
HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I would like to greet you all and we will start with this call right now, so I hope you are okay. Without further ado, I would like to start this monthly call. This is our last meeting before the Puerto Rico meeting, so we have a special agenda for today, because of the topics are related to the mediation of process and that we would address in Puerto Rico.

Now, Mario, I would like to give you the floor for you to start the call.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you very much, Humberto. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. I will be managing this call today. Welcome to the LACRALO monthly call on Monday, February 19th, at 23:00 UTC.

On the Spanish channel, we have Humberto Carrasco, Maritza Aguero, Sergio Salinas Porto, Harold Arcos, Carlos Gutierrez, Ricardo Holmquist, Leon Sanchez, and Alberto Soto.

On the English channel, we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond and Barlett Morgan.

We have no participants on the Portuguese channel, nor on the French channel.

We have no apologies for today.

From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber; and myself, Mario Aleman. As I said before, I will be managing the call.

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.

Our interpreters today are, on the Spanish channel, Veronica and Claudia. And in French, we have Camilla and Isabelle. In Portuguese, we have Bettina and Esperanza.

So, I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking not only for the transcriptions, but also for the interpreters.

I would like to remind you that we have real-time captioning, so perhaps this will take more bandwidth and we will need to take some minutes to adjust this to the Adobe Connect. So, we will wait for some minutes so that our colleagues from the RTT team are able to modify the pod so that we can begin with the call. We will begin shortly.

Humberto, Maritza, we will need to wait for the real-time transcription service to be active, and then we can start with the call. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Mario. I would like to ask Maritza to proceed with the agenda, with the approval of the agenda for today's call. So, Maritza, if you could be so kind so as to start with the agenda, please. Go ahead.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you, Humberto. As Humberto said before, the idea of today's agenda is to deal with very important topics for the community. So, we will begin with the ALAC public consultations. Barlett Morgan will be presenting this item on the agenda. Then, we will have an update on ICANN board current issues. In this case, this topic will be delivered by Leon Sanchez, who is a board member. Then, we will be talking about

the CROP program. As you know, there is a mailing list, so we will have the participation, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. We would like to thank him for his patience and we know that there is a time difference, so thank you very much for participating, Oliver, in this call.

Then, we will have the participation of David [Plumb]. He belongs to the mediation team. And we will discuss these topics because, as you know, we have been working on this issue. We have been working on different working group, so we will talk about the mediation, the phase two of this mediation process, and then we will have some update on the Governance Working Group. In this case, we will have the participation of Sergio Salinas Porto. Then we will have an update on the NomCom. [Jose Ovidio] will be in charge of this presentation. Then, we will deal with any other business in the agenda. So, this is the agenda for today. Thank you very much.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much, Maritza. So, we will adopt the agenda for today and we will start with the first item on the agenda and this is a summary of the public consultations for today. So, Bartlett, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

BARTLETT MORGAN:

Okay, great. Thank you. Hi, everybody. My job today is to see how quickly I can bore everyone to death within the space of 15 minutes. But, seriously, on a more serious note, I'm trying to give everyone today in a brief period of time, maybe 15 minutes or so, just a general feel for the work that the ALAC is doing right now, and certainly has been

engaged in in the last few months and will likely be engaged with in the coming months.

Now, in respect of all the different matters that we've been working on, I think the rational way to approach it is starting to put it into, more or less, four main categories. The first of which is really those statements that have been approved by the ALAC, the statements which are in the process of being drafted or commented on or been voted on. Those statements that have been stalled for whatever reason. And finally, the statements where public comments are likely to be requested soon. Actually, there is a fifth category, which is upcoming public comment requests.

Now, in real terms, to my mind, given the short period of time, I think importance would be placed on those statements which are in process. That is to say statements in which a response on behalf of the ALAC has been drafted, where we're commenting on some particular issue or where a vote is being taken. To my mind, those are perhaps the most important in the sense that if you start to think about what we're doing here in LACRALO or even in At-Large in general, it's really to sort of jump into the policy process and to help to move the policy process along. So, to my mind, those are issues that are live issues that are needed right now, those which we should give primacy to.

Now, in that regard, there are two key things that I'd like to mention. The first is the ICANN draft financial year 2019 operating plan and budget. Based on the overall flow of today's agenda, I won't be saying too much on this, given Olivier's item. Suffice to say that what's really important the budget or what jumps out at most of us is not so much

what's in it, but what isn't in it. Suffice to say I think perhaps more than any other time, this is an important time for those of us in LACRALO just to pay attention to the budget for the simple reason it appears that CROP has been taken out of the picture. It's been flushed from the budget. And given that many of us here at LACRALO have a stated interest in outreach and engagement, it's certainly the kind of thing that I think we'd want to pay attention to. If we haven't already jumped into that debate on the mailing list, I think now would be a very opportune time to do so. So, I'll leave that there for the moment.

The other issue, which is sort of live right now, is the plan to restart the root key signing key, KSK for short, rollover process. Now, most of you will recall that maybe last year the whole thing was [inaudible] and then at the eleventh hour the plug was pulled on that one, and in short the reason was more or less that persons or relevant publics or key parties weren't aware enough and weren't prepared enough. So, they had pulled the plug on that one, so they're now setting that process in motion again, and now public comments are being sought on that process and the approach to it. Again, if that's the kind of thing that you're interested in, you have a greater interest in the technical side of things, and certainly that's the kind of thing that you should perhaps seek out and try to get involved with in terms of, perhaps, helping to craft our response on behalf of the ALAC.

