EN

GISELLA GRUBER:	…the recording will now start and interpretation will begin as well.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome today's APRALO monthly call, on Thursday the 21st of May at 06:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Siranush Vardanyan, Ali AlMeshal, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Yasuichi Kitamura, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Gunela Astbrink.

Apologies noted from Satish Babu, Amal Al-saqqaf, and Alan Greenberg.

From staff today we have Silvia Vivanco and myself Gisella Gruber.

We have Spanish interpretation and our interpreters are Jessie and Yi Yi.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channel. And also to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you and over to you Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Gisella. Thank you very much and thank you all for joining this call. I'm sorry that I will be muted for the rest of the call, but at the beginning, I would just like to announce that based on the results of the consensus call, we have Maureen, Satish, and [inaudible], continuing their term for the next two years.

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.

So I would like all of you to congratulate them, and for their willingness to continue serving.

As well [CROSSTALK] …

Excellent. I now also, in the agenda, we have the [inaudible] with NomCom. I think that [inaudible] make the, will provide details of the timeline. Just to let you know that we are running the vote for two delegates, we have two nominations, Gunela and Amal. So I would like all of you to vote and to take, to let everyone know your vote and your preferences. Please, every ALS, we need all of you to participate in this voting process.

And Ali, over to you to continue the call. I will be on mute.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you very much Siranush. I think you have already taken one point of the agenda. We're starting the second point of the agenda, and we leave this to, I think Olivier will take the public consultation instead of Alan. Am I right Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, correct Ali.

ALI ALMESHAL: Yeah. And I can see that Cheryl is raising her hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No I'm not. [CROSSTALK] If my hand is raised, it's in some sort of error. I don't have my hand right. Sorry about that.

ALI ALMESHAL: Okay. Then Olivier, the mic is yours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Ali. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And indeed, I have been drafted to take Alan's place and talk to you about the current public comments that are taking place, but with the help of Alan who has sent instructions yesterday. So the first draft, the first statement, as you all noted, there is a statement that is currently in the process of being drafted.

In fact, it has just been sent out, I guess. The deadline was yesterday. It's a second draft proposal for the cross community working group to develop an IANA stewardship transition proposal, on naming relating functions. We're going to speak about this in a moment, on the next agenda item, so we'll pass on this.

The important public comment requests at the moment are listed on part of your agenda, 2E, where the first one is the cross community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability, with a proposed accountability enhancements of work stream one. Again, I'll be speaking to you about this in a little bit more detail in a moment. But the ALAC comment, as I said, on the draft proposal on the IANA stewardship transition was submitted several hours ago, and there will

be a statement, obviously, that needs to be, that really needs to be drafted about the enhancing accountability.

That really is our next target. And the deadline is, is it the 15ᵗʰ of June? It's the 3ʳᵈ of June. So there are about 10 days or so, and it's really important that we actually have input on this. There is a report that's out for comment, and I really hope that you will be able to read it. It's quite long version. There is a good PowerPoint presentation that comes with it, and in fact, there will be a link to the PowerPoint presentation there.

So that will open the door to your understanding the work that has been taking place. The life cycle of the comment is pretty short, and we will need to ratify this probably after, to ratify the statement after we have submitted it. So we really need to know of the support of people. Even if you're just support what's being drafted, then please just voice it. So we know in advance of any ALAC vote on this.

The next public comment, or consultation is the proposed renewal of the dot Travel, sponsored top level domain registry agreement. I'm sorry, I've missed one. First there is the gTLD registries stakeholder group RISG charter amendment. And I think that as far as that is concerned, it's quite unlikely that the ALAC would have anything to say about another constituency, especially a GNSO constituency changing its charter.

That said, Alan has had a look at this, and he has mentioned that in his mind, it's a completely reasonable set of changes, just to their internal business practices. So there is no reason for the ALAC to intervene in

EN

any direction on this. The proposed dot Travel sponsored gTLD registry agreement, that closes on the 21st of June. No one has actually reviewed that so far, because it's one of the TLDs that has been, it's one of the first ones that comes for renewal, one of these non-standard dot com, dot net, dot org.

