

APNIC EC Meeting Minutes

Teleconference

Friday 1 December 2000

Meeting Start: 11:10 a.m

Minutes

Present:

Geoff Huston
Akinori Maemura
Xing Li
Tommi Chen
Che-Hoo Cheng
Kuo Wei Wu
Paul Wilson
Anne Lord
Kyoko Day
Gerard Ross (minutes)

Agenda:

1. Agenda bashing
2. Finances
3. ICANN contracts
4. ICANN ad hoc group
5. Status of the Address Council
6. APNIC policy changes from last meeting
7. APNIC policy making
8. Review of member contribution and vote counts by Country
9. Proposal for a whole day EC meeting during APRICOT
10. APRICOT/incorporation and APNIC
11. Other business
12. Next meeting

1. Agenda bashing

no amendments

2. Finances

KD explained the current financial statement.

In response to a question about the ICANN payment, it was explained that this is not payable until the contract has been finalised, which is unlikely to be in 2000.

Opinions were sought from the EC as to the level of the surplus and how it should be used.

There was a discussion about the possibility of making a one-off rebate to members. It was suggested, however, that such a rebate may send the wrong signal to the membership.

As an alternative to the rebate, it was suggested that APNIC could establish and staff a unit with a focus on research and development. It was suggested that such a unit could prepare recommendations on addressing policy. In response to a discussion about earlier discussions on this, PW explained that developing this concept is an action item for 2001.

There was a comment, however, that APNIC should be careful to avoid overstaffing.

It was decided that this issue should be discussed further by email before the next meeting.

3. ICANN Contracts

PW summarised the progress ARIN has made on their new draft of the ICANN contract. He suggested that Frode Greisen had pre-empted the process somewhat by sending to ICANN his own redraft and that this may cause confusion about the versions being discussed.

PW explained that the main changes in the current ARIN draft are (1) that this draft refers to a specific version of the MoU; and (2) that rather than have three separate contracts, this is intended to be a single contract signed by all the RIRs at same time.

PW explained that the second point was at the suggestion of Ray Pzlak. He also noted that all other changes are along the lines suggested during the meeting with Lloyd Parker at the Brisbane meeting.

It was discussed that a common contract is good in principle but it will require unanimity rather than consensus among the RIRs. There was discussion about what the effect of a future divergence of RIR opinion would have on the contract. PW suggested that if this occurred the agreement could be split into three separate contracts.

It was decided that the EC should review the contract and refer it back to the other RIRs for joint presentation to ICANN.

4. ICANN Ad Hoc Group

PW explained the unsatisfactory circumstances surrounding the recent ICANN decision to extend the term of the Ad Hoc Group until March.

There was an expression of strong disappointment in this decision and a recommendation that action be taken to address this decision.

It was agreed to make a reconsideration request to ICANN, stating that their decision had not been made in open and transparent way, that the Ad Hoc Group had outlived its charter, and that there should be no further extensions of the term beyond March 2001. It was also agreed that the other RIRs and the AC should be asked to consider similar action.

5. Status of the Address Council

A concern was expressed that the AC is getting too far into core RIR business and this may not be appropriate. It was suggested that the true role of the AC should be as a conduit between the RIRs and ICANN.

PW suggested that the AC is indeed trying to define its role and that perhaps it should have had stronger direction from the RIRs in its early stages. He also noted that there is no move within the AC to overturn the structure set out in the procedural flow chart.

There was a discussion about the level of ICANN and At Large Membership input into the policy process and that this needs to be balanced by an appropriate level of input from the RIRs.

It was suggested that the review of the MoU is also relevant to this issue.

It was agreed to hold this item over for now and GH will prepare a proposal to be discussed at the next meeting.

6. APNIC policy changes from last meeting

It was reported that there are no specific policy changes arising from the recent meeting in Brisbane. It was suggested that this may be due to the lack of clarity in the policy making process.

7. APNIC policy making

It was discussed that with some proposals at the Brisbane meeting there had been good support during discussions but strong objections raised from the floor prevented consensus from being reached.

It was explained that in Seoul, proposals were put to the meeting and objections were called for, and that at that meeting several policy changes were accepted.

It was discussed that the current process for making decisions is unclear and too slow.

There was a discussion of the need to be more selective about what is put forward at SIGs.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would prepare a flow chart and description of the policy making process so that the issue can be discussed in more detail at the next EC meeting.

8. Review of member contribution and vote counts by Country

The breakdown of member contributions, voting rights, and participation in meetings was discussed. The discrepancy between financial contributions and voting rights was discussed. It was noted that the reality of the situation is not as bad as it seems on paper, due to the level of participation at meetings by the larger members.

Concern was expressed about the low membership turnout at APNIC meetings.

There was a discussion of possible changes that could be made, namely (1) establishing a new voting category for non-resource-holders or (2) allowing additional votes for extra large members.

It was suggested that the preferable option would be to establish the non-resource membership category as this would extend the potential level of participation by the community, especially in countries where NIRs are present. It was noted that this has been favourably discussed in the past.

There was a suggestion that a proposal should be prepared for the next Member Meeting for a non-resource membership category.

It was also agreed that the EC members need to discuss this topic further on the mail list.

9. Proposal for a whole day EC meeting during APRICOT

It was agreed to hold a full day EC meeting on Monday 26 February, in parallel with APNG meeting.

10. APRICOT/incorporation and APNIC

TC reported on the progress towards incorporation for APRICOT. He explained that this raises an expectation that APNIC will offer to assist. He explained that the anticipated assistance would relate to location or office facilities.

PW explained that in principle APNIC would be happy to host an APRICOT staff member, although there could be logistical difficulties in terms of sponsoring the person for a visa to work in Australia.

It was discussed that although APRICOT has not made a specific request, it would be appropriate for APNIC to make an offer.

It was agreed that TC will advise APRICOT of APNIC's offer to host a staff member in the APNIC office.

11. Other business

KD reported on the request from Don Heath for APNIC to commit to ISOC as a Platinum-Level Supporter.

It was explained that the required contribution would be US\$50,000, but that APNIC could determine the area to which the money would be applied. In APNIC's case it would be directed to support Internet standards.

PW reported that RIPE NCC had no hesitation in joining the Platinum-Level Program on these terms.

It was discussed that the Platinum Level program involves detailed recognition of the support on the ISOC web site and entitles the supporter to carry ISOC sponsorship badges on its web site.

It was agreed that APNIC should proceed to become a Platinum-Level supporter of ISOC.

12. Next Meeting

Friday 19 January 2001

KD was asked to prepare a budget in time for the meeting.

Meeting closed: 12:20.