Now, having gone through those two major ones ... Now, there is something else that is technically ... I guess you could consider it open for public comment in a technical sense, which is most of you would be aware of work stream 2 and the various subgroups within work stream

2. One of those subgroups is the group dealing with the issue of diversity.

Now, they had some time ago put together a paper and one of [inaudible]. I wouldn't quite call it a [sign], but certainly one of the observations of the paper was that there was no clear consensus on the question of whether or not an office of diversity, as it were, should be created.

Now, the ALAC has [inaudible] on that paper and the mailing list was [inaudible] recently in the past week and a half with comments on that issue. I don't wish to insert my own view, but it would appear that the consensus view of the ALAC so far is that we are all in favor of diversity in a broad sense, but certainly not necessarily in favor of an entire office being created to support that. That really is my broad paraphrasing of the tenor and tone of the debate so far.

So, those are the three lives ones, which are the three major ones. You'll be glad to know since the last time I gave this update – I think the last time I gave this update was in late November, and at that time not very many statements had been approved by the ALAC at that point. But, the tables have turned, as it were, in the space of just a few months. I'm quite pleased to relate to you that in the region of six or so comments have been approved by the ALAC. They have been voted on and they have been approved by the ALAC.

Just very briefly, those have to do with the proposed incremental changes to the ICANN meeting strategy. In brief, the essence of the ALAC's position is that we agree that no changes should be made

regarding the community forum, but we will recommend at least five days for outreach at the [inaudible] forum and six days, plus an additional wrap-up day for the AGM.

The other policy issue was recommendations to improve ICANN's office of the ombudsman. I don't mean to kill the joy of listening to me speak about all of these, so what I'll do is share a link to the detailed agenda in the chat. What you'll realize is that basically they've all been outlined there already, but suffice to say, in addition to the recommendations to improve ICANN's office of the ombudsman, there's also the recommendations on ICANN's jurisdiction. In that case, the ALAC fully supports the subgroup's proposals articulating the need for a path forward for jurisdiction concerns beyond the cross-community working groups, developing another multi-stakeholder process to resolve these concerns.

There is also recommendations to improve ICANN staff accountability, and in similar [inaudible] the ALAC has also endorsed the cross-community working group recommendations in that regard, and they've noted that suggestions to the [inaudible] contentious staff accountability issues are well-developed.

Most of you will recall the ongoing work of the competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice review team (CCRIT). So, new sections of input into their draft report of [inaudible] recommendations, I don't know if there is much value in going to the [inaudible] [CCRIT] at this time. But, suffice to say, we've provided broad support from the ALAC to recommendations A, B, C, and D and recommendation 5 related to DNS abuse.

Finally, enhancing accountability. Recommendation 5, diversity, which is what I would've mentioned earlier, but in a limited sense. More broadly, the ALAC supports the recommendations for enhancing diversity as a whole, while emphasizing the need for language diversity and captioning and real-time transcription, RTT services, which in theory should have been working and in fact it is working in this call because I'm looking at it right now as I speak.

So, those are the key ones that we have approved. In terms of statements that seem to be starred, there are none.

Now, in terms of public comment request at which the ALAC decided not to submit statements, those have to do with the proposal for Korean root zone label generation rules, the operating standards for ICANN specific reviews, and also maximal [inaudible] version 3, MSR 3, for root zone label generation rules. Now, that is a mouthful if I ever heard one.

I don't wish to project anybody of his views, but save my own, and I would say the reason why we would have opted not to provide opinions on those matters I just listed because the primary technical nature of them, not in and of itself, but because it's hard to see in a broad sense how those particular issues impact end users in general. So, in that sense, there would have been little value in us pursuing comments on those and adding our name to the response.

We do need to make a decision soon on public comment, whether or not we're going to make a public comment and that has to do with the draft procedure for community gTLD change requests.

Now, in addition to that, there's going to be some more upcoming public comments later in February and in March. Now, in February the ones coming up are the process for changes to [inaudible] top-level domain, registration policies, the dot-asia registry renewal agreement, the dot-coop registry renewal, proposal for [inaudible] script root zone label generation rules. Similar proposal.

There's also the consumer, the CCRT Review Team final report, which is different from what we discussed earlier. We discussed earlier the new addition to the report, but the final report seems to be on stream for later in this month. Also, international governmental organizations or IGOs. The Red Cross reconvened working group. Their recommendations are going to be up for comments as well. That's in February alone. In March as well we have some more coming up in the pipeline. Those are the guidelines for second-level strings similarity review processes, enhancing accountability recommendations, the proposal for updated supported traveler guidelines, and implementation of privacy and proxy services accreditation program.

That's the essence of what the ALAC has been working on and is likely to be working on in the coming weeks and months. I really just want to end with one key thing, and that's just to implore you. If there is any matter that's been mentioned, any policy issue that's on the review, if you're interested, please jump in. There is no thought of an easy way or another way to say it except to say jump in. Jump in doesn't necessarily mean you're going to be a pen holder, if that's not your thing. But, just try to become engaged with any one of these issues that appear to be of interest of you. Certainly, I wouldn't wish to force my own personal views on you, but I suspect that for many of us issues to do with CROP

are critically important at this time, and so if the opportunity exists I think we should absolutely jump on it to try to make our voices heard.

That's it for right now. Thank you very much for your time.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Bartlett. Your presentation has been really very interesting and it was properly explained. I think Alan is asking for the floor. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a couple of quick comments. On one thing, I'll disagree with Bartlett. I think things like the Korean root zone label generation rules are of great interest to users, but they're a great interest to Korean-speaking users. It is a very technical issue as he pointed out and we do have people working in that general area. But, it's not clear that a comment coming from At-Large as a whole, of which a very tiny percentage are Korean speakers, has any real credibility, nor I think is it reasonable to ask the rest of At-Large to make statements about things that they know absolutely nothing about.

So, it's one of those areas that we encourage people who have a particular interest to make their own comments, either individuals, ALSes, or RALOs. But, it's not necessarily something the ALAC itself will comment on.