The history of dot Travel is a little bit rocky, and the contract should really be reviewed to ensure there are no user implications to the proposed changes. So if there are any volunteers here, please step forward for that. Next is the release of country and territory names under the dot Sony, dot [Archie], dot [BO], dot [Sour Land] TLDs.

Now on this, it's the same sort of request that we have seen in the past. It's another request to release the country and territory names for dot brand TLD. All of these are brand TLDs, i.e. they're not kind of open for everyone to use. They're used specifically by a brand or are restricted in some way. The ALAC has not opposed such requests in the place, and in fact, it has advocated wider release on such names, based on the lack of evidence.

So consumer harm with similar names and traditional top level domains. So, on this one, I believe the ALAC will probably submit its standard statement on this that we have submitted in the past. Not much work to be done on this. Next the proposed schedule and process operational improvements for the AOC, that's the affirmation of commitments and organizational reviews. What basically happened is that the structural improvements committee of the Board has looked at the overall schedule of the usual cycle of reviews that we go through.

EN

If you recall, the ALAC went through a cycle of reviews a while ago. The GNSO went through it, the ASO, every single part of ICANN goes through a periodic review. And it is particularly onerous as far as the work is concerned to do this review. You have an external firm that looks and interviews dozens, if not hundreds of people, tries to find out what can be improved, produces its first report, works with the Chair of the subpart of the organization, and then works with the community, and the community itself draws together from the input of the report, and puts together recommendations and implements them afterwards.

That's the second part of it. It's a very, very onerous task, and especially when it comes down to this stretching more than a year. And with all of the other activities that are out there. So everyone involved in the ALAC review, really find a very large, has a very large sign of relief that this public comment could delay the At-Large review. This is what's being proposed at the moment.

And involved in delaying the outcome longer as well. So it will give us a bit more time to actually breathe in between the reviews. And just to let you know, we would have had to start the next review now, effectively, and I think, well Holly is in charge of this, maybe she wanted to add a couple of words on this. But in our, in Alan's personal opinion, looking at what he sent, he really believes that our current review process, even with the delays previously in place, has been too aggressive. And has resulted in severe overload, and we should be welcoming the proposed schedule and process operation improvements to these reviews.

The 2013 RAA registrar accreditation agreement. The WHOIS accuracy program specification review. This one, again, also needs to have someone to have a look at, and neither Alan nor I have had a chance to look at this. In traditional [inaudible] ALAC has been very, very close to WHOIS and any matters WHOIS, that's the database of domain name registrants basically, or databases of domain name registrants.

As you know, WHOIS accuracy is a very touchy subject. We are, generally the ALAC advocates for strong verification mechanisms so that we're actually able to, if an end user would actually be able to go and find out who the operators of a domain name are, accuracy is various among the different top level domains. And so here is another review of the whole specifications for this.

If anybody is interested in here to have a good reason at this and pick up the pen, then please, step forward. And then finally, the GNSO, generic name supporting organization, privacy and proxy services accreditation issues, working group initial report. That's a policy development process, a PDP, that has a really significant set of user implications.

There are some complex questions there. Again, we're looking at the privacy and proxy services accreditation is all related to WHOIS as well. Just to remind you quickly, it's a service that lets someone register with them, and so the proxy will appear in the WHOIS records, and only they will have records of the real registrant that stands behind there. These are entirely legitimate services, especially in cases where the registrant is a private individual and might not wish to release their home details.

EN

It really has a [inaudible] to privacy to people. If you have children running a website, you obviously don't want to put contact details for them. This sort of thing. So at the same time, you do need to have some specific level of both quality of service and legitimacy for these privacy and proxy services, and therefore there is an accreditation process.

