Venue: Banquet Room, Plaza ParkRoyal Singapore

Chair: Peter Dengate Thrush

Attended by: a total of 19 member representatives
(from .hk, .jp, .lk, .my, .nu, .nz, .sg, .tw, Afilias), plus proxies from .au.

Wednesday 6 July 2005 (Day 1)

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 9.49am with a welcome from the Chair, Peter Dengate Thrush (.nz) who thanked the SG hosts for their work in setting up the meeting. Peter Dengate Thrush noted the proxies (Chris Disspain (.au) appointing Peter Dengate Thrush as his proxy; Shariya (.my) appointing Ramesh; Richard (.nu) appointing Stafford; Ai Chin (.tw) appointing Ian).

Chair/

THAT the Proxies be accepted.

Carried U

Peter outlined the meeting recording technology and its method of use to members of the Meeting. It was intended that the meeting be webcast, but
the technology had proved uncooperative. The meeting would be recorded, and made available on the web. The intention was to facilitate participation by those members unable to attend. Given the wide geographic spread of the region, this was of particular importance.

If any member wished recording to stop, it was simply necessary to say “point of order; taping”, and the recording would be switched off. The matter (including whether confidentiality was needed) would be discussed without taping.

Apologies were received from Chanki Park from Korea.

Introductions – members went around the table and introduced themselves to the meeting.

Peter welcomed Andrew Haire from the host, .sg. Andrew gave the APTLD board and members a welcome to the city. Andrew noted the IOC meeting in Singapore that day would decide the venue of the 2012 Olympics, to be announced 8.00pm.

He noted that this meeting was important – to fortify the beliefs and understandings of APTLD. It was vital, he said to have a strong voice for the Asia-Pacific region in the domain name space. APTLD was a very important organisation, as it provides such a collective voice for the region.
Peter Dengate Thrush thanked Andy for his welcome, and agreed APTLD is an important forum for debating the issues.

2. Membership / Sponsorship Committee Report

Yumi Ohashi (.jp) spoke to her written report. She noted that she looks forward to the debate about a general manager.

Peter Dengate Thrush noted that an application for membership from Timor L’Este was on the way (.tl). Peter asked about the status of associate members’ fees. Yumi explained a consensus that the Associate Members’ fee be USD 2000 among the Board, but felt that more formal endorsement was required.

Peter Dengate Thrush explained the rationale behind the fee and responded to questions about the rationale behind the fee level from .lk. Edmon Chung (Afilias) asked for a discussion about what the fee is meant to represent – what is the rationale behind the increase. Also, will there be any change to involvement rights in APTLD for Associate Members?

Peter Dengate Thrush – the $100 was never set as a formal fee, as it was a matter under the bylaws for the board to decide. The first fees had been
set without the board setting the feethatIt was not clear about the added benefits that can be given; the only matter that Associate Members can’t engage with is vote.

Edmon noted the question might be more about whether Associate Members can stand for positions or be representatives, rather than voting per se.

Peter Dengate Thrush noted this should be a question for Constitutional Committee to consider – whether Assoc Members can stand for Committees, Board, etc.

Hiro Hotta ( .jp) on Associate Membership – biggest benefit to these is the information exchange not voting. Edmon agreed, that voting is not the key, but that the ability to participate and be represented in APTLD committees etc is.

Peter Dengate Thrush raised the question of our Regional Organisation membership. There was a need to decide on an APTLD Representative on the ccNSO Council. This is separate to the ccPDP Rep from the Region, where Jordan Carter from the Secretariat will take that role. Peter Dengate Thrush noted that this might best wait until after the GM discussion.
Peter Dengate Thrush reminded people to see what they can do to get other ccTLD members to join APTLD. Need to get a larger proportion of the region’s ccTLDs into the membership.

Chair/

THAT the meeting accept the Membership/Sponsorship Committee’s Report.

Carried U

3. ICANN Relations Committee

Peter Dengate Thrush passed the Chair to Ramesh (.my representing Shariya) and presented an oral report. Committee’s focus on two things: (1) individual relationships ccTLDs have with ICANN, and (2) collective relations the ccTLDs had organisationally with ICANN.

The committee formation came from a session with Kilnam Chong as Chair – to focus on the ccTld/ICANN “contracts”. The same debate continues today under the name of “Accountability Frameworks” after bad feeling developed about the term “Contracts”.

