

# **APNIC Survey 2001** Members' Report

researched and compiled by



December 2001

# **Table of Contents**

1.	Background	1
2.	Methodology	2
2.1	Members and Stakeholders	2
2.2	Confidentiality	3
2.3	Translation	3
2.4	Meetings	3
2.5	Mailing List and Related Problems	4
2.6	Efforts to Maximise Participation	4
Table 1	Additional Contact Efforts (by ISO – 3166 Country Code)	5
2.7	Type of Input to the Study	6
2.8	Members' Report	6
3.	Response Range and Sources	7
Table 2	Respondents by ISO-3166 Country Code	7
4.	Response Analysis Guidelines	9
5.	Member Response Analysis	.10
6.	<b>Comparison of Key Country Response</b>	
	with all Member Responses	
6.1	Korea .kr – Important Issues	
6.2	Japan .jp – Important Issues	18
6.3	India .in – Important Issues	19
6.4	Mainland of China .cn – Important Issues	19
7.	Analysis of AP Stakeholder Responses	21
8.	Analysis of Responses from	
	Stakeholders outside the AP Region	23

# 1. Background

In March 1999, KPMG Consulting in collaboration with Dr Tan Tin Wee of the National University of Singapore, carried out a survey of APNIC members. The prime focus of the survey was the identification of future needs as seen by APNIC members. The information gathered in the survey ensured that APNIC – as a member focussed organisation – was able to develop its strategic plan with the right emphasis.

The 1999 survey produced 50+ responses from members spread across 10 economies in the Asia Pacific region. It also received a number of responses from outside the Asia Pacific region. These were from individuals who expressed a constructive interest in APNIC's successful development.

A copy of the report prepared by KPMG Consulting, together with the subsequent commentary prepared by APNIC staff, is available from the APNIC web site.

In the two years since the 1999 survey, APNIC has grown significantly. Staff numbers have more than trebled. APNIC has not only expanded its service offering within its own region but members, Executive Council and staff have made a substantial and constructive contribution to global Internet development and governance.

In the light of this rapid expansion and the changing global scene, the Executive Council of APNIC decided that it was appropriate to carry out a further survey of members.

KPMG Consulting were commissioned to carry out this survey working once again with Dr Tan Tin Wee from the National University of Singapore.

# 2. Methodology

In developing the methodology for the survey, every effort was made to benefit from the experience gained in 1999.

The survey instrument followed a similar format but was enhanced by a section which sought comment on specific issues. It was developed with the assistance of the Director General and endorsed by the Executive Council before being implemented.

In accordance with APNIC's very open communication policy all the explanatory material, the survey response forms, the field visit programs etc. are available on the APNIC website. In the interests of brevity, they are not duplicated here – but a few aspects are worthy of comment.

#### 2.1 Members and Stakeholders

APNIC is a member owned organisation but other people and entities can be viewed as stakeholders who have a constructive interest in APNIC's successful operation. A range of the different stakeholder categories is set out in the APNIC website documentation.

In the previous survey, the comments volunteered by all other stakeholders had been seen to be of value. Accordingly, for the current survey, a separate form was developed for "Other Stakeholders". This was similar to the members' response form inviting their views on specific issues – but excluding, as not relevant, questions about APNIC services which they actually received.

In the subsequent analysis, responses from "Other Stakeholders" have been separated into

- "Other Stakeholders within the Asia Pacific Region"; and
- "Other Stakeholders outside the Asia Pacific Region".

This has allowed the identification of some differing views from inside and outside the region. For some issues Members and Stakeholders within the region have differing views when compared with Stakeholders outside the region. These are examined later in this report.

#### 2.2 Confidentiality

As in the previous survey KPMG Consulting gave an assurance of confidentiality of the source of response. In discussion and by email, many respondents and potential respondents sought confirmation of this assurance.

#### 2.3 Translation

As an outcome of the previous survey it was indicated that KPMG Consulting would receive responses in any AP language. This option was welcomed by many who availed themselves of this opportunity and commented favourably on its availability.