There will be a briefing about this in Buenos Aries. And Holly is our main rep on this one as well, and so she, I'm sure, my wish to add to my explanation here. So these are the current public comments, and you are very welcome, you can see there are quite a few, they're all open, so you all are all welcome to comment and ask questions. Thank you.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you very much Olivier. This is Ali AlMeshal for the record. We always say then, we advise [inaudible] for ALSs to participate in all of these public comments with some feedback and comments, which enrich all of these proposals. I can see that Holly has her hand raised. Holly, the floor is yours, please.

Holly?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are you muted Holly?

ALI ALMESHAL: I'm not [inaudible] I cannot hear, so I will send stuff by email. Okay.

EN

Okay. Holly will be, Gisella will be dialing Holly because she [inaudible] on update of ALAC review as well, so I guess she should be on the dial out as well.

[Make a suggestion], Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ali, if I may?

ALI ALMESHAL: Yes Cheryl, yeah, please go ahead until we reach Holly, you can go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I thought I might take the opportunity, whilst we're getting Holly online, just to speak up on the accountability public comment. It's really is important to make sure that our ALAC representatives know the views of the RALO in general, and the At-Large structures, and the rank and file members, in particular. As we go into this. These are pivotal pieces of work that are going on, along with the IANA stewardship transition public comment.

But the accountability public comment, which is still running, running until the end of June. If need be, and I will encourage it to continue doing that, we could, of course, run a webinar on the topic and have León and some of us that are, obviously myself. I'm representing the region on that group, answer any questions and go through the FAQ, the FAQ that has been put out and that sort of thing.

So I'm assuming now, I can see Holly is on the phone. I can stop filibustering, but Ali and the rest of the executives just let us know if you would like us to do a specific webinar for our region. Thank you.

Holly, I'm not sure if Ali has dropped, but if you're on the phone, you should just go.

HOLLY RAICHE: Can you hear me?

[CROSSTALK]

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Here I go. Really three things. The first is the… I'm echoing, wait a minute.

Okay. Back. Three things. First is in terms of the ALAC review, there will be a session in Buenos Aries, however brief, I will be talking to Larissa, and we'll be talking about the whole issue of reviews itself. And there is a special Wiki for that, and I'll send everybody the link.

The WHOIS specification, it's something that Carlton actually was deeply involved in. He and I are watching that, and I'll probably be involved with that. And thirdly, as Gisella knows, I will be running a session in Buenos Aries on the privacy/proxy initial report. I'll be talking about its contents. The comments are not due until after Buenos Aries. So I'll be seeking input then, and then we can actually all get together and have a consolidated ALAC comment on that issue, if that helps Ali.

ALI ALMEHSAL: Yes Holly. It's fine.

HOLLY RAICHE: Good.

ALI ALMESHAL: So thank you very much Holly, if you are done with that, then we may move to the next thing about the point three, IANA transition, which is Olivier as well. If you have some minutes to update us on that as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Ali. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I have the challenging task of taking you through, I would say is about a year's worth of work and countless number of hours. We're looking in excess of 5,000 working hours, more than 100 meetings in the CWG on stewardship transition. And I wouldn't say an equal amount of time, but we're reaching that point as well in the cross community working group on accountability.

So in order to make things a little bit more simple, you will notice in the agenda there are two links to several things actually. But there are two links, so we have got the CWG stewardship draft proposal without annexes, and for those of you who don't have that in the agenda, please reload your agenda page and you'll see that.

You've got the CWG stewardship draft proposal with annexes, and then you've got the input template as well. In fact, we can actually get rid of these input templates because the… Oh, and a comment period, as I

EN

mentioned, for the CWG stewardship has closed just a few hours ago. We're now really concerned about the cross community working group on accountability. But two important files for everyone here, are the CWG stewardship towards a final proposal, by Olivier Crépin-Leblond. This is just a cut and paste that Gisella has operated a couple of minutes ago.

