
YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the APRALO monthly call taking place on Thursday 15th of April 2021 at 06:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel we have Satish Babu, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gopal Tadepalli, Lianna Galstyan, Aris Ignacio, Holly Raiche, Mohan Raidu, Justine Chew, Suhaidi Hassan, Vladimer Svanadze, Pavan Budhrani, Edmon Chung, Winthrop Yu, Maureen Hilyard, Jenna Fung, Shah Rahman, Nadira Al-Araj, Ali AlMeshal, Namrata Khetrapal.

We currently don't have anyone on the Chinese channel.

We have received apologies from Shreedeeep Rayamajhi.

From staff's side, we have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Nazlar, and I'll also be doing call management on today's call.

We have Chinese interpretation, and our interpreters are Ray and Sandy for today's call. Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes in case someone joins our Chinese channel. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Satish. Thank you so much.

SATISH BABU: Thank you very much, Yesim, and welcome to everybody who's taken the time to join this call. This is the APRALO monthly call for April 2021,

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.

and I'd like to welcome in particular our guest from DotAsia, Edmon who's going to speak to us today, and I'd like to thank him on our behalf for taking the time to speak to us.

we now move on to the membership pipeline. We have recently certified two unaffiliated individual members. This is Idil Kula from Turkey and Dr. Yik-Chan from China. So we'd like to, on our behalf, welcome both of them to the APRALO community.

We also are processing two applications for ALSes, Virtual Cyber Labs and the ISOC India Hyderabad chapter. I note that the chapter chair, Mohan Raidu is on the call, and as soon as we complete our due diligence and they're inducted into APRALO, we'll be asking Mohan Raidu to introduce himself, maybe in the next meeting or sometime in the future.

So with that, I'm also told that Amrita has a medical family emergency, so she may join later, may not be able to join to this call, so this is for everybody's reference. We would now go to agenda item three, which is our regular ALAC policy update, and it's over to Justine and Holly for this. Justine, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Justine, I think I'm going to let you go ahead. Just to do a wrap-up on SubPro, because I think people may like to know, just an overview of where we got to now, which is pretty much the endgame. Thank you to your hard work. So I'll follow you if that's okay. Thanks.

SATISH BABU: Holly, Justine informed me that she would like that you do the ALAC policy update as she's on multiple calls today.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I was really only going to mention two things. First, [inaudible] Justine because SubPro is pretty well wrapped up. I don't know if people have taken the trouble to read the final statement, but its extensive, it reflects and awful lot of her time and a lot of consultation with ALAC and the Consolidated Policy Working Group. So it's a huge achievement, very proud of what Justine's been able to accomplished, which is terrific. I was hoping that we might—maybe Cheryl can put in a word just about the SSR2 review.

I was going to mention that the ITRP transfer registration policy, they're looking for members to form a new working group, because what has happened is with the GDPR, the processes that were involved in ensuring that if you transfer from one registrar to another, those processes were designed to make sure that the request was made, that the receiving and sending registrars both agreed and the whole process was verifiable. That requires access to some personal information, and of course now with the GDPR, we have to have a complete rethink about how to have some security of the transfer but without violating privacy, and that's a particular issue when you've got people using the privacy proxy servers. Happy to explain that if people would like, but that's just a rundown on some of the issues that are facing that group, if people are interested.

The one thing I was going to mention, and it was something I've not been aware of, but last night, Sidney time, from the CPWG meeting, there's a new body formed called the DNS Abuse Institute. This is a body that the PIR is funding. It is set up to actually start to address DNS abuse. Now, they define DNS abuse the way we do.

Graeme Bunton, who used to be [a very senior] [inaudible] Tucows, has taken on the role. I'm very excited about what's going to happen, but it's an initiative that I think we all should be aware of in moving forward on DNS abuse and DNS Abuse Institute. Justine said Graeme Bunton spoke at our last monthly call. He did an update last night, and it was actually really interesting. So if this is a topic that people want, his slides will be available, probably from last night and last month as well.

Other than that, I don't think there's anything that is particularly important that I need to talk about, and I actually would like to give Edmon as much time as possible, so unless there are any further questions, I'll pass it back to you, Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Holly. And I think, before I move on to Cheryl, I must say that Justine's note on the [inaudible] that Holly was referring to was phenomenal, and I've been hearing rave reviews about this work. In a Zoom context, we are unable to applaud, but on behalf of all of us, Justine, I'd like to thank you, and we'd like to applaud your work, which is extremely brilliant not just for APRALO but for the whole At-Large community. So, thank you very much.

