BUENOS AIRES – At-Large LACRALO Monthly Meeting
Wednesday, June 24, 2015 – 10:30 to 11:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Hello. Humberto Carrasco speaking.

ALBERTO SOTO: Hello, Humberto. Can you hear me? This is Alberto Soto speaking. Hello, Humberto. It's a pleasure to have you here. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. We will start our monthly meeting today. Now we will proceed with the roll call so as to begin with our meeting.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Meeting in Buenos Aires. I would kindly ask you to introduce yourself. Please say your name and ALS you represent. We will begin from the left. Thank you.

RENATA RIBEIRO: Good afternoon. I am Renata Ribeiro from Brazil.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible] but we plan on it.

JOHN FORMAN:	John Forman from Brazil, of the Fellowship Program.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	Good morning. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Trinidad and Tobago.
CARLTON SAMUELS:	Morning. Carlton Samuels, the University of the West Indies.
NIRAN BEHARRY:	Morning. Niran Beharry, Trinidad and Tobago, ISOC Chapter.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Good morning. I am from the Computing Association and New Technologies Association.
SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:	Good morning. I am Sergio Salinas Porto from the Internauta Association.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[inaudible], ICANN Staff from the Latin American Engagement Team.
EDUARDO ROJAS:	Good morning. I am Eduardo Rojas from the Internet Society from Bolivia. We are not an ALS yet, but we're to apply for that.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

ALFREDO CALDERON: Good morning. I am Alfredo Calderon from the ISOC, Puerto Rico. We are in Puerto Rico. I belong to NARALO, but I am here to participate.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] in Brazil.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Fellowship Program. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco.

SUSIE JOHNSON: Susie Johnson, ICANN Staff.

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella Gruber, At-Large Staff.

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida Noblia rom the Notary Publics Association from Uruguay.

ALYN ANDRADE: Alyn Andrade rom Brazil.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Juan Manuel Rojas from AGEIA DENSI, Colombia.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima Cambronero from AGEIA Argentina, ALAC member representing LACRALO.

TATIANA TOCULESCU: Tatiana Toculescu from ISOC Argentina.

TANYA LOPEZ**:**   Tanya Lopez, At-Large, Nicaragua.

IAN MITCHELL: Ian Mitchell, [inaudible] Program.

ALBERT DANIELS: Albert Daniels, ICANN Staff from the Latin American-Caribbean Engagement Team.

RAPHAEL SILVEIRAS: Raphael Silveiras, Brazil, NextGen program.

UNIDENFITIED MALE: I am from Brazil representing the Brazil program.

ENCEL SANCHEZ: Good morning. I am Encel Sanchez from the NextGen program.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

RAITME CITTERIO: I am Raitme Citterio, from Fellowship ICANN. I am representing the ISOC chapter from Venezuela.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Alberto, I am on the road. I am driving, so could you please proceed with the agenda so as to give me time to get home? Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay. Please, we will start with our agenda today. Humberto Carrasco has the action items, so we will proceed with item number 5 on the agenda.

Oscar Robles would be here to speak about the IANA transition topic, but I don't see him here. He will speak about the IANA transition and the RIRs. Then we have documents review, and then we have the LACRALO's proposed procedures for the creation, issuance, and publication of statements, proposals to recruit new ALSs, and metrics proposals.

Since Oscar Robles is not here, I will speak about these in order to give Humberto time to reach his destination. I will speak about numbers when it comes to transition.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

When it comes to transition, RIRs have prepared a preliminary or draft document in Chile, and they were providing their opinion, saying that that region of the RIR should be within ICANN. They were proposing the creation of a committee in charge of different issues. They call it the MONC in Chile. This was a committee devoted to resolving all the issues arising. But the main objective was that the operational part, which is working perfectly well so far, would remain within ICANN.

The policy development would be as it is right now. That is to say, the creation of policies would be within the community, respecting the multi-stakeholder model. This would match or agree upon what the U.S. government was requesting. That is to say, there were four to five important topics to be taken into account. The most important for me is to maintain and improve the multi-stakeholder model.

