

APNIC EC Meeting Minutes

Novotel Hotel, Brisbane, Australia
24 October 2000

Meeting Start: 13:45

Minutes

Present:

Tommi Chen
Che-Hoo Cheng
Geoff Huston
Xing Li
Kuo-Wei Wu
Kyoko Day
Paul Wilson
Anne Lord
Paul Gampe
Lloyd Parker

Apologies:

Kazunori Konishi
Oh Kwang Sok

Agenda:

1. Preparation for Open Policy Meeting
 - Review APNIC status report
 - Review of SIG policy papers
 - APNIC Policy development process
 - Meeting financial analysis
2. Financial Reports
 - Latest financial reports
 - Budget status
 - APNIC investments
3. ICANN issues
 - RIR-ICANN - contract
4. Confederation issues
 - Special NIR meetings
 - ISP confederation issues
5. Other
 - Next member meeting - APRICOT 2001
 - October 2001 member meeting - call for proposals

1. Preparation for Open Policy Meeting

PW previewed the APNIC status report due to be presented at Member Meeting.

The lack of response to call for ASO AC nominees was discussed, and a suggestion was made that APNIC should be sure to provide additional announcements before close of nominations.

Future locations for APNIC meetings were discussed. It was noted that several calls for proposals were made for this meeting, but no viable response was received, and so Brisbane was selected.

In future, another "fall-back" location could be selected, such as Singapore, in case no proposal is received or accepted. It was suggested that in this case, where member support is not available, APNIC should use an event management company in the host country to assist with conference.

It was noted that RIPE NCC meetings are regularly held in Amsterdam, and it was agreed that if no proposals are received, then Brisbane could also be selected as a fallback location. It was agreed that due to travel times involved, Brisbane would be used at most once in every two years.

PW presented a summary of the papers being presented at the Address Policy SIG.

Criteria for First Allocation: Currently no formal criteria exist. RIPE-NCC provide /19 to all members irrespectively, while ARIN has strict criteria.

It is proposed APNIC develop a specific set of criteria including: that the candidate is or will be multi-homed; and that they have used or can utilise a /22 immediately, and /21 by end of year. Noted that ARIN criteria do not include multi-homing.

PW reviewed the APNIC Policy (decision-making) process, and requested EC comment.

It was suggested that APNIC may need to move to a RIPE style of policy development at some time in future, allowing SIGs or Working Groups more autonomy to make policy changes. However APNIC membership would still require final review for any policies that directly affect them.

It was noted that the APNIC by-laws include reference to online voting, and it was noted that the CA project is the predecessor to secure online voting.

It was noted that previously a policy proposal on confederations was rejected because some members felt they did not have time to review all the relevant material. So voting on new proposals at meetings will always be problematic without procedural clarifications. It was noted that a balance has to be struck between the opportunity to review the material and to avoid decision paralysis.

Discussion ensued about history of consensus decision-making on certain issues within APNIC meetings. It was agreed that if general consensus is achieved in a meeting, then it should be considered a formal decision of the membership; if not, then the decision is deferred for further development.

It was noted that confederations introduce complexity in this process, due to additional structural layer they introduce, and delays in propagating decisions through NIR memberships.

APNIC bylaws were discussed, and it was noted that they do not require pre-announcement of the voting issues. Only the mode of voting must be announced in advance. However it was noted that the membership would not (and should not be expected to) ratify proposals without prior warning. It was also noted that all policy papers for this meeting have been published well in advance on the APNIC web site.

It was agreed that the EC continue the discussion on the decision process in the future.

It was agreed in conclusion that the current model of SIG discussions and member meeting summary and voting is an adequate compromise between timely decisions and meaningful participation.

KD presented a financial analysis of this Open Policy Meeting, and an estimate that the total cost of meeting in Brisbane may be around \$40,000. Meetings outside of Australia are likely to be more expensive.

PW noted that sponsorships were sought to subsidise the meeting, but do not cover all costs. He asked for EC guidance as to reasonable level of net costs for the APNIC Meetings.

It was agreed that the current budget seems entirely reasonable and a good basis for future meetings. A total net cost of up to \$50,000 is acceptable, taking into account sponsorship and registration fee income (but this should be reduced as much as reasonably possible through sponsorships).