Cheryl, would you like to add anything?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. I don't know why Holly thought I was one to speak to SSR2, but I don't.

SATISH BABU: Okay. That's fine. So Edmon will get this amount of time. Justine, would you like to say anything in passing before we move on to Edmon?

JUSTINE CHEW: Hi Satish. Sorry, I'm doing a couple of things at the moment, that's why—thanks, Holly, for stepping in. Just on the transfer policy PDP, I was going to suggest that if at all feasible, we may also want to consider if any shortcoming that can be derived from the Net4India registrar failure is adequately addressed in this new PDP that's going ahead. Thanks. Oh, and thank you for the applause, warmly received.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much. So we will now move on to the next agenda item which is—we were having guest speakers for the last several calls, including Graeme that Holly was referring to, who spoke at our last APRALO meeting, today we have the pleasure of having with us Edmon Chong from DotAsia. He's very familiar to us. And he's going to speak to us on IDN EPDPs update. Over to Edmon for the update.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, Satish. Great to be back at APRALO. I still call this one of my homes at ICANN. So I was told and then prepared a little bit about the IDN PDPs, both in the GNSO side and on the ccNSO side that is happening in parallel right now. So I'll give a little bit of the history and where each of those PDPs are at right now, and hopefully, actually, we should have some time to discuss as well.

So, instead of creating slides, I opened up a bunch of tabs here of the different parts through the ICANN history. So this is the first part, way back in 2010—that's 11 years ago—this is a decision by the ICANN Board that IDN variants at the top level will not be implemented at the 2012 new gTLD round, and therefore—but then started a number of works. So from the 11 years, we're obviously not idling around, but multiple things happened during those years.

First came what is called the IDN variant issues project, VIP, which looked at various case studies in different languages, eventually came to an integrated issues report which gave way to the development of what is now called the label generation rules and the label generation rules format and process as well.

So thereupon, the root zone label generation rules were also developed. In the last few years, this has started to develop. So now coming closer to the two PDPs—and this is the Board resolution in March of 2019 that kind of triggered the two kind of simultaneous tracks for the GNSO and the ccNSO to look into the IDN—especially IDN variant TLD issue, or more broadly the IDN TLD policies.

So from this March resolution by the Board, it actually asks the ccNSO and GNSO to coordinate and also work separately, obviously, because the policies themselves would be different, but because of the topic, there should be some coordination and consistency across gTLDs and ccTLDs. But nevertheless, I will now split my discussion. I'll talk about the work at GNSO first, and then the work at ccNSO.

So the work at GNSO started with what was called an IDN scoping team. The scoping team looked at the ICANN reports and all the documentation up to then and looked at what needs to be done. At that particular time, there were two—under number five here, you can see there are two main items that required work. That is because from the GNSO perspective, one thing was brought up, is the IDN implementation guidelines.

The IDN implementation guidelines—again, a little bit of a history—has been put in place since around 2003, and has been updated from time to time. The most recent update was questioned by the registry constituency and subsequently the GNSO took the position of asking ICANN to hold off on adopting the IDN implementation guidelines.

The most important reason is because the IDN implementation guidelines update is done by an expert working group, which has been the case over the years. However, because the IDN implementation guidelines are now embedded into the new gTLD registry agreement, the registries felt that it should involve the community further, it should include the multi-stakeholder model, and the GNSO, to make those updates. And therefore, this is one of the issues that is brought up to discuss.

And then of course, the IDN variant TLD issue. So as mentioned previously and in the last round, IDN TLDs were allowed but IDN variant TLDs were not accepted yet. So the scoping team looked at the issue and then basically decided that there could be two tracks, one track on the policy track which is to initiate a PDP, and then another operational track with an aim to see if the latest IDN implementation guidelines could be accepted by the registries as is, because it was recently updated, I think in 2019, around that time, but it hasn't been adopted by the Board yet. See if there are minor adjustments that could be acceptable by the registries, and then put in place, and then in the future, IDN implementation guidelines will be updated with a more formal multi-stakeholder process.