The second point I have to make is on the budget. Although CROP is obviously of great interest right now, the overall budget document has a lot in it. They're making a lot of decisions on our behalf. I think it really is

important that we not just focus on the one issue like CROP but look at the overall budget and try to understand what they're doing and the motivations and comment on it.

The last thing is one that is not on this list, because it sort of rolled off the bottom. It is one that we didn't comment on and it had a relatively obscure name of privacy, related to privacy. It was related directly to the actions that ICANN is taking with regard to European privacy legislation, which of course is not that different in many cases from privacy legislation in other countries, including Latin American ones in some cases. ALAC did not make a statement on that, not because we didn't have views, but in fact because we had a multitude of views, some of which clashed with each other. And it's these kinds of issues where it's really important that everyone get involved, so that we do understand when there's disagreement within At-Large that we do try to understand how people, what is the common threads in people's positions and where do we disagree, and is there any way to summarize that disagreement. We ran out of time on that one, so we didn't end up doing anything. But, it's something that as these things come up and privacy on WHOIS is going to continue coming up in the next few months that we do try to focus on. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much, Alan. I want to apologize to Alejandro because Alejandro was the first and I made an alteration in the order that it wasn't voluntarily. Alejandro Pisanty, you have the floor.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you very much, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Alejandro, we cannot hear you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Humberto, I wrote my question and I agree with Alan in certain respects because I think that the representatives should study the different topics and then let the community know about that.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alejandro. I will read the question by Alejandro Pisanty. What part of all this information is being subjected to the LACRALO community? In which order and what are the deadlines to give some recommendations? This is the question. Bartlett, you have the floor now to answer Alejandro.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Thanks, Alejandro, for the question. Here's the thing. LACRALO, as a RALO, is part and parcel of the greater At-Large community. The thing is all the particular policy issues that are [inaudible] are sort of open to all persons regards to RALO that they're a part of. I think, by default, once you join a RALO, [inaudible], you get placed on the ALAC list. So, all persons would be aware of the conversations and the debates around these types of issues. That's one thing.

But, in a more concrete sense, there is a Wiki space where all the policy issues which we're commenting or may comment on that [inaudible] and so on, so that all persons can go to review them and have a sense of what the issues are.

So, instead of saying, "Which ones are being submitted to LACRALO?" There is no formal process, per se, for submitting it. I think the presumption is that process within LACRALO are active and engaged and wish to be engaged on these issues, and so they [inaudible] to the general list and to the information wherever it's available and the same with everyone else [inaudible].

Oh, in addition, in terms of deadlines, there's a link I'm going to share with everyone right now, which actually gives you all the different LAC policy issues, as it were, and it gives you all this type of information on there. So, perhaps, it might be a good idea in the future just to bookmark that link and to check it in future routinely. It'll give you an idea of the deadlines, the timelines, by which the comments are actually made [inaudible]. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Bartlett. I think, Carlton, you have the floor.

MARITZA AGUERO: Humberto, Carlton was asking a question about the transmission, but we have already answered that. As a matter of fact, Mario did. But, Alberto is asking for the floor now.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: So, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: I would like to give an answer to Alejandro, a short one. In a meeting some dates ago between ALAC members and LACRALO leadership we discussed one topic. I propose that ALAC members, apart from their own issues and concerns, apart from LACRALO leadership [inaudible], we have to consider any topic before the public comment period.

So, if we see that the list of topic, there is an issue that would be important, that would be material, that would be significant for LACRALO to provide a statement, we have to engage immediately because, let's be honest, we sometimes have to resort to a webinar, so that people may be aware of that and give us an input so that we at the ALAC may discuss LACRALO's statement. I think this is something simple and may be implemented shortly. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alberto. I am opening my [inaudible] now because I was driving in my car. Maritza, can you please tell us about the next topic in the agenda? I don't know if there is any question pending answer.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. There is a question by Alejandro Pisanty. I'm going to read it, and then after the answer we'll move to the next topic on the agenda. Alejandro Pisanty is asking to Bartlett [inaudible] does not have any plan to make any direct question before

participating in ALAC. So, I think that we should proceed, as Alberto Soto was saying. So, it's a comment and a question. Bartlett, you have the floor.

BARTLETT MORGAN:

Thank you. [inaudible] make direct consultations. I don't know if that was I was saying. I think I pretty much covered all I want to say on that topic. Because as it was framed to me, and maybe there's some issue with the translation here, but I was referring to me, in my mind, the issue is engagement of persons within, for example, LACRALO.

My view, as it stands right now, and I'm very much open to different views on this and if there is an alternative view, please share it with me. I'm not closed off to different views. But, my view is that persons who are a part of LACRALO in particular, if it is we say we're interested in these issues, then we can't [inaudible] and hope other persons will introduce us to information that's available to us already, in the same way it would be available to that person.

As regards, my role on the ALAC, to my mind, although persons are sent to the ALAC from the RALOs, I don't think [inaudible] their role is necessarily to, as soon as the issue comes up, to go back and say, "Hey, guys, what should my opinion be on this issue?" I don't ... It was never conceptualized that way to me and maybe I'm wrong. If you have a different view, please share it. We have a mailing list. Feel free to follow-up with me on that. It's [inaudible] wish to have [inaudible]. There are a lot of really important issues we need to get to. So, I would

encourage you to continue this conversation on the mailing list. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Bartlett. Unfortunately, we do not have more time to deal with this topic, so if you have any question for Bartlett, I think Bartlett will have no problem receiving it through an e-mail and answering it. Thank you very much for your intervention and thank you very much for your summary on public consultations. Now we move to our next topic in the agenda. If I'm not mistaken – and I'm trying to read my agenda – it's an update on ICANN board current issues. This is in charge of Leon Sanchez, our board member. So, Leon, you have the floor. And thank you for being in this call.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, and thank you for your invitation. I have [inaudible] followed the discussions in the LACRALO mailing list and the ALAC mailing list. I would like to give you an update on some topics, of course.

