
HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. I believe that this is a very special meeting, especially because this is the last meeting that Maritza and I are holding as a chair and secretary before the Barcelona meeting. I will cease to be the LACRALO chair and I would like to thank you all for all the new things I've been able to learn. Once again, I would like to give thanks to Sergio and Harold Arcos. This new leadership will have all my support in whatever they need.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Humberto. We first need to give the floor to Claudia Ruiz, so she can start with the roll call.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Claudia, can you please go ahead and do the roll call.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We are now dialing out to Dev, so we are going to wait a little bit until we have someone on the English channel because we are not having [inaudible].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm on the English channel.

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.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Claudia, I think we will have no time, so perhaps we should start and then we will have other participants joining. If you can go ahead, Claudia, please.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to you call. Welcome to this LACRALO call on this Thursday, October 11, 2018, at 23:00 UTC. On the call today, on the Spanish channel, we have Humberto Carrasco, Hamzah Haji, Harold Arcos, Sergio Salinas Porto, [inaudible], Adrian Carballo, Olga Cavalli, Javier Chandia, Alberto Soto, Ricardo Holmquist, Antonio Medinas Gomez, and Eduardo Diaz.

The English channel, we have Carlton Samuels.

We also have apologies from Maureen Hilyard and Bartlett Morgan.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and Claudia Ruiz managing the call today.

Our interpreters today are Paula and David on the Spanish channel, Betina on the Portuguese channel, and Isabelle and Jacques on the French channel.

Before starting, I'd like to remind you all to please say your names before taking the floor not only for the transcript, but also to allow the interpreters to identify you in the other language channels. Thank you, and now I'll give you the floor back, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I hope you can hear me. Thank you very much, Claudia, for this roll call. I'm sure you'll realize that there are more LACRALO members that have joined the call. I'm going to repeat what I've said before. I want to thank you on behalf of this leadership, Maritza and myself, for all the support you have provided us, for all the experience we have gained. This is our last meeting as chair and secretary and then from the Barcelona meeting, there will be a new leadership by Sergio Salinas Porto and Harold Arcos. We wish them well and I will continue working as an ALAC member in the region. So, having said this, I now will give the floor to Maritza so that we can start approving this agenda.

MARTIZA AGUERO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Before starting, I'd like to thank all the community for the support they have provided us, for patience, for allowing us to develop as individuals, for joining the community, for being able to conduct joint effort. Without further ado, we are now going to start reading the agenda we have for today.

We are going to start the call with an ALAC presentation by Alberto Soto. He is our ALAC member. We are going to review the public consultation. Then, we will continue with the presentation by Eduardo Diaz. We are going to deal with the At-Large group consultation. Then, we will go on with the governance working group. We are going to deal with the operating principles and [inaudible]. This presentation will be made by Sergio Salinas Porto, our new chair. Then, we will continue with new intro topics for the community and then we are going to end this call with a LACRALO webinar on new gTLD subsequent procedures and the importance for At-Large. We are going to hear Carlton Samuels

who is part of the strategy that we are working on with the GSE and then we will wrap up with an evaluation service, as we always do in this kind of webinar. Thank you very much, and now I give the floor back to Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I hope you can hear me. I will now give the floor to Alberto, but before this, let me say now that Alberto, you will end your ALAC [inaudible] in Barcelona, so I would like to thank you for all the work you have done. I know you will continue working with your tremendous dedication and input. I wish you well, both you and your family, and I wish you success. I will now give you the floor, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Congratulations to you, too, and to Maritza and to all of those who have worked in this period that is now ending and a new period starting again. So, let's continue working. Thank you, Humberto and thank you [inaudible].

We're going to discuss ... Could you please show what I'm going to discuss in the first presentation, please? The first slide. Slide number one, please. Thank you.

So, the issue that we are going to deal with, the issues that are being discussed, are the following. As for data protection and privacy [inaudible], we are searching for ICANN's comments on both access models. This period will close on September 28th. The main question here is who can access the WHOIS data that are not public and by what

method? The link you're going to find [inaudible] to the specific topics that we deal with in each of the slides.