Why should we insist on that? Because there have been certain attempts not to maintain that model, and we as the defenders of the individual Internet users' rights would disappear within that function in the model. So I insist that it is important to support the model and to comply with that demand. That is a demand, a requirement, by the U.S. government, which is to improve the multi-stakeholder model. I think that in our mailing list, we have discussed this topic.

This is the only thing I can't inform you. They are finishing this document. I don't know if this is finished already, but they're working on that.

I think that also discussing who will have the domain name .IANA. That is to say, who should be the owner of that domain name? Some of

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

them say that it should be the IETF. Some others say it should be the numbering community. So this is being discussed.

Now I will proceed with another issue, another topic, on the agenda. If you see anyone from LACNIC, please let me know.

There is a proposal. One of these documents is LACRALO's proposed procedures for the creation, issuance and publication of statements.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I can speak about that item on the agenda, if you will.

ALBERTO SOTO: Go ahead, Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Good afternoon from here. I am in Germany and I have reached my destination. I see there are three documents that are still pending. One is the issuance of statements of interest. This has been discussed. Some comments have been made by [inaudible] and by Roosevelt King.

I am looking for the Adobe Connect link so that I can be able to access the Adobe Connect room. I don't know if you can see that document on your screens. I sent that information today's morning to Silvia Vivanco.

Any from the staff?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Humberto, yes, we are uploading that document and we have a hard copy of the document which was circulated as well. Please bear with us in minutes.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, great. So let me explain. What I did was this. I prepared a Word document with the proposal, then with the comments that were made on the Wiki page. Those comments were mainly by Dev and Roosevelt.

What I did, I uploaded the document on the right hand with the original document, and then on the left I put all the observations and comments for that document.

I am trying to access the Adobe Connect Room. As I said before, there were comments by Dev Anand and Roosevelt King. These comments were sent together with the document. They will be translated into Spanish and Portuguese. Then this document will be posted for voting.

This is in general terms. On the left, there will be a document, and it will be in blue the reasons why the comments were taken into account or not. So this is in general terms.

Now please let me know if you have any questions.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Humberto. Now we will go back to our agenda. Here we have Oscar Robles, the LACNIC CEO. I would like to thank him for being here and for sponsoring us for our showcase that we will be holding today. Thank you very much, Oscar.

Oscar, you have the floor. Go ahead please.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you very much for inviting me. Sorry for being late. May I speak in Spanish? Okay. I'm going to speak about two brief stories and how they are related to what we are doing in our RIRs, which are responsible for the distribution of IP addresses. If you have any questions, of course I will be happy to answer those questions.

These stories come from the late '90s and '80s when Vint Cerf defined the TCP protocol, and when the person responsible from the IETF or the technical group for the Internet defined the mechanisms to resolve the DNS names.

These two aspects at that time in the Internet of that time, which wasn't something decentralized without authority, included something that required centralization, that required an authority. The DNS was requiring that hierarchal element, and that hierarchy required that authority. So the IP addresses were requiring the distribution among the regions.

With the passing of time, communities were adopted at a regional level. These IP addresses, due to the benefits of the traffic and routing, and this led to the creation of Regional Internet Registries.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

The authority on the distribution have to do with the IP addresses, and these are the main elements of this process that the NTIA and the U.S. government started in 1998, and that is about to finish once the Internet community, [inaudible] in an [inaudible] way, the proposal for the transition to the multi-stakeholder community.

These 15 years would have ended, and during so many times, so many years, they kept the control of the numbers and of the addresses. This now is in the hands of the community. This was so in the '90s when we only had a few computers, when there was not a centralized control, when no authorization was required to have information ready, and when no authorization was required to update files. Then the updating of files required the implementation of a DNS.

So now we are having these meetings. We are working on this important topic to have this transition so that we can transfer the responsibility to the multi-stakeholder community.

