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WG Charter

• Purpose of the Working Group
  – to evaluate possible changes to APTLD's mission and objectives by studying the pros and cons of such changes

• Chair and membership of the WG
  – Chair:
    • Hiro Hotta (.jp)
  – Members:
    • Paul Szyndler (.au)
    • Lynn, Na Xing (.cn)
    • Henry Chan (.hk)
    • Minjung Park (.kr)
    • Yeo Yee Ling (.my)
    • Stafford Guest (.nu)
    • Wei San Soon (.sg)
    • June Seo (.cc and .tv)
Work plan (1)

• **Phase 1: analysis on current activities**
  1. To study the history of APTLD and to extract the historical mission and objectives (M&O) statements
  2. To study the Constitution and other documents (including web sites) and to extract from the documents various aspects of the current M&O
  3. To make a combined list of M&O statements using those obtained in 1. and 2
  4. To extract the important past activities/outputs of APTLD
  5. To map each activity/output (obtained in 4.) onto current and historical M&O (obtained in 3.)
  6. To study whether each activity/output of APTLD (obtained in 2.) is of value for IDN ccTLD registries and/or gTLD registries, and also for ASCII ccTLD registries after 2 years from now (when many IDN ccTLDs and gTLDs are around us)
  7. To write an interim report of the WG
Work plan (2)

- **Phase 2: analysis on possible extension of current M&O**

8. To shake down the current M&O statements into a set of mutually-exclusive unambiguous statements as far as possible

9. To reproduce a table with a new set of M&O, whose rows correspond to new M&O statements and whose columns are rating, value for ASCII ccTLDs, value for IDN ccTLDs, value for ASCII gTLDs, and value for IDN gTLDs: additional M&O statements may be proposed

10. To illustrate a radar chart for each M&O statement
   - (1) current rating vs. expected value for current APTLD members
     APTLD members' survey
   - (2) current rating vs. expected value for other TLDs

11. To study how current value for ASCII ccTLD can be upgraded/remained to/at their expected level for different types of TLDs

12. To elaborate a new set of possible M&O statements (there can be multiple possible sets) using the result of task 10 and task 11

13. To introduce/revise relevant membership eligibility structure for each M&O set obtained in task 12
APTLD's profile in terms of outputs and activities

(presented in August 2013 APTLD meeting)
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Shaken down M&O statements

- About 20 M&O statements are defined in APTLD Constitution, web-sites, and historical documents
  - Some of them are overlapped and/or have multiple M&O definition.
- M&O statements were shaken down by integrating and separating the statements, which resulted as
  1. To provide forum for exchange of knowledge
  2. To act as a voice for members
  3. To negotiate / lobby for member
  4. To encourage members participation in other fora
  5. To conduct training and workshops
  6. To develop Best Current Practice documents
  7. To research and produce reports to member
  8. To promote status of members through public education
  9. To provide services such as registry gateway
Assessment of M&O statements

• each M&O statement was rated by
  – APTLD Members' expectation and
  – Member's assessment of current APTLD performance

• Survey was conducted from late January to mid February, 2014
  – 14 respondents.
  – key highlights
  • The most important category of APTLD objectives is considered to be ‘forum of exchange and knowledge’
  • The largest gap between expectations and assessment of performance is the category ‘research and produce reports of interest to members’
  • The lowest interest of an objective considered is for APTLD ‘to provide services such as Registry gateway’
### Survey Result (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Objectives</th>
<th>expectation</th>
<th>current performance</th>
<th>gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide forum for exchange of knowledge</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act as a voice for members</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To negotiate / lobby for member</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To encourage members participation in other fora</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To conduct training and workshops</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop Best Current Practice documents</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To research and produce reports to member</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote status of members through public education</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide services such as registry gateway</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score = 1 (Not Supported) to 5 (Extremely supported)
Survey Result (2)

- To provide forum for exchange of knowledge
- To provide services such as registry gateway
- To act as a voice for members
- To promote status of members through public education
- To negotiate/lobby for members
- To research and produce reports to member
- To encourage members participation in other fora
- To develop Best Current Practice documents
- To conduct training and workshops

Legend:
- Blue line: expectation
- Pink line: current performance
# Intuitive assessment for kinds of TLDs

slightly modified from WG material considering the survey result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Objectives</th>
<th>ASCII ccTLD</th>
<th>IDN ccTLD</th>
<th>ASCII gTLD</th>
<th>IDN gTLD</th>
<th>ASCII geo TLD</th>
<th>IDN geo TLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide forum for exchange of knowledge</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To act as a voice for members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To negotiate / lobby for members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To encourage members participation in other fora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To conduct training and workshops</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop Best Current Practice documents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To research and produce reports to member</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote status of members through public education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide services such as registry gateway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX : support highly expected,  X : support expected
Discussion

• Observation ?
  – about tasks done by WG
  – about survey result
  – intuitive assessment for kinds of TLDs

• Opinion ?
  – value of APTLD is the same for all types of TLDs?
    • ASCII vs. IDN
    • stick-to-local ccTLD / gTLD-like ccTLD / brand gTLD / geo gTLD / generic gTLD / ...
  – more M&O needed than the current 9 statements?
  – no need for any current M&O's?
    • e.g., To provide services such as registry gateway
      To negotiate / lobby for member
  – Selection and Concentration for effective utilization of limited resource

• Any other comments ?