Venue: State Room, Palace of the Golden Horses

Chair: Peter Dengate Thrush

Attended by: a total of 28 member representatives

from .au, .cn, .jp, .kr, .lk, .my, .nu, .nz, .sg, .th, .tw, .vn, and

observers from Afilias and DotAsia.

Meeting opened at 9:15am

The Chair, Peter, opened the meeting by greeting the members, thanking
the local host and Secretariat for coordinating this meeting, and welcomes
the guest, Mr. Doug Barton, to give the members an update on IANA.

Guest Session with IANA GM, Mr. Doug Barton

Doug expressed thanks for the invitation come to APTLD meeting, and
thanked Shariya for coordinating this invitation. Doug said it’s important
to open up the communication on the operation of Internet, and that’s
what we are doing here now. The presentation given is entitled “Exciting
ICANN/IANA News. The presentation includes introduction on IANA
and Doug himself, the new management team at ICANN, new strategic
vision on IANA and the new workflow system that’s planed to launch after the Rome meeting. Doug’s presentation is available here.

During the Q&A, there was a discussion on the ICANN Bylaw, appendix C on ccNSO, regarding the level 2 ccTLD Registry Name Servers and how related policy will be developed. Doug replied that what I am working on the method by which the ICANN staff is going to use that data that submitted. There’s no policy implication in the web form how it submitted and how it looks like to get to the back-end of the system. There are certainly implications how the data is used when it gets into the system. So I confuse where is the overlap is there. The other thing is that the system I am working on is something going to be used by all the TLD managers but not just the country code. I think we need to be very careful about the winning the roles of the operation functions which as you point it out are the responsibility of IANA, and the policy function is really deal with how the information used when it gets to IANA. And the danger there quite simply is that if you feel that an attempting the micro-manager, the operations, the IANA is the way to go, I would just say I work it whole, but the reality is not a practicable way of either one of us getting on with works need to be done.
Shariya asked how many IANA staffs are there, and when a bulk request is made, and how is the scope of workload on ccTLD in comparison to the total of IANA works, and how much it costs to run IANA.

Doug replied that running IANA costs will be answered when the strategic plan is published, it will include a clearer picture of the operational cost of IANA. The IANA staffs consist me (Doug Barton), one full-time person (Michelle), part-time (Steven), and an equivalent full time administrative assistant, and is looking to increase of one more staff in the calendar of 2004. The composition of IANA function comprises of the registry (10%), RIR (10-15%), and the rest splits equally to IETF and TLDs. Center is interested to contribute to the cost of performing IANA function. But they are looking forward to some obligations delivered before transferring the fund. Most groups had expressed support for the success of ICANN. As a result, ICANN staff has then been basically researching various methods by which we can, in an open, transparent manner, accept contributions from communities and the ccTLDs.

Ching wanted to be clear that no government can ask the DOC for a removal of another ccTLD from the database or forced a re-delegation.
Doug: At this point, the interaction of the soon be-formed ccNSO and the top of that nature is that I don’t have a transmit information on, so the policy role on situation like that cannot be answered.

Ching: Who can request change to the ISO 3166 list?
Doug: The policy now is very black and white for ICANN to adopt the ISO 3166 list, there are discussions about the flexibility and appropriateness of adopting ISO 3166, such as the .eu case, and there is certainly room for flexibility, and the ccNSO is going to have the role to determine the way forward on that.

Peter: Why is the work carried on under “IANA” instead of “ICANN”?
Doug: Simply, because ICANN has a contract with DOC to perform the “IANA function”. And due to the historical background of IANA, people are familiar with the term “IANA” and it’s functions. But, we are currently trying to convey to people that the IANA function is performed by ICANN, and they are actually the same thing.

Yumi: When will the strategic plan be announced?
Doug: It’s currently been reviewed by the Board, once it’s accomplished, it will to be announced on the ICANN website, and hope it can be announced before the Rome meeting. But regardless whether or not it’s
announced, Doug will discuss the ideas with the community at
the Rome meeting to hear more views.

Ching: what’s your view on the role of root zone operators?
Doug: The root zone operators are very special situation, there are many
different opinions regarding the operators. So far the operators have
rejected a formal organization, but for whatever cause, the current
volunteering operation system is working, and thought there are rooms
for improvement.

Ching: How do you work with the zoon operators?
Doug: formally, the SECAC is the formal contacting channel of the zone
operators. I know lots of root server operators on an informal basis, but
formally, the interactions are through SECAC.

