

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I would like to welcome you all to this call. I would like to welcome the interpreters. We are holding this meeting now. I am in Santiago. I am on work travel. We will start with the call. I would like to give the floor to Maritza after this welcome.

MARITZA AGUERO: Claudia, would you like to start the call?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to you all. Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Call on Monday, the 21<sup>st</sup> of August, 2018, at 23:00 UTC.

On this call today, on the Spanish channel, we have Wladimir Davalos, Javier Rua-Jovet, Sergio Salinas Porto, Maritza Aguero, Adrian Carballo, Humberto Carrasco, Ricardo Holmquist, Antonio Medina Gomez, Alberto Soto, and Leon Sanchez.

We have no participants on the English, Portuguese, and French channels.

We have received apologies from Vanda Scartezini, Maureen Hilyard, and Heidi Ullrich.

Lito Ibarra has just joined the call.

On the staff, we have Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management today.

---

*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 Veronica and Paula for Spanish, Betina and Esperanza for Portuguese, and Claire for French.

Before starting with this call, I would like to remind you all to please say your name before taking the floor so that our interpreters can identify you and also for the transcript. I'll give the floor now to Maritza.

MARITZA AGUERO:

Thank you, Claudia. I would like to start with the agenda today after the welcome remark by Humberto Carrasco, our chair. We will start with today's meeting reviewing the ALAC public consultation. Alberto Soto, an ALAC member, will be in charge of part of the agenda. He is going to give us a summary. He is going to summarize for us the topics that have been open for comments.

Then, we will have a presentation by Leon on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data. As you know, Leon is a board member and he is going to give us an in-depth presentation on what we should expect in terms of changes resulting from the GDPR and the temporary specification.

Then, Javier Rua is going to talk about the work track five of PDPs on new gTLD subsequent procedures. He is also an ALAC member. He is part of NARALO and he will join us on today's call.

Then, we have any other business. Thank you, and Humberto, I give you back the floor.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Maritza. I think that the agenda has been adopted, so I'll give the floor to Alberto for him to talk about public consultation. You have 15 minutes. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Humberto. On the first slide in my presentation that you can see now on the screen, I'm going to share with you a brief introduction, then the [inaudible] that have been adopted by ALAC, those topics that are open to public comment and those topics that I suggest that LACRALO should start looking into, to later on work on them. So, if you can give me the control of the presentation, I will proceed with it.

The first recommendation for you is that you should visit this page. There is the link. Why? Because that is the way in which we work in the ALAC and I think that in LACRALO we should do the same more frequently in order to be able to get the views of all the members of LACRALO, not just our own views, because here we have the At-Large community policy issues. Why should end users be concerned the public comment procedures of ICANN, the upcoming public comment procedures by ICANN, the advice that has already been published, how the advice is developed within the ALAC. There we will talk about the timing and the processes, followed by the ALAC, and if there is something that is open for public comment, we will have the start and end date and also the status to see if it is still in the reaction phase or if it is still open for receiving comments. Then, the At-Large documentation reference system.

---

As you can see, the slide is both in Spanish and in English in order to make things clearer for you. All the links have been included in both languages.

So, we [inaudible] the statements that have been approved by the ALAC since our last meeting. The fellowship project and draft proposal, unfortunately we didn't get the opinion from LACRALO, but if you want, you can see what has happened in this arena. Although we haven't given an opinion from LACRALO, I think that this report is quite accurate.

Then, we have another one that finished on July the 31<sup>st</sup>, the short-term options to adjust the timeline for specific review. Then, we have the reviews. So, here, we make a difference between those that are short-term opinions and those that are long-term opinions. You have links on both of them. We have included them [inaudible]. I think that all the contributions have been really useful and that this recommendation is very clear and useful.

Then, we also have initial report on the protections for certain Red Cross names, the Red [inaudible] and the Red Cross. All these are domain names that belong to the Red Cross and all the international organizations related to the Red Cross. So, in a few words, I can say that these [inaudible] protection and I think that is very appropriate.

These are the comments that have been published so far. First, ICANN has taken the community feedback on the proposed unified access model. Still, there is no closing date, but this is just a draft for discussion to see what kind of model we can have for unified access to the WHOIS

---

data. At a high level, it provides a process to determine how third parties may access non-public WHOIS data. So, what I have done is to include the link here for you to have this information.