As has been said in the past, where N equals to zero and N means the numbers of governments with maximum authority to manage these mechanisms, N equals zero, and this is that the community should be responsible, and not governments, or only one government.

So you are better aware of all these efforts that are being made by communities. Now I will speak about the names community and how we will move forward.

Of course, this is being said on my personal capacity, and I am not speaking on behalf of the NRO. As you may know, last year the

different communities, the five RIR communities, started this process in their own communities, their open communities. We do not have this way of working by working groups as you may see in other fora. But at the same time, we're not establishing any participation criteria, such as membership. We don't say that only governments or private industry of the technical community may participate. Anyone can participate, even the Civil Society. They can file proposals for policies or requirements.

That is how this process was generated throughout the different communities. Then we have a new group, the CRISP group, and the task of this group was to unify these five ideas that were being created in a bottom-up model. As Alberto said, the Latin America proposal was important. We're still working on that proposal.

One of the most important elements is that the regional community in the Latin American region established the idea to have a multi-stakeholder – and I don't remember the acronym for that – but this was translated as MONC. Then we called it the Latin MONC so as to remember the name. But we forgot the acronym and the meaning of the acronym.

But the idea is to have a multi-stakeholder idea outside the RIRs and their authority so that if there were any need to evaluate the performance of the IANA operator, well, this would not be only an issue for the RIRs, but also the community involvement was required.

This Latin MONC led to a review committee, which is one of the elements that have been discussed during the last month. This is one

of the most recent documents that had been posted for comments by the NRO, and I think it was posted for comments last weekend. There will be a two-week period to make comments.

There are four topics. It is one-and-a-half page document. There this document establishes the general criteria for this review committee. So this is the contribution by the Latin American community.

So we're about to finish this and we are waiting for comments of course, and waiting for the document to be finalized with no major changes to be made.

When it comes to the CRISP proposal – I'm going back to the main topic – the CRISP proposal established certain criteria and should be met with the IANA operator or the new operator. These criteria were taken into account by the RIR staff to create a document most similar to a contract. Perhaps those who are lawyers might know that the CRISP proposal had [inaudible] elements with juridical or legal value. So we were working on that document, which was more like a contract.

This is the SLA, which was published on May the 1st. That was the first version. We had some comments. There was a new version that was generated. Then we will post this for comments so as to receive comments on this new version.

The idea is to see that there are no significant situations to adjust. When this is over, we will have a final version of the document. So this is to finish this stage.

We feel that we are ready. The fact that we are ready does not mean that we have the way to move forward. I mean, we're paying attention on what we can do, on how we can move forward. With the transition, we believe that as long as we comply with these elements – because we have been reviewing the SLAs, the review committee – so the inconsistencies that we might have other groups might not be so relevant.

We established that in a document not long ago where we stated that we can live with any of the options that the ICG might establish for the name community because they were managing certain possibilities; for example, to have a sub-contract for these functions. That is to say, to give these functions to an affiliate of ICANN. So for us, it's not important if ICANN will manage this or an affiliate of ICANN will manage this, or if this is transferred to a fully-owned ICANN affiliate.

We also considered some intellectual property topics. We believe that the intellectual property of IANA.org, even the domain name, should go to the IETF. But then we realized that it was just a name and the important thing is that it is on the website. So it doesn't matter the name, as long as the content has not any intellectual property issue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you hear me? Yeah? Yes? Okay. 1, 2, 3. Testing. Can you hear me? Yes? Okay. If I go too fast, please let me know. I don't know. You were paying attention, right?

As I was saying, in terms of intellectual property, we're not facing major difficulties. In general, with the ideas invested in the ICG and the CWG for names and protocols, we believe there are no major difficulties. We can live with any of the flavors they could offer, including the complex mechanism or membership or non-membership with the motives that have been discussed so far.

The IANA name for us is not relevant, but rather the content in the IANA site. I know the constituent elements, not only of the website but also the information related to these functions – now I remember what I wanted to say.