Peter: What would you like us to feed back on the security issues in
relation to your proposal and what kind of process would you like? From
APTLD or individual ccTLD managers.
Doug: It’s flexible, either with APTLD as organization or individual
ccTLD managers.
Peter asked the members to join together in thanking Doug for meeting with APTLD.

**The meeting recess for a break from 10:30am to 11:00am**

**APTLD AGM**

The Chair, Peter, opened the AGM on 11:00am and welcome members back to the morning session.

1. **Announcement and Approval of 2004 Board Election**

   Peter explained that as practiced in the past, the election has done online before the AGM so members who can not attend the AGM in person can also participate in the election process, nevertheless, according to the constitution, the election needs to approved at the AGM. The voting result was scrutinized by Hotta Hiroshima and Pete McCaulay, and a formal notice of that result had been sent to members two weeks ago as the constitution requests.

   .nz moved to adopt the on-line election result, motion seconded by .tw, and the election result is carried unanimously.
Peter congratulates to all those elected, and thank them for the willingness to contribute APTLD matters.

2. New Member Updates from .lk

Gihan Dias gave an introduction .lk. Currently the .lk domain registry is an independently non-profit organization, registrations are available under 3rd level, local presence are required for registration, and applications are processed manually, and that 90% of disputes can be resolved through negotiation, and there are not litigation case so far. The .lk presentation is available here.

Peter: How many .lk domain names are registered?
Dias: There are around 3000 registrations.

Shariya asked about the relation between the .lk domain registry and the government.

Dias: We have committee and we expect the government to make comment of their concerns through the committees. So far the government has not made policies related to domain name registration.
Peter thanked Dias for the presentation and welcome him to become APTLD member.

3. Updates from APTLD Committee

3.1. Report of the Board

Peter presented the Board’s report to members, which highlighted the major works carried out in 2003 since the last AGM in Taipei. Peter moved the Board’s Report to be accepted. .au seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

3.2. Constitutional Committee

Peter: The committee chair is in transition to be handed over to Shariya, who is a lawyer, and lawyer in Malaysia where APTLD is incorporated.

Shriya’s report included briefing on the current tasks of the committee and the current working mechanism (e-mail mailing list).

Chris: What’s the process to make a constitution change?

Shariya: Change needs to be done through resolution at a members meeting, but it doesn’t have to be a f2f meeting.

Peter: The constitution is published on the website.
Peter moved to accept the Constitution Committee Report. .nu seconded, the motion carried unanimously.

3.3. Meeting Committee

Peter: The Meeting committee is a new meeting created during the Wellington Board Meeting, and the chairmanship is to be handed over to Chris.

Chris: This committee was set up during the Wellington Board meeting, and it’s task is to arrange APTLD future meetings and there are questions to be propose:

a) uncoupled the APTLD meeting with ICANN meetings
b) need to formally decide on how many f2f meetings there will be for each year, currently there are 3 meetings.
c) do we want to have a tech training along with each APTLD meeting?

Chris continued to say that the meeting committee will think of ways to answer the above issues, and welcome any comment from the members.

Shariya: Regarding the first issue, we need to decide on what role does APTLD wants to take in relation to ICANN issues, and maybe members can concentrate on attending APTLD and
forming decision at APTLD meeting, instead of having to go to ICANN meetings personally.

Dias: Do we know how many f2f is required by the constitution?
Chris: We currently have 3, and the constitution only requires an AGM each year. We can start with 3, and see whether there will be needs for more meetings. Or, we can consider having a 2-day meeting instead of the 1-day meeting we have now.
Dias: .lk who attended the workshop on Feb 24 expressed that the content of the workshop was too basic.
Chris: Yes, maybe the workshop should concentrate more on training rather than orientation.
Peter: The issue of the workshop content should be addressed to the technical committee.
Chris: Will send e-mail to members before the ICANN Rome meeting to seek comments.
Choon Sai: When will the draft of meeting organizations be ready?
Peter: it will be confirmed shortly when the committee held it’s next meeting.
Shariya moved to adopt the Meeting Committee Report. .jp seconded, the motion carried unanimously.
Yumi presented updates on newly approved membership application and explained that two more application (afflias and register.com) to be discussed and approved later today at the Board Meeting. Updates are also given on the current status of the Sponsoring Program, and suggested to hand over the contact with APNIC to the Secretariat because it’s more of logistic coordination. The update report is available here.

