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1. Principles
   a. We would like Multi-Lingualism to be a fundamental principal of the Process.
      i. While it might be assumed to be included in one of the existing principles, just as “Global” and “Multistakeholder” and “Open [to all voices]” might be assumed to be included in “Inclusive”, we believe that Multi-Lingualism should be an explicit Principle of the process.
      ii. We recognise that Multi-Lingual support is included in the Mechanism, but we believe that Multi-Lingualism should be an explicit Principle of the process.
      iii. By Multi-Lingualism we mean that discourse and contribution will be available in at least all UN Languages and that sufficient time is available to allow translations from and to English by local communities.
   b. We do not understand what ‘Do No Harm’ means in respect to the process. Would you please explain?

2. Mechanism
   a. We believe that you should be explicit in your plans to use existing forums that relevant communities may be gathering at during the consultation period, particularly for affected parties. This will include the IETF meetings, ICANN meetings, meeting of ccTLD registries and gTLD registries.
   b. If greater contribution from the wider public (not just the affected parties) is desired, we also believe that you should have an explicit mechanism of using traditional media (Newspapers, Radio, Television) and new media channels (blogs, on-line newsletters, other on-line forum) to raise awareness of the issue.

3. Steering Group
   a. Under Affected Parties, we see no representation for TLD operators – neither ccTLDs nor gTLDs. We are not convinced that they will be fully represented by the ccNSO and gNSO representatives in the Steering Group because this group will clearly bring an ICANN perspective.
   b. It would be useful, we believe, if the representatives to the Affected Parties could include geographic diversity too. Perhaps a representative from each of the five regions.
   c. We don’t understand how ISOC is an Affected Party. Would you please explain?
   d. We believe that a “Coordinating Committee” would be a better term. We believe that the respective affected parties should be tasked with the work and regular communication between the communities through the Coordinating Committee should occur to make sure that there’s alignment in approach from the communities.
   e. We think the coordinating committee should work to define success so that all affected communities can work toward a common goal.

4. Scoping Document²
   a. The Scoping Document does not address an important function that NTIA currently performs, and that is the selection of the operator of both the IANA function and the Root Zone Publishing Function as well as the terms of the contract. These should be included within the scope of the “Proposal to Transition NTIA’s Stewardship of the IANA Functions”.

5. We believe that the appointment of participants in the Coordinating Committee by the Chair of ICANN and the Chair of the GAC should be replaced by having their respective communities select their participants.

6. We would like the process to be as simple as possible.

¹ http://www.icann.org/en/about/agreements/iana/transition/draft-proposal-08apr14-en.htm
APTLD is an association of ccTLD operators in the Asia Pacific region. The region is geographically wide, spreading from the tropical Pacific Islands to the Middle East. The Region is also home to many different cultures and languages.