So the operational track has not quite started, I think, yet. I haven't seen much movement there. But the policy track is now starting. But one more thing about the IDN scoping team is to come up with a few options. The options are really whether the IDN issues should be incorporated into the subsequent procedures working group or it should be separate, and how limited the group should be or should it be an expert working group.

So ultimately, the scoping team actually recommended—although it gave the options to the Council, it has a bit of a recommendation, an emphasis on a model that would be an independent IDN PDP that would take the input from the subsequent procedures working group that was concluding its work and also, most importantly, that it would suggest this to be an EPDP, an expedited policy development, based on the fact that there were tons of documents already for IDN issues and especially

IDN variant issues and the scoping team felt that there was no need to further produce an issues report.

So the main difference between an EPDP and a PDP is simply that the EPDP does not require an issues report. And as part of the work therefore, a list of documents relevant for the policy track was also included. So if we go to the bottom of the document, you will see that there is a comprehensive listing of the documents that already form the issues report, essentially the staff reports, the previous Board resolutions, the previous policy matters related to the issue, the root zone LGR project that's mentioned, the relevant standards, and so on. So these are the collected documents that would have formed the issues report anyway, and ultimately, what the council decided on is to initiate the EPDP. I thought I had it right where the resolution was, but apparently, it escaped. It should be August. Where is it?

Sorry about it. But anyway, since the GNSO Council accepted the final report from scoping team, a charter drafting team was initiated late last year, 2020, and since then, it has had weekly meetings, and the charter is being developed.

Just quickly walking through it, basically, of course, it has the background, but the key aspects that it is looking at is the implementation of the label generation rules, the—I see the chat, I will send all the links to everyone right after talking through them—variant TLD management at the top level, especially how to deal with the making sure that the same entity, basically the same registry, is operating the different variant TLDs. This is also looked at at the second level, how registries should implement that and make sure that the

same registrant is operating the various IDN variants at the second level as well.

And then also, any adjustments that are required for the registry agreement and service level registry transition and so on. One particular highlight is the domain name lifecycle. Because of the variants—and if registrants, for example, activate variants at different times in the lifecycle of a domain, what happens there? And also if there is a transfer, what happens there. And that relates a little bit to the UDRP and URS situation as well. So if one of the variants or the primary IDN is being challenged, what happens to the other domains.

And then there are a number of other processes, like the objection process, the string similarity reviews, string contention, reserve names and so on, that will need to be dealt with by the EPDP working group.

So finally, if I'm not mistaken, this is the last part which is, as I mentioned, the UDRP and the trademark clearinghouse. Those also need to be considered now given both the second-level and the top-level may have IDN variants.

As we were considering the discussion for the charter, a mapping table was put together which is quite useful. I know it's very small. I'm not expecting you to see it. But the point is that this mapping table looks at the staff papers, the previous policy papers, the advice from the SSAC—the Security and Stability Advisory Committee—and looks at whether there are differences or agreements between them to identify what the working group should focus on. Well, of course, the key focus is what is missing and also where there is a discrepancy.

So in terms of the process, so far, the working group is a little bit behind, but it's going through the remainder of the charter drafting, right now down to the working group model, the membership structure, and also how the consensus process would be. Much of it is boilerplate, although there will be some slight adjustments, especially considering that this is a relatively more technical issue, so we want better participation from those who have the technical knowledge.

So as it says here in the latest project list, the status is that it's somewhat on schedule. We're a little bit late, but we shouldn't be too far off. We were expecting in a few meetings, we'd be able to wrap up and start having this brought to the Council.

So that's the GNSO side. Now on the ccNSO side, the first part, the ICANN Board and the resolution to ask the GNSO and ccNSO is the same, but since then, the ccNSO has been operating a little bit differently. They did go through an issues report process, and the issues report was actually finalized in May of 2020, and it included a number of areas that the PDP would look into. And then a charter of the ccPDP was put in place, and in fact right now, we are starting to—I believe the working group actually—I have to admit that I haven't been following as closely the ccNSO developments, so those of you who actually are following more closely can correct me, but right now, they have been working since last year and they're going through a first pass of the recommendations. Some of the issues include the minimum number of non-ASCII characters, the meaningfulness of how it represents the name of the territory, what criteria those should be, and the language or the script of the IDN ccTLD should, or does it need to be an official language or native language of that territory or country? And also, the support

from the local community for that, and some of the other things that actually currently the fast track process—sorry, I missed talking about that, but some of the issues on the fast track process is now being relooked at, especially for the fast track process, it had a particular clause to say that to avoid any controversial delegations, essentially anything that’s controversial would be kind of withheld for now. That’s reason for the fast track.