ICANN now more interested in recording the actual relationships between managers and ICANN. No progress has really been made to
Discussion has been going on for more than a year between ICANN Staff and the Netherlands (trial of the concept). We are told going well but nothing has been delivered.

The second focus of the Committee – the organisational relationship, has now largely been dealt with by the formation of the ccNSO.

There are other ICANN issues which will be covered later on in the course of the meeting.

Question from Choon Sai (.sg): “will the Accountability Frameworks include an obligation to pay ICANN?” Peter Dengate Thrush – answer is yes. Guarantees IANA function etc, in response to payment of some fees. The ccNSO has a committee working out how to calculate these payments. The AF will likely say that a ccTLD manager agrees to pay a contribution to ICANN according to the ccNSO’s formula. That is, the AF itself will probably not set the fee – just an agreement to abide the decision reached in the ccNSO.

If managers are not members of ccNSO – how will their fee be set? Peter Dengate Thrush is not sure, but thinks ICANN expects to apply the same fee structure to everybody.

Jonathan Shea (.hk) – spoke confidentially regarding the .hk experience in their recent negotiations with ICANN over the change of .hk manager
– progress appears to be being made and on conditions that seem favourable to the registry.

The ccNSO is still to set fees. Yumi is on the committee setting the model for calculating the individual apportionment of costs among ccNSO members. Should aim in Luxembourg to speak to the people on the Budget working group. Peter Dengate Thrush – asked if anything APTLD could do, and if so Yumi should let us know.

Peter Dengate Thrush also noted the presence of a number of ccNSO councillors in the room.

**Acting Chair/**

THAT the report of the ICANN Relations Committee be received.

**Carried U**

Ramesh passed the Chair back to Peter Dengate Thrush, and the meeting broke for morning tea at 10 T.38am. The meeting reconvened at 11.09am, and considered the agenda for the next two days.

Edmon suggested position re IDN rules revision, and it was agreed that this would be done in Members Sharing.

**4. Minutes of the Kyoto Meetings**
Peter noted a few changes he had made to the draft minutes (see revised version).

Yumi noted on p. 5 of the draft, an incorrect ccTLD by Richard St Clair’s name.

Chair/

THAT the minutes of the Members Meeting held in Kyoto, Japan on 20 and 22 February 2005, be received and adopted as amended as a true and correct record.

Carried U

5. Matters Arising from the Minutes

- The ccNSO matters will come up.
- Constitutional changes will be occurring later in the year.
- Secretariat report to this meeting covers the Technical Forum

6. APTLD General Manager

Peter Dengate Thrush introduced the issue and outlined the background to where the current proposal has come from. The paper was put on the screen for members’ consideration, and Peter spoke to the items in the
first part of the paper (the job description). It will require tight liaison with the Secretariat.

Peter Dengate Thrush asked for feedback about any additional tasks that the GM should do, in addition to those listed. Members need to be certain the job focus is the right one.

Edmon suggested that generating new revenue should be a GM objective – creative ways to do this? (Agreed; added to item 3)

Peter noted that any other suggestions should come forward to the Board before tomorrow’s meeting.

Choon Sai - .sg – another task could be to raise the profile of APTLD in the region. (Added to item 1).

Naeomal - .lk – is this a contract job? Peter Dengate Thrush – one year is not enough time to assess whether the role is successful.

**Term** was added as a topic for discussion. .LK noted the idea of getting someone from a local registry to do the work. Peter Dengate Thrush noted any help would be welcomed. His view is that a two year term is important to bed this in. Building relationships and getting effective work takes longer than this. Ramesh spoke in favour of two years – a year to get systems in place and then another year to make it work.
Stafford Guest noted the term issue had been discussed in Kyoto, as the person will want some job security. In his view, three years was the best term. Choon Sai – minimum should be two years. Three years a standard term. See the best gains after two years in the role. Peter Dengate Thrush – two years with a one year renewal would be a good compromise. Jonathan Shea – also spoke in favour of the longer term.

The discussion moved on through the paper, looking at salary and costs, and location. Peter stressed that being located in New Zealand is not a critical requirement, as travel can be more affordable from other parts of the region (more central areas); and because the Secretariat is expected to move around the region. Asked for people’s views.

