APTLD Kuala Lumpur Members Meeting Minutes

18 July 2004, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Venue: Kehad Room, Shangri-la Hotel Kuala Lumpur

Chair: Peter Dengate Thrush

Attended by: a total of 30 member representatives

from .au, .cn, .cx, .hk, .jp, .kr, .my, .nu, .nz, .ph, .sg, .th, .tw,
.vn, and Afilias;
observer from and CENTR;
other participants from .ae, .af, .cl, gi, .ir, .mx, .pw, .za,
APNIC, CAT TELECOM PUBLIC Co, Ltd, LACTLD,
WEBCC.

Meeting opened at 09:10am

1. The Chair, Peter, opened the meeting by greeting the members to
APTLD Meeting in Kuala Lumpur, which is officially in conjunction
with ICANN KL Meetings. He also welcomed Prof. Qian, who is
currently an APTLD Board Director and ICANN Board
Director, CENTR’s Chairman Paul Kane and General Manager
Giovanni Seppia and other ccTLD colleagues. He also thanked the
Secretariat and Shariya for coordinating this meeting.
2. Peter suggested sending get well wish to Prof. Kilnan Chon as knowing his injury and noticed that request for meeting agenda amendment can be raised anytime during the meeting.

3. Peter welcomed the guest speaker, CENTR’s newly appointed General Manager Mr. Giovanni Seppia, to give the members a presentation on CENTR Overview.

**Guest Session with CENTR GM Mr. Giovanni Seppia**

1. CENTR’s new GM Mr. Giovanni Seppia gave a presentation on **CENTR overview**. During the Q&A, some questions raised by members:

2. Peter raised the issue of restructuring CENTR membership fee band and Giovanni replied CENTR is currently restructuring the membership fees and created a Funding Group, which concluded to reduce the fee band categories to three or four layers (still under discussion). It is a five years plan, started from the next year, with the objective a fair distribution of fees among CENTR members. The CENTR has received several positive responses from members that they are willing to join this plan.

3. Peter continued asking what will be the new membership fee bands for CENTR. Giovanni answered £30,000, £20,000, £10,000 and £5,000.
4. Yumi asked about CENTR’s outreach program and Giovanni answered there is no a concrete plan yet, but it is mainly based on volunteer donation work. So far there is no request received yet, maybe will identify the needs in certain developing countries through international organisations.

5. Shariya asked about the lesson learned regarding secretariat operation as CENTR grows. Giovanni said as a newly appointed GM and from a formal registry (.it) member’s point of view, it is a good chance to compare and learn from event organized by CENTR from a different perspective and to share views and best practice among members, which he thinks this is also one of the best achievements of an organisation like CENTR. This is also one of the advantages of taking part in this organisation: to well communicate with members.

6. Paul Kane further explained the reason for restructuring the fee band is currently 2/3 of the membership paid 1/3 of the budget, putting it in other way, 6 registries paid 2/3 of budget. As membership grew, CENTR hopes to change the model not to rely so much on the large registries. There is also the need is to embrace all sections of the community including emerging registry that can’t pay. A key element is what the members and potential members want from CENTR. Information flow is important. Smaller members might also contribute information which large members missed or they are going to
experience. So CENTR welcomes members from outside the European region. One does have to be aware of that CENTR is very European centric. One of the main things that many members wanted is to liaise with the European Commission to find out what is going on in Brussels, which could impact them. As Giovanni mentioned, CENTR’s next meeting will be at Armenia. To having a meeting there will be helpful to the registries from that region to have first real time experience.

7. Gabriella added it is hard to find out what members wanting from Secretariat. CENTR also visits members randomly and asks about their needs and current situation, and finds out if they need workshop etc., and it is a very good way.

