APTLD Member Meeting Minutes

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

14 – 15 September 2002

Venue: Perhentian Room, Putra World Trade Center, KL, MY

Chair: Ramesh Kumar Nadarajah

Day 1: 14 September, 09:00 – 19:00

* *Morning Session * *Meeting agenda review

1. Introduction of new participants

1.1 Ian: new Secretariat staff

1.2 Ms. Suranuch Thongsila: THNIC

1.3 Mr. Boo Zi Yan: dotcc Limited

1.4 Mr. Che-hoo Cheng: .hk

2. Upcoming meetings

2.1 A Board’s teleconference or NetMeeting should be arranged before Shanghai meeting for updates.

2.2 Schedule an APGAC meeting during Shanghai meeting.

2.3 There will not be an APTLD meeting with ICANN Meeting around March in Latin American, due to the long distance travel required
for members, but there should be a meeting during March and June.

3. ICANN Reform and ccNSO

3.1 Review of past events and new updates presented by Peter. So far, there are no comments or objections coming from APTLD members. During last meeting in Bucharest, around 20 ccTLDs presented comment on certain points from ccTLD’s position document at ICANN Public Forum to support and confirmed the need to form ccSO. Since ERC did not comment on the ccSO formation paper, ccTLD AdCom made a telephone call during August to request feedback. Later, action has been taken privately to invite some ccTLD managers to join the Assistance Group on the formation of ccNSO, and some non-ccTLD managers have been invited as well. Today, it’s important for APTLD to make decision on our position regarding the formation of Assistance Group.

3.2 Chris expressed that he has been invited to join the Assistance Group. Chris’s personal view is that it’s easier move things forward favorably if inside the “tent”. And Nigel has also commented that once the Assistance Group is formed, they cannot stop the discussion and direction of the Assistance Group.

3.3 Hotta-san is also invited to join the Assistance Group. Hotta-san expressed It’s important that ICANN’s reform is successful, and contribution should be made in every possible way to ensure that
success. But it’s not likely that there’re not going to be any concrete progress and action on ICANN reform by the time of Shanghai meeting.

3.4 Dr. Kanchana was also invited by turned down the invitation (invitation was extended around two weeks). Assistance Group Members are requested to make comments by 25 Sep. And there seems to be a conference call scheduled for the coming Tuesday (17 Sep.).

3.5 Ramesh asked what if ccTLD objects the result of the Assistance Group, what action can be taken? The common response is that the key point will be ICANN Board’s reaction to the Assistance Group’s proposal. Peter also asked what can we do if ICANN Board take the recommendations of Assistance Group that we object, or if the Board ignores the suggestions that are favorable to us?

3.6 Chris asked if ICANN proceed with their blueprint and form their ccNSO, what will be our response to that. Because, it’s very likely that ICANN will proceed with their own formation disregard the ccTLD’s positions.

3.7 Dr. Lee pointed out that Individual action from ccTLD is also a united front in another sense. But we should come up with a list of things that we can accept and things that we cannot accept.

3.8 Peter replied that the ccSO formation document is actually the consensus among ccTLDs since the Stockholm Meeting. And ccTLDs should be the ones leading the formation of ccSO.
3.9 Mr. Lim expressed that it’s still premature to comment on the work of the Assistance Group, and agrees that the ccSO document is a consensus among ccTLDs, but what would be the proper actions to make in order to put it forward?

3.10 Chris suggests posting of the ccSO document on website for comment and endorsement. And the supports will help to put it forward for the Assistance Group’s consideration.

3.11 Ramesh concludes:

3.11.1 Participation in the Assistance Group to put ccTLD voice in is supported.

3.11.2 Review on the ccSO document will be helpful for put in suggestions to the Assistance Group.

* * Coffee Break * *

4. Continuation on ccSO

4.1 Peter helped to brief and reviews ICANN’s Reform Blueprint and makes updates.

4.2 Peter helped to review the ccSO proposal.

4.3 Mr. Cheng commented that the ccSO structure is very similar to ASO, and ask whether APTLD will enter contract relationship with ICANN? Peter commented that it will just be a simple agreement to
endorse support to ICANN.