Yumi mentioned about applying funding from other organizations such ad INFODEV. Shariya answered the threshold of INFODEV funding is to have the workshop agenda finalized and confirmed when filing the application.

Peter: Would Keith agree to help coordinating candidates from the pacific islands on the occasion of APNIC meeting to be held in Fiji.

Keith: Agreed.

Richard: As the chairman of ISOC Pacific Chapter, I’m in the position to help communicating with candidates with the pacific islands, but not to make the decision. And suggest that .bu be considered.
Peter: is there any difficulty in finding candidates from the Asia region and sponsor them to attend the July meeting in KL?

Dias: Kanchana might have contact information with the ccTLDs in the Asia region.

Chris: There are new faces in the GAC from our region, such as India, suggest that we meet them in Rome.

Peter: We have the contacts and we all should help to get the contacting done.

Peter moved the Membership/Sponsorship report be accepted. Motion seconded by .nu, the report was accepted unanimously.

3.5. ICANN Relations Committee

Peter: Previously the job of the committee was to focus on the formation on ccNSO, and now the focus should be on operation of ccNSO and future relation with ICANN.

3.6. Technical Committee

Dr. Kanchana began her report by telling she volunteered to head the technical committee because she sees the need to increase technical coordination among members, but a lot of coordination
job was helped by Yumi and Ian, and the contents helped by various friends. After the first workshop held in Wellington, the attendees responded positively to continue the workshop, so a 2ND workshop was organized at KL.

Propose that the tech committee should have more activities other than the training, there should be more technical document archiving, technical contact name list, (these will be the focus in the second year), more training, maybe 3 regular training each year at fixed locations to reduce cost. Dr. Kanchan’s updates are available here. Yumi was invited to give updates on the workshop conducted on the Tuesday.

Yumi: We need to define whether we have common target group before organizing future trainings with APNIC.

Kanchana: The activity with APNIC should be considered as both a training and outreach. I propose to allocate 10 thousand dollars on organizing the workshops and volunteered to coordinate the trainings for one more year.

Dias: We should design the agenda and level of content according to the targets for the workshop. Formalized policy presentations will also be helpful.

Chris: How each member handles the policy procedure would be helpful discussions.
Kanchana: Separating the technical workshop and policy discussion will be a better idea to avoid confusion on what’s technical and what’s policy.

Richard: Most of the people here attending this meeting don’t run the servers, and the two issues should be separated. If it’s going to be a policy meeting, the location should be at a convenient point for everyone.

Chanki: I run the server and manage the policy, and it would be helpful to have country updates in the next meeting so we can learn from each other.

Vincent suggested the technical committee can be changed to NIC information exchange.

Peter: To avoid duplications, maybe we can help other organization, such as APNIC, to organize trainings instead of organizing our own activity.

Kanchana: The event we just had with APNIC is also for outreach.

Peter: looking forward to more active discussion on the technical committee mailing list on the issue.

Kanchana: I prefer to see separation of technical issues and policy issues.

.au moved to accept the Technical Committee, jp and .kr
seconded, the motion was carried unanimously.

3.7. Audit Committee

Chanki reported on the finance status, which includes income, expenditure and current balance, and confirmed that the finance report as prepared by the Secretariat was correct. [The Audit Report is available here.]

Peter: At this stage we should also look for an outside auditor, is there any question on the current auditing process?

Peter move to accept the report from treasurer, motion seconded by .th, and carried unanimously.

Before taking the lunch, there was a Lunch Sponsor presentation on Afilias given by Ms. Desiree Miloshevic.

Peter announced the morning session is closed at 12:30pm, and will reconvene at 13:30pm.

There was lunch break from 12:30 to 13:35
Meeting reconvened on 13:35

4. Review and Approval of Secretariat Reports

4.1. 2003 Annual Report

Ian gave a report on APTLD event highlights in 2004. The presentation is available here.

4.2. 2003 Financial Report

Ian gave a financial status Report on 2003, from 1 January to 31 December.

Dias: Are we doing cash accounting?

Ian: The Secretariat would like to record all the income and expenditure according to the bank statement. If there’s any additional information, the Secretariat will put it as note. It is to let the Treasure to know the exact numbers on the bank statement, or it might cause confusion.

Peter: this could be discussed this afternoon at the Board Meeting.