So it's not by Olivier Crépin-Leblond, thankfully, but it was from another webinar. And also the cross community working group CCWG accountability initial draft proposal for public comment, and that was not by Sébastien Bacholette. So we can also take him off. But in any case, you'll notice, when we refer to stewardship transition, it's CWG. When we refer to accountability it's CCWG.

Opening briefly, the CWG stewardship. You will note there the long presentation of 10 slides. I was going to focus on a couple of slides on this. First, slide number two, I think, let me just see. I see that Gisella is loading this up. So here we go. This slide, yeah. That's great. Thank you Gisella.

So on this one, it effectively shows you briefly the process of the stewardship transition. We had this announcement from the national telecommunications infrastructure administration. And I might be wrong on the exact, what the acronym means, but the US government. The US Department of Commerce. They asked ICANN to convene, well to basically find a solution to their dilemma, which is that they are relinquishing the stewardship that they have over several functions: names, numbers, and protocols.

And they would like ICANN to convene a number of groups or work, so that the international multistakeholder community comes up with an answer, and finds out whether there needs to be a replacement, and comes up with a proposal to them. That request was sent to the ICG, the IANNA coordination group. That coordination group said, "Well, we have three operational communities. One for names, one for numbers, and one for protocols. And so we're going to ask for each one of these operational communities to create its own group effectively."

So we had the CWG stewardship that was one… Actually, it would be good if I could have a little… Can I have presentation rights please? So I can then use the little green arrow to point at things.

Super, I like playing with green arrows. So we've got the ICG, the IANA coordination group here. And for the names proposal, a group was created in ICANN that was the CWG stewardship for the numbers proposal. The different regional Internet registries worked, first, on their side and then came together to create the consolidated regional Internet SP, I can't remember what that is.

Anyway, it's a cool name, the CRISP. It's a panel, yes, there you go. Something panel that basically came out, all of the five regional Internet registries working together. And as far as the numbers are concerned, the IANA plan working group was created. And aside from that also, you had the CCWG, enhancing ICANN accountability group that started, that was also created. And the reason for that was that because a large segment of the names proposal relied on increased ICANN accountability.

With this, the plan is to have the CCWG proposal on one side, with the ICG taking the proposals from the three operational communities, coming up with its own ICG proposal, both go through the ICANN Board, and that will be sent over to the NTIA. The timeline is very tight, as you will see in a moment.

We've moved on a couple of pages. We've got here all of what happens so far, how the development process took place, etc. I think what's important is actually page number seven, which I'm now showing you. And that's the linkage and coordination between the CWG stewardship, and the CCWG accountability. Several points which are important. First the ICANN budget. The community empowerment mechanisms, review and redress mechanisms and appeal mechanisms. These are four broad segments which require a lot of action from the CCWG accountability.

And because the CWG IANA has now ended its comment period, I think it's important to concentrate a bit more on the accountability side then on the IANA part of things. So we'll go, in a moment, we can go into the second set of slides, which is another 15 slides, but we'll pick on a couple and I'll explain to you where we are with the accountability.

And no doubt, Cheryl who is in the CCWG accountability will be able to help on this. The gist of the proposal on the CWG stewardship is that before what we had at the moment is the NTIA having a contract with ICANN. And IANA is just a small department in ICANN. It's a department of eight or nine full-time employees. It's very, very small when you consider that ICANN has several hundreds of employees.

But the NTIA has a contract with ICANN to run these, the basically running the root for the main, you know, performing updates the root, performing updates to the IP addresses, performing updates to protocols. And this will also be the coordination of these three types of data. It also has this oversight function. It basically checks that the work that is done in IANA is done according to a certain set of rules.

And it raises the flag if it isn't. And this is what they are now proposing relinquishing. They're proposing basically going away and saying, "Well, what do we have then? Well we have an ICANN. We have IANA, and you guys, the international, sorry, the multistakeholder community has to think of a solution to find some kind of way that you make sure that IANA still continues running and still is stable, etc."