Then, we also have the trust accreditation and access model for non-public WHOIS data. We don't have a [inaudible]. This is not an official formal ICANN public comment. It is rather an initiative that is led by the IPC and the BC [outside] of ICANN and this is related to GDPR.

The ALAC's request, staff has created a page on the website for IPC and BC accreditation model and you also see on the website the prior ALAC statements related to GDPR. So, you have the links there also to have access to this information.

Then, we have the recommendations for managing IDN variant top-level domains. You may say that you are not interested in this because we don't have IDNs, but actually we should have IDNs. I have spoken with members of our indigenous communities and we are looking into the possibility of having IDNs for some of our communities. So, if you're interested, please go to this website or into this link and see how this has been managed.

So, here the primary issues in the context of IDN variants at the top level. This arises from the fact that the DNS, as well as other Internet systems, such as [inaudible] work with a little interpretation of the IDN label, where if the community uses [inaudible] interpretation where multiple labels are considered equivalent. If such an equivalence does not work, the Internet end users may end up being confused. This is a [inaudible] technical issue.

---

When we see that there are open public comment processes, that is because there is one member, one ALS, who may be interested in making a comment, please join the working group looking into the topic of IDNs because that is the best way to contribute to that.

Then, we have the initial report on the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process. Here we are talking about work track one to four. All these are short links in order to make things easier for you. But, public comment process, [inaudible] the initial report the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group.

In the document, there are materials from the four working groups and four subteams within the working group, work tracks one through four. I am part of that work. Work track five is focused on geographic names at the top level and a separate report will be issued for that topic. We have Javier Rua-Jovet with us, one of the co-chairs there, who will later on give us more detailed information about the work done here. Shall I go on?

Then, we have the 12<sup>th</sup> ICANN Africa Strategic Plan for 2016-2020. Of course, we are representing Latin America and the Caribbean, but LACRALO leaders, members, we need to see how other regions are working and what the GSE team is doing.

Then, we also have the study on the technical use of root zone label generation rules. The closing date for this process will be September the 11<sup>th</sup>. This group has identified scope of work. Here you have the link that is being shared with the community and the group seeks feedback from the community on whether the questions identified are all

---

relevant to this study and whether there are any other issues that should be considered.

Then, we have the modification of the domains protected mark list service. There is a public comment process that will close on September the 24<sup>th</sup>. You have the link there. The purpose here is to gather input from the community on the proposed amendment to modify the domains protected marks list.

In this case, Donuts. I don't know if I skipped one slide. Let me check. The study on the technical [views] of the generation of labels in the root zone. The scope of work has been identified. I have already read that. Sorry.

ICANN is seeking input on the unified access that has been proposed. There is no date here and you have the link there. Then, we have initial report on the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP process. Javier is going to talk more about that. I don't have a title here. Actually, these are recommendations. On the link, you can access there because ICANN is seeking feedback.

The other one, the second bullet point, refers to all the guidelines and the procedures used within the ALAC who are dealing with public comment periods. Thank you. That would be all.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you, Alberto. As usual, you have been very clear and your presentation has been very detailed. I would like to open the floor to any questions from the participants on this call. Is anyone asking for the

---

floor? This is the second call. Does anyone want to take the floor? We see some comments here in the chat window. Participants say that everything has been very clear, so I don't see any raised hands. Therefore, I would like to thank Alberto for this very clear explanation. Now, I give the floor to Leon Sanchez. Leon, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Humberto, thank you very much for the invitation to participate on the call. I would like to speak about the temporary specification for gTLD registration data. This is related to the topics that many of you have already been studying, and of course this has to do with the GDPR, the enforcement of GDPR, the regulation from the European Union.

This measure, which is the temporary specification was adopted by the ICANN board on May the 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018. So, what happened?

The GDPR has imposed new obligations for those agencies gathering and processing and managing personal data. Personal data belonging to subjects within the European Union, the economic European Union. So, it is important to emphasize the fact that data subjects shouldn't be citizens of the European Union. It should be [inaudible] on the territory of the European Union to be covered by this regulation.

So, based on this and because of this situation, there are different consequences for registrars and registrants of domain names in terms of the management of data and the gathering of data. This also affects data and the use of data and the use of the database that we know as WHOIS.