We have seen that the functions IANA provides to RIRs are the most simple ones when compared to what it does with the other groups. The [inaudible] protocols different services that serve close to 2000 protocol registries, which is quite a complex function, not only because of its extent, but also because in some cases they are differentiated to services.

The names part is quite complex, and the gTLDs is even more complex in re-delegation. It is not clear yet what IANA can or should do in some cases.

In terms of numbers, we believe it's very simple, three basic functions. This could be used as a starting point for the transition so that we will not delay the startup. We have to design a plan, and this is one of the proposals produced this weekend by Paul Wilson in the ICG that we supported, which is a transition in stages.

Then we suggested the protocols. We wanted to be the first ones. I said, "Let's do the most simple things first. Let's check it works. Let's give it a sense of progress, of advancement. And let's get ready for the following phases, because we don't know what will go into phase. Also, let us give some time to the other proposals to get mature, which could be the names part."

So our feeling is that we're ready, that we're making progress. One of the main contributors to this advance is that the communities already existed with communication among communities, unlike the names community, where the mechanism of coordination, separation, generic and ccTLDs, that was a difficult approach.

Within the same ccTLDs, there may be some difference where the authority comes from.   Is it a booklet from Jon Postel? Is it a governmental decision? There are complex issues still to be resolved in the areas of the number registries.

There was a community that has been working for several years in Latin America since 2003 when the first public forum on policies or participatory PGP was held. So we have some experience in this process already.

Communities very quickly get engaged, created ideas, discussed, commented them, were commented upon, were reviewed, were re-published. This was a process that worked because the community already existed. This is something we should not lose sight of.

Well, if you have any specific question, I'll be happy to take it. If not, that's all.

ALBERTO SOTO: Any questions? Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you, Alberto. Oscar, thank you very much for your presentation. I find it very relevant. In the LACRALO community, there have been some issues discussed about the transition. This debate has not been significant in the collective group.

However, there have been some proposals, though not formally discussed, are targeted or take the direction of simplification of the final proposals.

The only one I remember now was on the concept of membership, which I happily see you are not mentioning. I understand that it's no longer being considered. At least it's not the one with the greatest weight. That is my comment.

There have been some mentions as well – let me be very careful not to convey a wrong message – there have been some mentions to avoid any centrifugal trend in the redesign of the IANA supervision, which trends would eventually facilitate a separation of IANA into separate identities to serve the three communities you referred to: protocols, numbers, and names.

So if the rest of the community supports this or if not individually, a call should be made to the community, the various RIRs, to be patient and have a comprehensive integrated proposal so that there will be no chance to have separate territories for the three entities. Thank you.

OSCAR ROBLES: We are aware that we should not promote this sensation of a separation of the communities. However, we are aware that we could be in greater risk if we do not start soon, or at least close to the deadlines initially established by the NTIA. Because of the political periods and processes in the United States, this might take three years, but we feel that if we start with these deadlines, this timeline, there would be a greater chance that we will not get delayed because of the political processes.

If we wait until the third year when we're ready to do the implementation across communities, because it will be a much more complicated implementation in a more uncertain and less controlled environment. There are several elements at stake, but again, we're trying to strike a balance between the perception of the community, which is important to us, and actually achieving this transition.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the opportunity to take the floor again. I think that the call by Mr. Strickling and the statements by Fadi Chehadé can be made compatible.

We should first focus on the essential, get to the simplest proposal. We do know it shouldn't be excessively simple because the system requires checks and balances, and that requires procedures. It should not be a business-as-usual proposal because actually what we must do is very complex. It's a bigger challenge. It's replacing a government by something that is not another government, not a coalition, not a United Nations organization.

That's why this committee of experts additional to the community has been very good. They've had a great interaction, and they have an international approach with a large experience in global-scale design.

So focus on the essential outcome is the other key to success. As it was said in other communities, I don't know if you can express what you've heard here. But do not bring to the table with the pretext of IANA supervision more agendas, more attempts to redesign, to repair, evil actions. But the essential for the transition and the other things that the community wants or needs with justification but are not useful for the transition of IANA supervision should be left for later.