Perhaps you are aware, perhaps you're not, that there was a meeting of the board in LA recently. At this meeting, there was a workshop. There were different works performed at the various communities that are part of the board, and we regularly met in plenary sessions. Some resolutions were adopted and I would like to specifically focus myself on two of them.

The first of these resolutions is related to applications for new gTLD with a dot-crop and dot-home and dot-mail extensions. For these applications, they were denied because the SSAC's ability to [inaudible]. ICANN issued a recommendation to the board talking about different concerns about any possible collision after the delegation of these descriptions of domain names that may have certain consequences. Of course, the collision may have certain consequences regarding the stability and safety of domain names. So, the resolution by ICANN's board was to give instructions to the CEO of ICANN Org, so as to give notice to the applicants to be delegated these domain names that they had been denied.

And since this was an unforeseen situation with the new gTLD round was launched, they would be fully reimbursed the application fee. Again, [inaudible] impact for ICANN is significant because we are talking about 20 applicants, 20 companies, that applied for the delegation of this domain name, and as \$185,000 per applicant. So, we are talking about \$3.7 million to be reimbursed to these applicants.

You know that the [inaudible] of gTLD are in reserve funds, so this did not have any impact on the operating budget of the organization, nor any program to the community.

The second resolution adopted by the board, and of course I have to highlight that there were significant contributions made by LACRALO members that are included in this resolution of the board. So, I gave an informal contribution, and of course I would like to thank Alejandro Pisanty for his guidance so as to make a better decision.

Now talking about the reserve fun. There was a request for comments about the desirable level for that reserve fund for the operations of ICANN. Once the public comment period concluded, the conclusion was that the desirable level for this reserve funds for the operations of the organization has to reach at least eleven months in agreement with the budget currently approved, of course. The objective of this reserve fund may be increased or may be decreased based on the various budgets that will be subsequently approved in the organization. Let's say if there is an increase in the budget in the future, this reserve fund will be increased accordingly. And if there is any decrease, the reserve fund will also be decreased accordingly or it will be extended for 13 or 14 months. Everything will depend on the budget needs.

I think this is really important, not only because we have a clear objective about how much funds we need for ICANN's operational reserve fund, but as you were discussing minutes ago, there is a public comment period for the approval of the budget for fiscal year 2019. There have been several discussions, several lists, and we have noticed that certain items may have an impact on community programs, and of course the reserve fund is one of the items that has to be considered because this reserve fund currently is not reaching the desired level and still we have to build [inaudible]. We have discussed the possibility of [inaudible] and day-to-day IANA transition from the option proceeds for the new gTLDs, and to decrease the current expenses of the organization so that the surplus of each fiscal year may be added to the reserve fund so as to reach that desired level.

I think that the [inaudible] solutions are the most important and they were adopted at the board meeting in LA, and I would like to speak

about what we will see in problem. The meeting is quite closed. It will be held in San Juan in Puerto Rico, and the board of course will have a workshop, as usual. The committees meet. There are certain topics discussed about training and there will be different sessions. Some of them will be closed, some others will be open sessions, and the board will meet with ALAC on Tuesday, March 13th, at 9:45 AM for one hour. I guess that you should have received a notice asking for questions that you may like to pose from ALAC to the board.

We tried to give priority to the topics based on the time available, but of course if we may get close to the board, we may discuss some other topics as well.

So, this will be a summary update of what the board has been doing recently, and of course if you have any questions, I am here to answer. Thank you very much for the time.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Leon, for your update. I see two participants, so Alejandro Pisanty and Alejandro Aguirre. So, Alejandro, go ahead please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you very much, Humberto. Can you hear me okay? Can you hear me okay?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Leon, thank you very much for this report. I would like to speak about dot-com, for example, because these are very important names that we need to take into account and there are some lessons that need to be learned from these TLDs because these TLDs should be included very early in the process. This was a very expensive process and we need to have a collision to [inaudible] working group and they had to work very hard on this aspect. We still have some negotiations pending because the parts are trying to get benefits from that, and LACRALO should support these wonderful decisions by the board and it should be taken into account in the next TLD round.

Secondly, keeping the ICANN reserve fund is an issue that is of great importance for all the registrants, and of course it is open for them for Internet users. If there is cooperation with interest in damaging ICANN, might litigate against ICANN, and ICANN will not have a reserve fund so that might create a very important issue. This might, of course, cause damage to ICANN. So, we have background, we have present on this, and of course this is something that we need to take into account. We need to be aware of this and we need to readjust some current expense programs and we need to take responsibility by end users by supporting these programs because this is in favor of the stability and of course we need to take into account programs for the benefit of users. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much. Before giving the floor back to Leon, I would like to say that, yes, we will provide a motion for our support, to show our

support to the board. This is something that Alejandro is proposing. So, we have a period of seven days for comments and if there is consensus, then we will provide this motion in support of the board decision. So, now Leon, I would like to give you the floor. Thank You.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Humberto. I fully agree with Alejandro and with what we said before, if we see this in general terms, of course we know that we need to have a strong ICANN Org not only from the technical point of view but also from the financial perspective, so that's why it is important to have a reserve fund available covering at least these baseline that needs to be created. And of course we need to have a reserve funds exceeding these baselines just in case we can suffer situations mentioned by Alejandro because these are real threats, and if we do not understand that ICANN is not a strong organization and if ICANN cannot face certain issues on a certain financial situation, well, we cannot do anything about it because if ICANN is not financially strong, then we will not be able to express our voices. So, thank you very much.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Carlos Aguirre, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Thank you very much, Humberto. Can you hear me okay?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, go ahead, please.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you very much. Okay. I'm going to ask a question for us because perhaps you can shed some light on this. I would like to know about the risks being analyzed to reject these extensions of the domain names on one hand, and on the other hand, and if I am not mistaken, if I understood correctly, you said this issue was not foreseen in the Applicant Guidebook when these extensions were applied for. So, that is my first question.

