APTLD Wellington Members’ Meeting Minutes

23 November 2003

Wellington, New Zealand

Venue: Ground Floor, E-Vision, Wellington, New Zealand

Chair: Peter Dengate Thrush (.nz)

Attended by: Chan-Ki Park (.kr), Chris Disspain (.au), Hiro Hotta (.jp),
Jeff Yeh (.tw), Jo Lim (.au), Jose Emmanuel Disini (.ph), Keith Davidson (.nz), Parkpoom Tripatana (.th), Phisit
Siprasatthong (.th), Richard St. Clair (.nu), Shariya Haniz
Zulfikli (.my), Stafford Guest (.nu), Sue Leader (.nz), Vincent
WS Chen (.tw), Yumi Ohashi (.jp), Yung-Jin Suh (.kr)

Observed by: Edmon Chung (Afilias)

Secretariat: Joanna Tso, Ian Chiang, Ching Chiao

1. Meeting called to order at 0900

1.1 Senior Vice Chair Peter as Acting Chairperson welcomed members
and new arrivals to the APTLD Members’ Meeting and gave an overview
today’s proceedings.
1.2 Peter explained that he is chairing APTLD matters because Ramesh is studying in England, and had suggested not a good time to change Chair due to the registration process, and have Peter to act as the chairman. Richard moved to have Peter carry on as the chairman until the next AGM. Motion was seconded by .au and .jp. There was no objection and the motion passed.

2. Update from APTLD Membership Committee

2.1 Yumi gave a presentation of Membership Committee Report since Busan Meeting, which included ”Re-development of Rules and Procedures”, “Review on Wellington Meeting Sponsorship”, “Status of Membership Application” and “Plan for the KL AGM (February 2004)”.  

2.2 Yumi’s report pointed out that .mn has applied for Wellington sponsorship, and future candidate include .ki, vn, ws. New membership received from .tk and .jo (.jo requires formality examine).

2.3 Regarding plan for the KL AGM, the Membership Committee plans to proceed with current membership application and sponsorship, but
needs to secure budget for the sponsorship, estimated need is 2000USD per applicant.

2.4 Peter complimented on the Membership Committee’s work. Yumi made proposal of .tk membership application. She further proposed the budget plan to support two ccTLDs to APTLD KL AGM in February 2004. The Chair asked why sponsor two ccTLDs when there are budgets available from this year.

2.5 Richard said that there are only 3 ccTLDs expressing interest from the pacific islands because the AGM is in conjunction with APRICOT in KL. And Chris added that there is another candidate from East Timor.

2.6 Peter concluded that since there are more candidates, and budget is available, unless Members have other thoughts, we should be able to sponsor up to 5 or 6 candidates.

2.7 Shariya added there are other meetings such as ICANN meeting in Rome and tentative APTLD meeting in Perth, which will require more sponsorship budgets, and this should be taken into consideration. She further suggested making the meeting information available to the
candidates on website, so they can decide which meeting they wish to attend.

2.8 Yumi said it’s a good chance to sponsor pacific island ccTLDs to attend APRICOT and APTLD AGM to learn about the technical issues. She proposed to cover the current 3 Pacific Island ccTLDs, and the current .mn case, which is not successful with this year’s budget.

2.9 Peter asked for committee member’s comment on this matter.

2.10 Vincent suggested keeping the budget per sponsorship flexible depending on the expenses required. Second, we can collaborate with APRICOT fellowship sponsorship and have more potential members attending APTLD meeting, and use the budget available for other meetings in 2004. Third, we need to simplify the procedure to increase success of this sponsorship program.

2.11 Regarding simplifying the procedure, Peter replied that we could do something including responding faster regarding the decision. And Yumi said she will consider collaborating with APRICOT fellowship.
2.12 Hotta asked about the numbers of ccTLDs that were actually contacted. The e-mail might be sent but not noticed. He suggested an attempt to develop other channels, such as university or conference. However, the issue is how we know the percentage of ccTLD been reached.

2.13 Peter concluded that now we are clear of what we can offer, and can discuss in more details regarding how to reach out to the ccTLDs. Yumi added that the list of ccTLD contacted is included in the meeting document and the Secretariat will explain it in detail later. She concluded to incorporate with the APRICOT fellowship.

