Tuesday 20 June 2006

Attendance: as per the register, but including representatives from .au, .tw, .nz, .kr, .my, .lk, .hk, .jp, .sg, and associate members Afilias and WebCC.

Meeting opened: 9.06am

1. Welcome from the APTLD Chair

Peter welcomed delegates to Hong Kong, and noted some housekeeping matters.

2. Keynote Speech: Christopher To, Chairman of HKIRC
Mr. To welcomed delegates, gave a brief history of the background of the .hk TLD, and noted the benefits of sharing information and best practice through the APTLD community.

3. **Confirmation of the Agenda**

Members present confirmed the agenda as revised and circulated.

4. **Update from the Board – Peter Dengate Thrush**

Peter gave an update. He noted that it is only three months since the previous meeting in Wellington. There have been no Board meetings and one e-vote, on the appointment of a General Manager.

The IGF has been formed, and while APTLD’s nomination of Jaeyoun Kim was not successful, Chris Disspain (.au) was appointed to the Forum.

WebCC from Malaysia have also joined.
5. Updates from APTLD Committees

a. Mem-Com

Yumi Ohashi spoke to the written report. Two new members since Wellington: Iran (.ir) and Web Commerce Communications Ltd. KH’s pending application is not progressing at this point.

There were a few questions, one about sponsorship guidelines. Yumi noted she was not sure where to raise proposed changes to the guidelines. Yumi has drafted a revision and discussed whether to best circulate to the Board first and then members?

Peter’s view was to do it the other way around, and ask members their view first before having the Board discussion. People agreed to discuss it on the members list and then to have the formal discussion at the next APTLD meeting.

b. ICANN Relations

Peter noted his ongoing work on the ICANN Board, and that this Committee is not an active one.

c. Tech Ctte / IDN Committee
Ai-chin has asked Ian to present a report, which he did through PowerPoint.

Questions – Chris Disspain noted that the joint working group includes three ccNSO reps. This will meet at Morocco on Sunday morning, a first chat to get the ball rolling.

d. Constitutional Committee
Shariya noted that not much progress since the Wellington meeting – no comments have been received on the proposed Constitutional changes discussed there. The only change is the membership bands which apply the same for associate members and ordinary members.

The discussion will occur on the substantive issue after lunch.

e. Meetings Committee
Chris noted his thanks to the Hong Kong members for organizing the meeting so far. The next meeting – there is a
proposal to hold the meeting in Sri Lanka in September, in conjunction with a relevant local conference.

Chris has been talking about detailed items and the safety situation in the country. These appear to be acceptable. Chris is comfortable with going there.

The conference is 13-17 September and the meeting could best be held concurrently. Chris asked for feedback on this: do people want to go with this?

On security, Peter asked if anyone has any concerns. No-one at the meeting thought we should not attend.

On timing. Tying to an ICANN meeting is problematic based on this attendance. This would be good if it does not clash with other meetings. (IGF meets in August for planning and in October. ICANN is in December).

The question is that the meeting is quite close to this one. The last meeting is usually later in the year.
Chris will advise the members lists regarding the options for next year’s meeting venues.

Shariya noted that there is a question regarding the role of the GM. Peter’s view is that we need to discuss this more fully during the Secretariat Report section on the GM.

Shariya also suggested having a technical training session at the next meeting, as there is the general intention to have a technical training workshop at least once a year in conjunction with an APTLD meeting.

Edmon – regarding sponsorship, the Secretariat could/should make a call for sponsorship before each meeting, to allow early timeframes for sponsorship to be secured.

6. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

Peter noted these have been circulated.

Chris Disspain (.au) / Shariya (.my)
That the Minutes of the members meeting held in Wellington on 25 March 2006 be received as a true and correct record.

Carried U

Matters arising – none that are not on the agenda.

On page 4 – the format of the APTLD plan is related to InternetNZ – not the content. Replace “it” with “format”.

No other corrections made.

AP: Meeting Agendas to include minutes as an item.

