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Survey Details

• Initiated by: APTLD Secretariat
• Time of Survey: January 2014
• No. of Respondents: 17
Key Highlights

• 88% of respondents (15 Registries) support the sub-region proposal

• 47% of respondents (8 Registries) support ‘partial diversity’ on the Board
Q1: Sub-regions in Asia-Pacific

To encourage participation by ccTLDs in different parts of the Asia Pacific (AP) region, APTLD is considering allocating some or all of the 8 Board seats to different "sub-regions" in the AP region. It is proposed that we divide the AP region into the following 4 sub-regions (the same approach as adopted by DotAsia).

Sub-region proposals

1. Australia and Pacific (Australia & Pacific Asia)
2. Middle East, Asia Minor and Eurasia (Middle East & Western Asia)
3. North and Northeast Asia (North & East Asia)
4. South and Southeast Asia (Central & South East Asia)
Q1: Sub-regions in Asia-Pacific

• The results show that 88% of respondents (15 Registries) support the sub-region proposal above with the remaining 12% (2 Registries) not in support of the proposal. There were no respondents who answered “no opinion” to this question.

• Comments from who do not support:
  – I would prefer to have a separate region for South Asia (Afghanistan to Mynamar)
  – Consider there may be other suitable boundaries to make up 4 sub-regions
Q2: Diversity of the Board Seats

Assuming there are 4 sub-regions, below are proposals of how the Board could be allocated:

1. Full Diversity - 2 Board seats are allocated to each of the 4 sub-regions
2. Partial Diversity - 1 Board seat is allocated to each of the 4 sub-regions. The other 4 can be taken by any sub-regions.

There are pros and cons for these approaches. Partial diversity is easier to achieve and has the flexibility to cater for situations where some sub-regions do not prefer to participate as much as the others. Full diversity is more rigid and takes longer to transit to from the present Board.
Q2: Diversity of the Board Seats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial Diversity</th>
<th>47%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Diversity</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments received for those that stated “other”
1. [somewhat intermediate solution] In an election, full-diversity is pursued - that is, if 2 or more candidates run for sub-region A, 2 seats are assigned to sub-region A. If some sub-region does not fill two seats, one seat is assigned to a candidate, in another sub-region, who is a runner-up.
2. This decision could be reviewed after it has operated for a few years
3. I support neither.
Other Comments received

- Partial diversity looks more appropriate and hope all sub-regions really have quite equal number of representatives, possibilities etc. otherwise some of them will be always outvoted.
- There should be a mitigation policy/process to handle problem/risk of going with full diversity.
- I fully support this initiative.
- In the worst scenario where a particular sub region has no Board seat, we should decide that whenever that sub region has a candidate to come forward to stand for election, he or she should be given the seat in the next available election.
- We should have geographic diversity - but it should be easily implementable.
- While we encourage ccTLDs in all sub-regions to participate to an equal extent, we should also respect the freedom of those who really don't want to (for various reasons). Therefore I think partial diversity is a better way to go to start with. Also, we can always migrate to full diversity at a later stage when the time is right.