In this case, in the WHOIS we make a query, and based on that query, we get information. We get personal information, personal data. We provide this information and we get information such as the e-mail, telephone, the fax number, telephone number, e-mail and some other personal information contained in the database.

With the enforcement of GDPR, there are some modifications and alterations that have to be taken into account in terms of this query to our WHOIS database.

Since registries and registrars have a contractual obligation with ICANN, they need to gather and publish this personal data. There is a kind of conflict or there is a clear conflict between the GDPR, the legislation, and the contractual obligation that they have with ICANN. And because of this, the ICANN Org and the ICANN board took some steps to help registries and registrars to be aligned with the regulation, with the GDPR, as well as with their contractual obligations with ICANN.

So, along these lines, the temporary specification has the purpose of finding middle point between the registries and the registrars and to avoid any problem with the registries and registrars and to allow them to comply with their contractual obligations with ICANN, and at the same time, to comply with the GDPR so that they can keep on gathering personal data for WHOIS as much as possible.

So, the text that we see on the screen is the wording of this temporary specification. I'm not going to read the text. However, I will take this text as a reference. As I said before, this temporary specification was [inaudible] by the ICANN board on May 17<sup>th</sup> this year and this

---

temporary specification will be enforced for a period of up until one year. Tomorrow, we will have a meeting, a board meeting, and the only item on the agenda is to ratify this temporary specification. As I said before, this specification will be in effect for one year and the ICANN board needs to ratify this specification for a period of three months. So, every three months, the ICANN board will have to ratify this temporary specification.

Now, what happens if this temporary specification is not ratified? Well, it will not be in effect anymore and, based on that and because of that, there might be a [inaudible] in the management and the gathering and publishing of personal data in terms of domain names.

So, once the year of this temporary specification is over, if there is no permanent measure already adopted, the registries and the registrars that have a contractual agreement with ICANN will not be subject to this temporary specification.

So, this specification was in effect on May 25<sup>th</sup> and from that date on, we have one year to find a solution to address the issue of data gathering and data managing in terms of gTLDs.

Another consequence of this situation is there is a special working group being created. This is the EPDP Working Group. This is the Expedited Policy Development Process Working Group. This EPDP Working Group has the objective of limiting this policy, if you will. And by [inaudible] of these policies, registries and registrars will be able to keep on complying with their obligation [inaudible] and at the same time, they will be able to comply with their contractual obligations with ICANN. This working

---

---

group is led by the GNSO. The GNSO is the one the coordinating this PDP process. The GNSO is the one in charge of drafting the policy.

And because this is a process that will have a result and the result is a policy effect, not only the domain name community but it will also affect end users and the whole ICANN community, the GAC, government, etc. So, this working group is composed by many representatives from the GNSO but, at the same time, it's composed by other representatives coming from other constituencies of ICANN. So, they will be working by means of conference calls on a weekly basis. They will have two calls and probably they will have some face-to-face meetings. Probably the first meeting will be in Los Angeles at the end of September.

The objective of this working group, as I said before, is within a short period of time to review a policy, a permanent policy, to be applied and to be implemented in the contract and that's between ICANN and registrars.

It is important to mention that we have an annex A for this temporary specification, so if you scroll down the document in your computer, you can scroll down appendix A and there you will see how the specification obliges the registrars and registries to publish a protocol to access domain name information. It also demands the provision of information.

When the registrar is placed on the economic European space or territory or when it is outside the territory but when it offers its services to domain name holders placed within the space of the economic

European Union or when the registry operator or registry are outside the EU but they include personal data from a registry operator hiring the services, hiring backend services, for data holders that are located inside the European Union, economic European Union.

In this case, you can see different items and any answer to a query for domain name carried out by the registrar or the registry operator, they should [suppress] translated into this temporary specification. They should [suppress] many data, many pieces of information that, in the past, were published openly for different purposes and that were useful for different sectors in our community. For example, in this case, we see that there is certain information that should be redacted or suppressed. For example, the name of a registrant, the registrant or registry ID, the registrant address, the city, the zip code, the telephone number, the extension number, the fax number, etc.

We also see that there are some results that should be redacted or suppressed. For example, those details that have to do with the technical or administrative points of contact.

For the case of the e-mail address, if we go to item 2.5, we can see that the e-mail address should be suppressed or redacted as well and they should provide any kind of way of media to have immediate communication with a domain name registrant. In this case, the registrar or the registries should implement a web form, for example. So, if someone wants to contact the registrant of a domain name, that person should have a web format or a web form so as to be able to contact that point.

