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APccTLD meeting, MORNING Session, July 21, 1998

Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza, Geneva

1. Greetings from Interim Chairman

Mr. Takahashi chaired the meeting.

Background: At the APRICOT meeting in Manila, Feb. 18th, a BoF meeting was held to discuss gTLD issues. During that meeting it was suggested that people involved with the administration of ccTLDs in the Asia Pacific region should get together to discuss issues of mutual interest.

The purpose of the APccTLD meeting is to establish a voice for AP
regions' ccTLDs, and to participate in the processes of forming the new IANA.

2. Confirmation of Today's Speakers (AGENDA)

AGENDA

1. Greetings from Interim Chairman
2. Confirmation of Today's Speakers (AGENDA)
3. Official name of "APccTLD" Forum
4. Definition of AP Region
5. Comments from POC
6. Comments from ITU
7. Comments from IANA
8. Report on RIPE CENTR
9. Report on JPNIC
10. Report on Domainz
11. Report on Canada .ca
12. Introduction of Handout
13. Procedure of APccTLD Forum

Agenda items developed during the course of the meeting and reflect the events and speakers who participated in the meeting.
When the secretariat is established, Power Point materials from the meeting will be available on-line at.

3. **Name for the "APccTLD" Forum**

The first issue is to name the organization. The interim working name for the group is "APccTLD", so far there are no alternatives.

Discussion on this matter will continue on APccTLD mailing lists (apcctld-discussion@apng.org and apcctld-announce@apng.org) and at IFWP Meeting in Singapore (August 11 - 13, 1998)

4. **Definition of AP Region**

We must identify what geographically constitutes "AP". APNIC and RIPE NCC have identified their respective regions for IP addressing issues.

It was generally agreed by the meeting that APccTLD should follow APNIC's definition of the countries that form the AP region.

A full list of these countries would be obtained from APNIC.
5. Comments from POC

David Maher, Chair of POC.

The Policy Oversight Committee (POC) evolved from the IAHC and gTLD-MOU process which began over 2 years ago as an attempt to expand the generic domain name space. The IAHC, which was formed by IANA and ISOC in September 1996, produced the gTLD-MoU in February 1997 and signed in May 1997 to carry out programs to expand Domain Name System. The POC is the policy oversight body designed for these programs.

In the summer of 1997, the US Government intervened with a consultative process that culminated in the White Paper on Management of Internet Names and Addresses. Mr. Maher expressed the view that while the USG's intervention may have put the Internet community back to where it was some two years ago, the bright side of this situation is that the final decision reached during the processes that are following on from the White Paper will at least have the USG's blessing. The POC is cooperating with the processes of the White Paper in forming the new IANA. Mr. Maher hoped that the new IANA will have substantial
representation from the AP region, and probably not a majority of members from the US.

POC's positions on the formation of the new IANA are available in "an open letter to the IANA" available on the POC web site, and a soon to be released document on the economics of multiple competing registrars.

6. Comments from ITU

Bob Shaw, ITU. Research on Domains.

Mr. Shaw's department had surveyed 220+ ccTLD administrators, contacting people by email, phone, fax and even telex, to try and identify who is the correct contact point for each ccTLD and record their address details. Current records of ccTLD administrative contacts are woefully out of date, and it is important that accurate records of who is the primary contact for ccTLDs is maintained.

The data collected has been sent to the IANA, and is currently available from as a database of "Internet ISO 3166-Based Top Level Domains". This resource will be linked from the APccTLD website.
7. Comments from IANA, Jon Postel

Dr. Postel remarked that he had been trying to encourage regional groups of people who manage ccTLDs express their views and was pleased to see this group getting together.

New IANA organization

IANA has been supported by grants from US Government contracts, this is not appropriate any longer and it is time to reorganize the functions and support of IANA. The Internet community is looking to form probably a not-for-profit corporation, with an interim board of directors who will hire staff and create committees for address management, protocol management in conjunction with the IETF and industry groups, and the management of domain names. These committees or "Councils" should be representative of all stakeholders in the Internet.

Dr. Postel has issued various memos which culminated in last weeks draft by-laws (see URL) IANA has produced these documents to provide information and stimulate discussion. Comments can be made to the IANA-discuss mailing list and all information is available on
IANA's website: draft documents, mailing list archives and information on how to subscribe to the lists, links to other relevant papers discussing the issues.

ccTLD groups should participate in the names council to ensure those running the gTLDs do not ride rough-shod over the concerns of ccTLDs.

Question and Answer session with Dr. Postel:

Q: What is the future relationship likely to be between IANA and US Government?