4.4 Shariya reported on issues raised by Centre for discussions.

4.5 Peter leads discussion on ccTLD’s response to ERC’s Reform Blueprint”.

4.5.1 There’s principle consensus agreement that ccTLD shouldn’t support ICANN expenses that are not related to ccTLD business. However, if ccTLDs cannot come up a not feasible mechanism for ICANN funding, this argument will not be able to be accepted by ICANN for implementation.

4.5.2 Discussion on the composition of ccNSO Council, and there were consensus that non-ccTLD should not be a member, but could be invited or participate as observer for discussion and inputs.

**Lunch Break**

Afternoon Session: 14:00-17:00

Continuation of Members’ meeting

4.5.3 Peter thinks it’s okay to remain 2 seats in ICANN Board for ccSO, provide that we got the ccSO that we want, then we don’t expect to have too many cc matters that need to be take care of by ICANN. But if we don’t have a SO that we wanted, there should be 3 seats instead of 2 seats.
in the ICANN Board from ccSO.

4.5.3.1 Mr. Cheng says RIRs suggested that ASO only requires one seat in ICANN Board instead of 2 seats.

4.5.4 Regarding NomCom, there should be 1 representative of the ccTLD managers and 5 regionally selected representatives from local internet communities.

4.5.5 Recommends that there be no extension of the current 2-term limitation for the Board of Directors.

4.6 Will revisit the drafting of comments regarding the Second Interim Implementation Report.

5. APTLD Constitution and Incorporation

5.1 Ramesh pointed out that there are needs for changes in the old draft of APTLD Article; a work team should be formed to re-draft the document for comments and further discussion through Netmeeting or teleconference.

5.2 Review APTLD Principle Draft and point out some changes required (This document will be forwarded to the working team for revision):

5.2.1 Membership: Ordinary membership is exclusive to ccTLD in AP region only, so Article “2.2 gTLD registries” should be deleted.

5.2.2 Associate membership should be restricted to ccTLD managers out
side AP region.

5.2.3 Goals (Principle: #2) should be revised, please submit suggestions.

5.2.4 AP should be defined all of Asia and Pacific, excluding the Pacific Rim.

5.2.5 Should consider whether APTLD will seek for sponsors. Peter comments that sponsors should be sought for events instead of APTLD organization.

5.2.6 Should include a statement that electronic meeting is equivalent to face-to-face meeting.

5.2.7 Should include statement that Secretariat does not stay in one country.

5.3 Appointing 4 members for the re-drafting team: Peter, Dr. Lee, Yumi, and Vincent. Peter Chairs the team.

6. Other issues:

6.1 Financial report (As attached)

6.1.1 Financial report review and accepted.

6.2 APTLD process (As attached)

6.2.1 The process was tabled by Ramesh at Bucharest meeting, now calls for comment.

6.2.2 Number of meetings in a year should be reduced to 4 meetings. One meeting is the AGM held with APRICOT, 3 meetings in
the AP region held one month before ICANN meetings. (Meeting at ICANN meeting will can be arranged if members are participating ICANN meetings, these meeting will be held mainly for the purpose of updates.)

6.2.3 At each meeting, there should be a review of the previous meetings minutes.

6.2.4 There should be a quick note on each meeting to circulate among members. This will be done by the Chair or the Vice Chairs.

6.2.5 The process outlines are “work guideline”, not a policy document.

6.2.6 Secretariat should perform liaison with the Chairs or WG? (Peter)

6.2.7 Decision Making suggestions are meant for both Member Meeting and Board Meeting.

6.3 “AP Outreach Program” presentation presented by Dr. Lee (As attached)

6.3.1 Peter raised question to clarify the difference between AP Outreach and ccTLD outreach. Dr. Lee replied that both are operated by .kr.

6.3.2 Funding for ccTLD outreach to attend ccTLD meeting at Shanghai comes from ccTLD Secretariat. This outreach targets at ccTLD in general, but since this meeting is in AP region, it is most likely that more AP ccTLDs will be sponsored.
6.3.3 Dr. Kanchana suggested that outreach sponsorship to be extended to AP neighboring countries who have interest in joining APTLD. If there’s any intention to invite someone in the Middle East, Dr. Kanchana volunteered to contact East Timor.

