having said all this, Sergio, you have the floor to start your call.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Mario. Good afternoon and good evening to everyone. I'm Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Today we have to work hard because we have two main topics to discuss. We have to celebrate that our first metrics paper has been translated and will soon be sent to the region for discussion and consideration. So, this is something we should commend ourselves on for the hard work we've been engaged in.

The two issues we will be discussing today are, on the one hand, the document sent by Dev on the participation of ALSes and individual

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.

members, we have to do some reading of that document. I think there were some sections that were not included – sorry, there were some paragraphs that were included with all the good intentions from Dev, but I think they should be removed and perhaps add some text for clarity.

Second, the big debate – the main debate – on the board of directors. Let me make note of clarification before we start the meeting proper that I have some technical glitches with my Adobe Connect platform. It goes on and off, so I might be losing some of you. If Silvia can be so kind to follow-up and let me know if there is someone raising their hand and I cannot see it.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I will certainly do that.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: If you agree, let us start with Vanda’s language which was modification of Dev’s work. She also translated it into Spanish. I want to thank her especially because it was very helpful for us. It’s actually two or three paragraphs and she’s done a very good job.

This document, section 3.1 says LACRALO will be composed of ALSes of the Latin American and Caribbean region accredited by the ALAC as the mechanism to promote and [guarantee] the training. And it should say all region and users in the process of ICANN policy development.

In my first reading, I found this aspect of training and I wonder if this is the mission of an ALS to provide training. It is certainly to participate

and to empower. I think that is the main attribute to the main characteristic that any user or organization could have within ICANN, to be able to participate and also to empower. So, training will be a secondary line of action and that is the natural outcome once you've been working in some environment for some time.

So, my suggestion is not to keep that word training and just use participation. So, I'd like now to know your views, if you agree, what do you think? I cannot see the AC platform. If there is any hand raised, please let me know.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Please go on. We have no hands raised. It's just a green checkmark from Vanda showing agreement, as well as Alberto Soto. Alberto Soto has raised his hand.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you, Silvia. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Unfortunately, I had to do many other things and I [inaudible] this document, unfortunately. This is my first reading. The thing is I made a very quick reading. I've seen that [3.3] individuals as interested users could become LACRALO members, and for this purpose, these individuals could set up a specific group to be accredited as an ALS in order to have representation and rights – similar representation and rights together with LACRALO. While this would be again the proposal, well, actually it hasn't yet been decided what the result will be for the

end user [assimilation] proposal [inaudible] that, but apparently we will oppose that. We do not mind about accepting end users expressing their views and being members of working groups, and if I recall properly, we said that while they are in the internal groups, they could vote within the working groups.

But, for the purposes of voting, for instance, for the elections of officials, they should among them one representative. And this representative would be the one whose constant vote on behalf of all end users. I mean, [inaudible] one ALS with all end users goes against participation in the capacity of individual end users. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Alberto. I was following you, but at some point in time, I lost you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: My hand has been raised.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay, please wait for an instant and I will soon give you the floor. I'm answering Alberto. Alberto, you say that individuals can participate. They can be members of the working group, but they cannot be elected. Is that what you're saying?

ALBERTO SOTO:

No, no. What I'm saying is that they should not set up one ALS because if they don't [inaudible], we are losing the concept, the notion, of individual users. They will eventually become one ALS. There may be among end users people who are highly competitive with extensive knowledge and maybe even better than any one of us and we would be restricting the freedom of elections for them.

So, what we have discussed – and I think that is the case in EURALO – if there is any vote for the vote, they must choose, elect one representative among all end users. They come to an agreement and they select one representative and that one representative is the one who casts one vote and that is added this vote to the ALSes vote.

Sorry if I'm repeating myself. The case is, if we force them to set up one ALS, we are saying somehow that end users do not exist.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Okay. Vanda, you have the floor. I'm taking note of everything you're saying so that we will afterwards be able to follow the logic of the discussion after your intervention.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I wrote this based on the discussion we had on the composition and the creation of the individual groups of individual users under a single group as it is the case in Europe, for instance. The most serious option is for groups of individuals to elect someone. This someone must abide by rules of procedure. So, the idea is that they should follow the rules of an ALS as it was the case with EURALO because if we're going to create

rules that are completely separate for them, I guess it would create complexity because they are set up as one ALS.