8. Chris asked about IANA shadowing. Paul replied CENTR is trying to identify the problems and find a mechanism to solve the problems. According the 6 months period survey (1st October 2003-29thFebruary 2004), there were 78 changes in the IANA database and most of them were ccTLD related. The time taken in the IANA process varied from 1 day to 168 days, with average of 23.6 days. One of the problems of identification is, authenticating a request going to IANA is being genuine form registry. A number of registries are provided CENTR and CENTR make it available to the IANA the specific PGP key. The next problem of IANA process is the time spent in the US government
for confirming the process. The time spent in the NTIA office varied, from a matter of one hour to weekend, to turn around. A request is received after the office hour on Friday will be delayed and processed until next Monday. The average of time taken in NTIA office during the weekend is 1.8 days. The amount of time taken into the root and file is about 1 day (between 0.8-1.2 days). What the IANA shadowing exercise has identified is confirming genuine requests from ccTLD managers and authentic. CENTR is trying to work with IANA to improve the IANA process. The concept of PGP key has been looked at by ICANN IANA. CENTR likes the PGP keys. One of the problems is who can identify the actual party, because IANA database is only 78% accurate. Therefore, the idea is to get facts and figures, focusing on information.

9. Chris continued to ask about the consideration of introducing of PGP keys as been ad hoc basis or cross the Board and everyone based on agreement. Paul replied three years ago, CENTR has done an internal study. PGP key in certain countries is not allowed. So, this paper again came up with 5 means of authentication (for example PGP or accurate letter with approved signature), which is required under different mechanisms. CENTR is starting to build the PGP structure to make sure it works.
10. Peter asked about working more and better with each other. Giovanni answered both could start with regular dialogue, communication and agreement to work together toward certain goal and make the Internet better. This meeting and information is quite helpful. APTLD is welcome to give comments, using CENTR as a communication channel and exchanging ideas with European ccTLDs. Communication is the first step of everything.

11. Chris asked about why CENTR’s membership includes non-European countries. Paul said CENTR membership is open to anyone, but will be advised that CENTR is focusing on European issues. CENTR welcome a broad membership of associate members and observers to exchange and share information and facts. CENTR would like to work closely with all regional associations, which will be beneficial to each other, trying to build a united community.

12. Shariya raised the issue about CENTR’s future activities regarding WSIS and the CENTR’s position. Paul pointed out that the WSIS concept in not a new idea. WSIS is a complicated mass. CENTR has been active in Geneva, more by briefing official delegates. Within any United Nation’s forum, there’s hierarchy and packing order. It is very difficult to get a message or a theme crossed. Trying to give neutral information is difficult. Governments want to be involved because the Internet has great impact on traditional telecommunication revenue,
such as African countries, and they want to cash in the revenue. The other reason is purely politics, also funding and control of traffic. Losing traffic control, spam mail and pornography are also disliked by governments. CENTR tried to help funding the problem and find the solution. The biggest show is who control what and who makes the money. CENTR will continue to participate in WSIS and certainly work together with APTLD.

13. Peter gave some information in return. APTLD has the vast region, and grab different cultures and problems. He thanked CENTR for coming and sharing information.

Updates from APTLD Committees

1. **Membership/Sponsorship Committee Report** by Yumi on future plan and wish to liaison with CENTR on outreach events.

   1.1 Peter mentioned that recently a travel application from is finalised. Members can use it for travel with APTLD financial supports.

   1.2 David Farrar said InternetNZ has just signed a MOU with two UN bodies, UNESCO New Zealand (the New Zealand Branch UNESCO) and the United Nations Development Fund and we called it the International Pacific Partnership, primarily we provide expertise and knowledge and they provide money. They are hoping
to do significant outreach and development in the Pacific region. It was just signed two weeks ago, and there is no project yet.

1.3 Peter suggested membership/sponsorship team takes opportunity to make visit to candidates while you are in the region to get the information out.

1.4 Ching suggested supporting ccTLD engineers to technical events in the region.

1.5 Chris said we should try to find out what smaller Pacific ccTLDs want. Keith and Chris will join the ISOC AP and try to reach to potential members to join APTLD.

**The meeting recess for a break from 10:23am to 11:00am**

2. [ICANN Relations Committee Report](#) by Peter.

