APTLD Busan Members’ Meeting Minutes

Date: 23rd August 2003
Time: 0900 to 1700
Venue: Ballroom C, 5F, Busan Marriott Hotel, (1405-16, Jung-Dong, Haeundae-Ku Busan, Korea)

The Chair, Ramesh, welcomed members to Busan for the members’ meeting, and the meeting was called to order at 0900 Busan Time. Member representatives of auDA (Chris Disspain), CNNIC (Hualin Qian), JPRS (Hirofumi Hotta, Yumi Ohashi), KRNIC (Chanki Park, H.J. Kwon, Keon-Ho Lee, Suk Jin Hong, Kilnam Chon (joining late for the afternoon sessions), MYNIC (Ramesh Kumar Nadarajah, Shariya Haniz Sulkifli), InternetNZ (Peter Dengate Thrush), SGNIC (Choon-Sai Lim), THNIC (Kanchana Kanchanasut) and TWNIC (Joanna Tso, Chin Chiao, Liping Chi) were present. The Secretariat is Ian Chiang and supported by TWNIC delegates.
1. **Update on APTLD Incorporation**

Ramesh briefed that the incorporation documentations were filed and submitted. The incorporation process is expected to complete by the end of this year.

2. **Report on APTLD Membership Working Group**

2.1 Yumi presented a Membership WG report briefing on it’s recent activities and current works on APTLD pamphlet, technical workshop, Sponsoring Program and membership qualification. ([Presentation file](#))

2.2 Yumi prepared several materials and presented to members and Board for consideration and comments. The documents presented were [APTLD Membership WG Charter (Draft)](#), [Invitation to APTLD (Draft, text for APTLD pamphlet)](#), [Proposal of APTLD Technical Workshop (Draft)](#), [Terms and Conditions for Admission as APTLD Member (Internal Guideline, Draft)](#), and [APTLD Membership Application Form (Draft)](#).

2.3 Ramesh called for comment and moved to approve the WG charter at the Board Meeting later today. Peter commented that there is no reason for the need to promote APTLD in relation with ccNSO.
2.4 At the Chair’s request, Secretariat, Ian, introduced the layout design for the APTLD pamphlet and asked for comment. Members’ comments (Chris, Kwon, Park) were focused on the map of the AP region, mainly about the inappropriateness of the map being cut by the folding line; whether Russia should be included and whether a global map or the map on APTLD website would be more appropriate. Peter mentioned that the map might not be an important criterion. Peter suggested options to replace the map by using a list of ccTLD codes of the AP region; to use the global map and highlight the AP region; or to the map on the APTLD website. But it could be left to the designer to make the best decision. Finally Ramesh resolved to take Peter’s suggestion and leave it to the designer and remind the designer that we should be inclusive as much as possible.

2.5 Yumi continues to introduce Overview of APTLD Introduction Text with a power point presentation, and asked for comments on the draft text. Peter thanked Yumi for the excellent draft, he pointed out that important information about free subscription or self-selection of subscription fee band is missing; Peter also suggested replacing “corporation” with “association”, and “governing” with “coordination” (we’re not governing
body). Shariya suggested not using specific words such as ICANN in section 3: Benefits of Membership. Hotta-San suggested that APTLD membership is open to “all those interested in domain name issues” instead of “all ccTLD registries in AP region” in order to avoid confusion. Yumi thanked all the comments given and will revise the text accordingly.

3. **Discussion on Technical Workshop** ([Presentation file](#))

3.1 Yumi explained about the target of Technical Workshop is primarily set for members and potential members, and the cost for travel to attend the workshop might range around few thousands.

3.2 Peter reply the cost is about US$1,500 to 2,000 to fly from the islands to Auckland. Peter further mentioned that the difficulty is to get to the airport. Some of them take them to take boat to the airport that only travel once a week. Cost can be provided once we know who’s coming. Peter there should be additional sponsorship from NZ sources available. Peter further suggested to set up a technical committee to plan the workshop.

3.3 Chris also mentioned that the accommodation should be added because of less flight schedule.
3.4 Peter questioned about co-organising the workshop with APNIC, and Yumi replied due to the busy pre-arranged training schedule in November, APNIC would not be possible to corporate this time. Yumi will keep in touch with APNIC for future cooperation.

3.5 Chris asked about the date for the workshop. Yumi preferred the last week of November in order to avoid crash with IETF in mid-November and JPRS’s technical event in early December. Peter also preferred the last week of November. It was resolved to request the secretariat send out possible dates and inquire member’s preference.

3.6 Choon Sai commented that if there’s no budget constraint, the workshop could be planed for more than one day. Because a one-day workshop could only provide general introduction, and to fly from Singapore for a one day workshop might not be very beneficial. Chris suggested if participants include someone who needs basic introduction, then two days will be needed.

3.7 Ramesh suggested considering forming a technical committee (it could be a committee of the board) at the board meeting this afternoon.