In addition, the process was greatly facilitated by a number of economies making translations of the response forms available on their web site and hard copies available for their meetings.

KPMG Consulting would also like to express their appreciation to those people who provided excellent translations at meetings. All of these were of a very high standard and did a great deal to encourage the smooth interchange of ideas.

#### 2.4 Meetings

A series of emails were sent to members inviting them to participate in the survey and to attend meetings which would allow them to discuss the issues involved before submitting their response.

It had been hoped that the average attendance at these meetings would be 10 - 12. Several were scheduled for each day at locations where meetings were held.

The targeted number was only achieved in some cases. In practice, the number attending ranged between 3 and 6 people.

While these numbers were initially seen as disappointing, the smaller numbers allowed much more in-depth discussion and debate on the issues. Given the wide range of geographic locations and the total number of individuals involved this, in practice, appears to be an effective way to gather representative, in-depth qualitative information. Examination of the subsequent responses showed that well over 80 percent of respondents had participated in some type of face-to-face discussion with a member of the consulting team. In addition, these responses contained a much greater degree of detail.

Meetings were held in Beijing, Sydney, <mark>Mel</mark>bourne, Mumbai, New Delhi, Singapore, Taipei, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Manila, and Seoul. In addition to these meetings for members, visits were also paid, in certain instances, to Government Departments and other relevant entities. In all cases such visits were undertaken in conjunction with the EC member or staff members of the NIR in the country concerned.

KPMG Consulting would like to acknowledge the considerable assistance given to country visits by members of the EC, their local colleagues, members of their staff, and staff of NIRs. In economies without such a formal structure the assistance and cooperation of leaders in the Internet industry and their staff was invaluable.

On a personal note – the hospitality and friendship received made a most interesting activity a very enjoyable one.

In addition to meetings within the region, visits were made to important stakeholders such as ICANN, RIPE NCC, ARIN and others. In all cases a high degree of assistance was provided with a constructive comment and input to the survey.

#### 2.5 Mailing List and Related Problems

Face to face consultations were organised with Australian APNIC members as part of the overall program of consultation visits to a range of AP cities. Each email address was mailed at least twice and a program of phone calls attempted to maximise contact coverage. In carrying out this program, it was established that 48 out of the 125 members listed had contact details which were out of date or in error. Australian members had one of the lowest attendance levels despite these efforts.

After the consultation meetings, a further program of email and direct phone contact was made to Australian members to encourage participation and survey response. Despite KPMG Consulting contacting each Australian member or member contact record, the response rate was disappointing. KPMG Consulting have recorded amendments to the APNIC lists where possible and this will be separately provided to APNIC.

Similar problems occurred in arranging the consultations which took place in India where the contact arrangements were made directly by KPMG Consulting. The meeting locations in India were arranged by Chirag Unadkat who was most helpful. His assistance is greatly appreciated.

From the experiences with the Australian and Indian lists it is possible that APNIC lists for other economies are also out of date to some extent.

#### 2.6 Efforts to Maximise Participation

In addition to using APNIC lists to contact members, APNIC mailing lists were used to contact a range of "other stakeholder" respondents. These

included Internet organisations, educators, associations and individuals throughout the Internet world.

Additionally Dr Tan Tin Wee and others provided a range of relevant contacts covering inter-country associations and other relevant sources as set out in the following Table 1.