AP: Update the minutes to show the Kiribati speaker.

7. Secretariat Reports

Activity Since Wellington:

- Ongoing preps for this meeting
- Preparing for GM appointment
- Accounts currently being audited, just in final stages, so approval at next meeting

- New fees band nomination

- If no advice from ccTLD by 30 June, Sec will write with intention to bill at same as last year. Chair urged people to reply on voluntary increases, and to attend to payment.

- New activities, 2 x Surveys – ineligible names, and training – both survey results coming up for discussion later – but strong need for participation by more ccTLDs, and encourage other ccTLDs to also participate.

Financial Report:

- Discussed the major costs incurred on Secretariat, and GM recruitment

New GM

- Looking towards a change of secretarial role as GM comes on board

Secretariat thanks to HK hosts for easy facilitation of this meeting.

GM Process of Appointment: Jordan detailed the process from the decision since the Singapore July 2005 meeting. Panel of PDT, Shariya, Yumi and AiChin. Secretariat provided admin support, no leading role.
Shariya added that Hiro Hotta was added to the GM Appointments Panel during the Wellington interviews. Also, need to take note of the form of the employment relationship, e.g. self employed contractor etc, and some aspects

Chris – paying the GM, in NZ$, what about exchange rate risks? Secretariat needs direction on how to pay the GM, the employing organisation etc.

Agreed the GM should be paid in NZ$, and APTLD should take exchange rate risk.

The discussion moved to key performance criteria for the General Manager:

Jonathan – things the GM needs to have a “balanced score card” of 3 to 4 major headings. Increasing membership is crucial milestone. General discussion on this occurred

The meeting broke for morning tea at 10.35pm, returning at 10.55am.
Choon Sai agreed with balanced score card, but noted the need to develop a work plan. Debbie also noted the need to have the GM collect the members’ fees.

A range of other items were discussed. In terms of performance requirements, these will be drafted and moved ahead in conjunction with the new General Manager.

8. **APTLD Training discussion**

Peter asked Jonathan to introduce the training discussion. He reported back on the work of the Working Group and noted the survey, which was done in May to examine training needs. He asked Jordan to summarise the results – Jordan noted that there is a sustained demand for training from both members and non-members (slightly more demand from non-members), and it is in both technical and policy areas.

Jonathan thanked AUDA for a detailed response too. There is a demand and we should meet it.
Jonathan suggests trying for a training session in September.

Need to suggest the “what” from the “where” – Peter asks the Working Group to prepare a syllabus – or two or three – on the levels required and the type of material to be covered. Then there could be thinking about how this could best be delivered – the training style, location and so on.

Peter noted that both ICANN and ISOC also offer ccTLD training, and also the arrangement offered by Thailand.

Jonathan believes there is information available for this. We could go to the next level of detail, but may need more assistance.

Debbie Monahan thought the survey was useful. There is more work that needs to be done to define what should be taught in each area – some are still quite broad. Training can best be about sharing knowledge and helping people decide what suits them best. Two different approaches – because technical training might be different.

Then there is also the question of who the audience is for each type of training – new ccTLDs? Experienced ones? Technical managers? Debbie Monahan will help.
Peter asked that the Working Group come back before the next meeting with:

- Draft training programmes
- Context for training
- Information versus training

There is also a need – Debbie noted Shariya’s earlier point – to have useful policy discussion alongside the APTLD meetings. We could theme meetings and have a session on a specified area at the heart of each meeting.

This was agreed the way ahead.

Jonathan noted one more item – the possible for an orientation session or a field day / visit to an existing registry, as a practical approach to training. An internship model.

Peter noted this is a separate topic but is a very good idea. An intern scheme where people can post their skills and people can opt in?
Jaeyoun noted the short term intern suggestion – KR suggested this and is willing to host.

Mahiya noted that LK can offer similar services, as based at the University. Sri Lanka could offer training too.

Jordan noted that the challenge is to get the syllabus right, so that people want to attend the training – a distinct offer that is not matched by any other training currently available.