Likewise, it may be that my Spanish version is not the clearest of versions, but the intention is that the form should be the same, that they should work together. These are independent individuals, but for any vote, they should be set up as one ALS. I wanted to make this clarification why I wrote it this way. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Vanda. I don't know if there is any other hand raised.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Aida.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Aida, you have the floor.

AIDA NOBLIA: Thank you and good morning, good afternoon to everyone. Can you hear me okay? Thank you. I'm also in the group of people who did not understand that one ALS was going to set up. What happens in EURALO, there is one ALS established and one individual user who joins is joining an existing ALS. That is not the case in NARALO where individual users meet and when there is a vote, they agree on what they're going to vote and they appoint a person who at that time will vote for them on their representation. So, that, I did not understand this was going to be

like a [inaudible] ALS, because in order to create an ALS, this ALS should have a common objective and if this ALS, end users, did not create an ALS it's because they didn't have an objective. So, somehow, it's not ... People who are, so to say, [inaudible] but they work hard. It happens. They can be very active for ICANN in general, but they maybe fail to find a place in the already existing ALSes and they want to set up a new one.

So, here, we want to offer possibilities to enable as much participation as possible, even for those people who cannot reach consensus. They should reach consensus when there is a vote, but they are not forced to have a common objective because it would be very hard for them to have it because they are people who come from different places, different origins. There are no affinities among them. So, I believe that forcing them is [undesirable] and also unnecessary.

Now, for the vote, that's different because that's a different case. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Aida. Alberto wants to speak. I don't know if there is anyone else who would like to take the floor. Harold, wait a minute. Alberto, please. I think Harold wants to take the floor. Can we give him the chance to speak?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Alberto. I agree with Aida's remarks because we are actually enabling individual participation to open up diversity. To put them under one ALS removes the criterion of plurality and diversity, which in ICANN can be expressed in many different ways. They may coincide or not. So, we're opening up the participation of individual members because there is a priority in this criterion for diversity. We create an ALS, and in an ALS we force them to follow a certain [position] and that would be taking a step back in this approach of diversity. Thank you. And I apologize. I'm connected only through my phone and I cannot raise my hand.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: No problem, Harold. Thank you for your input. Alberto, if I may, I'd like to give my opinion.

ALBERTO SOTO: Please. Of course.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you. I was thinking on dot three, there was a very singular experience for me. I understand as Vanda did that we were going to set up an ALS. I was of the impression that they were not going to have the same rights. We must provide some organization to them. I don't know how this will work. Let me be clear here. But, if someone wants to join an organization, from the very start, there are rules. And if this person cannot follow the rules of the organization well, he or she should stay at home because there are organized users who are going to ICANN to

discuss that are organized users, and these people cannot even get organized in their own countries. We are assuming that these people cannot get organized among themselves. And in order to have workers – and ICANN has people who are working and getting salaries, they have technical people – that is not what we need. We need people who care for the users rights and issues and discuss topics to get good workers, while ICANN has money to pay workers, staff. We need people, not people who are good workers but people who think on the region, who think for all users of the Latin American and Caribbean, which is very different from what we've seen.

In the past decade, we've seen people who are hard workers and we've heard many people say they are hard workers. But, actually, not many of them have thought about the region. They have always had a very self-centered position and we want people who think collectively, not individually.

So, in my view, I think we should consider, find a way to make these people who do not have deep involvement with organizations to give them some organization to enable their participation, be engaged in the working group meetings, [inaudible] fantastic. They could make a significant contribution. Here, this is a political issue. It is not a question of technical contribution, but political contribution. This is a political discussion. If we do not see representation here, this will be liquified and will disappear. So, let me lead you towards a reflection and think which could be the best [inaudible] for the end users who do not feel comfortable in any organization in Latin America and the Caribbean, and let me say there are over 50 [inaudible] countries. We have nine, ten organizations. And if they do not feel comfortable in any of those

organizations and they want to be involved in LACRALO, what are their rights? What are their obligations? And how are we going to do that?

So, let me urge you to take some initiatives that have already been in practice. We know about North America and EURALO. Let's see how we can apply it here with our Latin and Caribbean vision and let's get to it, let's give to these people the higher chances of participation. But, let's not think about the contribution they can make, which is great, but again the issue here is a political issue.

