

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO monthly call on Monday April 16th 2018 at 23:00 UTC. On the call today we have Vanda Scartezini, Carlos Vera, [inaudible], Lito Ibarra, Alfredo Lopez Hernandez, Humberto Carrasco, Javier Chandia, Carlos Aguirre, Harold Arcos, Carlos Gutierrez, Ricardo Holmquist, Alberto Soto, Gilberto Lara, and Javier Rua-Jovet on the Spanish channel. On the English channel, Bartlett Morgan, Dev Anand Teelucksingh and that's all I saw for the... For staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Andrea Glandon, and myself Claudia Ruiz doing the call management. For the interpreters today we have [inaudible], and on the French channel we have [inaudible]. I would like to remind... and we have apologies from... one second... I would like to remind everyone who is speaking to please state your names for the record and for transcription purposes. With that, I turn over to you [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We'll continue with some topics of interest, according to the agenda. That would be all Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you Maritza, so now I'll give the floor to Alberto Soto. Alberto you hold the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: I had asked before this meeting if we could have on screen my presentation. In the meantime, I will tell you what we have agreed with

---

*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.*

---

the ALAC and the LACRALO leadership, in order to have more participation and also for all of them to have better knowledge of the topics that are being discussed within ALAC and ICANN as a whole, for which LACRALO will have to give its opinions. So, we need to anticipate the topics as much as possible, so we are going to inform the LACRALO leadership about this, so if it is necessary we could also organize some training session on a given topic. If that is not possible, at least an update on those topics where LACRALO will have to give its opinion. It seems that I don't have the presentation on our screen, I have it both in Spanish and in English. I think we can see [inaudible] presentation instead of mine. OK. Let me continue, because I don't want to waste anymore of your time. Let's try to look at the statements that have been approved by ALAC, some of them were approved yesterday, we will look at the comments that have been made by the public, during the public comment period. I cannot see my presentation here on screen.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

We can see it now on screen, Alberto. It is now the Webex platform, it was together with the other presentations. Now we can see that on the screen.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Can we stay on this slide please. Here you can see an update of the 5 year plan, there is one additional word that shouldn't be there, but as you can see for all these statements we had added a link. We don't have enough time in this call to go into details for each of these statements, but I suggest that you have a look at the presentation afterwards,

---

because this presentation will be available to you. Please, go into those links and look at the detail for the fiscal year 19, we can highlight that the crop program is no longer available, we hadn't been informed that this was going to be the case. There was a change made from pilot program to a program and it was included within the ICANN budget, but then it disappeared after the first year. ALAC support the budget, that should be a balanced budget. I heard the different arguments for all these changes, but I think that the comments should not said... but this should not be directed to the most vulnerable part of the community. Another important point, has to do with a fellowship program. The ALAC report emphasises the importance of the less stable communities, and we know that there are certain things that we don't like but the candidates that are selected in our countries, so that we can comment on that. We also thought about having the fellowship as part of the active participants that we have provided, that are willing to participate in policy development processes. Another topic that we need to discuss has to do with data protection. I think we are not looking at the right slide now. Can we go back one slide please. We were talking about the ICANN fellowship program, and then the next bullet point refers to data protection. I think that this is a hot topic and we still need to get more involved in this discussion. In particular we have been working to comply with the GDPR, I don't know if you have read the blog by ICANN [inaudible] and you will see that he is not so happy and we aren't either about the meetings that are going to take place, because nothing has been said about the provisional model that ICANN has put forward. Remember that this is closely linked to the WHOIS system and therefore it is a very important topic for us. We have a few comments about that.

---

ALAC agrees on the fact that we should have a tiered approach for this provisional model, so please I insist, look at the details through that link.

Then we have the plan to restart the root key signing key rollover process, this is a subject that is being followed by our region. Procedure for community gTLD to request, ALAC supports the draft procedures that was put forward, subject to three conditions. First, the outreach for the TLD community. The second one, for the public comment period, for the changes and the [inaudible] approval criteria. So you can see, that all these clearly explained in the link that I added. Can we move onto the next slide please. These are the comments that have been published. First, the draft project plan for the proposed name collision analysis project. I think that this is going to involve end users, so if end users want to get to a private domain name and for reason has access to a public domain, that will be important, or will have an impact on trust. Then we also have some comments regarding the ICANN reserve fund, there are funds and these are comments related to ALAC and I apologize because the last [inaudible] is repeated here. Let's move on please. Which are the topics that we need to prepare for the LACRALO, first in terms of GDPR, the new European regulations, we need to be fully aware of what is happening there because this is going to have a bearing on end users. Today is a [inaudible] on the 18th, ALAC will hold a webinar that is scheduled for 21 UTC, and I'm sure that that will be very useful and tomorrow there may be a reminder about that webinar, so I suggest that you participate because that will be a good tool for us to enhance our knowledge about this. Then we have the new gTLD auction proceeds issue. I am going to forward the links also to the working groups, I didn't have the time to do that because I had some