My second question, if the answer is these things were not taken into account, perhaps you can tell me about this. I have a very different point of view. I believe that it is not only necessary to reimburse the \$185,000 which is the cost of the application, but this is something that we need to take into account because the money spent was really much more than the \$185,000. So, if this is not covered by the Applicant Guidebook, I believe they have the right to [inaudible] for more.

I mean, I'm not wearing my hat of a lawyer, but of course I believe that we need to take into account these points. If this is not covered by the Applicant Guidebook, well, this should be taken into account. I don't know if you understand my question, Leon. If this is not covered by the Applicant Guidebook and if the applicant was able to apply for that, I don't think it would be enough to reimburse the applicant the money because there is a possibility that they will demand for more money and they have the right to do so. What is your point of view about this, Leon?

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

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you, Carlos, for your question. When it comes to the criteria taken into account to determine the dismissal of this application, well, there are certain points to be taken into account. I'm going to share with you the link where you will see the board resolution. There, you will see the different documents that were taken into account.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I can hear you, but with an echo.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. I can hear an echo as well. Let's try to continue with our conversation. So, there are some documents—

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Leon, sorry for interrupting you.

MARIO ALEMAN: Sorry for interrupting you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I would like to interrupt the call for a minute because there is an echo on the call, so that we can solve this echo issue. Sorry for that.

MARIO ALEMAN: This is just a reminder for participants to please mute their phones or speakers. Thank you. Leon, are you on the AC only?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, I only have one audio channel.

MARIO ALEMAN: Leon, the echo seems to be coming from your line, so could you please reconnect?

LEON SANCHEZ: Let me try to change to the Adobe Connect room and let's see if this issue can be solved. Can you hear me better?

MARIO ALEMAN: No, we still have the issue of the echo.

LEON SANCHEZ: is it better? So, as I was saying before, I have already posted the link of all the documents the board took into account to take this decision. The thing is there are real serious issues for collision because these are labels that are being used at the private level, and of course this might imply collision, and of course this might also imply a risk for the DNS

stability. So, these are technical reasons. These are fully technical reasons. These are the reasons taken into account.

And when it comes to my opinion as to the reimbursement, well, I will abstain from giving you an opinion, because in this case, if there is a litigation, I might be put in the organization at risk, so I will just limit my thought to communicating the resolution as it was issued. I hope you can understand that.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Leon, for your answers. I see Alejandro Pisanty with his hand up, but for the sake of time and because we still have other presentations, I would like to continue with this discussion on the Wiki page. So, now I would like to move to the other item on the agenda because I see that Olivier Crepin-LeBlond is in the UK, so for him it's quite late at night. So, I would like to give the floor to Olivier for him to speak about the CROP program and the ICANN [Watch]. So, Olivier, thank you very much for your participation on this call and you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I'd like to first thank you for inviting me to speak briefly about the Community Regional Outreach Program, which is a program that has been around for quite some time. It started in I think it was fiscal year 2015 or so. No, even before, 2014, as a pilot program. It used to have two Ps, Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program.

The program itself, just to give you a quick summary of what it used to do, and what it still does, actually, it provides for trip allocation for fiscal year '18. It's four days and three nights maximum within the same region of the person who is traveling. So, it's five individual regional trips allocated to each one of the RALOs. So, LACRALO has got five slots that it could allocate for either five different events or more than one person traveling to the same event. It's a maximum of four days and three nights.

As I said, this is something which has gone on for a while for a number of years. It was a pilot program to start with because they weren't quite sure if there was much – how do you call it? Some kind of return on investment as one would say. In other words, you sent someone to perform outreach somewhere and then you try and find out if this has had a positive response, if this has resulted in any new At-Large Structures joining or any new members or any other types of metrics that you could look at for involvement in the region, such as the outreach, the general knowledge about the RALO being better in the region, etc. The various different ways to find out.

One of the ways that the CROP trips were evaluated was that the traveler, the person who was being sponsored to go over to that event would then have to write a report and that report would then be linked over to the website, on the Wiki, of the CROP procedures.

At the end of the year, the program managers of CROP would be looking at this. We're talking here about staff and the people in charge of the budget would be looking at those reports and producing an overall report finding out if this has really helped the overall strategy that

ICANN has in spreading its wings and telling the world about what it does and getting more people to join.

Now, it appears that in fiscal year '17, this was deemed that finally things were settled and the program didn't need to be a pilot program anymore and it was going to be turned into a program that was now a general program that would be part of the core budget and that would therefore not necessitate any reevaluation or strong reevaluation every year. So, it lost one P and it ended up being CROP with one P, as in Community Regional Outreach Program for this year, fiscal year '18.

The different RALOs, again, have made use of this program this year to send people. Each RALO has got full control, really, over which direction or what they wish to do with their slots. There are a number of actors, if you want, in the CROP system. First, you have the CROP – what do you call it? The CROP staff, if you want, who oversee the whole program. In the At-Large community, we have a working group called the CROP Review Team (CROP RT) which was established by the ALAC to review and approve the RALO requests for CROP according to a certain set of objectives, and also confirm that the requests which are made by the people applying for the CROP would respect a certain set of restrictions – restrictions as in the maximum number of days for the traveler to be there. Also, the minimum number of days until the travel was due to take place. There's a minimum of six weeks required prior to the proposed travel date for the request to be made. If you take less than six weeks, then it's very difficult to arrange visas. It's difficult to arrange hotels. It's often very hard to arrange flights in time. So, there are a number of small things that have to be checked.

