

LACRALO Summary Minutes 28.04.11 - EN

(draft minutes of the LACRALO call 28 April 2011)
Started 15 mins past the hour.

Dev T opened the call, reminded everyone at the previous LACRALO call that Lance Hinds of DevNet was to chair this call and turned the chair to Lance.

Lance reviewed the agenda and removed agenda item 4 - Report from LACRALO's ALAC representatives due to the absence of LACRALO ALAC reps - Carlton, Sergio (who sent apologies) and Sylvia

Roll call was done:

On English channel : Jessel Ackbarali, Lance Hinds, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Cintra Sooknanan

On Spanish channel : Carlos Vera, Aislan Vargas, Wladimir Davlos, Natalia Enciso, Maria Eugenia Mendez, Jose Ovidio Salgueiro, Jose Luis Barzallo

Apologies : Sergio Salinas Porto, Johnny Laureano, Jose Arce, Gladys Farina

Staff : Matt, Gisella, Heidi, Seth

Dev T went through Action Items

- more person added to beta test translation engine - DONE

- post to list Dev to post modifications regarding participation to Bylaw WG for consideration - there were suggested changes to modifications regarding this AI during Caribbean call participation so not fully completed

- Fatima, Sergio, Jose Arce to review SWOT C by close of business on April 8 2011 - not completed, but no changes can be submitted

- Dev to post issues out of comment (Geographic Regions WG discussion, PEDNR) in time for next LACRALO call – Completed

Dev T went through agenda #3. Open Public Consultations

Open Consultations mentioned:

- Proposed ICANN Bylaw Revisions Regarding the ALAC : <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#bylaws-xi>
- Proposal for Renewal of the .NET Registry Agreement : <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#net-renewal>
- Proposed .MOBI Contract Amendment "Additional Equitable Allocation Options for .MOBI One and Two-Character Domains" : <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#mobi-rsep-2010011>
- new gTLD Applicant guidebook : <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/comments-6-en.htm> - Dev T pointed out that an item in the gTLD Applicant Guidebook that new text that ALAC can object to a gTLD application once a process has been submitted by ALAC to show how RALOs and ALAC are included in this process.
- Cintra pointed out the work of the JAS WG <https://community.icann.org/display/jaswg/SO-AC+New+gTLD+Applicant+Support+Working+Group+%28JAS-WG%29>

Dev T reviewed ALAC statements out for the vote :

- ALAC Statement on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group Proposed Final Report <https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/ALAC+Statement+on+Post-Expiration+Domain+Name+Recovery+Working+Group+Proposed+Final+Report+-+April+2011>
- ALAC Statement to the ICANN Board on the RAA Negotiations <https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/ALAC+Statement+to+the+ICANN+Board+on+the+RAA+Negotiations+-+April+2011>

Dev T gave summary of the election results of the LACRALO chair and secretariat.

Cintra asked how many candidates from the region had applied to the Nomcom appointed positions for the Board, GNSO and ALAC representative from the Latin American and the Caribbean region.

Dev T gave overview of Proposed Participation Clause in LACRALO Bylaws

Essentially, the concept is akin to a traffic light indicating the ALS status in LACRALO : green light, yellow light, red light

Carlos V commented that that in the previous meeting, there was discussion on the different parameters that would establish the degree of participation because

there can be participation in the discussion like he is doing now, but the issue is it just joining the call or having any feedback?

and it not easy to establish good criteria ; Is it that I learn about the subject or make contributions on the subject? How to define good guidelines?

We have to come up with guidelines which is fair and measures the more active participation which can be recognized so in other circumstances, need to come up with well established criteria ;

If an ALS does not participate, and they gives an excuse, then there is no way of verifying this excuse, then it is a moot point

- to do a followup of said participation with a observation which is very clear in regards to the ALS that has been observed.

Cintra suggested a plus system - for example attend a meeting is 1 point , participating you add a plus
evaluate on substance, evaluate on merit or participation

Jessel - are we going to encourage meaningful participation, or it is a "yes, I agree" and voice their comments on it?

Lance - contributing in terms providing positions on certain issues. For e.g. comment on ALAC statements. The question is if we implement a point system, what would be the red light? If you only attend 10 meetings, then is it that you must participate on the 11 call ?

