1. CALL TO MEETING

Chair, Peter Dengate Thrush called the meeting to order at 1013h Taipei Time (GMT+8).

Participants:

Peter Dengate Thrush (Peter) (.nz), Chair of the Meeting
Chris Disspain (Chris) (.au)
Yumi Ohashi (Yumi) (.jp)
Chan-ki Park (Chan-ki) (.kr)
Shariya Haniz Zulkifli (Shariya) (.my)
Joanna Tso (Joanna) (.tw), and Secretariat of the Meeting
Ian Chaing (Ian) (.tw), Secretariat of the Meeting
Ching Chiao (Ching) (.tw), Secretariat of the Meeting

Apologies from:

Hualin Qian (.cn)
Richard St. Clair (.nu)
Vincent Chen (.tw)
Agenda:

(1) Preparation of July meetings

(1.1) ccTLD Meeting

(1.2) ccNSO meeting

(1.3) APTLD Meeting

(2) The Auditing of APTLD Budget

(3) ccNSO Matters

(3.1) ICANN Bylaw Amendment

(3.2) AP Nominations for ccNSO Election

(4) APTLD Endorsement of the dot Asia Proposal

2. PREPARATION OF JULY MEETINGS

2.1 The Board Meeting started with the discussion on the preparation of July meetings including ccTLD, ccNSO and APTLD meetings. Chair Peter pointed out the difficult balance of ccNSO and ccTLD meetings, and asked does APTLD support having separate ccTLD meeting in addition to ccNSO meeting, and what role should APTLD assume.

2.1.1 Joanna and Chris expressed concern about the funding and organization of ccTLD meeting in KL.
2.1.2 Shariya suggested posing this question and calling for members’ comment. However, there was consensus to support having a ccTLD meeting in KL because even some of APTLD members are not ccNSO members yet.

2.1.3 Peter concluded that APTLD does want to have both ccTLD meeting and ccNSO meeting - until the ccNSO has a majority (or many more) members than now. Peter continued, “I think once we have 2 meetings only a few more times, people will start to wonder why, and it will sort itself out Until then, cctlds in Rome wanted a meeting separate from the SO meeting.“

2.2 Chris asked about the mechanism (a committee or the AdCom?) for organising a ccTLD meeting.

2.2.1 Ching suggested APTLD, as a regional organization, to support the ccTLD meeting at Kuala Lumpur.

2.2.2 Peter said either the old AdCom or a new committee could organise the meeting. And Yumi suggested using the previous AdCom structure with European representatives is nice.

2.2.3 Chris also asked about the funding and secretariat service for the ccTLD meeting at Kuala Lumpur. Peter replied previous ccTLD meeting were mostly funded by ccTLD constituency contribution and attendee donations.
2.2.4 Chris asked about the ccTLD money in the bank. Peter replied there's no ccTLD money left. The last was spent in Carthage; the Rome meeting was funded by seeking contribution from attendees by Andy Lane. Peter thought the money will not be a problem because attendees will know in advance they have to pay to attend, and the European ccTLDs will fund at least their share of a meeting. Costs for the secretarial support will be sorted out and met by the cctld committee (Adcom/new)

2.2.5 Peter suggested re-appointing him as one delegate to the ccTLD meeting organising mechanism, and Joanna (or Ian) as alternative for approaching and future communication. Chris, Yumi and the Secretariat all agreed.

2.3 Peter further asked about the APTLD Secretariat’s additional administrative support for the ccNSO meeting.

2.3.1 Peter suggested a formal additional payment to APTLD Secretariat for the extra administrative support for the ccNSO meeting. Joanna agreed and said it is a good thing for APTLD. Chris expressed his welcome APTLD Secretariat’s support for the ccNSO meeting.

2.3.2 Shariya said that she will try to find out the meeting cost at KL and possible sponsorship.

2.4 Peter concluded that
(1) APTLD (a) will host its own meeting, as usual, (b) fund the Secretariat to support the ccNSO meeting, and (c) will support the ccTLD meeting if financial can be arranged.

(2) Peter and Joanna to join with others on APTLD AdCom list to see about financial and report on the future development.

(3) Figuring out the extra funding to compensate the Secretariat for additional work in hosting ccNSO meeting within a week or three, and suggested the Secretariat to discuss with Chris, Shariya and ICANN staffs for the ccNSO meeting requirements.

3. The Auditing of APTLD Budget

3.1 Peter asked Chan-ki or Joanna to explain the choices of auditing APTLD financial. Joanna replied that after negotiation, KPMG agreed to audit APTLD 2003 and 2004 finance for a total of US$3,500. Three options are proposed:

(1) Go ahead and hire KPMG to audit APTLD finance for 2003 and 2004

(2) Give up the auditing totally

(3) Hire KPMG to audit APTLD finance for 2004 only, but will need to ask KPMG for the cost. Previously, KPMG had quoted US$2,000 for 2003 auditing.
3.2 Shariya said that the auditor needs to be approved by members at the next meeting, and the auditing requirement is for 2004, as legally APTLD was not formed in 2003.

3.3 Chan-ki agreed to have a certified auditor; however, he pointed out that the volume of money APTLD handles is small and manageable. Peter and Yumi thought hiring an auditor has the benefit of setting up best practice for APTLD Secretariat; protecting the Secretariat against wrongs; and ensure transparency and soundness of the account.