So the scenario here for the post-transition is to, or the latest scenario, is to create a post-transition IANA, which you can see it here. That is actually, that has a legal separation with ICANN, and this legal separation is actually such that the post-transition IANA is created as a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN. And because it is therefore a separate legal organization, that you can have a contract between ICANN and its legally owned subsidiary.

The post-transition IANA Board would be, and this is very, very recent, hot off the press descriptions, would be a Board that would have very few members on it, perhaps a couple of members of the ICANN staff, a couple of members of the ICANN Board or the ICANN community. It's still exactly sure how Board members will be selected on this, but the idea is to make the Board as uninteresting as possible.

So the discussions and decisions do not take place on the Board of the post-transition IANA, except, of course, if you have to fire a specific employee or something. That's not, there is no discussion about policy in any way here. What you do have though, is a CSC, a customer standing committee, that would be primarily made up of registries and registrars, sorry. Registries, only registries. These are the direct customers of IANA, and they, the CSC has a purely operational concern, and that's to make sure that the updates to the database, etc. are all done, the work of IANA is all done according to the rules and fast.

So we have some service level expectations that are followed, and that work well. And they would meet monthly. The CSC would have a monthly call, and make sure that the service levels are as good as they have ever been. If that is not the case, then there is the next escalation process that would take place, that would involve also the GNSO and the ccNSO, and ultimately would involve the community if things were not worked out.

The whole idea is to [inaudible] if there is a problem with the IANA functions, with the post-transition IANA, initial discussions would take between, will happen between post-transition IANA Board staff, and the CSC so as to work out problems as much as they can. The IFR, the IANA function review, as in anything in ICANN, there needs to be a review of the function, and the IFR would make both on the ICANN side, but also on the post-transition IANA side.

And that would be a working group that at the moment, still under discussions at the moment, mostly though it would be created for the purpose of the review, and that would be multistakeholder, and that

would of course, include members of At-Large in there. And it would perform exactly the way it says on the [inaudible].

It would review the IANA function. It would be either periodic, or it could be called up if there was a really serious problem as part of the escalation process in place. The [real] problem with the way that IANA, the IANA function is run. And this whole thing, this whole new proposal, is all encased in accountability, in a sort of brand new accountability framework from the CWG accountability.

And this is where we then have to jump into the presentation, I think, let me just see. Yes. We have to go into the presentation of the CWG, CWG accountability. If you could please switch to that Gisella. CWG accountability is just has started its public comment process after the CWG IANA, and we really need your input on that. I'm going to take you past the different pages, introduction pages, I'm going to take you to page number five.

If when this thing loads up. The accountability scenario, accountability process is all based on four building blocks. The one, two, three, and of course, the four building blocks. Here we go. So, the first one is an empowered community. And empowering the community refers to the powers that allow you basically, the people in ICANN, in the different supporting organizations and advisory committees, to take action should ICANN breach the principles that have been put together by the cross community working group.

And that would be engrained in ICANN's DNA. Secondly, the Board, the ICANN Board represents the executives of the community, and

EN

therefore the community, so far, was not able to appeal to the Board significantly on decisions of the Board, and so the building block here is for the ICANN community to be able to act against the Board, or get the Board to do things, as appropriate.

Because in California law so far, the Board is only accountable to ICANN, the organization, and to no one else. Thirdly, the principles themselves. These are the ones which are currently drawn up by the cross community working group on accountability. And of course, any principles, and we're talking here about having those engrained in the bylaws, these will guarantee the core values of the organization.

It's technically like a constitution in a country. And finally, the independent review mechanisms, as you've seen the review of the IANA function is one thing, but this is a different thing. This is the sort of review process for ICANN and for the different component parts of ICANN. And that's the judiciary. It prefers the power to review and provide redress as needed.

Several things that go along that line, the fundamental bylaws, I talked about these a moment ago, this is very important within the context of the accountability process because fundamental bylaws are those that will guarantee that ICANN acts in the public interest through a number of processes, that the Board itself will not be allowed to change those bylaws.