Peter: It’s understood that TWNIC is sponsoring the running of
the Secretariat, how much would it cost to run the secretariat without the support?

Joanna: The operation cost is depended of the operation scope.

Peter: Any reason why .tv does not pay?

Ian: The secretariat’s e-mail never get any response, the secretariat would appreciate if members have other contact information to provide.

Chris: Do we have policy to terminate membership?

Peter: It would be the task of the Constitution Committee to study into this issue.

4.3. 2004 Action Plan

Ian presented the 2004 action plan including scheduled meeting dates.

Dias: So it’s possible for Taiwan to continue the Secretariat?

Peter: If Taiwan decided to submit proposal for a third term.

Peter suggested adding one more item as item 13 on the Secretariat appointment schedule that “the secretariat will carry on until next AGM (2005)”. Will that be a problem for the current secretariat?

Joanna: that will not be a problem. Just as a reminder, in addition to organizing the AGM, the first job of the new secretariat will be
running the on-line board election.

Chris: The hand over time of the Secretariat has been decided as December 31, though we can revisit the issue is necessary.

Shariya: It has been discussed earlier at Wellington.

Peter: Does any committee have any comments on the 2004 action plan before we review the 2004 Budget?

Yumi: Suggest to add and outreach event in September when APNIC held its meeting in Fiji, the secretariat can go to Fiji and make an introduction on APTLD.

Peter: In considering the cost involved, would it be reasonable to send a member who is closer to Fiji instead of sending the Secretariat far away from Taiwan? And how much would it cost be?

Peter suggested a combination of local and Secretariat to attend the APNIC meeting in Fiji.

Yumi: Budget of 2000USD per person including accommodation for local and the Secretariat.

Peter: Can we move the outreach to the Pacific Islands be earlier to July?

Shariya: Originally, the sponsoring target was to sponsoring the Perth Meeting.

Peter: Can we change the sponsoring target after the February
to South Asia for the ICANN KL meeting?

Yumi: Yes, agree to revise it as “progress sponsorship in south Asia countries instead of listing actual cc such as .ki, vn, ws, and mn.

Peter: Any other committee that needs special provision to the action plan for 2004?

Peter: Does cooperation, listed as item 2-3 of the action plan, requires any funding?

Ian: Cooperation can be done via e-mail, no extra cost is proposed.

Peter moved to accept the 2004 Action Plan, and .au seconded. The action plan was accepted.

4.4. 2004 Budget Plan

Ian presented the [budget plan for 2004].

Chanki: There should be an increase of administration fee to 5,000 in order to hire accredited auditor.

Peter: How much does the workshop in KL cost? And is 10,000 a reasonable allocation for the Perth workshop?

Peter: This is a deficit budget plan for 2004, is there any more
comments?
Chris: We are looking at decrease of membership income too.
Peter: Let’s propose changing the workshop budget to 5,000 for the Perth workshop.
Chris: It should be sufficient including sending an instructor.
Shariya: There is no budget to send secretariat or Board representative to ICANN meeting or CENTR meeting, should there be any budget to do that?
Peter: Is there a need to do that? And we might need more policy developed before paying for a Board member to meetings.
Shariya: It’s something to be discussed if there’s the need.
Chris: We can change the sponsoring budget from 40,000 to 20,000.
Peter: With the two reductions, the budget plan is again in surplus.

Hotta: APRICOT is trying to promote the Internet development in the AP region. How about thinking about sponsoring the APRICOT? The lowest level of sponsorship is 5 thousand dollars. In addition, APstar might ask APTLD to financially support them.
Peter: How does everyone think about sponsoring the other AP organization/event?

Yumi: It would be a good idea to reach out.

Peter: Do we see any benefit in the sponsorship?

Ching: The sponsorship will not directly help to recruit members, but it will be a good way to reach out.

Peter: Would it be a good idea to put down 5,000 dollars and call for proposal then decide on whom to sponsor?

Richard: It might go a lot further to use that budget to go to other places to reach out rather than have our logo on event banners.

Peter: What do members think?

Shariya: I think we should try to fill up our membership.

Peter: If there are no other comments, there will be no allocation on sponsoring the AP event or organization. The new budget is displayed on the screen for a final review.

Ian continued to conclude the secretariat report by introducing the list of the current board members and APTLD members. And asked if any member has any information on how to get in touch with .cx and .tj, please inform the secretariat.

Peter: We will now go ahead to pass serious of resolutions on the
secretariat reports.