So, in this first slide, based on the approach proposed, ALAC agreed and the users with a legitimate interest – for example, the police or groups that need to comply with specific data protection measures cannot be denied those measures. For example, data protection lawyers, they need to be able to access the non-public data based on certain limitations and their formal accreditation program. These are proposals. This is still being discussed. ALAC is, however, concerned about the development of the accreditation program and the number of issues that still are pending and the very brief period before applying the GDPR. Oh, I see I have control over the slides.

So, let's go to the second issue. The gTLD RDAP proposal, this is closing on October 7, 2018. The link is down there. This is one step before the proposed gTLD registration data access protocol profile. The temporary specification for gTLD RDAP adopted by ICANN's board happened on May 2018. It attempted to create an RDAP gTLD profile as a requirement to launch the registration data access protocol, as I said earlier.

The specific temporary specification is in the link that I just posted there. There will be another internal link where you will be able to see this. This was adopted by the board on December 2018. There is a discussion group for registrar and registries, contracted parties, that has already prepared a proposal for this profile that we are discussing now and it has two parts. There is an implementation guide for RDAP, and number two, there is a proposal. You will be able to see more

information later. This is still being discussed. It's an issue that is being discussed. You can access that link and if there is anything to say about this, [inaudible].

The third issue is the [inaudible] WHOIS2. The review team has prepared a preliminary report, recommendation report. As far as the Registration Directory Service review, well, it is a draft report. The Registration Directory Service will assess to what extent the recommendations of those reviews have been implemented and what has been the result of that implementation and the impact of it.

The review team will also assess the effectiveness of the directory service right now. They are also setting whether the implementation will comply with the legitimate needs of applying the law. I'm sure a person will refer to the consumer, the [inaudible] legislation. And there is also available documentation on this. The consultation period has the aim of collecting information and recommendations proposed.

Let's now go to the next slide. That is dealing with the draft KPI and IANA FY20 operating plan and budget. This is still open for public comment, this operating plan and budget, for the technical Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) for the 2020 fiscal year. We are analyzing several documents including ICANN strategic plan and also the five-year operating plan that ICANN has, as well as the budget proposal. Let's now go to the next slide.

This is important for everybody. It's an initial report of the new gTLD auction process cross-community working group. The link is there as

well. You can go and see it directly. I'm sorry, you can go and see the detailed information right there on that link.

The initial report includes the process of the cross-community working groups that are aimed to create the charter in January 2017. According to the charter, the process aimed to have a proposal for consideration by the chartering organizations. This charter includes a number of printables that we hope the group will consider and it [inaudible] 11 issues on the charter that we have no time to deal with and they need to respond to these in the course of their work.

It is [inaudible] that, as part of the proposal, the group will also consider the scope of the allocation of those funds, the due diligence requirement to reserve ICANN's fiscal state, and how to deal with these issues as potential conflicts or real conflicts that may arise. I'm now going to the next slide.

The final report of the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team – I'm sure Carlton will specifically deal with this later on. This Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team final report was pertaining to the board. There are multiple studies that have been conducted as well as input by the ICANN community [inaudible] report. I'm sure Carlton will deal with this.

The issues covered in this final report are the following. History of new gTLD program, competition in the DNS market, consumer choice, consumer rights, trust, DNS abuse, safeguards, public interest commitment, mechanism for data protection rights, and commercial

trademark. So, this is the end of my presentation. There are some issues that I'm sure Carlton will deal with. Thank you.

I'm sorry. I didn't have to deal with this, but I agreed with Maritza and they need to list the meetings. I hardly had some time to deal with this issue [inaudible]. I will be online [inaudible] and then have [to leave].

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

I hope that you can go on with your obligations and we will meet in person in Barcelona and we will hear about it. Okay. Thank you very much. Let's just go on.

Now I'll give the floor to a great friend of mine who comes from NARALO, although he has a Latin name, Eduardo Diaz, who has been working very actively in NARALO and in everything that has to do with the At-Large review and is going to give us an update on that. Welcome, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you for the invitation. Claudia, can we please display the presentation on the screen? Thank you. Claudia, are you going to have control over the presentation or should I do that?

Today, I am going to talk to you about this At-Large reform. We are going to talk about the background, why this review started. It took us two years to go through this entire process. Since its beginning, we encountered several difficulties, but the end result did not please a lot of people, so I'm going to give you some background information. I'm going to share with you the timeline, just to put things in context. I'm

going to talk about the results of the group that was set up that is called the ARIWG, At-Large Review Implementation Working Group. This is the group in charge of implementation. Then, we are going to talk about the next steps.