3. Update on APTLD Technical Committee

3.1 The secretariat made a Report on Wellington Technical Workshop.

3.2 Peter asked for members’ comments on the technical workshop program. Chris also ask for members’ comment whether there should be another workshop next time. Members expressed their supports for workshop unanimously.
3.3 Keith said that the workshop gives members an opportunity to share experiences and report from each member ccTLD also helps to reach out to others ccTLD and tell them what’s all about APTLD.

3.4 Hotta mentioned that one purpose of the workshop was to encourage new faces, but this time the participants are mostly familiar members. Maybe for the KL meeting, we should plan for more basic topics.

3.5 Peter asked Technical Committee members whether if it should include more persons in the committee.

3.6 Vincent said there are similar trainings in APRICOT. Maybe our workshop does not have to be very technical oriented. Maybe it could be more of orientation nature, to introduce Internet governance and updates from each ccTLD member. Maybe we can re-consider the name of the workshop.

3.7 Peter replied the Internet governance is something can be considered during the discussion this afternoon, but not sure whether we should replace the technical content to just orientation.
3.8 Peter further asked for Hotta’s opinion. Hotta said that the workshop should be done in two levels, both technical and orientation.

3.9 Chris and Peter thanked Prof. Kanchana as she was asked to perform the function and did so.

4. Report on APTLD and CENTR Crossover Observership

4.1 Secretariat reported that APTLD has applied for CENTR’s observership. CENTR will vote on next General Assembly on 26-27 November and should not have any obstacle. At the same time, we have also received CENTR’s application for APTLD observership.

4.2 Peter said due to APTLD constitution does not have observership, we created certain rules to have such an outside organisation to join us.

5. Secretariat Report

5.1 Secretariat presented Secretariat report on tasks done since last Busan Meeting, and financial status report.
5.2 On behalf of members Peter expressed his thanks to the secretariat for a busy period of work, and especially the printing of the pamphlet and name cards were appreciated by many in the ccTLD community.

5.3 Peter questioned what “N/A” means in the financial report. And Joanna replied it means information is not available because we have not been able to get in touch with .cx and tj, if member has any information on those two members, please inform the Secretariat on how to get in touch with them again.

5.4 Regarding the sponsorship, Yumi asked does the secretariat need any further support from the committee, and recommend to rename the membership committee mailing list to a shorter term such as “mem-com”.

5.5 Regarding .mn’s sponsorship application, the secretariat explained that Ms. Burmaa had problem getting her New Zealand visa in time. The last correspondence with Ms. Burmaa was that she was prepared to begin her trip and get her visa from Beijing, and she inquired whether APTLD will cover her travel expenses to Beijing and Singapore in order to trying to get her New Zealand visa. And the secretariat will need the committee and/or the board’s approval to cover her travel expenses to Beijing or Singapore to get her visa because she have apparently unsuccessful in
getting her visa, otherwise she would have arrived on 21st November.

6. Update on ICANN Cartage

6.1 The secretariat (Ching Chiao) presented a presentation on Update on ICANN Cartage.

6.2 Peter asked whether the secretariat attended the formation of Arabic ccTLD organisation? And Ching replied he’s not sure he is the right person to go to the formation. As he recalled, it is an US-based representative trying to negotiate with ICANN about Arabic regional organisation and .iq issues.

6.3 Jose asked about the discussion on the wildcard issue at the ICANN Cartage Meetings. And Ching replied that is was mostly the technical discussion as well as legal discussion which includes interception and consumer protection. And all information are available on SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) website.

6.4 Shariya said that the formation of Arabic ccTLD formation will have a direct impact to APTLD. Peter agreed with Shariya’s statement and
further said that it will effect both the AP region and the African region. He pointed out that before looking into this matter, we should first watch if that organisation will actually be formed.

6.5 Ching asked about any updates on ccTLD secretariat, and Peter mentioned that there was a straw pole in Carthage on whether people is going to support a secretariat, once decided, will respond the issue.