---

problems with my computer, but I'm going to share with you the links. We also need to look at the procedures that have nothing to do with the auctions, those would be the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process. Finally, the second review of RSSAC, I am going to share you the links. When we raise these new issues, we expect LACRALO to address them, and to do that beforehand well in advance. That would be all on my part. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much Alberto for you comments. I don't know if you have any question for Alberto? I don't know if there is any question posted in the chat?

MARITZA AGUERO: If I may. There are no questions for Alberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Now I will give the floor to [inaudible], are you on the call? If you are on the call, please you can take the call. Can anyone confirm if [inaudible] is on the call already.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, I am on the call, can you hear me.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, we can hear you, go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you for the invitation. I would like to provide some information on the NomCom. For that, I would like to tell you, or to talk about some rules of the NomCom, as you know they are confidential rules. Sometimes and that's why sometimes it is quite difficult to report to the community. I know that you have elected me as the NomCom representative, and sometimes because of these confidentiality issues, we cannot report to the community, but I can tell you the following. In Washington DC, between Friday and Sunday we were working to have the... to complete the objective for the meeting. They were really difficult to achieve and we had a conference call that we had been very difficult to achieve. So, I believe that this [inaudible] meeting that we had was vitally important to us to achieve good results, because this is the responsibility that the NomCom has. So, I have requested authorization to the leading team, the NomCom leading team, so as to be able to talk to you and in that meeting we talk about the information that we received. We had the first election of candidates that will be taken into account in the second round. The process that will continue with the selected candidates. The NomCom will now inform those candidates that were selected to proceed in the following round, which the next steps will be. I would like to make a point of clarification here because I have frequently been asked about this, whenever I deliver a presentation on this topic. This year taking into account the autonomy that the NomCom has, we decided not to have the monthly reports because of the confidential natures of our debates. Because of that, it was really difficult to report on new things, the process is a public process and you can find further information on the NomCom web page

---

within the ICANN web page. However, I would like to mention, personally I was able to participate on many LACRALO monthly meetings because this is the community that selected me to represent them at the NomCom. I explained that information on many meetings and calls, and I also presented this information personally at the San Juan meeting. I clarified all the doubts and questions that I was being asked in my different presentations. I would like to mention that the Latin American participation in terms of candidates was really good, taking into account the average amount of people that we have. I believe that the task that we carried out as a group in our outreach process was really successful. Basically, this is what I have to tell you about, and this information was especially authorized to be disclosed by the NomCom chair so confidentiality is still being kept. If you need further information I would like to invite you to visit the NomCom web page, that is at the ICANN web page, as I have already mentioned. This is ICANN web page slash NomCom. This is the end of my presentation and I will ask any question if you have questions so far.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much [inaudible] for your presentation. Maritza, is there any question for Jose?

MARITZA AGUERO: Let me check the chat. I see no questions for Jose.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: OK. If there are no questions, Maritza can you please tell me who will be the next presenter.

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, Lito Ibarra will be now delivering a presentation.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Please, I would like to remind all participants to mute your speakers.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you Maritza and thank you Humberto. I have chosen 5 topics to address today, we have many topics at the ICANN board. Some topics were mentioned by Humberto from the ALAC perspective, but I will mention them all the same. Next slide please. Next slide. In that case you can see the topics I have chosen, GDPR. When it comes to GDPR, let me tell you very briefly that we know that this is a regulation that will be in effect on May 25th 2018. This is a European regulation affecting all the countries around the world, because there are people and companies being affected or protected by these new regulations. When it comes to ICANN task in this respect, as you know, we have been devoting quite a lot of time to this discussion, we have working groups working on the topic. We also had some debates with the data protection authorities in Europe, some lawyers [inaudible]. We also have the article 29 working party. We are working with them, and we're exchanging information. We had an interim model and apart from this model we have been discussing about the accreditation issue, there should be an accreditation system as to be able to consult the WHOIS