---

If we scroll down the document, if we go to appendix B, we see other situations. For example, what happens when we have rapid suspension and uniform systems, as it might be the case of a UDRP. In this case, this is already covered by the temporary specification. In this case, a registry operator and the registry should provide the URS services provider. They should provide all the information that they have in their database in relation to the relevant domain name. So, they have to stick to the regular rules for UDRP and URS. So, these are the obligations that the registry operators and registrars have to provide this information to those who are involved in any kind of procedure that is related to dispute resolution system.

I see on the chat that Ricardo is asking about the procedure, the ongoing procedure, of the ongoing process in Germany. We have information on the blog post that are already posted on the ICANN webspace. As you already know, there is a registrar which showed its intention to eliminate all the information related to domain names. Of course, this was an infringement of the contract with ICANN, so ICANN started a case so as to avoid the elimination of this information.

So, this procedure is an ongoing procedure. It's still pending. There are no resolutions already for this action brought by ICANN. But, of course, we will keep you informed as this action moves forward. I'm sorry because I'm not able to provide you with further information, Ricardo, but all the information available is information that is already published on the ICANN blog.

With this, Humberto, I would like to open you the floor and open the floor for questions in case you have any questions or [inaudible]. If that

---

---

is the case, I will try to answer all your questions. Thank you very much, Humberto, for your time.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Leon, for your presentation. This is a very interesting presentation, a very detailed analysis of the situation. Now I would like to open the floor for questions. If you have any question or any [doubt], please feel free. I have the same question as Ricardo, but Ricardo already posted the question, so now I give the floor in case you have any questions for Leon Sanchez who is our board member. I see no hands up. I see no [doubts]. If that's the case, I would like to thank you again, Leon, for your presentation. Your presentation was very clear, indeed. We have little time to discuss this topic. Probably we will continue discussing the topic and we will be discussing the GDPR issue in the following months. Leon, once again, thank you for your presentation and now we will continue with our call.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Humberto, and thank you for the invitation. I'm glad that my presentation was clear. As you know, I am at your disposal. You can contact me by website, by e-mail. I'm always open to questions and open to talk to you. So, thank you once again for the invitation.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Leon, for being here. You and Lito are always willing to work with us, so we are very happy to have you here. We are really glad to work with you and to have your support. Having said this, I would like to

---

give the floor to our friend from LACRALO. I don't know why Puerto Rico in NARALO because it should be part of LACRALO. But, I would like to give the floor to our friend, Javier Rua-Jovet. You have the floor for you to speak about your topic. Thank you, Javier, for being here.

JAVIER RUA JOVET:

Thank you all for this welcome. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. I would like to begin by thanking you for inviting me to participate on this call. Maritza in LACRALO invited me to talk to you on work track five, specifically on the GNSO PDP process.

As you know, we have members representing all the constituencies. I am there representing ALAC. We also have Martin Sutton from the GNSO. We also have Annebeth Lang from the ccNSO. This is a working group that is made up of members of different parts of the community. We have excellent participants in this group who know a lot about this process.

Let me share with you a summary, an overview, of the work track five. You may interrupt me if you have any questions.

You know that here we are talking about geographic names at the top level. We have the ASCII and the IDN format. The geographic names have a certain definition. If we look at all the 2007 and 2012 documents, if we look at the policy documents and the Applicant Guidebook, we may find different definitions. I don't have slides, but I'm going to paste here in the chat window part of the text in order to give you an idea of the different categories that are considered and the definition of geographic names.

First, we have the names of countries and territories that are on the ISO list 3166 in their long and short form, where there are corresponding translations, permutations. These are the two-letter codes that are usually ccTLDs. We also have three-letter codes that have been reserved. We were talking about [ARG], USA, different three-letter codes that we were discussing about in the chat window. We can also mention the Olympic organization code that is also made up of three. Here, we are talking about these codes as gTLDs. They are not considered as geographic names.

So, the discussion within work track five is whether these codes can maintain that status, whether they can be considered differently. This tends to favor the current situation, the status quo.

So, right now, those names are not available as gTLDs, so there is a trend towards keeping the current status quo. Geographic names also include the names of capital cities. According to the 2007 policy and the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, in order to make an application for the name of a capital city, you require a non-objection letter from the governmental authority in the country. That is the current situation.