Let's start with why. The ICANN bylaws in section four, as you can see here, have provisions that establish a periodic review of the performance and operation of the SOs and the Advisory Committees and all the Advisory Committees, except for GAC and the Nominating Committee. This has driven ICANN to start with this review to make sure that these organizations are fulfilling the purpose that they were created for, and also to ensure accountability. So, this was a healthy process for everyone.

Let's talk about the timeline events. What I can say is that the ALAC underwent the first review for a period of five years between 2007 and 2012. The ALAC, at that time, was a young organization at the time and it underwent a review and this is something that we have been working on since we came to know this organization.

The second review [inaudible] the discussion about the second review started in 2014, but as you all know, the IANA transition started at that time, so much of the work that was being done within ICANN focused on that transition. People were concerned about the IANA transition, so the second review did not actually start until 2016. And in 2016, a proposal was put forward to look for an organization that is going to conduct this review.

Here you see a cross and then there you will find a link with all the information related to these reviews. This is a table that shows you the different phases. This is part of the timeline of the calendar of events. To the left, you can find a list of the activities that are included in English in the table.

In January 2016, there was a proposal put forward to select the company that was going to conduct a review and some months later, in May, the [inaudible] company was unfortunately chosen. We say unfortunately because, of course, the outcomes were not expected ones for us.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

It seems that we had missed you, Eduardo, for a few minutes. I lost you for a few seconds. I don't know if Claudia can confirm whether we lost you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I'm on the bridge. I was talking about items, the second point here. So, I was talking about the second bullet point here, about the selection of the review organization. I said that it was quite an unfortunate choice because the results of the review did not please a lot of people and many of us realized that the company perhaps failed to understand the composition of At-Large. Of course, they identified some of the problems that we had, but overall, it seems that they didn't understand how we worked.

The third point here speaks about the comment period. During this public comment period, nine months from May 2016 to February 2017 were devoted to holding interviews with many of us. The [items] team also attended two ICANN meetings and in February 2017, the [items] came up with a report. This report was subject to a comment period for three months. We had several meetings with them. We shared our comments, but they didn't pay attention to our comments and then they issues the final report.

The bullet point number five here speaks about the ICANN board's decision. Over all these months, all these events took place, and then we can look at the next item and between September 2017 and April 2018, that was part of that 13-month period, what happened was that the ALAC prepared a feasibility assessment. This is a very long document. You can read all these documents and basically that document mentioned that many of the recommendations were not appropriate.

The Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN board that was in charge of looking at the result of these reviews was asked to carry out a mapping exercise in order to identify the map between the document statement and our requirement. So, this was quite a lengthy process. This exercise, the feasibility assessment, and the mapping exercise took us approximately seven months. Many hours were devoted to these activities. We worked very hard in order to come up with a document. The document was called Implementational Review with a general summary of the implementation. This was a document that stated what [items] had identified and what we were going to do and the reasons why we were going to do that.

This document was forwarded to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the board for review and this committee adopted that document. Basically, the members of that committee agreed with those findings and then this resulted in some board resolutions. This is in English, but here you can see that these were the board resolutions with their rationale. Basically, I just took these three resolutions because they relate to specific results.

The first resolution speaks about the need to create an implementation working group. That is how the At-Large Implementation Working Group came into existence with the acronym ARIWG. This group is led by Maureen together with Alan and Cheryl who participated in that review. Basically, with that resolution, this group was created.

Then, the second resolution speaks about the need to have a detailed plan with all the budgetary implications and therefore within this working group, a development plan was put together. I would like to display this plan when I finish with this explanation because I also want to show you how we are working along these lines.

The third resolution that I have included here basically establishes that ALAC has to report its progress in its work twice a year. It's planned, how it plans to implement those activities. The first report will be out on December the 31st this year. So, what are the next steps?