Ian Chiang (.tw) – location not the key issue, because the person can present their work and be monitored by email. Plenty of opportunities to meet. Peter Macaulay (.nz) – location not relevant but need to remember that you’ll need to allow for Chief Executive travel to the Secretariat; they will have to meet face to face on a regular basis. Peter Dengate Thrush – most important is to get the right person, not where they are located. He noted an item about the title of the position had been raised inadvertently by the last comment – he asked which title; “General manager” or “Chief Executive” people preferred?. 
On a straw poll, “Chief Executive” received three votes: “General Manager” – two votes.

Faced with this lack of support for either, Peter asked whether there were other preferable titles. Suggestions from the floor were:

“Director General” and “Director of Outreach”.

Peter Dengate Thrush asked if there were any titles in any of the major Asian languages which might apply. It was suggested that there would be appropriate translations into the Asian languages of a title in English, which would be preferred because such titles were well understood.


Peter suggested that the whole proposal would be put to the members, for a full electronic vote, and we could ask members to endorse the title along with the rest of the proposal.

Discussion turned to the funding options, first looking at the costs. Peter Dengate Thrush confirmed that it will be a full time position. Cost including salary and overheads – especially travel, is about USD 70,000 per year. No thought has yet been given to the recruitment process – will probably ask for each member to advertise in their country, and decide by
a joint Board-Secretariat committee. Will need face to face meeting to interview the top candidates.

The position paper dealt with Funds on two assumptions: (A) no draw on APTLD reserves, or (B) a draw on reserves.

Peter Dengate Thrush noted that the assumption that there would be no draw on reserves inevitably meant an increase in membership fees, and recorded that there are offers from .AU and .NZ to consider doubling fees. He asked the members present to indicate (without commitment) the likely response from the members on a fee increase.

.LK – perhaps, need to see whether they can bring in revenue. Could have a bonus scheme to put pay at risk. Peter Dengate Thrush noted though that most of the larger ccTLDs are already APTLD members, so new members are not likely to generate enough revenue to make a difference.

.TW – no authority to say yes, but could be too expensive at this time. Future manager may not be able to find wealthy ccTLD members, but could recruit Associate Members with more money.

Afilias – depends what base fee. A good approach to increase the revenue from membership fees; should not exploit associate members.
.HK – purpose of recruiting is to increase the membership base as prime objective. In principle any increase in fees should be kept to a minimum. There was a balanced between trying to increase members and not leading to huge fee increases. Would be willing to pay more, but depends on the extent. 100% increase seems out of proportion.

.NU – support APTLD and always have; have made contribution since the beginning. Feeling is that if a proper plan is presented, as for .au and .nz, would look at an additional contribution. Not convinced doubling is the answer, but would look at an increase.

.JP – not able to speak for .jp but personal opinion – can contribute more if necessary, but a little too radical to double the fee until have seen the value added by such a person.

.NZ – might be prepared to double, but probably prefer to pay less and see what the outcomes are.

.MY – no mandate on doubling fees, so will reserve comment. Suggest taking out of reserves for 2005 year, and then think about higher fees for the future. Appears people are not happy about a 100% increase.

Peter Dengate Thrush – Confirmed that Shairya had suggested we could take salary and expenses for the balance of the 2005 year from reserves, which would allow members to have met the person, and start to assess
the value before next year’s fees are set. That would mean no increase in the current year, and time to consider and prepare for any possible increase next year.

PJM – noted that would still need a decision for fees increases, as could not hire someone without guaranteed fund increases.

.SG – 100% appears to be too steep, and can think of other options. More comfort once a business plan is in place on what the GM is going to work on.

Peter Dengate Thrush – increase fees at all? .SG – yes, but the question is by how much.

The worst possible case is 100%. Look at Option 2, 65% fee increase, and re-divert MemCom budget in full.

Yumi – does not agree with redirecting all budget from Membership Committee to the GM. Maybe most of the work will be done by the manager, but may still need potential members to be able to come to meetings. Maybe $5k kept in? Peter Dengate Thrush – agreed.

Peter Dengate Thrush – straw poll – would a 65% fee increase be accepted? NZ, MY, NU, LK, SG (AU previously).

Option 3 – 40% - more positive response from members.
ASSUMPTION B – Some use of Reserves

Peter Dengate Thrush outlined these options, and then asked for feedback. First, take up Malaysia’s suggestion for this year – only funded by reserves for calendar 2005. $30k or so.