**AP:** Webpage with a template for APTLD internships, so that people can record their offers and details of what they are best at. Jaeyoun Kim, Secretariat etc to work together on this, distinct from the training. (Under the Training WG)

Jonathan noted that Afilias manages a few ccTLDs and operates world class registry services, as a commercial concern. This commercial focus may make their approach different to some other ccTLDs, but would Afilias be able to contribute to the process of such training?
Edmon said that Afilias would be happy to help out. They do offer to share information with growing ccTLDs. WebCC could also assist – to be added to the list. CoCCA may also be able to assist – to check this out.

9. **IGF Update**

Chris provided an oral update. The proceedings of the IGF AG are under Chatham House Rules so he is constrained in what he can say, but he can give an overview.

- IGF will occur in Athens end of October.
- The UN Secretary General has set up an AG to advise on the Agenda for Athens, 46 people from government, business, NGOs etc.
- The first day will have an opening ceremony in the morning, and a general session in the afternoon on multi-stakeholder policy dialogue to set the scene for the common themes that run through the rest of the discussion for the next three days.
- The second day deals with openness and security.
- The third day deals with diversity and access.
The fourth day reviews the work of the previous days, with the Chairman summing-up the overall meeting.

The meeting will include an open microphone session taking stock of the Athens meeting and looking forward to the next meeting. It will conclude with a panel of young people who will look at emerging issues and issues of concern to youth, both from a technology and a public policy perspective.

In discussion –

Shariya asked if the management of Internet resources is off the IGF agenda. No, it is not – this needs to be continually managed. RIR role is something that some elements want to have discussed by the IGF – it won’t happen this time but it may be pushed again later. Also as anyone can run workshops, a government with the view that there should be IGF consideration of such issues could run a workshop.

There will be some ccTLDs there, and will CD coordinate these? Yes – once clearer about the agenda for the IGF, Chris will call for those coming from ccTLDs to pull together a workshop. They are not sure how many people will be attending but around 1000 is one estimate – so there may be lots of workshops going and all on our issues need to be covered.
Wider representation would be appreciated and if ccTLDs are taking a wider role in their local internet communities, then they should consider attending the IGF. After all most of your governments will be present.

There is some risk of having too many ccTLDs being present being seen as an endorsement of the IGF. The priority needs to be ensuring that critical infrastructure is not covered by it.

Peter asked if APTLD should make a submission along the lines of the earlier response to the WGIG process?

CD – useful to have input on:
- How ccTLDs operate within the regional and other ICANN structures
- On the major issues – diversity, access, security and freedom – are they within APTLD’s scope? Perhaps APTLD should not take a position as it is outside our purview as an organisation.

Peter asked a question about how APTLD should engage in this work and if this should be done or not. Perhaps we should sort out APTLD’s internal functions first?
Chris suggests:

- Send the GM to the IGF, if only as an education.
- “Enhanced Cooperation” is only a government function at the current time, through the GAC and better GAC/IGF liaison. 
  (mentioned in the WSIS Final Statement?)

Jaeyoun Kim will be attending as a Korean Government representative.

10. ccNSO Update

12:09pm

Chris noted that over 50 members have now signed up to ccNSO. The policy development process is complete and the Board should adopt it soon. This will mean the bylaws are at a point where some ccTLDs who had been waiting to join should be able to do so.

There is one item on the Morocco agenda which may be of significant importance – a discussion on regions themselves. The aim is to consider
the history of regions and whether there is an issue that needs to be dealt with. Two catalysts:

- Arab countries approached the Council with a view that they are a distinct region.
- A number of ccNSO members are caught by the overseas territory rule – they belong in regions outside where they are (e.g. Cayman Islands are part of Europe, New Caledonia the same).

So the issues are:

- Are the five current regions the right regions?
- Why should the ccTLD manager not be able to make a choice in the abovementioned circumstances?

