DotAsia Board Community Projects Committee (BCC) Meeting Minutes

Date(s) & Time:        April 25, 2022 (Monday)  
                        13:00 – 14:04 HKT

Location:              DotAsia Zoom Meeting Room: http://aji.asia/zoomboardcommunity

Attendees:

- Kashif ADEEL *
- Edmon CHUNG
- Murad IBRAGIMOV
- Leonid TODOROV
- Ellen STRICKLAND (Chair)
- Freda CHEUNG (DotAsia Team)
- Jennifer CHUNG (DotAsia Team)
- Christine OR (DotAsia Team)

Absents:

- Santanu ACHARYA
- Andi BUDIMANSYAH
- Joel DISINI

* Joined meeting during Discussion Item 3.6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action Items:</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2021.11.A02</td>
<td>Post the SCP report from KISA on DotAsia website.</td>
<td>DotAsia Team</td>
<td>Completed. Refer to Discussion Item 4.12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2022.02.A03</td>
<td>Table the SCP application from THNIC to BFC and AC for discussion at Feb 2022 meetings.</td>
<td>Edmon CHUNG</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2022.02.A04</td>
<td>Report DotAsia's engagement with BT and CN regarding root zone LGR to the Board at Feb Board meeting.</td>
<td>BCC Chair</td>
<td>Deferred to next full Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2022.03.A01</td>
<td>Recommend the Board to confirm the reappointment of Ellen STRICKLAND to be the BCC Chair at Mar Board meeting.</td>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>To be completed in next full Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2022.04.A01</td>
<td>Draft an action plan regarding the correspondence of reserved names to GAC representatives for further discussion.</td>
<td>Edmon CHUNG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2022.04.A02</td>
<td>Circulate the draft 3 of Community Reserved Names Policy to the Board, and make recommendation to the Board for adoption at the next full Board Meeting.</td>
<td>Edmon CHUNG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussions:

1. Roll Call

1.1. Apr BCC meeting was postponed from the scheduled meeting on Apr 19 and reconvened on Apr 25, 2022.

1.2. Ms. Ellen STRICKLAND led the meeting as BCC Chair.

1.3. Roll call. Those present for all or part of the meeting are included in the Attendees section.

2. Approval of Last Board Community Projects Committee Meeting Minutes (Mar 18, 2022)

2.1. Draft 1 of BCC meeting minutes 2022.03.18 and action items were presented.

2.2. BCC meeting minutes 2022.03.18 approved with no objections.

3. Community Reserved Names Policy Updates

3.1. It was reported that the previous draft was put out for public comments from Mar 8 - Apr 8 with an announcement to DotAsia Members, ICANN as well as .ASIA Accredited Registrars. Received comments, along with comments received from BCC, the Board and AC were incorporated into BCC Draft 3.

3.2. It was reported that comments received pertain 3 areas, (a) to include the AC, BCC and perhaps the governance bodies in the processing of the Community Reserved Names, (b) to develop more rigorous and straightforward criteria to avoid abuse, and (c) to include geographical indicators and public sector initiatives to the scope of eligibility in the policy.

3.3. Draft 3 of Community Reserved Names Policy was presented and briefed to BCC for discussion, with major edits highlighted:

3.3.1. Additional note and alignment to include geographic/cultural heritage purposes as considered in scope.

3.3.2. Additional section of Application and Approval Process was added to include circulation of applications to governing bodies of DotAsia (i.e. the Board, BCC and AC) for consideration. The approval process is anticipated to be similar to existing approval process of SCP, where the application would be circulated to AC for comment rather than as an approval process.

3.3.3. Additional section of Minimum Requirement of Assessment Criteria was added.

3.3.4. Clarification footnote added community or corporate social responsibility projects maintained by a for-profit company is acceptable.

3.4. In terms of the next step of adoption process, it is planned to table the draft to the Board for adoption once BCC accepted the draft, thereupon, DotAsia team would proceed to actual implementation.
3.4.1. It is planned to set up a simple web form for application submission, and then make announcement to registrars and interested registrants in utilising the process.

3.4.2. It is also planned to make announcement to DotAsia Members and registrars via social media posts on DotAsia social media pages, however, it is not anticipated to be a feature for marketing.

3.4.3. It was noted that only a small amount of applications are anticipated, including apsig.asia, apng.asia and some of the community initiatives that is clearly supporting the Vision & Mission of DotAsia.

3.5. It was noted that DotAsia reserved a number of domain names for each country/territory based on a list of reserved names provided by GAC representative or the ccTLD representative when .Asia first launched. Such domain names may be activated with the consent from the respective representative.

3.5.1. Concern was raised that dealing with GAC representatives is not enough to protect DotAsia from future challenges which may arise if certain sensitive domains are taken.

3.5.2. .ASIA Reserved Names Policies was presented and briefed to BCC for reference, which had been put in place in 2007. It was explained that there was a submission period of governmental reserved names in the launch phases, where a number of reserved names information were provided by GAC and ccTLD representatives.

3.5.3. If there is a need or a perceived need to let more GAC representative know about .ASIA Reserved Names Policies, it is open to have further discussion as next steps. However, it was highlighted that this should be a different consideration from the Community Reserved Names Policy, which protects actively used .Asia domains from going back to available pool for certain reasons rather than protecting names that are not taken.

3.5.4. It was commented that although effort has been made back in 2007, more governments were on GAC since then and are expected to be more keen to protect their interests of certain community projects or historical sites (e.g., UNESCO sites). Therefore, it was suggested to reach out to GAC representatives to revisit the issue to update the list of reserved names.