Secondly, the empowerment of the community, very important in that one of the pillars in the proposal of the CCWG, and specifically here, points which were put forward. Reconsidering or rejecting the budget,

EN

or strategy operating plans, reconsidering changes to ICANN's standard bylaws obviously, or rejecting changes to ICANN bylaws. Approved changes to fundamental bylaws, removing individual ICANN directors.

Yes, that's one proposal. One part of the proposal and also recalling the whole ICANN Board. If the ICANN Board doesn't follow what the community tells it to do, then the whole community can come together and kick the whole Board out. Yup. Get them out of here. Next one is, and here this is going into deeper discussion on each one of the proposals that were considered there. And I'm not going to go through all of them, since you'll notice there are 25 slides here, and I've probably overrun the allocated time on this topic.

But in your own time, since this is connected to the agenda, please have a look at those slides. They're very helpful, actually, to understand all of the proposals which have been made. I've listed through them on the other page. This is sort of the in-depth idea. There is one thing that I haven't spoken about. It's the SO AC membership model that part of the proposal is that we would actually have some kind of a membership system. And that's one legal way of making a Board accountable to its membership.

So that's one of the part of the proposal. There is also the idea of unincorporated associations, and that would be somehow to do with the creation of some kind of, unincorporated association relating to membership. There is the independent review panel that is listed in this whole set of proposals. And the idea is that the independent review panel would have decisions that are binding on everyone, including the Board.

EN

You'll see quite a few, I would sort of, an expansion of the independent review panel. There is the request for reconsideration process reform. So far, I've mentioned it, reconsiderations of decisions by the Board can, taken by the Board, can only take place, or do take place based on whether a protest has been followed, and is following the ICANN bylaws.

There is no way to say, I disagree with a Board decision, or our community strongly disagrees with a Board decision. Reconsider your position here. And here the reconsideration process reform is looking at that. Reviews of the affirmation of commitment is a very important pillar of the accountability process.   This is really what ICANN's accountability is based on today.

And then there is this stress test. Because remember, most of these, or in fact, all of these proposals here are part of work stream one, which are the accountability process relating directly to the IANA stewardship transition process. Very short timeline, very important. And in the request that the US government had made, they had asked, any solution that is proposed, needs to be shown to have gone through stress tests.

In other words, don't come up with a pie in the sky solution that is unworkable. Show that it works. And Cheryl Langdon-Orr is in charge of this process, as you know, our resident Australian is very good at picking things, and she might wish to add a couple of words on the stress test. Her team has done an incredible job in putting together a vast majority of doom day scenarios.

And then as was mentioned earlier, the two things are, the two processes are linked together. The timeline here, as you will notice, is very compressed. Very compressed indeed because all of the work stream one work, what we're looking at, at the moment, all of that needs to be completely finished and ready by the end of September.

And that's where there is a really, really hard time for all of us. So [inaudible] of this public comment at the moment. There will be a second public comment over the summer, but please, have a look at, first at this PowerPoint presentation, and then go through the proposals and ask other people, and as we said, there will be probably a webinar on this. Attend the webinar, and then make up your mind on this and comment.

We need all of the support we can have. And this is probably the most critical process happening on the Internet today. So be there or be square. Thank you.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you very much Olivier. This is Ali AlMeshal again. What a great, informative presentation, Olivier. To be honest, I haven't seen all of that before, but now, it's a tougher process, I guess. And one of the slides that you have shows, which is the internal accountability [inaudible] reminded me, with the [inaudible] studying, it's the [inaudible] design diagram, because of all of these errors, that will be developed.

Any questions?

EN

I can see no hands up. Holly is typing something.

Okay. Well we can move to the next point, which is the webinar. [Inaudible] there have been, some webinars, and I will… Yeah?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ali, it's Olivier. Just to add one last thing, I'm going to send links to the chat to the two public comments. First the draft proposal to the cross community working group for the IANA stewardship transition proposal. And I will also send a second link to the cross community working group on enhancing accountability. Both of these will be in the chat so you can all click on those, and that's where you'll find the first proposal. And of course, the current, the latest ALAC statement on this.