That is the simplification. So I would make a motion in LACRALO to support this, both in your community of RIRs and in the community of names.

ALBERTO SOTO: Anyone against the motion proposed by Alejandro Pisanty? To be certain, I will ask Alejandro to formulate to express the motion again.

We appeal to proceed with the redesign of parts of ICANN for the transition in the supervision of IANA to the greatest simplicity as possible, and to postpone the agenda so redesigns that are not directly related to the transition. That is the text of the motion. It would be at present targeted, in particular taking advantage of engineer Robles' presence here, as a message to RIRs in their processes.

This proposal could be extended to a message made public by LACRALO to the entire community, and that the members are representatives of LACRALO related to CCWGs, CWGs, and this new jungle of acronyms as you all take it on.

ALBERTO SOTO: I ask again. Anyone objects this motion? Okay. Motion approved. If I may, let me complete the idea of simplicity. In a meeting yesterday, we virtually left behind or discarded the model of membership because it was too complicated. It required the ACs and SOs to have legal personality, to be incorporated.

So this idea was discarded because we are actually considered as unincorporated entities, as de facto entities. So it would be enough for us to say that we are an association to be required to perform certain things. Apparently that's the road we will follow.

Any other comment? Question?

I have a question myself, Oscar. I think that the meeting held in Chile, which I could not attend but I followed it remotely, in my

understanding, the Latin MONC, what it specifically was offering was transparency, and that is what should be maintained. Right?

OSCAR ROBLES: Yes, that was one of the elements. But the main component it contributed was support to the system stability. As you will recall probably, one of the NTIA requirements is to support Internet stability. One of the criteria in this SLA, or one of the principles promoted by CRISP, was the possibility for the IANA operator under any circumstances could not perform. If that happened, that would have a negative impact on stability. Certainly we're talking about relevant failures.

So this is a complicated situation, because who will say when a failure is relevant and intervention is required for the operator no longer being the operator? So it is not appropriate. Maybe it's a question of conflicts of interests or [inaudible], whatever, that only the RIRs or the RIR Board, it was not appropriate only for them to make this decision.

So that was the intention in the CRISP, that it should be an entity that should not report under authority channels to the RIRs, and thus be able to determine if there was such a significant failure that the operator should no longer be set.

ALBERTO SOTO: Another concern I had was in the transition groups, when we were discussing in ALAC, I asked, "Are you considering when I can change an operator? In operational terms, that's not so simple. Have you taken

into consideration any legal term?" There is a legal term in the contract. But there is also a technical term. I was concerned about both things because of my background. I'm an IT person.

Before the contract, I'm going to change an operator. How will the technical people do to do the transition of the operator?

OSCAR ROBLES: What we are now evaluating is something similar to what ICANN has, the risk operators. You know the EBERO, the emergency back-end registry operator, which is basically a live registry whenever a registry of the new gTLD fails, the EBERO can get up very easily, get live very rapidly, for the TLD operator that has been affected.

We could have something similar, but it wouldn't be external. This emergent registry is for RIRs' backup, precisely considered in that it is an essential function. So we could have this backup operator ready for emergencies, and then a mechanism, again, external to the community.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Oscar. Now, not talking about transition, we have two ALSs that cannot participate because we do not have day-to-day communications with them. One is Haiti, and Nicaragua beside me. Perhaps we should have a talk, both of us. This is something that has already been discussed at ICANN level, but I would like to see how LACNIC and how can I contact the operators there, not right now, perhaps offline.

OSCAR ROBLES: By not being able to participate? What do you mean?

ALBERTO SOTO: We do not have a legal there.

OSCAR ROBLES: Okay. We have a person in ICG. As you know, ICG has held very extensive meetings, some of them face-to-face. I think it was April or May they met in Istanbul. Anyone remembers?

Well, anyhow, the person who was representing the RIRs is from Cuba. This person could not go because the ICANN could not finance because of political and economic reasons.