What we've seen in our region in so long was a political thing, not a question of capacity. Thank you. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Okay. Let's say that today the individual user can work in LACRALO. The user has the right to be heard, but not the right to vote. So, the recommendations made by items and that we have discussed on many occasions and we know RALOs are working on that, is that they should have [voice] and voting rights, so that they can work as individual users who might be in our region.

Let's imagine that we have one individual user per country. We have almost 30. We will have, for example, 30 individual users. One each representing a country. So, they cannot create an ALS because of the way in which our ALSes are created because, as Aida said, they have objectives, they have a mission, they have a vision and so on for one organization.

If we oblige them to become an ALS, we will put aside the concept of individual users and this is not what we want to ... We want the participation of individual users.

Vanda said rules. Well, rules should be very simple. Just as in LACRALO, they can, for example, work within the working groups as any member, but at the time of voting, they must elect one representative and they will have only one vote. That is the only rule they have to follow. But, to participate in LACRALO, there are other rules. They have to raise their hand. They have to provide their opinions, provide rationale for their opinions, etc.

So, the simple and less bureaucratic way of doing this, which provides a better way of creating individual users is that the other situation will be to create an organization with all the rules, but that would be impossible because we have one individual user per country. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Alberto. I am taking down notes of what you said before and I want to ask you. The proposal is individual users should unify at the level of voting rights. They should be come a [inaudible] ALS, for example, and they will have only one vote representing the whole group. If that is your idea, please indicate that with a green tick or please say yes so that I can close this issue. I'm checking if my Adobe Connect is working. Aida, you have the floor.

AIDA NOBLIA:

Yes. I just wanted to [ratify] what Alberto is saying and I would like to add that in order to create an ALS, it is not what we want. In fact, they have to follow certain formalities. They need to have a common objective, and if they do not have a common objective, we are [inaudible] them to [inaudible] because they must have a common goal. And they will not be following the rules of an accredited ALS, so they will be creating an objective, but they will not fulfill that objective because this is just for the sake of creating the ALS.

So, what we want to do is to create a group for people to work. We want to add active participation. And when it comes to voting rights, well, they are almost [inaudible] because as a whole they have ten different – or whatever the amount might be – number of interests and they will have to be represented by only one. So, at the time of voting, they have really very bad conditions or [inaudible] done via ALSes because in that case there is a common objective and there are many votes in favor of that common interest within that ALS.

But, in this case, they will not have the same rights. They will not have the same level of right. I don't know if I'm being clear. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Aida, it's clear. Thank you. Vanda has raised her hand, so Vanda, please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you. What worries me is how these individual users will meet. I mean, how they will cast their vote based on what, how they will elect a

representative – I mean, they should have special roles. If they want to participate, they cannot do it without asking the other users. In the case of the ALSes, the participants usually get organized at an internal level and there is one candidate.

So, how will the individual users, how they will manage that? Are they going to apply for different positions or they will be candidates without consulting with the rest? I mean, that is my concern. That's why I suggested the forum of an ALS or to create an ALS.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Vanda, are you done with your comment?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, I'm done. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. Thank you, Vanda.

HAROLD ARCOS: If I may, I would like to make a comment.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes. Please, bear with me a minute, and then I will give the floor to you after Aida. Aida, please, just a second. Vanda, I'm taking down notes of your comment. So, you don't agree with Alberto and with Aida, as far as I understand, because when we say metrics, we will have an [annex] for

the participation of end users that would be on a separate note. So, if that issue is [inaudible]. Can we take, for example, Alberto's proposal, which is to have individual users participating, as they are participating now, but at the time of voting they should meet. They should gather together and they will have to choose one representative to cast the vote representing the rest of the group.

If that would be contained in the rules of procedures, not in the metrics, but in the rules of procedures, [inaudible], if that is addressed in our rules of procedures because in our case we are just mentioning operating principles. In this case, we say end users can participate and there is one user that will cast a vote representing the other users. If we leave it there, we can move forward into a very important debate in terms of rules of procedures because then we will have to say or specify how they will vote and we will have to create a mechanism.

So, would you agree with Alberto's proposal that we should include these on the rules of procedures? I mean, we should [add these] in order to specify how these members will vote.