TABLE 1Additional Contact Efforts by ISO - 3166 Country Code							
Countries	Country Code	Emails	Faxes	ΤΟΤΑΙ			
AUSTRALIA	au	7	1	8			
BRUNEI	bn	1	-	1			
CANADA	са	1	-	1			
COOK ISLANDS	ck	4	-	4			
FIJI	fj	3	-	3			
HONG KONG	hk	4	-	4			
INDIA	in	4	-	4			
INDONESIA	id	5	3	8			
JAPAN	jр	6	4	10			
KOREA	kr	7	1	8			
MACAU	mo	2	-	2			
MALAYSIA	my	3	1	4			
MALDIVES	mv	1	-	1			
MICRONESIA	fm	1	-	1			
NEPAL	np	1	-	1			
NIUE	nu	-	1	1			
PAKISTAN	pk	1	1	2			
PALAU	pw	1	*(1)	1			
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	Pg	1	-	1			
PHILIPPINES	ph	4	-	4			
SINGAPORE	sg	10	-	10			
SRI LANKA	lk	1	1	2			
THAILAND	th	13	-	13			
USA	us	1	-	1			
ASIA-PACIFIC ORGANISATIONS	"ap"	-	1	1			

() faxed same organisation as emailed due to unsuccessful email attempt

#### 2.7 Type of Input to the Study

There were three types of input to the study.

- ① Where the response came directly to the consultants in English.
- (2) Where the response came to the consultants in another language and was translated into English.
- ③ Where an individual made verbal comments which were noted by the consultants and referred back to the individual who confirmed that these could be taken as their response.

#### 2.8 Members' Report

At the request of the EC, this special report for Members has been drafted. This has removed a considerable amount of detail allowing for much easier reading.

The EC has also determined that members who are interested in the detail may request a copyof the full "Working Report" from the APNIC Director General.

# 3. Response Range and Sources

In alphabetical order, the economies of respondents were:

TABLE 2Respondents by ISO - 3166 Country Code							
Countries	Country Code	Number of Respondents					
AUSTRALIA	au	9					
CAMBODIA	kh	1					
CANADA	са	1					
CHINA	cn	40					
FRANCE	fr	1					
HONG KONG	hk	8					
INDIA	in	14					
INDONESIA	id	4					
JAPAN	jр	29					
KOREA	kr	25					
MALAYSIA	my	1					
NEPAL	np	1					
NETHERLANDS	nl	2					
NEW ZEALAND	nz	2					
NORWAY	no	1					
PHILLIPINES	ph	2					
SINGAPORE	sg	2					
SRI LANKA	lk	2					
TAIWAN	tw	2					
THAILAND	th	7					
UK	gb	3					
USA	us	16					



Economies visited for discussions and meetings have a very much higher level of response. However, in general, they are also the economies with the largest numbers of members.

Over 80 percent of responses, which also contained greater detail, came from those who had attended a meeting or had an individual interview.

As this is a qualitative survey, open in participation but protected in source, the aim has been to encourage response but allow some flexibility in manner and format.

As described earlier, members could be emailed a note of their individual meeting with the consultants and either embody this in their formal response or request that the material in the note be taken as their response.

In addition, members of country NIRs who were not members of APNIC were free to make responses to their NIR, who then submitted a response on behalf of their members. In some cases, APNIC members contributed to their NIR and also made a submission directly to the consultants.

As this is not a qualitative study, such participation demonstrates a constructive interest which should be encouraged.

# 4. Response Analysis Guidelines

For the purpose of analysis, responses have been divided into three categories:

- Members;
- Stakeholders within the Asia Pacific;
- Stakeholders outside the Asia Pacific.

Of the total responses, approximately 150 were from address users – either individual or in groups. Each group response appeared to represent the view of several end users. Many individual responses came from large users. For these reasons the views expressed represent a significant proportion of AP address holders.

Within the "Member" category, a subsidiary analysis was undertaken of economies which had greater than 10 responses. These included:

- Mainland of CHINA .cn;
- INDIA .in;
- JAPAN .jp;
- KOREA .kr.

There were no differences of opinion between any of these economies and the total body of member response as to what should be done or what should not be done. However priorities varied in certain economies and these have been set out later in this report.

The analysis attempts to strike a balance between summarising the data as briefly as possible and providing sufficient quoted material to give a realistic picture of the weight and thrust of respondents' views.

Section A of the survey contained questions to identify the respondent to the consultants. This information is excluded from the analysis.