So we do understand the political context, but they have always existed, and they must be resolved. No region should be in a disadvantageous position. We make a lot of effort to overcome barriers of language and financial barriers.

And then, very simple items. Technology offers solutions, but we cannot participate, so we fully agree. We must make it very clear that there shouldn't be additional disadvantages to already-disadvantaged regions.

ALBERTO SOTO: I was in Cuba months ago, and we had two ALSs to certify. I said to them, "Please wait." We can start with the whole formal processing, but e-mail is not sufficient for them to have full participation.

OSCAR ROBLES: This is something sad because we have participation from someone from the U.S. but not from Cuba, for example, but not from someone from that country.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay. Yes, perhaps this is the right moment. When there is a crisis or there is a problem, that also means there is a good opportunity to find a solution for that.

Oscar, thank you very much for your participation. You can stay here with us. If not, you are released. You can leave the room. Let's see you somewhere around.

OSCAR ROBLES: Okay. I have some other meetings to attend, but thank you very much for your invitation.

ALBERTO SOTO: Let's continue. We have a few minutes today. We have only one hour for our meeting, and we have five minutes left. In fact, two minutes.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I have two minutes, and that is enough for me. There are two or three pieces of news that I would like to tell you regarding the two groups that I chaired within the region. One is the Governance Working Group, and the other is the ccTLD Working Group.

When it comes to the Governance Working Group, after a meeting that we will have to adjust certain issues that we have when it comes to the comments and inputs provided by the region to the different documents that we are debating right now, we will be able to have the final documents. Then we will send those documents for translation so that we can circulate those documents to the LACRALO community so as our colleagues may provide their input.

When it comes to the ccTLD Working Group, we will request a formal meeting of the working group within 15 days. This is enough time for us to meet.

There are certain proposals that arose yesterday from some ALAC activities. There was a report presented by Carolina Aguerre and Hugo Salgado Hernandez. This report had to do with ccTLDs, and there was another report related to the DNS, especially regarding the DNS Observatory being carried out in Chile.

They were invited to participate in our monthly teleconferences so that they can tell us about their experience. But before putting this formally, this is just for information purposes. We will discuss this with the group so that we can work on an activity strategy regarding this topic.

So this is the two things that I have to inform to you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alejandro, go ahead, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Sergio, does this report include the discussion about metrics?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: There was a webinar for the metrics discussion. The Metrics Sub-Working Group within the Governance Working Group made a report. There were some proposals that were incorporated to the document, and this final document will be presented once it is finished.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you. Sergio, once again I would like to make a brief comment. I find the metrics issue is a very complex topic. The LACRALO Metrics Working Group and the At-Large Metrics Working Group have great difficulties to reach to conclusions.

I consider this is a very difficult problem to solve because what we want is to have certain metrics to be applied and to identify participation and engagement opportunities, and also to identify weaknesses.

Of course, metrics have always a problem because their definitions will lead to certain cases where you cannot measure. The other

problem that we have with metrics is that all metrics are or can be manipulated or can be falsified so that numbers or figures may be turned into a positive result when in fact the result is negative.

This said, for the perfect indicator might lead to a never-ending task or activity.

I'm also paying attention to the different discussions and activities, and I see that there is a group that is preventing all efforts. I see that there are other proposals that are against metrics that come from certain representatives of organizations that will not use metrics because they have very little participation and not relevant participation.

So I would like to urge you that all the groups would, once again, address these issues so as to find a few metrics, simple metrics, so that we can measure our participation levels and that we can implement these metrics very soon. Once they're implemented, we can measure and make improvements.

I would like to express my support to you, since you are the Chair of this group. So I would like to express my support to you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Alejandro. Thank you for your comment. We are well aware of what you say. The whole group is concerned about this issue, and we are making our best effort to move forward. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Rodrigo, go ahead, please. We have very little time. Sorry, Fatima. Go ahead, please. Sorry, my secretary is not here.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Before Alejandro's comment, I wanted to say something. I wanted to ask about something which is more global that we have pending from our London meeting.

