APTLD Members’ Meeting Minutes
Shanghai, China

09:00 – 12:30, 26 October 2002

Venue: 5B~5C (at the 5th Floor),
Shanghai International Convention Center

Chair: Ramesh Kumar Nadarajah

1 Review of Meeting Agenda

1.1 Peter suggests to add discussion on review and
finalization of “APTLD Statement on ICANN Zone
Access Policy” and “APTLD’s Recommendation about
the Membership of DNSO”

2 Secretariat Report

2.1 Review of Previous Meeting minutes.

2.1.1 Discuss about APTLD-GAC Dinner in the
27th or 28th evening.

2.1.2 Peter asked about the attendance of .mm, and
the Secretariat answered that the invitation has been
sent earlier but there was no reply received from .mm so far. Peter suggested again adding the “Sponsorship Program” into the meeting Agenda.

2.2 Financial report (as Attachment 1): After Shanghai Meeting, the Secretariat will remind those members to pay the membership fee before the year ends.

3 ICANN Reform

3.1 Peter presented an update on ICANN Reform since the Kuala Lumpur Meeting. (as Attachment 2)

3.1.1 Relations with the GAC: Since APTLD KL Meeting, there was no response from GAC. GAC has scheduled a 3-days meeting in Shanghai. GAC concerned about the development of recent ITU meeting held in Marrakesh, Morocco and EU’s intention to take over Secretariat and GAC and others. Nancy Victory, who is a senior official of US DoC, is attending the GAC Shanghai Meeting. Her attendance showed that US had concerns about ICANN’s fundamental problems. She presumed this ICANN meeting will be significant to whether if ICANN is succeed or not.
3.1.2 Relations with Asia Pacific members of Assistance Group: There was no response to request to set up feedback with ccTLD managers to validate work. A paper on framework proposed by Dutch member was released 22 October.

3.2 Kouwei (TW) asked: What’s APTLD’s or ccTLD’s position in terms of ICANN Reform, and if ICANN still fails to reach the requirement that TLD wants after another year operation, what will be our oppositional think?

3.3 Kouwei also pointed out that in ICANN’s structural reform, what will be members of TAC, a new design after IETF disappeared from ICANN. RIR also worried about this situation and looking for negotiation with ICANN. The same thing might happen to Domain Name and what will APTLD think about?

3.4 Peter Concluded that APTLD Shanghai Meeting should review the text of reform reports; review and take position on “Bart’s Matrix”; participate in ccTLD meeting debate and participate in ccTLD meeting debate, which Peter emphasized.

3.5 Peter summarised and reviewed on the re-drafted By-law (page 29) related to ccNSO and its Assistant Group.
3.6 Ramesh: Most of the documents will take too much time to go to details, but the Matrix is something that we should all look at it. It will be a real substantial thing that comes out from the Assistant Group will affect ccTLDs.

4 Update on ccNSO Assistant Group by Hotta (as Attachment 3)

4.1 ccNSO AG had 6 teleconferences held, once a week, but Hotta did not attend some of them.

4.2 The first telecom was a discussion about the scope of ccSNO, scope of the ccNSO as a global policy-development body; process of policy development in the ccNSO; ccNSO membership; structure of the ccNSO; ccNSO Council as the document said.

4.3 The AG was in the middle of the discussion. So far, it is decided not to itemize the work, but to develop the Framework Table. The discussion was about how the items should be in each of the column of the Table. There was no consensus. So, the Table remains blank.

4.4 The 2nd table in the document was just an example, for example, third item: ccNSO membership: who are the members and who to pay to ccNSO, discussion still continues. But there was no consensus on that.
4.5 ccNSO AG will meet tomorrow (10/27) for two days and continue the discussion.

4.6 Comments and discussion:

4.6.1 Peter: In the Matrix, “dispute resolution” should not be a function and responsibility of ccTLD. It cannot be a fundamental obligation between ICANN and ccTLD.

4.6.2 Remesh: We should clear up the things that are our obligation and ICANN should not touch.

4.6.3 Peter: Suggest to identify ccTLDs’ fundamental roles on a list and to ask them how to meet the obligations. For example, data entry accuracy is a fundamental responsibility of ccTLD.

4.6.4 Ramesh: is it the table to define a boundary to identify what ccTLDs should do? For example, looking at the “policy”, ICANN should not mention national boundary.

4.6.5 Kouwei: In the Matrix, it not only defines ccTLD’s boundary, but it should also define ICANN’s boundary. ccTLDs is running their business. There’s nothing related to ICANN. Coordination is the only connection between
ICANN and ccTLDs or something not more than coordination.

4.6.6 Ramesh: Anything that is ccTLD matters, ICANN should not interfere. What we need to respond is to plus a list that state clearly about the duties of ccTLD.

4.6.7 Peter: The listing and drafting will be done by ccTLD meeting, and we don’t need to go in to details, and there is one thing miss from the list is the funding.

4.6.8 Ramesh: Regarding the areas that have not been processed and identified, we should wait for the AG report to come up with a clearer conclusion and continue our discussion.

4.6.9 Peter: Look at the bylaw, there are many things take care by Security Advisory Committee, and we need to be careful. Peter suggested members to have our lawyers to review this recommended new bylaw, because it’s about the organization that we are going to join.

4.6.10 Ramesh: As far as the issue of by-law is concerned, the most important thing for us is to read
the by-law and other reports. The Secretariat is requested to arrange a members’ net-meeting to discuss about the by-law.