6.6 Peter felt that we seem to have problem with GAC regarding the delegation and re-delegation, and the process can be a long one. He asked Shariya to provide an update as she was at the GAC workshop session. Sharyia said that there was not position paper available to make any position. In the secretariat’s ICANN update report, there should be correction because the issue has nothing to do with ccNSO.

6.7 Chris asked it seems that a paper was sent out to the ccTLD prior the GAC Meeting. Peter answered that was one person’s point of view about re-drafting the actual GAC principles. Shariya added it was decided that paper will not go to the ccTLD community at that time. However, Chris said there seems to be a decision that the principle paper will go to ccTLD community for comments.
7. ccNSO

7.1 Chris made an update report on the ccNSO as the spokesperson. He said that the Launching Group has received 34~35 applications. The LG also received fake applications but managed to identify them and did not approval them. Each region has at least 4 members except Europe. Launch Group is currently working on persuading the European colleagues. A serious discussion on council election is also nearly launched; very shortly, the Launch Group will announce the decision of election made at Carthage.

7.2 Peter note that the European ccTLDs are waiting for the legal comment for a formal paper that’s drafted by one member. The general trend of the decision was to remove subjective and tried to make it simpler. Chris added some ccTLDs have expressed concerned on some sections of ICANN bylaws. At Carthage Meeting, LG tried to clarify some concerns and invited Vinton G. Cerf to the ccTLD meeting. The fundamental principal is that the change is simple, the ICANN Board will include that discussion during one of their telephone conference.

7.3 Peter said under ICANN bylaws, regional associations are appointed as responsible for policy development for the region. It was decided in
October last year that it would be a good thing for APTLD to manage Asia Pacific as a regional organisation. And of course this is an independent case to individual member’s status with ccNSO.

7.4 Regarding ccNSO issues, Jose brought some questions to members’ discussion, and Chris and Peter answered.

7.5 Discussion 1: What will happen if there’s a government deal on re-delegation by the government of one ccTLD and the US Government, and will that re-delegation be forced through the ICANN process and be recognized?

7.6 Peter pointed out the whole mechanism of ICANN process is to take out governmental involvement in the Internet matters. Shariya also said that in addition to ICP-1, the GAC principle is the second document in reference when a re-delegation takes place. Peter continued the importance is that currently, ICANN does not have an organization to deal with matters that are related to ccTLD.

7.7 Discussion 2: Being a ccNSO member, the member will be bond by ICANN bylaw, and hence bond to pay ICANN fee, right?
7.8 Chris replied it means that while you are a member, you will agree to the rules. The ccNSO fee is independent from the fee paid to ICANN, joining ccNSO does not require you to pay the ICANN ccTLD fee unless you have a contract with ICANN.

7.9 Discuss 3: regarding whois, ICANN bylaw requires whois information made public, but if member has privacy concerns and would not want to make whois public, what’s the situation.

7.10 Peter replied the purpose of having ccNSO, is for ccNSO to make policies related to ccTLD matters through the ccNSO, and nothing can go through without ccNSO. Peter mentioned there are issues such as .tk re-delegation, but there is no procedure to deal with that. So far, there’s no organization to deal with any ccTLD related matters, and by not having the ccNSO, means we can’t do anything but to watch things happen without any participation. There’s no way of fighting with any unreasonable situation and happening.

8. 2004 Strategic Planning -

8.1 Position papers from Committees
8.1.1 Membership/Sponsorship Committee

8.1.1.1 Yumi presented membership committee plan for 2004 seeing three meeting ahead of us in 2004, she propose to promote membership program and sponsorship program in accordance with the 3 meetings, and there should be more promotion with the effort of the Membership Committee and secretariat. Most works will be handled by the Committee and the secretariat, but need support from the members to provide contact information.

8.1.1.2 Peter added to survey on which region the sponsorship is most needed. The expense for sending 2 people from that region is expensive. Yumi agreed with Peter and replied that since the budget can support it, we can send board member or teacher to the region.

8.1.1.3 Peter agreed with Yumi’s suggestion on sending speaker to meetings in other regions. He added one thing is to organise our own meeting, and the other option is to send our people to other meetings, which could be another strategy.
8.1.1.4 Richard suggested that we should have a outreach kit available on website to members and have standard script (ppt) for members to use at occasions that members go to.