But now for the long track in some sense, and especially with the IDN variant TLDs as well, we’ll look at more in detail on some of those. If there are any controversial issues, those need to be dealt with. I think they're up to—I was listening into their latest conference call the last couple of days, and I realize they're right up to about item four or five, and as you can see, there are still lots of working group comments here and there, so I'm expecting that they would go through another pass, and that’s sort of where they are.

One important aspect that happened a couple of meetings ago is they spun out a variant management subgroup, so this subgroup I believe will be focusing on the IDN variant issue whereas the larger group would be in the overall processes.

So this is sort of my update on where we are, I think for the two PDPs. From the GNSO side, it’s still going through the chartering process. The chartering, we’re expecting in a few meetings, so probably late May or June that we could start thinking about putting it to the GNSO Council for consideration, whereas in the ccNSO side, I think the charter has been adopted and the working group is now working through the policy

recommendations that will eventually become the policies for IDN ccTLDs. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Edmon. Now we will take maybe one or two questions if there are any. Does anybody have any question or comment? Justine, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you. Edmon, thank you very much for coming and speaking to us today. It's wonderful to get an update on all the work that's been happening with respect to IDN. I'm not sure whether you're in a position to tell us, but could I ask whether you could elaborate on any avenues by which APRALO members could partake in the PDP process or even to help support some of the positions that may be discussed or led by yourself perhaps? More so on the EPDP side rather than the ccTLD side. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Sure. Thank you, Justine. I think right now, the working group is still open, although we are starting to wrap up. I can say that recently, an IPC member asked to join, and I believe they would be joining in the next meeting. So, as with most GNSO groups, it's quite open. So I do encourage anyone interested to join. Dennis Tan is currently the lead for this drafting team. You can send a note to him, or I'm happy to forward it to him or the staff team into the mailing list to see if they could take an extra person to participate.

In fact, for the ccPDP, I see that there are a couple of At-Large participants, Hadia and Oksana on the working group, but from APRALO, I guess beyond—is Hadia considered from APRALO?

SATISH BABU: She's from Africa.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Sorry. So I guess if APRALO is interested—I can't be sure, I'm not as familiar with the ccNSO process, but I'm sure there are possibilities to add observers if not participants.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Edmon. Justine is asking in chat, in the case of GNSO, which specific working group were you talking about?

EDMON CHUNG: On both sides, there's only one so far. It is the charter drafting working group. This is the one. You can go into the Confluence and find IDN EPDP drafting team. That's the only one active IDN group.

We have actually on this particular topic a discussion about the issue of spawning potentially multiple IDN working groups, and there is some reluctance to do that because it ended up being that, say, a small same group of people would have to be at multiple meetings through that time. So in essence, it's likely going to kind of go this way, that we'll only have one particular main working group that's working.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Edmon. That makes sense. So I would request staff to circulate later the links and the document so that in case there's anyone who's interested in either of these, the GNSO and the CC, wants to participate, then we can take that up and talk to the people responsible and push them through.

Thanks very much, Edmon, once again, for your presentation. It's very kind of helpful for us to understand the challenges that are happening right now, particularly with reference to variants.

Right, so keeping in mind that our time is limited, we would now move on to item five of the agenda, ALAC updates. So it's over to Maureen and Justine. Who would like to go first?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'll go first, and Justine can follow on. As far as what's been happening since ICANN 70, it's been reasonably quiet, but one of the things that has been really important—and I'm glad it's been mentioned—is of course the work that's been done with Justine and the CPWG, getting that advice to the Board on the SubPro issues of concern to At-Large. And it's really important that we fulfill our obligations with regards to the bylaws expecting that we contribute to the development of ICANN policy, but at the same time, we give advice to the Board. And I think that, as Satish has said, some excellent feedback on the work that's been done in the CPWG overall, and in particular on the SubPro.

But one [inaudible] development that has occurred at ICANN 70 of course was—and Justine reminded me of it—was at the wrap up, with the delivery of the finalized individual member policy paper. That complemented the paper that had concluded earlier on ALS criteria [and expectations]. And this is probably the final major thing that we needed to complete from the At-Large review that we spent the last four years working on, and this was just the icing on the cake.