There are four documents: the amendments to the operating principles of LACRALO, the amendments of the [inaudible] procedure, this document that we have, which is a procedure to publish the statements, and then we have the metrics proposal.

Those who are working for long know exactly that we want to modify these, but there is no will to do it. They have been posted for comments, and we cannot move forward. We're stuck. It is important to review these because there is an At-Large review, and they will come to us. They will come to review out ALSs, and one of the pending topics was that these are accreditations of ALSs that are not active, so why don't we can just start to self-evaluate ourselves before having someone from outside telling us, "You have to leave," or, "You have to stay"?

So I support Alejandro's comments when he says that we need to make our best effort to move forward. The time is running, and we need to keep on working.

Today, we are a mature community and we need to adjust to the environment and changes. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Fatima. If we have been working since 2010 and if we are in 2014 and nothing has been done, well, that doesn't mean that we don't have a will to work. I think we shouldn't criticize here. We know that we have very little time. We are only one or two people working on that, and we are trying to simplify everything.

Rodrigo, go ahead, please.

RODRIGO SAUCEDO: This is Rodrigo Saucedo from ICANN staff for the record. Sergio mentioned the DNS Observatory. Well, this is not an initiative by NIC Chile. This is a project within the LAC strategy that NIC Chile is leading.

Just to sum up, the idea is to invite you all to participate in this [inaudible] open project for everybody, so if you are interested in participating, please let me know.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Rodrigo. We said that this is going to be done in our monthly meetings. We cannot add any more webinars because we have little participation. So if we have more webinars, we will have even less participants.

That's why I'm asking you to help us more in our webinars and in all our activities.

Since we are running out of time – excuse me. Go ahead, please. I'm sorry. My secretary is not here and I didn't see your card.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I'm here.

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes, but you are not looking at the papers and the documents. Go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: First of all, how much time to do we have? That's going to be my question. Two minutes? All right. Look, many issues I wanted to comment on, but all right.

Regarding this issue regarding the Governance Working Group, it was only within the metrics call that happened earlier, I think a month or two ago, that we really had our first formal discussion of what was [inaudible] on the Wiki and to hear the comments about what was happening.

Regarding the things such as metrics, I understand what Alejandro was saying, but we submitted comments, and you know, there's no feedback on the Wiki page as to, "Do you agree? Do you not agree?" So it's kind of like nothing is happening.

So even if you want to start the conversation there, if you want to start the conversation on the Wiki, then let's do that.

Also, I want to raise a question also, issue, just to get an update, what exactly is happening regarding the LACRALO representatives. I know there was two selection processes that concluded, but I haven't heard anything about new steps or anything on the mailing list about that.

ALBERTO SOTO: As the Chair and the only member of the Metrics Working Group, I am fully responsible for the metrics activities. I had to move in the middle of this process. I'm also part of some other working groups within ALAC. I have about four meetings a week, and then we had the Buenos Aires meeting. So I apologize, but I didn't have time. I apologize for this.

After this meeting, I will be working within this. I promise that I will simplify the metrics. I didn't have the time to post that information on the Wiki, but your amendments have been taken into account. We are eliminating certain wording that was sensitive, perhaps, but that were not leading to a good wording of the metrics, as Alejandro is saying.

So we will have a much simpler text, and we'll be able to finish this very quickly.

AIDA NOBLIA: Very brief. I participated in some of the working groups. I participated in the Metrics Working Group. I participated with some questions, and in my country, I spoke to someone to deliver those questions.

Then that activity was stuck, and I know that there was an issue with that working group. Then another working group began. We left everything there. Nobody called us again. We were participating at the very beginning, and Sergio had health problems in the middle of all this process, but we didn't learn about this anymore. This was stuck. It was stuck between that working group and the Governance Working Group.

So it's not clear to me why we were not called again. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Aida, just an issue. The questions were for the ccTLD Working Group. They didn't have to do with the Metrics Working Group. You are participating in both groups?