This is at the ccNSO level, not necessarily at the ICANN level though it may lead to ICANN changes if a new model can be devised.

Peter asked what the specific issue is – the internal ccNSO breakdown? This would only affect internal ccNSO elections.
ICANN partly uses the UN list, but ignores Oceania which is a region in the UN but not ICANN. As ICANN does not always follow the UN list change should be possible.

North America has 3 councillors for few member organisations. This could be seen as undesirable.

In Marrakech there may be no interest in this but it will be discussed.

Shariya asked how strong the Arab desire is for a separate region – Chris doesn’t know but believes a large number of Arab countries are behind the request. He has asked for more information on this. He also noted that there was a meeting of Arab ccTLD managers a while ago. Shariya is asking because APTLD’s region – does it follow ICANN? PDT – no, because colonies in our area can join.

Shariya noted that APTLD may have an interest here as a new Arab region may cause a change to APTLD’s borders if we choose for it to do so.
Chris noted there could be a sub-region under APTLD, for the Middle East region, and have some representation at APTLD meetings. This would be possible.

The point would seem to be the desire for recognition – as a subset or as a region of their own. So it will be discussed at Marrakch. PDT asked about the PDP – was APTLD involved? Yes, there was some involvement.

Chris also noted the lack of a regional rep on ccNSO Council – it would be worth having an APTLD one. This should be the General Manager.

ccNSO will also discuss:

- ccTLD contribution to ccNSO (check – might be to ICANN)
- ICANN financing from ccTLDs

Chris was thanked for his reports.

The meeting broke for lunch at 12.28pm and returned at

11. Extraordinary General Meeting
Minutes of a meeting of an Extraordinary General Meeting of
the Asia Pacific Top Level Domain Association

Present: APTLD members as noted on the Attendance

Register: .au, .hk, .jp, .kr, .lk, .my, .nz, .sg, .tw
(Ordinary Members), Afilias, WebNic (Associate Members).

Meeting opened: 1.49pm

The meeting opened with Shariya Haniz Zulkifli noting the quorum rules for General Meetings in the Constitution. Due to a lack of members to vote, the meeting is inquorate, with only nine Ordinary Members present.

Thereby using the power granted by 12.3 of the Constitution, there will be an attempt to reconvene this Extraordinary General Meeting at the next APTLD Members’ Meeting, in Sri Lanka in September, with a firm date to be agreed ASAP. It is also to be noted that the meeting in September can proceed without a quorum if it does not arrive.
Chris Disspain took the floor and said members should be asked to vote on the proposed changes, even though this is not formally recognised by the Constitution.

Peter noted we don’t want to over-complicate matters, but the thought of engaging all Members in the discussion is important.

Shariya’s view is that an online vote could occur, as set out in 24.4 of the Rules. Her view is that the document should be tabled again at the next meeting.

The two major changes were to accommodate online Board elections, and to amend the membership fee bands. The rest are mainly administrative.

Peter noted that 8.3 in the Constitution provides for the Board to set fees on the bands. However past practice has been to encourage and allow voluntary selection. The power is there to set the fees unilaterally.

The inquorate meeting lapsed at 1.59pm.
Yumi gave a presentation summarising the survey of how ccTLDs handle ineligible names.

Peter asked for any questions, discussion, starting by asking whether there was the chance to come up with best practice principles in this area to be applied across the region or the world to harmonise treatment of ineligible name?

Yumi – high level statements might be possible. Not on a detailed level though, as different national treatments etc have a range of drivers.

Debbie (.nz) found it difficult to answer the survey, as .nz has thirteen SLDs. No eligibility requirements other than 18+ or a legal entity. .nz also has moderated SLDs, beyond eligibility requirements (.mil, .cri, .govt and .iwi). These have caused some problems in the past. If names are registered in breach of the moderation policy, the Domain Name Commissioner can cancel the domain name.

Yumi asked if there were any actual cases, and Debbie gave a case from .iwi, where the moderator was associated with a large iwi. He
registered generic .iwi.nz domain names which are not related to the
name of the tribe, which is the intention of the SLD. An odd situation
with a moderator breaking the rules.