---

once this is defined. Which ones are the elements that will be published as defined. Then we have our third element, and this is compliance, how we can reinforce legal compliance for ICANN itself as data administrator or data manager as well as compliance for the companies or associations ICANN works with. This is a hot topic and this is changing on a daily basis because we have news every day, we have more information coming from the civil society government, they are always expressing their points of view and the thing is that we have many interests, I mean many stakes, we have private interest, public interest, social interest that are at stake and of course we have to take all this into account. One of the risks that we have is to fragment the WHOIS, this is not our desire but we still have a long way to go because we have to shed some light on this topic and as I said before, we also discussing the answer of the article 29 working party. This answer is quite different from the outreach provided by the GAC. So, that would be one clear example of the situation that we are facing, because there is no coincidence on certain topics when it comes to governments. We have article 29 on one hand representing the data protection authorities. Next slide please. When it comes to budget, as you know, and Alberto mentioned that. We had to file the first version of the budget, there were some deductions because ICANN growth has been stabilized by now, and we have begun to deal with the budget more carefully. Alberto has already mentioned that. So taking all this into account, we opened a public consultation and these consultation was closed, will be closed on May 8th, staff is reviewing and revising the possible impacts of these comments and then in the workshop that we'll have on May 11th, we will be reviewing these comments on the board. Then at the end of May, we will approve the budget. We have to wait for that, there

are many reductions to be taken into account, and of course we have to take into account the comments we've received. Just to see what we can do, and if we can take money from one part of the budget to another part of the budget, so as to be able to compensate our obligations in a better way. Next slide please. Then we have the change of the key signing key. As you already know, that was planned for October 11th last year, but it was... ICANN decided to postpone these date, because there were servers that were not ready for that process. So this KSK rollover was postponed and now there is a new date and that is October 11th 2018. There is a study provided by the [inaudible], analyzing the situation and the result of the analysis says that there is a low proportion of domain names that will be affected. Humberto and [inaudible] were discussing this topic on the mailing list and the idea is to contribute to the discussion and to contribute to the ISPs and domain name managers using the [inaudible]. Next slide please.

There you see the link for the [inaudible] article, there you see the information, you can read the information based on the [inaudible]. According to the study, those who were not ready for the KSK rollover would be only 0.05%, so this reduces the risk of people being affected or disconnected by the situation. We hope the figures are quite clear and precise. Then we have another topic that is being addressed, in fact this is an old topic with the dot home, dot court, and dot mail domain names. This is name collision, as you know there is name collision in the domain name space and this might imply a possible security threat. So the security and stability advisory committee was requested to conduct study so as to make the right decisions. So far, they decided to reimburse the money to those registrars to those domain names and

---

---

they were suspended, perhaps they will not be released in the future. The idea... they decided just to take care of the security and stability SSAC, has presented a proposal and this is a very important topic, a very important theme for ICANN, so there is a small working group within the ICANN board working with the RSSAC and the ITF so as to define and agree upon the proposal of the SSAC and the study to be conducted. The last topic has to do with the review, the [inaudible], I mean this is the change of the review within ICANN, and this is because there is a very important workload and high cost, as you know ICANN has 7 organization reviews and 4 specific reviews that are carried out every 4 years. This represents or implies cost and an increase in the volunteer workload. Now we have the ATLRT 3 on the WHOIS review, these are the processes being reviewed, so the idea is to consult with the community the situation, but of course, we also need to take into account the possibility of delaying or deferring these reviews. The ones that are being carried out right now just to see if we can do that. This is because of the workload that we have, but these reviews are set forth in the by laws so it is a very complex topic to address, as it is not that easy. If the community agrees on that, perhaps we have to change the by laws so that we can carry out these new proposals. This is something that we are working on. I will finish with this and if you have questions, I will answer those questions. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you so much Lito for these summary. I would like to know if there are any questions.

---

MARITZA AGUERO: There are some comments in the chat but not questions for Lito.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Is there any questions for Lito?

MARITZA AGUERO: Carlos Gutierrez has a question.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Can you hear me Lito? Thank you so much for this excellent presentation, I would like to [inaudible] what we discussed at the GNSO council and board meeting when we had our meeting in Puerto Rico. I don't know whether you were there, do you remember Silvia Vivanco comments? I think it is important in this discussion to have a clear understanding of what kind of reviews we are talking about. We have on the one hand a review that existed before the transition, they were called external reviews. Those were expected to be independent reviews. After the transition we started having the internal reviews, and I think the classification of importance of the back of these reviews have become lost in this discussion. So, I think that we need to take these issues very seriously, so thank you Lito for this excellent presentation.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you Carlos for your comment, yes this is quite a complex issue. We have the implementation of the changes of the work stream 2, everything that happened before [inaudible] and everything that we have at the ATRT, now the RDS review is also conditioned by the GDR,