2.1 David Farrar raised some issues regarding wwTLD and ccNSO. Does APTLD want to have a global ccTLD body? If so, do you want the current wwTLD grouping? Or a MOU suggested by Elisabeth Porteneuve among the five regional organisations? Dr. Lee agreed to have a serious discussion about forming a forum in which all ccTLD can communicate and participate. She also agreed to have discussion on APTLD’s position on this issue.
2.2 Peter asked for each member’s position. He assumed David has clarified .nz’s position. Dr. Lee said .kr recognizes the importance of a global wwTLD body. Chris said .au understands the current ccNSO has narrow scope; it is needed to have a forum for discussing large number of general ccTLD issues associated with ICANN or not. .au is equally enthusiastic to see a global ccTLD body. Sultan Mohd. Al Shamsi (.ae) and Leo Yu (.cn) both said they have been monitoring the development of ccNSO. They are happy to listen to the update.

2.3 Shariya suggested reversing the question to: is there anyone who is not keen on setting up some forms of structure for this (global ccTLD body). (no one objects) She pointed out that the question is what the structure should be and asked David Farrar to repeat the structure again for further discussion. David said there are three primary choices: (1) continuation of current wwTLD structure; (2) formal federation or MOU between 5 regional organisations; (3) setting up an entirely new body.

2.4 Peter thought status quo structure should not be an option due to European’s withdraws. David replied the AdCom is listed as default until we have a new structure. Chris said the call for MOU might be a problem because ccTLD must join a regional organisation in order to get involved. Shariya added that means
ccTLD manager will need to join 3 organisations (global body, regional organisation and ccNSO).

2.5 Joel thought it is unfair to those ccTLDs who can not afford to fly and attend the meetings. The views presented will only be the one who can afford to travel. A more democratic way is one country one vote. Regional organisation function is good. ccTLD can voice at regional organisation and regional organisation can voice at global occasion. Joel personally favours on-line meeting where speaking and hearing language will not be a problem.

2.6 Shariya pointed out that there is a structure debate on this matter. Peter did not think there is anything or a clear direction for the .wwTLD meeting on Wednesday. It seems to support a general conception of open membership and lean structure.

2.7 Dr. Lee suggested a loose structure might be an option. If you want things done, you need a lot of commitments. If you don’t want lots of commitment, we have to be satisfied a loose, occasional on-line discussion with no expectation of getting anything seriously important and done. There are two extremes. There will probably not have resources to have another global organisation besides ccNSO, so a loose structure might be an option in term of .kr.
2.8 David Farrar said the European countries most concern about what model of ccTLD grouping might take. He suggested inviting CENTR to propose a workable/acceptable model. Asking those who have strong view to come up a proposal, and then we can discuss and decide.

2.9 Chris thought we might be running too fast here. He believed the first thing to go at the meeting on Wednesday is to get a clear idea of what the purpose and reason of such an organisation is. We need to have some consensus on the reason of having this organisation. He suggested attending the Wednesday meeting and having a general talk with everyone about the reason rather than putting APTLD’s position on it.

2.10 Paul Kane agreed with Joel’s point. A vast number of ccTLDs has never been into ICANN meeting, and some might not be aware of what ICANN is about. The linguistic issue is another problem. Therefore, having an open forum to all ccTLDs is very important. He further clarified some issues raised regarding wwTLD/AdCom, ccNSO and the arrangement of wwTLD manager meeting. He said CENTR has not withdrawn from wwTLD and AdCom, and believed that wwTLD is an important community service and will support it. CENTR has a number of issues regarding ccNSO, but it has noting to do with
ccNSO. CENTR will be pleased to participate in ccNSO as a liaison role as CENTR Board agreed.


3.1 Hotta-san thought it is better to find a place for people to go together and for trainers and trainees to go. APRICOT will be a good option.

3.2 Kanchana replied an APRICOT training once a year will not be sufficient. There should be a place where new ccTLDs engineers can go anytime in the year. She wished to have free hands to organise the training workshops for maybe one year because the mailing list has no response.