Section B of the survey sought information on APNIC services and Section C sought information/views on a number of specific issues. As non-members do not actually receive APNIC services their comments in this section are, accordingly, limited.

Respondents were invited to raise other issues which they considered important and many availed themselves of this opportunity. These have been grouped under a number of separate headings. In creating separate headings the opportunity has been taken to extract and group topics of significant response which can be logically grouped such as IPv6.

# 5. Member Response Analysis

This section analyses the full set of responses from members. It also makes a comparison of country responses for economies which have greater than ten responses, against the full set of member responses.

#### **B** Survey Questions

#### **Question** 1

### Please describe the services that you currently receive as a member of APNIC, in their order of importance to you.

Many members divided services into:

- Resources Services;
- Training Services;
- Technical Consultation Services (which APNIC does not formally offer);
- APNIC meetings.

Within **Resources Services** over 95 percent of respondents listed "IP Address Allocation" as the most important service.

There was then a second level which received relatively equal ranking. These were:

- Reverse DNS delegation;
- Autonomous Number assignment;
- Routing and Whois database;
- Second opinion requests.

Within **Training Services** there was a very high level of demand for growth in number, location and extension of content. This is clearly an important and valued service to many members and is perhaps better considered in the context of the later specific Issue on Training and Education.

**Technical Consultation Services** were identified by a relatively small number – but it should be born in mind that many members may see this as part of another service – and not a service in its own right.

A range of other items were listed as "Services". Easily the largest, with a significant number of responses, were APNIC meetings which were seen as essential and very valuable.

Other topics, which received significant mention in varying forms of words, were:

- Linkage to the Internet community;
- Information on global and AP issues from a reliable source;
- "Agent service" for IP address allocation;
- Policy Issues Information;
- Forum for examination of social issues concerning the Internet.

#### **Question 2**

### Please comment on whether the current services you receive meet your needs in terms of timeliness, quality or any other aspect.

The majority of members are satisfied with the services they receive. However, a number of important issues were raised and these are presented by an extensive range of examples in the working version of the report. These should be seen as an indicative sample of a very much larger number of responses.

A number of respondents proposed that APNIC should adopt a system of ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT. This would ensure a more consistent focus on the needs of individual members.

At one meeting, one person was critical. While his name cannot be mentioned by KPMG Consulting, the APNIC EC Chairman was present for part of the time this person commented so the Chair can advise the EC in regard to the circumstances and the comments which were made.

#### **Question 3**

#### Please describe in priority order, any services which you need, which should be provided by APNIC in future. Please indicate whether you would be prepared to pay increased membership fees in order to receive these services.

A number of new services or the enhancement of existing services were suggested.

These included:

- the provision of more user friendly databases;
- the provision of a consultancy service;
- advice on virus protection;
- routing registration service;
- monthly APNIC statistical information on address and its member allocation by member;
- provision of case study examples of good applications and address management;

- more information on IPv6 (this is addressed later as a separate item);
- a range of enquiry windows;
- development of home pages in other AP languages.

There was some support for additional fees but this was predominantly for a "fee for service" basis – not an increase in membership fees.

#### **Question** 4

# As a member, what do you consider to be the most appropriate ways for APNIC to encourage and receive input from the APNIC community?

Suggestions included:

- the need for APNIC to be seen as an authority on technical and policy issues;
- creation of a web based user forum;
- more outreach;
- special interest groups;
- a communication journal;
- open mailing lists;
- conducting regular surveys;
- develop a member credibility assessment structure;
- enlarge the EC membership;
- more meetings with APNIC leaders;
- strengthen working arrangements with NIRs;
- have simultaneous interpretation at meetings;
- more visits to economies without NIRs.

#### **Question** 5

APNIC is a body of members which makes its decisions on the basis of consensus, with open and transparent consultation. What are your views on the manner in which the organisation should make (and be seen to make) decisions in appropriate ways – but at the same time quickly enough to stay relevant?

This was seen as a challenging issue – but members have a very positive view of APNIC's democratic processes.