Shariya asked, from a legal perspective, what can be covered. The survey
was very relevant for MY because have been trying to do some work on
this. This will help with the domestic regulator.

Worries about customers suing if cancelled – if the contract covers the
right of the domain authority to cancel domains, is this not watertight?
Peter responded that firstly you can’t stop people taking legal action. You
just want to win if they do. If you can you avoid being sued. You also
need to ensure that responsibilities are clear in the contracts – whether the
accuracy in the data base is the registrant’s responsibility or someone
else’s (the registrar’s). Set up so the registrar is responsible for data being
right and ensuring their customers get the data right? (Could provide
financial incentives for registrars to meet this requirement.)

Debbie noted that in .nz the registrars are protected. They have to correct
information they know is wrong, but they cancel the name if details are
wrong. The DNC does this. It is in the DNC’s interests because DNC
covers liability.
Peter responded that it’s not the who cancels question but the liability issue – in his view the liability should be with registrars.

Choon Sai – if contract means the registrant has to assert they meet eligibility requirements, would the liability not rest with the registrant?

Peter – yes, you could do that.

Choon Sai – it is difficult to check. So far there have been few cases like this in .SG.

Chris Disspain - .AU has some of this now. The registrant warrants their eligibility. Registrars check some but are entitled to rely on the registrant’s warrant of eligibility. If this is found to be wrong, the AUDA can cancel the name. Registrar not liable.

A current case – released some two-letter domain names. A registrar rang a group of businesses and said you should apply for these names because eligible. However they were not eligible, the registrar was wrong. So the registrants are upset, with the registrar at this point. The names have been
cancelled. AUDA’s job is over, can penalise the registrar. The registrant
could sue the registrar for misleading them.

Peter added – if a rule is being broken all the time you look at the rule,
and see if it is required. Peter thanked Yumi for her presentation.

13. Accountability Frameworks – Donna Austin, ICANN

Donna introduced her role with ICANN and spoke to her presentation.

Donna then worked through the framework AF with those present to
explain them.

Chris Disspain spoke on some of the implications for ccTLDs of the
inclusion of ‘redelegation’ in the AF. This is to support managers not to
undermine them.

Donna then worked through the Exchange of Letters template, the other
way of recognising ccTLDs by ICANN. The commitments are same as in
the template AF’s, as is the contribution clause and there is a termination
clause. The mutual recognition and recitals are not there, and no dispute resolution steps are set out. The German

There were no other questions for Donna at this stage. Peter thanked Donna for speaking.

14. **ICANN Nominating Committee**

Donna Austin noted ICANN’s Nominating Committee is in action and explained what it is working on. Details are available on the ICANN website.

15. **Members Sharing sessions**

SG, HK, MY, WebCC.

Shariya presented first, as it sets out the broad issues for consideration.

Shariya thanked Jonathan for raising the issues of the Shared Registry System to be shared between members, as he raised this at
the Wellington meeting. MY is looking at an SRS system, and so what she is setting out today is an overview of the issues. Looking forward to input from the current operators of SRS models.

This is a scene-setting presentation and after others give their prepared presentations, it is hoped all members will address some of the questions raised by Shariya.

.SG

Choon Sai Lim gave the .sg presentation.

Shariya asked if any price cap is set – Choon Sai replied no, it is up to registrars to set prices. It is not SGNIC’s role to do so. Jordan noted the margins are higher than in the .NZ case. SG has no regulatory authority to set fees.

The meeting broke for a brief afternoon tea at 3.45pm and reconvened at 3.58pm.

.HK
Jonathan gave a first presentation on the basic HK model for SRS. He has also got a presentation on sensitive names, but first Jaeyoun will present on the KR SRS.

In between the changeover, Peter suggested that the Committees each brief the new General Manager tomorrow with the issues their group is working on, and how the GM can assist and support.