And certainly when it comes down to the aims of each one of the trips, that the drafting of the request needs to be approved a little bit. So, each one of the RALOs has appointed two people to the CROP Review Team. One who has come through the Finance and Budget Subcommittee because the CROP is closely aligned with finance, obviously. It is financing of people, funding of people, to go to places. And ICANN has got ... As you know, the At-Large Finance and Budget Subcommittee not only deals with the finance side of things, but also deals with the review of the ICANN strategic plans. And obviously ICANN doesn't only have a strategic plan about its development, but it also has the significant strategic plan with regards to its outreach. So, there's this request to be able to be aware of the ICANN strategic plan and the outreach strategic plan for a request to be made under CROP.

The second person in the CROP Review Team for each RALO comes from the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee, which is another At-Large subcommittee that is really there to try and coordinate the outreach across all of the RALOs, so that we're not just running in all directions, but sometimes we can share in good practice about outreach, etc., in coordination. Especially in cases such as representation at the Internet Governance Forum where there was a need for all of the RALOs to coordinate, and we actually indeed have people from all of the different RALOs, the more recent one being in Geneva.

So, why am I telling you all this? I'm telling you all this because so far this appears to have worked. Maybe I wouldn't say in a perfect way. There's always improvement that can take place, but the RALOs have managed to make use of the current program. In some cases, there

have been some requests made under a separate program called the additional budget requests. Let's call it ABR, additional budget request, in English. This additional budget request—

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a horrible echo on the Spanish side. They need to fix that because no one can understand what you're saying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry about this.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not your fault, but they need to fix it. if you listen, you can hear it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, now they've stopped talking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, they're stopping talking because ... This was Alan Greenberg telling me there was an echo on the Spanish line. Is there an echo on the Spanish line?

ALAN GREENBERG: It seems to be fixed now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I've been told that it seems to be fixed, so I'll continue then. Effectively, I'm telling you all of this because there are also additional budget requests that the ALAC has been asking over the years for specific projects that we have had and some of the additional budget requests have been to do with putting together workshops at the Internet governance forum. So, in some cases, At-Large travelers have been funded to go to the Internet governance forum with thanks to additional budget requests. In some cases, for other events – and there are a lot of regional events that take place – we have filed requests for additional budget requests and we have been told, no, this actually works well as a CROP request because what you are asking for is for travel within your own region to a regional event. So, that would work as a CROP request.

This year, however, we have found out from the latest budget – and this has been alluded to earlier by Bartlett Morgan and also touched upon by Alan Greenberg – that the CROP, along with a number of other things, a number of other points, if you want, and programs to perform outreach. The CROP has been basically deleted from this year. So, it's been removed. It's no longer supported for this year. This year being the

year that starts on the first of July 2018 and that will run until the end of June 2019.

The announcement was made rather late, which means that when the RALOs have put together their additional budget requests, they have not taken this into account. I was thinking, well, we will be making regional requests through the CROP. And so we're in this position at the moment where we, as in our community, is in this position where we've got no additional budget requests filed for regional events. Perhaps, it looks as though there could be an increase in the RALO funding or direct RALO funding, but we're not quite sure whether this could be used for travel or not, and with the CROP, that will disappear altogether for that year.

CROP is not the only outreach that is being downsized. There is also a downsize in the number of fellows that will be traveling to ICANN meetings and there's also downsizing in the Next Gen program. So, it's a wider concern that I think our community, and certainly the CROP Review Team and the Outreach and Engagement Working Group have, which is that ICANN needing to get a stronger grip on its budget because the income for the new gTLD program hasn't been as great as expected. ICANN is basically taking those programs, which are really core to our own mission in our community and reducing them, and it's a real concern that this seems to be the first thing that seems to be getting reduced, whilst there are many other things that take place at ICANN and many other increases in budgets that have taken place in other departments of ICANN and which appear not to be touched in the same way.

So, I wanted to see ... Only three minutes, but I'll give you back the floor in a second. I just wanted to let you know that there is a statement that is currently being drafted and you really need to take part into drafting this statement. The RALOs are the front line being affected by these budget cuts, perhaps more so than other parts of ICANN and I hope that we can, as RALOs, work together and work together with the ALAC to have a strong statement that gets not only the support of the 15 ALAC members, but also shows the support from all of our At-Large Structures, all of our regions, and all of the people out there who are in touch with the people in the street and in our organizations rather than being at the core of the ICANN ivory tower. It's easy to cut things when you're inside, but we really are the ones that are connected to the outside world. And I see Alan has put his hand up, so perhaps Alan Greenberg would like to add a few more....

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. Just one very quick thing. Everyone always considers the things that support them as important. So, there is going to be a natural inclination to say, yes, this is something that the ALAC or At-Large gets, and therefore they are going to object to it.

To the extent that we can demonstrate that the CROP funding has been useful and has generated good results and the results will vary – it may be outreach, it may be involvement with other groups within your region, but to the extent that we can demonstrate that there has been real benefit for it, we're in a much stronger position than just saying, "Please don't take it away." Thank you.

MARITZA AGUERO: Humberto, Carlton has a question in the chat pod. It's addressed to Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. I think Olivier is answering that question in the chat box. Carlos Gutierrez has raised his hand. So, Carlos, you have the floor. Carlos, you may speak.

CARLOG GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Olivier. I would like to add some consideration to this discussion. How much does budget cuts affect the participation of civil society? I think this is a very important point because if civil society is not engaged and civil society has not [inaudible] of its own to participate in this model, the model will fall apart.