There is a very heated discussion around this issue because some people want to maintain it like this. Others want to have a more open approach.

So, we have the government on the one hand that want to protect their national identity, their important places. The countries want to avoid confusion with names that represent national or provincial locations. Then, you also have the applicants who are interested in getting these

---



---

names registered. That is why a non-objection letter is required for the approval and use of those names.

The ccNSO participates also in this process. You have the ccTLD operators that want to also keep things as they are now in the market.

There are others who wanted those three-letter codes, like [ARG], to be released somehow as well as for the names of the capital cities. So, that has created certain tension.

Something I would like to see more in the work track five for which LACRALO could have some contributions would be the discussion of those names that resemble the interest of the government but perhaps refers to names such as those of indigenous groups. Those names that have a linguistic, cultural, historical significance.

You also have the community gTLDs in this discussion, but those refer to specific cases, peoples, or groups that may be more specific. I'm being told by staff that my audio is not so good. I hope that you can hear me and follow me.

Then, we have the UNESCO regions that correspond to the macro-geographic regions of UNESCO. In this case, I'm talking about large areas like Europe, Asia that have also the requirement of having 70% approval of the government of the regions to proceed with that application. This is similar to the previous case where a non-objection letter is required.

Then we have geo-names that are not included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. These are the non-[AGP] geographical terms. Here we are talking about geographic places like valleys, mountains, places that may

---

have a significance for certain people. I think that here we could include the discussions around dot-amazon, dot-patagonia.

So, how can we make sure that there are policies in place that can give us [inaudible] predictability in this process to avoid the kind of situations and confusion that occurred in the past?

The work track, as you can see, covers a diverse range of issues, so I invite you to join us. We have a schedule of work that moves forward at a slow pace. Perhaps it is slower than other groups. We are working under a lot of pressure because others want to see more progress, faster progress, but we have said that we wanted to have an initial report on our work before the Barcelona meeting, by the 30<sup>th</sup> of September, and there has been a lot of discussion among the members of the group and they thought that was a target too difficult to meet so we would have to revisit it.

We have some LACRALO prominent members who participate in this work track five. Olga, Alberto, and others. But, I encourage you to join us because this region has been an active part of this discussion. For instance, in the case of dot-amazon.

So, we have to make sure that these kinds of problems do not happen again. We need to work on the prevention side and it is very important to have many other topics and many other cases included in our discussions under work track five. Sometimes it might be a little bit frustrating because it is quite difficult to reach consensus, especially because these are very difficult topics. They are deeply rooted positions, hot positions.

---

Overall, there is a tendency towards keeping the status quo, but we need to see what kind of innovation we can bring into the process in order to improve things. There are some proposals that are being put forward along these lines and I encourage you to get acquainted with all this work.

The goal here is to prevent future problems. There may be pre-existing lists that can be consulted. Some of the proposals hinge on the idea of having this list with names that can be consulted whenever there is an application. Perhaps initially they will not be reserved, but they will be there to make sure that there is some level of protection.

There is a lot to be said about the work that we do in this work track five. You can just send an e-mail to the right address. I will leave you with that address and you can join us also as observers. If there is time, I would rather take questions from participants, and if I cannot answer them, I'm sure that Olga will be able to do that. That will be all. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Javier. We see an interest in discussion also in the chat window. There are several questions that have already been raised but also answered by Olga. There is a question by Alberto Soto. Could you please identify the preventive and corrective terms?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Look at the words. They are self-explanatory. We are talking about doing something at an early stage in the process, to have consultations

---

between the parties and applicants that may consult a specific panel or certain government authority in order to prevent future problems. Then, we may also have corrective measures, processes, to revisit the contract and to revisit the rules that may be established. Perhaps the creation of some rules or [views], some specific provisions. So, we have this kind of preventive and corrective approach.