Suggestions included:

- requirements for members to attend at least one APNIC policy meeting each year;
- introducing a committee structure similar to Olympics or International sporting bodies;
- requiring modifications to proposals to be treated as new proposals;
- extending the duration of policy meetings and / or increasing their frequency.

#### Question 6

#### For APNIC to more effectively carry out its responsibilities in the Asia Pacific region, what do you feel is your role as a member of APNIC?

Encouragingly, most respondents did see that membership of APNIC was a two-way responsibility. The main responsibilities mentioned were:

- an obligation to participate;
- an obligation to obey APNIC rules;
- cooperating in local training;
- paying fees in time;
- providing feedback;
- sending staff to be trained.

#### Issue A

# Should APNIC seek ISO quality certification for any of the services it provides. If so, for which ones?

Those in favour very significantly outweighed those against and there were a small number who were unsure.

However, support was qualified by the need to ensure:

- value for any money and effort invested;
- emphasis on specific service quality and not a blanket approach;
- more investigation of the costs, workload and benefits before commitment.

As one respondent stated "the true value is not in certification but the benefit to services gained from certification."

#### Issue B

#### Has APNIC a role to play in proactively supporting geographic diversity? If so, in what effective ways can it play this role?

There was wide-ranging, strong support for APNIC to play a proactive role in this area of activity. In meetings, there was not only strong support, but considerable emphasis that the Asia Pacific RIR operated in a very different environment to other RIRs.

Within an overall regional policy there was very strong demand for a diversity program which took account of individual country needs. It is expected that APNIC will operate as the initiator, catalyst, driver, coordinator of information in the development of an innovative program to meet regional needs.

#### Issue C

#### How widely, and in what ways, should APNIC support Internet development in the AP region, including the provision of specific technical and other services?

APNIC was seen as an increasingly successful and influential body. Because of its success and stability, it is increasingly seen as "the provider of choice" where new needs are identified, existing needs are met or other providers lack resources or stability.

Balancing the maintenance of its quality core services while undertaking SOME service expansion will be a major challenge for APNIC.

Once again, some of the topics raised under the heading of this issue overlap other issues and questions contained in this survey.

Suggestions include:

- encouraging QoS between members, promoting peering and settlement arrangements;
- promoting web based services such as training and conferencing;
- providing a consulting service;
- acting as a regional information coordinator;
- increasing NIC autonomy;
- introducing special programs for developing regions;
- applying for special grant funding;
- introducing a "reserved allocation" policy for very large ISPs;
- involving and informing governments.

#### Issue D

It appears to KPMG Consulting that the successful training programs provided by APNIC are in part, at least, occasioned by the fact that ISP members often have no option but to recruit staff from training and educational programs which are not up to date e.g. still teaching classful addressing or not including IPv6. How should APNIC address this

### issue so that its resources can be channelled more effectively? By discussion with governments? By discussion with tertiary institutions?

APNIC training is highly valued. There was a universal demand for more training courses, training at more locations and a wider curriculum. The initial question posed by KPMG Consulting was driven by what appeared to be, the lack of currency of content in other training courses for ISP staff. While this was endorsed by respondents, the issues of range and demand appear to be equally, if not more, important to members.

This also highlights the general point that as a stable, competent service provider, APNIC becomes the "provider of choice" when members have new or growing needs. While the question of updating the curriculum or other education and training entities remains, there is a much bigger challenge. What is the most effective way for APNIC to ensure that members' training needs are met to an acceptable quality standard – without APNIC being the prime provider at a massive and unsustainable cost?

Respondents made a range of suggestions:

- provision of content to existing training providers;
- expanding APNIC membership to include academic / teaching staff;
- collaboration with vendors, telcos, ISPs and research organisations;
- links to commercial organisations who have teaching / training budgets;
- APNIC having a testing / certifying role for students;
- APNIC having a role in developing competency standards and certifying courses;
- involving governments as sponsors and providers of funding either directly to APNIC or to students participating;
- consideration by APNIC of a range of possible models such as the one CISCO adopts to train CCNA, CCNP and CCIE;
- APNIC train-the-trainer programs;
- use of the Internet itself;
- APNIC to develop material such as CDs on training issues;
- establishment of a separate, not-for-profit training foundation.