But I think what is really important is that now that those documents have been completed, I understand it's certainly really important for the RALOs to review their rules of procedure—and that includes APRALO—to update their rules based on this new information regarding the criteria and expectations for ALSes and individual members. So it's going to be a major update that'll take place across all of the At-Large RALOs, and as I said, it just finalizes our At-Large response to what was considered an important challenge that the review team put forth all those years ago. And I think that At-Large participants in both those committee have done an excellent job creating a structure and expectations for At-Large membership [inaudible]. So it's a really great achievement.

But I guess just to end, one of the things that happened just today, we actually had what was sort of like a leftover of ICANN 70 by holding our ALAC meeting with the ICANN Board, and it was a decision that we'd made basically around the fact that it felt that the ALAC Board meeting and Board meetings within an ICANN meeting could seem a little bit constrained, it just became another meeting, another session, and we just didn't feel that it was a comfortable dialoguing between the groups.

So we just asked if they would mind coming to one of our meetings, and they were very obliging and they were really keen to look at a new way of doing things. So there were four main discussion topics, the multi-stakeholder model, the potential of a holistic review of ICANN—that's something that Alan Greenberg raised—and Olivier looked at the long-windedness of the GNSO PDP process, which we're all very aware of, but looking at effectiveness of the decision making process. It's a good discussion, nothing too in depth, but at least we're raising what is important. And finally, Jonathan raised registry voluntary commitments, which he'd actually covered during an ICANN plenary, but we had to get our questions in so early. And one of the good things about the plenary too was that—and not just the ICANN plenary but our own plenaries—was that we actually had broad participation, which was really valuable.

So all in all, I think it was an interesting discussion, and I just felt that it was a little bit more relaxed and that also, it was good for At-Large. I just checked the attendance at one stage and there were over 140 people there. So I just think it's important that—Board meetings always attract ICANN-wide attention, so it certainly gave At-Large a little bit more publicity about what our views and concerns are in relation to what we're doing within ICANN.

So yeah. I saw Cheryl saying about the next ICANN meeting. [inaudible] We're starting ICANN preparation for the next ICANN meeting, and I'd really like to see some APRALO—I really enjoyed Amrita's session at one stage, so [inaudible] that again. Thank you very much, Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Maureen. Before moving to Justine, I think the point about the ROP review, it's extremely important. We had actually created a group and started the work, but then Alan's and Roberto's reports were due, so we had kind of put it on the backburner. So now we'd like to revive it, very shortly, so we'll be working on it.

So Justine, looking at the time, I think we can also combine the APRALO policy forum while you speak. Over to you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Satish. Just to add on a couple things to what Maureen said. Back to ICANN 70, there was an APAC Space ICANN 70 readout session, or webinar I think it was. I think Maureen was our rep in that particular webinar. I'll put the link in the chat. But just to suggest that if any of our ALSes wants to organize some sort of ICANN 70 readout for their members, then obviously, that's something that leadership can contemplate and we can work on details offline. Also, it's just a useful summary from the different stakeholder perspectives on what happened in ICANN 70, what people can look forward to in the next meeting.

In terms of capacity building, two new At-Large ICANN courses were launched at the end of ICANN 70. The names of the courses are listed on the agenda. I'm sure that staff can help provide the links if necessary. Just to highlight those new resources that our members can rely on as well in terms of capacity building. Thank you.

Moving on to policy forum, I didn't really want to take any time on this, but just to mention that we completed the survey in March, and the

report and recommendations are out. I posted the chart there for people to view. It was also circulated through the list and appears in the March newsletter as well.

So we're definitely going to take the recommendations forward in driving the agenda for the APRALO policy forum, and one of the things that we probably need to kick off—or two things we need to kick off is one is the mentorship program which Ali and Lianna will speak to in a little while, and the second thing that we'll be looking to kick off is the registry of skills and interests. So we've had a number of you volunteer for the second one already, but we can certainly make another call on the list in due course. Thank you, Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Justine. A lot of opportunities for our community to get involved. So those of you who are interested, please respond to the calls when they happen. The next agenda item, number six, is the APRALO update. We're slightly short of time so we'll move quickly. The first update is the APRALO mentorship program which Ali and Lianna will be speaking to us about. Over to you, Ali.