Then from start of 2006, what is the model for next year – increased fees, and higher reserves.

Peter Dengate Thrush thinks should use reserves, but doesn’t want to spend all the reserves.

Hotta-San – experimental project for 2-3 years. Need to secure the budget for 2-3 years; spend a max of 1/3 of reserves each year. 2/3 from other areas.

Peter Dengate Thrush – 1/3 from reserves, 1/3 from redirection of the Budget, and 1/3 from fee increases.

Some consensus behind this approach.

.NU – suggested a new spread sheet showing options. Secretariat to develop over the lunch break.

Peter Dengate Thrush asked if there were any other concerns. Fluency in English a priority. Asked to think about this and bring it back to the Board.
The meeting broke for lunch at 12.45pm and agreed to resume at 1.45pm.

[Note: the amended GM paper incorporating the above discussion is available here.]

7. ccNSO Regional Representative and PDP

Jordan Carter from the Secretariat reported on the ccPDP currently in motion, aimed at exploring the concerns of some European ccTLDs with the nature of the ccNSO’s structure under the ICANN bylaws. The meeting worked through each of the twelve issues highlighted for discussion, (link) and a few comments were made by a range of members.

The key proposals which are substantive are D) and L) – the rest are relatively trivial.

Jordan noted that comments are required to be with him by end of 13 July 2005, to feed into the PDP by 16 July. There will also be a second round of consultation later in the year. Members are asked to consider the issues paper and get any feedback to Jordan as soon as possible.

Secretariat also to approach non-ccNSO and non-APTLD members in the region, seeking their input.
Chair/

That the report be received.

Carried U

On the matter of appointing an APTLD Representative to the ccNSO Council, it was agreed to defer this again until a decision regarding a General Manager is made.

8. Secretariat Reports

Jordan Carter presented the Secretariat’s report for the period until 30 June 2005. This included the handover accounts from the previous Secretariat for January-March 2005, the financial report (report, notes, income) for the six months to 30 June 2005, and a slide show outlining the Secretariat’s work since Kyoto and future plans.

There was also an extensive discussion on the operation of the proposed Technical Forum for APTLD, which was agreed to proceed as outlined in the Secretariat's slide show (linked above).

Chair/

THAT the Secretariat Handover Financial Report be formally adopted.

Carried U
Chair/

THAT the financial statements for the period to 30 June 2005 be adopted.

Carried U

Chair/

THAT the Secretariat’s report be received, with thanks for the work done by the Secretariat.

Carried U

9. WSIS/WGIG Discussion

Ramesh presented Shariya’s slides in her absence, and then Peter Macaulay presented an update from Keith Davidson (.nz) on the latest events in the WSIS/WGIG process, including updating the situation in light of the recent US Government statement on control of the root.

Peter Dengate Thrush asked if there were any questions – none came up.

The next issue was what APTLD can do, and where it can be debated:

a) 3 hr seminar at Luxembourg with major WSIS/WGIG players. Chaired by Peter Dengate Thrush. Rumour is that the Working Group is leaking, and versions of the Report were already being discussed.
b) the WGIG Report launch workshop on 19 July in Geneva

c) engagement at the PrepCom 3 stage, through an APTLD statement/comment etc.

Ramesh noted that you need to be accredited to make a presentation to PrepCom, but that this was not too difficult a process.

It was accordingly agreed that the **Secretariat was to apply for Accreditation** for APTLD to PrepCom 3.

Volunteers were called on to help work on a presentation for PrepCom 3, with offers received from .my, .nz, .jp. The **Secretariat is to call for further assistance from the membership.**

Peter Dengate Thrush asked Ramesh to follow up on GAC process becoming more binding. Ramesh explained: GAC acts as an advisory committee. The members of GAC know that even if they disagree with something, they can keep silent or reserve their view, and goes up as an advice. If it becomes binding for GAC, then governments will need to start ‘fighting harder’ – harder to bring up and discuss issues. And as Governments move slow but issues move fast, problems emerge.

Peter Dengate Thrush notes that GAC has a strong advisory presumption under the bylaws.
Social arrangements: Bee Leng (.sg) outlined the procedure for the DuckTour, and dinner. The meeting rose at 3.45pm, and reconvenes tomorrow morning at 9.15am.

Thursday 7 July 2005

The meeting reconvened at 9.10am.