Peter move to pass 2003 Financial Report and Annual Report, .my seconded, motion passed and accepted.

Peter moved to adopt the 2004 action plan, .au seconded, the action plan was adopted unanimously.

Peter moved to adopt the budget plan for 2004 as it has just been revised, .nu seconded, the 2004 budget plan was adopted unanimously.

Peter further moved to thank the secretariat for all the work done in 2003, members seconded and clapped to express thanks.

5. ICANN Issues
5.1. Upcoming ICANN Meetings

Peter, the ICANN meeting for 2004 in Rome, KL and Cape town respectively, there should be not further clarification required.

5.2. Update on ccNSO by Launching Group

Chris: There’s the requirement; currently we have more thank 30
members with more than 4 from each region except Europe, which there are only currently 3 members from that region. However, there is one more European application pending now, with the expectation this application be passed, an announcement can be made to ICANN that ccNSO has been formed. The AP region is well represented, once the ccNSO is formed, there will be a short time for new ccTLD to join and join the Council election. Members that are interested to stand for the Council election, will have to get ready to send application, the policy is that the council member from each region will be voted by members of that region. If things proceed well, this will be the last update from me as the launching group.

Peter: please update us on the ccNSO agenda in Rome.

Chris: Yes, there will be a ccNSO on 3rd March, members and non-members are all welcome. The agenda include discussion on the best practices for security in the ccTLD, IANA and ccTLDs; structuring a channel of input to IANA issues and procedures, updates from the Launching group, discussion on the upcoming ccNSO election, and by laws clarifications, but will not discuss amending the constitution.

Shariya: Can you give some highlights on the clarification?

Chris: They are, basically, meeting of ccTLD and the members of
ccNSO to identify 3 or 4 clauses of the bylaw.

Peter: If no other question, we thank Chris for the update.

Peter before the next presentation, what do you think the term “interoperability” means? It’s in the bylaw but we have trouble defining it. This is something to think about.

5.3. Updates on ALAC activity in AP

Ching Chiao presented the ALAC update presentation prepared by Izumi Aizu, whom is a member of the ALAC from our region. The presentation is here.

5.4. Discussion on ccTLD AdCom

Peter: I have served on the ccTLD AdCom for 3 or 4 years. Since the drop out of GNSO, it was decided that we still want to keep the wwTLD forum and that the operation will continue as usual, although it involved a lot of hard work and late night teleconference, things worked out, until BK Kim resigned, and Ahbisak took over and continued to work until just before the Rio meeting, and Peblo took over to organize the Rio ccTLD meeting. The things carried on as “Adhoc”,

the Montreal meeting was organized by .ca, and then CENTR said they would withdraw their support the AdCom. And next week this issue will be revisited, and we have to decide if APTLD is going to have a position. My goal will be to keep things together until the ccNSO is there.

Chris: If I keep on the ccNSO cap, then I have no problem operating under ICANN. But as .au, my question is do we need another organization, a term which I don’t like is a “trade organization” to gather opinions from the non-ccNSO members. Should we not concentrate on coordinating with the other regional organization instead of having another organization.

Peter: It’s nearly time to re-elect your representative in the ccTLD AdCom, do you want to do that? And how do you know if the elected people are doing the job. Another question, what if ICANN fails, would it be better to have another organization in the meanwhile like what we have now?

Chris: What do we have now?

Peter: We have the wwTLD website, the mailing list and the database. Shariya, what’s your view as a non-ccNSO member?

Shariya: the situation is not clear, and I think this is the chance for APTLD to come out and presenting our positions on
issues. Despite of the disagreement, but I have faith that people will still communicate, either through the secretariat or the chairman, and organize the upcoming meeting as the others have done it.

Peter: While we are willing to organize the meeting, but do we want to organize a meeting for non-members of the ccNSO.

Chris: APTLD will be involved and liaison the meeting organization, if the ccTLD organization, which ever it is, approach us to ask for help to set up the meeting, what would happen next. The CENTR has a position that AdCom is dysfunctional, and Lacnic and NANIC have positions.

Peter: North American has a position that they agree a coordination body among the regional organizations.

Chris: I think it’s good that we have a position especially since this will be discussed in Rome.

Peter: CENTR has published its statement without ant consultation. Their position could wait to see whether ccNSO is a sufficient organization.