A: Conditions are laid out in the USG White Paper.

- Go out and build consensus
- Put the organization together
- Go cap in hand to Ira
- Ira gets to look it over and delegate whatever authority they think they have over these issues.

Q: What are the timelines?

A: 2 months, because the contracts are ending.
Q: Has the US Government agreed that IANA reincorporate itself? Or any competing element?
A: Not aware of competing elements.

Q: What happens to domain delegation, when nIANA is established?
A: No major change will be caused. Hope the new board selects existing staff and continue existing procedures. Gradually and over time, move to more formal relationships - signed contracts.

Q: How will the Names Council be put together?
A: Names council needs a charter. APccTLD, RIPE center, CORE, InterNIC, TM folks all should be involved. How to get them together is real tricky. An opportunity here on Friday and Saturday and in Singapore.

Q: How about members (Erica)
A: Membership is a very interesting question.

The Supporting Organizations.

Q: More details on transition board?
A: Getting started is difficult. It is also difficult to conduct wide-ranging process. It should be international, representing all
Q: What is the role of the board re: IP addresses and names?
A: Oversees the activities of the councils. Make sure that processes are correct.

Q: How is accountability of the board? Whom it is accountable to?
A: Membership of the new organization.

Q: Governments have interest in affecting the planning of ccTLD. What presence do they have within the organization?
A: Proposal for a committee of governments to provide more direct input to the board. Whether it has membership status is a separate question.

Q: Will governments have some form of membership in the new organization?
A: Possibly. But that needs balancing. There are also people thinking government should not have anything to do with this.

Q: Who is going to work on the Council representing industry and user?
A: Not much is done about that. But I suppose we should identify some
association of industries or users to take the role of supporting
the organization in that area.

Q: How can the number of directors from a given country be limited?
A: His current proposal is to limit on the basis of regions:
no more than half from any one region.

8. Report on RIP>

Transfer interrupted!

cct Manager

RIPE CENTR, the Coordination of European National TLD Registries,
was formed from a RIPE working group and first met in the Autumn of
1997, and held its first formal meeting in March 1998. CENTR has now
held 3 plenary meetings and one taskforce meeting. Currently 36
countries have joined and the project has a cash fund of 120,000
ECU. CENTR is not directly associated with RIPE NCC, both come
under the umbrella of the RIPE meetings and conferences. A taskforce
has been setup to examine how to establish RIPE CENTR as a separate legal entity and will report back to the plenary session with its proposals.

Purpose is liaison with key bodies involved in the Internet: with the US Government over the White Paper, with the IANA, APccTLD, etc.

CENTR will produce documentation on best practices, particularly to support emerging registries, and a technical workshop for registries has already been held. A workshop on managerial issues will be held soon.

CENTR is developing a view of governance issues, submitted comments to the USG's Green Paper, and will participate in the formation of the new IANA.

Ms. Howard said there is some concern among the membership over funding levels: how members should pay, what are the appropriate funding level (membership fees) should be. CENTR group members recognized that when the USG ended funding for the IANA those involved in IP allocation and ccTLD registries would have to pay something for the services they received. However, ccTLD registries operate under local jurisdiction and receive quite limited services from
the IANA --maintenance of their TLD in the root server-- , but do realize they will have to pay something towards the new IANA.

See an important liaison role for CENTR.
To provide a common view on the incorporation of the new board.
Provide a locus for technical collaboration between registries.
To ensure that the ccTLD voice is heard as clearly as that of those concerned with gTLD issues.

CENTR has been talking with Canadian domain name administrators, but has had no contact with South America. CENTR is careful to say that it focuses on Europe but is not exclusively for European ccTLD registries.

Daniel Karrenberg, of RIPE NCC, explain the relationship between the various organizations under the RIPE banner. RIPE NCC is responsible for IP addresses and protocol issues, RIPE CENTR is becoming responsible for issue relating to ccTLDs.

**Question and Answer session with Ms. Howard:**

Q: Contact with the American registries?
A: Talking to Canada, very little contact with South America.
Q: Issue as to whether for-profit ccTLDs can be a member of RIPE CENTR.

A: A good question. Some not-for-profit orgs *cannot* be a member of an organization that has "for profit" members.

Q: Geographical restrictions on membership. Does it make sense?

A: Most RIPE CENTR members are happy to allow anyone to join.

One or two don't feel that way. Currently under discussion.