Vanda says yes. Okay, if that is the case, we can move forward. I believe this is a good starting point. Aida, please go ahead.

AIDA NOBLIA:

I just wanted to ratify something. When they have to vote, we say that the rules of procedures is one. I mean, the procedure is that they will have to reach consensus in selecting or appointing one representative. That would be the case. That is the case in NARALO, for example.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. Thank you very much, Aida. Harold, you have the floor and then Alberto.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you very much, Sergio. Since you are taking the different items, I would say that I do agree with the participation of individual users within LACRALO, but I believe that there are certain issues in the general concepts that we have interpreted and I believe that at the time of voting we have to take into account the [inaudible] diversity, and we perhaps are asking individuals to provide or to follow one decision, and in that case, we will be losing participation diversity.

The other issue that I want to mention is that there might be a conflict because when we vote in the region, this is taken into account based on countries, not based on individuals. When we say regions, we are referring to countries and the organizations belonging to those countries and participating. This is not considered in terms of users or individual users within these countries.

So, I think that this would change the way and concepts or scores in the voting procedure, because in that case, it might be the case that one country may have different organizations. But, in this case, we are talking about many individual participations, many individual users who would like to participate and who would come from different origins.

So, even though that might be explained in the procedures, that would be an issue that we would need to address because there are different

criteria. So, let's take into account that participation in the region is based on countries and not based on individuals. So, that might bring a conflict because we are providing the individual the same weight as an individual, so we will have an individual user and a country and who will have more weight if, for example, they have to vote or if they represent an individual ALS?

So, this would be a huge issue. We have to address these two questions that are facing us. In NARALO, they have already solved this situation. This has been agreed. So, they have these virtual ALS, but in LACRALO we need to address this because we need to pay attention that we have a huge conflict when it comes to diversity. We have concerns about recognizing our diversity, our regional diversity, so we may have an organization which might be very diverse, but we might have other issues appearing or coming up that should be taken into account because there were [inaudible] very important in our mediation process. So, we have to take into account this macro point of view and [both ways], if you will.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. Thank you, Harold, for your comment. This is a very important issue that you are mentioning. I might say that I have a quick solution, but first of all, I would like to give the floor to Alberto and then to Aida, and then after Alberto in fact I will reply to your comment. I have a quick solution for that, but first I will give the floor to Alberto. Alberto, go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO:

David is here on the call, but I would like to say something, and perhaps David does not agree with this. What I don't like from the mediation process is the time they are taking. If I'm not mistaken, when they spoke about the approval of metrics for LACRALO, in the mediation or in the process, there will not be a score to be taken into account for countries. So, in one case, they are restricting us. So, this process is taking too long and is delaying things. But, if we put aside the country weight or the weight per country, that will not be the issue.

But, if that is the case, if it remains, the rules should be very brief and simple. I mean, only one paragraph devoted to individual users. Not here, but perhaps on the procedures. That would solve the issue. Without the need of having an ALS, they will have the obligation to appoint one representative to cast their vote, either for a vote for candidates, a vote for PDP, a vote for a motion, etc.

So, we have the same principle. We are not restricting any [liberty]. If we cannot have 50 individual users, and if we have 50 individual users, we cannot give them one vote each because we don't have 50 ALSes, so we cannot give the same power to the end user, to the individual user. We are giving them freedom of expression, freedom to participate. We are giving them the freedom to be elected, but at the time of expressing their vote, they should be only one. They should have one representative. We follow the same criteria. For me, it's not an issue.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you, Alberto. I will give my own point of view, and then I will give the floor to Aida. My point of view is this. We have moved forward on

this issue. In fact, we discussed with Dev, he said there was no issue with the issue of weight. I believe that these would contribute to the balance within the region because, otherwise, Argentina with nine organizations would take the lead in the policies of the region. So, changing this issue of the weighing or the balance is not breaking the rules. The idea was to strike a balance between different organizations – organizations coming from Argentina. When we began with this in 2006, there were many Argentinian organizations that were in favor of taking over the region. We have to take this into account because this is not a game. This has a very deep rationale because it means that no country can control the region.

On the other hand, if we have an issue or in terms of vote, we can provide one vote, so they will be represented. They will be represented one vote. So, we will have this vote and they will represent a percentage and they will be able to work.