---

so there are several aspects here that we need to take into account. This is quite a complex issue and we need to give due consideration to it. That is why we are going to have this consultation with the community. Let me take advantage of the fact that I have the floor. This is a question by Fatima there, WHOIS change to GDPR will be applied to all registrants. As I said, this is changing dynamically. We have what ICANN does, the information that ICANN generates and therefore a decision will have to be made in order to comply with a new regulation and then we have the registries and the registrars, they will also have to comply with this new regulation and contracts will need to take into consideration, all these new regulations. Once again, this is another complex issue that we are trying to see which is the best path to take. We still don't have a clear view on what needs to be done. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I don't know if you can hear me better now.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes. Go ahead Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Are there anymore questions? Otherwise we can move onto the next presentation. Do we have anymore questions?

SILVIA VIVANCO: No we don't have any questions in the chat room, so we can continue with the presentation.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: OK. Let's continue. Now I think David Plumb, or who is next?

SILVIA VIVANCO: We have [inaudible], we have all the new gTLD subsequent procedures. OK, so I'll give the floor to them. I would like to thank the three of them for being with us.

OLGA CAVALLI: Hello, can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes Olga, you have the floor.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. I congratulate you for all these large turnout for this call. I was asked to make a few comments about the new work track specifically the aspect related to the new gTLD subsequent procedures, as brought some [inaudible] prepared for some ICANN meetings. I also have a few comments that I'm going to make on my individual capacity, they do not necessarily reflect the entire working groups opinion. If you have any questions, I would be glad to take them. Let me explain to you why did work track 5 emerged. We established within the GAC a specific group to discuss how to deal with geographic names in future gTLD rounds. We always talked about geo names that would not be included in any ISO list, any United Nations list or any formal list already included

---

in the applicant guidebook. Why? Because there are certain [inaudible] conflicts. There are some in negotiation so also underway in a private setting with some of the applicants. So, the governments have this concern about preventing future conflicts in future gTLD rounds. So several governments, or many governments, not only the Argentine government had the concern about these potential conflicts in the new gTLD round, when actually we don't know yet which have been the outcome of the round that we have just had. In particular, we see that there have been several problems for applicants to meet their outcomes, the ones that they expected, so I don't know if you attended the meeting we had in Puerto Rico, where we had this discussion with other parts of the community where everybody showed their concern for rushing into coming up with new policies. We were focusing on those geo names that were not part of any specific list, and GAC and the GNSO participated in this discussion, and they agreed on discussing geographic names at the top level, that would be on this list. This was a concern of different parts of the community and the government. Based on this pressure that was created we tried to make emphasis on dealing with geonames, so as part of the GNSO PDP, a space was open for discussing the geographic names at the top level, that is how the work track 5 came into existence, and it is interesting to note that this is a PDP that is open for anyone to participate but it should have joint leadership shared by the GNSO, the ccNSO, the GAC, and my colleagues in GAC had this brilliant idea of appointing me to be in this group, so that is why I am one of the co-chairs of this working group. You have [inaudible] who is an excellent co-chair and Christopher Wilkinson was the co-chair before. As I was saying, Javier is another co-chair and before we had Christopher Wilkinson. I was able to convey the views of

---

---

the government on this topic, so let me share with you some information about the terms of reference.

Here we are going to focus on geographic names at the top level, not at the second level. The work that we are doing now is to consider and review what is already included in the first version of the applicant guidebook , 2007 GNSO policy recommendation, the relevant rules contain in the 2012 guidebook and also to take into consideration the work done by the working group that did some work in this arena within GAC. There is membership structure in the work track 5, at a given point the GAC had suggested to have a similar structure of members with a supporting organizations advisory committee to have 5 members as we have in the accountability work track. Because the GNSO usually makes decisions based on consensus and rough consensus and they may go to a vote, but in GAC we don't vote. So, the membership structure and the number of members here could be much larger so we thought that this might lead to an imbalance situation but this idea was not supported. Therefore, can we go to the next slide. So far we have developed work plan, we have been trying to analyze what is already contained in the applicant guidebook to see whether that can be expanded or not. I don't know whether we can open the link that appears on the last slide, perhaps I can show you that file. It is quite difficult to navigate that file, although it is not complex in itself. If you move to the last slide, you will see a link there, if you cannot do it right now, I can forward it to you later. This is an Excel spreadsheet file that you can use for making comments. LACRALO has had a quite active participation in making comments to this file, so, we would like to see what would happen, can we have a country name as a new gTLD, like Argentina, what about the



