

23/04/2026

Matthew Enger

via email

Dear Matthew,

**RE: Voter participation aggregate data**

Thank you for contacting the APNIC Executive Council regarding the issue of EC election voter participation data. We appreciate your patience as we considered your request.

The EC has discussed your suggestion at length, and is supportive of initiatives that encourage Member participation in APNIC activities. This includes EC elections, which is a key governance responsibility of all APNIC Members, and indicative of Member engagement at APNIC.

While it is possible that awareness of voter participation data could potentially support more active Member participation in the election process, the aim of transparency needs to be balanced against the sanctity (i.e. the preservation of anonymity) of each EC ballot. In this regard, we have strong concerns about the potential consequences of reporting this data.

For example, if data was available that showed votes by Member size and economy, it may make it possible to infer the vote of a specific Member in an economy. This is particularly an issue in smaller economies with fewer large Members.

The EC had also considered broadening this out to a sub-regional level rather than by economy. However, this did not assuage concerns on anonymity, and providing data at this macro level weakens any potential benefit towards encouraging voter participation.

A second issue in seeking this data relates to the role of the Secretariat.

A fundamental tenet of APNIC's elections is that each election is facilitated by the Secretariat in an impartial manner. The Secretariat does not have access to data on which Member voted for which candidate; they can only see the total votes, which is published to the community. The Secretariat does have access to whether a Member has voted (but, importantly, not who they voted for) to be able to handle troubleshooting enquiries from Members (i.e. whether the system has recorded them as having voted). The Secretariat does not conduct analysis on this data to determine votes by economy, for the same reason noted above – that it may make it possible to infer the vote of a specific Member in an economy.

Permitting granular analysis of voter data could be perceived as weakening the Secretariat's impartiality in relation to EC elections. The integrity of our election processes is of the greatest importance and must be above reproach, as even a perception of partiality or bias could have severe consequences for confidence in APNIC's elections.

Releasing the raw data to a third party to perform this analysis would unnecessarily increase costs and introduces confidentiality and other data risks, while also not addressing the risk of inferring votes by Members.

For the above reasons, the EC concludes that maintaining election integrity is paramount and we are unable to proceed with your suggestion.

The EC remains supportive of encouraging greater voter participation, and we applaud your interest in helping improve participation. Voter turnout is a collective issue that the membership needs to work on together, in addition to the efforts made by the Secretariat in encouraging participation.

Perhaps as part of the community discussions aimed at improving EC candidate diversity, ways to encourage greater voter participation could also be considered. We would welcome your inputs in those discussions when the Secretariat announces the consultation details.

Thank you again for contacting the APNIC EC. This letter will be published on the EC Correspondence page on apnic.net for transparency.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kenny Huang". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Kenny Huang  
APNIC Executive Council Chair  
On behalf of the APNIC Executive Council