6.3.4 Other suggestions and recommendation should be directed to ccTLD Secretariat.

6.4 AP* update by Hotta-san

6.4.1 AP* recently met in Shanghai for 1.5 days.

6.4.1.1 Most AP organizations were present except APTLD.

6.4.1.2 All AP organizations seem to do well except APIA. APIA was a trade organization facing member decrease, and it recently merged with APRICOT.

6.4.1.3 BK Kim and Kilnan Chon commented that APTLD should exercise the same power/authority as CENTRE.

6.4.1.4 There were common concern that the current chairs of AP internet organizations are mostly in their forties, and there’s need to education and prepare the next generation leaders soon.

6.4.1.5 Another concern is that if AP* does not develop self-governance soon, there’s possibility that government will tend to take over the control.

6.4.1.6 Paul Wilson pointed out that in the future about 80 percent of IP in the AP region will be allocated for China due to their fast
growth. And IP fees will mostly coming from the AP region.

6.4.2 Peter asked how to handle the meeting clash issue? And what is the importance of APTLD’s participation in AP* meeting, and what are the looses of not participating? Hotta-san replied that that AP* has setting up a website to publish all meeting dates to avoid clash, and APTLD should have at least one representative to participate in AP*.

6.4.3 Dr. Kanchana added that APTLD should participate and make contributions to the AP*, because currently, AP* is fully depended on Toru-san’s personal contribution. AP* website URL is www.apstar.org, and the next meeting will be held at Taipei with APRICOT.

6.5 Centre update by Hotta-san

6.5.1 JP is an associate member at CENTR, and was invited to deliver a talk on IDN experience in Japan. VeriSign is also associate member.

6.5.2 Meeting held form Sep 5 to 6, 50-60 members attended

6.5.3 Code of Conduct was introduced.

6.5.4 Czech, Finland and Bulgaria’s primary server were operated by KPNQwest, and created disaster, and now primary server is transferred to RIPNCC.

6.5.5 There was consensus that there is no need to transfer zone file to IANA.

6.5.6 Peter’s ccSO proposal was on the table, because there were
many controversial issues, it was impossible to make comments, but commonly agreed that ccTLD should define its relationship with ICANN before deciding on the format of ccSO.

6.5.7 Members expressed anger for not been consulted for the .eu registry appointment of the European Commission.

6.5.8 The consensus was that Names Council member should no more be appointed.

6.5.9 European ccTLD is aware of the market demand of IDN and that’s the reason for the invitation to Hotta-san for a presentation.

6.6 Briefing on Kilnan Chon’s comments on ICANN reform by Dr. Lee (as attached)

6.6.1 Dr. Chon’s 2 recommendations should be incorporated into APTLD resolution.

6.7 Topics for GAC dialogue tomorrow

6.7.1 ITU participation in ICANN Reform
6.7.2 GAC’s representation in ccNSO
6.7.3 Funding ICANN by ccNSO
6.7.4 Resolution of GAC disagreements
6.7.5 Regional GAC workshop
6.7.6 Increase level APTLD-GAC dialogue

6.8 Response to IANA “ICP 1”
6.8.1 Chair Ramesh volunteered to draft a response statement to the document’s request for complete access to cc zone file, calling for volunteer to respond to this issue.

6.9 DNSO Name’s Council

6.9.1 Since Peter De Blanc’s death, Elizabeth’s turn expire soon etc, there will be seats opening up for election in the Name’s Council, does APTLD wants to take more active involvement in the DNSO? The resolution is that since ccTLD is forming ccSO on our own, there’s no need to participate. But Peter will speak with other ccTLD and Centre to find out their position.

6.9.2 ccTLD Constituency has not pay dues, but will still be able to exercise voting rights at the time of election.

6.10 ICANN Reform Comments should be drafted by 20 October

** Meeting called to close at 16:50 **

* * Dinner hosted by MYNIC at Bangsar Seafood Village * *

Day 2: 15 September, 09:00 – 12:00

GAC Dialogue

There is consensus that no meeting minutes is required for this dialogue, but a communiqué will be drafted published afterwards.
APTLD Appreciate GAC Chair Paul Twomey, Vice Chair Mohamed Sharil Tarmizi and Ahmad Razif Ramli’s participation for this fruitful discussion and discussion will continue in shanghai. An APTLD-GAC dinner is proposed.