I don't think there is any specific consensus on this, but many members of the work track see that the 13<sup>th</sup> of September is a deadline is too aggressive, but that is more or less the status of the discussion right now.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Sergio, you have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Humberto. I know that Olga does not have a mic, so I'm sure she will write in the chat window. I'm very much concerned—

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Sergio, we cannot hear you. We lost you. I can't hear you. Sergio, are you there? We lost you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I believe that Sergio will reconnect shortly. I'm going to speak about a concern that has to do with two-letter domain names. We know ccTLDs, but we also have the three-character domain names such as USA or

---

[DAR]. These domain names will be somehow delegated and the ccTLDs will keep their current status, but when we speak about three-character codes, perhaps there is a group within the working group requesting the re-delegation of those three-letter domain names and there is another sector who does not want any delegation.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I'm back. I'm back again. I don't know if you heard my question.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Sorry, we couldn't hear any part of your question.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: For me, for my point of view, this issue of having these three codes is dangerous because they will become new gTLDs. I believe they should be taken as extensive or extensions of domain names from countries. I was wondering what the status of the situation of this topic, of this issue. Is this issue being discussed?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I have something on the chat. I don't think there will be much movement of three or release three-letter domain names according to the 3066 list. I believe that it will keep their current status. It will be kept as reserved domain names. At least this will be for the next round of auctions of new gTLDs. So, your concern which is a wide concern in other sectors in the work track. I believe that these fears will not materialize.

---

There is a sector, there is a group within the working group, within the work track, requesting the delegation but the current situation is that even countries are not able to request those domain names.

So, as co-chair of the working group, we are not expressing our personal opinions, but I believe that it would be reasonable for countries to be able to request these three-char domain names. But, as far as I know, I'm taking into account the agreement and this agreement, I believe they will keep their current reserved status, at least for the next round. That's the situation, Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Javier, for your answer.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Are there any other questions? Please let me know.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I believe this is a very interesting discussion, so the floor is open for questions or for comments. I believe that there are no further questions. We know that there is a concern within the WT5 and we need to be aware of that.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: In fact, I don't want to say that there is a conflict within the working group. We have different positions. Very reasonable and different positions from many sectors in the work track five. At the very

---

beginning, this was seen as something negative but this is not the case because these positions are reasonable. And as long as these positions are reasonable, it's okay. I believe that these differences that are seen, and as I said before, this issue is not over. We are just starting with discussions. But, in general terms—

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Sorry, Javier. Alberto has a question.

ALBERTO SOTO: Well, it's not a question. In fact, I wanted to help Javier. He's a co-chair, so he shouldn't be expressing his personal opinions because then we may face some issues about it. I believe what he means is that we need to take into account that this working group is composed by many stakeholders, the multi-stakeholder model, the different stakeholders of this model.

So, if someone wants to sell a domain name, that person will be requesting for that domain name to be released. I am a member of that work track and, as Javier is saying, positions are very different but they are reasonable positions. So, each party has a reasoning. I do agree with the fact that it's going to be difficult to reach consensus and it would be difficult to reach the deadline with consensus. But, we need to take into account that with other topics within ICANN, we can reach consensus among the different stakeholders. But, in this case, this is a much more complex issue. Thank you.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Alberto. I see a comment by Olga Cavalli. She says, “[inaudible] because this is a multi-stakeholder working group.”

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Well, this is very interesting because this is a PDP from the GNSO and we need to learn about the GNSO process because this process, the processes of the GNSO are different from the processes of GAC, of ALAC. So, in this case, we have many parts from the community working together. This might look like a multi-stakeholder working group, but in fact it is a GNSO working group.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Alberto is requesting the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: No, no. I’m not requesting the floor anymore. It was an old hand.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: And as Olga is saying, this is a GNSO process. The GNSO will provide some recommendations to the board and the board will decide upon those recommendations.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, thank you. It is not clear that this is an ongoing topic, if this is an ongoing discussion. Olga says that you are very optimistic.



---

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Well, I know that Olga has been working on this process for a long time now. I am new at these processes, so that's why I'm being optimistic.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Well, we have different points of view.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Well, Olga has plenty of background and history.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I see Lito typing. He says the GAC also sends recommendations to the board.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Well, the GAC is very important in this process because the position or the point of view from government, from countries, is very important. Now we may talk about the different points that are not in the document in the AGB of 2012. I mean, cities that are not [inaudible] as cities, names of rivers, names of cities, geographical areas.

For example, in the case of dot-amazon, how can we solve this issue in the future? We need to take into account, of course, the opinion of government, of countries. That is what we are trying to do, but of course, if you might imagine, this is something difficult to do.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Javier. I see Dev is typing and Olga. They are typing in the chat. I don't see any hands up, so Javier, thank you very much for your time to stay with us in this call. I know that you are not a member of LACRALO. You belong to NARALO, but of course you're always welcome to LACRALO.