The second question to be considered is there may be some downsizing in some other programs. In the NCUC, in particular, like a mentorship or fellowship, some programs of the like.

So, I think that we should have a [inaudible] and a discussion. The budgetary problem is not about a [inaudible] process. [inaudible] some friction that we have. It will continue affecting us. We cannot accept that there will be [inaudible] comments when the structure itself, the budgetary process itself, is beyond any participation.

So, we're running the risk of going into circles if we do not structure the discussion in a better way.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Carlos. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I agree with you on this. One of the things that I'm concerned about is we are in touch. I've certainly been in touch with the NCUC, [inaudible] a few days ago, who is a member of the NCUC. He was pointing out that he was trying to look for the CROP in the budget and couldn't find it anywhere. In fact, the whole impact on civil society participation of ICANN is terrible because it seems that all of the programs that favor the involvement of end users in civil society, when you look at the overall budget of ICANN that is devoted to involvement of civil society and end users of ICANN, that the percentage cuts – and unfortunately, we haven't managed to do the calculations yet, but I'm sure we can try and find some rough calculations on this.

The percentage cuts for those programs is much higher than the percentage cuts on other programs. This is where there is a real concern I think. I've shared in the ALAC internal mailing list. The concern is we're not seen as being part of the core activities of ICANN. We're being seen as the add-on, the it's nice to have these people being involved. But, really, our main business, our core interest, is not in At-Large, is not in civil society and this is the beginning of the end for ICANN because when you look back in the history and the very reasons for which ICANN was put together, forget all the politics. Forget all of the things that go around and think accusations and go on that ICANN was done for specific political reasons. One of the things of ICANN is it runs in a multi-stakeholder system. It's based on a multi-stakeholder participation.

The moment you start unbalancing the equal multi-stakeholder system, the balanced multi-stakeholder that you have at ICANN, you end up

with a system that is not multi-stakeholder anymore and then we cannot preach the whole thing of saying the Internet should be run in a multi-stakeholder way if we don't actually practice it ourselves.

It really has deep consequences and I think that this is one of the angles that we need to actually show. As I said, there are other departments that spend a lot more money and that might have had some budget capping, but as a percentage of their budget, it's been much less than the reduction that we're seeing in outreach and engagement. Thank you.

MARITZA AGUERO:

Thank you very much, Olivier. We are going to continue with this discussion to the mailing list because we're running out of time. Thank you very much, Olivier. I know you are in the UK.

Now, David Plumb will talk about the mediation. You have the floor, David.

DAVID PLUMB:

Good afternoon, good evening. My name is David Plumb from the Consensus Building Institute. I'm happy to be with you and participate in this call. Some of you have met me. Some of you don't. But, we started with this process one year ago. How to imagine a LACRALO that will work better, a LACRALO that may overcome certain challenges of governance and coexistence.

We met in January 2017. In that meeting, it was called a mediation within LACRALO. Many of you attended the meeting and we tried to

reach a balance and there is views of the region, various [inaudible]. During last year, we saw that certain things happened as a result of that meeting.

INTERPRETER:

I apologize that David's sound is getting choppy.

DAVID PLUMB:

We are going to meet again in March to continue with our job. Maritza and Humberto have asked me to discuss on this call what we are willing to do in the meeting to be held next month. Unfortunately, it will be smaller of what we have done last year because of budget restrictions, but it will still be the same.

Next month, our intention is to take a look at the past 12 months, to take stock, to find out whether we have achieved what we hoped for and then we will devote time to topics related to governance. So, we will take what we have done within the Governance Working Group. What actual things can we take a look at? We talk about operating principles and matters of ruling LACRALO, so as to be prepared to everybody. A new manner of dealing with the governance, because this can certainly be a tough topic within LACRALO.

So, I would like to tell you that this is happening. For those of you who will not attend the Puerto Rico meeting, we're going to meet for two days. I'm certainly available to discuss about the challenges and to [inaudible] this outlook will be with us among ourselves in the council. Through Maritza, Humberto, or Silvia, you can get in touch with me easily and I will certainly talk to you before that meeting, so as to be

sure that we have a good outlook of good prospects and that they represent the diversity within this RALO.

This is it, Maritza. I'll be happy to answer any questions. Next month we will follow-up the process started in 2016 that became a reality in 2017 with January meeting and now we have to reinforce it and to have new governance proposals to reflect this new spirit in LACRALO. This is it, Maritza. Thank you very Much.

MARITZA AGUERO:

Thank you very much, David. Unfortunately, we do not have much time to answer questions, but we're going to update on this topic for the mailing list, as we have done. So, you will receive all the documents. I've seen some questions in the chat pod about phase two of the mediation. It will be held in the next ICANN meeting. Thank you very much, David, for your participation. We will move ahead. Sergio Salinas Porto, you have the floor. Thank you very much.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you very much, Maritza. I will briefly summarize. Hello, can you hear me?

MARITZA AGUERO:

Yes, Sergio. Go ahead, please. Sergio, please, you have the floor. Mario, can you please check if Sergio is on the line?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Can you hear me?

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, Sergio, you have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Can you hear me? Hello, can you hear me? Okay. I will briefly summarize what we're doing at the Governance Working Group at LACRALO. We have ended with the first document that was sent for translation and was submitted to the comments of the region. The comment period closes on March 8th – no, excuse me.

This has been submitted for consideration. Leon has pointed out some issues that we have not taken into account and it has been incorporated into the main document. So, this draft document will define the metrics and how the metrics will be considered within the region may be finalized.

We are about to conclude with the final document for the operating principles. We have discussed this within our working groups in this month, and I think in the face-to-face meetings, those of us who will be in Puerto Rico will continue to discuss on this. And of course it will be submitted for comments for the region so as to be finally approved.