Daniel Karrenberg, RIPE NCC noted on the white board:

RIPE == APRICOT (or APNG)
RIPE NCC == APNIC
RIPE CENTR == APccTLD

Notice from Chairman

As most at the meeting will know, David Conrad resigned as Director General of APNIC. A new DG has been selected and appointed, and the name of this person will hopefully be announced this week or early next week. The new DG will start on August 3. The Chairman thanked Mr.
Conrad for his very important contribution to APNIC and the region.

9. **Report on JPNIC**

Naomasa Maruyama, JPNIC Vice President, Overview of JPNIC and experience establishing registry policies.

Mr. Maruyama had prepared 2 papers which he summarized for the meeting.

JPNIC is a non-profit organization, it was founded as a union of Internet service providers in Japan in April of 1993 and registered as a pro-bono association on March 31, 1997.

JPNIC operates an open decision making process, with a board of trustees, a number of advisory committees and mechanisms for hearing opinions from the public.

Policy is to operate on a non-profit basis, supported by ISPs, as a common infrastructure for the Japan domain space. JPNIC stresses that it does not make any commitment to connectivity and routing as these
are the responsibilities of the commercial entities which make up its membership.

Basic principles for domain name allocation:
Allocation on a first-come first served basis; 1 domain name per entity; names are not transferable; registration requires local presence in Japan.

JPNIC received no government funds and began charging for assignments in June 1995, so was the first registry to operate on a commercial basis.

Mr. Maruyama had prepared a second paper "Internet governance and the importance of bottom up coordination."

**Role of the country NIC:**

* Ensure the uniform coordination of registration policies in a country.
* Establish domain name assignment and dispute policies.
* Maintain positive relations with the country's government.
* Establish procedures for interaction with police and courts, the
country NIC is often regarded as a central organization in the Internet in that country, and is an important point of contact for other organizations.

* Ensure that the Whois database is up to date to ensure fairness and transparency in the registration of names. But the NIC must also be conscious of privacy issues regarding information held about individuals and organizations.

* Security, coordinate and support local, regional and international CERT activities.

* IP address and number resource assignment.

* Maintain relations with IX and telecommunications industries.

The two papers Mr. Maruyama wrote for this session will be available online at once the secretariat is established.

Question and Answer session with Mr. Maruyama:

Q: Measures against spamming?
A: JPNIC's open database contains information of the person responsible for the domain name.

Q: How can foreign company operating in Japan satisfy the condition
"local presence in Japan" that is required upon applying for .jp?

A: In Japan, foreign companies should register as "Foreign Company"
The registration satisfies the condition.

Q: How to establish domain name registration policy?
A: Have open, general discussion mailing list.

Q: Any provision in order to become a JPNIC member?
A: None. But up to now almost all of them are ISP's.

Q: Any relationship between .jp domain names and trademarks?
A: Currently JPNIC does not commit to trademark issues. So no relation between .jp and trademarks.

10. Report on Domainz, New Zealand,

Patrick O'Brien, Chief Executive, Domainz

The New Zealand domain registry system offers a contrasting model to that presented by JPNIC.
Domain names in New Zealand are registered by a company called "Domainz". Domainz is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Internet Society of New Zealand, an incorporated not-for-profit society owned by its members, that has been delegated to manage the .NZ domain. Anyone can join ISOC NZ.

New Zealand is 3rd largest name space in Asia Pacific, but traditionally New Zealand looks to the US and UK for its legal and business models, so it will be interesting to see if New Zealand's concerns over the DNS are similar to those of other AP region countries or to those of the US and UK. New Zealand is 2nd ranked in domains per capita, so again, perhaps New Zealand's interests will be closer to those of other high penetration countries such the Scandinavian nations.

Background: Like most country code domains, .NZ administration has its roots in the academic community. About 3 years ago, ISOC NZ incorporated as a society with the aim of fostering the development of the Internet in New Zealand. In February 1996, ISOC NZ took on DNS administration from Waikato University. July 1996, a university began charging ISOC NZ for running the various DNS servers it used and so it became necessary to consider means of passing on those charges to the
users of DNS services. Domainz was formed and a system for charging for the registration and maintenance of the DNS was established.

The registry/registrar model is strong in New Zealand with over 95% of registrations being made through agents. The transition from the university model to Domainz was marked by a move to a customer service based approach. Domainz regularly publishes a range of performance statistics with the intention of being accountable to its customers. Domain name registrations that might have taken weeks when operated by the university are now usually completed within the same business day.

In May 1998, 100% of registrations were completed the same day.