Everybody in ALAC, including the regional leaders, will have to work on all the implementation cases. Some of you are already working on them and you have been assigned to those. I don't know if Claudia or somebody from the staff can add here the link for the prioritization of

these activities. Perhaps you can add it here. So, you can perhaps click on that link and display it here on the Adobe room. Basically, through that link, you are showed a table that shows the recommendation, what the ALAC is going to do, how priorities have been set for those recommendations. Some of them are easier to implement than others and some will be implemented before others. And of course there is also an impact on the budget. Here, we identify what kind of impact they have. That is how these recommendations are being implemented. This is the approach for implementation.

There is another table that contains the budgetary implications, the steps being followed. There is a template that we have used and that we will also use to report all this information to the board before December 2018. On Friday, the day after the Barcelona meeting, the ALAC will hold a meeting with all the leaders and there will be a specific session to discuss this implementation because everybody should be in synch and aware of this.

Basically, what you can see here on the screen, there is that table. Please let me know if I'm taking too much time. But, something that is happening, the first recommendation speaks about quality versus quantity. So, this means that the reviewers found that we were making comments on everything and that instead of ... The recommendation is that instead of making comments on every single issue discussing ICANN, we need to choose on which specific issues we are going to make comments on. But, why did they say that? Because they just entered the ALAC page where all comments are displayed and posted. But, they thought that all those comments were being made generally

and were considered like that. They didn't understand that we had put in categories for those comments.

Then, we have the At-Large Summit, the ATLAS-3, and we are going to discuss about that in Barcelona. That will take place in 2019. With this, I conclude my presentation. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you.

MARITZA AGUERO:

Thank you, Eduardo. Are there any questions? I don't see any hands raised and I don't see any questions in the chat window, but let's wait for a couple of minutes. In the meantime, let me thank you, Eduardo, for taking the time to share all this information with us and joining us for this monthly call.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Not at all. I can stay for a few more minutes and then I leave.

MARITZA AGUERO:

Humberto is asking for the floor. Go ahead, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

This is extraordinary summary of what is happening around implementation. I wanted to ask Eduardo whether these groups are open or closed. I know the answer but I want the community also to be aware of that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is a very good question. I think that this group, these tables, are close to the general public but perhaps Silvia can help me with that. I have access to these tables and I do work on them but I think that this is a closed group, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know the answer, but I do know the ALAC staff are working on this.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I can hear you now.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, we can hear all of you. I don't know the answer to this question, Humberto. I don't know which ones are open, which ones are closed. It's a very good question.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Eduardo. That was all I wanted to know.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Excuse me. I was muted and I wanted to say ... To respond to the question whether it is public or private, well, yes it is public. You can [inaudible] the content of the discussions. But, I believe only some people have the right to edit this website. Otherwise, any person can participate. It's public.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Silva.

MARITZA AGUERO: There is a question on the chatroom for Eduardo. The question reads as follows. It's a question from [inaudible]. Eduardo, in agreement with what Humberto has said, do you know any current participation methods and if it's effective as it is requested [so many times]?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, in the context of this group, people are working. We do not really have a method as such. Of course in the meetings, we do say who is there present and who has been excused. But, those who are working are actually working and the result is being seen in the comments that we are getting constantly on this table. They're not empty and there is a very healthy discussion about them, but there are no specific metrics to measure whether there is participation or not, but the result is on what we see in the comments. I'm not sure if this is a good response.

MARITZA AGUERO: Yes. That's an excellent answer. Humberto, if you're there, could you please [inaudible] Eduardo.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I just wanted to thank Eduardo for his presentation. That was very clear. I think now we can go to the presentation from Sergio Salinas Porto who

will discuss or actually provide an update on the government working group in relation to the metrics and the new operating principles. Sergio, you now have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Good afternoon and good evening to you all. Before starting with this, knowing that this is our last teleconference with the leadership of Humberto and Maritza, let me just say that I want to thank them as a LACRALO member for all the massive work they have done throughout this time and the very valuable contribution they have made to the issues that have been arisen.

There is no doubt that all the work of the Governance Working Group – this is what [I’m going to deal with now] – would never have been possible if we had not had the support of these two very valuable colleagues. [inaudible] support from staff and [inaudible]. I’m sure that we will now make the most of all of these, the most of [inaudible] so that we can provide some input as well.

But, let me once again refer to the great work from Humberto and Maritza that has allowed – their leadership has allowed us to have the possibility to discuss the new operating principles for the region as well as other documents that the governance group has issued.