What's interesting here is that in all these months we have been able to move forward regarding consensus and diversity. So, really, we're very hopeful that even though we have had some fights in the past and discussions about which laws should rule us, I think this will give us hope for a better future. So, I will stop my presentation here and if you had

any question, any doubt, or any comments about this document you can see on the screen what we are discussing in the working group. I am happy to answer any of them. Thank you very much.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Sergio. You have been very [inaudible] will continue with discussion in the working group and in the mailing list. And now we'll go to the topic in the agenda that is in charge of Jose Salguiero an update on NomCom. Jose, you have the floor.

JOSE SALGUIERO: Hello, can you hear me?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello, Jose. Go ahead, please. You have the floor.

JOSE SALGUIERO: When it comes to the NomCom update, let me tell you that the nomination period is already opened. This is for the year 2018 and in this year we have three positions for the board. The term will be for three years, so this is a very good opportunity for Latin American participants to participate because one of the positions that is open needs Latin American participation. We have a position for the GNSO and we have two positions for [inaudible] – one for Europe and Latin America. So, these are the positions that are open right now. Ricardo Holmquist was appointed last year and we have two positions for the ccNSO, one for two years and the other is for three years.

I have circulated an e-mail to the mailing list with all the information and the links available where you will be able to find this information and the NomCom webpage, and also the link for the appointment. So, this information is also posted in Twitter and in LinkedIn. And of course I will circulate this e-mail again to the mailing list as a reminder. Any additional information that is required, of course you can ask me.

And I would like to ask you to please circulate this information, this call for volunteers, to your colleagues, to your peers, and to those who you believe might be interested in this position. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you very much for the information, Jose. I am a little bit concerned about the fact that the NomCom has requested for two [inaudible] meetings per year. So, I want to ask you what is the rationale for this request. Thank you.

JOSE SALGUIERO:

Perhaps I am not the proper person to provide this information, but the chair should be the person giving you a formal reply. However, let me tell you that it is not that we will have two additional meetings. The NomCom believed that it could develop its activities in a better way if they had additional face-to-face meetings because last year – and that is at least my experience last year – they have little time to discuss different topics. So, that was the request being made.

However, there is no formal decision on this aspect. This is the information that I can give you right now, and as far as I know. Once

again, I would like to invite you to find further information or if you would like to have a formal reply, I would like to invite you to request that information to the chair of the NomCom. He will surely give you the right reply.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you, Jose.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Jose. Maritza, please go ahead. I'm sorry for interrupting you, but I wanted to say that Carlos wants you to ask the question to the chair. Hello, can you hear me? I can hear background noise. Carlos Aguirre, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: This is a question for my friend, Jose Ovidio. Jose, what can you tell me about the NomCom review? Do you have any news about this? Because I am interested in that process and I think there were many things to improve within the committee. Have you got any information about that?

JOSE OVIDIO SALGUIERO: Well, I know that this is an ongoing process, and as Carlos Aguirre said, there is a possibility of having additional meetings. But, as I said before, that is only a possibility. We are still waiting for the formal answer. So, this is just a way of improving the task of the NomCom.

Now, as far as the process itself is concerned, well I cannot give you further information because this is an internal process in the NomCom and I don't know the details because I am not part of the team working on those details. So, I don't have further information to share with you. However, when the report is available, they will publish the report and there you will get the information.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you. Maritza, you have the floor.

MARITZA AGUERO: I just wanted to check that they have already finished with their comments.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes. I don't see any other questions.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. So, I just want to remind you that there was a new ALS request being sent to the mailing list. So, you would have time to review these up until February the 22nd, so please take this into account. I would like to give the floor to Mario.

[HUMBERTO CARRASCO]: Thank you very much, Maritza. When it comes to these new ALS, we already know the deadline and we want to give you the opportunity to provide feedback. So, that's why we were mentioning this. So, now, I

would like to thank you all for your participation. Maritza, would you like to add something else? Is there anything that you would like to say before closing this call?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you. I would like to ask Mario Aleman to please put the survey on the AC room, so that we can evaluate the RTT service. As you know, this is a real-time transcription service. Mario, please go ahead.

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, Maritza, can you hear me?

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes. Go ahead, please.

MARIO ALEMAN: Sorry, I was on the other line. Thank you very much for your answer to the first question. The first question is RTT feature of the Adobe Connect room is part of the pilot, so please select one choice. Very helpful, helpful, less relevant, not helpful, no vote.

Now, let's go to question number two. Please identify one of these categories that describes who you are. A participant with disabilities or specific needs. Number two, participant from whom English is not the second language, participant who doesn't speak English, participant who has a limited or low bandwidth access, all the above. And number six, none of the above.

Thank you very much. Now let's continue with the question number three. What benefit did you get from accessing the RTT feature? Please choose the valid answer. Greater understanding of the topics, ability to understand the session more effectively, provided the correct spelling of the technical terminology, all the above.

The following question is number four. How accurate was the live RTT service in terms of the participant names, terminology, etc.? Please select one option from one to five, one being not accurate and five extremely accurate.

Question number five reads how useful was the RTT feature for this call? So, on a scale from one to five, one being not useful at all and five being extremely useful.

Thank you very much for your replies. Question number six is where else do you think RTT should be required? Working groups, task forces, ad hoc groups, RALO calls, ALAC calls, CCWG calls, other constituencies, all of the above.

And finally we have the last question. This is question number seven. If you have any final comments, please type that comment on the box that you see below.

Thank you very much for your participation on this survey. Now I would like to give the floor to Humberto or Maritza so that we can finish with these calls.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Mario. Thank you for your participation. Attendance was great. We had 27 participants, so this means that these meetings are really interesting for the ALS members. So, thank you very much for your participation once again.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and see you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]