And when it comes to weighting individual users in terms of nationality, in this case nationality disappears somehow and we take this to this expression and this is the vote of each ALS with more countries.

Aida, go ahead, please.

AIDA NOBLIA:

Irrespective of whether the weighting criteria remains or not, this group of people who would be engaged on an individual basis is actually an exception to the rule. We would be already accepting an exception to the rule. And as such, I think that an additional constraint coming from the fact that they are individuals is that they would not be comprised

within the regions. They are not considered for ... If they country based weighting is to be used, they are not going to be applied for them because there are many countries. [inaudible] outside. And that is a rule.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sorry, Aida. The weight has to do with the value of each country's vote. [inaudible], for instance, has only one ALS, so it's 3.something.

AIDA NOBLIA: I do understand. What I meant was that ALS would be so to say harmed as individual users because it wouldn't be added to the weight of the countries. That would not affect either the distribution – as you say, where do we put it? We do not put it anywhere. It's elsewhere. It's separate.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Let me make a proposal. What we are now discussing is a question of rules of procedure. But, what we have to think about now is how to draft a couple of lines, only that at this moment, because we must submit a document to our region. We are in agreement. Those here, we agree that the user has to be given chances to participate. I believe that we are also in agreement with Alberto's proposal. So, let's take the wording, let's reshape it and say that the end user – the individual user – will have full and relevant participation, which participation for a vote will be cast under an ALS and then we still have to define how to name it. [inaudible] now just for the vote. [inaudible] will come under debate,

[inaudible] extensive debate on the rules of procedure, but let's finish first with this, what the principle states. And the principle is that any person, any individual user, that applies for LACRALO can participate fully in all LACRALO's activities, and when there is a vote, when there are elections, he or she will be ruled by the rules of procedure or LACRALO and we put it up for that debate. If you agree, let's move on. Let's close this because we only have 20 minutes left to discuss the other items, which is the ICANN – sorry, the LACRALO board, which is very important. If you agree, I already see a couple of checks. If Harold agrees and wants to say so, we can move on. Aida, do you agree?

AIDA NOBLIA: Yes.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Harold, do you agree?

HAROLD ARCOS: On my part, if it says that the participation of LACRALO's activity is enabled, yes. And the issue of ALSes, we put it off. But, giving participation to individual users in LACRALO's activities, yes I agree. I don't know if I would say full because full participation means that they would have the same rights as other full members, and as you said, this is something to work out under the rules. So, no full participation. But, yes, participation in LACRALO's activities. It actually meets the criteria. The rest will be put off until the next [inaudible].

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. If you think it's okay as it is, we move onto the next item. Do you agree, Alberto? Please show me a check. Thank you. He was the last one. Let me check something else, to make it clear.

So, first, we will remove the term training and we state empowerment and participation. Then, 3.2 LACRALO will promote the creation of users group in the form of ALSes and accreditation of the ALSes together with ALAC. This is similar to what we did in 2006 and I think it's okay.

3.3, we've just discussed it. We're going to reword it. Vanda, are you taking any notes of what we're saying? Because I've taken some, but you are our star penholder, so if you could actually take notes, it would be fantastic.

Now, moving on to another item, we have to talk about the LACRALO board of directors. I'm not sure if there was a final result here, but I understand almost all members involved in the debate, we agreed that the chair and the secretary of LACRALO would have a term of two years. If you agree with this, show a check, please and we move on to the next item, which is the most complex one – the board of directors.

As I said, two years with no reelection. Alberto has the floor. Please hold on, Alberto. Let me know if Harold agrees with this. Then I will give you the floor.

HAROLD ARCOS: Yes. Sergio, thank you. I agree with that term.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. I think you've said it. I cannot hear very well, but I see all debates focused on the duration of all positions, chairs, secretary, ALAC members, so the proposal is two years without reelection. That's enabling [inaudible] participation. Let me give you the grounds for the—

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: We all agree. Let me be clear here. We all agree with that. There's no need for you to give us any grounds. Of course you have the freedom to do so.