Domainz operates as a company, it has a business plan and aims to provide an adequate return on investment: operating as a not-for-profit does not mean operating at a loss. New Zealand is very price conscious, geographically remote and these factors have helped to create an innovative culture. Domainz is a small operation, 7 staff, so even as a non-profit is must be cash driven. Domainz operates on a strong service delivery ethic.
Key lessons for the operation of a domain registry:

* Need for seed capital funding for operations and capital for the initial period of operation. The organization should be formed to be self-sustaining, seed capital is important so that the organization can make decisions based on sound business practices rather than the need for immediate cash flow. Decision made at the beginning may create problems in the future.

* Obtain a contract to operate the ccTLD. Important to agents and customers that the registry has a firm contract with the new IANA.

* Vision, where does the registry want to be in 2 or 3 years in terms of customer services, performance, etc.

* Key personnel, people will leave, don't let them be indispensable to your business.

* Policies that add value (if it does not add value, it shouldn't be there.)

* Make a business plan.
* YR2000, ensure systems and processes are compliant.

**Question and Answer session with Mr. O'Brien:**

Q: How do you deal with bad debt?
A: 1. Send invoice
2. Next month send a statement saying that you owe money.
3. Try email & fax, in that order.
   
   70% respond to email. The overall process takes 2 months and is geared to encouraging payment before the ultimate action, to cut the customer off, is taken.

Q: Fee collection seems to be a heavy cost on the registry.
A: 2 years ago the registry needed money up-front to start operations. 40% of name holders were willing to pay up-front and that gave the cash flow necessary to operate. However, this may have been the wrong option as there is a lot of dead money in debt collection. Seed capital may have been a better solution. The registry is re-examining this policy.
11. Report on Canada .ca, Paul Pierlot, Industry Canada

Mr. Pierlot commented that he is not directly involved with the .CA domain, but Industry Canada, a government department, has been involved in the transition of the .CA domain from a volunteer based system to new non-profit/cost recovery membership organization. The new organization will operate in a very similar manner to the New Zealand registry, it has been formed by the Canadian Internet Society and other organizations, and will work on a agency registrar model with a central registry. The Canadian Government has a non-voting seat on the board, membership will be comprised of all .CA domain name holders. The model produced does not include any seed capital for the organization, that may be a concern in light of New Zealand's comments.

12. Introduction of Handout

Adam Peake, GLOCOM, Survey on AP Region ccTLD registration policies.

The survey began life at a BoF meeting held during INET97 in Kuala Lumpur. The survey asked basic questions about the formation and
operation of APccTLD registries. 11 AP region registries have complete the survey and the data can be found on the web at URL

The survey data is for information only: definitive information should be obtained from the appropriate registry/national NIC, this is particularly important where policies are in languages other than English and the survey data is provided as an unofficial translation.

Suggested improvements to the survey questions, and contributions from AP Region NICs/Registries that were missed during the first round of questions are welcomed.

13. Procedure of APccTLD Forum

Suggestion from the Chairman, Mr. Takahashi

* To form advisory board
* To define role and function of APccTLD forum
* To nominate chairman

After strong comments from the audience it was agreed that these issues
must be fully discussed and it was agreed to continue the meeting during the afternoon. The purpose of the afternoon session would be to discuss the formation of some organization to represent APccTLD issues.

------LUNCH------

AP cc TLD meeting, AFTERNOON Session, July 21, 1998
Holiday Inn Crowne Plaza, Geneva

Toru Takahashi, Interim Chair.

PLENARY

The purpose of the afternoon session is to discuss the formation of the APccTLD organization and what the functions of that organization should be.

Introduction:
Professor Kilnam Chon explained that the idea for AP regional registries to form some representative organization came from
conversations he had with Jon Postel of IANA in late 1997. IANA wants
some central contact point for ccTLD administrators, and ccTLD
administrators themselves have an interest in presenting a collective
voice when the IANA is reformed following the White Paper. After
some discussion online and at the APRICOT meeting in Manila, a
mailing list and temporary web page was set up by Dr. Tan Tin Wee.

**General discussion**

Membership: The first point raised was if a ccTLD organization was to
be formed, then who should constitute it's membership. The meeting
agreed that membership should be AP region ccTLD administrative
contacts and agreed to the following statement:

> That voting membership is limited to the ccTLD
> administrative representative or his/her designated
> representative. One vote per ccTLD.