It would appear that this is an area of great importance to members. APNIC needs to undertake a separate investigation as to the most effective way to meet needs without creating an unsustainable drain on its resources.

#### Issue E

Many organisations start for technical reasons – and these will continue to be important. However there is increasing interest by Governments in all aspects of Internet policy and operation. To protect the long term interest of its members KPMG Consulting would believe that APNIC should adopt a pro-active and constructive role with government and other bodies in policy development. Do you agree with this view? If so, can you suggest which departments and organisations APNIC should liaise with? What policy issues do you believe to be important?

There was a high level of support for the establishment of regular, constructive relationships with governments. Within this overall support, the following points were made.

- ① The relationship should be one of collaboration for the constructive benefit of the community without any surrender of authority. As one respondent put it, "do not give government a say in the running of APNIC."
- (2) There is an important role for APNIC to play in collaborating with NIRs to jointly ensure that global and regional policy is maintained but that country issues are accommodated whenever possible.
- ③ APNIC has a planning and co-ordination role across the region which could benefit governments; accordingly governments could contribute to costs of data collection for planning and forecasting purposes.

While these were the views of members it was pleasing to note that governments gave an equally positive response. This augurs well for constructive and meaningful future relationships.

#### **Other Issues**

Members and stakeholders raised issues which fell outside those raised in the survey pro forma or issues of particular importance e.g. IPv6. These are listed below.

#### **AP Region Administration Issues**

These included:

- requests for local APNIC offices;
- the need for an arbitration committee in case of address space conflicts;
- the need for an independent avenue of appeal such as an ombudsman.

#### Strategy and Policy Issues

These included:

- the issue of a membership category for linked or affiliated entities;
- the need for an Internet growth forecasting program;
- requests for more "outreach".

#### **Exchange** Points

The need for APNIC to take an active role in AP exchange point development. The importance of AP exchange points was consistently raised by many AP economies.

#### Address Ownership, Allocation and Administration

The growing need to regulate use, misuse and cost of address space. This topic was also of concern to respondents in the "other stakeholder" category. APNIC should have a greater role in administration and management rather than only allocation.

#### Potential problems or opportunities

These covered:

- peering services;
- the growth of video multicasting;
- AS number digit growth and recycling;
- detection of unused address blocks;
- database transparency.

#### IPv6 Related Issues

These focussed on the importance and growth of IPv6 and the need for APNIC to have a high profile, constructive and proactive role. The growth of IPv6 was seen as an important issue in many economies. The view was expressed that APNIC should have a bipolar approach which gave strong support to IPv6 development – but at the same time continuing a high level of commitment to IPv4.

#### Issues Not Otherwise Covered

These included:

- the form and conduct of APNIC meetings;
- attracting more experienced members to APNIC meetings and AP Internet roles;
- other sources of revenue;
- questions as to how India is represented in the APNIC world.

### 6. Comparison of key country responses with all member responses

Certain economies had greater than ten responses. These were:

- KOREA .kr;
- JAPAN .jp;
- INDIA .in;
- Mainland of CHINA .cn.

All these economies supported the majority viewpoint on each. However, each saw particular issues to be of greater importance to their particular country.

#### 6.1 Korea .kr – Important Issues

Is particularly keen on APNIC adopting an Account Manager approach with appropriate back-up. In addition, wished to be advised as to which staff member they were dealing with – not simply be a ticket.

See the rapid development and introduction of IPv6 as an issue which is growing in importance. This would require APNIC to have

- good, speedy, explicit procedures;
- strong customer service orientation.

Believe that the NIR model is the most constructive way for APNIC to work within the region.