8.1.1.5 Stafford said that it would be a good strategy to work with organisations, such as APNIC, that’s already doing a lot of outreach in the Pacific region, and Peter noted the most important thing is to provide the contact information of the appropriate organisation such as APNIC and ISOC to work together.

8.1.1.6 Yumi replied that she will review and revise the website and make the promotion kit material and target information etc available on the website.

8.1.1.7 Peter asked who the current Membership members are and whether if the numbers of member are enough. And Yumi replied the current members are not enough, so support was sought from other board members. The Committee needs support from the Pacific region, and legal and administrative support from Malaysia will also be helpful.

8.1.1.8 As there are many ccTLD in the AP region, Hotta suggested that we should publish the list of eligible members on our website. He
proposed to conduct small analysis to use assess of participants to past APTLD meetings, APRICOT meetings and ICANN meetings and make use of the information available.

8.1.1.9 Yumi said she will continue to contact the APNIC training coordinator and report the status. She also invited Shariya to introduce on funding resources available. Shariya suggested “Development funding of the World Bank”, and the person in charge of “InfoDev” will attend WSIS, if agreeable, will ask for more information to put forward a pitch for APTLD at that occasion.

8.1.1.10 Peter asked why the second workshop is only for November? Chris also suggested that if there’s workshop in July, it should also include program about ICANN and DNS. Yumi proposed to re-organize the Technical Committee to organise the workshop.

8.1.1.11 Vincent provide an update information from Prof. Kanchana about Internet education research laboratory opening ceremony. Peter thought this could be another strategy to send someone to go to the event with a kit.

8.1.2 ICANN Relations Committee
8.1.2.1 Peter said there’s a historical document on this committee and anyone interested to read this document, the secretariat will make it available. We are in transition of moving to the ccNSO probably in the next 6 month, propose this committee to continue and focus on the ccNSO, the individual contract issue with ICANN and best practices.

8.1.2.2 Chris inquired whether the contract is still an issue, and peter clarified yes because ICANN still requires a contract to perform re-delegation, such as in .tk case.

8.1.2.3 Shariya mentioned in addition to ICANN matters, there’s also IANA issue. In the Carthage Meeting, Paul Towmey announced new mechanism, and we haven’t done anything in this regard. Peter agreed that much of activity of ICANN has been political and not technical. And Chris suggested we could have someone on this committee to deal the technical issues.

8.1.3 Meetings (new committee proposed)
8.1.3.1 Peter expressed that we need to have a meeting committee to work out on where to have the meeting and what are the procedure, and to plan the AGM quite early ahead.

8.1.3.2 Jose said that the on-line meeting is very usually for member who can not afford to make the travel and days away from work. And on-line meeting should be kept.

8.1.3.3 Vincent and Hotta suggested the meeting schedule is needed to plan well ahead, cause some members need one year ahead to plan budget required.

* Lunch sponsored by InternetNZ

8.1.4 Technical Committee

8.1.4.1 Chris said the purpose of this committee to organise technical workshop, instead of a standing committee, it could be an ad hoc committee. And the technical people from, for example the technical staff of registry of .au and someone from the technical committee, would be better served on the technical committee. Peter also thought the technical exchange and workshop should be and could be one expertise of APTLD.
8.1.4.2 Chan-Ki asked about any one here doing dynamic DNS update. He said this is a focus of KRNIC at the stage, and would appreciate any sharing members can provide. Peter added alternatively, the job could be done by members’ expression on topics interested and have the secretariat to put things together.

8.1.4.3 Jose said that we will be happy to volunteer host the mailing list. If website forum is available, it might encourage discussion.

8.1.5 Constitutional Committee

8.1.5.1 Peter clarified that this committee is to collect issues that requires changes and review on the APTLD constitution on yearly basis for action. He asked for Stafford’s interest to be on as he was the original constitutional committee. Stafford replied only if not to be involved with Election Committee, and yes.

8.1.5.2 Peter suggested that the election committee could be close now since it’s the job to develop the process, and we have the procedure now that election is run by the Board, and have scrutiny.
8.1.5.3 Peter also suggested to close Financial Committee. We had finance committee when there was no secretariat, but now we have the secretariat to perform the work, supervised by the Board, is there any objection to close this committee? However, Keith thought it might be good to reserved for any future need. It might be a committee that takes inquiry, and maybe only two members will be required.