Now, more specifically, this document that we have submitted and that we have worked on with other colleagues in the region has the aim of first establishing some organization guidelines and some institutionalization in our region. All of these are issues that make the

work in the region from now on to be more fluid and with less conflict for not being able to [understand the rules]. Many times this was because the initial translation of those documents created in 2006 was not very clear. It wasn't properly done. And I think part of it was the beginning of the conflict that is created by having different components in the region with a participation with the rules that were not clear and precise.

The document we have submitted is the result of very hard work for about two years and it was prepared with all of the issues associated to the internal governance in our region and also with some sensitive issues that have caused a not very productive work in terms of policy development.

Now, let me – give me just a second. The origin of the document had some very important milestones. One was in Los Angeles and the other one in San Juan, Puerto Rico, where we discussed together with group of people in the region, we have discussed issues related to governance but also issues to [inaudible] that have [risen] in these three years that we have [inaudible].

Some elements that we are going to see now in this new operating principles are related to some new figures that will allow us to modify this, especially the chair and vice chair. This is something that surprised us. [inaudible] this is now [inaudible] the very nice idea of [inaudible] that we could include such issues. But, he also proposed us to think about a different construction in the region and this idea of chair-elect and secretary-elect. For those of you who live in the Caribbean, the proposal was to refer to an incumbent chair and secretary. I apologize.

Actually, the word choice was chair-elect and secretary-elect. They proposed that instead of choosing a chair and a vice chair, to give the possibility to the chair-elect and secretary-elect to tell them what their function will be with training one year before they have access to the position. So, they would allow us to have this chair-elect and secretary-elect, to have [inaudible] that is higher from the chair or secretary elect at the time. Any of this [inaudible] in the region will have a better vision because they will have been trained for one year and the policies to be implemented by the chair-elect and secretary-elect would allow us to have good results in the region.

In addition, what we have stated as an innovation is the creation of a board of directors. The mission is to be able to coordinate the discussion on the basis of policies that are discussed in ICANN to be able to deepen [inaudible] and not just discuss the domestic issues, [inaudible] the domestic issues as we have seen. We have been very critical about this and many of us in the region, precisely [inaudible] some criticism about what was happening in our region.

So, now, this participation and commitment by a board of directors would create more [inaudible] policies within the region for their discussion. So, we will start to discuss policy issues exclusively and this will allow us to have a [inaudible] in the production of documents and in the involvement of all of these in the region.

The other main issue is rotation in the position in a way that would not imply that countries or regions will continue to take the same positions over and over again. This was a discussion or a concern that some components have and this also arises from discussions we've had but

especially [inaudible] discussion we generated based on the main document. We generated a proposal so that all the countries and all the regions can rotate and can have the possibility to be [inaudible] in the region.

So, the process implies a rotation by four regions. We have divided all of this big region, this big Latin American and Caribbean regions into four regions and these four regions would rotate in their position, aside from the fact that we are also having this regional balance and we have the [inaudible].

So, all of these issues that level the playing field and have a horizontal line in the region was thinking about [inaudible] of involvement and commitment.

I apologize because my Internet connection has just dropped. I will need just some seconds until my connection comes back. In the meantime, I will continue with whatever I can remember.

We need to add to all of this a document that we have submitted a few days ago. This was the metrics document. I'm not sure whether this is [open for vote], but it was [inaudible] to be adopted or approved by [inaudible].

MARITZA AGUERO: Sergio, are you there?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Have we lost our audio from Sergio?

SILVIA VIVANCO: It seems he dropped. He has disconnected. Just a moment until he can reconnect his audio.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: He is now accessing the AC room, but the operator is dialing out to him.

MARITZA AGUERO: David has his hand up. Humberto, can we allow David to speak in the meantime?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: David, please go ahead.

[DAVID]: I was going to say [inaudible], but please resume, if you have the presentation there with you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: What we also need to mention is the inclusion of individual users. Based on what we are shown now, we will have the following process. The first thing we need to think about is these are principles [inaudible]. So, first, we need to adopt these operating principles. They are the [inaudible] guidelines that will help us to administer the region, [inaudible] the region, and then we will need to think how we're going to [inaudible] all of these. This applies to a second stage where we would need to bring

together everything that we have planned within these operating principles and within that second stage, we will need to [rule] them.