ALBERTO SOTO: No problem. I agree then.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: The second issue was the discussion on the board. This board, I know Aida was very concerned and I sympathized with her because I was also concerned. The board, there will be participation actually. This creation of the institution of the board has a dual command. The first purpose is to give some power to those people who are watching and they are outside the party, and others – and besides I think it would enable concrete coordination and cooperation from the office of the chair and the secretary in management that can be measured and with proposals for LACRALO chairs and secretaries office, and the same applies to members, to ALAC members.

I think here we can have a board with the chair, so the working groups – and there are not very many – it would be great if we had 20 operational working groups, but if we check we will find only two or three. And the official ones are those who are already in the list and they should actually sit at a table to see how the regional policies manage the policies. That was my dream when LACRALO was created, to have a space – a table – where to discuss the region strategy from the user perspective.

So, if we have those people who are leading the working groups, on the one hand are [inaudible] natural elected leaders, that is the chair and the secretary, and if in addition to that we add those who will act as a support of the chairs, secretary and ALAC members whom we've designated as alternate – I don't know if that is the proper name. Well, this group of people all together, someone could say it would be like 14 people. Well, what's the problem? Let's have 14 people meet. We're talking about promoting participation. We're talking about individual users and we get [scared] with 14 people. Well, that's also in the metrics. When we take up the responsibility of leading the working group, we should know that in addition to the working group, they should work under internal metrics because the chair and the secretary have to lead a region.

So, if we are able to put order into that, we can move forward with the work. When I submitted the idea, the first discussion I had with this LACRALO board, I don't know if it was 2012 or 2010 – I discussed it with Fatima in the Cartagena meeting and I asked her to present it because there were some internal waves, and if I were going to present it, that would be a conflict. So, this is the draft project which eventually became

the working proposal of this working group. So, now this is the second working proposal.

My idea is to have a board with the elected officials plus those responsible for leading the working groups. if there are three working groups in the region, well there would be three people. If we have more, the better. There's someone here who should be leading and checking progress, etc. We cannot do that yet because it hasn't been set up.

So, the [inaudible] group, Vanda is asking if the [inaudible] group will be part of this board. Actually, I do not know. I think it should operate in parallel. I don't know if they should be part. I don't know.

HAROLD ARCOS: I'd like to take the floor whenever you allow me to.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hi, everyone. Sergio dropped. His communication was cut off. We are redialing him. Please bear with us. Thank you. I see that Alberto is asking for the floor. Sergio is back.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I don't know where I was cut off. I was just saying ... Vanda, go ahead. You have the floor.

HAROLD ARCOS: Can you hear me? I'd like to be added to the queue.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, of course, Harold, but Vanda is first. If Vanda doesn't speak, I will give the floor to Alberto who is second. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: [inaudible] is separate. The role of [inaudible] is cemented in role. We should not mix them up. It's not part of LACRALO's administration which doesn't mean that if there is anyone in [Meditors] who is the chair or the leader of a working group could be in the LACRALO broad. Sergio, if I'm not wrong, we have one chair and one vice chair, two ALAC members or three ALAC members. Can't we invite the NomCom appointee? And if there are only two ALAC members, we would have seven plus the working group leads. Then, another ALAC member. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, Alberto. It was in the project I sent to you. It's the three ALAC members elected by the users, plus the NomCom one. We've also discussed the alternate for the ALAC members. I don't know if two is necessary or one is enough who would be acting as a replacement if anything happens to the others. This could also be operating as a group or acting as a group vis-à-vis ALAC. Who else? Vanda, you have the floor. Are you there, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I was muted. I wanted to know your opinion because we're going to close the day afterwards, we're going to close the [Amertius] group

proposals. That's why I asked, because it's important to have the view of the governance group for or against. It hasn't been anticipated, but I just wanted to ask.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Vanda. It is clear that mentoring will not be included. On the other hand, I don't know if I missed any comment. Silvia was asking why it is not this group open to members of other bodies. Actually, Silvia, something that has given some, I don't know, [rash] about this board – the question by Carlton I remember, and also the question by Dev was how many people would be on this board? I think, for them, this creates red tape and it opens up to order to rule in the LACRALO system and [inaudible] having ALAC members that do whatever they want because they're hard workers. That certainly, the ALAC members should follow a strategy established by the region on certain topics, which could be infrastructure, DNS, DNSSEC, whatever. But, we will certainly, based on that we will start checking on the user participation policy from a different angle because it will be organized. There will be nobody acting as a maverick because they should follow an organized policy. I think that is an enhancement.