And that's also where you'll find the comment page for the second page, for the ICANN accountability proposal. That's where you can just log in and put your points of view on there by commenting. And that's how we'll be able to build a statement on this. Thank you.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you Olivier. Thank you very much. So, we go to the webinar announcement. I'll leave this to [inaudible], please.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello Ali. This is Silvia Vivanco from staff. I would like to speak about the next webinar that we are organizing. As you know, this is the second webinar that we have organized with the AP CROPP colleagues.

EN

And this will be the title, the Internet governance, including the ICANN and the multistakeholder model.

And essentially, especially on [inaudible] Internet Governance, and that this is [inaudible] introduction to [IG] overview of Internet architecture. And this is development because NetMundial, IGF, etc. And both issues will be addressed from the Asia and Pacific perspective. All the speakers have been confirmed. And the webinar will be interactive, with quiz questions during the presentation.

So people have the opportunity to test their knowledge and ask questions. And at the end, there will be an evaluation survey. [Inaudible] and that will help us, the staff, to collect feedback and to see how we are doing and how to improve this webinar. So [inaudible] and the invitations have been sent already.

You have the webinar probably on your calendar. Thank you very much.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you Silvia. What is the date again please, Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Sorry, what's that?

ALI ALMESHAL: What is the date of that, yeah, of the webinar.

EN

SILVIA VIVANCO:	The date is Thursday, June 4th from…
ALI ALMESHAL:	June 4th.
SILVIA VIVANCO:	5:50 UTC.
ALI ALMESHAL:	Thank you Silvia. Olivier, I can see your hand. Is that a new or old hand?

Okay. Thank you. Any comments? Any feedback before we move, I think we are almost there. |
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Ali, sorry, Cheryl here. My connection seems to be very poor. What I type in takes forever to show up on my screen. I just wanted to ask before we moved off this agenda item, will a calendar invite be going out for the webinar on the 4th?
ALI ALMESHAL:	Yes, as Silvia confirmed, yeah.
SILVIA VIVANCO:	[Inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm often interested in the speakers, I was interested in the attendees, but that's fine.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes join, and ask everybody to join because the last webinar, we, I think we had 15 or something like that. So [inaudible]… We are hoping to bring more people to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Silvia. But as you know, I for one attend an enormous amount of meetings, and I attend just about anything that is in my calendar that I don't have competition for. In fact, in most cases, and this is Cheryl speaking, I can do two calls at once, sometimes even three.

So I didn't attend the last webinar because I didn't get a specific invitation for it. And that's what I was suggesting, an actual calendar invite might be good to send out to people. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you for that Cheryl. We'll take it into account. Thank you.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thank you Cheryl. Thank you Silvia. The next item [inaudible] consists of the leadership [inaudible] whichever that part, and for the [inaudible] please practice your right to vote for the NomCom delegate from the

APRALO. So you have that. And the timing for that is already sent, when it will be closed.

On the agenda item number six, the monthly call, we said going to be on the third Thursday of each month, and the one for the Buenos Aries, I think the time and date has not been yet, the date, I think, has been confirmed, as far as I know.

[Gisella] can you just confirm that?

GISELLA GRUBER: Hi Ali. Yes, Gisella here for the record. The meeting in Singapore will be held on the Wednesday morning from 8 to 9 in the morning.

ALI ALMESHAL: It's not Singapore, it's Buenos Aries. Yeah?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, sorry. And [inaudible] will be sent out to the APRALO list with all of the details as well as the Adobe Connect for them to be able to access the meeting. Thank you.

ALI ALMESHAL: Great. Thanks Gisella. And now for the last point, any other business, any other comments? Somebody need to add anything before we close up?

I see no comments, I see no hands up. Thank you very much, and see you again, hopefully, in Buenos Aries. Thanks, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]