8.1.5.4 Regarding Legal Committee, Peter said that we have Constitutional Committee to look after legal matters and ICANN Relation Committee to look after contract. If there’s not objection, we will close this committee. Dispute Committee, IDN Committee and Translation Working Group were also suggested to close.

8.2 Review of Events including


8.3 Output Documents
8.3.1 Board Elections schedule/procedure:

※ It was suggested that the representative confirmation will be made earlier than 2 January.
※ The new board will be elected for a 2-year term.
※ The election and scrutiny have to be someone other than the board, so the board has to appoint someone in depended from any member state.
※ The procedure is same as before.

8.3.2 Secretariat Appointment schedule/procedure:

※ Secretariat appointment schedule is appropriate, except to add one more schedule to confirm the job description for the secretariat by the end of May, with the draft completed by the end of April.
※ The current secretariat should not run the appointment procedure.
※ The Board will appoint committee to draft the secretariat job description.

8.3.3 2004 APTLD Meetings Schedule

※ 26 February for AGM in KL
※ 17 July for APTLD meeting
※ one day between 4-6 November in Australia

8.3.4 Budget
8.3.4.1 Peter suggested that we should try to get as much approval and agreement as possible, so the next AGM final approval can be made.

8.3.4.2 Chris asked could the budget reserved for 2003 sponsorship carry on to 2004. Richard proposed that the sponsorship for new members should be separated. Chris preferred to have a lump of budget and allocate the budget to different purpose. Peter concluded that basically we agree to carry forward the 2003 sponsorship to 2004. Chris added we will also need to spend 2004 budget for sponsorship to 2005 meetings. Shariya suggested setting a tentative budget allocation and having the budget finalized at the AGM next year.

8.3.4.3 Peter concluded to allocate another 20,000 for 2004 to sponsorship.

8.3.4.4 Yumi asked does the 40,000 include sending speaker or Board to the AIT event? Peter replied the 2,000 for each of the trip sponsored might not require that much, so there’s room for that. He continued that meeting schedule was discussed and should be posted on the website for reference.
9. Report on At-Large in Asia Pacific Region

9.1 Ching Chiao presented the At-Large in Asia Pacific Region, which is prepared by Tommy, Chair of APNG, on behalf of APNG.

9.2 Hotta asked why APNG want to do at-large. Is this going to be a core business? And Ching replied at this point of time, APNG intends to use APNG as a platform and a mechanism to pass out the at-large issue to the AP region.

9.3 Hotta further asked about the attendees of the At-Large Asia/Pacific Organizing Meeting. Ching answered that .jp, .th, .kr and .tw attended and Izumi chaired.

9.4 Hotta asked about any contact with the Arab society, and Chris asked about the members of APNG. Ching said that 7 to 8 members including Vincent Chen, Kilnan Chon, Xing Li.

9.5 Peter wondered why would any of the organisms going through the long at-large process, when there’s a shorter chain of mechanism by joining the non-commercial constituency of the gNSO. Ching said the nature of most member of ALAC to be passionate, and it’s good to get
involved in any possible channel. Vincent further explained that the purpose of this presentation is for members interested in the at-large issues to bring back the information to the home.

10. WSIS Issues

10.1 Peter said that most ccTLD attended the Carthage Meeting agreed to bring back the information to their government. If you haven’t got the information, it is available here. WSIS is meeting next month in Geneva and you should convey the ccTLD’s concerns to your government and if you need help, you can get it from Peter, Chris or CENTR.

10.2 Shariya asked what about GAC WG, and Peter said that we can send out invitation and see if it could be organized.

11. Close of Member’s Meeting

11.1 Peter said that if there’s no other business, the Members’ Meeting will be closed for a brief break and reconvene with the Board Meeting. Thanks the Secretariat for putting together the meeting materials.
11.2 On behalf of the Secretariat, Vincent thanked InternetNZ for having us here for this wonderful meeting.

12. Meeting adjourned at: 16:30