(Coffee break)

5 ccTLD Name Server Training update presentation by BK. (as Attachment 4)

5.1 Comments and questions:

5.1.1 Hotta: Is the training for ccTLD managers? Because ccTLD manager has to train local operators.

5.1.2 BK: It can be expended, for example in APRICOT, people in APRICOT can also join. The first tier of audience is ccTLD managers, but can’t block anybody out.

5.1.3 Vincent: Is there fellowship? Is the material available on website? Any idea to standardize the curriculum teaching material? Answer: Yes, the materials are available on website, in the case that presentation is not available, there is notes taken for
reference. In the future, teaching material will be organized and standardized.

5.1.4 Kouwie: For example, when developing country asked for assistance, what can we do?

5.1.5 Qian: What about country that are blocked?

5.1.6 Suranuch: The training in Bangkok, was there any sponsorship to support East Timor representative to attend?

5.1.7 Ramesh: There’s budget, but the main issue is to identify the person, who is the real person running East Timor. (Comment supported by Kouwie)

5.1.8 Strafford: There are need for training for the pacific islands, but it’s difficult to bring them to one place, there should be some effort for pacific island region such as Fiji, and probably going on together with other meetings. At least once 2-3 year.

5.1.9 BK: Fiji has representative attending the Shanghai training, and will bring back the materials.

5.1.10 Kouwei: What is the effective way to do the training? Maybe Australia is a suitable location.
5.1.11 Strafford: If there’s material available, that will be useful, (comment also supported by Sue). Because the travel is difficult.

5.1.12 BK: If there’s a meeting in Pacific Island area, please advice for training program coordination.

5.1.13 Qian: Is the training supported by APTLD?

5.1.14 BK: It will be great to have the support and work together.

5.1.15 Peter: There’s US$10,000 planned for this already.

5.1.16 YJ: It might be better for us to have a channel for communication, maybe open up a mailing list for discussion between APTLD and AP Outreach in the future.

6 APTLD Incorporation

6.1 Update by Ramesh: incorporation process has already started and requested for fast-track processing. The draft constitution will be provided and circulated to members soon. The best way is to set up a WG during these five days to discussion the details. Two papers needed for registration: constitution and bylaw is required for the
registration process. Another important thing is that the first Official meeting needs to be held in Malaysia.

6.2 Peter: how many signatures needed for the registration? The constitution can be changed ever year, so let’s go ahead.

7 IDN update by Vincent (as Attachment 5)

7.1 Vincent: There’s a JET informal dinner meeting on 10/27 opened to interested persons to attend.

7.2 Hotta: JET meeting on 30 October is open to public too.

7.3 BK: John Klensin’s multilingual doc multilingual is not possible on the current name basis. Is there any conclusion?

7.4 Kouwie: In some points, agreed with John’s points. The multilingual cannot be only for certain parts of this area.

7.5 Vincent: Klensin’s view is to request for language specific rule: language mapping table and registration policy, then you can go ahead. But gTLD is not ready. And there is no multilingual dot multilingual discussion so far.
APTLD Statement on Zone file transfer

8.1 Yumi: JP’s statement suggested IANA should consult with ccTLD regarding the stability for zone file transfer.

8.2 Kouwei: The only one thing that we have to deal with ICANN is re-delegation. Re-delegation is a local issue, and it should be decided by local, and ICANN follow the decision.

8.3 Ramesh: Add JP’s comment to the statement. (As item number 2-8 of the Statement)

8.4 The paper approved unanimously by all members present.

(Dr. Chon joined)

9 Other issues:

9.1 Chon: Regarding IDN, what is APTLD’s role and position? What is the recommendation of ccTLD to APTLD? 90 percent of IDN user is in AP, and the majority user should be able to decide the rules. Regarding the recent paper from Klensin, what is APTLD’s response?
9.2 Vincent: there are CDNC and JET meetings going on in this period, if some ccTLD is not aware of the progress, it’s recommended to participate those meetings and get the information.

9.3 Dr. Lee: Is there any one from JET to represent and explain about guideline of the conditions.

9.4 Sue: APTLD had a statement to ICANN regarding IDN, telling that they should not proceed. If there can be a paper that clarifies the technical conflicts that will break the Internet and policy.

9.5 Vincent: a presentation on “The Impact of IDN Registration Policy” by UNICODE variants issue – case study, which was concluded to alert members that there are conflicts in multilingual gTLD and multilingual ccTLD.

9.6 Ramesh: is there anything that APTLD can do? Support? Or APTLD can express support to JET’s work as regional effort on IDN.

9.7 Chon: No single party can make IDN work alone, IETF does not want to be involved with operational issue, ICANN does not want to be involved with technical issue. Each organization must work together and coordinate with
others. APTLD can sit down with MINC, JET and other organizations to make a discussion and try to come up recommendation on policy on gTLD. We do need to educated people about the IDN situation.

9.8 Ramesh: it’s a good suggestion to make things forward, but maybe setting up a WG is feasible. And what is the urgency and deadline for submitting recommendations? Are we able to come out a result on this matter?

9.9 Lim: There will be an ICANN session on IDN, are we going to put something forth for that session?

9.10 Peter: There’s no ready statement at hand, otherwise it’s good to submit the statement to the 28th IDN session.

9.11 Chon: will try to draft APTLD position paper on IDN during the lunchtime.

Meeting adjured at 12:30