10. ICANN Strategic Plan

Peter Dengate Thrush handed the Chair to Stafford Guest (.nu) and then spoke to his presentation on the ICANN Strategic Plan. (link to come)

Peter noted at the end that the ICANN budget is too complex to be covered in this presentation. The Budget is not currently linked to the Strategic Plan, which is not usual practice. Usually the operational plan is driven by the strategic plan, and the budget forms the immediate plan of activity. This is changing slowly.

Choon Sai from SG asked a few questions about new gTLDs.

Peter Dengate Thrush noted that the Board discusses new gTLDs with great intensity. Some have been added this year, and each has caused much debate, including about what basis they are agreed on. It may become an auction; may remain as is; let these go under ccTLDs? Not sure what the outcomes will be.
Stafford thanked Peter Dengate Thrush for his presentation.

**Ramesh (.my) / Choon Sai Lim (.sg)**

THAT Peter’s Report be adopted.

**Carried U**

Stafford handed the chair back to Peter.

**11. ccTLD Manager Training**

Peter gave a brief report. APTLD past practice has been to fund people to come along to meetings and training sessions. This has had some limited success. There may be a better way. Kanchana from .th earlier suggested setting up a training centre for ccTLD Managers; suggested the AIT in Bangkok.

Peter has started a dialogue with Kanchana to see if she would be prepared to set up such a course. It would have some regularity and a defined location, with a training programme etc. Kanchana is preparing a response on this.

There may be a number of options on this; it could be in one place for some time and then move to another location. Need training on a range of levels for new ccTLDs, and for those already well developed.
Peter asked if there were any other comments on ccTLD training?

Stafford – place more emphasis on APNIC’s training courses? These occur throughout the region and could be a useful resource.

Peter Dengate Thrush – we have explored that in the past few years, supported them and had some joint sessions with APNIC. However, we have found that we tend to be aiming at different markets – APNIC at ISPs, APTLD at registry managers and their staff. Cooperation should continue, but we need something more directed at our own needs.

May also be able to get some assistance from ISOC for training initiatives. ICANN may also be moving in this direction.

.MY – plans to send people for training, but it is difficult to find good training. Sent one person to Bangkok and to work with APNIC to hold training in KL. How can APTLD help meet this type of need?

.MY – training that covers all aspects of registry operation could be useful, as we could plan engagement with this. ICANN etc very policy driven – the technical outreach is sometimes lacking.

Peter Dengate Thrush – the Board will need to resolve this this afternoon. A DNS training programme committee perhaps.

.MY – need to go into deeper issues.
Peter Dengate Thrush – thanks. See where we go with Kanchana’s suggestion, and then have a syllabus committee and consult with members about what their needs for training are.

12. Best Practices

Jordan Carter introduced the letter from CENTR asking for a speaker from APTLD on best practices, for the forthcoming wwTLD meeting in Luxembourg. Peter noted that there had been no real discussion on ccTLD Best Practices since the ccTLD constituency discussions ending in 2000. In discussion Ramesh noted that it would be better to share information among members, rather than to try and codify best practices. Others agreed that registry practices were largely a matter of local law and custom. Members considered some documents on the wwTLD website – ccTLD best practices (dated June 2000). Jordan outlined what other presentations are being made to the session.

Peter asked if there are any volunteers to present in this slot. Hotta-San noted he can do a presentation on these matters - .jp could provide an example of a model. Interesting as an ICANN contracted party.

Stafford - .nu – best practice in a document MoU with the Niue government, which has been in some dispute. Peter Dengate Thrush note
that .nu had an unusual stakeholder model, with money provided from
external registry back to the local Internet community. Stafford agreed to
consider a presentation on .nu, with a

Technical focus – to be given by Emani. And with reference to
RFC1591.

13. Jordan meeting

Jordan outlined the paper. Peter Dengate Thrush asked three questions:

(1) Do members present at the meeting think APTLD should meet in the
far West of the region?

Answer: In general, yes.

(2) If we did such a meeting, would people present come?

Answer; Yes - .nz, .jp, .tw, Afilias, .sg

(3) What was the best timing? Linked to an ICANN meeting, or better to
have them separated?

After general discussion some suggestions have come through:

- WSIS PrepCom link might be useful.
- If close to ICANN, make it close in time to ICANN to avoid long absence
- OR make them quite separate but with a definite break in between them

Peter Dengate Thrush suggested that a benefit of a Jordan meeting was local outreach. Tajikistan was already a member, another “stan” thinking of joining. Jordan thinking of withdrawing. Yumi and Peter Dengate Thrush have a strategy about approaching ccTLDs in the area.