4. Discussion on APTLD Sponsorship Program Guideline
4.1 Chris is in charge of the revision of APTLD Sponsorship Program, he suggested reviewing the current Sponsorship Program Guideline and exchanging views before he begins drafting a new Guideline that is deployable.

4.2 Chris expected the Program to have a wider purpose for education. Peter expressed that the first purpose is to recruit new member; second purpose is to get to know those ccTLDs in the APT region who are not members.

4.3 Chris suggested widening the targets to “ccTLD in AP region” rather than just non-members of the region. Peter noted that we should be careful not to sponsor the same person again and again; Peter also suggested actively identifying the targets and maybe visiting them for better result. Ramesh suggested widening the program to workshop too. Hotta seconded and further suggested including members who have financial problems. This program should include.

4.4 Chris commented that the recommendation Procedure had not worked well in the past, and suggested the WG to pro-actively seek the right target; the first step is to identify a list of potential ccTLDs; the list is a long-term plan, and subject for on-going review and comment. Peter seconded the suggestion. Hotta asked acceptance of self-recommendation, and Chris replied self -
recommendation is acceptable but it does not mean getting the sponsorship.

4.5 Peter suggested setting up a schedule, if no candidates appear before the dateline, then the WG could refer to the potential list and seek out targets.

4.6 Chris questioned whether the selection needs the whole board to make the decision, or if there could be a committee? Ramesh replied that there’s no problem for having a sub-committee to make the decision if there’s a criteria list for consideration. Chris then suggested alternative for WG to review application and make recommendation for board’s approval.

4.7 Chris suggested deleting flight-booking information. He explained that it’s a process rather than a guideline. At Peter’s comment to add principles to prevent sending money to where we don’t know and not knowing if that person will be coming after all, Chris responded he will re-word it in a more generic accounting clause.

4.8 Chris suggested it is inappropriate to set a maximum amount per sponsorship; rather there should be a minimum number of targets depending on the cost of each sponsorship. Peter agreed, instead of setting the individual sponsorship amount, it might
work better to set the number of targets and request appropriate budget to achieve that goal.

4.9 Chris asked the Secretariat about the budget available in 2003 in order to set the amounts for the Sponsorship Program. And Peter suggested to proposing a list of targeted name, country and budget in two months for Board’s approval.

4.10 Chan-ki suggested developing a table with APTLD meeting location. Chris replied that we should review the meeting schedule and decide which meeting is to be planned. And Choon Sai asked, is the sponsoring only covers the airfare, not include accommodation? Chris replied it depends on the circumstances; sometimes accommodation is necessary.

5. Discussion on Terms and Conditions for Admission as APTLD Member

5.1 Yumi Introduced Terms and Conditions for Admission as Member and Membership Application Form. Yumi explained the Guideline is a reference for international procedure, not to be published.

5.2 Peter commented the form catches all the important items. More discussion on details can be done over lunch with Yumi.
6. APTLD and CENTR crossover observer membership

6.1 Ramesh explained that he received invitation from Center for APTLD to join them as observer, and inquiry the possibility to join APTLD as observer. Ramesh proposed to join Centr as observer called for comments on this issue.

6.2 Shariya asked if there’s an overall principle for joining other regional organization and what are the benefits for joining. Ramesh answered that it is not intended to make a policy to join all regional organisations; rather, we would to join others depending on the benefits.

6.3 Qian asked about how many Centr meetings we expect to attend. Ramesh replied that the benefit of joining Centr is that we can access the agenda in advance, reading meeting minutes after the meeting, and participate in their mailing list discussions, not necessary to join their meetings physically. It depends on the matter of adjusting the budget and the facts about whether it’s worth to attending the meeting according to the agenda published. Peter opposed the concept of APTLD attending CENTR meeting, ordinarily, commenting that joining CENTR is about sharing information rather than sitting physically at the meeting. And we should join as associate member to any organization based on our interests. In the case if we do join, I
proposed that the secretariat would sit on the list as filter for information.

6.4 Choon Sai moved to agree joining Centr, which is quite effective to join and there’s no membership fee required. And that we could join other regional organization in the future if we find the interest. Ramesh moved on with discussion on inviting Centr joining APTLD with observer status. Ramesh explain that we do not have observer status in our Constitution, and associate membership is limited to AP organization. It would be complicated to change the constitution at the time, but we do need to look into the need of non-AP organization that would like to join us as observer. Centr wish to discuss the matter of joining APTLD at their GM in September, and Ramesh moved to create a new observer status. Peter agreed the need of create a new observer status and proposed to instruct the secretariat to add Centr to our member’s mailing list so they can begin receiving our information immediately. Ramesh agreed, but he is concerned whether Centr is looking for a more formal relationship than just participating in the mailing list. It was concluded that Ramesh will write to Centr and inquire if they want to be added to our members list immediately. Ramesh also suggested the creation of
a constitution committee to review any amendments to the constitution on a continuous manner.

7. Technical Corporation

7.1 This Session is led by Kanchana, and she proposed to use APTLD as a forum to work on technical issues. Peter agreed and noted that the ability for strong technical education would make APTLD a more valuable organization for joining.