Chris: There is an difference, where as the people sitting at this APTLD meeting are mostly ccNSO members, and where as the people sit at the CENTR meeting are mostly non-members, so it’s actually for the non-members to said what they want, say whether
they want and ad com.

Peter: Could we take a position of wait and see?

Chris: Instead of saying we will wait and see, maybe we could said that we’ve discussed the issue and it’s up to the members and non-members to said what want. Or, we could just do nothing.

Chris: How about saying AP representative on the AdCom will sit down with representative of other regions.

Peter: That’s a good idea.

Chris: Yes, because there is the AdCom and there is the regional organization.

Peter: Is there any other comment? Could Chris help to draft the wording for the position?

5.5. APTLD on GAC Principles

Shariya expressed the purpose of this is to brief members on the current developments of the GAC ccTLD WG on revising the ccTLD principles, and see if there should be an APTLD position on this issue.

Chris: I can give some update on a recent talk with Sharil, the Chairman of GAC, who doubts if anything is going to happen in Rome, there is still a long way to go, and it’s not going to be
something that will happen soon.

Peter: I can give you the view of New Zealand’s national perspective on the delegation, and I will explain it by drawing a diagram. So what’s APTLD’s position on this issue, should we form another committee to work on it?

Chris: The problem of a regional position is that there might be different views on the issue as there are different model of operation, some are run by government, some run by non-profit and some run by company.

Peter: In terms of how policy purpose, any ccTLD related policy should go to ccNSO first, not the regional organization, so suggest that we say the issue should be addressed to ccNSO for communication.

Shariya: At the next ICANN meeting in KL, we might be asked to organize a meeting with the GAC, and it would be beneficial to talk and see what everybody thinks.

Peter: We can put it down in our resolution that we will work on organizing discussion meeting in KL.

Ching: We should each go back and talk to our own GAC and see if there’s consensus to arrange the discussion.

Chris: Are you saying that APTLD should not pass a resolution that the GAC principle should be discussed with ccNSO first?
Ching: Yes, but before we do that we all make sure that we talk to our GAC representative.

Peter: I got five elements to APTLD position on this:

1. We note the further development of the GAC principles;
2. We note that we address this issues associated with ccTLD delegation and re-delegation;
3. Invite the GAC to present the principles to discuss with the ccNSO;
4. APTLD is going to organize a meeting with GAC representatives to discuss issues of interest including the GAC principle in KL;
5. Before the GAC meeting, we encourage all APTLD members to discuss the issues with GAC representatives.

Chris: Currently there are response from CENTR and Taiwan, and I don’t think it should be that way.

Peter: We will go ahead with the 5 points of feedback as presented.

Peter: We can now look at the resolution wording on the resolution on the AdCom issue.

Chris: Resolved that:-
a) APTLD notes with regret the unilateral withdrawal by CENTR of support for the ccTLD ADCOM.

b) The APTLD instruct its representatives on the ADCOM to liaise at ICANN Rome with the other ADCOM members from North America, Latin America and Africa to discuss the future of the ADCOM and the ccTLD organization in general and report back to the APTLD as soon as possible.

**Meeting recess for coffee Break at 16:00**

6. Other Business

6.1. .asia proposal

A dot Asia TLD initiative was introduced by Mr. Che Hoo Chen, the presentation is available here.

Peter: Signing a LOI is an issue that requires further discussion, suggest that members submit your comment via e-mail and the Board will discuss the issue on line.

Chris: Could you provide more documentary and sample of LOI?

Che Hoo: Yes.

Peter: Any one would like to advise the Board to refrain from
further discussion into this issue? If there’s not, we thank Mr. Cheng for the update.

6.2. ENUM

Ching Chiao

Peter: Do you want our technical committee to be in touch with you? Dr. Kanchana what’s your view?

Ching: Yes.

Kanchana: Fine.

6.3. WSIS

Peter: We decided in Busan that we will take position and talk to our GAC in relation to the WSIS, and I presented Ramesh’s update report on WSIS at the ICANN Carthage meeting, and again all ccTLD agreed to decide to take a stand on WSIS. On next Thursday in Rome, I’ve been asked to speak as one of the 3 speakers at WSIS workshop. Does APTLD have any further position other than the resolution made in Busan?

Peter suggested the APTLD’s position remind as the Busan resolution.

Richard: Is it an open workshop?
Peter: Yes, it’s open to everyone.

At 16:30 Peter declare the 2004 APTLD AGM close.

**AGM 2004 adjourned on 16:30**