Support cooperative approach with governments. Stressed that this should be by regular collaboration between APNIC, who should know and distribute information on different economies, and the NIR, to fully take into account the fact that "Each country has different policy and technical necessity".

#### 6.2 Japan .jp – Important Issues

Has the greatest number of concerns in regard to problems with automatic responses from APNIC.

Within the region, this country is the leading and most proactive user of IPv6. For this reason, they flag issues such as the need to eliminate allocation database overlaps which involve additional work and delays, and potential errors.

Believe that NIRs form a particularly important role in the AP regional structure both as a consolidator of country views and playing an important

role in the address allocation process. Believe that economies with NIRs are actively supporting geographic diversity already.

Are strong supporters of ISO – provided it is clearly focussed on quality improvement in ESSENTIAL service areas.

Are keen on combined action to develop unified training programs which should look at APNIC / NIR collaboration for delivery on a country by country basis in appropriate language.

See APNIC / NIR collaboration with each government to be important – but on a cooperative basis without surrender of autonomy.

#### 6.3 India .in – Important Issues

See training as an important need on a very large scale.

Believe that regular, proactive interaction between APNIC / members and government is very important to share views, share information and foster constructive strategic planning – "but do not give governments a say in running APNIC."

Believe IETF should look after technical innovation and allow APNIC to be "an authentic, non-biased source of information and training which coordinates strategic planning in the APNIC region."

Believe strategic planning is important and believe that there is a role for APNIC in coordinating 2 – 5 year growth projections by:

- Individual economies;
- RIRs;
- Globally.

While acknowledging growth of IPv6 believe that India needs a sound IPv4 allocation process for several years and would like to be assured that APNIC will ensure that a high level of support for IPv4 remains in place.

#### 6.4 Mainland of China .cn – Important Issues

Are concerned that very large ISPs with multiple offices are treated as separate memberships. Apart from inconsistencies in decision making and variations in amount of addresses etc., this involves multiple applications and dealing with several different APNIC staff members.

Believe that large organisations with many provincial subsidiaries, which use new technology in mobile communications, will need a special membership structure and a different process for speedy and effective allocation of large address volumes. See Government acting as a very positive driver of the Internet and telecommunications expansion. This creates a whole range of service delivery challenges in infrastructure development, address allocation and rationalisation, education and training. Organisations are keen to take up these challenges and do not believe that APNIC really understands or is speedily responsive to their needs.

Are extremely positive about the need for APNIC to have a geographic diversity policy which takes account of the circumstances / needs of each country.

Has members and government who are particularly aware and supportive of the need for innovative solutions to the issue of training.

Are proponents of APNIC having a reserved allocation policy which simplifies problems with address allocation and allows rapidly expanding organisations to progressively draw down contiguous addresses.

# 7. Analysis of AP stakeholder responses

In Section B Survey Questions, AP stakeholders principally answered Questions 1 and 4 while covered comments on services and effective ways for APNIC to receive Internet community input.

The main points were:

- APNIC is well regarded for its services;
- continual efforts should be made to streamline and automate services;
- more APNIC training;
- the need to ensure that any legislation was "enlightened".

#### **Responses in Section C**

#### Issue A

# Should APNIC seek ISO quality certification for any of the services which it provides? If so, for which ones?

Stakeholders in the AP were evenly balanced. They saw it largely as a question of whether the benefits justified the cost.

#### Issue B

#### Has APNIC a role to play in proactively supporting geographic diversity? If so, in what effective ways can it play this role?

Geographic diversity was seen as important by all respondents – with a key role for APNIC.

#### Issue C

#### How widely, and in what ways, should APNIC support "Internet Development" in the AP region, including the provision of specific technical and other services?

APNIC was seen by AP stakeholders to have a key role in "Internet Development".

Areas where examples were provided were in extending training and the provision of technical consultation.