AIDA NOBLIA: Yes, I participated in both groups.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: We were stuck there because we were preparing the documents. There is a final document that is required once these documents are approved by the region. So there is a process being carried out, and then we have to wait for that.

That's why we have to wait. We have to wait for our colleagues to read the documents, to approve the documents, and to finalize the document, which is the rules of procedure document.

So what we do is to analyze and take that into account.

When it comes to the other topic, I think that you are confused. You are mixing up things. Those questions that were for the ccTLD Working Groups, you are confusing with the Metrics Working Group and the Governance Working Group.

Thank you.

AIDA NOBLIA: It might be because I was on the three groups, but none of the three groups is active nowadays. I want to say that I am available to work whenever it is required.

ALBERTO SOTO: Humberto, go ahead, please. You have your hand up.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I just wanted to say that when it comes to the documents, we're moving forward. But we have to prepare the document, and we have to gather all the comments together. That is what I did for the procedure for the statements. So we have to prepare the document. We have to gather all the comments together. We have to explain or provide rationale about why we decided to include certain comments and why not.

This takes really a lot of time. It took me many days to prepare the document, and I offered myself to take it to the Governance Working

Group because this is what is still missing. I mean, this is not an easy task.

I know that for this document, for the proposal for statements, this is ready. We can send it to translation and post it on the Wiki and see if it is approved or not, as it is.

So it is a slow process because we have few volunteers. There are many comments in English. In order for documents to be prepared, well, I have to do it myself because there are comments that are in Spanish and I have to translate the information. This has nothing to do with the translation itself because this is done afterwards, but it takes time.

Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. Carlton, go ahead, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you very much here. I quite understand it takes a lot of time to get these documents done, but one of the things that I was quite moved by was we attempt to write these documents without understanding or without declaring certain principles. We must begin to write, contemplate operating documents based on principles.

For example, if the operating principles are not well understood and defined, we're going to end up with a document that is confused. If the operating principles under which participation in the names and

numbers policy development is not understood, we are going to get confused.

That is why, for example, we see in the participation document something like an excuse for not attending a meeting as a measure of participation. Anybody who understands what participation is and the objective to participation would not have included that clause. You cannot participate by not participating. It is ridiculous.

So let us understand this. The document will be dead on arrival if the principles on which we are participating are not understood.

Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Carlton, that provision was removed in our last webinar. That provision was removed.

Juan Manuel, go ahead, please.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: I only had a question. On the agenda, we have the document to be reviewed. This is the document. I wanted to know why are we reviewing this document? What is our aim with this document? Because we have been speaking about some other things, but not about the document.

So I wanted to see or to know what is that we're going to do with the document today? Is this going to be sent for translation? Are we going

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

to decide upon the document? What are we going to do with the document?

ALBERTO SOTO: We circulated this document because there are people from the Caribbean region, and this is in English. We are not going to debate this. We are going to wait for the Spanish translation.

Fatima, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Okay, this is to be translated for publication and voting. Thank you.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Two topics. As Humberto said regarding the work that it implies, it is too much. It takes time. That's why LACRALO has a staff and that things can be requested and must be requested to the staff, because he by himself cannot do it alone. So my suggestion is that Humberto ask for help so that he cannot be overloaded with certain activities.

I know this is out of our agenda, but I would like you to, even by e-mail, tell us how the CROPP meeting was applied to attend this meeting because I don't know how this CROPP program was applied for this meeting, who came due to the CROPP program to this meeting, and what were the criteria applied, taking into account the people that were not able to attend.

So I would like to have that information.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alberto, if I may, I have received very negative comments outside LACRALO regarding this CROPP program adoption or assignment to bring people to attend this meeting.

ALBERTO SOTO: We have to finish this meeting. That was the exception that we have within the CROPP program. There was an e-mail list circulated to the list, so please do read the e-mails.

With this, we bring this meeting to an end. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Just a reminder for the region [inaudible]. The meeting will start here at 12:00. If you have not yet had lunch, if you could maybe get some lunch before coming to the meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]