---

country codes, can they be mistaken for gTLDs, but there are some two letter codes that are not taken in the ISO list. So, we don't [inaudible] in the applicant guidebook, we have been making comments. Next Wednesday we are going to have our next call in the group, unfortunately, I will be traveling to [inaudible] to a meeting there and I won't be able to participate in that call, but you can participate in that call. We are trying to gather comments. Overall, we see that we have a similar position among several countries in terms of being cautious not to rush into a new round of gTLDs. We all want to take into account the disputes and conflicts that emerged in the current round, and we know that the community has put a lot of time and effort into this current round and sometimes that effort did not pay off. We want to make sure that we take all these considerations into account for a future round, perhaps Javier can add some more detail.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, can we now go on to the next speaker, please try to be brief as we do not have much time left on this call.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Hello to all of you, I can see [inaudible]. I don't know if you have the same echo. I am the representative of the work track 5 for at-large. We have quite an open position, we have [inaudible] as the members and Olga is the other co-chair. Perhaps we can summarize the path that we have followed, the work track 5 was a little bit delayed with regard to the other work tracks. Let me share with you this timeline. In March, we started discussing the [inaudible] of the terms that appear in the 2012

applicant guidebook. The experience with 3 character codes, we had a long list of territory names. So, we know that those lists cannot be used as gTLDs, so the discussion sent us on what may happen with these names in the future, we should be able to maintain the current status of these names for this geographic country and territory names. From now onwards, in May we will discuss the future treatment of those names that are not included in the guidebook. Dot Amazon, names of rivers, some geographic indicators, [inaudible], other have talked about cultural community, linguistic rule. All these names that are not included in the guidebook, so that discussion will start soon in May, and I think that at-large can make a significant contribution to to that discussion, in some cases our position is similar to that of GAC, in other cases it is a different position. For instance, we can talk about some national linguistic groups and there we might find some differences among our views. As Olga said, we have our next call on April 18th, so I invite you to join us in this working group, you can look at all the criteria there and all the members, we try to be as broad as possible in terms of participation. I'll stop here, I encourage you to contact me over email or Skype, and let me say that we had a meeting on work track 5 and the DNS in order to also see what are the opinions of the community, because we want to have the full community engaged in the discussions on work track 5. Thank you.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Can you hear me?

---

---

MARITZA AGUERO: Carlos, please go ahead.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you Maritza. After having or hearing to our [inaudible] co-chairs, what can I say. Perhaps I may add some personal considerations on these topics, because I am the [inaudible] between LACRALO and work track 5. I have been appointed to be the liaison recently, the working group begun shortly, before in fact my designation and I see that there are many interesting topics to be addressed as Olga has said before. This has to do with a stream, and with two and three character domain names, and short and long names or geonames, or geographic names. Including, as Javier said before, country names, but we also have names of rivers, names of mountain ranges. They can be included within this designation. It is really difficult nowadays, because these issues are being discussed right now and there is a public comment which is open. It is really difficult to delimit certain topics or questions. However, I would like to mention, and I believe this was somehow expressed before by my colleagues, and this that I was lucky, because I was able to participate in the policy making process of the first round of the gTLDs, that was a round that was open in 2008, in the Paris meeting and ended in the Singapore meeting. In 2011 the application round was opened for the first time, and it took almost 4 years to create policies for that first round, and those policies after some time, we see that despite all of that work and despite the time, and despite the many working groups that we had, we still have some pending issues to address. The first round is not completed yet, we had some issues with certain domain names, so I would like to agree with Olga when she said something. Why do we have to rush, or why do we want to have a second round, if

---

we still have to solve some serious problems arising from that first round and those are problems may impact on the ICANN budget. I believe that we need to be very careful with that, we need to have wider participation. This is a cross community working group and as you know, we have participants from many constituencies. We have participants from the ccNSO, the GNSO, from ALAC, and participation is very active from Latin American members, for example, Carlos Gutierrez, he's a very active member and participant. We also have members from the contracted party house, they offered a very interesting proposal. However, I believe that we need to take some time, despite Javier's remarks regarding the work track 5. I believe that because of the importance of these work tracks, and because we have very sensitive names, these are names related to the national life, or the national nature of a country, we need to be very careful. What we'll be discussing, we will continue with a discussion of the topics and I would like to invite you, as Javier said before, to participate. I would like to encourage you to participate because we need to learn from this and we need to learn about some of the issues that are related to these new gTLD round, or these things will be added to the second applicant guidebook. I am really open for questions, as I said before, I am the liaison representing the region, so you can ask me questions now or whenever you want, you can contact me, if you need further clarification or if you need my help. Thank you.