.KR

Jaeyoun is now the SRS System manager for Korea. The number of registrars is increasing, up to 27. He detailed the operation of the monitoring systems on the KR SRS, in contrast with the earlier text based interface.

The KR system is available to work with others, if needed. Some images are available.
Sensitive Domain Names

Shariya presented on .my and in summary form across a number of ccTLDs which she has researched for comparison purposes.

Jonathan Shea gave a presentation on the HK experience with such names:

Peter Dengate Thrush noted that the only job of the registry is to maintain a register. All the uses and values of these names should be someone else’s problems.

A number of other contributions were made, including by Chris Disspain and Choon Sai.

The meeting closed its official business at 5.04pm.

Wednesday 21 June 2006
16. APTLD General Manager Introduction

The meeting opened at 9:06am with the same attendance as yesterday’s list, barring the absence of Australia (Chris Disspain) and the addition of Don Hollander, the new APTLD General Manager.

Peter introduced Don and a round of introductions was made. Don was asked to give a presentation introducing himself, which he did.

Don finished with some questions.

a) Who are the members now – and why?

- Jonathan (.hk) – all run ccTLDs and it is good to share knowledge and experience in this industry. Non-profit focus.
- Jaeyoun (.kr) – the question is often asked in KRNIC. Need to attend to make a contribution. Can find useful tips and experience from other members. Share best practice with other ccTLDs to improve own policies. Would like to see more members involved. Three meetings a year can lead to things being slow, so work between meetings can be very helpful.
Yumi – asked #2 and #3. Prime benefit in joining is to share experience and expertise in registry management. This can help – not just sharing about registry, but also about the direction in other global forums – e.g. UN or ITU activities. Another benefit is to develop a specific position in a specific area, e.g. in IDNs last year. Also on the WSIS/WGIG process.

Membership – look forward to working with the GM to build success.

Don – do all the prospective members know that APTLD exists? Keith – no. Some ccTLD managers are not contactable. Peter added that the outreach has not been top notch, due to a lack of resources.

Shariya added that .my is a medium small ccTLD. Invaluable resource for .my’s policy development process and operational decision-making. With 25 members, the APTLD is too small.

Peter noted that in terms of ccTLDs on registration numbers, a higher proportion are already involved.

Peter also noted that a reason for early membership was self-protection, responding to the uncertainty around ICANN’s role and the role of the
USG in ccTLD sovereignty. Still an advantage of safety in numbers in dealing with the wider world.

Edmon from Afilias – run the .INFO registry and technology provider for .org and other ccTLDs. Not the core target for membership drive, maybe looking for customers but Afilias believes that strong ccTLDs help their business. When ccTLDs do well, gTLDs do better. They grow interrelated. Invest a lot into regional organisations, to try and help this. Also keen on a self-regulated area. Happy to share experience in gTLD management with the ccTLD managers. And also to keep the pulse of the industry and see potential customers.

Don – why aren’t people here? Insufficient funds to pay for the travel? No perception of value? The benefits of membership ought to be clearer.

Debbie – ccTLDs are in the same business but do not compete, so APTLD maximises the possible benefits of this. As the manager of .nz there are not many people domestically who understand the situation. The work Jonathan is doing on the training etc will help APTLD reach out to smaller, new ccTLDs.
Choon Sai – from the telco industry – most NICs are fairly small. The benefit from APTLD meetings is to get the shared information. Each NIC puts different emphasis on different items. The learning in this forum is incredibly valuable: to pool resources and to learn from each other.

Mahiya – a great chance to share experiences.

Donna – ICANN staff – ccNSO policy support – first APTLD meeting. Did a presentation on accountability frameworks, but also a chance to meet the players (is based in Sydney).

Ian – the meetings are useful but we could do more teleconferences or online discussions. Outreach can be hard due to the IANA list not always being accurate or correct. Would like to see APTLD becoming a larger group with better outreach, more members. We could do more on the technical side too.