3.5.5. It is planned to draft an action plan regarding the correspondence to GAC representatives for further discussion. (C2022.04.A01)

3.6. A follow up question was raised regarding the application process of existing .Asia name that might fall into the .ASIA Community Reserved Names Policy.

3.6.1. It was explained that DotAsia has had a relatively robust set of reserved names and sunrise policies because of the history of DotAsia. The startup policies of .ASIA were well received by the community and continue to be used as a benchmark.

3.6.2. In terms of the implementation, it was noted that the process should be as simple as possible for those who are interested.

3.6.3. It was clarified that the policy is called “Reserved Names” because the reserved names functionality was being used, however, they are not the usual reserved names since eligible domains are names that have been registered and are being actively used.
3.6.4. DotAsia market development team will plan to review existing .Asia domain names that are being used for community purposes, then connect with potential candidates via social media platforms and probably leverage the effort to reach out to them for testimonials that may support further market development for .Asia.

3.7. It was commented that there might be some government bodies who are not aware of the existence of the .Asia domain, and that there could be opportunities to engage with them in promoting .Asia domain as their official communication channels for tourism purposes.

3.8. BCC discussed and agreed to accept Draft 3 of Community Reserved Names Policy and make recommendation to the Board for adoption at the next full Board Meeting. (C2022.04.A02)

4. SCP Updates (.TH Application)

4.1. The SCP application from .TH was reviewed and accepted by BCC and AC in previous meetings, and tabled to BFC at Apr BFC meeting for discussion.

4.2. Comment was raised during previous discussion that some of the items were not detailed enough, clarifications were sought from .TH for a more detailed breakdown on concerned budgeted items and references of how the amounts were calculated.

4.2.1. It was highlighted that the SCP application (BCC-002) itself requests a very simple budget breakdown only, which is based on received comment from the AC to design the application process as simple as possible.

4.2.2. It was noted that there seems to now be a suggestion to update the SCP application form to be more robust in the future.

4.2.3. It was further explained that however, for an application that has already entered into the process, it would be best to remain aligned with the published process.

4.3. Regarding the comment on the supporting quotations, based on the reporting requirements on the BCC-003: DotAsia SCP Report adopted in Jun 2021, receipts and invoices are required to be submitted along with the SCP report, which covers the accountability of the money spent.

4.4. It was proposed to review the SCP process to include a more robust budget requirements for future applications.

4.4.1. It was suggested that for entertainment or hospitality costs, if any, should be reflected in the proposal with supporting quotations and price comparisons for future SCP applications for better accountability and transparency among recipients.

4.4.2. It was commented that requesting quotations for sensitive or costly items would be sufficient instead of quotations for every details.

4.5. DotAsia team will continue work with .TH to make sure they understand the reporting requirement on expenses with receipts and invoices, especially for those hospitality items.
4.6. BCC discussed and agreed to continue support the SCP application of .TH for Board acceptance.

4.7. It was reported that the setup of SCP Funds webpages on DotAsia website was completed, which includes a list of previous SCP programs and information of individual SCP programs.

4.8. It is planned to enhance the webpage with more background on the projects and include DotAsia’s Member Engagement work as the next step. Further updates will be provided to BCC when available.

5. Community Project Updates (APrIGF, Eco-Internet Index & .KIDS)

5.1. APrIGF 2022 Updates

5.1.1. It was reported that APrIGF 2022 is confirmed to be held in hybrid mode in Singapore in early Sep 2022, which will be co-located with APSIG and APNIC 54 for the first time.

5.1.2. It was also reported that call for session proposals and local hubs are out. Fellowship program will be joint with APSIG with a unified application process and costs shared between APrIGF and APSIG.

5.1.3. Preparatory work on having F2F Board Meeting in Singapore in conjunction with APrIGF has commenced, updates will be provided to the Board for further discussion.

5.2. EcoInternet Index Updates

5.2.1. It was reported that the final report has been published and the website (https://ecointernet.asia) is live. There are two animated videos for the outcomes of the report featuring Ajitora.

5.2.2. It is planned to expand the research this year with the support from our funder HBS to more countries and territories in the APAC region in the coming year to have a more meaningful comparison. It is also planned to connect with government officials and private sectors to introduce the index to present the findings and involve them in the discussion.

5.2.3. It was reported that APNIC Foundation, who initially started the proposal with DotAsia, has recommended to apply for their funding as well for the continuation of the EcoInternet project.

5.3. .KIDS Updates

5.3.1. It was reported that .KIDS has been officially delegated to the Root Zone on Apr 4, 2022.

5.3.2. The launch schedule of .KIDS proceeds as presented to the BCC previously and progress will be further discussed at the next BCC meeting.

5.4. IGF Updates

5.4.1. IGF Expert Group Meeting was held in New York from Mar 30 to 1 Apr, 2022 where Jennifer participated as a selected participant representing Asia Pacific. Discussions included improvements of the IGF, structure of the leadership panel and the MAG, and placing more emphasis on the national and regional initiatives (NRI i.e. the APrIGF) as feeders into the
global discussions as well as leveraging the NRI network for public consultation input for the Global Digital Compact.

5.4.2. The Expert Group Meeting also discussed the sustainability of the IGF in terms of funding, and raising the profile of IGF in terms of outputs and intersessional outputs at relevant decision making bodies.

6. **Next Meeting Schedule**

6.1. Based on the Doodle poll and the May AC meeting schedule, it was discussed and proposed to set the next BCC meeting on May 20, 2022. Meeting confirmation to be sent to BCC.