MARITZA AGUERO:

Thank you very much Carlos, for your comment. I would like to give the floor to David Plumb. He will be talking about the mediation phase 2. David, please go ahead.

DAVID PLUMB:

Hello, good afternoon, good evening everyone. I hear some echo on my line, but I will try to speak. I don't know if it's possible to upload some of the slides. We had a summary that was circulated, this is a summary of our meeting that we had in Puerto Rico last month. First of all, I would like to say that my name is David Plumb, I have been working with LACRALO, I have been helping them to have conversations on how to become more effective on how to improve certain governance aspects. Based on that, we have our first meeting in 2017 in Los Angeles, that was a face-to-face meeting, and then we had a second meeting in Puerto Rico last month. We had many participants, many of them were the same participants as in the previous meeting. The idea was to hear the LACRALO voices, the idea was gather together so as to discuss the hot topics. That was an opportunity to have a better and more effective LACRALO in at-large. This opportunity in Puerto Rico, our intention was to see the progress we had made since 2017, and the commitment that we have achieved. Then we focused very heavily on governance, on how we can move forward, and how we can solve some of the governance issues that are still pending in LACRALO, so as to be able to improve our processes. When we begun our meeting, we realized that before getting into details, before getting into governance topics and the things we would like to improve in terms of LACRALO governance, we realized that we had to do some pre work. That previous task was to define the real purpose of LACRALO, because without having that context clear, focusing on the governance issue would make no sense. That was a very proactive activity and a very fruitful conversation in terms of our common... our purpose. Based on that, we were able to

---

define in a better way, the LACRALO mission and why LACRALO has this vision, and why this vision is important in the future. We also defined what we need to do to have our vision clear. This was a very positive activity and these are the results I am going to show you right now. I believe those results are already posted on the Wiki, please let me know if that is so. On the Wiki, you should also be able to find this summary of the meeting. Now, I would like to briefly tell you about some of the more relevant conclusions that we had in our meeting and then the step forward for the future. Taking into account the time that we have, I will be very brief and I will be also telling you what we agreed among all participants in Puerto Rico. The intention was to make the most of this opportunity that was today face-to-face event, because it was much easier than having a virtual meeting and the result is to invite participants in LACRALO that were not present in Puerto Rico. The idea is to include in the conversation, so perhaps in that case we will need to discuss over the phone, because when you devote time to a certain challenge, results are really positive. Let me tell you now about the most important topics that we had on our meeting. We have spoke about some principles, we've spoke about governance, and we also discussed about issues related to principles. For example, when it comes to governance, we, and there you can see the Powerpoint presentation. I don't know who is having the control of this slide, but please let's move forward to slide number 8 please. So we had wide agreement among participants to have LACRALO board of directors, as to be able to coordinate efforts in a better way. This will include the LACRALO leaders, the ALAC representatives, and the NomCom members. Plus the working group tiers. Having a group like that would be a very important step forward for the region. But it's another topic to be discussed that

---

was an idea that came out from the meeting, but there was not full consensus. This is to create a process, because as you know, we vote for a chair-elect and then after a certain period of time that chair-elect becomes the chair. With that process, you gain some experience before getting the leadership position, before occupying the leadership position. That would be one option, you first become the chair-elect and then after 2 year period you become the chair. That is a topic, an issue to be discussed and addressed in the governance working group. Next slide please.

There is interest in having a rotation system for our positions in the region, and in that sense, we were interested in one proposal, and this is to divide LACRALO in three main regions or four main regions. You are rotating those regions, for example, having Central American region and Mexico, for example, they will be providing the chair for the chair position, and then they will be providing the ALAC representative, and so on. That is a way for us to access the different leadership positions. This is another topic to be discussed, because it took us quite a lot of time to understand why this system would be important. The governance working group is also starting this conversation, just to see why we had this conclusion, and this is to have a rotation system and sub regions within LACRALO. In any case, this idea was supported by many members in the Puerto Rico meeting. Let's move now to slide number 11 please. We have some conversations on different topics, for example, we have spoke about the election process, and we discussed the idea of having a new category of ALSes and this is ALSes in good standing. This means ALSes having an active participation with the LACRALO. They will be the ones having the possibility of participating in