3.3 Paul Wilson added the training requires extensive travels to the countries where the training is needed. APNIC can gain by collaborating and cooperating with others for the training. He expressed his interest of working with APTLD, which will be useful. The coming training in Fiji and future trainings in February and August 2005 would be opportunities to cooperate with APTLD. He also conveyed that Steve Crook of ICANN SSAC was not aware of the APTLD meeting taken place and would have wished to participate and share his current project on DNSSEC with APTLD community. If anyone is interested to discuss with
him, he will be available on Wednesday or Thursday this week and happy to discuss with anyone from APTLD community. Chris added Steve will give a talk on DNSSEC at ccNSO meeting on Tuesday.

3.4 Paul Kane said CENTR faces the same questions from techie communications regarding the training. CENTR is willing to work with APTLD in regard to giving the code points to the technical community.

4. Constitutional Committee by Shariya. She reported that the final document filing for incorporation is completed.

5. Meeting Committee by Chris

5.1 Chris briefed updated on the Committee’s current performance. He said he is putting together a pack of hosting APTLD meeting, which will send for Board’s consideration once completed. The next meeting will take place in Perth, and we need to work on meeting schedule and location for 2005.

5.2 Peter added that we need to get the call for meeting host early as many require at least six months notice in advance.

6. Audit Committee by Chan-Ki. The Board decided to hire auditor during the 30th April on-line meeting, and 2003 auditing report has just completed by Deloitte & Touche.
Secretariat Report

1.  **Secretariat Update** by Ian Chiang

   1.1 Peter suggested members to look at the RFP and thanked the work done by TWNIC. InternetNZ is thinking about responding the RFP and will discuss with the Board.


   2.1 Peter moved to accept the financial report. It was accepted unanimously.

Presentation from Lunch Sponsor-WEBCC

WEBCC gave an introduction presentation on WEBCC before lunch break.

Lunch break from 12:30 to 13:35

Peter announced the morning session is closed at 12:30pm, and will reconvene at 13:35pm

Member Meeting reconvened on 13:45

ccNSO Update
1. ccNSO update by Chris on ccNSO Council Member appointment (three representatives from each region), and the preliminary teleconference among the council members. When the ccNSO bylaw was negotiated, a lot time was spent agreeing details on policy development process. It is also agreed lots of logistic matters outside the party of policy development process will be left to ccNSO members to agree on itself. That is partly what ccNSO meeting of next two days is about. Currently, there’s no rule and procedure in place to cover things like quorum and so on. ccNSO meeting Day 1 will have more discussion on those in detail. The issue paper has been sent out on that particular matter.

2. Chris continued, the Council is very conscious the fact that they are to be guided by the members of ccNSO. That is why the Council take a very slow process to make sure we have guidance from members on sorts of things and the fact that real decision can only be made on the mailing list rather than in the face-to-face meeting to ensure that everyone has input. Until the decision is made about the things like quorum, voting percentage and so forth, it won’t be possible for members to provide guidance to the Council on the various matters that Council has to make a decision on the bylaws. So, it is decided to go through points, which is needed to be decide and made recommendations to the members, such as identify the regional
organisation and appoint liaison; to fill ICANN Board seat 11 and 12; election of Council Chair and Vice Chair; and appointment of ccNSO nomination to NomCom (currently, there were not volunteer from members present).

3. Dr. Lee inquired if any APTLD member would like to volunteer for NomCom. There were not volunteers from members present.

4. Paul Kane said CENTR wishes to be involved in the process as a liaison.

**ICANN Issues 1: ICANN Budgets**

1. [An overview report on ICANN Budget Proposal for 04-05](#) by Hotta-san.

2. ICANN Vice President Paul Verhoef was invited to APTLD meeting and he expected to have more interaction with APTLD in the future and schedule more extensive discussions on various topics. He shared some points regard to ICANN budget.

2.1 ICANN is an organisation in transition from academic centric to professional footing as the size grew, and matters such as security and stability issues grew complicated. ICANN feels necessary to put forward a realistic budget to reflect the demand. ICANN needs substantial details from the community as to what is not required of ICANN to do.
2.2 ICANN budget is large also because the global operation.