One of the issues we need to [rule] is how the individual users who are not associated to any At-Large organization would participate. This would be a very big challenge because we need to think about a region where the collective persons is represented. That is, civil society organizations related to issues associated to end users, but we will also need to think about how these individual users who is not related to any organization would participate. So, this will have to be present in this [rule] as well.

We have also been working on the issue of conflict of interest. We have had many concerns and many discussions on how to represent or whether we may or may not be able to represent the users in conflicts of interest, what conflicts of interest are [inaudible].

So, we set some kind of framework where the boundaries for participation are within those frameworks. If we are within those frameworks, we will be the representative or we may be the representatives of end users. Otherwise, we would not be their representative.

So, what are next steps? This is a final draft and what we need to do now is to engage in a comment process. The deadline October 17th. We still have one week to review this, to [inaudible]. You will see that we have added a glossary. We have collected the opinions from all of our colleagues and members of this committee and what we need to do now as a final step is to provide this framework and this framework will

[imply] that you will be able to read and give an opinion. Ricardo Holmquist has also provided us some ideas of some issues that were failing and need to recognize that. I did see the [inaudible] issues and there will be some other things that we're going to add, that any input that you want to add would be very welcomed by [inaudible]. We try to incorporate them all. We will then close the document and we hope to have consensus, so that we can [basically] go to the ruling of these operating principles so that we can then finally have a package of participation documents in LACRALO.

I'm not really sure how much time I have left, but I am now open to your questions or suggestions if you have any.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you, Sergio. I thank you or your presentation. Unfortunately, we are running out of time, so let's have questions through the chat window, so that they can be answered also in that window because we only have 30 minutes left and we need some also for the next speakers. So, apologize to Sergio and I hope you understand. If you don't mind, you can answer questions through the chat window. Is that okay, Sergio?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Yes, Humberto. No problem. I see that Alexis and [inaudible] has just written a comment there, so I'm going to reply to that through the chat window. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Sergio. So, with this, we conclude the formal part of this call and now we welcome Carlton. We give the floor to Carlton. We [inaudible] to listen to you talking about the new gTLD procedures. Carlton, you have the floor.

CARLTON SAMUELS: [inaudible] done an excellent job of it and I wish them all the best in their new positions elsewhere.

So, we're going to speak now about the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP working group. I'm going to give you an overview of its work and outputs to date. Next slide. Maybe I have the opportunity to change my own slides.

So, why the PDP? The policy process was chartered to evaluate changes or additions that needed to be made to the existing new gTLD policy recommendations. Most of you would know that these recommendations are contained in two major documents. Introduction of new generic top-level domains and that was a document that was produced back in August 2007 and the Applicant Guidebook, the final one is dated June 2012.

It's important to recognize that both the GNSO Council and the ICANN board agree that these two documents together represent the systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains. So, anything you want to see about the gTLD program goes to those two documents.

So, let's talking about the PDP work group, the organization. Very quickly, the GNSO had a discussion group back in June 2014 to examine what happened in the 2012 gTLD round and they wanted to extract a set of subjects that required further analysis and study. So, these subjects that were extracted from that discussion group were brought together in the issued report which was finalized in December 2015. The working group was chartered in January 2016 and a call for volunteers went out in late January 2016 and the group began its work in earnest in February 2016.

The leadership is shared by Jeff Neuman and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl Langdon-Orr replaced Avri Doria, who for because of changes in her circumstances had to give up the co-chair of this group.

This is a very big working group. It has over 180 members from all over the community and 65 observers. A lot of us from ... There are quite a few members from our region on it. Alberto Soto is there, Vanda Scartezini is there, Harold Arcos is there, myself, several others are members of this working group. So, it's quite big. Much bigger than usual.

The group organized itself into six work tracks and each of these work tracks, a very extensive scope of work assigned for them. I'll go a little bit more into the scope of work to show you. But, the work tracks were one overarching issues work track and that looked at all of the top-level issues surrounding the new gTLD program. Work track one, we have overall process support, outreach.

Work track two, legal regulatory. This is a work track I want to highlight some of the issues in certain work tracks. This is one work track, legal regulatory. This is the one that [inaudible] the question of the global public interest, for example; the closed generics; and the second level rights protection mechanisms.