Aida, you have the floor. Let me remind you that we are on the hour and we need some time.

AIDA NOBLIA: Well, I was of the same impression that I thought there were too many people, perhaps too many, and now even more with all those from the working groups. So, the only ones who are not here are the members of

the working groups. Again, I think it's perhaps too much, but if the majority believes otherwise...

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: No, Aida, this has to be restricted to those persons with responsibility roles.

AIDA NOBLIA: Well, responsibility is a very vague concept because the working group leads have responsibilities.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: If there is anyone who has to organize and check that the working groups are working, it's chair and secretary and they are taking operational matters. That's the working group chairs.

AIDA NOBLIA: Yes, but they were not included in what we were discussing.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, because this is what we call the directors – I mean, the board is composed by the official ones ... I mean, we have three chairs right now, or two chairs from the working group. That's all. It doesn't mean we will take a lot of people. But, they are also giving others the opportunity to participate. For example, the secretary and the chair may also be participating in other groups, but in fact there are only two groups. The chair of the working group should be there.

Second point. I would like to ask ... Silvia is asking what will happen with the individual membership document. We will have two minutes to discuss this. There will be a new wording for this individual membership. I will be drafting this document for tomorrow, but I'd rather doing it right now so I can send that information. I will have a very brief wording, change in the wording, and I will add the last comments that will be taken into account in the rules of procedures. So, we will mention the representation of individual users and then we will discuss how we will manage or address that point.

Then, I will circulate that. Let's start by the leadership document. Let's create another item. If there is someone who would like to add something, please feel free. I would like Alberto, [Aida], and myself to gather together tomorrow or the day after tomorrow just very briefly, 15 or 20 minutes, so that we can discuss how it will get organized so that we can start working on this topic. If you agree, this will be done outside the structure that we have in ICANN, but we can have a meeting in Skype or What'sApp, no more than 30 minutes so that we can get organized. If you agree, that would be the next steps.

So, I will now draft these final wording or that is the idea. I will circulate that to the working groups. Silvia will create a discussion item on the Wiki page for comments. In the meantime, we can develop the final task so that we can comply with the metrics we agreed last week.

If you agree – and I see many green ticks. So, I would finish with that. Tomorrow, I will call you. I believe I will create a What'sApp chat group so that we can get organized and that's all. So, having met the agreed time, we finish this meeting now.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Sergio, if I may, I have two questions. When is the next call? That would be on February the 15th, correct? That would be 23:00 UTC. Okay. Number two, I have a doubt in terms of the metrics document that we have been translating and that is already posted on this working group Wiki page. We have it in English and in Spanish that is already posted, so you can read that information. What is the next step in terms of metrics?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Alberto last week provided a list of future steps or next steps so that people can see those steps. I think that we should open this to the community. So, this is our proposal in terms of metrics. So, we have to open these topics to the community and we should organize a webinar. Those were the next steps. Then, see if we can approve that or not in the region.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. I have another question. The document would be presented in the LACRALO monthly meeting and that would be in the February monthly meeting and this is on the 19th. But, from now to the LACRALO monthly meeting, there are 15 days, so we will have 15 days for public comment. So, it is not enough time. I see Alberto is asking for the floor, so perhaps we can send the document to the list and we can also send a message to the list. Alberto, go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: I would suggest that in today's [inaudible] and we only have ten days ahead – I think we should publish this right now. We should open this to the community, to the region.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, Silvia. I agree. I think that we should put that on the agenda for the LACRALO monthly meeting on the 19th, so that we can have some time to explain this document and if there are questions or doubts, we can take some comments. Then, after 15 days, we should submit this document for voting and that's all.

Alberto, I see your hand up and Silvia as well. Would you like to proceed?

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry, that was for my previous intervention, but I agree. The document will be posted for public comment for 15 days and then we will have the LACRALO meeting to clarify things.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, that's noted. And I will send a message to the Governance Working Group about the document that will be presented to the community by e-mail and then it will be included in the LACRALO monthly meeting agenda.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Silvia, thank you. I have a problem and I would like to talk to you, but I have no Skype. Can I use the What'sApp chat?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Sergio, of course.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Let's meet next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]