2.3 There is still disagreement among the stockholders in regard to the budget, and discussion will be needed.

3. David Farrar said .nz is happy to make contribution as made to ICANN in the past for several services, but is not in agreement with the spending on lawsuits.

4. Paul Kane expressed CENTR has an account to fund ICANN with contributions from around ten members and has noticed ICANN that funding is available, but has not received response from ICANN yet. And Joel suggested separating the expenses for ccTLDs, and we can review afterwards whether we should fund more or reduce it.

5. Paul Verhoef replied ICANN has problem with the CENTR funding models and to comply with the conditions. The request to identify the works and have stockholders decide if they are to be funded will not work either. Paul also replied it is impossible to separate the expenses on ccTLDs. There are staffs engaging in ccTLD matters, and those works should be account for too.

6. Peter asked there are expressions to fund ICANN, but is there any appropriate policy for us to consistently follow.

Paul Verhoef responded there are disagreements as how to distribute the cost among ccTLDs. There are options, but no agreement. There need to be an agreement to fellow.
7. Dr. Lee said the issue is that there is no agreement on the cost itself, and we need to know why the cost is needed before we can work out a plan on how the ccTLD community will split the cost. Paul Verhoef replied the issue is more complex. There are three questions to be answered: (1) what is the cost in total, what is ICANN supposed to do and the costs associated with doing that; (2) who should contribute and how is the formula of division between those groups; (3) how does every group find formula for contribution. So, there are number of important steps to go through. ICANN hopes the combination of this budget plus strategic plan to be published in couple of months, which will provide with a clear insight. He continued to answer that ICANN does not see it is very easy to split the costs and associated activities.

8. Paul Kane said CENTR does not have pre-conditions for the funding. He further explained the portions of CENTR’s funding to ICANN. He agreed with Joel and Dr. Lee that cost should be justified before discussion how to split them. And David Farrar thought it will be not difficult to find the portion.

**ICANN Issues 2: IANA Administrative Procedure**

1. IANA GM Doug Barton was invited to brief on IANA’s administrative procedure. He first explained that
historically root server administration procedure is to handle root server delegation upon request. There are two important tasks: that the evaluation process has been documented which TLD managers can fellow; another is to handle the request from TLD mangers to remove data by an email explaining the conditions and request to ensure operational stability.

2. Peter asked has IANA received any response from individual ccTLD regarding the removal of data. Doug replied there were lessons learned in undergoing the procedures and wished to continue the procedures in the future. It is the IANA’s responsibility to serve the ccTLD community. IANA has no problem should a ccTLD decide to turn off certain undesirable ccTLD. The situation concerned is when the query rate becomes too high for the root server operation.

3. Hotts-san agreed to let IANA to conduct a roll-back of root server data.

4. David Farrar asked Doug to describe the procedure for a change of technical contact. Doug answered, most frequently required service are contact change. We need to make sure that the party requesting the change is authorised to do so, and automatically we need to make sure that the sponsoring organisation is aware of the request to change. Our current procedure is to make sure everyone is aware of the change and everybody has to approve the change.
5. Paul Kane mentioned CENTR did a study on IANA service, and there is great significance of improvement in IANA services under Doug’s team. He suggested in the future the documentation of procedures can be made through bottom-up process. Doug responded that there is difference between policy and procedure. This particular document is the process of IANA internal working procedures. It is posted to ask for suggestions, but it should be differentiated from policy.

6. Before the end of this session, Doug mentioned he is currently seeking experienced staff and has published the job opportunity on the web site, and welcomes recommendation from the AP region or others.

**Reports on APEET Status**

1. Ching Chiao briefed on [APEET Status](#), and welcome APTLD members to join the trail. .au, .nz and .my expressed the interests of participation.

2. Paul Kane said NIC-AC runs four ENUM registries, and would like to participate in the APEET trail.

**Report on APNG Activities in Cairns**

Ching Chiao briefed on last [APNG Activities in Cairns, Australia](#) in July.
Members Meeting adjourned on 15:55