Keith – won’t repeat others, but InternetNZ’s desire is to engage with APTLD because of operation of .nz ccTLD, but also because of its broader objectives aligned to ISOC principles.
From the ccTLD perspective, the chance to test our policy and practice against peers in the region is very useful for us. There is, after all, no textbook and all are learning as we go.

InternetNZ’s commitment to this broad range of work includes our outreach work in the Pacific. It’s not only there though. APTLD has an outreach programme and the sponsorship programme can help engage people.

Also note APTLD is a resource for all ccTLD managers, it’s not strictly for ICANN engaged ccTLDs. This is a more neutral space for sharing.

One of the biggest challenges is the regionalisation of the Internet – the huge area of APTLD. The time to travel and distance etc in the region makes this interaction difficult.

Don – is outreach on digital divide etc part of the role of APTLD? This may be useful. Should APTLD do good works, or just focus on running excellent ccTLD operations?
Peter – yes, good works, but it’s part of self-interest. If a country falls off the Internet then this is a problem for all. Not to operate in that country but to persuade people to do things better.

**Top 3 Recent Achievements:**

- Appointment of a General Manager
- Surveys – ineligible domain names and training, use of the list to share more information
- WSIS submission
- Membership growth

**Top 3 Priorities for 2006:**

- Address the value proposition of APTLD – why here and what we are doing, to flow on to better outreach.
- Better outreach to members and to prospective members. Cost is one issue but if fantastic value perceived, they would come.
- Some technical training availability or general training, in time for the September meeting.

Jonathan updated the training discussion for Don. There are a range of training events already going on – CENTR, ISOC etc. Peter also noted
internship programme suggestion, to work with Jonathan on this, and noted that Internet Governance is an important issue to stay abreast of.

Other stakeholders to be influenced – UN, ITU, ICANN, local and regional government organisations and governments, other regional ccTLD organisations, other regional Internet organisations…

Next member focus – there may be different drivers in different sub-regions for new members. Emerging newly successful, larger ccTLDs might be a focus for revenue and for whom APTLD may be more relevant.

The meeting broke for morning tea at 10.18am, and reconvened at 10:48am in a more Board-like format.

This session is for building relationships and also for contract-negotiation with the General Manager.

**Membership Targeting**
Peter asked Yumi what she would be doing in the absence of a General Manager:

- Limited budget and resource a factor
- Potential members in the Pacific region and in Asia
- Physical outreach efforts, working with Training committee to increase the value of membership tailored to the needs of each sub-region.
  - Study results of training survey to identify sub-regional needs
  - Visit these sub-regions for outreach

Peter asked which order – do we work out what we want to offer and then go and sell? Or do we identify where we want to recruit? The former seems to be preferred.

So an action point arising is for a questionnaire on what would people like from APTLD be helpful for prospective members to get?

- Information on commercial gains/marketing?
- More…
AP: A questionnaire introducing APTLD and asking prospective members what they would like APTLD to focus on. To be designed by Yumi and the GM, for distribution to all non-member ccTLDs.

Note: start with non-members who responded to the Training Survey.

Don noted that he would do a telephone campaign, to find the right people and ask some questions along the lines of the above.

Back to the offer – what does APTLD do, deliver? For larger ccTLDs – e.g. .NZ – the benefit of sharing information here.

Don – benefits that one might speak of could cluster around stage of development of the relevant ccTLD. .nz appreciates best practice sharing and even with less developed ccTLDs, this can be useful. Another instance is the development for .nz of IDNs, where we will need APTLD input. (Note: IDN’s are a key advantage of APTLD.)

Is this a theme for the next meeting – half a day or a day on IDN issues? Also include the most recent APTLD newsletter? Discussion about how to put this material out.
In terms of members only material – do we want to stay open and visible or focus on private benefit to members? Don’s impression is that the public good is most important. The odd free rider is not a serious problem. It may be appropriate once membership is higher, to protect some information to the benefit of members only. There was an extensive discussion on this.

For associate members – what are the benefits to them?