3.4 Shariya said she could try to ask for a Malaysian quotation, which might cheaper. Chris agreed. But, Chan-ki and Peter suggested that the Secretariat and the audit should be close to each other to exam the books and answer to questions. Joanna explained it is better to have local Taiwan auditor to get all the currency conversation correct. Joanna said she will seek alternative auditors for less cost.

3.5 Chris asked to check the constitution to see whether the terms of auditor is defined and the auditor be a non-Malaysian firm? Shariya replied the constitution does not define the term.

3.6 Peter called for a vote on spending the US$3,500 on audits for two years (2003 and 2004). Yumi, Chris, Shariya, Joanna (on behalf of Vincent) agreed.
4. ccNSO Matters

-----------------

4.1 Peter pointed out that the issue for us is the possible councillors from the AP region. ccNSO members in each region gets to elect 3 reps. Chris also asked for APTLD to have a position on the council nomination.

4.2 Yumi expressed uncertainty to discuss nominating someone from APTLD, but could discuss general requirements for the candidates. She believes that a preferable candidate should have good knowledge about the purpose, role and architecture about ccNSO, and about ccTLD community. So someone already working well within the ccTLD community is a better choice, in general.

4.3 Peter agreed with Yumi and pointed out it would be good to have people on the council familiar with the AP issues, candidates seems to include (without excluding anyone) people like Chris and Hiro, who have been on the Assistance and Launching groups. Peter also sought suggestions for some other candidates who might be good for AP region. Peter further clarifies that this is only general discussion on the issue and agreed to Yumi’s suggestion that the board can state the above qualifications as preferred qualifications.

4.4 Shariya and Yumi suggested calling for members’ input on the candidate’s qualification. Chris agreed and suggested that the
candidate can contribute and have familiarity with AP issues and thus represent the region.

4.5 Yumi emphasised the qualifications should include: familiarity, expertise, time and energy to contribute; but geographical representation (eg. Pacific, Asia, Middle Eastern Asia) should not be a required. Shariya and Peter agreed.

4.6 Chris expressed his intends to stand for the council. And Yumi said JP will nominate Hotta as he meets the requirements. Chris and Yumi mutually expressed willingness to second each other for the nominations.

4.7 Peter suggested hosting a Q and A session with the AP candidates, and Chris and Yumi agreed. Shariya suggested that members should be informed by e-mail ASAP.

5. APTLD Endorsement of the dot Asia Proposal

5.1 Peter said many of our members are .asia members, and asks if APTLD can post support in the next few hours?

5.2 Shariya mentioned that Che-Hoo Cheng has email a few points to her to pass on to Board. She was particularly keen on development projects support by them for APTLD:
- “Clear synergy between DotAsia and APTLD, especially on development side
- Outreach to recruit new APTLD members (we have done that for MO, ID, IR and IN and we'll continue to do that)
- Potential financial aid to APTLD
- Training and technical knowledge sharing
- No capital liability from APTLD
- One initial board seat still open for founding members (from AP groups)
- Looking for LOI only at this time (formal membership agreement will be created upon delegation of .Asia from ICANN)

5.3 Yumi said JP will post support this afternoon, and from APTLD’s point of view, we can mobilize this DotAsia to promote outreach and other projects. Chris, Peter, Chan-ki agreed to show support.

5.4 Peter will prepare a brief support piece.

6. AOB

-----------------

6.1 Yumi made a report on current status of sponsorship: We have IR, IN, LA, ID - still approaching, waiting for reply. Looking at their lack of response, Yumi is skeptical about having APTLD workshop in KL in July (Whole ccTLD workshop is of course still a possibility). Also,
APNIC is asking whether we send tutor to APNIC training in Fiji during the coming September. Will prioritise TLDs and study feasibility, and can invite candidates if technical committee has good topics. Further updates will be reported to the board later via email.

6.2 Peter pointed that that we links the sponsorship to the technical workshop a lot to attract more members, and asked about the preparation for Kuala Lumpur. He thought Kuala Lumpur would be good as so many people will be there for ICANN. Perth, by contrast, will be only for Pacific new members. As far as Fiji is concerned, he thought it was agreed to send people to talk about APTLD, ICANN the GAC and more general matters - including possibly any training that we schedule for Perth.

6.3 Regarding Perth meeting preparation, Chris said needs to know very soon whether to book 1 day or 2 days for the tech training in addition to the 1 day for APTLD meeting. Chan-ki proposed to discuss the technical training in Perth over the email. Yumi thought we do not need separate workshop in Perth, due to lack of response from potential TLDs and lack of connections.

6.4 Chris and Peter agreed to have technical workshop in Kuala Lumpur, but not Perth. Peter thought Perth meeting could be a strategic planning session for 2005, and try hard to invite people to come to
technical training in KL and seeing how we are going in about 2-3 week.

6.5 Chris and Peter asked for a person from Board to assist the Chair of Technical Committee, and Chan-kivi volunteered to contact and discuss with Dr Kanchana regarding tech workshop, and send the result over the email.

7. End of Meeting

-----------------

The meeting was adjourned at 1206h Taipei Time (GMT+8).