Work track three was about string contention objection and disputes. This is the work track that looked at community applications and applicant freedom of expression.

Work track four was internationalized domain names, technical, and operations.

Work track five was geographic names at the top level. Note, geographic names. The work track five was actually added at a later stage in the work groups and they are going to deliver their own report. Since they started late, they are a little behind on their work and they will eventually release their report.

I wanted to show you the scope of work for just one work track. This is work track one. This is the work track that dealt with the issues of outreach and so on.

The first line you see there, you see principles A and C, recommendations 1, 9, 10, 12, 23. Those are referencing those two documents we spoke of earlier. The document from 2007 and Applicant Workbook. So, when you see those references, it's about those principles and recommendations are in those documents. The Applicant Guidebook had something to do with that.

If you go to the next slide quickly, it continues. Clarity of the application process, the accreditation program, systems, application fees, communications, application submission portal, support for applicants in developing countries. All of these things. Ways to provide comment and the role of public comment in the whole process. All of those issues are within scope for work track one. So, it's a huge, huge piece of work that is going off of work track one.

The output. As you know, the PDP has been going on since 2016. It's now 2018. And they've been having weekly calls, both in the work track teams as well as in the overall PDP. They have finally released initial report in July of 2018. That report is available for community input and I think it's become [inaudible] comment period was open until the 28th of September. So, you are looking at that report which has just overarching issues, plus the outputs from work tracks one through four.

Recall that work track five which is dealing with geographic names at the top level, their initial report is yet to come out.

This report, this initial report, is a little different—

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Has he dropped from the call or have we lost the audio?

MARITZA AGUERO: I think that he is being called again by the operator. Just a moment, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, let's give him a couple of seconds to reconnect. I don't think that it will take long and he will reconnect soon. So, we'll bear with him. I'm sure that he will reconnect quickly. He's talking about a very important issue. He's talking about the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton. I'm back on. I'm sorry I got cut off. Are you hearing me?

INTERPRETER: Yes, I can hear you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Wonderful. So, we are talking about the initial report. I was about to tell you when I got cut off that this initial report does not have any information about the level of consensus for the recommendations presented, but in the report itself, the community is asked to respond to 150 questions, some 20 options and various matters for the community to select an option and some of those issues include application to be accessed in rounds, where it will seize objections, close generics, IDNs.

Then, you have over 140 preliminary recommendations for analysis and response. It is a very big report and it is interesting that the work group tells you that they don't expect you to answer every question that is in that report. They do not expect an answer from everybody for every question, but they certainly expect to get feedback on all questions from the community as a whole. The community is not restricted to making comments only on the questions or the options that they have

listed and put in their recommendations. You can make comments on anything that you see in the report. For example, the report itself has a long piece in analysis to do with whether or not we should have rounds. To go forward, you can make some comments. There's been a lot of comments online about that issue, for one.

What is important to pull from this report, this initial report, from the working group is that it thinks it might be too early to make a call on the benefits or negative effects from the 2012 round, but they see no compelling reason to alter the existing policy. That is to say, have a continuing mechanism for new gTLDs to be introduced to the DNS.

They are also referring the consumer trust, consumer confidence CCTRT report. It was mentioned earlier that report is out in final stage now and it's out for review. That report actually did have a lot to say about whether or not the new gTLD is actually introduced more competition and whether or not it has created more confidence in the user community. Those questions were answered in the consumer trust and consumer confidence report from the review team. In that final report, you will see the recommendations there. I would urge you to read that report, at least the recommendations in that report, as you think about what the PDP is asking for in the list report.

I told you that for the next steps, the comment period was for the final report – for the initial report, rather – was closed on the 26th of September. The staff report which is the report that takes in all the comments from the community into consideration of the initial report, that report is due at the end of October. And something you should note, even while the report has been out for comment, the working

group continued to progress and ask questions and it has decided that it would submit a supplemental report and that report, the supplemental report, is in draft stage now. It started on the 28th of September and once it's completed, they will have that supplemental report available for a 40-day comment period from the community.

So, the initial report captured a lot of work that was done by the working group, but because work continued and there was still some contentious issues going on, the work group has decided that a supplemental report to that initial report is deemed necessary to show further progress.