ALI ALMESHAL:

Thank you, Satish. A quick update on this. Lianna and myself have worked on the form and we shared it with the team for feedback and input, and it's completed. It was supposed to be circulated two weeks ago, but for a reason, we were trying to combine some of these GDPR and other things and some feedback from staff. But I will be having a chat soon after this with the At-Large staff just to finalize the circulation

of that form for the mentees who will be interested to join the mentorship program. So that's a quick one, and expect to get this form and the email circulated soon. Unless Lianna has any update, I hand it back to you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Ali. Lianna, you have anything to add?

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you. No, just to encourage everyone to follow the announcement, and of course, [inaudible] mentorship for APRALO [inaudible]. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Lianna. So yeah, this is especially important for our unaffiliated individual members who are actually new to the system. I don't think there were any during the last mentorship program, so I strongly encourage our individual members also to make use of this opportunity. So please await an announcement by e-mail about the next steps of this program.

The next item is, the last meeting, I think it was Cheryl and Amrita who had raised this question of since we started having guest speakers, we're finding that our meetings have become crowded. It's of course very useful to have guest speakers, but what is a good way to organize our meetings, how to make our meetings more engaging and useful for everybody?

So this requires discussion and input from the broader community. [I with basically the] leadership team, e-mail, chat on this, we were proposing to have a small group, maybe two or three people who could then reach out to the community and ask some kind of a tool, some instrument like a survey maybe or even a call to ask people in our community as to what we expect from these meetings, what have they, in the past, found useful, and in what way it can be improved, these meetings.

So, are there any volunteers who can lead this particular activity? Amrita has asked me if we should have a poll or a Google form or a Survey. Yes, the small group can decide what they want to do. It could be good to have a survey because it's the most [factual,] but it also may be useful to have a call. So Amrita has volunteered as one. We need at least one other person. If there are more volunteers, we'll be happy to—Cheryl says she can help. Anybody else?

Mohan Raidu. Okay, Mohan Raidu, you're actually new to our community, but you can join so that you can learn. So Gopal is suggesting guest speakers at the end of the meeting instead of the middle. Okay, this input should go to the small group [and the reach out.] So we have now four people, which I think Lianna has also joined, so that is Lianna, Amrita, Cheryl and Mohan Raidu. So staff, please note, and maybe we need to set up a mailing group or whatever that is required. But Cheryl is saying one more person. Anybody else interested, any other person want to join the group? Justine, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect. I was hoping she might [get her arm twisted.] Excellent. Color me happy, Satish.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. Great. So I think there should be a timeline for this. I would propose two months, maybe, for the group to get back with a better estimate of how long this should take. So we will be back later and [they'll work with staff.] The next item, item number seven, is the NomCom update. Amrita, it's over to you for the NomCom update.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Satish. There may be some background noise, but I apologize for it. So for NomCom, we are starting a busy time now. The application phase for the nine leadership positions concluded on 29th March, and we have received 116 completed applications. While there are 58% applications from men, we only have 26% application from women, and 16% did not disclose their gender.

We have 28% applications from Africa, we have 29% applications from our region, the APAC region, 16% from Europe, 17% from Latin America and Caribbean, and 10% from North America. So we are now at the evaluation process. Each NomCom member has had to evaluate all the candidates. We start our calls from tomorrow when we will be doing our initial winnowing or even presenting upon the applicants, and then we will have the deep dive and then have the second assessment of the candidates before we conduct the virtual interviews or shortlist any candidates. so that's about it from me, Satish. And a request to all: in case your ALSes or you have done anything this month, please do share

your update with staff and me, preferably by the 25th of this month.
Thank you, Satish. Over to you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Amrita. So we have come to the end of our agenda. We still have a few minutes left. So in case anybody would like to raise any issues or have any comments, you can go ahead. Our next meeting is currently scheduled for 20th of May, Thursday, same time, 06:00 UTC.

So, are there any last-minute questions or comments? I'm not seeing any hands raised. I'd like to thank everybody for joining the meeting. It was a very productive meeting, and Edmon's talk added a lot of value, and you are living in the third wave currently in many countries, so I hope all of you and your families remain safe. Bye for now. Back to Yesim for closing the call.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thanks so much, Satish, and thank you all for joining today's call. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]