#### Issue D

It appears to KPMG Consulting that the successful training programs provided by APNIC are in part, at least, occasioned by the fact that ISP members often have no option but to recruit staff from training and educational programs which are not up to date e.g. still teaching classful addressing or not including IPv6. How should APNIC address this issue so that its resources can be channelled more effectively? By discussion with governments? By discussion with tertiary institutions?

There was strong support for APNIC having a proactive role in training. This was seen to be most effective as an instigator, coordinator or catalyst working with governments, educational establishments and other educational providers such as commercial organisations. Similar examples were given to those contained in the section on responses from members.

#### Issue E

Many organisations start for technical reasons – and these will continue to be important. However there is increasing interest by Governments in all aspects of Internet policy and operation. To protect the long term interest of its members KPMG Consulting would believe that APNIC should adopt a pro-active and constructive role with government and other bodies in policy development. Do you agree with this view? If so, can you suggest which departments and organisations APNIC should liaise with? What policy issues do you believe to be important?

Liaison with governments was supported positively. This included responses from governments themselves stressing the need for collaboration on such issues as policy review, technical standards and the rapidly growing need for training.

#### **Other Issues**

AP stakeholders raised a range of other topics. These covered similar issues to those raised by members, which were:

- AP Region Administration Issues;
- Differences Between APNIC and Other RIRs;
- Strategy and Policy Issues;
- Exchange Points;
- Process and Opportunities;
- IPv6 Related Issues.

### 8. Analysis of responses from stakeholders outside the AP region

In Section B Survey Questions, respondents principally answered Questions 1 and 4.

They indicated support from outside the AP region for APNIC's role in ensuring good internet management.

#### **Responses in Section C**

#### Issue A

# Should APNIC seek ISO quality certification for any of the services which it provides? If so, for which ones?

While members and other stakeholders WITHIN the AP region were supportive of ISO certification, the other stakeholders OUTSIDE the AP region tended to have negative views. They pointed out that documentation did not, of itself, improve services and that there was potential for wasting both time and money.

#### Issue B

#### Has APNIC a role to play in proactively supporting geographic diversity? If so, in what effective ways can it play this role?

APNIC was seen to have an important role to play – but respondents generally saw that how this was done was a matter for those in the AP region.

#### Issue C

#### How widely, and in what ways, should APNIC support "Internet Development" in the AP region, including the provision of specific technical and other services?

Most respondents believed that APNIC had a key role to play, especially in collaborating and supporting AP\* and APRICOT activities.

#### Issue D

It appears to KPMG Consulting that the successful training programs provided by APNIC are in part, at least, occasioned by the fact that ISP members often have no option but to recruit staff from training and educational programs which are not up to date. Eg still teaching classful addressing or not including IPv6. How should APNIC address this issue

### so that its resources can be channelled more effectively? By discussion with governments? By discussion with tertiary institutions?

Respondents who knew of APNIC's training expressed positive comments. They believed that APNIC should act as a catalyst and promoter through entities like the CISCO Network Academy rather than shouldering a potentially massive direct service provision role.

#### Issue E

Many organisations start for technical reasons – and these will continue to be important. However there is increasing interest by Governments in all aspects of Internet policy and operation. To protect the long term interest of its members KPMG Consulting would believe that APNIC should adopt a pro-active and constructive role with government and other bodies in policy development. Do you agree with this view? If so, can you suggest which departments and organisations APNIC should liaise with? What policy issues do you believe to be important?

There were constructive suggestions as to how government could be targeted both as a funding source and to ensure that it was better informed. However, unlike from within AP members, there was a reluctance to see APNIC having anything to do with government. Where there could be interaction it should not be with the surrender of any authority.

#### **Other Issues**

Stakeholders outside the AP region raised a range of other issues. Again these have been categorised under the same headings used in the analysis of member responses.

The main areas covered are:

- Judging RIR Performance and between RIR Collaboration;
- Differences Between APNIC and Other RIRs;
- Strategy and Policy Issues;
- Exchange Points;
- Address ownership, allocation and administration;
- Potential problem or opportunities;
- Pv6 Related Issues.