2. Financial Reports

KD presented the quarterly financial report, and updated budget for 2000.

Brief discussion ensued about a number of line items, but no major concerns were raised.

KD presented the APNIC investments summary.

GH (APNIC Treasurer) explained the investment portfolio, and the diversification of funds into various investment forms, currencies and market sectors.

3. ICANN issues

PW summarised the state of the RIR-ICANN contract and introduced Lloyd Parker to the Executive Council.

LP presented a summary of the background of the current contract. Several versions have been in circulation. Originally ARIN drafted the first contract. APNIC then started from scratch again with a goal to produce a clear English document. ARIN accepted the new APNIC version. ICANN rejected the APNIC version as too legalistic. APNIC/Freehills have prepared a summary of the amendments from RIPE-NCC and APNIC.

LP: The general purpose of the contract is twofold. Firstly to explain some of the terms and conditions of the relationship. Second purpose is to clarify the funding relationship

LP: First major issue is a heavy reliance on the ASO MoU within the contract. With an MoU there are a number of legal concerns. Under some legal systems, for instance, an MoU is a very general document and may not be legally enforceable.

LP: The first issue the EC needs to consider is whether they are happy with the MoU. Freehills have not reviewed the MoU, but the EC may choose to request the secretariat to have it reviewed.

Agreed that reference from the contract to the MoU is an acceptable structure. Also, although the MoU may need some changes, modifying it at this stage may be problematic, because substantial changes may involve protracted negotiations.

It was noted that the MoU achieves a number of useful objectives of the RIRs. Specifically the MoU prevents ICANN from inventing new addressing policies without the ASO.

LP: If we move forward with two documents, then we will need more thorough legal analysis of the MoU. For example, we need to evaluate whether ICANN will unilaterally modify the MoU and what is the scope of the relationship agreement to be? Specifically, is it just funding?

It was agreed that the contract should cover funding and service only, and that the MoU should cover policy processes.

MoU clause 4(b) was noted as being in conflict with the current ICANN contract.

LP noted that the proposed "Authorised status" of an RIR under the ICANN contract gave ICANN considerable freedom in determining who was authorised or not, and withdrawing authorisation unilaterally.

PW noted that in APNIC's latest redraft that the term "Authorised" was replaced with "Recognised" and that the RIRs receive recognition not just from ICANN, but from their communities also.

LP stressed that the clarification that APNIC's authority/recognition comes from its members', support is very important. For consistency, the MoU should also include reference to the recognition of its signatories by their communities/memberships.

LP noted that the agreement talks about affirming the MoU process. The ICANN version was internally inconsistent favouring ICANN. The newly revised (APNIC) version resolves the

inconsistency. That is both ICANN and the RIRs must have their recommendations accepted by the ASO and ICANN before it may become a global addressing policy. Specifically section 3.3(a) and 3.3(b).

It was agreed finally that APNIC should redraft the document as APNIC's current position, for review by RIRs (including ARIN in their upcoming re-evaluation of the contract).

4. Confederation issues

PW summarised the agenda of the NIR meeting to be held later that day, and also the agenda of the proposed "Special" NIR meeting.

Discussion ensued about whether the secretariat should attend, or withdraw from the meeting to allow an unbiased review of NIR recommendations with the membership at the member meeting. It was suggested that attendance by APNIC Secretariat would not be appropriate if specific proposals are to be developed in this meeting.

Discussion ensued about existing NIRs and relationships with ISPs who are direct members of APNIC. Some NIRs are working well with ISPs who are direct APNIC members and have no specific concerns. A likely issue is whether NIRs have enough votes to ensure that they have adequate representation, for instance in an EC election.

PW described a new model being trialled where APNIC makes allocations directly to member ISPs of one NIR, where the ISPs are large and consuming address space rapidly. It was agreed that this direction should be followed if possible, for better management and aggregation of address space.

Discussion followed of the history of the funding relationship with NIRs, specifically the earlier per member fee, which some NIRs objected to, and the eventual development of the per allocation fee (which has not been reviewed in several years).

It was noted that the majority of small members never attend APNIC meetings and never vote, so in practical terms the large members have a larger influence on policy than many people realise. With attempts to change the voting structure, there may be a large change in voting patterns which would not favour large members.

5. Other

No time remaining for this item.

Meeting closed: 17:35