It was noted that this meant that some individuals might be represent
more than one ccTLD.
Fay Howard of RIPE CENTR commented that CENTR found the best way to move forward with identifying organizational and functional issues, and issues the organization should be concerned with, was to create a separate small taskforce. The taskforce would meet on- and/or offline to discuss general proposals identified by the plenary session, and report back to the plenary with its findings. Ms. Howard also mentioned that CENTR asked its members for seed funding, to be paid on a volunteer basis on a sliding scale from $1000 to $7000 maximum.

9 members of the meeting volunteered to form the Taskforce and a 10th representative joined the group later. The taskforce was comprised of AP region ccTLD representatives present at the meeting:

- KR Kilnam Chon
- JP Toru Takahashi
- AU Clive Flory
- NU Bill Semich
- HK Che-Hoo Cheng
- TW Kuo-Wei Wu
- SG Agnes Lee
- NZ Patrick O'Brien
CN    Hualin Qian
Secretary    Tan Tin Wee (at least until Singapore meeting)

The meeting created a list of discussion points they wanted the taskforce to discuss.

Taskforce discussion points:

1. Chairman of the new organization
2. Establish new email lists and information resources
3. Funding and budgeting
4. Membership
5. Locations
6. Company form/structure
7. Aims
8. Secretariat
9. Liaison issues (relations with other organizations: APNIC, RIPE CENTR, etc.)
10. Board structure
11. Legal structure of member organizations
12. Initial projects
13. Prioritize tasks and provide key dates

14. Name the organizations

The taskforce would discuss these issues and prepare proposals for the next plenary session to be held in Singapore, August 11. It was recognized that time was short and the taskforce could not be expected to make detailed proposals on all the issues listed before the Singapore meeting.

Dr. Tan Tin Wee would continue to act as Secretariat at least until the next meeting. Dr. Tan would create 2 mailing lists:

apcctld-taskforce@apng.org
apcctld-discussion@apng.org

3 days before the Plenary session (August 8) the taskforce should post their proposals to the discussion mailing list.

JPNIC offered their services as the organization's secretariat for an initial period of one year. The meeting thanked JPNIC for this generous offer, however it was felt that this was an issue that the taskforce should discuss before any firm decision was made.
At this point the taskforce began its discussion. Some plenary meeting members remained, but took no further part in discussion.

**TASKFORCE**

Notes of discussion among Task Force Members

The discussion point list created during the plenary session was clarified during taskforce meeting. The taskforce began by prioritizing the items and a modified list with some initial proposals noted was created as follows.

15 items were suggested, and categorized as:

(A): urgent   (B): less urgent   (C): can be decided later

Due to limitation in time, all (A)s and one of (B)s were discussed.

(A) Chairman:

Kilnam Chon/Toru Takahashi (transition at Singapore meeting)

(A) Mailing Lists/Website:
be kept by Secretariat

until Singapore meeting - under APNG site

after Singapore meeting - new secretariat will create

the lists under the organization's new name

(A) Seed Funding:

$50,000 (until next APRICOT and INET, depending on the cost)

(A) Membership:

Voting Member

Associate Member

Liaison Member (exchange)

Affiliation(one way from them to us)

(A) Aims:

Internet self governance

Skill(maintaining stability and continuity)

Harmonization

guidelines - good practice or bad practice

e.g. US domain name practice

Dispute resolution
(A) Time Schedule/Time Frame:

(Mailing list management and local arrangement will be done by Singapore Secretariat)

- August 8 Deadline (agenda, draft documents)
- August 11
- 3:30 pm - 6:30 pm Open Plenary Meeting (make rough consensus)
- 8:00 pm - 9:30 pm Inauguration Meeting
  of ccTLD administrative contacts
  morning of August 12

- August 12 Presentation at IFWP Meeting

(A) Name:

Decided in Singapore Meeting straw vote:

  Council of Asia Pacific Registries (CAPR) - 2
  APccTLD - ?
  APTLD - 6
  CAPTAIN - ?
  APDNS - 5
(A) Decision Making Process:

Vote by ccTLD administrative contact

Task Force - structure making

(B) Secretariat:

Until Singapore meeting - APNG

After Singapore meeting - volunteer by JPNIC (1 year?)

to be decided in Singapore

(B) Form (e.g. whether to incorporate) and Location:

(B) Board Structure:

(C) Funding and Budgeting:

(C) Liaison:

Keep relationship with APNIC

(C) Difference of Legal Structure in Each Member Country:

(C) Initial Projects:
4. Other

- Press Conference/Press Release

  Toru Takahashi and Bill Semich?

  Short announcement on establishment of this new body

  Bring summary of minute (by Friday afternoon)

- Mailing list would be apcctld-taskforce@apng.org

  consisting of Task Force member and Secretariat