Olivier - While attending is a good idea and recording such is good, the participating part becoming is more difficult - imagine 30 persons in a call, if you are going to ask each one to participate by actively saying things, it will be a 5 hour or longer meeting. The attendance is one thing, the active participation - some ppl are here to listen, some ppl are here to put their points across, or if it is their first meeting, its not fair to pressure them to participate actively.

Carlos - why do we want to carry out this measurement of participation? Eg this is to be done if an ALS is active or inactive ; also establish a threshold of participation to be eligible to vote ; establish other criteria that will qualify an ALS as active, because a problem is that ALS only show up during elections or when decisions are made, day to day work is not taken seriously, so we need criteria to grade an ALS. Due to country weight, perhaps something can be devised to take into account the ALS activity with the number of ALSes in the country. But need to define the reasons of why we are doing this, then easier to come up with criteria.

Lance - country weight don't not have have a impact on the participation, should deal with each ALS. So the participation criteria could be a set number of LACRALO activities and if an ALS does only a certain number of activities, they are considered active.

Dev T - regarding point system - good idea but how to quantify subjective criteria? Not all policy work is of interest to all ALSes, so e.g IDN has less interest in LAC region compared to Asia Pacific so expecting all ALSes to have participation on all issues is not realistic. This started out because it was difficult to have quorum on conference calls or on any on votes. For eg. just concluded Secretariat elections, 10 ALSes did not vote. Quorate for election, but not if LACRALO wanted bylaw modifications. So those ALSes (worst cases) that are not participating at all should be identified first rather than those attending, even for those attending, but not yet participating to a level that we may want, at least they have an intent to participate and thus should be encouraged. But those ALSes that don't respond at all are the worst cases and should be dealt with.

carlos - that is a good focus - identification of assistance is not just for the ALS but for the RALO itself and in the bylaws, quorum has to do the persons in a election, Perhaps an ALS has hasn't voted in two or more consecutive elections can be removed from quorum

Lance - take suggestions and put it out there.

Cintra - 2nd Lance's suggestion, but hearing fine and punish those not participating instead perhaps reward/highlight those ALSes that do participate a lot. Put a +ve spin on it. By Highlighting those ALSes that are participating, LACRALO can see who are our leaders, where are our strengths.

Dev T agreed with Lance.

Lance moved to next agenda item on RALO communication needs

Olivier said there is a push for At-Large to beef up its communication strategy and to do outreach and inreach. We have the support of ICANN Communications with Scott Pinzon since Cartagena had good discussions with him. A podcast was done with ALAC's Chair (Olivier) but genuine wish to do podcasts from the regions ; one idea to get the RALOs on how they wish to select people to go on a podcast - either RALO leadership or ALS representatives. It would be good to get non-english speakers to demonstrate the diversity of persons involved with ICANN At-Large. 6th May 2011 is deadline for feedback

Dev T supported the idea of podcasts in other languages in English ; wants to see more visual content on Youtube

Lance - we would have to look at LACRALO developing content.

Olivier - the other thing is what are the communication needs in the region. Lot of material out such as the Confluence guide in 6 UN languages. Are there other material that will be needed for outreach / inreach within your ALS and for the public.

Heidi - Matt as At-Large Coordination, will be increasing Twitter and Facebook use more and with mentions of support for developing visual content in FY12 budget

Cintra mentioned Sergio's proposal in LACRALO's FY12 proposal to create radio content idea.

Under last agenda item "Any other business" :

Dev T gave an update on the progress of the beta email translation list which has seen improvements since ICANN San Francisco (<https://> urls work, a do not translate tag <DNT> was implemented)

Cintra mentioned that she thinks emails to the Spanish version were not being received on the English version of the list

Dev T outlined plans to conduct a survey to get LACRALO's users of social media such as Facebook and Twitter and VOIP programs like Skype usernames so that LACRALO can use social media more effectively. Already there is a LACRALO Facebook page and a LACRALO Twitter account created.

Congratulations and well wishes to At-Large staff re: Heidi going on maternity leave and Matt joining At-Large Staff

Meeting concluded at 90 minutes past the hour.