

### DotAsia Board Community Projects Committee (BCC) Meeting Minutes

<b>Date(s) &amp; Time:</b>	July 16, 2025 (Wed) 13:00 PM – 14:02 PM (HKT)
<b>Location:</b>	DotAsia Zoom Meeting Room: <a href="http://aji.asia/zoomboardcommunity">http://aji.asia/zoomboardcommunity</a>
<b>Attendees:</b>	Maureen HILYARD Rupesh SHRESTHA Akinori MAEMURA Edmon CHUNG  Phyo (DotAsia Team) Amina MEIRASBEK (DotAsia Team)  Apologies: Boyoung KIM Jo-Fan YU

No.	Action Items:	Owner	Remarks
C2025.05.A01	Update the SCP Process and Report (BCC-002/003) to reflect the changes discussed.	Edmon CHUNG & Rebecca CHAN	Completed
C2025.07.A01	Update SCP evaluation process based on discussion.	Edmon CHUNG & DotAsia team	To be circulated before next BCC meeting.

### Discussions:

#### 1. Roll Call

- 1.1. Maureen HILYARD chaired BCC meeting on Jul 16, 2025.
- 1.2. Roll call. Those present for all or part of the meeting are included in the Attendees section.

#### 2. Adoption of Last BCC Meeting Minutes (May 13, 2025)

- 2.1. Draft 1 of BCC meeting minutes on May 13, 2025 was presented.
- 2.2. The BCC meeting minutes May 13, 2025 were adopted.

### **3. SCP Common Pool Concept (BCC-002/003)**

- 3.1. The updated draft for SCP Process (BCC-002) and a Board Paper on the introduction of the Common Pool concept was circulated and presented.
  - 3.1.1. The background and motivations for the Common Pool were explained in detail in the Board Paper, and the key updates, including the introduction of a Common Pool structure itself, the extension of the expiration cycle from 4 to 6 years (3+3), and the clarification on the discretion to partially fund projects were highlighted.
  - 3.1.2. On the consideration of potential risks, the financial implications due to the extended expiration cycle and anticipated increase in fund utilization, were identified. DotAsia team will monitor these risks, their potential impacts and report further to the Board upon implementation.
  - 3.1.3. It was noted that the updated document provides better clarity that reports are available upon request, and that funding proposals for the Common Pool can also be applied through Sponsor Members.
- 3.2. There was a question about whether the DotAsia Foundation should administer the fund like other foundations (e.g., ISOC Foundation or APNIC Foundation), but it was explained that due to the small scale and simpler process of this fund, it is managed administratively within DotAsia without a formal evaluation committee. The final approval of grants is made by the DotAsia Board, which also has the discretion to offer partial funding depending on available resources and proposal merits.
- 3.3. A question was raised on whether final approval of grants recipients will be decided by the Board, and what it means by “circulated to Advisory Council (AC) for considerations.” The background and practice for the AC to consider SCP proposals given that SCP funds were only available through Sponsor Members, whereas the AC is formed by Co-Sponsor Members was explained. It was confirmed that the approval of SCP funds remain with the Board, and agreed that the description on the evaluation process be updated.
- 3.4. A recommendation was made to exclude representatives of Members, for which a particular SCP proposal was submitted through, from the evaluation process for such grant. It was discussed and agreed to incorporate such provision into the document.
- 3.5. The BCC will further discuss a revised draft of the SCP documents with a plan to table it for full Board consideration at the upcoming F2F Board meeting.  
(C2025.07.A01)

### **4. Updated DotAsia Position Paper**

- 4.1. Updated DotAsia Strategic Position & Talking Points was circulated and presented.
- 4.2. The background of the development of the Position Paper was explained. It was highlighted that the document is intended to be dynamic and be updated from time to time. The primary objective is to provide guidance to the team on DotAsia’s position on different issues regarding Internet governance and ICANN policies, with a potential for Board Directors to also reference from.

- 4.3. It was suggested and agreed that the ample time should be allocated for an in-depth discussion of the Position Paper during the next F2F meeting.

**5. AOB**

- 5.1. The draft of a public comment on the Draft Applicant Guidebook (AGB) for the Next Round of New gTLDs was circulated and presented.
- 5.2. It was highlighted that the comment is focused on the Applicant Support Programme (ASP). It was discussed that based on feedback from prospective ASP applicants, the concept of “bid credits” was problematic.