---

the elections for leadership positions in LACRALO. In this case, we should take into account a broad definition of active participation. That is, participation at different stages in LACRALO and at-large, and ICANN as well. The idea here is to have certain support and incentive for the ALS to be more involved, not only in the monthly meetings, but also in other meetings or activities where the ALSes might be supporting the at-large work for Latin American and Caribbean regions. This is another topic to be taken into account and to be discussed in the future, but many of the participants did agree on the fact that it would be good to have further metrics on how to measure participation and how to measure the participation of ALSes in different activities. Slide number 12 please. Here we have the same ideas, [inaudible]. If you would like to get further information on this discussions, please let me invite you to participate in the governance working group. Now I'm going to move to slide number 14 for the sake of time, and here we see a summary of the discussions that we had about individual membership. This is a long standing topic, but based on the review that we had, and based on the review of the at-large structures, LACRALO was the only one who did not have a way to allow individual members. So, the idea is to have ALSes open, or RALOs open to individual membership. Based on this dilemma, and this is how to include further participation and to recognize that the ALSes have a representative role already, an important role. The idea is to measure the participation of individual members in LACRALO and the idea is to use a model perhaps, to have [inaudible] ALS representing individual members. We had some discrepancies and members did not agree on certain topics, for example, if these individual members would be able to occupy leadership position, but on general terms, we have said that an

---



---

individual member would be able to apply for a position in ALAC but not for a position within LACRALO. This is another topic that we need to address in the working group.

I don't know if anyone who has participated in the meeting we had in Puerto Rico would like to mention something else. I would like to hear your feedback about that. I would like to invite you all to read the summary, read the information that is already posted on the Wiki. Now the future is focused on the governance working group, we have Sergio Salinas and Vanda, they're working on the governance working group. They will be having a call and they will address these topics, that will be translated into the new operating principles and rules of procedures. These are the proposals for the operating principles and rules of procedures, and of course these have a very high level of credibility within LACRALO. The idea is to have greater participation and a higher interest in the LACRALOs activities. I will stop here, and now I would like to give you the floor for questions and for comments. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me? Thank you David. I think that you have made an excellent summary of our discussion. Let me add that as regards the issue of sub regions, the document that we have prepared had a broad support among ourselves. I see there is an echo.

DAVID PLUMB: Sorry Humberto, I couldn't hear you well because there was an echo.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes, I was trying to say that there has been consensus on what you have just said. So, you made an excellent summary of many hours of discussion, and I think that all of us who participated there should give our opinion whether we agree on that, so we can avoid misunderstandings. That is all I wanted to say.

DAVID PLUMB: Thank you Humberto, any more comments?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Fatima, would you like to say something? Fatima, go ahead please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Can you hear me well?

DAVID PLUMB: Yes.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you for your presentation David, hello to everyone. What I didn't understand from Humberto's comments is that there is a document that have broad support from all participants. What document was he talking about?

DAVID PLUMB: I think he's talking about the summary, because this summary was circulated before the call.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: That summary. I'm sorry.

DAVID PLUMB: Yes, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This was a summary of the discussions we had in Puerto Rico. Of course, everything has to be submitted to the consideration of the region, and then we need to have a vote. There is no decision that can be made without following that procedure. The only thing that I was trying to convey to you is that this summary reflects clearly what we discussed in Puerto Rico.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you Humberto for this clarification. I also understood that you said that the agreements made in Puerto Rico, like the division of the sub regions, had been reflected in the operating principles document that is being discussed in the working group. Is that correct?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Regarding the operating principles document in Mexico, we made many comments, some substantial issues and we would like to have more

---

explanation about some of those aspects and then we also made some comments regarding the format, because it was not entirely clear what those documents were referring to. I think that we should use Sergio's email in order to continue the discussion on this [inaudible] issue. Vanda was asking a question in the chat about the possibility of running a pilot test of the elections in May, and we believe that we cannot hold elections following principles that have not yet come into force. We will have to abide by the rules of procedure and the operating principles that are currently in effect, not the ones that we are discussing now. Regarding the participation of individual users, when that email was sent to the working group list, I also expressed my opinion, in the by laws the participation of individual users has already been covered. They will have the right to speak but not to vote, so I think that that was always a conflicting point in LACRALO, but I think that we cannot make a decision on that without discussing all the other aspects, I don't think that we can follow a fast track procedure as ALAC wants.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can I reply to that Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Yes, go ahead Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I have reviewed the operating principles, I think that that would imply a [inaudible] but there is not an explicit agreement there. That is why we have somehow showed our agreement, but there is no statement

---

referring to this. LACRALO may or may not accept this, but that is a separate discussion. Then, in Puerto Rico we also agreed that the coming elections will abide by the current operating principles and by no means will they abide by the new operating principles that are currently under discussion. At least, that is what I remember from the Puerto Rico group, unless the governance team has made some changes to that.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: No no. I was referring to Vanda's comments in the chat window where she talked about the possibility of having a pilot for these new principles. What did you mean when you say that had some agreement, because you gave into ALACs request?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: No. We decided to submit this to a vote.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: But this was in the working group, not the whole LACRALO list.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: A motion will be put forward, and this is going to be discussed by the entire LACRALO list. The working group was just looking at the language of that motion, so that it could later be discussed by the entire region, but of course, that would have to have the vote of all of us.