So, now we will go to any other business. We have some any other business on the agenda, but Sylvia Herlein is not on the call. Sergio, would you like to make any comments? I will start by saying that we are going to put forth consensus, the [report] on individual users and the document on metrics. If we don't get consensus, we will put forth this document for voting. The same will be done with the Ameritus Council. I know that Sylvia Herlein was going to speak about this topic, so perhaps, Sergio, you have some comment on it.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Well, I think that you mentioned everything. As we said before, shortly we will have two documents to reach consensus. That is the metrics and the brief reform document. This will pave the way for a short discussion in the community on operating principles. I believe that on Tuesday we will have a meeting and we will finish with this document. [inaudible] review the wording of the document for the wording to be in line with the needs of the region. I know there will be minor differences between the Spanish and English version, but of course these have to do with our understanding – the differences with our understanding on the text.

---

We are now creating a glossary that is going to be attached to the document to have a better understanding of this rule that we are now discussing.

This is the result of hard work of two working group, the Ameritus working group; and on the other hand, the work of the governance working group. I believe this is a huge step in LACRALO in terms of topics that will be discussed in the future.

The great challenge ahead is the rules of procedures. We will have to make our best effort to develop the rules in a clear and transparent manner. Of course, this will require discussion in our region, not because we do not agree with the rules but because we need to [improve the rules]. And we are group of colleagues, a group of people from the region. We will discuss, we will think about this, and of course we will be needing the input from some of our colleagues, some lawyers, to help us with these topics so that we can have our rules of procedure in a formal way.

So, this is the challenge that we have ahead. This is something we're working on to reach to a positive goal.

I don't have clear in my mind the deadlines, but in any case, I believe that we will be working on this document shortly so that we can reach consensus and so that we can approve the document because the work of the working group needs to be reflected in the approval by the region. That's my comment. Thank you very much, Humberto.

---

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Sergio. Alberto Soto, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: I have a question. How is consensus defined? I know how voting works, but what do you mean? Are we going to publish and if someone requests a modification, is the document going to be republished?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: The thing is that we have discussed this several times. So, this is already posted on the working group and on the mailing list. When we say consensus, for example, in the case of metrics, it is possible that we have consensus for all the users, so in that case, the document will be approved by consensus.

In our leadership, we believe that when there is a question for the proposal, then consensus is not possible, consensus is not reached; and therefore we need to put that document for voting. So, that is what we are trying to do.

Why do we have to decide upon consensus? Well, because sometimes we all agree on a certain issue and we avoid the voting stage, but in any other case, we need to resort to voting. So, that is how our leadership works. Is that clear for you, Alberto, now?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Humberto, if I may, I would like to make a motion.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, go ahead.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I believe that this thing that you're mentioning about consensus that is now being exercised in this leadership led by you and Maritza, I believe this is something very positive and this should be added to our – I don't know our operating principles, but we should document this. We should document the way in which we work with consensus and the voting stages, so as to avoid any conflict or any doubt in the processes of the region. I believe this is a [inaudible] step forward.

So, we need to express this in some way so that we can have a clearer procedure for the future in the region.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I would like to give the floor to Alberto first before making my comment. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: I believe that we can do that, but we need to take into account that, for example, the consensus exercised by the GNSO is very different to the one that we exercise. We need to be very careful with this but we can write some document about this. We need to make a difference between consensus and vote, and if consensus is not reached, we can proceed to the voting stage. But, of course, we can agree on certain topics by consensus.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you. I see Bartlett is typing. There is a rule, an item, on the rules of procedures stating that we can reach a general agreement. So, we understand that there is consensus when most of the opinions are in favor, but if one or two or more than two opinions are not in line, then consensus is not reached. Therefore, we need to proceed with the voting stage. So, we might take this into account for our rules of procedures in the future. This is a topic that we need to discuss. I believe we need to discuss it shortly as well.

Is there any other question or any other comment? If not, if there are no further questions or comments, I will bring this call to an end. I don't see anyone with a hand up, so thank you for your participation. Thank you for the presentations. I would like to thank our board members because they are always willing to participate in our monthly call. So, thank you very much and have a nice rest of the week. We will be meeting shortly. Thank you for your participation.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]