Peter Dengate Thrush asked all members to be aware of this issue, and if you know ccTLD managers in the centre to West of the region, please try and get them to make contact with APTLD and get involved.

The meeting broke for Morning Tea at 10.30am, to reconvene at 11.00am.

14. Members’ Sharing

Members presented updates on their current activities and issues.

.HK – Jonathan spoke to his presentation. (Link). Will make a separate presentation.
Peter Dengate Thrush – suggest a technical workshop on best practices at the Jordan meeting, covering some of the issues in Jonathan’s presentation.

SG asked – in response to RFP. Registry outsourcing, referring to total outsourcing or partial? Customisation? Jonathan – customised, able to edit source code as required. (further discussion).


SG – Yeow Hui Tan spoke to the SGNIC presentation, and spoke to a few questions. IDN market testing.

.LK – Including Sinhalese characters as IDNs in the Registry. Character set deposited with IANA. Edmon – is a font set in Unicode? Yes. That language set for domain names? Yes. Tamil? No, not yet. Peter Dengate Thrush – apparent we have a lot of expertise in IDN. Edmon has been doing some work and believes that information sharing can help with IDN implementation.

Peter Dengate Thrush – could APTLD do anything to help with this process, or is it helping well enough as it is?
Edmon – help the revision of the IDN guidelines which is being undertaken by ICANN.

Peter DT – arising out of discussion, the Board to form an IDN Ctte for APTLD, to provide technical assistance to those wishing to implement IDNs, and to form an APTLD position on the IDN guidelines.

.TW – Ian Chiang spoke to his presentation, on an Internet Broadband usage survey.

Peter DT asked whether there is any censorship – restricted web locations or need to register sites? Ian – no. The final report will be ready at the end of the month, and Ian will provide the link.

Peter Macaulay impressed with the statistics provided and wondered what the process was.

Peter Dengate Thrush thanked Ian for his presentation.

15. General Manager - Finances

There was further discussion on the spreadsheet prepared following discussion the previous day on funding the GN position. In summary, the paper showed that adequate funding for the position was available for 3 years, with gradual reduction of the reserves each year providing 1/3 of
the cost, an increase in membership fees of approximately 33% providing a further 1/3, and an internal reorganisation of other budget spending providing the remaining 1/3.

After further discussion, it was moved;

**Peter Dengate Thrush .nz / Stafford Guest .nu**

THAT the members present at the APTLD Meeting in Singapore recommend the employment of a General Manager on the terms and conditions set out in the papers presented, and recommend this to the rest of the membership of APTLD.

**Carried U**

Ramesh reminded the meeting that there needs to be a debate about the title of the position.

16. **General Business**

**Meeting Timetable**

Peter Dengate Thrush noted the difficulties of the load created by three meetings a year, and suggested consideration of this. One example is a two-meeting cycle as used by APNIC: an AGM at APRICOT, and a second meeting six months later somewhere else in the region.
On the other hand, there has been the difficulty of needing to make
decisions on a speedy basis at times, and more frequent meetings allow
for this to occur.

Peter asked for views.

Ramesh – fewer and bigger. Much of the initial turbulence gone; less of a
need to meet urgently. Also, appointment of a GM, much of the work that
gets done at meetings could be done by the GM and would be more about
making decisions.

Choon Sai – fewer but longer meetings preferred, shares the view.

Ramesh - Fewer but better meetings.

Peter Dengate Thrush – the Meetings Committee needs to sort out a
meeting schedule by Jordan later in the year.

Jonathan – also prefer to have fewer but more substantive meetings.

Peter Dengate Thrush – if required, we can have a Board meeting, to deal
with issues that may come up in between less frequent meetings.

.IN representation
Edmon will introduce the .IN representative to APTLD members in Luxembourg. Peter Dengate Thrush – also noted Indonesia. Should network as many as possible.

Yumi noted that KH has put our invitation to membership letter before the Minister, and a result is hoped for some time shortly.

With no other General Business, the meeting closed at 12.25pm. The Board Meeting will reconvene at 2.00pm.

Signed as a true and correct record:

…………………………………………

Peter Dengate Thrush, .nz, CHAIR