---

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, that was not clear when this was forwarded to the working group letter. My final comment has to do with a very important point, the agreement at the Los Angeles mediation meeting. We agreed to look at the ICANN policies, I think that the fact that we have made progress with the operating principles means that we've taken into account what we agreed on in 2014. But, we focused our attention on the principles on formalities but we did not get involved this year in policy issues. LACRALO was not involved in the policy discussions that are relevant to ICANN, so I think that we shouldn't lose sight of that. We need to continue, considering that in the start of the mediation process.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Let me say that we did get involved with policy issues, but we got to the conclusion that there are different ways of coming up with policies. This new leadership we have a different view of what it means to develop policy. Other groups may have a different opinion. Anyway what you are raising here was also raised by David and by different people, and in the mediation process, we gave our answer to that and we can talk about this separately from this call in order to explain to you what we discussed at that time, but I don't want to take anymore time off this meeting but I'd rather do that separately.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Humberto, we can have a private conversation, a separate conversation if you want, but I think that in order to be transparent we need to share that information with the entire LACRALO list.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Yes. I have said that to the entire list.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: There are some issues that have not been reflected in the summary report. Let me disagree with you. Developing policies not a matter of leadership, getting involved in ICANN policy issues has to do with what Lito said. We need to focus on that kind of issues, focusing our attention on LACRALO governance issues that is not equivalent to developing policy.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Who has raised their hand?

MARITZA AGUERO: Alejandro Pisanty holds the floor now.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: If you agree, I will give the floor back to the staff, so that they can continue with the management of this call.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Go ahead Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Can you hear me now?

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, go ahead Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Can you hear me? This is Alejandro Pisanty. Humberto, what you have just said must be discussed more seriously during the years under your leadership as chair, I thought Mexico submitted motions repeatedly related to ICANN policy issues. Out of the 5 points raised by Lito, we have made comments, at least about 4 of them over the last year. But this motion have been left there stationary. I understand you are talking about a different leadership style. In Los Angeles, the mediation group last year agreed that item 1 would focus on policy. I think that this deserves serious deep analysis because it has been decided that the policy proposal should not proceed. I think that has been decided by design.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Go ahead Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Go ahead Humberto.



HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I think that Alejandro has made an accusation that has been ungrounded. I said that there were different ways of developing policy, one is the way that you propose, but now they are telling me that they are [inaudible] me, they say that. This is the interpreter speaking, Humberto's audio is cutting off. In no way have I deliberately tried to put a stop to the motions you have put forward. I think that that is really far from reality. I regret that that is your view, I have a different way of working on policy issues. I can give you as an example, the agreements that we establish with the different bodies, and all the discussions around individual users. We said that this is OK to make statements and we encourage statements, but we also have other responsibilities to fulfill, but never have we tried to [inaudible] motions [inaudible]. I thank you for allowing me to reply to you, because that is really far from reality.

I don't know whether there are any other questions or comments, I can continue this discussion on the email list or through any other means that you deem appropriate. I think that there are no other outstanding issues. Maritza, could you please confirm that?

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes, we have some other points and Maritza is going to take care of them.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Can you hear me?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello.

SILVIA VIVANCO: We're ready for the announcement for the elections for this year.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, we can hear you. So, let me continue. I don't know if the other speakers are connected.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: In fact, I would like to bring this meeting to a close. Perhaps we can have a special meeting to see these topics.

SILVIA VIVANCO: We have several participants on the call. Carlos Aguirre, I am still connected, I am still connected to the call.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: OK. I just wanted to say that I have no problem in addressing these topics on a different or a special meeting.

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: I just wanted to say that an email will be circulated for the LACRALO elections, ALAC members, chair secretary and the representative to the NomCom. That email will be circulated soon. Thank you very much.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: OK. If there are no further comments or questions, I believe that we can bring these calls to an end.

MARITZA AGUERO: We can continue with a [inaudible] and I believe we are done with the meeting right now.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: OK. Thank you very much for your participation. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Thank you again for your participation in this meeting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you once again to the interpreters for doing this beyond the call of duty.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you everyone, this call is now adjourned. Please remember to disconnect your lines and enjoy the rest of your evening. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]