The ongoing arguments in the work group include how you resolve contention sets. Part of the issue in the 2012 round was that contention if more than one group applied for the same string, then you were in a contention set and the usual way to resolve that contention is by going auctions and you could have a private auction or the ICANN public auction. There were concerns expressed from the board and from the members of the community that the private auctions, there's a possibility that the private auctions could be gamed and some contentions were actually deliberately executed because they intended to get some kind of outcome, some kind of outcome through the private auction process. There have been concerns that this is a situation that needs to be addressed.

There's also been contention going on about variable fees. A question is whether or not fees should be varied, and given the formula that was used to determine what the fee was, it was supposed to be a fee that did not produce a profit. So, it was just supposed to cover the cost of

the program, programmatic costs. There is some concern that maybe we need to look at that again and we need to look at fees, varying the fees for, for example, community type applications, whatever those are finally decided to be. So, those are probably the two most contentious subjects that are in ongoing discussions in the working group.

The working group reports, if you look at this presentation, all of them are hyperlinked. So, where you see initial report, there's a hyperlink that will take you through the initial report where you see the reports about the two documents, the Applicant Guidebook and the 2007 principles for new gTLD program. Those are all hyperlinked. You can get to them.

I would suggest that you look at the report and choose some of the things that you think are important to end users. For example, a case if you live in the global south, you might be concerned about the ability of global south entities to participate in the gTLD program and you might have to look at ways that might be inhibiting more of our people from participation. So, you have to look at those.

You may want to be concerned about variable fees because how fees might impact the ability of entities of the global south to participate. You might look for applicant support. You might want to take into consideration [inaudible] systems. You might want to look at community applications. These are some of the things that I believe that the At-Large would probably have heightened interest in looking at. All you have to do is to look at the work tracks that are looking at those issues and make your comments there. You can see there are some ... If you go to the Wiki, you will see a lot of Google Docs, links to Google

Docs that have blow-by-blow descriptions of what occurred in some of the discussions.

There are lots of other things in the report that might be of heightened interest to the At-Large, but it's a long report. It's a big report. What I would recommend that you do is you go first through [inaudible] contains all of the recommendations and the questions and look at the areas of the work. It's laid out by work team and interventions, work track interventions. Look for the work tracks that you are interested. Look at the questions that are on the preliminary recommendations that are associated with those work tracks and make your comments.

Please remember that the working group is still in place. You can join the working group as a member. You can join as an observer. So, there are lots of opportunities to participate.

I think I'll stop there and maybe take a few questions. Thank you, Humberto. Thank you, Maritza. Back to you, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you very much, Carlton Samuels. That was a very good presentation and we will now open the floor for any debate or any question you may have after this very good presentation. I'm trying to see if there are any hands up. I don't see any for the time being. The presentation has been very clear. It seems we have no questions so far. I am now reviewing the AC chat window and I don't see any other questions. So, thank you very much, Carlton. And since we have no more questions, we can wrap up this webinar.

But, before you all go, we would like you to reply to the survey that we're going to show you on the screen. So, I now give the floor to Claudia or Rodrigo. I'm not really sure who is going to conduct the survey.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Thank you very much, Humberto and Maritza. But, let me first on behalf of the staff, thank Humberto and Maritza for their leadership and companionship in this time that they have been leaders in LACRALO. On behalf of Heidi and all the staff, let me thank you. We will meet soon in Barcelona. Claudia, please go ahead with the survey.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

The first question is: how was the timing of the webinar for you? You can now answer. Thank you and let's go to the next question.

How is the technology used for the webinar? You can answer now. Thank you. We will now continue to the third question.

Did the speakers demonstrate mastery of the topic? Please answer now. Thank you. We are going to go now to the next question.

Are you satisfied with the webinar? Thank you.

Next question. What region do you live in at the moment?

Okay, let's go on. How many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community?

And the final question, what topic would you like us to cover for future webinars? You can write your replies right here.

Okay. Thank you very much for your replies. We can now continue with this webinar.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. Good evening, good afternoon, and good morning and see you very soon. This call is now adjourned. Thank you. Thank you to the interpreters. Thank you to the interpreters and good afternoon to you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]