7.2 Prof. Qian asked whether the target of technical corporation is limited to APTLD members or inclusive of non-members. He further noted that some ccTLD might need technical support to set up the DNS. Peter responded that the target should be member first, but later the board can review the target and decide on the proportion of members and non-members.

7.3 Chan-ki expressed that most of our members are encountering similar situation and problem, inquiry can be done on mailing list, and members can help to provide comments and experiences.

7.4 Ramesh and Chris mentioned that the board would consider setting up a technical committee later on today.

7.5 Hotta further suggested few topics for technical cooperation: server, website, network security, and mirror site.
8. Secretariat Report

8.1 Ian presented the secretariat report and financial report. Peter inquired and commented that if TWNIC is supporting the Secretariat expenses in any way, it should be stated in the financial report in the future for acknowledgement.

8.2 Ian also demonstrated the APTLD Name Card design. It is decided that the Name Card will be provided for Board members and Secretariat’s use. The name card will display the Secretariat’s postal address, telephone and fax number as contact information, but the individual is to be inquire on whether he/she wants to display his/her own e-mail address on the name card. It was general agreed that the individual’s information with his/her organization will not be displayed on the APTLD name card.

9. Update on ccNSO and LG

9.1 Peter presented an update on ICANN's ccNSO Launching Group - The team to start the country code supporting organization, and asked APTLD members to begin consider the “Type of election process for 3 councilors from AP” and “Conflicts of interest” issue.

10. Discussion on Regional At-Large Orgs/Structures
10.1 Ramesh explained at the Maria Del Ray meeting in 2001, there was an informal meeting about whether ccTLD could perform the at large organization. He wondered that whether APTLD as an organization would like to be engage with at large matters, or does individual ccTLD may want to consider as the catalyze for the at large matter.

10.2 Peter asked about the experience of involvement in the at large exercise. Hotta-San mentioned that JPNIC was involved with local at-large exercise. He thought it should be each individual ccTLD to decide if they want to be involved with the at-large matters.

10.3 Yumi replied that as membership WG Chair, she thinks we should concentrate on our membership, so potential members will not get confused with ATPLD’s function. But the at large issue could be included in the consider list and be aware of individual ccTLD’s action on the at-large issue.

10.4 Prof. Qian responded that there’s an at-large organization in China, and CNNIC is not involved with at-large matters. And that he knew Izumi is involved with organizing the regional at large organization.

11. Report on Deployment of IDN
11.1 Chanki delivered a presentation on IDN Deployment in Korea to share their experience.

11.2 Ching asked why trademark could register 3 names, but company can only register 1? Chanki replied it’s because company name does not have variation, but trademark have many variation.

11.3 Shariya asked about the special registration rules for IDN. Chan-ki answered the staffs will examine all the application. If they don’t meet the requirements, the application will be rejected. 70% of applications were returned to registrants. Shariya further asked about the lottery process, and Chanki replied the lottery is done by a system, the system will put in all the application data and perform the drawing, KRNIC will then publish the result.

11.4 Peter asked why KRNIC did not reserve some good names and auction later for better price? Chan-ki replied that VeriSign did that and got many complains, and also because KRNIC is a non-profit organization.

11.5 Yumi asked what the steps are after the government name and legislative names had been reserved for one year? Chanki answered the names will be reviewed the registration rate and decide whether to open up those names or to maintain them for a longer period.
12. Report on WSIS

12.1 Ramesh gave a presentation on “The World Summit on the Information Society: The Internet Governance Perspective”, introduced the process and issues about WSIS.

12.2 Peter questioned about the Article 44 that fundamentally challenges what our efforts for the past 6 years is not working. It shows that the governments will take the leading position. There will be no role for ccNSO if there’s going to be an inter-governmental organization.

12.3 Hotta asked about the consequence if the WSIS declaration is adopted and Peter replied in a lawyer’s respect that once the declaration is adopted, it will develop into treaty, then every country has to follow the measure and review and report the progress every year.

12.4 Peter suggestion suggested to take Ramesh’ recommendations to try to get ccNSO statement or to lobby our government to do/say things that is right.

13. Next Meeting in New Zealand
13.1 Peter suggested that this be a 2-3 days meeting including a
technical workshop. An important objective of this meeting is to
approve all the plans for the next years.

13.2 Kanchana agreed to coordinate the Technical Committee as
Ramesh suggested. Ramesh asked the Secretariat to send call for
participation in the Technical Committee to Members.

13.3 .jp, .kr, .cn and .au volunteered to participate in the Technical
Committee.

13.4 Ramesh outlined the APTLD meeting plan in 2004 would be:
AGM in KL (22nd Feb) in conjunction with APRICOT; KL
meeting (June) in conjunction with ICANN Meeting; Perth
meeting (end of October or early November). KN Chon
suggested holding a meeting and training at Bangalore (South
India) next January. KN will provide more details on this matter.

14. End of Meeting

Ramesh moved to thank Chan-ki and KRNIC people for meeting
arrangement. The Member Meeting adjured at 16:22.