Edmon’s view – and indicator for success would be attracting non-regional ccTLDs. Peter pushed on whether there are other associate members who might like to join.

Debbie – share multi-national accreditation / mutual recognition of registrars? In NZ it is a factor to be considered.

There was a discussion about the benefits of associate members and who APTLD might most gain from having involved in this status. Registrars are seen as a prospective audience.
Training Projects

Peter reprised yesterday’s discussion for the need for two or three syllabi to be prepared.

Jonathan notes the survey assumed two streams of work – technical and non-technical. There was no open question about what was not included in the survey for coverage. Apart from some very basic technical items which were not felt necessary, there was a desire for training in all areas noted.

It was not obvious as to whether there were any language issues in limiting responses or in the desire for training to be made available. Don noted that in the West, Arabic might be the preferred language.

Peter noted from the survey report that about 30 people would attend. Is this a one-off offer, or would it be ongoing? Jonathan’s feeling is that in such a small population of prospective attendees, at most once a year (or perhaps twice).

Some basic introductory training on the international and regional institutional structure would be felt to be useful in the non-technical
training stream. Peter has given a talk like this in the past and ISPs were particularly interested (in Indonesia).

Peter noted that the meeting in Sri Lanka, besides being for planning and budget setting, could be based on training.

What other items should be in a strategic plan?

Keith noted that it may be better to take a longer term focus for the strategic plan, and then drive the business plan off it. There was support around the table for this and Peter asked what should be included in the strategic plan.

Don noted that including greater interest in Internet issues in member countries may be an area to expand into, but if people don’t want it then that is fine too. Note that it is a matter of sharing experiences, not telling people what to do. Increasing Internet up take is to the benefit of all.

Profile with sibling organisations
Other than a CENTR visit, what can we do with sibling CC organisations?

AFTLD, LACTLD, and CENTR? What steps can be done to improve things?

Ian’s view that the exchange of faces at the other International meetings is enough unless there are particular needs. PDT wondered if joint programmes should be pursued?

Jordan noted his visit to CENTR in October last year, and Debbie noted the need to have some quite clear agreement about the direction of how to move ahead. She said this related to the need for a longer term strategic plan.

Shariya noted that this may not be a top priority, after the establishment of contacts. The focus should be on membership and benefits at the current time.

There was a question as to how CENTR’s benefits could be shared with APTLD members. CENTR’s policy development role in the past has
been noted, and Jordan noted that CENTR are quite careful about sharing information.

The aim would be that APTLD is generating benefits of a level which mean an exchange of value can be of a nature between equals.

Debbie noted that CENTR’s approach is very operational. APTLD seems to be of a view to move in this direction. This would expand the potential range of attendees at APTLD meetings. CENTR does earn money from Associate Members and they wish to protect that value for them.

This session came to an end at 12.07pm with a brief break.

17. **ALAC Presentation – Dr. Xue Hong**

Dr Hong spoke to the assembled members over lunch, and the meeting concluded after her speech at 1.05pm.

Signed as a true and correct record:
Table of Action Points (status at 8 Nov 06)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/06 – include consideration of minutes in meeting agendas</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06 – Update the minutes of the Wellington meeting to show the Kiribati speaker.</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06 – Webpage with a template for APTLD internships, so that people can record their offers and details of what they are best at. Jaeyoun Kim, Secretariat etc to work together</td>
<td>Secretariat, Jaeyoun</td>
<td>Not Done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on this, distinct from the training. (Under the Training WG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Responsible(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/06</td>
<td>Reconvene Extraordinary General Meeting at next meeting to ratify Constitutional changes.</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>A questionnaire introducing APTLD and asking prospective members what they would like APTLD to focus on. To be designed by Yumi and the GM, for distribution to all non-member ccTLDs.</td>
<td>Yumi Ohashi and GM</td>
<td>Not Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06</td>
<td>Complete contract agreement with Don Hollander as new General Manager.</td>
<td>Chair, GM</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>